

CHAPTER 2—ALTERNATIVES

2.1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter describes the Proposed RMP that was crafted primarily from the Preferred Alternative in the Draft Resource Management Plan/Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DRMP/DEIS) (Alternative B) as well as from other decisions within the range of alternatives presented in the DRMP/DEIS, including the No Action Alternative N and Alternatives A, C, and D. The No Action Alternative N and Alternatives A, C, and D are repeated from the DRMP/DEIS into the Proposed Resource Management Plan/Final Environmental Impact Statement (PRMP/FEIS) for comparative purposes and to correct minor deficiencies pointed during the DRMP/DEIS public comment period and from internal review. The changes from the Preferred Alternative (Alternative B in the Draft RMP/EIS) to the Proposed RMP have been highlighted gray.

Evaluation of a reasonable range of alternatives is required by National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) regulations (40 Code of Federal Regulations [CFR] Part 1502.14), as well as by BLM planning regulations. As required in the CEQ regulations, the reasonable range must include a “no action” alternative (CEQ 1981, Question 3.A), which is the continuation of current management under the *Mountain Valley Management Framework Plan (MFP)* (1982), the *Henry Mountain MFP* (1982), the *Parker Mountain MFP* (1982), the *Cedar-Beaver-Garfield-Antimony Resource Management Plan (RMP)* (1986), the *Forest MFP* (1977), and the *San Rafael RMP* (1991), as well as subsequent plan amendments.

The BLM recognizes that social, economic, and environmental issues cross land ownership lines and that extensive cooperation is needed to actively address issues of mutual concern. To the extent possible, these alternatives were crafted using input from public scoping comments and cooperating agencies.

Once the alternatives were developed, the BLM analyzed them to predict their impacts on the environment. Based on the impacts analysis of these alternatives, along with knowledge of specific issues raised throughout the planning process, input from cooperating agencies and BLM resource specialists, consideration of planning criteria, and potential resolution of resource conflicts, the BLM has identified the Proposed RMP. Each alternative provides a different emphasis for managing public lands and resources within the planning area, and each alternative represents a complete and reasonable RMP that: 1) meets the purpose and need described in Chapter 1; 2) responds to environmental, operational, and economic concerns raised by the public, agencies, business, and other special interest groups during the scoping process; and 3) addresses potential environmental issues identified during review of the proposed management actions.

2.2 ALTERNATIVE COMPONENTS

The alternatives and the Proposed RMP described in this chapter represent varying approaches to addressing and resolving key planning issues (Chapter 1) and to managing resources and resource uses in the planning area. Each comprises two categories of land use planning decisions: (1) desired outcomes (goals and objectives) and (2) allowable uses and management actions that are anticipated to achieve the desired outcomes. These two categories are discussed below.

2.2.1 Desired Outcomes (Goals and Objectives)

Goals and objectives provide overarching direction for BLM actions in meeting the agency's legal, regulatory, policy, and strategic requirements. Goals are broad statements of desired outcome but generally are not measurable. Objectives are more specific statements of a desired outcome that may include a measurable component. In general, the objectives are anticipated to achieve the stated goals.

2.2.2 Allowable Uses and Management Actions

After establishing desired outcomes, the BLM identifies allowable uses (i.e., land use allocations) and management actions for different alternatives that are anticipated to achieve the desired outcomes (i.e., goals and objectives). Alternatives were developed to address planning issues, resolve resource conflicts, improve consistency, and ensure resource-specific decisions for the following categories in the RMP revision process: 1) physical, biological, and cultural resources; 2) resource uses; and 3) special designations.

Allowable uses identify where land uses are allowed, restricted, or prohibited on all BLM-administered surface and federal mineral estate in the planning area. Alternatives may include specific land use restrictions to meet goals and objectives and may exclude certain land uses to protect resource values. For example, alternatives considered for this Proposed RMP close all suitable wild and scenic river segments to oil and gas leasing. Because the alternatives identify whether particular land uses are allowed, restricted, or prohibited, allowable uses often include a spatial (e.g., map) component.

Management actions are those actions anticipated to achieve desired outcomes. These actions include proactive measures (e.g., measures taken to maintain, restore, or improve land health), as well as measures or criteria that would be applied to guide day-to-day activities occurring on public land.

Although anticipated to achieve desired outcomes, the components described above may not be achieved during the planning period because of limitations in funding or staffing, changing policies or priorities, or new information. These factors could also affect the rate of RMP implementation. It is important to note that the RMP is strategic in nature, and, while it provides an overarching vision for managing resources in the planning area, it also allows management flexibility in light of changing priorities, information, and circumstances.

2.3 ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED IN DETAIL

2.3.1 Overview of the Alternatives

The BLM identifies and analyzes the Proposed RMP in the PRMP/FEIS. The BLM does not carry forward the DRMP/DEIS Alternative B (the Preferred Alternative) into the PRMP/FEIS Proposed RMP. Rather the Proposed RMP consists of a combination of all the alternatives, including Alternative B in response to public comments and internal review. While, the Proposed RMP was crafted primarily from Preferred Alternative in the DRMP/DEIS (Alternative B), it is important to note that other decisions within the range of alternatives presented in the DRMP/DEIS, including the No Action Alternative and Alternatives A, C, and D that have been incorporated into the PRMP/FEIS as well. The DRMP/DEIS Alternative B has been removed from the PRMP/FEIS. The BLM only identifies and analyzes the Proposed RMP in the PRMP/FEIS. The other DRMP/DEIS Alternatives N, A, C and D and analysis are just carried forward in the PRMP/FEIS for comparative purposes and to correct some of the mistakes that were identified during the public comment period.

This section summarizes four DRMP/DEIS alternatives and the Proposed RMP. It includes a brief description of each plus a comparative summary of proposed LUP decisions by alternative (Section 2.6).

2.3.1.1 Alternative N (No Action Alternative)

Alternative N represents the continuation of current management under the existing six LUPs, as amended. The existing LUPs are the *Mountain Valley MFP* (1982), the *Henry Mountain MFP* (1982), the *Parker Mountain MFP* (1982), the *Cedar-Beaver-Garfield-Antimony RMP* (1986), the *Forest MFP* (1977), and the *San Rafael RMP* (1991). Alternative N provides the baseline against which to compare the other alternatives. It includes existing Areas of Critical Environmental Concern (ACEC) (four areas totaling 14,780 acres) and eligible wild and scenic river segments (WSR) (12 segments totaling 135 miles). None of the eligible segments would be found suitable for congressional designation to the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System. Alternative N is the least restrictive to off-highway vehicle (OHV) use.

2.3.1.2 Alternative A

Alternative A emphasizes commodity production, and mineral extraction—mining, oil and gas leasing, grazing, commercial recreation, and commercial woodland products harvesting—and motorized recreation. Compared with all other alternatives, Alternative A conserves the least land area for physical, biological, and cultural resources and proposes the least special designations (no suitable WSR segments; no ACECs).

2.3.1.3 Proposed RMP

The Proposed RMP has been identified by BLM because it represents an attempt to balance protection/conservation of physical, biological, and cultural resources while providing for commodity production and mineral extraction. The Proposed RMP designates ACECs (two areas totaling 2,530 acres) recommends a WSR segment (5 miles), and manages non-Wilderness Study Area (WSA) lands for wilderness characteristics (78,600 acres).

2.3.1.4 Alternative C

Alternative C emphasizes conservation of physical, biological, and cultural resources over commodity production, mineral extraction, and motorized recreation access. Alternative C (along with Alternative D) designates the most ACECs (16 areas totaling 886,810 acres) and recommends the most eligible WSR segments (12 segments totaling 135 miles) as suitable for congressional designation to the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System.

2.3.1.5 Alternative D

Alternative D emphasizes conservation of physical, biological, and cultural resources over commodity production, mineral extraction, and motorized recreation access. Compared with all alternatives, Alternative D conserves the most land area for physical, biological, and cultural resources; (along with Alternative C) designates the most ACECs (16 areas totaling 886,810 acres) and recommends the most eligible WSR segments (12 segments totaling 135 miles) as suitable for congressional designation to the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System; and emphasizes management of non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics (682,600 acres), in order to protect, preserve, and maintain their wilderness characteristics. Except for management of lands with wilderness characteristics, decisions under Alternative D are the same as under Alternative C.

2.4 ADAPTIVE MANAGEMENT

Adaptive management is a formal, systematic, and rigorous approach to learning from the results of management actions, accommodating change, and improving management. It involves synthesizing existing knowledge, exploring alternative actions, and making explicit forecasts about their results. Management actions and monitoring programs are carefully designed to generate reliable feedback and clarify the reasons underlying results. Actions and objectives are then adjusted based on this feedback and improved understanding to continue to try to achieve the desired outcomes. In addition, decisions, actions, and results are carefully documented and communicated to others so that knowledge gained through experience is passed on rather than lost when individuals move or leave the organization.

LUP-level decisions would not be immediately adaptable. These include the goals and objectives, allowable uses, management actions, and special designations. Plan amendments would be required to change these decisions. Implementation- or activity-level decisions could be subject to adaptive management. Future activity-level plans would follow NEPA procedures and involve the public.

This PRMP/FEIS recommends an adaptive management strategy. The adaptive management process is flexible and generally involves four phases: planning, implementation, monitoring, and evaluation. As the BLM obtains new information, it is able to evaluate monitoring data and other resource information to periodically refine and update desired outcomes (goals and objectives), management actions, and allowable uses. This allows continual refinement and improvement of management prescriptions and practices.

2.5 ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED BUT ELIMINATED FROM DETAILED ANALYSIS

This section provides a summary of two alternatives the BLM considered but eliminated from detailed analysis, as well as the reasons for not analyzing them in detail.

2.5.1 No Grazing Alternative

An alternative that proposes to make the entire RFO unavailable for grazing would not meet the purpose and need of this PRMP/FEIS. NEPA requires that agencies study, develop, and describe appropriate alternatives to recommended courses of action in any proposal that involves unresolved conflicts concerning alternative uses of available resources. No issues or conflicts have been identified during this land use planning effort that require the complete elimination of grazing within the planning area for their resolution. Where appropriate, removal of livestock and adjustments to livestock use have been incorporated in this planning effort. Because the BLM has considerable discretion through its grazing regulations to determine and adjust stocking levels, seasons-of-use, and grazing management activities, and to allocate forage to uses of the public lands in RMPs, the analysis of an alternative to entirely eliminate grazing is not needed.

An alternative that proposes to make the entire planning area unavailable for grazing would also be inconsistent with the intent of the Taylor Grazing Act, which directs the BLM to provide for livestock use of BLM lands; to adequately safeguard grazing privileges; to provide for the orderly use, improvement, and development of the range; and to stabilize the livestock industry dependent upon the public range.

FLPMA requires that public lands be managed on a “multiple use and sustained yield basis” (FLPMA 43 United States Code [U.S.C.] Section 302 (43 U.S.C. 1732)(a) and Section 102 (43 U.S.C. 1701)(7)) and includes livestock grazing as a principal or major use of public lands. While multiple use does not require

that all lands be used for livestock grazing, complete removal of livestock grazing in the entire planning area would be arbitrary and would not meet the principle of multiple use and sustained yield.

Livestock grazing is and has been an important use of the public lands in the planning area for many years and is a continuing government program. The CEQ guidelines for compliance with NEPA require that agencies analyze the “No Action Alternative” in all EISs (40 CFR 1502.14(d)). For the purposes of this NEPA analysis, the “no action alternative” is to continue the status quo, which includes livestock grazing. For this reason and those stated above, the RFO dismissed a no grazing alternative for the entire planning area from further consideration in this PRMP/F EIS.

2.5.2 No Leasing Alternative

During scoping and/or the comment period for the DRMP/DEIS, it was suggested that the BLM should address a “No-Leasing Alternative” because the “No-Leasing Alternative” is the equivalent of the “No Action Alternative” that must be analyzed in all EISs.

The “No-Leasing Alternative” in an RMP revision is actually an action alternative because where lands have already been leased, the no-action for NEPA purposes continues to allow for (honor) valid existing rights. Proposing a “No-Leasing Alternative” would require revisiting existing leases and either buying them back from the lessee or allowing them to expire on their own terms. The first option (buying back), is outside the scope of any RMP. This is a political decision that the BLM has no authority to undertake in planning. As a result, the BLM does not regularly include a “No-Leasing Alternative.”

The purpose and need for the LUP is to identify and resolve potential conflicts between competing resource uses rather than to eliminate a principal use of the public lands in the RFO. Leasing the public lands for oil and gas exploration and production is required by the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920, as amended, and the BLM’s current policy is to apply the least restrictive management constraints to the principal uses of the public lands necessary to achieve resource goals and objectives. A field office-wide “No-Leasing Alternative” would be an unnecessarily restrictive alternative for mineral exploration and production on the public lands.

NEPA (Section 102 (E)) requires that agencies “study, develop, and describe appropriate alternatives to recommended courses of action in any proposal that involves unresolved conflicts concerning alternative uses of available resources.” No issues or conflicts have been identified during this land use planning effort that require the complete elimination of oil and gas leasing within the planning area for their resolution. The BLM’s Land Use Planning Handbook (BLM Manual Rel. 1-1693), Appendix C, item H, requires that LUPs identify areas as open or unavailable for leasing.

Given the potential range of decisions available in the DRMP/DEIS, the analyzed alternatives include no leasing for certain areas; but a field office-wide “No-Leasing Alternative” is not necessary to resolve issues and protect other resource values and uses.

As mentioned above, a “No-Leasing Alternative” should not be confused with the “No Action Alternative” for purposes of NEPA compliance. Leasing and No Leasing on the public lands has previously been analyzed in several NEPA documents. In 1973, the Department of the Interior (USDI) published the *Final Environmental Impact Statement on the Federal Upland Oil and Gas Leasing Program* (USDI, 1973). The proposed action was to lease federal lands for production of oil and natural gas resources. Alternatives included the No Action Alternative, which at initiation of the program was “No Leasing.” To supplement that EIS, the BLM prepared a series of Environmental Assessments (then titled Environmental Analysis Records or EARs) including the *Richfield Oil and Gas Program Environmental Analysis Record (EAR)*, 1975–76, which addressed oil and gas leasing for the public lands

in the RFO area. Alternatives again included the No Action or “No Leasing” alternative. The outcome was a category system for leasing that categorized all public and United States Forest Service (USFS) lands into four groups: 1) open to leasing with standard lease stipulations, 2) Special Stipulations to address special concerns, 3) NSO and 4) No Leasing. Since completion of the EAR in 1975–76, oil and gas leasing in the RFO has been an ongoing federal program under the established categories.

The CEQ (Section 1502.14(d) of NEPA) requires the alternatives analysis in an EIS to “include the alternative of no action” but explains that there are two distinct interpretations of “no action” that must be considered, depending on the nature of the proposal being evaluated. “The first situation might involve an action such as updating a land management plan where ongoing programs initiated under existing legislation and regulations will continue, even as new plans are developed. In these cases ‘no action’ is ‘no change’ from current management direction or level of management intensity. To construct an alternative that is based on no management at all would be a useless academic exercise. Therefore, the ‘no action’ alternative may be thought of in terms of continuing with the present course of action until that action is changed.” (CEQ Forty Most Asked Questions, Question 3). Therefore, for the RFO DRMP/EIS, the “No-Action Alternative” is to continue the status quo, which is to lease under the oil and gas stipulations (formerly categories) established in the *Mountain Valley MFP* (1982), the *Henry Mountain MFP* (1982), the *Parker Mountain MFP* (1982), the *Cedar-Beaver-Garfield-Antimony RMP* (1986), the *Forest MFP* (1977), and the *San Rafael RMP* (1991), as well as subsequent plan amendments.

2.5.3 Livestock Grazing Adjustments Alternative

During scoping and comment on the DRMP/EIS, it was suggested that the BLM consider adjustments to livestock numbers, livestock management practices, and the kind of livestock grazed on allotments within the RFO to benefit wildlife and protect and promote land health, including soils, hydrologic cycles, and biotic integrity.

BLM policy regarding adjustments to the levels of livestock use authorized is to monitor and inventory range conditions under existing stocking levels and make adjustments to livestock use as indicated by this data to help assure that the Utah Standards for Rangeland Health and resource objectives are met. 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” (Standards for Rangeland Health) and further, that “livestock grazing use shall not exceed the livestock carrying capacity of the allotment.” It would be inappropriate and unfeasible to estimate and allocate the available forage, design specific management practices, and determine if changes to the kind of livestock are necessary for each allotment in the RFO or in the area as a whole in the RMP/EIS. Such changes would not be supportable considering the type and amount of data required and the analysis necessary to make such changes.

According to BLM policy, decisions regarding authorized livestock use levels and the terms and conditions under which they are managed is an implementation decision (H-1610-1, Appendix C, Page 15). BLM range condition according to the Utah Standards for Rangeland Health conducts monitoring and inventories, and evaluates this data on a periodic basis, normally on an allotment and/or watershed basis. After NEPA analysis, necessary changes to livestock management and implementation of Utah’s Guidelines for Rangeland Management are implemented through a proposed decision in accordance with 43 CFR 4160. These decisions determine the exact levels of use by livestock in conformance with the LUP and to meet resource objectives and maintain or enhancing land health. For these reasons the Livestock Grazing Adjustments alternative has been dismissed from further consideration in this LUP revision.

2.5.4 SUWA Alternative

In November 2003, the Southern Utah Wilderness Alliance (SUWA) submitted to the BLM an outline and map for an RMP alternative. It divided the lands managed by the RFO into management zones and provided brief prescriptions for managing each zone. While it provided an outline for management, it fell short of a fully developed alternative because it did not address and attempt to resolve the issues raised during scoping nor the multiple laws, regulations, and policies that BLM must consider in developing an RMP. Consequently, the SUWA Alternative does not meet the purpose and need for this plan revision, and it is largely inconsistent with the FLPMA's multiple use sustained yield mandate. For these reasons, the RFO dismissed the SUWA Alternative from further consideration in this PRMP/FEIS. However, elements of it are included in Alternatives C and D.

2.6 PROPOSED RMP AND DRAFT RMP ALTERNATIVES DECISION TABLES

The following tables present the details of the proposed management for each resource, resource use, and special designation for the Proposed RMP and DRMP/DEIS Alternatives.

2.6.1 Natural, Biological, and Cultural Resources

Air Quality

Table 2-1. Air Quality

Desired Outcomes (Goals and Objectives)	
Issue: Management of Air Quality	Management Actions
Common to the Proposed RMP and Draft RMP Alternatives	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure authorizations and management activities comply with local, state, and federal air quality regulations, requirements, and implementation plans. • Manage all BLM and BLM-authorized activities to maintain air quality within the thresholds established by the NAAQS and ensure that those activities continue to keep the area in attainment, meet PSD Class II standards, and protect the Class I airsheds. • Manage BLM and BLM-authorized activities to comply with the Utah Enhanced Smoke Management Plan, August 11, 2003, and the Utah State Law R307-204 Emission Standards: Smoke Management, August 1, 2007. • Minimize the impact of management actions in the planning area on air quality by complying with all applicable air quality laws, rules and regulations. • Maintain concentrations of criteria pollutants associated with management actions in compliance with applicable State and Federal Ambient Air Quality Standards (AAQS). • Maintain concentrations of Prevention of Significant Deterioration (PSD) pollutants associated with management actions in compliance with the applicable increment. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mitigate potential adverse impacts of site-specific actions identified in NEPA documents prepared at the time an action is proposed, through best available control technology as part of the state permitting process and PSD review. • BLM will continue to work cooperatively with state, federal, and tribal entities in developing air quality assessment protocols to address cumulative impacts and regional air quality issues. • BLM will continue to work cooperatively with the Utah Airshed Group to manage emissions from wildland and prescribed fire activities. • National Ambient Air Quality Standards are enforced by the Utah Department of Environmental Quality, Division of Air Quality (UDEQ-DAQ), with EPA oversight. Special requirements to reduce potential air quality impacts will be considered on a case-by-case basis in processing land use authorizations. • BLM will utilize BMPs and site specific mitigation measures, when appropriate, based on site specific conditions, to reduce emissions and enhance air quality. Examples of these types of measures can be found in the Four Corners Air Quality Task Force Report of Mitigation Options, November 1, 2007. • Project specific analyses will consider use of quantitative air quality analysis methods (i.e. modeling), when appropriate as determined by BLM, in consultation with state, federal, and tribal entities. • Mitigate actions that compromise ambient air quality standards or visibility within the Class I airsheds.

Soil Resources

Table 2-2. Soil Resources

Desired Outcomes (Goals and Objectives)				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Maintain or improve soil quality and long-term soil productivity through implementation of Standards for Rangeland Health and other soil protection measures. Manage uses to minimize and mitigate damage to soils. Manage soil resources to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Maintain or increase soil productivity Prevent or minimize accelerated soil erosion Prevent or minimize flood and sediment damage, as needed Reduce resource loss from floods and erosion Maintain vegetation cover at or above the level necessary to avoid accelerated soil erosion. 				
Issue: Protection of Soil Resources				
Management Actions	Common to the Proposed RMP and Draft RMP Alternatives	Alternative A	Proposed RMP	Alternative C
Alternative N (No Action)	Not specifically addressed in existing plans.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Implement appropriate BMPs designed to protect water quality for all ground disturbing activities (Appendix 14). Close and reclaim all temporary roads immediately upon completion of the project. Reclaimed roads could be barricaded or signed until reclamation objectives were achieved. Remove facilities or improvements no longer necessary reclaim them, provided no historic properties would be affected. 	Alternative D	

Water Resources

Table 2-3. Water Resources

Desired Outcomes (Goals and Objectives)	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Maintain and/or restore overall watershed health and reduce erosion, stream sedimentation, and salinization of water. Work to improve water quality on listed streams and prevent listing of additional streams under the Clean Water Act, Section 303(d) (Appendix 4). Improve quality and quantity of water in all streams, with particular emphasis on streams with populations of native species, or with non-native game fish, as well as other aquatic species. Maintain and/or restore the chemical, physical, and biological integrity of the planning area's waters. Protect community watersheds and sources of culinary water. Avoid adverse impacts to floodplains. Restore and preserve the natural and beneficial values served by floodplains in carrying out BLM's responsibilities for acquiring, managing, and disposing of federal lands and facilities (Executive Order 11988, Floodplain Management). Manage resources to reduce salinity loading where possible and make progress toward accomplishing the goals and objectives outlined in the Colorado River Salinity Control Act. 	
Common to the Proposed RMP and Draft RMP Alternatives	
Issue: Water Quality and Quantity	Management Actions
Implement appropriate BMPs designed to protect water quality for all ground disturbing activities (Appendix 14).	
Surface water:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Utah DEQ-Division of Water Quality identifies impaired watersheds for which total maximum daily loads (TMDL) must be developed. BLM will continue to cooperate and contribute to both the completion of the TMDL process and implementation of recommendations in the final reports. 	
Recreational water standards:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Maintain or improve water quality and quantity for recreational uses 	
Municipal watershed areas:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Manage culinary water sources to preserve the quality and health of water sources. 	
Public water systems:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Continue to operate and maintain public drinking water systems at BLM facilities to comply with transient non-community water system requirements as defined by State of Utah Administrative Code 309—Water Quality Monitoring Standards. The RFO would continue to gather source samples for laboratory analysis when the water system is operating (seasonal use), including coliform samples quarterly; nitrates yearly, and nitrite/sulfate every 3 years. Identify public water systems with surface water or ground water sources (e.g., delineated drinking water source protection zones) that may be affected by BLM-authorized activities. Ensure that BLM-authorized activities do not pose a threat to public water systems. 	

Issue: Protection of Groundwater				
Management Actions				
Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Proposed RMP	Alternative C	Alternative D
Maintain a 500-foot buffer zone of no surface disturbance and/or occupancy around natural springs unless it can be shown that (1) there are no practical alternatives, or (2) all long-term impacts can be fully mitigated, or (3) the activity will benefit and enhance the riparian area. Base the size of the buffer zone on geohydrological, riparian, and other factors necessary to protect the water quality of the springs. If these factors cannot be determined, maintain a buffer zone of the 100-year floodplain or 330 feet on either side from the centerline, whichever is greater.	Maintain buffer zones of no surface disturbance and/or occupancy around natural springs unless it can be shown that (1) there are no practical alternatives, or (2) all long-term impacts can be fully mitigated, or (3) the activity will benefit and enhance the riparian area. Base the size of the buffer zone on geohydrological, riparian, and other factors necessary to protect the water quality of the springs. If these factors cannot be determined, maintain a 660-foot buffer zone from the outer edge.			

Vegetation

Table 2-4. Vegetation Decisions

Desired Outcomes (Goals and Objectives)				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Manage and mitigate activities to restore, sustain, and enhance the health of plant associations. • Manage all resources and resource uses to achieve the Standards for Rangeland Health. • Enhance and/or restore native and desirable naturalized plant species. • Manage for a mix of vegetative types, structural stages, and landscape and riparian functions, and provide for native plant, fish, and wildlife (including SSS) habitats. • Enhance biological and genetic diversity of natural ecosystems. • Maintain relict vegetation communities. • Sustain or reestablish the integrity of the sagebrush biome to provide the amount, continuity, and quality of habitat that is necessary to maintain sustainable populations of the Greater sage-grouse and other sagebrush-dependent wildlife species. • Manage all riparian areas to maintain, restore, or improve unique habitat characteristics, including diversified plant species composition, plant species structural diversity, and adequate native vegetative cover and density for stream bank stabilization. All riparian areas would be managed to be in properly functioning condition. 				
Issue: Overall Vegetation Management				
Management Actions				
Common to the Proposed RMP and Draft RMP Alternatives				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Treat areas determined to need reseeding with a variety of plant species that are desirable for wildlife habitat, livestock, watershed management, and other resource values while maintaining vegetation species diversity. • Where appropriate, require on-site mitigation when surface disturbance cannot be avoided on a site-specific basis. The BLM will approach compensatory mitigation on an “as appropriate” basis where it can be performed on-site, and on a voluntary basis where it is performed off-site, or, in accordance with current guidance. • Maintain existing vegetative treatments to provide suitable habitats for wildlife and adequate forage for livestock. 				
Issue: Vegetation Treatments				
Management Actions				
Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Proposed RMP	Alternative C	Alternative D
Manipulate vegetation using mechanical, wildland and/or prescribed fire, and chemical treatments on a case-by-case basis to achieve or maintain Standards for	Maintain existing vegetation treatments and implement additional treatments (including prescribed fire and wildland fire use, mechanical, biological, manual, and	Maintain existing vegetation treatments and implement additional treatments (e.g., prescribed fire and wildland fire use, mechanical, biological, manual, and	Allow only natural processes (e.g., prescribed fire and wildland fire use, disease, and insects) to achieve or maintain Standards for Rangeland Health and desired vegetation condition. Vegetation treatments could be conducted on up to 520,000 acres over the life of the plan. (An annual average of 26,000 acres would need to receive treatment to reach the	

Table 2-4. Vegetation Decisions

Rangeland Health and desired vegetation condition.	chemical) to increase productivity for resource uses and achieve or maintain Standards for Rangeland Health and desired vegetation condition. Vegetation treatments (e.g., wildlife habitat treatments, watershed treatments, livestock grazing treatments, fuels treatments, stewardship contracts, etc.) could be conducted on up to 1,472,000 acres over the life of the plan. (An annual average of 73,600 acres would need to receive treatment to reach the total treatment acreage listed (Table 2-11a). Actual annual treatment acreage would vary depending on conditions, staffing, etc. These acreage figures include all vegetation and fire fuel treatments (Table 2-11)).	chemical) to achieve or maintain Standards for Rangeland Health and desired vegetation condition. Vegetation treatments (e.g., wildlife habitat treatments, watershed treatments, livestock grazing treatments, fuels treatments, stewardship contracts, etc.) could be conducted on up to 1,472,000 acres over the life of the plan. (An annual average of 73,600 acres would need to receive treatment to reach the total treatment acreage listed (Table 2-11a). Actual annual treatment acreage would vary depending on conditions, staffing, etc. These acreage figures include all vegetation and fire fuel treatments (Table 2-11)).	total treatment acreage listed (Table 2-11a). Actual annual treatment acreage would vary depending on conditions, staffing, etc. These acreage figures include all vegetation and fire fuel treatments (Table 2-11).
No action.		Allow temporary non-renewable use of targeted grazing to reduce site-specific fuels and/or noxious and invasive weeds (e.g., cheat grass).	No action.
The use and perpetuation of native species would be emphasized. However, when restoring or rehabilitating disturbed or degraded rangelands, non-intrusive, non-native plant species would be considered appropriate for use where	The use and perpetuation of native species would be emphasized. However, when restoring or rehabilitating disturbed or degraded rangelands, non-intrusive, non-native plant species would be considered appropriate for use where	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are not available • Are not economically feasible • Cannot achieve desired conditions, desired plant communities (DPC), or other ecological objectives as well as non-native species, and/or • Cannot compete with already established non-native species. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are not available • Are not economically feasible • Cannot achieve desired conditions, desired plant communities (DPC), or other ecological objectives as well as non-native species, and/or • Cannot compete with already established non-native species.

Table 2-4. Vegetation Decisions

Issue: Management Activities in Riparian Areas			
Management Actions			
Common to the Proposed RMP and Draft RMP Alternatives			
native species (a) are not available, (b) are not economically feasible, (c) cannot achieve ecological objectives as well as nonnative species, and/or (d) cannot compete with already established non-native species.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Allow uses and activities in riparian areas consistent with Utah BLM Riparian Management Policy and in compliance with Executive Orders 11990 and 11988. Allow no new surface disturbing activities within a specified distance of riparian areas (see specific buffer sizes below), as measured from bank-full width along all perennial streams or streams with perennial reach unless the following criteria can be met: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There are no practical alternatives to the surface disturbance; or All long-term impacts could be fully mitigated; or The activity would benefit the riparian area. The Utah BLM Riparian Management Policy identifies that Riparian areas will be retained in the public land system unless it can be clearly demonstrated that specific sites are so small or isolated that they cannot be managed in an effective manner by BLM or through agreement with State or Federal agencies or interested conservation groups. Coordinate riparian management with interested federal, state, tribal and local governments and private conservation groups, etc. 	<p>Proposed RMP</p> <p>The buffer zone would be 330 feet on each side of the stream.</p>	<p>Alternative C</p> <p>The buffer zone would be equal to the 100-year floodplain or 330 feet on either side from the centerline, whichever is greater, and would be included for riparian areas.</p>
Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Proposed RMP	Alternative D
The buffer zone would be 500 feet in the Cedar/Beaver/Garfield/Antimony RMP area, and 330 feet throughout the remainder of the RFO.		The buffer zone would be 660 feet on each side of the stream.	The buffer zone would be 660 feet on each side of the stream.

Table 2-4. Vegetation Decisions

Issue: Management of Noxious Weeds and Invasive Species				
Management Actions				
Common to the Proposed RMP and Draft RMP Alternatives				
Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Proposed RMP	Alternative C	Alternative D
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Implement noxious weed and invasive species control actions as per national guidance and local weed management plans in cooperation with state, federal, affected counties, adjoining private land owners, and other partners or interests directly affected. Adhere to the Standard Operating Procedures and Guidelines for All Treatment Methods from the Biological Opinion from the Vegetation Treatments on BLM lands in 17 Western States Programmatic Environmental Report, 2007. Control invasive and non-native weed species and prevent the introduction of new invasive species by implementing a comprehensive weed program including: coordination with key partners, prevention and early detection, education, inventory and monitoring, and using principles of integrated weed management. 	<p>Apply approved weed control methods to noxious weeds in an identified integrated weed management program (including preventive management and education, as well as mechanical, biological, and chemical techniques). Do so in cooperation with state, federal, affected county governments, adjoining private land owners, and other directly affected interests.</p>	<p>Emphasize natural processes (e.g., wildland and/or prescribed fire, disease, and insects), preventative management and education to reduce the spread of noxious and invasive species. Other methods, including biological and hand cutting, could be used to remove noxious weeds and non-native invasive species to restore ecological condition of a site.</p>		
Issue: Insect Pest Management				
Management Actions				
Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Proposed RMP	Alternative C	Alternative D
Develop and implement strategies in cooperation with the State of Utah, adjacent states, federal agencies, affected counties, adjoining private land owners, and other interests directly affected.	Treat all insect pests in coordination with the State of Utah, adjacent states, federal agencies, affected counties, adjoining private land owners, and other interests directly affected.	Treat insect pests that exceed an economic threshold on public land adjacent to other landowners or that impact resources in coordination with the State of Utah, adjacent states, federal agencies, affected counties, adjoining private land owners, and other directly affected interests.	Implement no control measures for insect pests.	

Cultural Resources

Table 2-5. Cultural Resources Decisions

Desired Outcomes (Goals and Objectives)				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Preserve and protect significant cultural resources and ensure that they are available for appropriate uses by present and future generations. • Seek to reduce imminent threats from and resolve potential conflicts caused by natural or human-caused deterioration, or potential conflicts with other resource uses. • Identify priority areas for new field inventory, based on their probability for significant resources. • Coordinate with local historic and cultural preservation and interpretation efforts. • Provide opportunities for traditional (American Indian) uses of cultural resources and sites. • Ensure compliance with Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA) and National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA). 				
Issue: Management of Cultural Resources				
Management Actions				
Common to the Proposed RMP and Draft RMP Alternatives				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identify and manage traditional cultural properties (TCP) in coordination with American Indian tribes. • Mitigate adverse impacts to cultural resources resulting from authorized surface disturbing activities. • Meet responsibilities under the NHPA as addressed in the State Protocol Agreement between the Utah State Director of BLM and the Utah State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) and the Programmatic Agreement among the BLM, the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, and the National Conference of SHPOs. • Complete cultural resources inventories prior to allowing permitted surface disturbing activities, excluding those areas and circumstances identified in BLM Manual M-8110.23, Identifying & Evaluating Cultural Resources, and Handbook UT-BLM-H-8110, Guidelines for Identifying Cultural Resources, Section II.C and Appendix 1. • Coordinate Old Spanish Trail management with the National Park Service (NPS) and other agencies under Public Law 107-325. Specifically. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Provide interpretive information at appropriate locations – Retain public lands in federal ownership – Limit OHV use to designated routes. • Protect eligible cultural sites and mitigate impacts. 				
Issue: Management of Cultural Resource Sites by Allocation to Use Categories				
Management Actions				
Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Proposed RMP	Alternative C	Alternative D
Mitigate impacts to cultural resources from permitted		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allocate and manage cultural resource sites for scientific use, public use, conservation use, traditional use, and experimental use categories described in Manual BLM-M-8110.4, Identifying and Evaluating Cultural Resources. 		

Table 2-5. Cultural Resources Decisions

Issue: Identification of Areas for New Field Inventories				
Management Actions				
Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Proposed RMP	Alternative C	Alternative D
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> activities. Reevaluate and revise cultural resources site allocations by site or area when circumstances change or when new data becomes available. Consult with the SHPO and Native American tribes as appropriate. Mitigation actions would not be necessary on cultural resource sites if both of the following conditions are met and documented: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – BLM and the SHPO have formally agreed the site is not eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) – The site has no value for other cultural uses (as described in BLM-M-8110.4). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No priority areas for new field inventories are identified in existing LUPs. 	<p>Inventory the following priority area:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Horseshoe Canyon South WSA. 	<p>Inventory the following priority areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Horseshoe Canyon South WSA Bull Creek Archaeological District Areas of special cultural designation that have not been fully inventoried. 	<p>Inventory the following priority areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Horseshoe Canyon South WSA Trough Hollow area Bull Creek Archaeological District Areas of special cultural designation that have not been fully inventoried.
Issue: Coordination with American Indian Tribes				
Management Actions	Alternative A	Proposed RMP	Alternative C	Alternative D
<p>Continue coordinating with the Paiute Tribe to identify the types of projects on which it wants to consult.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Work with Native American tribes to accommodate tribal access to sacred sites and traditional cultural properties and prevent or mitigate physical damage or intrusions that might impede their use. Establish agreements with all Native American tribes interested in the lands managed by the REO to identify the types of projects on which they want to consult. 			
Issue: Bull Creek Archaeological District				
Management Actions	Alternative A	Proposed RMP	Alternative C	Alternative D
<p>Manage Bull Creek Archaeological District as open to oil and gas leasing.</p>	Same as Alternative N.	Manage the Bull Creek Archaeological District with major constraints (NSO).		

Paleontological Resources

Table 2-6. Paleontological Resources Decisions

Desired Outcomes (Goals and Objectives)	
• Protect scientifically significant paleontological resources.	
• Provide opportunities for scientific, educational, and recreational uses of paleontological resources.	
• Cooperate with other federal, state, and local agencies in paleontological resources management activities.	
Issue: Management of Paleontological Resources	Management Actions
Common to the Proposed RMP and Draft RMP Alternatives	
• Mitigate adverse impacts to vertebrate and significant non-vertebrate paleontological resources resulting from surface disturbing activities.	
• Support and provide public education and interpretive opportunities for paleontological resources, including agreements with visitor information providers, use of special designations, or interpretive sites.	
• Issue paleontological resource use permits for scientific study as appropriate.	
• Prohibit commercial collection of invertebrate and plant fossils without a BLM-issued permit.	

Table 2-6. Paleontological Resources Decisions

Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Proposed RMP	Alternative C	Alternative D
No similar action in any of the existing plans.	Require paleontological assessments prior to permitting surface disturbing activities in areas where there is a high potential to affect scientifically significant paleontological resources.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Require on-the-ground paleontological inventories prior to permitting surface disturbing activities in areas where there is a high potential to affect scientifically significant paleontological resources. Require paleontological assessments prior to permitting surface disturbing activities in areas where there is a moderate potential to affect scientifically significant paleontological resources. 	Require on-the-ground paleontological inventories prior to permitting all surfacing disturbing activities.	
No similar action in any of the existing plans.	Paleontological inventories would not be required.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Conduct paleontological inventories intermittently as resources allow. Prioritize paleontological resource inventories based on the potential to affect scientifically significant resources. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Conduct paleontological inventories on a limited but annual basis. Prioritize paleontological resource inventories based on the potential to affect scientifically significant resources. 	

Table 2-6. Paleontological Resources Decisions

Allow collection of common invertebrate and botanical paleontological resources for personal use.	Allow surface collection (as defined in BLM Manual 8270, <i>Paleontological Resources Management</i>) of common invertebrate and botanical paleontological resources for personal (non-commercial) use without permits and if consistent with other management decisions in this RMP. Significant resources of critical scientific and educational value would be protected.	Allow collection of common invertebrate and botanical paleontological resources for personal (non-commercial) use without permits only in specifically designated fossil collecting areas.
No similar action in any of the existing plans.	When appropriate, target fossil localities with significant scientific value for excavation and curation either by the BLM or by a qualified outside academic or curatorial/research facility to protect them from theft, erosion, and/or vandalism. If excavation is not carried out within one field season, periodically monitor to document the integrity of the locality until excavation and curation are completed.	
No similar action in any of the existing plans.	Monitor highly significant (scientific) localities with paleontological resources that are not feasible to excavate, curate, or interpret. Frequency of monitoring for identified localities would be determined by the significance of the resource and the risk of damage by either natural processes or human intrusion.	
No similar action in any of the existing plans.	Develop interpretation for significant localities and sites with displays that foster scientific knowledge of the unique nature of the resource and that create opportunities for public education and access to such resources.	
No similar action in any of the existing plans.	For all permitted actions occurring in paleontologically sensitive areas, include stipulation(s) to cover unanticipated paleontological discoveries during disturbance. This stipulation would mandate work stoppage (or avoidance), notification to the authorized officer, and protection of the material and geological context if any paleontological resources were discovered during disturbance activities. Other stipulations might be appropriate on a case-by-case basis.	

Visual Resources

Table 2-7. Visual Resource Management Decisions

Desired Outcomes (Goals and Objectives)				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Manage public lands for their scenic values while providing for overall multiple use and quality of life for local communities and visitors to public lands. Manage actions to preserve those scenic vistas that are deemed most important. 				
Issue: Assignment of Visual Resource Management Classes to All Public Lands in the RFO				
Management Actions				
Common to the Proposed RMP and Draft RMP Alternatives				
<p>Designate WSAs as VRM Class I to maintain an undeveloped landscape and preserve their natural values according to direction in Instruction Memorandum IM-2000-096, Use of Visual Resource Management Class I Designation in Wilderness Study Areas.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensure all activities authorized by the BLM meet the management objectives for the designated VRM class in that particular area. To the extent practicable, bring existing visual contrasts into VRM class conformance as the opportunity arises. 				
Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Proposed RMP	Alternative C	Alternative D
Manage the RFO according to the following VRM classes, as indicated on Map 2-1:	Designate the following VRM classes, as indicated on Map 2-2:	Designate the following VRM classes, as indicated on Map 2-3:	Designate the following VRM classes, as indicated on Map 2-4:	Designate the following VRM classes, as indicated on Map 2-5:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Class I: 0 acres Class II: 529,500 acres Class III: 569,000 acres Class IV: 1,029,500 acres. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Class I: 446,900 acres Class II: 0 acres Class III: 392,800 acres Class IV: 1,288,300 acres. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Class I: 446,900 acres Class II: 249,800 acres Class III: 393,100 acres Class IV: 1,038,200 acres. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Class I: 446,900 acres Class II: 230,600 acres Class III: 509,100 acres Class IV: 941,400 acres. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Class I: 1,129,600 acres Class II: 66,700 acres Class III: 355,100 acres Class IV: 576,600 acres. <p>WSAs would be designated as VRM Class I (446,900 acres).</p>
In accordance with BLM policy, WSAs would continue to be managed as VRM Class I (446,900 acres).	WSAs would be designated as VRM Class I (446,900 acres).	WSAs would be designated as VRM Class I (446,900 acres).	WSAs would be designated as VRM Class I (446,900 acres).	WSAs would be designated as VRM Class I (446,900 acres).
Issue: Application of VRM Standards to Existing ROWs				
Management Actions				
Common to the Proposed RMP and Draft RMP Alternatives				
<p>To avoid potential conflicts with the construction, operation, maintenance, and termination of facilities and improvements located on existing ROWs on public land, apply the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Where a ROW grant specifically identifies an area and/or width, the VRM class within the specified area/width would be VRM Class IV. Where no width is specified, the VRM class within the interior boundaries of the area disturbed when the facility or improvement was initially constructed would be VRM Class IV. 				

Special Status Species

Table 2-8. Special Status Species Decisions

Desired Outcomes (Goals and Objectives)	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conserve and recover all SSS (including listed species) and the ecosystems on which they depend. • Manage, minimize, and mitigate impacts to plant, fish, and animal species and habitats so that the need to list any of these species as threatened or endangered does not become necessary. • Promote recovery and conservation of special status plant, fish, and animal species, including those listed under the Endangered Species Act (ESA). • Prevent long-term habitat fragmentation through avoidance and/or site-specific reclamation to return areas to productive levels. • Continue to work with United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) and others to ensure that plans and agreements are updated and implemented as necessary to reflect the latest scientific data. • Where possible, implement the conservation actions identified in the Utah Comprehensive Wildlife Conservation Strategy (Utah Division of Wildlife Resources [UDWR] 2005C), which identifies priority wildlife species and habitats, identifies and assesses threats to their survival, and identifies long-term conservation actions needed, including those on BLM-administered lands. 	
Issue: Overall Special Status Species Management Guidance	
Management Actions	Common to the Proposed RMP and Draft RMP Alternatives
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For listed species that do not have designated critical habitat, cooperate with the USFWS and other agencies, such as the UDWR, in managing the species and their habitat. • Allow, initiate, or participate in scientific research of listed and sensitive species and their habitats. • Collaborate with the appropriate local, state, and federal agencies to promote public education on species at risk, their importance to the human and biological community, and reasons for protective measures that would be applied to the lands involved. • Implement species-specific conservation measures to avoid or mitigate adverse effects to known populations of listed and non-listed special status plant and animal species on public lands. • Prohibit actions that destroy, adversely modify, or fragment listed threatened or endangered species' habitat. • Maintain the integrity of SSS habitat to provide the quantity, continuity, and quality of habitat necessary to maintain SSS populations. • Conduct habitat improvement treatments for SSS. future consultation would be needed for biological controls in SSS habitat. • Retain habitat for federally listed and candidate species in federal ownership. Exceptions may be considered in exchanges with the State of Utah and others after consultation with and concurrence from the USFWS. • Consider SSS habitat in all wildfire suppression efforts. • Conduct Section 7 consultation with the USFWS if biological treatments as a result of vegetation management actions are proposed in federally listed species habitats.
Recovery Plans and Conservation Agreements	

Table 2-8. Special Status Species Decisions

Reintroduction/Translocation of Special Status Species					
Issue: Habitat Mitigation					
	Management Actions				
Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Proposed RMP	Alternative C	Alternative D	
Decisions for habitat mitigation are not specifically addressed in existing plans.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Use strategies to avoid or reduce habitat fragmentation when possible, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Collocating communication and other facilities Employing directional drilling for oil and gas Closing and reclaiming roads Landscape scale evaluations Using topographic and vegetative screening to reduce the influence of intrusions. Mitigate the effects of proposed projects that have the potential to cause long-term or permanent habitat impacts or losses by enhancing, restoring, or creating other habitat within the project's region of influence. Consider protecting the habitat when the habitat type is rare and under severe development pressures. Protection should only be a portion of the mitigation and must contain elements of restoration or enhancement. Use species-specific buffers and seasonal, temporal, and spatial restrictions to conserve habitat for SSS (Appendix 11 and Appendix 14). 				
Issue: Protection of Raptor Habitat					
	Management Actions				
Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Proposed RMP	Alternative C	Alternative D	
Manage raptors as required in current LUPs.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Employ "Raptor Best Management Practices" (Appendix 10), using seasonal and spatial buffers, as well as mitigation, to maintain and enhance raptor nesting and foraging habitat, while allowing other resource uses. 				

Table 2-8. Special Status Species Decisions

		Management Actions				
		Proposed RMP		Alternative C		Alternative D
Alternative N (No Action)		Alternative A				
Issue: Management of OHV Use in Greater Sage-Grouse Habitats						
Alternative N (No Action)		Management Actions			Management Actions	
Alternative N (No Action)		Proposed RMP		Alternative C		Alternative D
Continue to follow current policy for sensitive species.		Limit OHV use to designated routes in sage-grouse leks and nesting habitats.		Limit OHV use to designated routes and/or seasonal closure of designated routes in all Greater sage-grouse habitats, including; breeding (leks), nesting, brood-rearing, and wintering habitats.		
Issue: Special Stipulations for Surface Disturbing Activities Within Greater Sage-Grouse Habitat						
Alternative N (No Action)		Management Actions			Management Actions	
Alternative N (No Action)		Proposed RMP		Alternative C		Alternative D
Prohibit surface disturbing activities from March 1 through July 15, for protection of species sensitivity during lekking activities.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Prohibit surface disturbing activities within one-quarter mile of sage-grouse leks from March 15 through June 1 for protection of species sensitivity during lekking activities. Any surface disturbing activity conducted outside this time frame would not result in an above-ground structure within 2 miles of leks from March 15 through June 1. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Manage oil and gas leasing as open subject to major constraints (NSO) within ½ mile of greater sage-grouse leks. Allow no surface disturbing or otherwise disruptive activities in greater sage-grouse winter habitat from December 15 through March 14. No special stipulation required for surface disturbing activities within sage-grouse brooding habitat. 		
Prohibit surface disturbing activities within sage-grouse brooding habitat from April 1 through June 15 for protection of brooding and nesting activities.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Prohibit long-term surface disturbing activities within sage-grouse brooding/nesting habitat from April 1 through July 15 for protection of brooding and nesting activities. See Appendix 11 for exceptions, modifications, or waivers. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Allow no surface disturbing or otherwise disruptive activities within 2 miles of a greater sage-grouse lek from March 15 to July 15 to protect sage-grouse breeding and brood-rearing habitat. See Appendix 11 for exceptions, modifications, or waivers. 		

Fish and Wildlife

Table 2-9. Fish and Wildlife Decisions

Desired Outcomes (Goals and Objectives)	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Maintain, restore, protect, and enhance habitats to support healthy populations of diverse fish and wildlife species, recognizing crucial habitats as management priorities. Manage habitat to prevent additional listings of species under the federal ESA, or the State of Utah's Species of Concern List. Manage for unfragmented blocks of habitat that provide for a variety of wildlife and fish species. Recognize and support the role of UDWR in managing wildlife and fish populations and regulating hunting and fishing. Recognize and support the role of USFWS in managing raptors, migratory birds, and threatened and endangered species. Recognize and support the role of the Federal Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service (APHIS) in controlling predators. 	Issue: Overall Fish and Wildlife Management Guidance
Common to the Proposed RMP and Draft RMP Alternatives	
	Management Actions
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recognize and coordinate with UDWR on its Management Plans and associated revisions, and (where appropriate) plans of other cooperating agencies. To the extent practicable, implement future plans on a case-by-case basis through applicable regulations. Implement BLM wildlife management plans. Implement the conservation actions identified in Executive Order 13186, Federal Agency Responsibilities under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act, with particular emphasis on those migratory birds identified as Priority Species in the Utah Avian Conservation Strategy (Parrish et al. 2002). Consider the USFWS Birds of Conservation Concern and the Utah Partners in Flight Priority Species to identify and conserve priority nesting habitats for migratory birds. Cooperate with UDWR in the management of fisheries, including habitat improvements and treatments. Work with UDWR to establish and maintain Blue Ribbon Fisheries, as defined by the Utah Blue Ribbon Fishery Advisory Council. Coordinate with UDWR to address population dynamics and habitat conditions for major habitat types that support a wide variety of game and non-game species. Use strategies to avoid or reduce habitat fragmentation, such as collocating facilities, employing directional drilling, reclaiming roads, reclaiming roads no longer serving intended purpose, reducing road densities, and using topographic and vegetative screening to reduce influence of intrusions. The BLM will approach compensatory mitigation on an “as appropriate” basis where it can be performed onsite, and on a voluntary basis where it is performed off-site, or, in accordance with current guidance. Minor adjustments to crucial wildlife habitat boundaries periodically made by the UDWR would be accommodated through plan maintenance. Where possible, implement the conservation actions identified in the Utah Comprehensive Wildlife Conservation Strategy (UDWR 2005c), which identifies priority wildlife species and habitats, identifies and assesses threats to their survival, and identifies long-term conservation actions needed, including those on BLM-administered lands. 	Issue: Overall Fish and Wildlife Management Guidance

Table 2-9. Fish and Wildlife Decisions

Issue: Forage Management and Allocations					
		Management Actions	Proposed RMP	Alternative C	Alternative D
Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A				
Manage big game winter range to maximize browse production, using class of livestock and season of use.	Use prescriptive grazing to favor forage production on crucial big game winter range.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Use prescriptive grazing to favor forage production for big game crucial winter range. On suitable allotments, as determined on a case-by-case basis, authorize livestock grazing only on a nonrenewable basis to meet wildlife habitat objectives. These actions would be limited to crucial wildlife habitat where conventional grazing management practices were not allowing attainment of RMP objectives. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Use prescriptive grazing to favor forage production for big game ranges. On suitable allotments, as determined on a case-by-case basis, authorize livestock grazing only on a nonrenewable basis to meet wildlife habitat objectives. These actions would be limited to crucial wildlife habitat where conventional grazing management practices were not allowing attainment of RMP objectives. 		
Issue: Management of Henry Mountain Bison and Mule Deer					
		Management Actions	Proposed RMP	Alternative C	Alternative D
Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A				
Provide no special management for Henry Mountain bison or mule deer.		Develop a Habitat Management Plan (HMP) for bison, mule deer, and other	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Designate an ACEC in the Henry Mountains (288,200 acres) to recognize bison, mule deer, and scenic values. 		

Table 2-9. Fish and Wildlife Decisions

<p>big game species within the Henry Mountain area in consultation with UDWR. (The HMP would address management objectives with respect to size of herds (numbers of animals), desired ratio of male to female animals, and the reauthorization of voluntarily relinquished grazing preference and reallocation of forage on specific grazing allotments. The HMP would also address needed improvements for range conditions, including proposed habitat improvement projects for both livestock and big game species to mitigate potential conflicts during seasons of use and the strategies required for herd adjustments during critical droughts.)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Manage bison habitat in cooperation with UDWR. • Allow manipulation of habitat to benefit wildlife. • Allow range improvements outside of wilderness characteristics areas (Alternative D only) that benefit wildlife (water developments, fencing riparian areas, etc.). • Develop an HMP for bison and mule deer within the ACEC. • Address voluntary relinquishments of grazing preference and reauthorization of AUMs as provided for in Instruction Memorandum IM-2007-67, Relinquishment of Grazing Preference on BLM-Administered Lands. • See Table 2-21 (ACEC Decisions) for other management prescriptions.
Issue: Management of Desert Bighorn Sheep Habitat	
Management Actions	Alternative C
Alternative N (No Action)	Proposed RMP
Comply with the Henry Mountains Desert Bighorn HMP (1990).	Prohibit change in kind of livestock from cattle to domestic sheep in those allotments with bighorn sheep habitat identified in the <i>Desert Bighorn Sheep HMP</i> .
Issue: Management of OHV Use in Deer and Elk Habitats	
Management Actions	
Alternative N (No Action)	Proposed RMP
Continue OHV management as outlined in current LUPs.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limit OHV use to designated routes in • OHV use in 509,000 acres of deer and elk • OHV use in 393,000 acres of deer and elk

Table 2-9. Fish and Wildlife Decisions

		Issue: Management of OHV Use in Crucial Bison Habitat			
		Management Actions			
Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Proposed RMP	Alternative C		Alternative D
Close crucial bison habitat to OHV use from December 20–March 20 at Swap Mesa and Cave Flat.	Limit OHV use to designated routes in crucial bison habitat (251,000 acres).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> OHV use in 257,600 acres of crucial bison habitat would be limited to designated routes. 1,000 acres of crucial bison habitat would be closed to OHV use. Consider seasonal closure of designated routes on a case-by-case basis. <p>(Maps 3-6 and 3-7)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> OHV use in 62,000 acres of crucial bison habitat would be limited to designated routes. 189,000 acres of crucial bison habitat would be closed to OHV use. Consider seasonal closure of designated routes on a case-by-case basis. <p>(Map 3-5)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> OHV use in 44,000 acres of crucial bison habitat would be limited to designated routes. 207,000 acres of crucial bison habitat would be closed to OHV use. <p>(Map 3-5)</p>	
			Issue: Management of OHV Use for Game Retrieval		
			Management Actions		
			Common to the Proposed RMP and Draft RMP Alternatives		
			Manage OHV use for game retrieval consistent with OHV area and route designations.		

Table 2-9. Fish and Wildlife Decisions

Issue: Seasonal Stipulation for Surface Disturbing Activities in Bison Habitats				
Management Actions				
Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Proposed RMP	Alternative C	Alternative D
Restrict oil and gas exploration and leasing activities in crucial bison habitats (Map 3-5) from December 1 through April 15 for protection of winter habitats and species sensitivity during calving season.	No special stipulation required; however, mitigation may be required for surface disturbing activities in crucial bison habitats (Map 3-5) from November 1 through May 15.	Restrict surface disturbing activities in crucial bison habitats (Map 3-5) from November 1 through May 15 for protection of winter habitats and species sensitivity during calving season. Issue: Seasonal Stipulation for Surface Disturbing Activities in Crucial Mule Deer and Elk Habitat	See Appendix 11 for exceptions, modifications, or waivers.	
Issue: Seasonal Stipulation for Surface Disturbing Activities in Crucial Mule Deer and Elk Habitat				
Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Proposed RMP	Alternative C	Alternative D
Restrict oil and gas exploration and development in crucial and high-value mule deer and elk habitats (Maps 3-6 and 3-7) from December 15 through May 15 for protection of winter habitats and species sensitivity during fawning season.	No special stipulation required; however, mitigation may be required for surface disturbing activities in crucial and high-value mule deer and elk habitats (Maps 3-6 and 3-7) from December 15 through April 15.	Restrict surface disturbing activities in crucial mule deer and elk habitats (Maps 3-6 and 3-7) from December 15 through April 15 for protection of winter habitats, unless the action is carried out to enhance habitats for mule deer, elk, and/or other wildlife. See Appendix 11 for exceptions, modifications, or waivers.	Restrict surface disturbing activities in crucial and high-value mule deer and elk habitats (Maps 3-6 and 3-7) from December 15 through April 15 for protection of winter habitats. Grant no exceptions.	
Issue: Seasonal Stipulation for Surface Disturbing Activities in Crucial Desert Bighorn Sheep Habitat				
Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Proposed RMP	Alternative C	Alternative D
No special stipulation required.	No special stipulation required; however, mitigation may be required for surface disturbing activities in crucial		Prohibit surface disturbing activities in crucial Desert bighorn sheep habitat (Map 3-5) from April 15 through June 15 for protection of species sensitivity during lambing season. See Appendix 11 for exceptions, modifications, and waivers.	

Table 2-9. Fish and Wildlife Decisions

Issue: Special Stipulations for Surface Disturbing Activities in Crucial Pronghorn Habitat					
Management Actions					
Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Proposed RMP	Alternative C	Alternative D	
Prohibit oil and gas exploration and development activities in crucial pronghorn habitat (Map 3-5) from December 1 through April 30 for protection of species sensitivity during fawning season.	No special stipulation required; however, mitigation may be required for surface disturbing activities in crucial pronghorn habitat (Map 3-5) from May 15 through June 15.	Restrict surface disturbing activities in crucial pronghorn habitat (Map 3-5) from May 15 through June 15 for protection of species sensitivity during fawning season. See Appendix 11 for exceptions, modifications, or waivers.			
Issue: Special Stipulation for Surface Disturbing Activities in Riparian and Wetland Habitats					
Management Actions					
Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Proposed RMP	Alternative C	Alternative D	
Prohibit surface disturbing activities within 500 feet of live water.	Prohibit surface disturbing activities within the 100-year floodplain or 330 feet on either side from the centerline, whichever is greater, of streams with intermittent or perennial reaches, resulting in NSO in this area, for protection of habitat for riparian-obligate species.		Prohibit surface disturbing activities within 660 feet of streams with intermittent or perennial reaches, resulting in NSO in this area, for protection of habitat for riparian-obligate species.		
Issue: Reintroduction, Transplantation, Augmentation, and Reestablishment of Wildlife and Fish Species					
Management Actions					
Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Proposed RMP	Alternative C	Alternative D	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cooperate with UDWR and USFWS in reintroducing wildlife species into historic ranges as determined through NEPA analysis. • Consider wildlife 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Analyze UDWR and USFWS proposals to introduce, augment, transplant, and reestablish wildlife species through NEPA evaluation. • Allow introduction, translocation, transplantation, augmentation, and reestablishment of both native and naturalized fish and wildlife species in cooperation and collaboration with UDWR. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Analyze UDWR and USFWS proposals to introduce, augment, transplant, and reestablish wildlife species through NEPA evaluation. • Allow introductions, translocation, transplantation, augmentation, and reestablishment of native species only in cooperation and collaboration with UDWR. 			

Table 2-9. Fish and Wildlife Decisions

		Issue: Management of Raptor Habitat				
		Management Actions				
		Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Proposed RMP	Alternative C	Alternative D
transplants of big game species and fish.						
Manage raptors as required in current LUPs.		Implement the following direction: “Raptor management will be guided by the use of “Best Management Practices for Raptors and Their Associated Habitats in Utah” (BLM 2006) (Appendix 10), utilizing seasonal and spatial buffers, as well as mitigation, to maintain and enhance raptor nesting and foraging habitat, while allowing other resource uses.”				

Wild Horses and Burros

Table 2-10. Wild Horses and Burros Decisions

Desired Outcomes (Goals and Objectives)	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Manage wild burros at appropriate levels in viable, vigorous, and stable populations to ensure a natural ecological balance among wild burro populations, wildlife, livestock, vegetation resources, and other resource values. Manage for genetic diversity of wild burros within the Canyonlands HMA. Maintain, enhance, and perpetuate the viable herd's distinguishing characteristics that were typical at the time of the passage of the Wild Free-Roaming Horse and Burro Act or that are identified in population management plans. 	Issue: Overall Wild Horses and Burros Management Guidance
Management Actions	
<p>Common to the Proposed RMP and Draft RMP Alternatives</p> <p>Manage wild burro populations for appropriate age and sex ratios, genetic viability, and adoptability, as well as maintaining AML on the established HMA (Map 3-8). Allow wild burro research, as long as other wild horse and burro program goals are met. Wild burro herd research data that may be collected include, but are not limited to, data to determine population size and characteristics, assess herd health, determine herd history and genetic profile (blood and hair sampling, Instruction Memorandum IM # 2002-095 <i>Gather Policy and Selective Removal/Criteria for Wild Horses Program Area: Wild Horse and Burro Program</i>), and conduct immuno-contraceptive research and monitor results as appropriate. Other data that could be useful in population management would include general characteristics such as age ratios, sex ratios, and color, as well as health characteristics such as pregnancy rates, parasite loading, and the general physical condition of the burros. In addition, genetic sampling would determine the genetic health of the herd.</p> <p>BLM will coordinate with the NPS to address burro trespass issues.</p>	

Table 2-10. Wild Horses and Burros Decisions

Issue: Management of the Canyonlands Herd Management Area					
		Management Actions		Proposed RMP	Alternative C
Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A			Alternative D	
Manage Canyonlands HMA as a wild burro HMA. No AML has been set in existing planning documents (Map 3-8).	Manage Canyonlands HMA as a wild burro HMA with an AML of 60–100 (Map 3-8).	Manage Canyonlands HMA as a wild burro HMA with an AML of 120–200 (Map 3-8).		Manage Canyonlands HMA as a wild burro HMA with an AML of 120–200 (Map 3-8).	Manage Canyonlands HMA as a wild burro HMA with an AML of 120–200 (Map 3-8).
• Allocate 100 AUMs for wild burros.	• Allocate 600 AUMs for wild burros to meet an AML upper limit of 200.	• Allocate 600 AUMs for wild burros to meet an AML upper limit of 100.		• Allocate 1,200 AUMs for wild burros to meet an AML upper limit of 200.	• Maintain the AML of the Canyonlands HMA at levels to maintain genetic viability.
• Maintain the AML of the Canyonlands HMA at levels to maintain genetic viability.		• Maintain the AML of the Canyonlands HMA at levels to maintain genetic viability.		• Allow introductions of wild burros from other herd areas to maintain genetic viability, given the burros being introduced have characteristics similar to the burros in the Canyonlands HMA.	• Maintain the AML of the Canyonlands HMA at levels to maintain genetic viability.

Fire and Fuels Management

Table 2-11. Fire and Fuels Management Decisions

Desired Outcomes (Goals and Objectives)				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Manage fire and fuels to protect life, firefighter safety, property, and critical resource values. Reduce the threat of wildfire in the Wildland Urban Interface (WUI). Manage fire and fuels, where appropriate, to restore natural systems to their desired future condition, considering the interrelated social and economic components. Manage wildland fires to minimize cost considering firefighter and public safety, benefits, and values to be protected, consistent with resource objectives. 				
Issue: Fire Management in the Wildland Urban Interface				
Management Actions				
Common to the Proposed RMP and Draft RMP Alternatives				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Employ WUI Fire and Fuels Management according to national policy to meet vegetation treatment goals. Work with partners in the WUI in prescribed fires, hazardous fuels reduction, prevention and education, and technical assistance. Apply Resource Protection Measures for fire management practices to protect natural or cultural resource values as described in Appendix 19 (obtained from the Utah Land Use Plan Amendment for Fire and Fuels Management Finding of No Significant Impact and Decision Record, Table 2.3). 				
Issue: Appropriate Management Response, Hazardous Fuels Reduction, and Wildland Fire Use				
Management Actions				
Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Proposed RMP	Alternative C	Alternative D
Manage fire using a full suite of tools that allows for the graduated movement to a more ecologically sustainable condition and reduction of hazardous fuels.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Implement appropriate management response (AMR) according to General Risk Categories (GRC), as contained in Appendix 6. The GRCs contain criteria for managing dynamic vegetation communities. Wildland fire use would not be appropriate in the following areas: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Administrative sites Developed recreation sites Communication sites Oil and gas facilities Mining facilities Above-ground utility corridors High-use travel corridors Crucial wildlife habitats where fire is unwanted GRC A, such as desert scrub communities. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Priority other fire management activities as directed and prioritized in the GRCs. Adhere to specific fire suppression directions within Potential ACECs as noted in Table 2-21, for protection of identified relevant and important values from irreparable damage. 		

Table 2-11. Fire and Fuels Management Decisions

		Management Actions			
		Issue: Hazardous Fuels Reduction			
Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Proposed RMP	Alternative C	Alternative D	
Reduce hazardous fuels to restore ecosystems; protect human, natural, and cultural resources; and reduce the threat of wildfire to communities.	Manage fire and fuels through treatments conducted on up to 1,472,000 acres over the life of the plan. Use the full range of treatment types (e.g., prescribed and wildland fire use, mechanical, chemical, biological, and cultural treatments). An annual average of 73,600 acres would need to receive treatment to reach the total treatment acreage listed (Table 2-11a). Actual annual treatment acreage would vary depending on conditions, staffing, etc. These acreage figures include all vegetation and fire fuels treatments (Table 2-4).	Manage fire and fuels through treatments conducted on up to 520,000 acres over the life of the plan. Use prescribed fire, intensively treating areas to create properly functioning ecosystems and desired natural communities. The type of treatment would vary depending on case-by-case environmental conditions. Human management would be applied to protect life and property and to ensure ecosystem function in areas currently at risk of losing key ecosystem components following wildfire. (An annual average of 26,000 acres would need to receive treatment to reach the total treatment acreage listed [Table 2-11a]. Actual annual treatment acreage would vary depending on conditions, staffing, etc. These acreage figures include all vegetation and fire fuels treatment [Table 2-4]).			
Issue: Prevention and Mitigation of Wildland Fire					
Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Proposed RMP	Alternative C	Alternative D	
Prevent human-caused fires through coordination with partners and affected groups and individuals. Use a full range of prevention and mitigation activities.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Prevent human-caused fires through coordination with partners and affected groups and individuals. Use a full range of prevention and mitigation activities. Use prioritization criteria contained in the GRCs (Appendix 6). 				

Table 2-11. Fire and Fuels Management Decisions

Issue: Emergency Stabilization and Rehabilitation (ESR)			
Management Actions			
Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Proposed RMP	Alternative C
Undertake ESR efforts to protect and sustain ecosystems, public health, and safety, and to help communities protect infrastructure.	<p>Undertake ESR efforts to protect and sustain ecosystems, public health, and safety, and to help communities protect infrastructure.</p> <p>Prioritize implementation of post-fire emergency stabilization and rehabilitation activities considering the following criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Areas that could pose a threat to life and property • Areas with potential for invasive species invasion, significant ecosystem alteration (e.g., Condition Class 3 areas), and soil stabilization 		Alternative D

Table 2-11a. Estimated Treatment Acresages

Estimated Treatment Acresages	
20 Year Treatment Acreage— Alternatives A and Proposed RMP	20 Year Treatment Acreage—Alternatives C and D
0	0
58,634	7,329
5,786	1,927
171,140	34,228
19,629	7,852
16,378	8,189
671,277	223,759
343,781	171,891
185,515	64,930
0	0
1,472,140	520,105
Estimated Average Treatment per Year	26,005
73,607	26,005

Non-WSA Lands with Wilderness Characteristics

Table 2-12. Non-WSA Lands with Wilderness Characteristics Decisions

Desired Outcomes (Goals and Objectives)				
Issue: Management of Non-WSA Lands with Wilderness Characteristics				
Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Proposed RMP	Alternative C	Alternative D
No special direction for managing the non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics is included in the existing LUPs.	Provide no special management direction for protecting the non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics.	<p>Manage the following 12 non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics (78,600 acres) specifically to maintain their wilderness characteristics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (1) Dirty Devil/French Spring (6,100 acres) (2) Dogwater Creek (3,100 acres) (3) Horseshoe Canyon South (12,200 acres) (4) Jones Bench (2,600 acres) (5) Labyrinth Canyon (2,800 acres) (6) Little Rockies (9,500 acres) (7) Mount Ellen-Blue Hill (3,900 acres) (8) Mount Pennell (4,700 acres) (9) Notom Bench 	Same as Alternative A.	<p>Protect the 29 areas (682,600 acres) of non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics (identified in Chapter 3 and on Map 3-9) through the following land allocations and prescriptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Designate as VRM Class I • Manage for primitive and semi-primitive non-motorized recreation • Close to motorized use • Retain land in public ownership • Designate as an Avoidance Area for ROWs • Propose for withdrawal from mineral entry • Close to oil and gas leasing • Close to mineral

	<p>(8,200 acres)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Designate as unavailable for further consideration for coal leasing.
	<p>(10) Ragged Mountain (7,900 acres)</p> <p>(11) Red Desert (8,900 acres)</p> <p>(12) Wild Horse Mesa (8,700 acres)</p> <p>Protect the 12 areas (78,600 acres) of non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics through the following land allocations and prescriptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Designate as Visual Resource Management (VRM) Class II • Limit motorized use to designated routes • Retain lands in public ownership • Designate as an Avoidance Area for rights-of-way (ROW) • Designate leasing category as no surface occupancy (NSO), no exceptions, waivers, or modifications • Close to mineral material sales • Designate as unavailable for further consideration for coal leasing • Continue maintenance and use of existing facilities • Prohibit private or commercial woodland harvest or seed collection • Healthy Lands Initiative projects could be

	<p>considered where they improve the overall goals and objectives for managing the wilderness characteristics of these areas</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Consider no coal leasing proposals in the 12 (78,600 acres) identified non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics.

2.6.2 Resource Uses

Forestry and Woodland Products

Table 2-13. Forestry and Woodland Products Decisions

Desired Outcomes (Goals and Objectives)				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide forest and woodland products (including fuelwood, timber, posts, pinyon nuts, and Christmas trees) on a sustainable basis. • Reduce pinyon-juniper encroachment through woodland product use where increased density threatens other resource values. • Provide opportunities for seed and live plant collecting where and when ecologically feasible. • Emphasize forest and woodland health. 				
Issue: Overall Management of Forests and Woodlands	Management Actions	Common to the Proposed RMP and Draft RMP Alternatives	Management Actions	Alternative D
Issue: Areas Open to Timber Harvest	Management Actions	Proposed RMP	Management Actions	Alternative C
Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Proposed RMP	Management Actions	Alternative D
West of Capitol Reef National Park:	Provide for commercial and non-commercial timber harvest where feasible, sustainable, and compatible with restoring, maintaining, or improving forest health.	Provide for commercial and non-commercial timber harvest where feasible, sustainable, and compatible with restoring, maintaining, or improving forest health.	Allow no commercial timber harvest.	
East of Capitol Reef National Park:	Manage commercial timber harvest on a case-by-case basis.	The 12 non-WSA lands (78,600 acres) with		

Table 2-13. Forestry and Woodland Products Decisions

Issue: Areas Open to Woodland Products Harvest: Christmas Trees, Posts, Green Wood Cutting, and Fuelwood				
Management Actions				
Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Proposed RMP	Alternative C	Alternative D
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Continue to prohibit commercial timber harvesting. 	wilderness characteristics would be closed to commercial and non-commercial use of forest and woodland products. Exceptions for traditional Native American use may be considered.	Provide for commercial and non-commercial use of forest and woodland products where sustainable and compatible with restoring, maintaining, and improving woodland health, in areas specified by permit. WSAs, the 12 non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics (78,600 acres), and suitable WSR corridors would be closed to commercial and non-commercial use of forest and woodland products. Exceptions for traditional Native American use may be considered.	Provide for commercial and non-commercial use of forest and woodland products where sustainable and compatible with restoring, maintaining, and improving woodland health, in areas specified by permit. WSAs and suitable WSR corridors would be closed to commercial and non-commercial use of forest and woodland products. Exceptions for traditional Native American use may be considered.	Provide for commercial and non-commercial use of forest and woodland products where sustainable and compatible with restoring, maintaining, and improving woodland health, in areas specified by permit. WSAs, non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics (682,600 acres), and suitable WSR corridors would be closed to commercial and non-commercial use of forest and woodland products. Exceptions for traditional Native American use may be considered.
West of Capitol Reef National Park: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Allow harvest of dead and down woodland products by permit on a case-by-case basis Allow green wood cutting in specified areas by permit. East of Capitol Reef National Park: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide for non-commercial use of woodland products outside WSAs by permit. 				
Issue: Management of Seed and Live Plant Collecting				
Management Actions				
Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Proposed RMP	Alternative C	Alternative D
Allow commercial and non-commercial live plant and seed collecting by permit.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Allow commercial and non-commercial live plant and seed collecting by permit. Consider designating 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Allow commercial and non-commercial live plant and seed collecting by permit. Consider designating 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Allow commercial and non-commercial live plant and seed collection by permit in areas outside WSAs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Allow no commercial or non-commercial live plant and seed collecting within WSAs, non-WSA lands with

Table 2-13. Forestry and Woodland Products Decisions

	<p>specific seed collecting areas for resource benefits.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Allow no commercial or non-commercial live plant and seed collecting within WSAs, non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics (78,600 acres), and suitable WSR corridors. Exceptions for traditional Native American use may be considered. 	<p>and suitable WSR corridors. Exceptions for traditional Native American use may be considered.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consider designating specific seed collecting areas for resource benefits. 	<p>wilderness characteristics (682,600 acres), and suitable WSR corridors. Exceptions for traditional Native American use may be considered.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consider designating specific seed collecting areas for resource benefits.
--	--	---	---

Livestock Grazing

Table 2-14. Livestock Grazing Decisions

Desired Outcomes (Goals and Objectives)				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide for the orderly use, improvement, and development of the range for livestock grazing. Provide for livestock grazing while maintaining rangelands in proper functioning condition. Maintain healthy, sustainable rangeland ecosystems and restore degraded rangelands to meet Utah's Standards for Rangeland Health and to provide a wide range of public values, such as wildlife habitat, livestock forage, recreation opportunities, clean water, and functional watersheds. Integrate livestock use and associated management practices with other multiple use needs and objectives to maintain, protect, and improve rangeland health. 				
	Issue: General Grazing Management			
	Management Actions			
	Common to the Proposed RMP and Draft RMP Alternatives			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Monitor and evaluate grazing allotments to maintain or improve rangeland productivity. Adjust permit terms and conditions (e.g., permitted use, amount of use, season of use, and kind and class of livestock) when grazing permits are renewed, transferred, or as otherwise deemed necessary by site-specific evaluation of monitoring data and environmental analysis. Use livestock grazing to enhance ecosystem health or mitigate resource problems (e.g., noxious/invasive weed control and hazardous fuel reduction) where supported by site-specific environmental analysis. During periods of drought, adjust livestock numbers annually based on estimates of the available forage. Exclude livestock grazing from small areas (such as springs) within allotments that cannot meet Rangeland Health Standards with livestock grazing. Site-specific management actions that protect riparian areas would be addressed at the project level. 				
		Management Actions		
		Proposed RMP		
		Alternative C		
		Alternative D		
	Issue: Forage Allocations			
	Management Actions			
	Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Proposed RMP	Alternative C
Continue to permit livestock use on those allotments	Permit livestock use on those allotments shown on	Permit livestock use on those allotments shown on Map 2-7 and in Appendix 7 (Table A7-3).		

Table 2-14. Livestock Grazing Decisions

Alternative N (No Action)	Issue: Grazing Allotment Boundaries			
	Management Actions	Proposed RMP	Alternative C	Alternative D
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> shown on Map 2-7 and in Appendix 7 (Table A7-1). Acres available for grazing: 1,989,048 Acres unavailable for grazing: 138,952 Available AUMs: 146,202 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Map 2-6 and in Appendix 7 (Table A7-2). Fourteen allotments comprising 36,950 acres previously unavailable to livestock grazing would again be available to livestock grazing. Acres available for grazing: 2,025,998 Acres unavailable for grazing: 102,002 Available AUMs: 147,281 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Acres available for grazing: 1,989,048 Acres unavailable for grazing: 138,952 Available AUMs: 146,202 		

Table 2-14. Livestock Grazing Decisions

Issue: Guidelines and Criteria for Adjusting Allotment-Specific Grazing Management Practices					
	Management Actions				
Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Proposed RMP	Alternative C	Alternative D	
Existing LUPs do not specifically address this issue.	<p>Conversion in Kind of Livestock Authorize conversion in kind of livestock on a case-by-case basis when justified through environmental analysis. Permittees may be required to provide needed range improvements to support the conversion. A conversion may be justified when it meets the following criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Monitoring studies or other acceptable data support the conversion. • Environmental conditions (e.g., vegetation types, topographic features, and water availability) can accommodate the conversion. • Change in kind of livestock poses no threat to other resources. • A trial change proves acceptable. <p>Adjusting Livestock Season of Use Consider adjustments to season of use when resource conditions indicate a change is needed. Conduct appropriate environmental analysis prior to any changes. Resource conditions include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Physiological requirements (reproduction and maintenance) of desired plant species are not being met. • Range conditions are declining because of season of use. • Conflicts with other resources or uses are identified. <p>Consider the following actions if livestock grazing is contributing to declining range conditions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Shorten the grazing period • Temporarily suspend use • Implement or change grazing system • Authorize non-use until conditions improve. <p>Authorize permittee requests for changes to livestock season of use when the following conditions are met:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Physiological requirements (e.g., reproduction and maintenance) of desired plants can be met. • On community allotments, all permittees in that allotment agree to the change. • Requested changes do not conflict with other established land uses. • A trial of the change proves acceptable. • Permittees may be required to provide needed range improvements to support changing the season of use. <p>Adjusting Permitted Use</p>				

Table 2-14. Livestock Grazing Decisions

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consider changes to permitted use if: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Change is supported by monitoring data, field observations, ecological site inventory, or other acceptable data. Conflicts with other uses are identified. There is a change in public land ownership (increase or decrease). Protection of other resources is required. Changes are required by 43 CFR 4180 (Rangeland Health regulations). 										
Issue: Administrative Access for Grazing Management											
Common to the Proposed RMP and Draft RMP Alternatives											
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Continue to allow motorized access to range improvements for allotment management purposes. Allow access within WSAs according to IMP. 											
Issue: Managing Domestic Sheep/Wildlife Conflicts											
<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="2">Management Actions</th></tr> <tr> <th>Alternative N (No Action)</th><th>Alternative A</th></tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Permit domestic sheep grazing in bighorn sheep habitat while following the Guidelines for Domestic Sheep and Goat Management in Native Wild Sheep Habitats.</td><td> Proposed RMP Permit no domestic sheep and goat grazing in bighorn sheep and goat grazing east of Capitol Reef National Park, subject to existing livestock grazing permits. </td></tr> <tr> <td></td><td> Alternative C Permit no domestic sheep and goat grazing in bighorn sheep habitat throughout the lands managed by the RFO, subject to existing livestock grazing permits. </td></tr> <tr> <td></td><td> Alternative D Permit no domestic sheep and goat grazing in bighorn sheep habitat throughout the lands managed by the RFO, subject to existing livestock grazing permits. </td></tr> </tbody> </table>		Management Actions		Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Permit domestic sheep grazing in bighorn sheep habitat while following the Guidelines for Domestic Sheep and Goat Management in Native Wild Sheep Habitats.	Proposed RMP Permit no domestic sheep and goat grazing in bighorn sheep and goat grazing east of Capitol Reef National Park, subject to existing livestock grazing permits.		Alternative C Permit no domestic sheep and goat grazing in bighorn sheep habitat throughout the lands managed by the RFO, subject to existing livestock grazing permits.		Alternative D Permit no domestic sheep and goat grazing in bighorn sheep habitat throughout the lands managed by the RFO, subject to existing livestock grazing permits.
Management Actions											
Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A										
Permit domestic sheep grazing in bighorn sheep habitat while following the Guidelines for Domestic Sheep and Goat Management in Native Wild Sheep Habitats.	Proposed RMP Permit no domestic sheep and goat grazing in bighorn sheep and goat grazing east of Capitol Reef National Park, subject to existing livestock grazing permits.										
	Alternative C Permit no domestic sheep and goat grazing in bighorn sheep habitat throughout the lands managed by the RFO, subject to existing livestock grazing permits.										
	Alternative D Permit no domestic sheep and goat grazing in bighorn sheep habitat throughout the lands managed by the RFO, subject to existing livestock grazing permits.										

Recreation

Table 2-15. Recreation Decisions

Desired Outcomes (Goals and Objectives)	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide recreational opportunities in a variety of physical, social, and administrative settings, from primitive to near-urban, that allow visitors to have desired recreational experiences and enjoy the resulting benefits. Provide opportunities for recreational experiences unique to the lands managed by the RFO, consistent with resource capabilities and mandated resource requirements; provide for visitor education and interpretation of the recreational opportunities within the RFO. Work with local communities to foster recreation and tourism. Provide for public health, education, and safety through interpretation, facility development, and visitor management. Maintain important recreational values and sites in federal ownership to ensure a continued diversity of recreation settings, activities, and opportunities. 	
Issue: Overall Recreation Guidance	
Management Actions	Common to the Proposed RMP and Draft RMP Alternatives
	<p>Implement the Utah BLM Standards for Rangeland Health and Guidelines for Recreation Management, as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recognize that various levels of regulations and limits may be necessary, but that restrictions and limitations on public uses should be as minimized as possible without compromising the primary goal. Use an on-the-ground presence as a tool to protect public lands. Use enhanced off-site interpretation, education, and information as a tool to protect public lands. Where long-term damage by recreational usage is observed or anticipated, limit or control activities through special management tools such as designated campsites, permits, area closures, and limitations on numbers of users and duration of usage. Revise recreation management plans and RMPs when they prove to be either overly restrictive or inadequate to protect public land health. Coordinate with other federal and state agencies, county and local governments, and tribal nations in recreation planning and managing traffic, search and rescue operations, trash control and removal, and public safety. Consider and implement where appropriate, management methods to protect resources while maintaining the quality of the experience of various users. Limitations could include numbers, types, timing, and duration of usage. Encourage the location of public land recreational activities near population centers and highway corridors by the placement of appropriate visitor use infrastructure. Provide restrooms and other facilities adequate for anticipated uses at designated campgrounds, trailheads, and other areas where recreational users concentrate. Allow non-commercial dispersed camping without permit, throughout the RFO administered lands, unless directed by other management prescriptions. Allow no rock climbing within 300 feet of cultural sites or within one-quarter mile of raptor nests during nesting seasons. Allow no camping within one-half mile of any Mexican spotted owl protected activity center (PAC). BLM Back Country Byways may be designated in the future as deemed appropriate with site-specific environmental analysis.

Table 2-15. Recreation Decisions

Issue: Management of Extensive Recreation Management Areas (ERMA)				
	Management Actions			
Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Proposed RMP	Alternative C	Alternative D
Continue managing recreation as directed in current LUPs.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identify portions of the decision area not delineated as a SRMA as an ERMA. ERMAs would receive only custodial management (which addresses only activity opportunities) of visitor health and safety, user conflict, and resource protection issues, with no activity-level planning. Therefore, actions within ERMAs would generally be implemented directly from LUP decisions. Manage the ERMAs to provide a variety of recreational opportunities, including primitive, semi-primitive non-motorized, semi-primitive motorized, roaded natural, and rural. Provide outdoor settings ranging from areas with a high-to-moderate opportunity for solitude and closeness to nature, where visitors should be prepared for a high level of self reliance, challenge, and risk; to areas where visitors have the convenience of facilities and a higher interaction with other users. Consider limiting recreational access, season of use, and numbers of users, if needed, to protect other resources. Provide facilities based on needs for resource protection and user demand. Consider site-specific development on a case-by-case basis, ranging from minimal, rustic facilities to larger developments that would require major site modifications. Manage public lands in the Fiddler Butte, Labyrinth Canyon, Blue Hills, and Little Rockies areas in a primitive, naturally appearing setting for a high probability of experiencing solitude, freedom, closeness to nature, self reliance, challenge, and risk. Interaction and evidence of other users would be low. (In some alternatives, these areas are part of SRMAs.) Achieve this by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Preserving resources while providing for a sustainable recreational opportunity Managing access and travel primarily as non-motorized, with motorized travel limited to designated routes (access for people with disabilities would be difficult) Providing minimum improvements needed for site protection Providing no on-site interpretative facilities. Manage public lands adjacent to other federal and state lands to complement the recreational experience on the adjoining lands. Designate sites and areas appropriate for large group events and camping, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Starr Spring campground McMillan Spring campground Sandy Creek Overlook (except in Alternative D) Apple Brush Flat near McMillan Spring road junction Turkey Haven 			

Table 2-15. Recreation Decisions

Issue: Establishment and Management of Special Recreation Management Areas (SRMA)					
Alternative N (No Action)	Management Actions				
	Alternative A	Proposed RMP	Alternative C	Alternative D	
Current LUPs identify one SRMA.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Establish and manage SRMAs, as identified below. Manage recreation activities and developments in the SRMA to support SRMA goals and objectives. Establish recreation management zones (RMZ) to address specific recreation uses, user types, and site-specific prescriptions during activity planning for each SRMA, except for the Factory Butte SRMA. Develop recreation facilities in response to resource management needs appropriate to the intent of the SRMA. 				
One SRMA, 120 acres Yuba Reservoir (defer management of Yuba SRMA to Fillmore Field Office (FO) in all alternatives)	<p>Five SRMAs, 514,500 acres OHV:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Factory Butte Big Rocks Sahara Sands <p>Dispersed Recreation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Dispersed Recreation: Dirty Devil Otter Creek <p>(Map 2-8)</p>	<p>Five SRMAs, 860,390 acres OHV:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Factory Butte Big Rocks Dispersed Recreation: Henry Mountains Dirty Devil Capitol Reef Gateway Sevier Canyon <p>(Map 2-10)</p>	<p>Four SRMAs, 930,000 acres Dispersed Recreation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Henry Mountains Dirty Devil Capitol Reef Gateway Sevier Canyon <p>(Map 2-10)</p>	<p>Seven SRMAs, 1,358,100 acres Primitive and semi-primitive recreation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Henry Mountains Dirty Devil Capitol Reef Gateway E. Fork Sevier River San Rafael Swell Little Rockies Labyrinth Canyon 	<p>Seven SRMAs, 1,358,100 acres Dispersed recreation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Capitol Reef Gateway E. Fork Sevier River (Map 2-11)

Table 2-15. Recreation Decisions

Issue: Management of Recreational Opportunities in the E. Fork Sevier River (Including Otter Creek Reservoir)				
Management Actions				
Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Proposed RMP	Alternative C	Alternative D
Continue managing the area as a part of the ERMA in cooperation with the Utah Division of Parks and Recreation (Otter Creek State Park).	Otter Creek Reservoir SRMA Establish the 3,200 acres of public land adjacent to Otter Creek Reservoir as an SRMA (Map 2-8). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Manage the area as a part of the ERMA in cooperation with the Utah Division of Parks and Recreation. If warranted by demand, enhance and expand recreation opportunities and facilities such as campgrounds, water, restrooms, and other recreation, picnic, and trailhead facilities. Manage the SRMA to provide a roaded natural experience, providing users the opportunity to interact with each other in developed sites while providing some chance of privacy. Provide a moderate level of access for people with disabilities. Provide some facilities for user comfort. Allow site modifications if needed. Provide simple way-side interpretive exhibits. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Manage the area as a part of the ERMA in cooperation with the Utah Division of Parks and Recreation. 	East Fork of the Sevier River SRMA Establish the East Fork of the Sevier River SRMA (59,500 acres). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Manage lands around Otter Creek Reservoir for dispersed recreational uses in cooperation with the Utah Division of Park and Recreation. Manage non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics in and around Kingston Canyon for primitive recreation opportunities. Manage remaining lands for a roaded natural experience, providing users the opportunity to interact with each other in developed sites while providing some chance of privacy. Manage the East Fork of the Sevier River in cooperation with the UDWR to enhance the blue ribbon fishing opportunities 	

Table 2-15. Recreation Decisions

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Enhance, expand, and market recreation opportunities and facilities such as the Paiute ATV Trail, campgrounds, water, restrooms, and other recreation, picnic, and trailhead facilities as a regional destination location.
Continue to manage the area as open to OHV use.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Limit OHV use in the SRMA to designated routes and trails east of the reservoir. Provide an OHV open area west of the reservoir. 	Limit OHVs to designated routes, according to the area designations shown in Table 2-16.	Close non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics to OHV use. Elsewhere in the SRMA, limit vehicles to designated routes. Allow permitted access, where needed, to range developments and mining claims as identified in the activity plan.
Not applicable.	Complete an SRMA activity plan within five years of RMP Record of Decision (ROD).	Not applicable.	Complete an SRMA activity plan within 5 years of RMP ROD.
Issue: Management of Recreational Opportunities in the Factory Butte Area			
Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Proposed RMP	Management Actions
Continue managing the Factory Butte area as part of the ERMA.	Factory Butte SRMA Identify 199,700 acres of public land as the Factory Butte SRMA (Map 2-8) to provide a motorized recreational experience that involves a high degree of self-reliance, challenge, and risk in a natural setting.	Factory Butte SRMA Identify 24,400 acres of public land as the Factory Butte SRMA (Appendix 18) to provide a motorized recreational experience that involves a high degree of self-reliance, challenge, and risk in a natural setting.	<p>Alternative C</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Develop no facilities to support recreation activities unless needed to meet ACEC objectives. <p>Alternative D</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Manage recreation values in the Factory Butte area as part of the ERMA in concert with the Badlands ACEC designation. Identify 127,100 acres of public land in the Factory Butte area as part of the San Rafael Swell SRMA (Map 2-11) for primitive and semi-primitive recreational opportunities. Manage in coordination with the Price FO. Preserve or retain the

Table 2-15. Recreation Decisions

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> modifications. Provide limited signing and interpretation. Develop facilities to provide for visitor health and safety and support the objectives of the SRMA. Establish three RMZs including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> OHV Play Area RMZ (8,500 acres) Motorized Touring RMZ (11,300 acres) Landmarks RMZ (4,600 acres) Designate three OHV open areas as the OHV Play Area RMZ: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Factory Butte (5,800 acres) Caineville Cove Inn (100 acres) Swing Arm City (2,600 acres) Manage the Factory Butte SRMA according to the prescriptions outlined in Appendix 18. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> existing character of the landscape. Develop facilities to support motorized and non-motorized recreation in a dispersed setting and to provide for health and safety, such as restrooms, staging areas, loading facilities, and parking areas. Manage the SRMA for a medium probability of experiencing solitude, closeness to nature, self-reliance, challenge, and risk in an unmodified and natural appearing environment with low interaction or evidence of other users. Manage recreational activities to sustain natural resources while meeting social and economic needs, emphasizing the opportunity to experience solitude by recreational vehicle touring, camping, and hiking. 				
<p>Continue to manage OHV use in accordance with the <i>Notice of OHV Travel/Restriction for motorized use in the Factory Butte area (Table 2-16)</i>.</p>	<p>Designate SRMA as open to OHV use (Map 2-8).</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="1253 910 1423 1712"> <tr> <td>Designate SRMA as open to OHV use in the OHV Play Area RMZ (8,500 acres).</td> <td>Close mesa tops to OHV use. Elsewhere in the ACEC, limit OHVs to designated trails to prevent irreparable damage to cultural resources, badlands</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Limited to Designated Routes in the Motorized Touring RMZ and Closed to</td> <td>Close mesa tops and non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics to OHV use. Elsewhere in SRMA, limit vehicles to designated routes. Allow permitted</td> </tr> </table>	Designate SRMA as open to OHV use in the OHV Play Area RMZ (8,500 acres).	Close mesa tops to OHV use. Elsewhere in the ACEC, limit OHVs to designated trails to prevent irreparable damage to cultural resources, badlands	Limited to Designated Routes in the Motorized Touring RMZ and Closed to	Close mesa tops and non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics to OHV use. Elsewhere in SRMA, limit vehicles to designated routes. Allow permitted
Designate SRMA as open to OHV use in the OHV Play Area RMZ (8,500 acres).	Close mesa tops to OHV use. Elsewhere in the ACEC, limit OHVs to designated trails to prevent irreparable damage to cultural resources, badlands				
Limited to Designated Routes in the Motorized Touring RMZ and Closed to	Close mesa tops and non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics to OHV use. Elsewhere in SRMA, limit vehicles to designated routes. Allow permitted				

Table 2-15. Recreation Decisions

Issue: Management of Recreational Opportunities in the Big Rocks Area Near Loa				
Management Actions				
Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Proposed RMP	Alternative C	Alternative D
Continue to manage the Big Rocks area as part of the ERMA.	<p>Big Rocks SRMA Identify Big Rocks SRMA (9,300 acres) and provide for motorized and dispersed recreational use, including competitive motorized recreation events (Map 2-8).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Manage recreational activities to sustain natural resources while meeting social and economic needs, emphasizing the opportunity to experience solitude. Provide access ranging from moderate to easy through a full range of motorized vehicle types with little self-reliance and a high or moderate level of interaction between users. Provide signing and 	<p>Big Rocks SRMA Identify Big Rocks SRMA (90 acres) to provide for motorized recreational use, including competitive motorized recreation events (Map 2-9).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Manage motorized recreational activities to sustain natural resources while meeting social and economic needs. Provide access ranging from moderate to easy through a full range of motorized vehicle types with little self-reliance and a high or moderate level of interaction between users. 	Manage the Big Rocks area as part of the ERMA.	Manage the Big Rocks area as part of the ERMA.
Not applicable.	Complete an SRMA activity plan within 5 years of the RMP ROD. *Implementation level decision.	Not applicable.	Complete an SRMA activity plan within 5 years of the RMP ROD.	access, where needed, to range developments and mining claims as identified in the activity plan. (Map 2-11).

* This is an implementation-level decision that cannot be protested under the planning regulations. Please see the cover letter for further information.

Table 2-15. Recreation Decisions

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • between users. • Provide signing and interpretation as needed. • Develop facilities to support motorized and dispersed recreational activities, such as restrooms, staging areas, loading facilities, and parking areas. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interpretation as needed. • Develop facilities to support motorized and dispersed recreational activities, such as restrooms, staging areas, loading facilities, and parking areas. 	
Continue managing as an OHV open area.	Manage SRMA as an OHV open area.	Manage SRMA as an OHV open area.	Limit OHVs to designated routes according to Table 2-16.
Not applicable	Complete an activity plan within 5 years of the RMP ROD.	Complete an activity plan within 5 years of the RMP ROD. *Implementation level decision.	Not applicable
Issue: Management of Recreational Opportunities in the Dirty Devil/Robbers Roost Area			
Management Actions	Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Proposed RMP
Continue to manage area as part of ERMA.	Dirty Devil SRMA Identify the Dirty Devil/Robbers Roost area as an SRMA (290,000 acres, Map 2-8) to provide recreational experiences complementary with the remote and scenic nature and other resource values of the area. (SRMA includes the Dirty Devil WSA, Horseshoe	Dirty Devil SRMA Identify the Dirty Devil/Robbers Roost area as an SRMA (290,500 acres, Map 2-9) to provide recreational experiences complementary with the remote and scenic nature and other resource values of the area. (SRMA includes the Dirty Devil WSA, Horseshoe	Dirty Devil SRMA Identify the Dirty Devil/Robbers Roost area as an SRMA (375,800 acres, Map 2-10) in concert with the Dirty Devil/North Wash ACEC to provide for recreational experiences complementary with the remote and scenic nature and other resource values of

* This is an implementation-level decision that cannot be protested under the planning regulations. Please see the cover letter for further information.

Table 2-15. Recreation Decisions

Canyon WSA, Happy Canyon—French Springs WSA, and the Beaver Wash ACEC.)	Canyon WSA, and the Happy Canyon—French Springs WSA.)	the area, notably the ACEC values. (SRMA includes the Dirty Devil WSA, Horseshoe Canyon WSA, Fiddler Butte WSA, Happy Canyon—French Springs WSA, proposed Dirty Devil/North Wash ACEC and the suitable Dirty Devil River and tributary WSR segments.)	the area, notably the ACEC values. (SRMA includes the Dirty Devil WSA, Horseshoe Canyon WSA, Fiddler Butte WSA, Happy Canyon—French Springs WSA, proposed Dirty Devil/North Wash ACEC and the suitable Dirty Devil River and tributary WSR segments.)
• Manage SRMA consistent with prescriptions identified in the Beaver Wash ACEC and direction provided in the IMP for WSAs.	• Manage the portions of the WSAs within the SRMA according to the IMP. • Manage the portions of the Dirty Devil/French Springs non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics in accordance with the management prescriptions identified for these areas.	• Manage SRMA consistent with prescriptions identified in the Dirty Devil North Wash ACEC, with direction provided in the IMP for WSAs, and with protection for WSR outstandingly remarkable values.	• Manage SRMA consistent with prescriptions identified in the Dirty Devil North Wash ACEC.
• Manage SRMA for a high probability of experiencing solitude, closeness to nature, self-reliance, challenge, and risk in an unmodified and natural appearing environment with very low interaction or evidence of other users.	• Manage SRMA for a high probability of experiencing solitude, closeness to nature, self-reliance, challenge, and risk in an unmodified and natural appearing environment with very low interaction or evidence of other users.	• Manage SRMA for a high probability of experiencing solitude, closeness to nature, self-reliance, challenge, and risk in an unmodified and natural appearing environment with very low interaction or evidence of other users.	• Direction provided in the IMP for WSAs.
• Provide opportunities for primitive and semi-primitive, non-motorized recreation within the Dirty Devil River corridor, its tributaries, and the Horseshoe Canyon drainage.	• Provide opportunities for primitive and semi-primitive, non-motorized recreation within the Dirty Devil River corridor, its tributaries, and the Horseshoe Canyon drainage.	• Provide non-motorized access on trails, cross-country and some primitive roads (access for people with disabilities would be most difficult).	– Protection of WSR outstandingly remarkable values.
• Provide semi-primitive motorized activity on designated routes.	• Provide non-motorized access by means of trails, cross-country travel, and some primitive roads (access for people with	• Provide semi-primitive motorized activity on designated routes.	– Protection of non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics.
• Provide no site developments or only			• Manage SRMA for a high probability of experiencing solitude, closeness to nature, self-reliance, challenge, and risk in an unmodified and natural appearing environment with very low interaction or evidence of other users.

Table 2-15. Recreation Decisions

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> disabilities would be most difficult). Provide no site developments or only the minimum required for site protection, considering user comfort secondarily. Provide no on-site interpretive facilities. Manage to allow natural processes to achieve self-sustaining systems. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide non-motorized access by means of trails, cross-country travel, and some primitive roads. (Access for people with disabilities would be most difficult.) Provide no site developments or only the minimum required for site protection, considering user comfort secondarily. Provide no on-site interpretive facilities. Manage to allow natural processes to achieve self-sustaining systems. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the minimum required for site protection, with user comfort secondary in consideration. Provide no on-site interpretive facilities. Manage to allow natural processes to achieve self-sustaining systems. Provide no on-site interpretive facilities. Manage to allow natural processes to achieve self-sustaining systems. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> disabilities would be most difficult.) Provide no site developments or only the minimum required for site protection, with user comfort considered secondarily. Provide no on-site interpretive facilities. Manage to allow natural processes to achieve self-sustaining systems. Provide no on-site interpretive facilities. Manage to allow natural processes to achieve self-sustaining systems.
Manage OHVs according to existing area designations (Map 2-12).	Limit OHVs to designated routes.	Close canyons and portions of WSAs to OHV use. Limit OHVs to designated routes elsewhere (Table 2-16).	Close WSAs and WSR segments to OHV use except for limited designation in Poison Springs/North Hatch Canyon road corridor. Limit OHV use to designated routes in the portion of the SRMA outside the ACEC (Table 2-16).	Close WSAs and non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics to vehicle use. Elsewhere in the SRMA, limit vehicles to designated roads and trails. Allow permitted access, where needed, to range developments and mining claims as identified in the activity plan (Table 2-16).
Continue dealing with recreation use conflicts on a case-by-case basis.	Consider limiting recreational activities if they conflict with other resources or users, if necessary. (Limitations could include numbers of people, season of use, or area of use.)			
Not applicable		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Develop an activity plan for the SRMA within 5 years to address developed facilities, special recreation permits (SRP), and special rules for protecting resources such as regulating campfire use, camping, sanitation, backcountry permits, group size, spatial and seasonal restrictions. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Implementation level decision. 	

* This is an implementation-level decision that cannot be protested under the planning regulations. Please see the cover letter for further information.

Table 2-15. Recreation Decisions

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continue to issue current SRPs according to site-specific analysis already completed and according to existing permit stipulations. (SRPs are currently in place for commercial uses such as canyoneering, rock climbing, backpacking, hiking, guided hunting, and vehicle tours.) • Prior to completing the activity plan, issue additional similar SRPs, subject to the following stipulations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Within one-half mile of canyon rims and below the rim, limit group size to 12 or fewer. Allow no commercial or organized group larger than 12 to operate in this area. – Allow only one commercial group to occupy the same side of the canyon at any one time. – Review itineraries prior to each operating season. – Allow no camping within one-half mile of Mexican spotted owl protected activity centers. Require all activities be consistent with the guidelines in the Mexican spotted owl recovery plan. – Allow no camping within the 100-year floodplain or 330 feet on either side from the centerline, whichever is greater, of any spring or water sources in Desert bighorn sheep use areas during the lambing season (April 15–June 15). – Stipulate additional requirements, if needed, to protect sensitive species and their critical habitats. • Consider developing facilities to support the objectives of the SRMA, to provide for visitor health and safety, and for resource protection. • Locate facilities such as trailheads, instructional signs, group sites, and parking areas on the bench lands near existing access roads. • Address changes to OHV route designations, if needed. • Conduct environmental analysis on SRP proposals that do not meet the criteria above or that are different than existing SRPs. 	<p>Manage oil and gas leasing in SRMA (outside WSAs) as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lease VRM Class II areas and canyon rims within the viewshed of all canyons (approximately one-quarter mile), with major constraints (NSO). • Lease the remainder of the SRMA subject to CSU and/or timing limitations. <p>(Map 2-37)</p>	<p>Manage oil and gas leasing in SRMA (outside WSAs, WSR corridors, and VRM Class II areas within Poison Springs Canyon and Happy Canyon) as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lease VRM Class II areas and canyon rims within the viewshed of all canyons (approximately one-quarter mile) with major constraints (NSO). • Lease the remainder of the SRMA as NSO or subject to CSU and/or timing limitations. <p>(Map 2-39)</p>
<p>Continue managing oil and gas leasing according to existing LUPs and applicable law (Map 2-35).</p>	<p>Manage oil and gas leasing in SRMA (outside WSAs) as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lease remaining areas subject to CSU and/or timing limitations. <p>(Map 2-36)</p>	<p>Manage oil and gas leasing in SRMA (outside WSAs, WSR corridors, and VRM Class II areas within Poison Springs Canyon and Happy Canyon) as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lease VRM Class II areas and canyon rims within the viewshed of all canyons (approximately one-quarter mile), with major constraints (NSO). • Lease the remainder of the SRMA subject to CSU and/or timing limitations. <p>(Map 2-37)</p>

Table 2-15. Recreation Decisions

Issue: Management of Recreational Opportunities on Lands Adjacent to Capitol Reef National Park		Management Actions		
Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Proposed RMP	Alternative C	Alternative D
<p>Continue managing the Capitol Reef Gateway area as part of the ERMA.</p> <p>In addition:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Manage the Fremont Gorge WSA under the IMP. Manage the eligible Fremont Gorge wild river segment to protect its outstandingly remarkable values. 	<p>Manage the Capitol Reef Gateway area as part of the ERMA.</p> <p>In addition:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Manage the Fremont Gorge WSA under the IMP. Manage the eligible Fremont Gorge wild river segment to protect its outstandingly remarkable values. 	<p>Capitol Reef Gateway SRMA</p> <p>Identify the Capitol Reef Gateway as an SRMA (12,800 acres, Map 2-9) to manage recreation opportunities associated with Capitol Reef National Park.</p> <p>SRMA boundary includes Fremont Gorge WSA, the suitable wild river segment of the Fremont River, and the Fremont Gorge Cockscomb potential ACEC.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Manage the Fremont Gorge WSA under the IMP. Manage the Fremont Gorge suitable wild river segment to protect its outstandingly remarkable values. Manage the Capitol Reef Gateway SRMA for a moderate probability of experiencing solitude, closeness to nature and tranquility, high degree of self-reliance, challenge, and risk in a predominately natural-appearing environment with low interaction but often evidence of other 	<p>Capitol Reef Gateway SRMA</p> <p>Identify the Capitol Reef Gateway as an SRMA (12,800 acres, Map 2-10) to manage recreation opportunities associated with Capitol Reef National Park.</p> <p>SRMA boundary includes Fremont Gorge WSA, the suitable wild river segment of the Fremont River, portions of the Fremont Gorge Cockscomb potential ACEC and non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics adjacent to the east boundary of the park.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Manage appropriate portions of the SRMA in concert with the Fremont Gorge/Cockscomb ACEC. Manage the Fremont Gorge WSA under the IMP. Manage the Fremont Gorge eligible wild river segment to protect its outstandingly remarkable values. Manage the Capitol Reef Gateway SRMA for a moderate probability of experiencing solitude, closeness to nature and tranquility, high degree of self-reliance, challenge, and risk in a predominately natural-appearing environment with low interaction but often evidence of other 	<p>Capitol Reef Gateway SRMA</p> <p>Identify the Capitol Reef Gateway as an SRMA (168,800 acres, Map 2-11) to manage recreation opportunities associated with Capitol Reef National Park.</p> <p>SRMA boundary includes Fremont Gorge WSA, the suitable wild river segment of the Fremont River, portions of the Fremont Gorge Cockscomb potential ACEC and non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics adjacent to the east boundary of the park.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Manage appropriate portions of the SRMA in concert with the Fremont Gorge/Cockscomb ACEC. Manage the Fremont Gorge WSA under the IMP. Manage the Fremont Gorge eligible wild river segment to protect its outstandingly remarkable values. Manage the Capitol Reef Gateway SRMA for a moderate probability of experiencing solitude, Protect non-WSA lands

Table 2-15. Recreation Decisions

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • users. • Provide access into the area through motorized and non-motorized routes. (Access for people with disabilities would be difficult.) • Allow facilities to reduce resource impacts, including campgrounds, picnic areas, restrooms, parking and staging areas, and interpretive facilities. • Explore concession opportunities for management and development of additional facilities. 	<p>closeness to nature and tranquility, high degree of self-reliance, challenge, and risk in a predominately natural-appearing environment with low interaction but often evidence of other users.</p> <p>• To facilitate access into the area and staging apply a higher level of interaction with visitors; allow travel through the interior using non-motorized means on trails or cross-country. (Access for people with disabilities would be difficult.)</p> <p>• Provide no interior site developments and only the minimum required for site protection.</p> <p>• Provide no on-site interpretation facilities.</p>		<p>closeness to nature and tranquility, high degree of self-reliance, challenge, and risk in a predominately natural-appearing environment with low interaction but often evidence of other users.</p> <p>• Manage the Capitol Reef Gateway SRMA for a moderate probability of experiencing solitude, closeness to nature and tranquility, high degree of self-reliance, challenge, and risk in a predominately natural-appearing environment with low interaction but often evidence of other users.</p> <p>• To facilitate access into the area and staging apply a higher level of interaction with visitors; allow travel through the interior using non-motorized means on trails or cross-country. (Access for people with disabilities would be difficult.)</p> <p>• Provide no interior site developments and only the minimum required for site protection.</p> <p>• Provide no on-site interpretation facilities.</p> <p>• Close the Fremont Gorge WSA, Fremont Gorge wild river corridor, and VRM Class II areas to OHV use.</p> <p>• Limit OHVs to</p>	<p>with wilderness characteristics.</p> <p>• Manage the Capitol Reef Gateway SRMA for a moderate probability of experiencing solitude, closeness to nature and tranquility, high degree of self-reliance, challenge, and risk in a predominately natural-appearing environment with low interaction but often evidence of other users.</p> <p>• To facilitate access into the area and staging apply a higher level of interaction with visitors; allow travel through the interior using non-motorized means on trails or cross-country. (Access for people with disabilities would be difficult.)</p> <p>• Provide no interior site developments and only the minimum required for site protection.</p> <p>• Provide no on-site interpretation facilities.</p> <p>• Close the Fremont Gorge WSA, Fremont Gorge wild river corridor, and VRM Class II areas to OHV use.</p> <p>• Limit OHVs to</p>
Continue managing OHV use according to current LUPs.	Manage OHV use according to designations in Table 2-16.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Close the Fremont Gorge WSA and Fremont Gorge wild river corridor to OHV use. • Limit OHVs to 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Close the Fremont Gorge WSA, Fremont Gorge wild river corridor, and VRM Class II areas to OHV use. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Close the Fremont Gorge WSA, Fremont Gorge wild river corridor, and VRM Class II areas to OHV use.

Table 2-15. Recreation Decisions

Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Proposed RMP	Alternative C	Alternative D
Continue managing Sahara Sands as part of the ERMA.	Sahara Sands SRMA Identify Sahara Sands SRMA (12,300 acres) as indicated on Map 2-8. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Manage for a roaded natural recreational 	Manage Sahara Sands as part of the ERMA.		
Issue: Management of Recreational Opportunities in the Sahara Sands Area				*Implementation level decision
Not applicable.				

* This is an implementation-level decision that cannot be protested under the planning regulations. Please see the cover letter for further information.

Table 2-15. Recreation Decisions

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opportunity providing users the opportunity to interact with others in developed sites, with some chance of privacy. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide a managed OHV recreation experience, including cross-country all-terrain travel. • Develop facilities for user comfort and convenience (as opposed to site protection) to promote and enhance recreation experience as a managed open area. This could include development of parking and staging areas, restrooms, and instructional signing, and could involve moderate or even heavy site modifications. • Explore concession opportunities for management and operation of recreation activity in the area. 	<p>Designate as an OHV open area.</p> <p>Manage OHV use according to area designations in Table 2-16.</p>
	Not applicable.	Complete an SRMA activity plan within 5 years of RMP ROD.	Not applicable.

Table 2-15. Recreation Decisions

Issue: Management of Recreational Opportunities in the Henry Mountains				
Alternative N (No Action)	Management Actions		Proposed RMP	Alternative C
	Alternative A	Alternative D		
Continue to manage the Henry Mountains as part of the ERMA. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Manage WSAs according to the IMP. Manage Bull Creek Archaeological District to protect cultural resource values. 	<p>Manage the Henry Mountains as part of the ERMA.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Manage WSAs according to the IMP. Manage Bull Creek Archaeological District to protect cultural resource values. 	<p>Henry Mountains SRMA Identify a Henry Mountains SRMA (532,600 acres, Map 2-9). Area includes the Mount Ellen–Blue Hills WSA, Bull Mountain WSA, Mount Pennell WSA, Mount Hillers WSA, and Bull Creek Archaeological District.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Manage WSAs according to the IMP. Manage Bull Creek Archaeological District to protect cultural resource values. 	<p>Henry Mountains SRMA Identify a Henry Mountains SRMA (533,900 acres, Map 2-10). Area includes the Mount Ellen–Blue Hills WSA, Bull Mountain WSA, Mount Pennell WSA, Mount Hillers WSA, and Bull Creek Archaeological District.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Manage WSAs according to the IMP. Manage Bull Creek Archaeological District to protect cultural resource values. 	<p>Henry Mountains SRMA Identify a Henry Mountains SRMA (479,500 acres, Map 2-11). Area includes the Mount Ellen–Blue Hills WSA, Bull Mountain WSA, Mount Pennell WSA, Mount Hillers WSA, and Bull Creek Archaeological District.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Manage WSAs according to the IMP. Manage Bull Creek Archaeological District to protect cultural resource values.

Table 2-15. Recreation Decisions

	<p>needed to protect resources and provide for visitor safety.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide signs, trails, trailhead parking, and staging areas to facilitate the use and enjoyment of the SRMA and protection of resources. Maintain and improve non-motorized trails, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Panorama Knoll Mount Ellen Burro Wash Cottonwood Wash Sheets Gulch Five Mile Wash. Designate areas for large group events and camping, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Starr Springs Campground McMillian Spring Overlook Sandy Creek Overlook Apple Brush Flat Turkey Haven. 	<p>evidence of other users).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide facilities needed to protect resources and provide for visitor safety. Provide signs, trails, trailhead parking, and staging areas to facilitate the use and enjoyment of the SRMA and protection of resources. Maintain and improve non-motorized trails, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Panorama Knoll Mount Ellen Burro Wash Cottonwood Wash Sheets Gulch Five Mile Wash. Designate areas for large group events and camping, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Starr Springs Campground McMillian Spring Overlook Sandy Creek Overlook Apple Brush Flat Turkey Haven. 	<p>self-reliance, challenge, and risk (interactions between users would be low with minimal evidence of other users).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide facilities needed to protect resources and provide for visitor safety. Provide signs, trails, trailhead parking, and staging areas to facilitate the use and enjoyment of the SRMA and protection of resources. Maintain and improve non-motorized trails, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Panorama Knoll Mount Ellen Burro Wash Cottonwood Wash Sheets Gulch Five Mile Wash. Designate areas for large group events and camping, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Starr Springs Campground McMillian Spring Overlook Sandy Creek Overlook Apple Brush Flat Turkey Haven.
--	---	---	--

Table 2-15. Recreation Decisions

Issue: Management of Recreational Opportunities in the Sevier Canyon Area				
	Management Actions	Alternative A	Proposed RMP	Alternative C
Alternative N (No Action)				Sevier Canyon SRMA Identify a Sevier Canyon SRMA (7,500 acres, Map 2-10.)
Continue OHV area designations from current LUPs.	Continue to manage Sevier Canyon as part of the ERMA.	Manage according to area designations in Table 2-16.	Manage according to area designations in Table 2-16.	Close WSAs and non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics to motorized vehicle use. Elsewhere, limit vehicles to designated routes. Allow permitted access, where needed, to range developments and mining claims as identified in the activity plan.
Not applicable.	Complete an SRMA activity plan within 5 years of the RMP ROD. *			
		*Implementation level decision.		
		Alternative D		
		Continue to manage Sevier Canyon as part of the ERMA.		
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Manage the SRMA to protect the scenic values in and around Sevier Canyon. • Manage the SRMA in concert with the Sevier Canyon ACEC. • Provide opportunities for semi-primitive motorized and non-motorized recreation. 		
Continue OHV area designations from current LUPs.	Manage OHV use according to area designations in Table 2-16.	Limit OHV use to designated routes.		

* This is an implementation-level decision that cannot be protested under the planning regulations. Please see the cover letter for further information.

Table 2-15. Recreation Decisions

Issue: Management of Recreational Opportunities in Horseshoe Canyon				
Management Actions				
Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Proposed RMP	Alternative C	Alternative D
Not applicable		Complete an SRMA activity plan within 5 years of the RMP ROD.	Not applicable.	

Table 2-15. Recreation Decisions

		with very low interaction or evidence of other users.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide non-motorized access on trails, cross-country, and some primitive roads. • Provide no on-site interpretation facilities.
Manage OHVs per direction in existing LUP.	Manage OHVs per management direction in the Dirty Devil SRMA (above) and Table 2-16.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Close WSAs and non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics to OHVs. Elsewhere, limit vehicles to designated routes (Table 2-16). • Allow permitted access, where needed, to range developments and mining claims as identified in the activity plan.
Not applicable	Complete an SRMA activity plan within 5 years of the RMP ROD. *Implementation level decision.	

Issue: Management of Recreational Opportunities in the Little Rockies

Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Proposed RMP	Alternative C	Alternative D
Continue to manage as part of the ERMA.				<p>Little Rockies SRMA</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Manage the 64,000 acres of the Little Rockies SRMA for primitive and semi-primitive recreational opportunities (Map 2-

* This is an implementation-level decision that cannot be protested under the planning regulations. Please see the cover letter for further information.

Table 2-15. Recreation Decisions

<p>(11).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To facilitate access into the area and staging, apply a higher level of interaction with visitors; allow travel through the interior using non-motorized means on trails or cross-country (access for people with disabilities would be difficult) • Provide no interior site developments and only the minimum required for site protection and public safety elsewhere. • Manage the SRMA in coordination with National Natural Landmark values. • Preserve or retain the existing character of the landscape. • Manage SRMA for a high probability of experiencing solitude, closeness to nature, self-reliance, challenge, and risk in an unmodified and natural appearing environment with very low interaction or evidence of other users. 	<p>Manage OHVs in accordance with direction in existing LUP.</p> <p>Manage OHVs in accordance with management direction in Table 2-16.</p> <p>Close WSAs and non-WSA lands with wilderness</p>
---	--

Table 2-15. Recreation Decisions

Issue: Management of Recreational Opportunities Around Yuba Reservoir				
	Management Actions			
	Alternative A	Proposed RMP	Alternative C	Alternative D
Not applicable.				• Characteristics to OHVs. • Allow permitted access, where needed, to range developments and mining claims as identified in the activity plan.
			Complete an SRMA activity plan within 5 years of the RMP ROD.	
Issue: Overall Special Recreation Permit (SRP) Guidance				
	Management Actions			
	Alternative A	Proposed RMP	Alternative C	Alternative D
Continue implementing the current <i>Yuba Reservoir Management Plan</i> .	Implement the <i>Yuba Reservoir Management Plan</i> , as revised by the Fillmore FO.			
Common to the Proposed RMP and Draft RMP Alternatives				
Permit no competitive events in WSAs.				
Issue: Criteria for Commercial SRPs				
	Management Actions			
	Alternative A	Proposed RMP	Alternative C	Alternative D
Alternative N (No Action)				
Current plans provide no guidance on SRPs. Issue SRPs on a case-by-case basis.	Authorize commercial use permits that provide recreational opportunities, enhance recreational experiences, and protect resources on a case-by-case basis, subject to environmental analysis.			

Table 2-15. Recreation Decisions

		Issue: Criteria for Competitive SRPs			
		Management Actions			
		Alternative A	Proposed RMP	Alternative C	Alternative D
Alternative N (No Action)	Current plans provide no guidance on competitive events.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Authorize motorized and non-motorized competitive events consistent with OHV area and route designations on a case-by-case basis, subject to environmental analysis. Permit no competitive events in the Dirty Devil/Robbers Roost SRMA. 			
					Issue: Criteria for Organized Group SRPs
		Management Actions			
Alternative N (No Action)	Current plans provide no guidance on regulating organized groups.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Require SRPs for organized groups outside designated large group areas meeting any one of the following criteria: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Group includes 50 or more participants. Group uses 10 or more vehicles. 			
					Issue: Criteria for Vending
		Management Actions			
Alternative N (No Action)	Current plans provide no guidance on vending.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Authorize vending on a case-by-case basis subject to environmental analysis in conjunction with organized events or when the vending is necessary to support protection of resources or recreational use. Authorize vending permits for uses that enhance recreational experiences. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Authorize vending on a case-by-case basis subject to environmental analysis in conjunction with organized events or when the vending is necessary to support protection of resources or recreational use. Authorize vending permits for uses that enhance recreational experiences. Authorize no vending along scenic byways and backways. 		

Travel Management

Table 2-16. Travel Management Decisions

Desired Outcomes (Goals and Objectives)					
Issue: OHV Area Designations					
Management Actions					
Common to the Proposed RMP and Draft RMP Alternatives					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Maintain existing access, where needed and allowed, to meet public and administrative needs, including acquiring or maintaining necessary access across non-Federal land. Continue compatible traditional, current, and future use of the land by establishing a route system that contributes to protection of sensitive resources, accommodates a variety of uses, minimizes user conflicts, and is sustainable. Consider public access, resource management, and regulatory needs through transportation planning. Coordinate OHV management with other agencies where possible (USFS, NPS, State of Utah, counties, and communities). 	<p>The BLM, in preparing its RMP designations and its implementation-level travel management plans, is following policy and regulation authority found at: 43 C.F.R. Part 8340; 43 C.F.R. Subpart 8364; and 43 C.F.R. Subpart 9268.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Where the authorized officer determines that OHVs are causing or would cause considerable adverse impacts, the authorized officer shall close or restrict such areas. The public would be notified. The BLM could impose limitations on types of vehicles allowed on specific designated routes if monitoring indicates that a particular type of vehicle is causing disturbance to the soil, wildlife habitat, cultural or vegetative resources, especially by off-road travel in an area that is limited to designated routes. Site-specific management actions that protect riparian areas would be addressed at the project level. Designate WSAs as closed or limited to designated ways for OHV use (Table 2-19, WSA decisions for details). If OHV use in areas designated as open or limited causes threats or adverse impacts to resources, take appropriate steps, including, but not limited to, use restrictions or closures, installation of additional signs and barricades, restoration of affected areas, etc. 	<p>Proposed RMP</p>	<p>Alternative C</p>	<p>Alternative D</p>
<p>Alternative N (No Action)</p> <p>Continue existing OHV area designations as follows (Map 2-12):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Open: 1,636,400 acres Limited: 277,600 acres Existing routes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – 271,000 acres – Designated routes: 4,900 acres 	<p>Provide motorized access to the public lands with the minimum restrictions needed to protect other resources. Designate areas as follows (Map 2-13):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Open: 449,000 acres Limited: 1,679,000 acres 	<p>Balance motorized access to public lands with other resource and resource use needs. Designate areas as follows (Map 2-14):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Open: 9,890 acres Limited: 1,908,210 acres Closed: 209,900 acres. 	<p>Restrict motorized access to public lands to protect other resources and resource uses. Designate areas as follows (Map 2-15):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Open: 0 acres Limited: 1,445,000 acres Closed: 683,000 acres. 	<p>Restrict motorized access to public lands to protect other resources and resource uses. Designate areas as follows (Map 2-16):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Open: 0 acres Limited: 972,800 acres Closed: 1,155,200 acres. 	

Table 2-16. Travel Management Decisions

Issue: Designation of Managed Open Areas				
Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Proposed RMP	Alternative C	Alternative D
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Maintained routes: 1,700 acres. Closed: 214,000 acres. <p>Continue to manage OHV use in accordance with the <i>Notice of OHV Travel/Restriction for motorized use in the Factory Butte Area</i>, published September 20, 2006 (2,602 acres open to OHV use, 142,023 acres limited to designated routes, and 3,843 acres of North Caineville Mesa closed to OHV use). This restriction will remain in effect until the RFO RMP becomes final.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Closed: 0 acres. 	<p>Designate the following managed open areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ticaboo Play Area (19,000 acres. Cane Spring Desert east of Ticaboo)—Designate and manage as an OHV open area to accommodate existing use and growth, provide alternative modes of recreation adjacent to Glen Canyon National Recreation Area (NRA), and provide opportunities for economic development. 	<p>Designate no OHV open areas.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Factory Butte Play Area (5,800 acres)—Designate and manage as an OHV open area to provide a unique OHV riding experience on Mancos shale badlands to accommodate existing use and future growth. Swing Arm City Play Area (2,600 acres)—Designate and manage as an OHV open area. 	<p>Designate no OHV open areas.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Caineville Cove Inn

Table 2-16. Travel Management Decisions

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sahara Sands Play Area (12,000 acres. Northeast of Hwy 95/276 junction)—Designate and manage as an OHV open area to provide a sand dune riding opportunity, accommodate existing use and growth, provide alternative modes of recreation adjacent to Glen Canyon NRA, and provide opportunities for economic development. • Roost Play Area (19,000 acres. Northwest of Antelope Valley)—Designate and manage as an OHV open area to provide a sand dune riding opportunity and to accommodate existing use and future growth. • Factory Butte Play Area (200,000 acres. Near Caineville and Notom)—Designate and manage as an OHV open area to provide a Mancos shale riding opportunity and to accommodate existing use and future growth. • Miners Mountain (9,500 acres. Southeast 	<p>Play Area (100 acres)—Designate and manage as an OHV open area.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Big Rocks Trials Play Area (90 acres)—Designate and manage as an OHV open area to provide trials motorcycle/rock crawling OHV recreational opportunity. • Glenwood Play Area (1,000 acres)—Designate as an OHV open area and manage as a community OHV area. • Aurora Play Area (300 acres)—Designate as an OHV open area and manage as a community OHV area.
---	--

Table 2-16. Travel Management Decisions

<p>of Torrey)—Designate and manage as an OHV open area to accommodate dispersed camping, prospecting, firewood cutting, game retrieval, and other traditional uses of the land.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Beas Lewis Flat (4,500 acres, East of Torrey)—Designate and manage as an OHV open area to accommodate dispersed camping, prospecting, firewood cutting, game retrieval, and other traditional uses of the land. • Big Rocks Dispersed Recreation Area (9,000 acres, South of Loa)—Designate and manage as an OHV open area to accommodate trials motorcycle/rock crawling use and dispersed camping. • Dry Wash (6,500 acres, East of Antimony)—Designate and manage as an OHV open area to accommodate dispersed camping, prospecting, firewood cutting, game retrieval and other traditional uses of the land.

Table 2-16. Travel Management Decisions

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hunter Spring (4,500 acres. West of Antimony)—Designate and manage as an OHV open area to accommodate dispersed camping, prospecting, firewood cutting, game retrieval, and other traditional uses of the land. • Otter Creek Reservoir (1,000 acres. Public land around the reservoir)—Designate and manage as an OHV open area west of the reservoir to accommodate dispersed camping and access to Otter Creek Reservoir and nearby OHV trails. • Antelope Range/Kingston Canyon (102,000 acres. Southern Sevier County and western Piute County)—Designate and manage as an OHV open area to accommodate prospecting, firewood cutting, game retrieval, dispersed camping, and other traditional uses of the land. • Glenwood Play Area (3,500 acres. East of Glenwood)—Designate
--

Table 2-16. Travel Management Decisions

	as an OHV open area and manage as a community OHV area.
• Richfield to Aurora Play Area (7,000 acres. West of I-70)—Designate as an OHV open area and manage as a community OHV area.	
• Rocky Ford Play Area (12,500 acres. East of Rocky Ford Reservoir)—Designate as an OHV open area and manage as a community OHV area.	
• White Hills Play Area (16,500 acres. North of Aurora.)—Designate as an OHV open area and manage as a community OHV area.	
• Fayette Play Area —(4,500 acres. West of Fayette)—Designate as an OHV open area and manage as a community OHV area.	
• Salina to Mayfield (12,500 acres. North and east of Salina and west of Mayfield)—Designate as an OHV open area and manage as a community OHV area.	
• Gunnison Reservoir (5,500 acres. West of	

Table 2-16. Travel Management Decisions

Issue: Management of OHV Play Areas Adjacent to Communities				
Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Proposed RMP	Alternative C	Alternative D
Gunnison Reservoir)—Designate and manage as an OHV open area to provide access to the west side of the reservoir and an associated open OHV area.		Consider no requests for R&PP leases for OHV open play areas.		
Common to the Proposed RMP and Draft RMP Alternatives				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Prohibit all motorized travel in closed areas, with the following exceptions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> For emergency and other purposes as authorized under 43 CFR 8340.0-5(a)(2), (3), (4) and (5); Minimum use necessary to exercise a valid existing right or authorized use. 				
Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Proposed RMP	Alternative C	Alternative D
Continue existing closed areas. (Map 2-12)	Close no areas to motorized use. (Map 2-13)	Close the following areas to motorized use. (Map 2-14) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> WSAs: To prevent impairment of the areas' suitability for preservation as wilderness. 	Close the following areas to motorized use. (Map 2-15) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> WSAs: All WSAs, to prevent impairment of the areas' suitability for preservation as wilderness. Little Rockies WSA <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Portions of the Dirty Devil, Fiddler Butte, Fremont Gorge, French 	Close the following areas to motorized use. (Map 2-16) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> WSAs: All WSAs, to prevent impairment of the areas' suitability for preservation as wilderness. Non-WSA Lands with Wilderness Characteristics: All non-WSA lands with wilderness values. (Refer to Table

Table 2-16. Travel Management Decisions

<p>Hillers WSAs.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ACECs: All of the existing ACECs as specified by management prescriptions to protect relevant and important values. – North Caineville Mesa ACEC – South Caineville Mesa ACEC (overlaps portion of Mt. Ellen/Blue Hills WSA) – Beaver Wash Canyon ACEC (overlaps a portion of Dirty Devil WSA) – Gilbert Badlands ACEC (overlaps a portion of Mt. Ellen/Blue Hills WSA). • Tough Hollow: to protect cultural resources in this area. 	<p>Spring/Happy Canyon, Horseshoe Canyon North, Horseshoe Canyon South and Mount Ellen/Blue Hills WSAs.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WSRs: to protect outstandingly remarkable values. (Refer to Table 2-20, Wild and Scenic River Decisions) • ACECs: As specified by management prescriptions to protect relevant and important values. (Refer to Table 2-21, ACEC Decisions) – Old Woman Front ACEC – Rainbow Hills ACEC – A portion of the Badlands ACEC (mesa tops) – Fremont Gorge – Suitable Wild River. • ACECs: to protect R & I values (Refer to Table 2-21, ACEC Decisions) – North Caineville Mesa ACEC – Old Woman Front ACEC. • SRMAs: Portions of the proposed SRMAs to retain the desired recreation setting, scenic values, and for consistency with other management decisions. – Gilbert Badlands ACEC (overlaps a portion of Mt. Ellen/Blue Hills WSA). • Tough Hollow: to protect cultural resources in this area. 	<p>2-20, Wild and Scenic River Decisions)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ACECs: As specified by management prescriptions to protect relevant and important values. (Refer to Table 2-21, ACEC Decisions) – Old Woman Front ACEC – Rainbow Hills ACEC – A portion of the Badlands ACEC (mesa tops) – Fremont Gorge – Suitable Wild River. • ACECs: to protect R & I values (Refer to Table 2-21, ACEC Decisions) – North Caineville Mesa ACEC – Old Woman Front ACEC. • SRMAs: Portions of the proposed SRMAs to retain the desired recreation setting and for consistency with other management decisions. (Refer to Table 2-15, Recreation Decisions) – Dirty Devil SRMA – Fremont Gorge SRMA – Factory Butte SRMA (Landmarks RMZ). 	<p>characteristics, to protect their naturalness and opportunities for solitude and primitive recreation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WSRs: All segments proposed to protect outstandingly remarkable river-related values. (Refer to Table 2-20, Wild and Scenic River Decisions) • ACECs: As specified by management prescriptions to protect relevant and important values and for consistency with other management decisions. In areas where the potential ACECs overlap WSAs, non-VSA lands and/or VSRs, the decisions in those sections would apply to the ACEC. (Refer to Table 2-21, ACEC Decisions) – All of the Old Woman Front, Rainbow Hills, Dirty Devil, Horseshoe Canyon, and Lower Muddy Creek ACECs – Portions of the Badlands, Bull Creek, Fremont Gorge/Cockscomb, Henry Mountains,
---	---	--	--

Table 2-16. Travel Management Decisions

Issue: Designation of Limited Areas				
Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Proposed RMP	Alternative C	Alternative D
Continue managing 277,600 acres identified on Map 2-12 as limited to OHV use as identified in current LUPs.	Manage 1,679,000 acres identified on Map 2-13 as limited to designated routes or designated routes with seasonal closures or size/	Manage 1,908,210 acres identified on Map 2-14 as limited to designated routes or designated routes with seasonal closures or size/	Manage 1,445,000 acres identified on Map 2-15 as limited to designated routes or designated routes with seasonal closures or size/	Manage 972,800 acres identified on Map 2-16 as limited to designated routes or designated routes with seasonal closures or size/

Table 2-16. Travel Management Decisions

Common to the Proposed RMP and Draft RMP Alternatives				
Issue: Route Designation and Vehicle Use within Limited Areas				
Management Actions				
Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Proposed RMP	Alternative C	Alternative D
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prohibit all cross-country (off-transportation system) motorized travel in limited areas, with the following exceptions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – For emergency and other purposes as authorized under 43 CFR 8340.0-5(a)(2), (3), (4) and (5). • Coordinate OHV route designations with USFS, NPS, State of Utah, counties, and communities, where possible. • Rehabilitate closed OHV routes on a case-by-case basis as required to mitigate impacts to resources. Closed or non-designated routes would be allowed to rehabilitate naturally unless a specific resource impact was occurring that warranted expedited rehabilitation of the route (e.g., soil erosion, water quality concerns, and/or continued illegal use). • Route designations are implementation decisions that are subject to change based upon future site-specific environmental analysis. Appendix 9 provides additional details of the travel management/route designation process, the implementation process, and the process that would be required to add or remove route designations following completion of the RMP. 			Not applicable (all WSAs are closed to motorized travel).	
Where routes would remain available for motorized use within WSAs, such use could continue on a conditional basis. Use of the existing routes in the WSAs (“ways” when located within WSAs – see Glossary) could continue as long as the use of these routes does not impair wilderness suitability, as provided by the IMP (BLM 1995). If Congress designates the area as wilderness, the routes will be closed. In the interim, if use and/or non-compliance are found through monitoring efforts to impair the area's suitability for wilderness designation, BLM would take further action to limit use of the routes, or close them. The continued use of these routes, therefore, is based on user compliance and non-impairment of wilderness values.			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Designate routes for motorized use unless significant, undue damage to or disturbance of the soil, wildlife, wildlife habitat, improvements, cultural or vegetative resources, or other authorized uses of the public lands is imminent. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Designate routes for motorized use unless significant, undue damage to or disturbance of the soil, wildlife, wildlife habitat, improvements, cultural or vegetative resources, or other authorized uses of the public lands is imminent. • Designate routes for motorized use unless significant, undue damage to or disturbance of the soil, wildlife, wildlife habitat, improvements, cultural or vegetative resources, or other authorized uses of the public lands is imminent. • Designate routes to
Designate existing, inventoried routes for motorized use in accordance with existing LUP direction.				

Table 2-16. Travel Management Decisions

Issue: Identification of Routes Where Seasonal Closures Are Needed to Protect Deer and Elk			
Management Actions	Proposed RMP	Alternative C	Alternative D
<p>Alternative N (No Action)</p> <p>Not specifically addressed in existing plans.</p>	<p>No specific restrictions within crucial habitat.</p>	<p>Limit OHV use to designated routes in deer and elk crucial winter range, except for Glenwood and Aurora Managed Open Areas.</p>	<p>Close identified routes in deer and elk crucial winter range seasonally (December 1–April 15) to protect wildlife values.</p>

Table 2-16. Travel Management Decisions

Issue: Identification of Routes Where Seasonal Closures Are Needed to Protect Bison in the Henry Mountains				
Alternative N (No Action)	Management Actions			
	Alternative A	Proposed RMP	Alternative C	Alternative D
Continue seasonal (December 20–March 20) closures in bison crucial habitat at Swap Mesa and Cave Flat.	Limit OHV use to designated routes in bison crucial habitat. Consider seasonal closure of designated routes on a case-by-case basis. (Map 3-5)	Manage OHV use in bison habitat as closed or limited to designated routes, according to the prescriptions outlined in the Henry Mountains ACEC (Table 2-2).		
Summary of Route Designations, For Proposed RMP and Draft Alternatives*				
Common to the Proposed RMP and Draft RMP Alternatives				
<i>Route designations are implementation decisions that are subject to change in the future based on site-specific environmental analyses.</i>				
Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Proposed RMP	Alternative C	Alternative D
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Designated routes: 4,315 miles Designated routes with seasonal closures or size/ width restriction: 0 miles Closed routes: 65 miles 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Designated routes: 4,063 miles Designated routes with seasonal closures or size/ width restriction: 249 miles Closed routes: 68 miles (Map 2-17) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Designated routes: 3,739 miles *Implementation level decision. Designated routes with seasonal closures or size/ width restriction: 538 miles *Implementation level decision. Closed routes: 345 miles *Implementation level decision. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Designated routes: 2,601 miles Designated routes with seasonal closures or size/ width restriction: 591 miles Closed routes: 1,188 miles (Map 2-19) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Designated routes: 2,493 miles Designated routes with seasonal closures or size/ width restriction: 591 miles Closed routes: 1,296 miles (Map 2-20)

* This is an implementation-level decision that cannot be protested under the planning regulations. Please see the cover letter for further information.

Table 2-16. Travel Management Decisions

		Issue: Motor Vehicle Access for Parking/Staging in OHV Limited Areas Outside WSAs	
		Management Actions	
		Proposed RMP	Alternative C
Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	<p>Allow motor vehicles to pull off a designated route up to 100 feet of either side of the centerline for the purposes of parking/staging.</p>	<p>Allow motor vehicles to pull off a designated route up to 50 feet of either side of the centerline for the purposes of parking/staging.</p>
		Issue: Motor Vehicle Access to Campsites in OHV Limited Areas Outside WSAs	
		Management Actions	
		Proposed RMP	Alternative C
Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Allow motor vehicles to use existing spur routes for ingress and egress to established campsites within 300 feet of the centerline of designated routes. (Previous campsites can be distinguished by evidence of rock fire rings, old tent sites, and tracks from earlier vehicle access.) This does not authorize creation of new campsites or travel ways. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Allow motor vehicles to use existing spur routes for ingress and egress to established campsites within 150 feet of designated routes. (Previous campsites can be distinguished by evidence of rock fire rings, old tent sites, and tracks from earlier vehicle access.) This does not authorize creation of new campsites or travel ways. Prohibit motorized travel ways between multiple campsites, establishment of motorized play areas, race tracks, or travel across wet meadows or riparian areas.

Table 2-16. Travel Management Decisions

Issue: Motor Vehicle Access to Campsites and for Parking/Staging in OHV Limited Areas Within WSAs			
Common to the Proposed RMP and Draft RMP Alternatives			
Require vehicles to stay on designated ways or cherry-stemmed routes within WSAs, in accordance with IMP direction.			Not applicable (All WSAs are closed to motorized travel.)
Issue: Game Retrieval			
Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Proposed RMP	Alternative C
Not specifically addressed in existing plans.	Do not allow use of non-motorized wheel carriers to retrieve game kills inside of WSAs.	Precclude the use of game carriers off designated routes.	Alternative D
Issue: Management of Paiute ATV Trail and Great Western Trail			
Common to the Proposed RMP and Draft RMP Alternatives			
Cooperatively manage with the USFS, State of Utah, and local governments the portions of the Paiute ATV Trail and Great Western Trail systems that lie on public lands managed by the RFO.			

Lands and Realty

Table 2-17. Lands and Realty Decisions

Desired Outcomes (Goals and Objectives)	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Retain public lands in federal ownership, unless it is determined that disposal of a particular parcel will serve the public interest. • Emphasize a balanced program of disposals, acquisitions, and land exchanges in conducting land tenure adjustments. • Consider land tenure adjustments to improve land ownership patterns, accomplish resource management goals, and accommodate community expansion and economic development needs. • Support alternative energy development purposes, such as wind and solar energy resources, and coordinate with other resource objectives. • Use ROW corridors and collocate new proposals within existing sites or ROW areas, to the extent practical, in order to minimize adverse environmental impacts and the proliferation of separate ROWs. • Retain in federal ownership, public lands that enhance multiple-use management, allow access to public lands, or contain sensitive or rare resources. • Acquire lands or interests in lands to complement existing resource values and uses. • Consider for disposal lands or interests in lands that are difficult and/or uneconomical to manage, or are no longer needed for federal purposes. • Consider land or interest in land for disposal if: 1) it was acquired for a specific purpose and is no longer required for that or any other federal purpose; 2) said land would serve important public objectives that cannot be achieved prudently or feasibly on lands other than public lands and that outweigh other public objectives and values; or; 3) because of its location or other characteristics is difficult and uneconomic to manage as part of the public lands and is not suitable for management by another federal department or agency. The method used to identify the parcels considered for disposal (Appendix 5) included: FLPMA Section 203 sales criteria, land tenure adjustment criteria (identified in Appendix 5), a BLM inter-disciplinary team review of land status ownership maps, historical index, the LR 2000 database, and resource information. • As per the State of Utah v. Andrus, Oct. 1, 1979 (Cotter Decision), the BLM would grant the State of Utah reasonable access to state lands for economic purposes, on a case-by-case basis. 	
Issue: Land Tenure Adjustments General Direction	
Management Actions	Common to the Proposed RMP and Draft RMP Alternatives
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For any form of land tenure adjustment (including, but not limited to, exchanges, in lieu selections, state grants, desert land entries, R&PP patents, easement acquisitions, etc.), except for FLPMA Section 203 sales, ensure it meets one or more of the following criteria: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Is in the public interest and accommodates the needs of state, local, or private entities, including needs for the economy, community growth and expansion, and be in accordance with other land use goals, objectives, and planning decisions – Results in a net gain of important and manageable resource values on public lands such as crucial wildlife habitat, significant cultural sites, high-value recreation areas, high-quality riparian areas, live water, SSS habitat, or areas key to maintenance of productive ecosystems – Ensures the accessibility of public lands in areas where access is needed and cannot otherwise be obtained; – Is essential to allow effective management of public lands in areas where consolidation of ownership is necessary to meet resource management objectives – Is not suitable for management by another federal department or agency

Table 2-17. Lands and Realty Decisions

Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Proposed RMP	Alternative C	Alternative D
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Results in the acquisition of lands that serve a national priority as identified in national policy directives. In addition to the above criteria, require a site-specific environmental analysis in accordance with NEPA for all future land disposal actions. Critical elements of the Human Environment and other resource issues identified through public and agency involvement would be adequately considered and appropriately evaluated. Certain elements of the human environment are subject to requirements specified in statutes, regulations, or executive orders. Program-specific consultation would occur (if required), and respective on-site surveys and documented clearances would be obtained prior to any land disposal action. This subsequent analysis and documentation may reveal resource conditions that could not be mitigated to the satisfaction of the authorized officer and may, therefore preclude disposal. Ensure all land tenure adjustments must be in conformance with other decisions (goals, objectives, management actions) within this RMP. Habitat for listed and candidate T&E species are generally required to be retained in Federal ownership. Consider exceptions in disposal actions with the State of Utah and others with consultation with and concurrence of the USFWS. Permit surface lands identified for disposal with unpatented mining claims to be conveyed if the purchaser is the mining claimant, or the mining claims are relinquished if the purchaser is other than the mining claimant. Issue patents for existing shooting ranges [Appendix 5, Table A5-11]. No portions of these R&PP patented lands, under any circumstances, would revert to the United States if any such portion was used for solid waste disposal or for any other purpose that may result in the disposal, placement, or release of any hazardous substance. Where consistent with the goals and objectives of the RMP, classify as suitable for lease and/or disposal under Section 7 of the Taylor Grazing Act of 1934, as amended, lands disposed of or leased under the R&PP Act, Desert Land Entry (DLE) Act, Color of Title, Carey Act, and state grants. As the preferred method, manage OHV Open Play Areas located near communities by issuing a lease or patent under the R&PP Act, and have the relevant state, county, or local community manage the areas. Pursue land acquisitions from willing sellers when lands: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Are within or adjacent to WSAs, ACECs, WSRs, or other special designations Are associated with key fisheries or wildlife habitats and riparian zones Provide linkage or public access to other public lands Have significant paleontological or cultural resources Provide high recreation or other significant resource or public values Are needed to improve manageability of public lands. Give land exchanges with the State of Utah priority consideration to resolve inholdings issues. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Maintain important recreational values and sites in federal ownership The Utah BLM Riparian Management Policy identifies that Riparian 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Retain the suitable WSR segment (1 segment—5 miles) in federal ownership, unless such action would benefit outstandingly 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Retain all suitable WSR segments (12 segments—135 miles) in federal ownership, unless such action would benefit outstandingly 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Retain all suitable WSR segments (12 segments—135 miles) in federal ownership, unless such action would benefit outstandingly

Table 2-17. Lands and Realty Decisions

remarkable values and improve WSR management potential.	areas will be retained in the public land system unless it can be clearly demonstrated that specific sites are so small or isolated that they cannot be managed in an effective manner by BLM or through agreement with State or Federal agencies or interested conservation groups. • Retain identified, relatively undisturbed Old Spanish Trail segments in federal ownership. • Retain habitat for federally listed and candidate species in federal ownership. Exceptions may be considered in exchanges with the State of Utah and others after consultation with and concurrence with the USFWS.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • remarkable values and improve WSR management potential. • Retain non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics carried forward (78,600 acres) in federal ownership. • Maintain important recreational values and sites in federal ownership. • The Utah BLM Riparian Management Policy identifies that Riparian areas will be retained in the public land system unless it can be clearly demonstrated that specific sites are so small or isolated that they cannot be managed in an effective manner by BLM or through agreement with State or Federal agencies or interested conservation groups. • The Utah BLM Riparian Management Policy identifies that Riparian areas will be retained in the public land system unless it can be clearly demonstrated that specific sites are so small or isolated that they cannot be managed in an effective manner by BLM or through agreement with State or Federal agencies or interested conservation groups. • Retain identified, relatively undisturbed Old Spanish Trail segments in federal ownership. • Retain habitat for federally listed and candidate species in federal ownership. • Retain habitat for federally listed and candidate species in federal ownership. Exceptions may be considered in exchanges with the State of Utah and others after consultation with and concurrence with the USFWS. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • remarkable values and improve WSR management potential. • Retain non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics (682,600 acres) in federal ownership. • Maintain important recreational values and sites in federal ownership. • The Utah BLM Riparian Management Policy identifies that Riparian areas will be retained in the public land system unless it can be clearly demonstrated that specific sites are so small or isolated that they cannot be managed in an effective manner by BLM or through agreement with State or Federal agencies or interested conservation groups. • Retain identified, relatively undisturbed Old Spanish Trail segments in federal ownership. • Retain habitat for federally listed and candidate species in federal ownership. • Retain habitat for federally listed and candidate species in federal ownership. Exceptions may be considered in exchanges with the State of Utah and others after consultation with and concurrence with the USFWS.
---	---	--	--

Table 2-17. Lands and Realty Decisions

Issue: FLPMA Section 203 Sales				
Management Actions				
Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Proposed RMP	Alternative C	Alternative D
Continue to offer for sale lands identified in the <i>Mountain Valley MFP</i> (280 of the acres identified are still available).	Make approximately 13,400 acres of public land available for FLPMA Section 203 sales (as listed in Appendix 5 and shown on Maps 2-21 through 2-25) subject to NEPA compliance and consistent with other decisions in this RMP.	Consider no lands for FLPMA Section 203 sales.		
Issue: Withdrawals, Classifications, and Segregations				
Management Actions				
Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Proposed RMP	Alternative C	Alternative D
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review existing withdrawals to determine whether they are serving the purposes for which they were withdrawn. (Existing withdrawals are listed in Table A5-7 in Appendix 5.) • Manage any lands becoming unencumbered by withdrawals in a manner consistent with adjacent or comparable public land within the RFO. • Review existing classifications and segregations on a case-by-case basis to determine whether the classification or segregation is appropriate and should be continued, modified, or terminated. 				
Continue existing withdrawals (154,700 acres). Recommend withdrawing the following developed recreation sites from mineral entry:	Continue existing withdrawals (154,700 acres).	Continue existing withdrawals (154,700 acres). Recommend withdrawing the following areas from mineral entry (Map 2-27):	Continue existing withdrawals (154,700 acres). Recommend withdrawing the following areas from mineral entry (Map 2-28):	Continue existing withdrawals (154,700 acres). Recommend withdrawing the following areas from mineral entry (Map 2-29): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rainbow Hills ACEC • Old Woman Front ACEC • All suitable WSRs within one-quarter mile each side of those rivers
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lonesome Beaver Campground • McMillan Spring Campground • Starr Springs Campground 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Old Woman Front ACEC • Fremont (Fremont Gorge) suitable wild river within one-quarter mile of each side of 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Old Woman Front ACEC • All suitable WSRs within one-quarter mile each side of those rivers

Table 2-17. Lands and Realty Decisions

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Dandelion Flat Picnic Area Hog Springs Picnic Area. <p>Recommend withdrawing the four existing ACECs (14,780 acres) from mineral entry. Total acres: 169,480</p>	<p>high water mark on each bank of the river</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Developed recreation sites, including Lonesome Beaver Campground, McMillan Spring Campground, Starr Springs Campground, Dandelion Flat Picnic Area, Hog Springs Picnic Area, Otter Creek Reservoir Recreation Sites, Kingston Canyon Recreation Site, and Koosharem Picnic Area Area, Hog Springs Picnic Area, Otter Creek Reservoir Recreation Sites, Kingston Canyon Recreation Site, and Koosharem Picnic Area. <p>New recommended acres: 21,500</p> <p>Total acres: 176,200</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Developed recreation sites, including Lonesome Beaver Campground, McMillan Spring Campground, Starr Springs Campground, Dandelion Flat Picnic Area, Hog Springs Picnic Area, Otter Creek Reservoir Recreation Sites, Kingston Canyon Recreation Site, and Koosharem Picnic Area Recommend withdrawing the VRM Class II portions of the following ACECs from mineral entry (see ACEC prescriptions for details): Dirty Devil/North Wash ACEC Fremont Gorge/Cockscomb ACEC Badlands ACEC Henry Mountains ACEC Horseshoe Canyon ACEC Little Rockies ACEC. <p>New recommended acres: 176,400</p> <p>Total acres: 331,100</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All areas identified as non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics. Developed recreation sites, including Lonesome Beaver Campground, McMillan Spring Campground, Starr Springs Campground, Dandelion Flat Picnic Area, Hog Springs Picnic Area, Otter Creek Reservoir Recreation Sites, Kingston Canyon Recreation Site, and Koosharem Picnic Area Recommend withdrawing the VRM Class II portions of the following ACECs from mineral entry (see ACEC prescriptions for details): Dirty Devil/North Wash ACEC Fremont Gorge/Cockscomb ACEC Badlands ACEC Henry Mountains ACEC Horseshoe Canyon ACEC Little Rockies ACEC. <p>New recommended acres: 749,200</p> <p>Total acres: 903,900</p>
---	---	---	---

Table 2-17. Lands and Realty Decisions

Issue: Management of ROWs	
Management Actions	
Common to the Proposed RMP and Draft RMP Alternatives	
<p>In existing ROWs, authorize culinary water source developments (Culinary Water Sources Table A5-12 in Appendix 5) subject to valid existing rights and future land use authorizations to ensure that they do not lead to degradation, pollution, or contamination of water supply.</p> <p>When compatible, require multiple communication site users to share the same sites and buildings, and use the same facilities. See Existing Communication Sites Table A5-10 in Appendix 5.</p> <p>Continue to maintain roads for resource management purposes.</p> <p>Consider obtaining easements across non-federal land to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide public access • Enhance resource management in key fishery and wildlife habitats and riparian zones • Cooperate with other federal, state, and local governing agencies, organizations, tribes, and private individuals in obtaining ROW easements • Enhance resource management. 	
Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A
Issue: ROW Avoidance and Exclusion Areas	
Management Actions	
Proposed RMP	Alternative C
Alternative D	
<p>Apply the spatial and temporal restrictions outlined in Table 2-9, Fish and Wildlife Decisions to ROW construction and maintenance activities. These restrictions do not apply to emergency maintenance.</p> <p>Manage the following as ROW avoidance areas (Map 2-30):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WSAs • ACECs • Eligible WSR corridors • Areas closed to oil and gas leasing • Areas open to oil and gas leasing with NSO stipulations. 	
<p>Manage the following as ROW avoidance areas (Map 2-31):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WSAs • Areas closed to oil and gas leasing. • Areas closed to oil and gas leasing with NSO stipulations. 	
<p>Manage the following as ROW avoidance areas (Map 2-32):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ACECs • Non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics • Areas closed to oil and gas leasing • Areas open to oil and gas leasing with NSO stipulations. 	
<p>Manage the following as ROW avoidance or exclusion areas (Map 2-33):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WSAs • ACECs • Suitable WSR corridors • Areas closed to oil and gas leasing • Areas open to oil and gas leasing with NSO stipulations. 	
<p>Manage the following as ROW avoidance or exclusion areas (Map 2-34):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • VVSAs • ACECs • Suitable WSR corridors • Non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics • Areas closed to oil and gas leasing • Areas open to oil and gas leasing with NSO stipulations. 	

Table 2-17. Lands and Realty Decisions

		gas leasing	WSAs.		
Consider exceptions in the avoidance areas on a case-by-case basis if the proposed ROW would:					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not create substantial surface disturbance or would cause only temporary impacts • Be compatible with the resource values being protected by the goals and objectives of the avoidance areas • Be consistent with management prescriptions for ACECs and WSRs and pose no irreversible or irretrievable impacts (Proposed RMP and Draft Alternatives N, C and D) • Be consistent with the goals and objectives of the identified non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics (Proposed RMP and Draft Alternative D). 					
Issue: Management of Wind and Solar Energy Development					
Management Actions		Proposed RMP	Alternative C	Alternative D	
Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	For authorization of any ROW for wind or solar energy development, incorporate best management practices (BMP) and provisions contained in the Wind Energy Development Program Record of Decision (Appendix 15 of this Proposed RMP/Final EIS and BLM 2005d) and BLM's Solar Energy Policy.	Consider proposals for wind and solar energy development throughout the RFO except within the following areas:	Consider proposals for wind and solar energy development throughout the lands administered by the RFO except within the following areas:	Consider proposals for wind and solar energy development throughout the lands administered by the RFO except within the following areas:
Not specifically addressed in existing plans.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WSA (ROW exclusion areas in accordance with IMP). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WSA (ROW exclusion areas in accordance with IMP) • Fremont (Fremont Gorge) suitable wild river corridor • ACECs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WSA (ROW exclusion areas in accordance with IMP) • Suitable WSR corridors • ACECs • Areas open to oil and gas leasing with NSO and areas closed to leasing. • VRM Class I and II areas 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WSA (ROW exclusion areas in accordance with IMP) • Non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics • Suitable WSR corridors • ACECs • Areas open to oil and gas leasing with NSO and areas closed to leasing. • VRM Class I and II areas
Consider wind and solar energy exploration and development on a case-by-case basis.					

Table 2-17. Lands and Realty Decisions

		Issue: Transportation and Utility Corridors			
		Management Actions			
		Common to the Proposed RMP and Draft RMP Alternatives			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To minimize adverse environmental impacts and the proliferation of separate ROWs, use common ROWs whenever possible, including collocation of new utility transmission lines and other facilities within existing utility and highway corridors. Carry forward to or amend the Richfield RMP with any decisions on designation of energy corridors contained within the “West-wide Energy Corridor Programmatic EIS” currently being developed separately from this RMP analysis that affect public lands in the RFO. 					
Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Proposed RMP	Alternative C	Alternative D	
Designate no transportation and utility corridors.	Designate those transportation and utility corridors listed in Appendix 5.				
Issue: Leases (Including R&PP Leases), Permits, and Easements					
<p>Common to the Proposed RMP and Draft RMP Alternatives</p> <p>Consider authorizing leases, permits, and easements that are compatible with other decisions throughout this RMP.</p>					

Minerals and Energy

Table 2-18. Minerals and Energy Decisions

Desired Outcomes (Goals and Objectives)	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Manage conservation of leasable mineral resources using appropriate best management practices, and without compromising the long-term health and diversity of public lands. Manage mining claim location, prospecting, and mining operations in a manner that would not cause unnecessary or undue degradation of public lands and resources. Provide salable minerals needed for community and economic purposes while minimizing impacts to other resource values. Encourage and facilitate the development by private industry of public land mineral resources in a manner that satisfies national and local needs and provides for economical and environmentally sound exploration, extraction, and reclamation practices using appropriate BMPs. Support the domestic need for energy resources. 	<p>Issue: Management of Fluid Mineral Leasing (Oil and Gas, and Coalbed Natural Gas)</p>
Common to the Proposed RMP and Draft RMP Alternatives	
	Management Actions
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Issue oil and gas leases and allow for oil and gas exploration and development. Continue closure of WSAs to leasing, pursuant to the federal onshore Oil and Gas Leasing Reform Act of 1987. To the extent allowed by a site-specific environmental analysis that justifies a constraint, consistent with 43 CFR 3101.1-2, and consistent with the terms of an existing lease, apply the constraints and requirements for leasing implemented in this RMP to leases that were authorized prior to the signing of the ROD and the approval of the RMP. Manage the following sites as closed to leasing: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Incorporated municipalities. Manage the following additional sites as open to leasing with NSO, except as otherwise provided in other management decisions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> All cemeteries Culinary water sources Landfills—existing and closed Lands managed under a R&PP lease Sites listed on the NRHP Developed recreation sites BLM administrative sites. Lease split-estate lands according to BLM RMP stipulations for adjacent or nearby public lands or plans of other surface management agencies as consistent with federal laws, 43 CFR 3101, and the surface owner's rights. Work cooperatively with stakeholders to research interim measures, such as those presented by the Four Corners Air Quality Task Force (i.e., limits of 2g/bhp-hr on engines less than 300 HP), to determine which emission mitigation strategies should be required as conditions for future lease and land use authorizations. 	

Table 2-18. Minerals and Energy Decisions

Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Proposed RMP	Alternative C	Alternative D
Area closed to leasing: 459,700 acres	Area closed to leasing: 446,900 acres	Area closed to leasing: 447,300 acres	Area closed to leasing: 586,300 acres	Area closed to leasing: 1,160,500 acres
Manage fluid mineral leases as shown on Map 2-35:	Manage fluid mineral leases as shown on Map 2-36:	Manage fluid mineral leases as shown on Map 2-37:	Manage fluid mineral leases as shown on Map 2-38:	Manage fluid mineral leases as shown on Map 2-39:
Issue: Management of Geophysical Operations				
Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Proposed RMP	Alternative C	Alternative D
Geophysical operations are subject to the oil and gas leasing categories.				
Subject geophysical operations under 43 CFR 3150 to the oil and gas leasing restrictions with the following exception:				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consider geophysical operations proposed for lands that are designated as NSO or closed to leasing for approval when (1) the circumstances or relative resource values in the area have changed, (2) less restrictive requirements could be developed to protect the resource of concern, or (3) operations could be conducted without causing unacceptable impacts to the resource of concern. 				

Table 2-18. Minerals and Energy Decisions

Common to the Proposed RMP and Draft RMP Alternatives					
Issue: Management of Geothermal Resources					
Management Actions					
Issue: Management of Tar Sands Areas					
Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Proposed RMP	Alternative C	Alternative D	
Continue to allow geothermal leasing on a case-by-case basis. Use the oil and gas leasing designations as a guide for geothermal resources.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lease geothermal resources in conformance with the oil and gas leasing restrictions (open, open with moderate constraints, open with major constraints, and closed) for oil and gas leasing, consistent with the authorities granted at 43 CFR 3200, including 3201 and 3250. Note: exploration operations under 43 CFR 3250 proposed for lands that are designated as NSO or closed to leasing may be considered for approval when (1) the circumstances or relative resource values in the area have changed, (2) less restrictive requirements could be developed to protect the resource of concern or (3) operations could be conducted without causing unacceptable impacts to the resource or concern. 				
Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Proposed RMP	Alternative C	Alternative D	
Areas available for future consideration for tar sands leasing will be identified in the ROD for the <i>National Oil Shale and Tar Sands Programmatic EIS</i> , being conducted by BLM separately from this analysis. If lands are identified, future leasing considerations will be conducted under site-specific NEPA analyses, and would be subject to the oil and gas leasing restrictions identified in the Proposed RMP and DRMP/DEIS Alternatives.					
Issue: Surface Mining of Coal					
Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Proposed RMP	Alternative C	Alternative D	
Consider leasing coal resources on the following lands identified in the existing LUPs as acceptable:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consider applications for exploration licenses for lands that are subject to leasing as defined at 43 CFR 3400.2. Licenses would be subject to the surface disturbing restrictions and the provisions for exceptions, modifications, and waivers, similar to the oil and gas restrictions consistent with the regulations at 43 CFR 3400. Consider proposals for coal leasing on public lands determined to be acceptable for further consideration for leasing in the coal unsuitability analysis (Appendix 8), if and when there is interest. Prior to leasing, complete a multiple use analysis (43 CFR 3420.1(3)), consult with other surface owners (43 CFR 3420.1-5 (4) (i)), and address other applicable requirements of 43 CFR 3400 Coal Management. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In the Henry Mountains coal field, 14,719 acres are acceptable for consideration for leasing by surface mining methods. In the Wasatch Plateau and Emery coal fields, 0 acres are acceptable for consideration for leasing by surface mining 				

Table 2-18. Minerals and Energy Decisions

Issue: Subsurface Mining of Coal				
Management Actions				
Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Proposed RMP	Alternative C	Alternative D
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 30,052 acres of federal mineral estate in the Wasatch Plateau and Emery coal fields are identified as acceptable for consideration of coal leasing by surface mining methods. <p>Consider no coal leasing proposals in VRM Class I areas. VRM Classes II, III, and IV areas would be subject to coal exploration and development mitigation requirements, with VRM Class II being most restrictive and VRM Class IV least restrictive.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consider no coal leasing proposals in VRM Class I areas. <p>VRM Classes II, III, and IV areas would be subject to coal exploration and development mitigation requirements, with VRM Class II being most restrictive and VRM Class IV least restrictive.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consider no coal leasing proposals in the 12 (78,600 acres) identified non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consider no coal leasing proposals in VRM Class I or II areas. <p>VRM Classes II, III, and IV areas would be subject to coal exploration and development mitigation requirements, with VRM Class II being most restrictive and VRM Class IV least restrictive.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consider no coal leasing proposals in VRM Class I or II areas. <p>Consider no coal leasing proposals in non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics (682,600 acres).</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consider no coal leasing proposals in VRM Class I or II areas. <p>Consider no coal leasing proposals in non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics (682,600 acres).</p>

Table 2-18. Minerals and Energy Decisions

		Issue: Management of Non-Energy Solid Leasable Minerals		
		Management Actions		
		Common to the Proposed RMP and Draft RMP Alternatives		
in the Henry Mountains are identified as acceptable for consideration of leasing by underground mining with 19,255 acres subject to no surface facilities.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> requirements of 43 CFR 3400 Coal Management. In the Henry Mountains coal field, 41,842 acres of BLM lands are acceptable for consideration for leasing by underground mining methods. In the Wasatch Plateau coal field, 18,672 acres of National Forest, and in the Emery coal field, 9,624 acres of BLM lands and 3,542 acres of National Forest are acceptable for consideration for leasing by underground mining methods. 	Consider no coal leasing proposals in VRM Class I areas. VRM Class II, III, and IV areas would be subject to coal exploration and development mitigation requirements, with VRM Class II being most restrictive and VRM IV least restrictive.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consider no coal leasing proposals in VRM Class I or II areas. Consider no coal leasing proposals in non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics. 	
73,952 acres of federal mineral estate in the Wasatch Plateau and Emery coal fields are identified as acceptable for consideration of leasing with 43,567 acres subject to no surface facilities.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consider no coal leasing proposals in VRM Class I areas. VRM Class II, III, and IV areas would be subject to coal exploration and development mitigation requirements, with VRM Class II being most restrictive and VRM IV least restrictive. 			
Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Proposed RMP	Alternative C	Alternative D
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Continue to prohibit leasing in WSAs, within 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Manage leasing as 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Manage leasing as 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Manage leasing as 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Manage leasing as

Table 2-18. Minerals and Energy Decisions

<p>one-quarter mile of eligible wild and scenic rivers, and within ACECs.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Allow leasing where it is consistent with the existing LUPs and has been addressed in a NEPA analysis. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> shown on Map 2-40. Areas closed to leasing (WSAs): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – 446,900 acres Areas open to leasing subject to standard conditions of approval: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – 860,600 acres Areas open to leasing subject to CSU and/or timing limitations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – 820,500 acres Areas open to leasing subject to NSO: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – 0 acres 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> shown on Map 2-41. Closed to leasing in WSAs and, within one-quarter mile of the high water mark on each bank of the Fremont Gorge WSR recommended as suitable. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> shown on Map 2-42. Closed to leasing in WSAs, within one-quarter mile of the 12 WSRs recommended as suitable, and within the following ACECs: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Dirty Devil/North Wash ACEC – Fremont Gorge/Cockscomb ACEC – Badlands ACEC – Henry Mountains ACEC – Horseshoe Canyon ACEC – Little Rockies ACEC – Rainbow Hills ACEC – Areas closed to leasing: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – 586,300 acres – Areas open to leasing subject to standard conditions of approval: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – 491,900 acres – Areas open to leasing subject to CSU and/or timing limitations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – 901,100 acres – Areas open to leasing subject to NSO: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – 148,700 acres 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> shown on Map 2-43. Closed to leasing in WSAs, non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics, within one-quarter mile of the 12 WSRs recommended as suitable, and within the following ACECs: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Dirty Devil/North Wash ACEC – Fremont Gorge/Cockscomb ACEC – Badlands ACEC – Henry Mountains ACEC – Horseshoe Canyon ACEC – Little Rockies ACEC – Rainbow Hills ACEC – Areas closed to leasing: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – 586,300 acres – Areas open to leasing subject to standard conditions of approval: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – 491,900 acres – Areas open to leasing subject to CSU and/or timing limitations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – 901,100 acres – Areas open to leasing subject to NSO: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – 148,700 acres
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Areas closed to leasing (WSAs): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – 446,900 acres Areas open to leasing subject to standard conditions of approval: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – 860,600 acres Areas open to leasing subject to CSU and/or timing limitations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – 820,500 acres Areas open to leasing subject to NSO: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – 0 acres 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Closed to leasing in WSAs, within one-quarter mile of the 12 WSRs recommended as suitable, and within the following ACECs: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Dirty Devil/North Wash ACEC – Fremont Gorge/Cockscomb ACEC – Badlands ACEC – Henry Mountains ACEC – Horseshoe Canyon ACEC – Little Rockies ACEC – Rainbow Hills ACEC – Areas closed to leasing: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – 586,300 acres – Areas open to leasing subject to standard conditions of approval: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – 491,900 acres – Areas open to leasing subject to CSU and/or timing limitations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – 901,100 acres – Areas open to leasing subject to NSO: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – 148,700 acres 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Closed to leasing in WSAs, non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics, within one-quarter mile of the 12 WSRs recommended as suitable, and within the following ACECs: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Dirty Devil/North Wash ACEC – Fremont Gorge/Cockscomb ACEC – Badlands ACEC – Henry Mountains ACEC – Horseshoe Canyon ACEC – Little Rockies ACEC – Rainbow Hills ACEC – Areas closed to leasing: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – 586,300 acres – Areas open to leasing subject to standard conditions of approval: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – 491,900 acres – Areas open to leasing subject to CSU and/or timing limitations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – 901,100 acres – Areas open to leasing subject to NSO: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – 148,700 acres 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Closed to leasing in WSAs, non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics, within one-quarter mile of the 12 WSRs recommended as suitable, and within the following ACECs: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Dirty Devil/North Wash ACEC – Fremont Gorge/Cockscomb ACEC – Badlands ACEC – Henry Mountains ACEC – Horseshoe Canyon ACEC – Little Rockies ACEC – Rainbow Hills ACEC – Areas closed to leasing: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – 586,300 acres – Areas open to leasing subject to standard conditions of approval: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – 491,900 acres – Areas open to leasing subject to CSU and/or timing limitations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – 901,100 acres – Areas open to leasing subject to NSO: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – 148,700 acres

Table 2-18. Minerals and Energy Decisions

Issue: Management of Locatable Minerals			
Common to the Proposed RMP and Draft RMP Alternatives			
Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Proposed RMP	Alternative C
<p>Continue to make existing operations subject to the stipulations developed for the notice or plan of operations. The BLM would evaluate all operations authorized by the mining laws in the context of its requirement to prevent unnecessary and undue degradation of federal lands and resources and the non-impairment standards of the federal regulations at 43 CFR 3802 and the IMP for WSAs. Consistent with the rights afforded claimants under the mining laws, operations conducted after the RMP is approved would be required to conform to the stipulations developed in the RMP and as generally provided in the oil and gas stipulations. The oil and gas stipulations would be a general guideline and may not apply uniformly to all operations under the mining laws. Operations on BLM-administered lands open to mineral entry must be conducted in compliance with all of the BLM's surface management regulations. The BLM surface management regulations apply to public lands, including split estate lands where the minerals are reserved to the United States, but the regulations do not apply to surface lands managed by other federal agencies. All public lands with federal mineral estate are open to mining claim location unless specifically withdrawn from mineral entry by Secretarial order or by a public land law. Therefore, other than the existing withdrawals and those recommended by this RMP, all public lands within the RFO remain open to mineral entry under the mining laws. The BLM may recommend future withdrawals in areas identified as closed or with a NSO stipulation for oil and gas leasing, if it becomes necessary to prevent unacceptable resource impacts.</p>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Continue to allow location, exploration, and development of locatable minerals while preventing unnecessary and undue degradation of other resources and preventing impairment to wilderness suitability of WSAs. Continue existing withdrawals (154,700 acres). Total acres: 154,700 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Allow location, exploration, and development of locatable minerals while preventing unnecessary and undue degradation of other resources and preventing impairment to wilderness suitability of WSAs. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Allow location, exploration, and development of locatable minerals on public lands while preventing unnecessary and undue degradation of other resources and preventing impairment to wilderness suitability of WSAs. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Allow location, exploration, and development of locatable minerals on public lands while preventing unnecessary and undue degradation of other resources and preventing impairment to wilderness suitability of WSAs. Continue existing withdrawals (154,700 acres). Recommend withdrawing the following areas from mineral entry: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Developed recreation sites, including Lonesome Beaver Campground,
<p>• Continue to allow location, exploration, and development of locatable minerals while preventing unnecessary and undue degradation of other resources and preventing impairment to wilderness suitability of WSAs.</p>			
<p>• Continue existing withdrawals (154,700 acres). Total acres: 169,480</p>			
Alternative D			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Allow location, exploration, and development of locatable minerals on public lands while preventing unnecessary and undue degradation of other resources and preventing impairment to wilderness suitability of WSAs. Continue existing withdrawals (154,700 acres). Recommend withdrawing the following areas from mineral entry: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Developed recreation sites, including Lonesome Beaver Campground, 			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Allow location, exploration, and development of locatable minerals on public lands while preventing unnecessary and undue degradation of other resources and preventing impairment to wilderness suitability of WSAs. Continue existing withdrawals (154,700 acres). Recommend withdrawing the following areas from mineral entry: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Developed recreation sites, including Lonesome Beaver Campground, 			

Table 2-18. Minerals and Energy Decisions

McMillan Spring Campground, Starr Springs Campground, Dandelion Flat Picnic Area, Hog Springs Picnic Area, Otter Creek Reservoir	McMillan Spring Campground, Starr Springs Campground, Dandelion Flat Picnic Area, Hog Springs Picnic Area, Otter Creek Reservoir	McMillan Spring Campground, Starr Springs Campground, Dandelion Flat Picnic Area, Hog Springs Picnic Area, Otter Creek Reservoir
Recreation Sites, Kingston Canyon Recreation Site, and Koosharem Picnic Area	Recreation Sites, Kingston Canyon Recreation Site, and Koosharem Picnic Area	Recreation Sites, Kingston Canyon Recreation Site, and Koosharem Picnic Area
– North Caineville Mesa ACEC	– Dirty Devil/North Wash ACEC (VRM Class II area)	– Dirty Devil/North Wash ACEC (VRM Class II area)
– Old Woman Front ACEC	– Fremont Gorge/ Cockscomb ACEC (VRM Class II area)	– Fremont Gorge/ Cockscomb ACEC (VRM Class II area)
– Fremont Gorge Suitable WSR (within one-quarter mile of the high water mark of each bank of the river).	– Badlands ACEC (VRM Class II area)	– Badlands ACEC (VRM Class II area)
The proposed new withdrawals would encompass 21,500 acres. Total acres: 176,200	– Henry Mountains ACEC (VRM Class II area)	– Henry Mountains ACEC (VRM Class II area)
	– Horseshoe Canyon ACEC (VRM Class II area)	– Horseshoe Canyon ACEC (VRM Class II area)
	– Little Rockies ACEC (VRM Class II area) Rainbow Hills ACEC	– Little Rockies ACEC (VRM Class II area) Rainbow Hills ACEC
	– All suitable WSRs within a one-quarter mile corridor along each side of the river.	– All suitable WSRs within a one-quarter mile corridor along each side of the river.
	The proposed new withdrawals would encompass 176,400 acres. Total acres: 331,100	All non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics. The proposed new withdrawals would

Table 2-18. Minerals and Energy Decisions

Issue: Management of Salable Minerals (Mineral Materials)				
Management Actions				
Common to the Proposed RMP and Draft RMP Alternatives				
<p>Authorizations for mineral materials include: exploration permits, exclusive sale contracts, free use permits, community pits, and common use areas. As used herein, the term <i>disposal</i> is used as inclusive of any mineral material authorization, because exploration permits would not be issued in areas closed to disposals. Existing disposals would continue to be subject to the existing stipulations and conditions for that disposal. Disposals issued or designated after the RMP is approved would be subject to the stipulations developed in the RMP. The open and closed areas for mineral material disposals would be the same as provided for oil and gas leasing, including exceptions, modifications, and waivers.</p>				
Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Proposed RMP	Alternative C	Alternative D
Continue to prohibit disposal of mineral materials in WSAs, within one-quarter mile of eligible WSRs, and ACECs. Allow mineral material disposals on a case-by-case basis subject to site-specific environmental analysis outside of these areas.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Manage disposal of mineral materials as shown on Map 2-40. Areas closed to mineral material disposals (WSAs): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – 446,900 acres Areas open to disposal of mineral materials subject to standard conditions of approval: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – 860,600 acres Areas open to disposal of mineral materials subject to CSU and/or timing limitations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – 820,500 acres Areas open to disposal of mineral materials subject to NSO: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – 0 acres 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Manage disposal of mineral materials as shown on Map 2-41. Allow no disposal of mineral materials in WSAs, non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics, and within one-quarter mile of the high water mark on each bank of the Fremont Gorge suitable WSR. Areas closed to mineral material disposals: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – 601,800 acres Areas open to disposal of mineral materials subject to standard conditions of approval: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – 608,700 acres Areas open to disposal of mineral materials subject to CSU and/or 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Manage disposal of mineral materials as shown on Map 2-42. Allow no disposal of mineral materials in WSAs, within one-quarter mile of suitable WSRs, and within the following ACECs: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Dirty Devil/North Wash ACEC – Fremont Gorge/Cockscomb ACEC – Badlands ACEC – Henry Mountains ACEC – Horseshoe Canyon ACEC – Little Rockies ACEC – Rainbow Hills ACEC Areas closed to mineral material disposals: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – 586,300 acres Areas open to disposal 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Manage disposal of mineral materials as shown on Map 2-43. Allow no disposal of mineral materials in WSAs, non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics, within one-quarter mile of suitable WSRs, and within the following ACECs: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Dirty Devil/North Wash ACEC – Fremont Gorge/Cockscomb ACEC – Badlands ACEC – Henry Mountains ACEC – Horseshoe Canyon ACEC – Little Rockies ACEC – Rainbow Hills ACEC Areas closed to mineral material disposals: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – 586,300 acres Areas open to mineral material disposals: • Areas open to disposal

Table 2-18. Minerals and Energy Decisions

<p>timing limitations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – 917,500 acres 	<p>of mineral materials subject to standard conditions of approval:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – 491,900 acres • Areas open to disposal of mineral materials subject to CSU and/or timing limitations: – 901,100 acres • Areas open to disposal of mineral materials subject to NSO: – 148,700 acres 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Areas open to disposal of mineral materials subject to standard conditions of approval: – 290,200 acres • Areas open to disposal of mineral materials subject to CSU and/or timing limitations: – 634,000 acres • Areas open to disposal of mineral materials subject to NSO: – 43,300 acres 	<p>material disposals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – 1,160,500 acres
--	---	---	--

2.6.3 Special Designations

Wilderness Study Areas

Table 2-19. Wilderness Study Areas Decisions

Desired Outcomes (Goals and Objectives)	
Continue to manage WSAs in a manner that does not impair their suitability for designation as wilderness in accordance with FLPMA Section 603 and the <i>Interim Management Policy for Lands Under Wilderness Review</i> .	
Issue: Interim Management of Wilderness Study Areas	Management Action
Common to the Proposed RMP and Draft RMP Alternatives	
Manage WSAs according to the IMP (BLM-H-8550-1). The BLM is statutorily (FLPMA Section 603(c)) required to manage these areas to protect their suitability for congressional designation to the National Wilderness Preservation System unless and until Congress either designates an area as wilderness or releases it from further consideration. The BLM's discretion to make planning decisions on management of WSAs is limited to designating WSAs as VRM Class I and determining whether the WSAs will be limited or closed to OHV use.	
Issue: Oil and Gas Leasing in WSAs	Management Action
Common to the Proposed RMP and Draft RMP Alternatives	
Close all WSAs to leasing pursuant to the Federal Onshore Oil and Gas Leasing Reform Act of 1987.	
Issue: Visual Resource Management and Designation in WSAs	Management Actions
Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A
Manage WSAs as VRM Class I.	Designate all WSAs as VRM Class I.
Issue: Off-Highway Vehicle Area and Route Designation in WSAs	Management Actions
Common to the Proposed RMP and Draft RMP Alternatives	
Where routes would remain available for motorized use within WSAs, such use could continue on a conditional basis. Use of the existing routes in the WSAs (“ways” when located within WSAs – see Glossary) could continue as long as the use of these routes does not impair wilderness suitability, as provided by the IMP (BLM 1995). If Congress designates the area as wilderness, the routes will be closed. In the interim, if use and/or non-compliance are found through monitoring efforts to impair the area’s suitability for wilderness designation, BLM would take further action to limit use of the routes, or close them. The continued use of these routes, therefore, is based on user compliance and non-impairment of wilderness values.	

Table 2-19. Wilderness Study Areas Decisions

Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Proposed RMP	Alternative C	Alternative D
Continue managing WSAs as closed or limited for OHV use as identified in existing LUPs and shown on Map 2-12.	<p>Designate WSAs as limited for OHV use as shown on Map 2-13. A total of 51.6 miles of inventoried vehicle ways would be designated for use subject to the IMP (Table 2-16, Travel Management).</p> <p>Where routes would remain available for motorized use within WSAs, allow such use to continue on a conditional basis. Use of the existing routes in the WSAs (“ways” when located within WSAs), could continue as long as the use of these routes did not impair wilderness suitability, as provided by the BLM Handbook 8550 (<i>Interim Management for Lands Under Wilderness Review</i>). If the Congress designates the area as wilderness, the routes would be closed. In the interim, if use and/or non-compliance were found through monitoring efforts to impair the area's suitability for wilderness designation, BLM would take further action to limit use of the routes, or close them. The continued use of these routes, therefore, is based on user compliance and non-impairment of wilderness values.</p>	<p>Designate the following WSAs as closed for OHV use (as shown on Map 2-14):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Little Rockies (40,700 acres) • Dirty Devil (70,500 acres) • Fiddler Butte (2,200 acres) • Fremont Gorge (2,800 acres) • French Spring/Happy Canyon (11,400 acres) • Horseshoe Canyon North (500 acres) • Horseshoe Canyon South (7,500 acres) • Mount Ellen/Blue Hills (39,700 acres) <p>Designate the following WSAs as limited to OHV use (as shown on Map 2-14):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bull Mountain (13,200 acres) • Mount Hillers (19,300 acres) • Mount Pennell (77,100 acres) • Dirty Devil (1,600 acres) • Fiddler Butte (71,800 acres) • Fremont Gorge (16 acres) • French Spring/Happy Canyon (12,900 acres) • Horseshoe Canyon North (1,600 acres) • Horseshoe Canyon South 	<p>Close WSAs to OHV use as shown on Map 2-15.</p>	<p>Close WSAs to OHV use as shown on Map 2-16.</p>

Table 2-19. Wilderness Study Areas Decisions

Issue: Wilderness Study Areas if Released by Congress	Management Action	Common to the Proposed RMP and Draft RMP Alternatives
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (32,400 acres) • Mount Ellen/Blue Hills (41,700 acres) <p>A total of 44.0 miles of inventoried vehicle ways would be designated for use subject to the I/M/P (Table 2-16). * Implementation level decision.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bull Mountain: 2.8 miles • Dirty Devil: 6.8 miles • Fiddler Butte: 4.1 miles • Fremont Gorge: 0.2 miles • French Spring/Happy Canyon: 3.6 miles • Horseshoe Canyon South: 5.6 miles • Little Rockies: 0.8 miles • Mount Ellen/Blue Hills: 8.7 miles • Mount Hillers: 5.0 miles • Mount Pennel: 6.4 miles 		<p>Only Congress can release a WSA from wilderness consideration. Should any WSA, in part or in whole, be released from wilderness consideration, examine proposals in the released area on a case-by-case basis for consistency with the goals and objectives of the RMP decisions. Actions inconsistent with RMP goals and objectives would be deferred until completion of requisite plan amendments. Because the management direction of the released land would continue in accordance with the goals and objectives established in the RMP, no separate analysis is required in this LUP to address resource impacts if any WSAs are released by Congress.</p>

* This is an implementation-level decision that cannot be protested under the planning regulations. Please see the cover letter for further information.

Wild and Scenic Rivers

Table 2-20. Wild and Scenic Rivers Decisions

Desired Outcomes (Goals and Objectives)													
Issue: Determination of Suitability of Eligible Wild and Scenic River Segments													
Management Actions													
Common to the Proposed RMP and Draft RMP Alternatives													
<p>BLM would work with the State of Utah, local and tribal governments, and other federal agencies, in a state-wide study, to reach consensus regarding recommendations to Congress for the inclusion of rivers in the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System. Besides applying consistent criteria across agency jurisdictions, the joint study would avoid piece-mealing of river segments in logical watershed units in the state. The study would evaluate, in detail, the possible benefits and effects of designation on the local and state economies, agricultural and industrial operations and interests, outdoor recreation, natural resources (including the outstandingly remarkable values for which the river was deemed suitable), water rights, water quality, water resource planning, and access to and across river corridors within, and upstream and downstream from the proposed segments(s). Actual designation of river segments would only occur through congressional action or as a result of Secretarial decision at the request of the Governor in accordance with provisions of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (the Act). BLM will work with the State, local and tribal governments, and the agencies involved to coordinate its decision making on wild and scenic river issues and to achieve consistency wherever possible.</p>	<p>BLM recognizes that water resources on most river and stream segments within the State of Utah are already fully allocated. Before stream segments that have been recommended as suitable under this Proposed RMP are recommended to Congress for designation, BLM will continue to work with affected local, state, federal, and tribal partners to identify in-stream flows necessary to meet critical resource needs, including values related to the subject segments(s). Such quantifications would be included in any recommendation for designation. BLM would then seek to jointly promote innovative strategies, community-based planning, and voluntary agreements with water users, under State law, to address those needs.</p>	<p>Should designations occur on any river segment as a result of Secretarial or congressional action, existing rights, privileges, and contracts would be protected. Under Section 12 of the Act, termination of such rights, privileges, and contracts may happen only with the consent of the affected non-federal party. A determination by the BLM of eligibility and suitability for the inclusion of rivers on public lands to the Wild and Scenic Rivers System does not create new water rights for the BLM. Federal reserved water rights for new components of the Wild and Scenic Rivers System are established at the discretion of Congress. If water is reserved by Congress when a river component is added to the Wild and Scenic Rivers System, it would come from water that is not appropriated at the time of designation, in the amount necessary to protect features which led to the river's inclusion into the system. BLM's intent would be to leave existing water rights undisturbed and to recognize the lawful rights of private, municipal, and state entities to manage water resources under state law to meet the needs of the community. Federal law, including Section 13 of the Act and the McCarran Amendment (43 U.S.C. 666), recognizes state jurisdiction over water allocation in designated streams. Thus, it is BLM's position that existing water rights, including flows apportioned to the State of Utah interstate agreements and compacts, including the Upper Colorado River Compact, and developments of such rights would not be affected by designation or the creation of the possible federal reserved water right. BLM would seek to work with upstream and downstream water users and applicable agencies to ensure that water flows are maintained at a level sufficient to sustain the values for which affected river segments were designated.</p>	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Alternative N (No Action)</th><th>Alternative A</th><th>Proposed RMP</th><th>Alternative C</th><th>Alternative D</th></tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>• Existing LUPs contain no decisions regarding</td><td>• Recommend no eligible river segments as</td><td>Recommend and manage the following eligible river as</td><td>Recommend and manage all of the eligible rivers as suitable for inclusion in the National Wild and Scenic River System:</td><td></td></tr> </tbody> </table>	Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Proposed RMP	Alternative C	Alternative D	• Existing LUPs contain no decisions regarding	• Recommend no eligible river segments as	Recommend and manage the following eligible river as	Recommend and manage all of the eligible rivers as suitable for inclusion in the National Wild and Scenic River System:	
Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Proposed RMP	Alternative C	Alternative D									
• Existing LUPs contain no decisions regarding	• Recommend no eligible river segments as	Recommend and manage the following eligible river as	Recommend and manage all of the eligible rivers as suitable for inclusion in the National Wild and Scenic River System:										

Table 2-20. Wild and Scenic Rivers Decisions

WSRs.	suitable for inclusion in the National Wild and Scenic River System.	suitable for inclusion in the National Wild and Scenic River System:	• Dirty Devil River (54 miles)* • Beaver Wash Canyon (6.8 miles)* • Larry Canyon (4 miles)* • No Man's Canyon (7.1 miles)* • Robbers Roost Canyon (31 miles)* • Sams Mesa Box Canyon (9.5 miles)* • Twin Corral Box Canyon (9 miles)* • Fish Creek (0.25 mile)
• As directed by BLM Instruction	• Provide no special management for outstandingly remarkable values.	• Fremont River in Fremont Gorge with a tentative classification as "wild" (5 miles)	• Fremont Gorge (5 miles) – Below Capitol Reef National Park to Caineville Ditch Diversion (4 miles)
Memorandum IM-2004-196, Clarification of Policy in the BLM Manual Section 8351, Wild and Scenic Rivers, with Respect to Eligibility Criteria and Protective Management, manage all of the eligible river segments (135 miles) to protect their outstandingly remarkable values, free-flowing nature, and tentative classification, as follows:			• Maidenwater Creek (3 miles) • Quitchupah Creek (1.4 miles).
– 126.4 miles of river segments tentatively classified as "wild"			*All or portions of these eligible WSRs overlay WSAs that are managed pursuant to the IMP.
– 3.25 miles of river segments tentatively classified as "scenic"			
– 5.4 miles of river segments tentatively classified as "recreational"			
• In accordance with BLM Manual 8351, make no suitability determinations for any of the eligible river segments. They would remain eligible and would be managed to protect their			

Table 2-20. Wild and Scenic Rivers Decisions

Issue: Management of Fremont River—Fremont Gorge (5 miles)				
Management Actions				
Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Proposed RMP	Alternative C	Alternative D
outstandingly remarkable values, free-flowing nature, and tentative classification to the degree that BLM has authority (e.g., BLM lands within the corridor) and within the parameters of decisions made in the previous planning documents until such time as suitability determinations are made.	Manage all eligible streams to protect their outstandingly remarkable values, free-flowing nature, and tentative classification to the degree that BLM has authority (e.g., BLM lands within the corridor) and within the parameters of decisions made in the previous planning documents until such time as suitability determinations are made.	Do not manage the Fremont River—Fremont Gorge as eligible or suitable for inclusion in the National Wild and Scenic River System. Manage the river corridor in the manner identified under other resource headings for Alternative A.	Manage the Fremont River in Fremont Gorge (5 miles) as suitable for inclusion in the National Wild and Scenic River System and tentatively classified as a wild river. Manage to protect the outstandingly remarkable scenic values. Specific management prescriptions within one-quarter mile of each side of the river include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Close to oil and gas leasing • Close to OHV use • Recommend withdrawing from mineral entry 	Manage the Fremont River in Fremont Gorge (5 miles) as suitable for inclusion in the National Wild and Scenic River System and tentatively classified as a wild river. Manage to protect the outstandingly remarkable scenic values. Specific management prescriptions within one-quarter mile of the high water mark on each bank of the river include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Closed to oil and gas leasing • Close to OHV use • Recommend for withdrawal from mineral entry.

Table 2-20. Wild and Scenic Rivers Decisions

Issue: Management of Dirty Devil River (54 miles)			
	Management Actions		
Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Proposed RMP	Alternative C
Manage all eligible segments to protect their outstandingly remarkable values, free-flowing nature, and tentative classification to the degree that BLM has authority (e.g., BLM lands within the corridor) and within the parameters of decisions made in the previous planning documents until such time as suitability determinations are made.	Do not manage the Dirty River as eligible or suitable for inclusion in the National Wild and Scenic River System. Manage the river corridor in the manner identified under other resource headings for Alternative A.	Do not manage the Dirty River as eligible or suitable for inclusion in the National Wild and Scenic River System. Manage the river corridor in the manner identified under other resource headings for the Proposed RMP.	Manage the Dirty Devil River (54 miles) as suitable for inclusion in the National Wild and Scenic River System and tentatively classified as a wild river. Manage to protect the outstandingly remarkable values, including scenic, recreation, geologic, and fish and wildlife. Specific management prescriptions within one-quarter mile of each side of the river include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Close to OHVs except for Poison Spring Road crossing • Close to oil and gas leasing • Recommend withdrawing from mineral entry
Issue: Management of Fremont River—Capitol Reef National Park to Caineville Ditch Diversion (4 miles)			
Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Proposed RMP	Alternative C
Manage all eligible streams to protect their outstandingly remarkable values, free-flowing nature, and tentative classification to the degree that BLM has authority (e.g., public lands within the corridor) and within the parameters of decisions made in the previous planning documents until such time as suitability determinations are made.	Do not manage the Fremont River—Capitol Reef National Park to Caineville Ditch Diversion as eligible or suitable for inclusion into the National Wild and Scenic River System. Manage the river corridor in the manner identified under other resource headings for Alternative A.	Do not manage the Fremont River—Capitol Reef National Park to Caineville Ditch Diversion as eligible or suitable for inclusion into the National Wild and Scenic River System. Manage the river corridor in the manner identified under other resource headings for the Proposed RMP.	Manage the Fremont River from Capitol Reef National Park to Caineville Ditch Diversion (4 miles) as suitable for inclusion in the National Wild and Scenic River System and tentatively classified as a recreational river. Manage to protect the outstandingly remarkable values, including scenic and geologic. Specific management prescriptions within one-quarter mile of each side of the river include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Close to oil and gas leasing • Close to OHV use • Recommend withdrawing from mineral entry

Table 2-20. Wild and Scenic Rivers Decisions

Issue: Management of Beaver Wash Canyon (6.8 miles)			
Management Actions			
Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Proposed RMP	Alternative C
Manage all eligible streams to protect their outstandingly remarkable values, free-flowing nature, and tentative classification to the degree that BLM has authority (e.g., BLM lands within the corridor) and within the parameters of decisions made in the previous planning documents until such time as suitability determinations are made. Beaver Wash Canyon is also located within the Beaver Wash Canyon ACEC and would be managed according to those management prescriptions.	Do not manage Beaver Wash Canyon as eligible or suitable for inclusion into the National Wild and Scenic River System. Manage the river corridor in the manner identified under other resource headings for Alternative A.	Do not manage Beaver Wash Canyon as eligible or suitable for inclusion into the National Wild and Scenic River System. Manage the river corridor in the manner identified under other resource headings for the Proposed RMP.	<p>Manage Beaver Wash Canyon (6.8 miles) as suitable for inclusion in the National Wild and Scenic River System and tentatively classified as a wild river.</p> <p>Manage to protect the outstandingly remarkable values, including scenic and ecologic. Specific management prescriptions within one-quarter mile of each side of the river include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Close to oil and gas leasing • Close to OHV use • Recommend withdrawing from mineral entry
Issue: Management of Larry Canyon (4 miles)			
Management Actions			
Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Proposed RMP	Alternative C
Manage all eligible streams to protect their outstandingly remarkable values, free-flowing nature, and tentative classification to the degree that BLM has authority (e.g., BLM lands within the corridor) and within the parameters of decisions made in the previous planning documents until such time as suitability	Do not manage Larry Canyon as eligible or suitable for inclusion into the National Wild and Scenic River System. Manage the river corridor in the manner identified under other resource headings for Alternative A.	Do not manage Larry Canyon as eligible or suitable for inclusion into the National Wild and Scenic River System. Manage the river corridor in the manner identified under other resource headings for the Proposed RMP.	<p>Manage Larry Canyon (4 miles) as suitable for inclusion in the National Wild and Scenic River System and tentatively classified as a wild river.</p> <p>Manage to protect the outstandingly remarkable values, including scenic, recreation, wildlife, and ecologic. Specific management prescriptions within one-quarter mile of each side of the river include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Close to oil and gas leasing • Close to OHV use • Recommend withdrawing from mineral entry

Table 2-20. Wild and Scenic Rivers Decisions

Issue: Management of No Man's Canyon (7.1 miles)				
Management Actions				
Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Proposed RMP	Alternative C	Alternative D
Manage all eligible streams to protect their outstandingly remarkable values, free-flowing nature, and tentative classification to the degree that BLM has authority (e.g., BLM lands within the corridor) and within the parameters of decisions made in the previous planning documents until such time as suitability determinations are made.	Do not manage No Man's Canyon as eligible or suitable for inclusion in the National Wild and Scenic River System. Manage the river corridor in the manner identified under other resource headings for Alternative A.	Do not manage No Man's Canyon as eligible or suitable for inclusion in the National Wild and Scenic River System. Manage the river corridor in the manner identified under other resource headings for the Proposed RMP.	Manage No Man's Canyon (7.1 miles) as suitable for inclusion in the National Wild and Scenic River System and tentatively classified as a wild river. Manage to protect the outstandingly remarkable values, including scenic and recreation. Specific management prescriptions within one-quarter mile of each side of the river include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Close to oil and gas leasing • Close to OHV use • Recommend withdrawing from mineral entry 	Manage No Man's Canyon (7.1 miles) as suitable for inclusion in the National Wild and Scenic River System and tentatively classified as a wild river. Manage to protect the outstandingly remarkable values, including scenic, recreation, and cultural (historic). Specific management prescriptions within one-quarter mile of each side of the river include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Close to oil and gas leasing • Close to OHV use • Recommend withdrawing from mineral entry
Issue: Management of Robbers Roost Canyon (31 miles)				
Management Actions				
Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Proposed RMP	Alternative C	Alternative D
Manage all eligible streams to protect their outstandingly remarkable values, free-flowing nature, and tentative classification to the degree that BLM has authority (e.g., BLM lands within the corridor) and within the parameters of decisions made in the previous planning documents until such time as suitability determinations are made.	Do not manage Robbers Roost Canyon as eligible or suitable for inclusion in the National Wild and Scenic River System. Manage the river corridor in the manner identified under other resource headings for Alternative A.	Do not manage Robbers Roost Canyon as eligible or suitable for inclusion in the National Wild and Scenic River System. Manage the river corridor in the manner identified under other resource headings for the Proposed RMP.	Manage Robbers Roost Canyon (31 miles) as suitable for inclusion in the National Wild and Scenic River System and tentatively classified as a wild river. Manage to protect the outstandingly remarkable values, including scenic, recreation, and cultural (historic). Specific management prescriptions within one-quarter mile of each side of the river include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Close to oil and gas leasing • Close to OHV use • Recommend withdrawing from mineral entry 	Manage Robbers Roost Canyon (31 miles) as suitable for inclusion in the National Wild and Scenic River System and tentatively classified as a wild river. Manage to protect the outstandingly remarkable values, including scenic and recreation. Specific management prescriptions within one-quarter mile of each side of the river include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Close to oil and gas leasing • Close to OHV use • Recommend withdrawing from mineral entry

Table 2-20. Wild and Scenic Rivers Decisions

Issue: Management of Sams Mesa Box Canyon (9.5 miles)				
	Management Actions			
Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Proposed RMP	Alternative C	Alternative D
Manage all eligible streams to protect their outstandingly remarkable values, free-flowing nature, and tentative classification to the degree that BLM has authority (e.g., BLM lands within the corridor) and within the parameters of decisions made in the previous planning documents until such time as suitability determinations are made.	Do not manage Sams Mesa Box Canyon as eligible or suitable for inclusion in the National Wild and Scenic River System. Manage the river corridor in the manner identified under other resource headings for Alternative A.	Do not manage Sams Mesa Box Canyon as eligible or suitable for inclusion in the National Wild and Scenic River System. Manage the river corridor in the manner identified under other resource headings for the Proposed RMP.	Manage Sams Mesa Box Canyon (9.5 miles) as suitable for inclusion in the National Wild and Scenic River System and tentatively classified as a wild river. Manage to protect the outstandingly remarkable values, including scenic and wildlife. Specific management prescriptions within one-quarter mile of each side of the river include: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Close to oil and gas leasing• Close to OHV use• Recommend withdrawing from mineral entry	Manage Sams Mesa Box Canyon (9.5 miles) as suitable for inclusion in the National Wild and Scenic River System and tentatively classified as a wild river. Manage to protect the outstandingly remarkable values, including scenic and wildlife. Specific management prescriptions within one-quarter mile of the river include: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Close to oil and gas leasing• Close to OHV use• Recommend withdrawing from mineral entry
Issue: Management of Twin Corral Box Canyon (9 miles)				
Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Proposed RMP	Alternative C	Alternative D
Manage all eligible streams to protect their outstandingly remarkable values, free-flowing nature, and tentative classification to the degree that BLM has authority (e.g., BLM lands within the corridor) and within the parameters of decisions made in the previous planning documents until such time as suitability determinations are made.	Do not manage Twin Corral Box Canyon as eligible or suitable for inclusion in the National Wild and Scenic River System. Manage the river corridor in the manner identified under other resource headings for Alternative A.	Do not manage Twin Corral Box Canyon as eligible or suitable for inclusion in the National Wild and Scenic River System. Manage the river corridor in the manner identified under other resource headings for the Proposed RMP.	Manage Twin Corral Box Canyon (9 miles) as suitable for inclusion in the National Wild and Scenic River System and tentatively classified as a wild river. Manage to protect the outstandingly remarkable values, including scenic and wildlife. Specific management prescriptions within one-quarter mile of the river include: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Close to oil and gas leasing• Close to OHV use• Recommend withdrawing from mineral entry	Manage Twin Corral Box Canyon (9 miles) as suitable for inclusion in the National Wild and Scenic River System and tentatively classified as a wild river. Manage to protect the outstandingly remarkable values, including scenic and wildlife. Specific management prescriptions within one-quarter mile of the river include: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Close to oil and gas leasing• Close to OHV use• Recommend withdrawing from mineral entry

Table 2-20. Wild and Scenic Rivers Decisions

Issue: Management of Fish Creek (one-quarter mile)			
	Management Actions		
Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Proposed RMP	Alternative C
Manage eligible streams to protect their outstandingly remarkable values, free-flowing nature, and tentative classification to the degree that BLM has authority (e.g., BLM lands within the corridor) and within the parameters of decisions made in the previous planning documents until such time as suitability determinations are made.	Do not manage Fish Creek as eligible or suitable for inclusion in the National Wild and Scenic River System. Manage the river corridor in the manner identified under other resource headings for Alternative A.	Do not manage Fish Creek as eligible or suitable for inclusion in the National Wild and Scenic River System. Manage the river corridor in the manner identified under other resource headings for the Proposed RMP. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Close to oil and gas leasing • Close to OHV use • Recommend withdrawing from mineral entry 	Manage Fish Creek (one-quarter mile) as suitable for inclusion in the National Wild and Scenic River System and tentatively classified as a scenic river. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Manage to protect the outstandingly remarkable cultural resource values. Specific management prescriptions within one-quarter mile of each side of the river include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Close to oil and gas leasing • Close to OHV use • Recommend withdrawing from mineral entry
Issue: Management of Maidenwater Creek (3 miles)			
	Management Actions		
Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Proposed RMP	Alternative C
Manage eligible streams to protect their outstandingly remarkable values, free-flowing nature, and tentative classification to the degree that BLM has authority (e.g., BLM lands within the corridor) and within the parameters of decisions made in the previous planning documents until such time as suitability determinations are made.	Do not manage Maidenwater Creek as eligible or suitable for inclusion in the National Wild and Scenic River System. Manage the river corridor in the manner identified under other resource headings for Alternative A.	Do not manage Maidenwater Creek as eligible or suitable for inclusion in the National Wild and Scenic River System. Manage the river corridor in the manner identified under other resource headings for the Proposed RMP. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Close to oil and gas leasing • Close to OHV use • Recommend withdrawing from mineral entry 	Manage Maidenwater Creek (3 miles) as suitable for inclusion in the National Wild and Scenic River System and tentatively classified as a scenic river. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Manage to protect the outstandingly remarkable values, including scenic, recreation, geologic, fish, wildlife, and cultural. Specific management prescriptions within one-quarter mile of the river include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Close to oil and gas leasing • Close to OHV use • Recommend withdrawing from mineral entry

Table 2-20. Wild and Scenic Rivers Decisions

Issue: Management of Quitchupah Creek (1.4 miles)				
	Management Actions		Proposed RMP	Alternative C
Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Alternative D		
Manage all eligible streams to protect their outstandingly remarkable values, free-flowing nature, and tentative classification to the degree that BLM has authority (e.g., BLM lands within the corridor) and within the parameters of decisions made in the previous planning documents until such time as suitability determinations are made.	Do not manage Quitchupah Creek as eligible or suitable for inclusion in the National Wild and Scenic River System. Manage the river corridor in the manner identified under other resource headings for Alternative A.	<p>Manage Quitchupah Creek (1.4 miles) as suitable for inclusion in the National Wild and Scenic River System and tentatively classified as a recreational river.</p> <p>Manage to protect the outstandingly remarkable values, including cultural. Specific management prescriptions within one-quarter mile of the river include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Close to oil and gas leasing • Close to OHV use • Recommend withdrawing from mineral entry 	Manage Quitchupah Creek as eligible or suitable for inclusion in the National Wild and Scenic River System. Manage the river corridor in the manner identified under other resource headings for the Proposed RMP.	

Areas of Critical Environmental Concern

Table 2-21. Areas of Critical Environmental Concern Decisions

Desired Outcomes (Goals and Objectives)				
Issue: Designation and Management of Areas of Critical Environmental Concern				
Management Actions				
Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Proposed RMP	Alternative C	Alternative D
Continue designation and management of four existing ACECs (Map 3-16): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • North Caineville Mesa (2,200 acres) • South Caineville Mesa (4,100 acres)* • Gilbert Badlands (3,680 acres)* • Beaver Wash Canyon (4,800 acres)* Total acres: 14,780	Designate no ACECs.	Designate and manage the following areas as ACECs (Map 2-45): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • North Caineville Mesa (2,200 acres) • Old Woman Front (330 acres) Total acres: 2,530	Designate and manage the following areas as ACECs (Map 2-46): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Badlands (includes existing North and South Caineville Mesas and Gilbert Badlands ACECs, 88,900 acres)* • Bull Creek Archaeological District (4,800 acres) • Dirty Devil (includes Beaver Wash Canyon ACEC, 205,300 acres)* • Fremont Gorge/Cockscomb (34,300 acres)* • Henry Mountains (includes No Man's Mesa Potential ACEC, 288,200 acres)* • Horseshoe Canyon (Richfield RFO portion only, 40,900 acres)* • Kingston Canyon (22,100 acres) • Little Rockies (49,200 acres)* • Lower Muddy Creek (Richfield RFO only, 16,200 acres) • Old Woman Front (330 acres) • Parker Mountain (107,900 acres) • Quitchupah (180 acres) • Rainbow Hills (4,000 acres) • Sevier Canyon (8,900 acres) • Thousand Lakes Bench (500 acres) • SSS (15,100 acres)* Total acres: 886,810	

*All or portions of these potential ACECs overlay WSAs, which are managed pursuant to the IMP.

Table 2-21. Areas of Critical Environmental Concern Decisions

		Issue: Designation and Management of North Caineville Mesa ACEC (2,200 acres)		
		Management Actions		
Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Proposed RMP	Alternative C	Alternative D
Continue designation of the North Caineville Mesa ACEC (Map 3-16). Manage to protect the relevant and important relict vegetation values:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do not designate the North Caineville Mesa ACEC. Manage the North Caineville Mesa area in the manner identified under other resource headings for Alternative A. Allow no uses that would cause irreparable damage to relevant and important values Close to OHV use Manage as closed to oil and gas leasing Designate as unavailable for livestock grazing Identify area as withdrawn from consideration for leasing for surface coal mining Acquire inholdings within ACEC Consider withdrawing from mineral entry. 	<p>Continue designation of the North Caineville Mesa ACEC (Map 2-45).</p> <p>Manage to protect the relevant and important relict vegetation values:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Allow no uses that would cause irreparable damage to relevant and important values Close to OHV use Manage as open to oil and gas leasing with major constraints (NSO) Designate as unavailable for livestock grazing Identify area as unsuitable for surface coal mining Acquire inholdings within ACEC Recommend withdrawing from mineral entry. 	<p>Manage the North Caineville Mesa area as part of the Badlands ACEC. (See the Badlands ACEC for special management prescriptions.)</p>	

*All or portions of these potential ACECs overlay VWSAs, which are managed pursuant to the IMP.

Table 2-21. Areas of Critical Environmental Concern Decisions

Issue: Designation and Management of South Caineville Mesa ACEC (4,100 acres)				
	Management Actions			
Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Proposed RMP	Alternative C	Alternative D
<p>Continue designation of the South Caineville Mesa ACEC (Map 3-16).</p> <p>Manage the area to protect the relevant and important values:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allow no uses that would cause irreparable damage to relevant and important values • Close to OHV use • Manage as open to oil and gas leasing with major constraints (NSO) • Unavailable for livestock grazing • Identify area as withdrawn from consideration for leasing for surface coal mining • Nominate cabin on South Caineville Mesa to NRHP • Increase public awareness of cultural resources, increase law enforcement presence, and if necessary, fence or otherwise directly protect important sites, 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do not designate the South Caineville Mesa ACEC. • Manage the South Caineville Mesa area in the manner identified under other resource headings for Alternative A. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do not designate the South Caineville Mesa ACEC. • Manage the South Caineville Mesa area in the manner identified under other resource headings for The Proposed RMP. 	<p>Manage the South Caineville Mesa area as part of the Badlands ACEC. (See the Badlands ACEC for special management prescriptions.)</p>	<p>Manage the South Caineville Mesa area as part of the Badlands ACEC. (See the Badlands ACEC for special management prescriptions.)</p>

Table 2-21. Areas of Critical Environmental Concern Decisions

Issue: Designation and Management of Beaver Wash Canyon ACEC (4,800 acres)					
Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Proposed RMP	Management Actions	Alternative C	Alternative D
and maintain stability of cabin on South Caineville Mesa <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consider withdrawal from mineral entry if area is released from wilderness consideration. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do not designate the Beaver Wash Canyon ACEC. • Manage the Beaver Wash Canyon area in the manner identified under other resource headings for Alternative A. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do not designate the Beaver Wash Canyon ACEC. • Manage the Beaver Wash Canyon area in the manner identified under other resource headings for the Proposed RMP. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Manage the Beaver Wash Canyon area as part of the Dirty Devil ACEC. See Dirty Devil ACEC (below) for special management prescriptions. 		

Table 2-21. Areas of Critical Environmental Concern Decisions

withdrawing from mineral entry	

Table 2-21. Areas of Critical Environmental Concern Decisions

Issue: Designation and Management of Gilbert Badlands ACEC (3,680 acres)				
Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Proposed RMP	Alternative C	Alternative D
Continue Gilbert Badlands ACEC and RNA designations, to be managed for protection of relevant and important natural systems or processes and in accordance with 43 CFR 8223.1 (Map 3-16). Manage the Gilbert Badlands ACEC with the following special management to protect the relevant and important values from irreparable damage:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do not designate the Gilbert Badlands ACEC or RNA. Manage the Gilbert Badlands area in the manner identified under other resource headings for Alternative A. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Close to OHV use Manage as closed to oil and gas leasing Consider withdrawing from mineral entry Prohibit all surface disturbing activities Acquire in-holdings within ACEC. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do not designate the Gilbert Badlands ACEC or RNA. Manage the Gilbert Badlands area in the manner identified under other resource headings for the Proposed RMP. 	Manage the Gilbert Badlands area as part of the Badlands ACEC. (See the Badlands ACEC for special management prescriptions.)	
Issue: Designation and Management of Potential Badlands ACEC (88,900 acres)				
Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Proposed RMP	Alternative C	Alternative D
Continue managing the existing North Caineville, South Caineville, and Gilbert Badlands ACECs to protect their relevant and important values as prescribed above.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do not designate the Badlands ACEC or Research Natural Area. Manage identified under other resource headings 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do not designate the Badlands ACEC or Research Natural Area. Manage identified under other resource headings 	Designate the Badlands ACEC and RNA, to be managed to protect relevant and important values, including scenic, special status plants, natural processes, and riparian and relict vegetation from irreparable damage (Map 2-46). Special management of the area to protect these values includes:	

Table 2-21. Areas of Critical Environmental Concern Decisions

for Alternative A.	under other resource headings for the Proposed RMP.	<p>Vegetation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Allow no uses that would cause irreparable damage to relevant and important values. Continue unavailability for grazing on North and South Caineville Mesas to protect rilect vegetation. <p>Cultural Resources</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increase public awareness of cultural resources, increase law enforcement presence, and if necessary, fence or otherwise directly protect important sites, and maintain stability of cabin on South Caineville Mesa. Fencing or other surface disturbing activities would not be allowed in non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics in Alternative D. <p>Visual Resources</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Designate Class A scenery (outside of WSAs and outside of non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics [Alternative D only]) as VRM Class II, and implement VRM BMPs. <p>Special Status Species</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increase law enforcement patrols, educate the public about values of listed cacti, evaluate proposed upstream water developments to determine impacts on fish species, and, based on that evaluation, take appropriate action to protect SSS. <p>Travel Management</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Close mesa tops to OHV use. In Alternative D, close non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics to OHV use. Limit OHV use to designated routes in the remainder of the ACEC to prevent irreparable damage to cultural resources, badlands topography, listed species of cacti, and scenic values. <p>Lands and Realty</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recommend withdrawing the non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics (Alternative D only) and Class A scenery outside WSA from mineral entry. <p>Minerals</p>
--------------------	---	--

Table 2-21. Areas of Critical Environmental Concern Decisions

Issue: Management of Potential Bull Creek Archaeological ACEC (4,800 acres)					
Management Actions					
Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Proposed RMP	Alternative C	Alternative D	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do not designate the Bull Creek Archaeological District as an ACEC. Manage the Bull Creek Archaeological District consistent with properties listed on the NRHP. 					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Close to oil and gas leasing.
Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Proposed RMP	Alternative C	Alternative D	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do not designate the Bull Creek Archaeological District as an ACEC. Manage the Bull Creek Archaeological District consistent with properties listed on the NRHP. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Designate the Bull Creek Archaeological District as an ACEC for the purpose of protecting relevant and important cultural resource values (Map 2-46). Special management to protect these values from irreparable damage includes: <p>Cultural Resources</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increase public awareness of cultural resource values, increase law enforcement presence, and if necessary, install fencing or other direct protection of important sites. Fencing or other surface disturbing activities would not be allowed in non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics in Alternative D. <p>Travel Management</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Limit OHV use to designated routes to protect cultural resources from damage. In Alternative D, close non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics to OHV use. 				

Issue: Designation and Management of Potential Dirty Devil/North Wash ACEC (205,300 acres)					
Management Actions					
Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Proposed RMP	Alternative C	Alternative D	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Manage Beaver Wash Canyon ACEC (a portion of the potential Dirty Devil ACEC) according to the management prescriptions outlined above for that ACEC. Manage remainder of the potential Dirty Devil ACEC according to other decisions outlined in the 1982 Henry 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do not designate the Dirty Devil/North Wash potential ACEC. Manage the Dirty Devil/North Wash area in the manner identified under other resource headings for Alternative A. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do not designate the Dirty Devil/North Wash potential ACEC. Manage the area included in the Dirty Devil SRMA, according to those prescriptions. Manage areas not included within the Dirty Devil SRMA in the manner identified under other resource headings for Alternative A. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do not designate the Dirty Devil/North Wash potential ACEC. Manage the area included in the Dirty Devil SRMA, according to those prescriptions. Manage areas not included within the Dirty Devil SRMA in the manner identified under other resource headings for Alternative A. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Allow no uses that would cause irreparable damage to relevant and important values. <p>Riparian</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Restore, maintain, and improve riparian areas to proper functioning condition (PFC). Fence riparian areas to exclude livestock. Fencing or 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Designate the Dirty Devil/North Wash area as an ACEC for protection of relevant and important values, including scenic, cultural, paleontological, wildlife, and SSS (Map 2-46). Special management for protection of these values includes: <p>Prevent Irreparable Damage</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Allow no uses that would cause irreparable damage to relevant and important values.

Table 2-21. Areas of Critical Environmental Concern Decisions

Mountain MFP, as amended.	the Proposed RMP.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Other surface disturbing activities would not be allowed in non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics in Alternative D. • Rehabilitate springs. • Plant willows and cottonwoods. <p>Fire and Fuels Management</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allow no prescribed or wildland fire use in Mexican spotted owl core areas and nest protection areas at any time. • Suppress wildfires that threaten Mexican spotted owl core areas and nest protection areas. <p>Cultural Resources</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduce vandalism of cultural resources by increasing public awareness of their value, increasing law enforcement presence and, if necessary, fencing or otherwise directly protecting important sites. Fencing or other surface disturbing activities would not be allowed in non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics in Alternative D. <p>Visual Resources</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Designate Class A scenery outside of WSAs (Alternatives C and D) and outside of non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics (Alternative D) as VRM Class II. • Designate remainder of ACEC (outside of non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics— Alternative D only) as VRM Class III. • Implement BMPs appropriate to the VRM class to protect scenic values. <p>Special Status Species</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Manage the Mexican spotted owl in cooperation with USFWS and UDWR. • Restrict motorized access in sensitive plant areas. • Increase law enforcement patrols. <p>Wildlife</p>
---------------------------	-------------------	---

Table 2-21. Areas of Critical Environmental Concern Decisions

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Manage Desert bighorn sheep in cooperation with UDWR. Allow water developments that would benefit Desert bighorn sheep. Water developments would not be allowed in non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics (Alternative D only). <p>Livestock grazing</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Permit no domestic sheep grazing to protect bighorn sheep from disease. Keep Beaver Wash unavailable for grazing to protect riparian values. <p>Recreation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Construct no camping facilities in the Mexican spotted owl nest protection core areas or within non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics (Alternative D only). Reduce harassment of bighorn sheep and Mexican spotted owls by regulating the number of recreational parties, party size, and season of use. Limit recreation use through use of permits, if determined necessary to protect relevant and important values. <p>Travel Management</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Limit OHVs to designated routes to protect scenic values. During management plan development for this ACEC, OHV route designations would be reviewed and revised if necessary (with appropriate NEPA review) to protect scenic values. In Alternative D, close non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics to OHV use. Discourage recreation use within one-half mile of known Mexican spotted owl nest sites during breeding season (February 1 to August 31). <p>Lands and Realty</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Avoid authorizing ROWs in VRM Class I or II areas. Retain ACEC in public ownership. Acquire inholdings within the ACEC from willing sellers.
--	---

Table 2-21. Areas of Critical Environmental Concern Decisions

Issue: Designation and Management of Potential Fremont Gorge/Cockscomb ACEC (34,300 acres)				
Management Actions				
Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Proposed RMP	Alternative C	Alternative D
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do not designate the Fremont Gorge/Cockscomb ACEC. Manage the Fremont Gorge/Cockscomb area in accordance with existing LUP. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do not designate the Fremont Gorge/Cockscomb ACEC. Manage the Fremont Gorge/Cockscomb area in the manner identified under other resource headings for Alternative A. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do not designate the Fremont Gorge/Cockscomb ACEC. Manage the Fremont Gorge/Cockscomb area in the manner identified under other resource headings for Alternative A. <p>Portions of this area are included in the Capitol Reef Gateway SRMA and the Fremont Gorge Suitable WSR corridor and would be managed according to the prescriptions identified in those sections. Areas not included within the</p>	<p>Designate the Fremont Gorge/Cockscomb area as an ACEC for protection of relevant and important values, including cultural, scenic, riparian, plant, and wildlife (Map 2-46). Special management for protection of these values includes:</p> <p>Prevent Irreparable Damage</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Allow no uses that would cause irreparable damage to relevant and important values. <p>Riparian</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evaluate proposed upstream water developments to determine possible adverse impacts on riparian areas. Limit recreation use in riparian areas, if needed to protect riparian values. <p>Cultural Resources</p>	<p>Designate the Fremont Gorge/Cockscomb area as an ACEC for protection of relevant and important values, including cultural, scenic, riparian, plant, and wildlife (Map 2-46). Special management for protection of these values includes:</p> <p>Prevent Irreparable Damage</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Allow no uses that would cause irreparable damage to relevant and important values. <p>Riparian</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evaluate proposed upstream water developments to determine possible adverse impacts on riparian areas. Limit recreation use in riparian areas, if needed to protect riparian values. <p>Cultural Resources</p>

Table 2-21. Areas of Critical Environmental Concern Decisions

	<p>Capitol Reef Gateway SRMA and Fremont Gorge WSR corridor would be managed in the manner identified under other resource headings for the Proposed RMP.</p> <p>Visual Resources</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reduce vandalism of cultural resources by increasing public awareness of their value, increasing law enforcement presence, and, if necessary, fencing or otherwise directly protecting important sites. Fencing or other surface disturbing activities would not be allowed in non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics under Alternative D. <p>Fire</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Designate Class A scenery outside of WSAs (Alternatives C and D) and outside of non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics (Alternative D) as VRM Class II. Designate remainder of ACEC (outside of non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics— Alternative D only) as VRM Class III. Implement VRM BMPs appropriate to VRM Class to protect scenic values. <p>Recreation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Suppress wildfire in crucial mule deer habitat containing browse species. <p>Travel Management</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Limit recreation use in Fish Creek Cove and Beas Lewis Flats to protect cultural resources, if needed. <p>Lands and Realty</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Manage OHVs as limited to designated routes to protect scenic values. In Alternative D, close non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics to OHV use. <p>Minerals</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Maintain crucial mule deer habitat in public ownership. Recommend withdrawing Class A scenery outside WSA and non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics (Alternative D only) from mineral entry.
--	---

Table 2-21. Areas of Critical Environmental Concern Decisions

Issue: Designation and Management of Proposed Henry Mountains ACEC (288,200 acres)				
Management Actions				
Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Proposed RMP	Alternative C	Alternative D
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do not designate the Henry Mountains ACEC. Manage the Henry Mountains area in accordance with the existing LUP (Alternative N) and in the manner identified under other resource headings for Alternative A and the Proposed RMP. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Manage VRM III areas as open to leasing subject to CSU and/or timing limitations. Manage VRM Class I areas in non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics (Alternative D only) as closed to oil and gas leasing. 	<p>Designate the Henry Mountains area as an ACEC for protection of relevant and important values, including wildlife (e.g., bison and deer), SSS (e.g., Townsend's big-eared bat, ferruginous hawk, burrowing owl, hole-in-the-rock prairie clover, Dana's milkvetch, and Barneby milkvetch), scenic, and ecological values (Map 2-46). Special management for protection of these values includes:</p> <p>Prevent Irreparable Damage</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Allow no uses that would cause irreparable damage to relevant and important values. <p>Riparian</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Restore, maintain, and improve riparian areas to bring them into PFC. Surface disturbing activities would not be allowed in non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics under Alternative D. Maintain erosion control structures in Nasty Flat area. <p>Vegetation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Manage vegetation to benefit mule deer and bison habitat. Manage No Man's Mesa to protect relict vegetation. <p>Cultural Resources</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reduce vandalism of cultural resources by increasing public awareness of their value, increasing law enforcement presence and, if necessary, fencing or otherwise directly protecting important sites. Fencing or other surface disturbing activities would not be allowed in non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics under 		

Table 2-21. Areas of Critical Environmental Concern Decisions

<p>Alternative D.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Close Starr Ranch to recreation/interpretation use until stabilization can be accomplished. <p>Visual Resources</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Designate Class A scenery outside of WSAs (Alternatives C and D) and outside of non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics (Alternative D) as VRM Class II. Designate remainder of ACEC as VRM Class III to allow manipulation of habitat to benefit wildlife and mule deer; in all cases, apply appropriate VRM class BMPs. <p>Special Status Species</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Restrict motorized access in sensitive plant areas. Increase law enforcement patrols. <p>Wildlife</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Manage mule deer and bison habitat in cooperation with UDWR. Allow manipulation of habitat to benefit wildlife. Surface disturbing activities would not be allowed in non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics in Alternative D. Allow range improvements that benefit wildlife. Fencing or other surface disturbing activities would not be allowed in non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics under Alternative D. Develop a Habitat Management Plan for bison and mule deer within the ACEC. <p>Fire and Fuels Management</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Use appropriate management response to protect and enhance relevant and important values. Suppress all wildfires near Starr Ranch to protect historical values. <p>Livestock Grazing</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Change class of livestock on the Pennell Allotment from sheep to cattle.
--

Table 2-21. Areas of Critical Environmental Concern Decisions

<p>Recreation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Allow continued maintenance, upgrade, and use of existing campgrounds and picnic facilities within the ACEC at Starr Springs, Lonesome Beaver, McMillan Spring, and Dandelion Flat. Additional recreation facilities may be developed in response to user demand and for resource protection if it would not cause irreparable damage to relevant and important values. <p>Travel Management</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Limit OHV use in the Nasty Flat area to designated routes. Limit OHV use to designated routes to protect scenic and cultural resources and bison habitat. During management plan development for this ACEC, OHV route designations would be reviewed and revised if necessary (with appropriate NEPA review) to protect these relevant and important values. Close No Man's Mesa to OHVs. In Alternative D, close non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics to OHV use. 	<p>Lands and Realty</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Authorize no ROWs in VRM Class I and II areas. Retain ACEC in public ownership. Acquire inholdings from willing sellers within the ACEC. Recommend withdrawing No Man's Mesa and areas with Class A scenery designated as VRM Class II from mineral entry. <p>Minerals</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Manage VRM Class II areas and non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics (Alternative D only) as closed to oil and gas leasing. Manage VRM Class III areas as open to oil and gas leasing subject to controlled surface use and/or timing limitations. Close No Man's Mesa to oil and gas leasing.
--	---

Table 2-21. Areas of Critical Environmental Concern Decisions

Issue: Designation and Management of Potential Horseshoe Canyon ACEC (40,900 acres—RFO only)				
Management Actions				
Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Proposed RMP	Alternative C	Alternative D
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do not designate the Horseshoe Canyon ACEC. Manage the Horseshoe Canyon area in accordance with the existing LUP (Alternative N) and in the manner identified under other resource headings for Alternatives A and the Proposed RMP. 	<p>Designate the Horseshoe Canyon area as an ACEC for protection of relevant and important values including scenic, cultural (e.g., Cowboy Cave), riparian, and SSS (e.g., Townsend's big-eared bat) (Map 2-46). Special management for protection of these values includes:</p> <p>Prevent Irreparable Damage</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Allow no uses that would cause irreparable damage to relevant and important values. <p>Riparian</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rehabilitate springs to bring them into PFC. Plant willows and cottonwoods in riparian areas. <p>Cultural Resources</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reduce vandalism of cultural resources by increasing public awareness of their value, increasing law enforcement presence and, if necessary, fencing or otherwise directly protecting important sites. Fencing or other surface disturbing activities would not be allowed in non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics in Alternative D. <p>Visual Resources</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Designate Class A scenery outside of WSAs (Alternatives C and D) and outside of non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics (Alternative D) as VRM Class II. <p>Livestock Grazing</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fence riparian areas to exclude livestock. Fencing or other surface disturbing activities would not be allowed in non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics in Alternative D. <p>Recreation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Limit recreation use through use of permits, if needed, to protect sensitive resources. 			

Table 2-21. Areas of Critical Environmental Concern Decisions

Issue: Designation and Management of Potential Kingston Canyon ACEC (22,100 acres)				
Management Actions				
Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Proposed RMP	Alternative C	Alternative D
<p>• Do not designate the Kingston Canyon ACEC.</p> <p>• Manage the Kingston Canyon area in accordance with the existing LUP (Alternative N) and in the manner identified under other resource headings for Alternative A and the Proposed RMP (such as non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics).</p>	<p>• Limit OHVs to designated routes to protect scenic, SSSSS, and cultural values. During management plan development for this ACEC, OHV route designations would be reviewed and revised if necessary (with appropriate NEPA review) to protect these relevant and important values. In Alternative D, close non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics to OHV use.</p>	<p>• Authorize no new ROWs in VRM Class I and II areas.</p> <p>• Retain ACEC in public ownership.</p> <p>• Acquire inholdings from willing sellers within the ACEC.</p> <p>• Recommend withdrawing areas with Class A scenery designated as VRM Class II from mineral entry.</p>	<p>• Manage VRM Class II areas as open to oil and gas leasing with major constraints, such as NSO.</p> <p>• Manage VRM Class I areas in non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics (Alternative D only) as closed to oil and gas leasing.</p>	<p>Designate and manage the Kingston Canyon area as an ACEC for protection of relevant and important values including riparian and mule deer habitat (Map 2-46). Special management for protection of these values includes:</p> <p>Prevent Irreparable Damage</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Allow no uses that would cause irreparable damage to relevant and important values. <p>Fire</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Suppress wildfire in crucial deer winter range. <p>Travel Management</p>

Table 2-21. Areas of Critical Environmental Concern Decisions

Issue: Designation and Management of Potential Little Rockies ACEC (49,200 acres)			
Management Actions			
Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Proposed RMP	Alternative C
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do not designate the Little Rockies ACEC. Manage the Little Rockies area in accordance with the existing LUP (Alternative N) and in the manner identified under other resource headings for Alternative A and the Proposed RMP. 	<p>Lands and Realty</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Limit OHV use to designated routes. In Alternative D, close non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics to OHV use. Limit OHV use with seasonal closures (December 15 through April 15) to protect mule deer habitat. Acquire in-holdings in the riparian corridor. Retain the ACEC in public ownership. 	<p>Designate the Little Rockies area as an ACEC for protection of relevant and important values, including scenic and wildlife values, notably Desert bighorn sheep and Townsend's big-eared bat, special status plant species, including hole-in-the-rock prairie clover, and ecologic values (Map 2-46). Special management for protection of these values includes:</p> <p>Prevent Irreparable Damage</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Allow no uses that would cause irreparable damage to relevant and important values. <p>Visual Resources</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Designate Class A scenery outside of WSAs (Alternatives C and D) and outside of non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics (Alternative D) as VRM Class II. <p>Wildlife</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Manage Desert bighorn sheep in cooperation with UDWR in accordance with the Henry Mountains Desert Bighorn Habitat Management Plan, as revised. Continue to cooperate with UDWR in transplants of Desert bighorn sheep into the area consistent with carrying capacity. Allow range improvements that would benefit Desert bighorn sheep, primarily water developments. Surface 	<p>Alternative D</p>

Table 2-21. Areas of Critical Environmental Concern Decisions

<p>disturbing activities would not be allowed in non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics under Alternative D.</p> <p>Livestock Grazing</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Convert domestic sheep use in Trachyte Allotment to cattle to prevent transmitting disease to Desert bighorn sheep. <p>Recreation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Regulate recreation impacts by limiting party size, season of use, and/or location to minimize harassment of Desert bighorn sheep, if needed. Limit recreation access and party size in Maidenwater and Trachyte canyons to protect ecological values, if needed. <p>Travel Management</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Limit OHV use to designated routes. In Alternative D, close non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics to OHV use. <p>Lands and Realty</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Authorize no new ROWs in non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics (Alternative D only) or in areas with Class A scenery. Retain ACEC in public ownership. Acquire inholdings from willing sellers within the ACEC. Recommend withdrawing Class A scenery designated as VRM Class II from mineral entry. <p>Minerals</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Manage VRM II areas as open to oil and gas leasing with major constraints, such as NSO. Close in non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics (Alternative D only) to oil and gas leasing.
--

Table 2-21. Areas of Critical Environmental Concern Decisions

Issue: Designation and Management of Potential Lower Muddy Creek ACEC (16,200 acres—RFO portion)				
Management Actions				
Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Proposed RMP	Alternative C	Alternative D
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do not designate the Lower Muddy Creek ACEC. Manage the Lower Muddy Creek area in accordance with the existing LUP (Alternative N) and in the manner identified under other resource headings for Alternative A and the Proposed RMP. 	<p>Designate the Lower Muddy Creek area as an ACEC for protection of relevant and important values, including scenic, riparian, and special status plant (e.g., Wright fishhook and Heil's beavertail cacti) values (Map 2-46). Special management for protection of these values includes:</p> <p>Prevent Irreparable Damage</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Allow no uses that would cause irreparable damage to relevant and important values. <p>Visual Resources</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Designate Class A scenery outside of WSA (Alternatives C and D) and outside of non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics (Alternative D) as VRM Class II. <p>Special Status Species</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increase law enforcement patrols to deter illegal cacti collecting. Increase public education. <p>Travel Management</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Limit OHVs to designated routes to protect listed plant species. During management plan development for this ACEC, OHV route designations would be reviewed and revised if necessary (with appropriate NEPA review) to protect listed plant species. In Alternative D, close non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics to OHV use. <p>Lands and Realty</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Authorize ROWs consistent with VRM Class II objectives. No new ROWs would be authorized in non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics (Alternative D only). Retain ACEC in public ownership. Acquire inholdings within the ACEC from willing sellers. 			

Table 2-21. Areas of Critical Environmental Concern Decisions

		Management Actions				
		Proposed RMP		Alternative C		Alternative D
Alternative N (No Action)		Alternative A				Minerals
Issue: Designation and Management of Potential Old Woman Front ACEC (330 acres)						
• Do not designate the Old Woman Front ACEC and RNA.				Designate the Old Woman Front area as an RNA ACEC for protection of the relevant and important values of relict vegetation.		
• Manage the Old Woman Front area in accordance with the existing LUP (Alternative N) and in the manner identified under other resource headings for Alternative A.				• Coordinate special management for protection of relict vegetation with the USFS Old Woman Cove RNA Plan.		
				• Manage the area for multiple use, while protecting the relict vegetation.		
				Ecological Processes		
				• Permit no human activities that directly or indirectly modify ecological processes.		
				Wildlife		
				• Allow no wildlife habitat manipulation.		
				• Prohibit the introduction or spread of exotic animal species.		
				Fire and Fuels Management		
				• Allow wildland fire use within the parameters of an approved fire plan and only under a prescription designed to accomplish the objectives of the area.		
				• Suppress fires using minimal impact tools and techniques.		
				• Avoid the use of heavy equipment.		
				• Avoid post-fire rehabilitation; if needed, use seed of indigenous species, and locally adapted ecotypes.		
				Forest Products		
				• Allow no logging or harvest of woodland products, fuelwood gathering, or Christmas tree cutting.		
				Livestock Grazing		
				• Unavailable for livestock grazing.		
				• Construct no range improvements.		
				Recreation		
				• Issue no SRPs.		
				Travel Management		

Table 2-21. Areas of Critical Environmental Concern Decisions

Issue: Designation and Management of Potential Parker Mountain ACEC (107,900 acres)				
Management Actions				
Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Proposed RMP	Alternative C	Alternative D
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do not designate Parker Mountain ACEC. Manage the Parker Mountain area in accordance with the existing LUP (Alternative N) and in the manner identified under other resource headings for Alternatives A and the Proposed RMP. Continue to consider ongoing land management practices, vegetative treatments, and grazing regimes, and continue to coordinate management efforts with Parker Mountain Adaptive Resource Management (PARM), BLM, UDWR, USFWS, and Utah State University to address vegetative treatments specific to improving the sagebrush-steppe community. 	<p>Designate Parker Mountain area as an ACEC for protection of relevant and important values, including sagebrush-steppe habitat and wildlife values, notably the Greater sage-grouse, Utah prairie dog, and pygmy rabbit (Map 2-46). Special management for protection of these values includes:</p> <p>Prevent Irreparable Damage</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Allow no uses that would cause irreparable damage to relevant and important values. <p>Vegetation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Actively manage invasive species. Evaluate potential vegetation treatments to ensure they are beneficial to sagebrush-steppe habitat and pygmy rabbits, Greater sage-grouse, and Utah prairie dogs. <p>Wildlife</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Educate hunters on pygmy rabbit identification. <p>Fire and Fuels Management</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Suppress wild fire in sagebrush-steppe habitat. <p>Livestock Grazing</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Continue to implement proper grazing management through coordination with PARM. Base stocking rates on timing and amount of precipitation and the condition of the range. 			

Table 2-21. Areas of Critical Environmental Concern Decisions

Issue: Management of Potential Quitchupah ACEC (180 acres)			
Management Actions			
Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Proposed RMP	Alternative C
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do not designate the Quitchupah ACEC. Manage the Quitchupah area in accordance with the existing LUP (Alternative N) and in the manner identified under other resource headings for Alternative A and the Proposed RMP. 	<p>Travel Management</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Limit OHV use to designated routes. Retain ACEC in public ownership. Acquire inholdings within the ACEC from willing sellers. 	<p>Lands and Realty</p> <p>Designate the Quitchupah area as an ACEC for protection of relevant and important cultural and riparian values (Map 2-46). Special management for protection of these values includes:</p> <p>Prevent Irreparable Damage</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Allow no uses that would cause irreparable damage to relevant and important values. <p>Cultural Resources</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reduce vandalism of cultural resources by increasing public awareness of their value, increasing law enforcement presence and, if necessary, fencing or otherwise directly protecting important sites. Fencing or other surface disturbing activities would not be allowed in non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics in Alternative D. <p>Travel Management</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Restrict OHV use to designated routes to protect cultural and ecological resources and riparian areas from damage. Under Alternative D, close non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics to OHV use. <p>Lands and Realty</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Avoid granting new ROWs; if ROWs are granted, mitigate impacts to ACEC values. Under Alternative D, new ROWs would not be authorized in non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics. 	<p>Alternative D</p>

Table 2-21. Areas of Critical Environmental Concern Decisions

Issue: Designation and Management of Potential Rainbow Hills ACEC (4,000 acres)				
Management Actions				
Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Proposed RMP	Alternative C	Alternative D
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do not designate the Rainbow Hills ACEC. Manage the Rainbow Hills area in accordance with the existing LUP (Alternative N) and in the manner identified under other resource headings for Alternative A and the Proposed RMP. 	<p>Designate the Rainbow Hills area as an ACEC for protection of relevant and important values, including mule deer habitat, natural systems, and SSS, including Utah phacelia, Arapien stickleaf, Ward's penstemon, rainbow rabbitbrush, Sigurd townsendia, and Glenwood milkvetch (Map 2-46). Special management for protection of these values includes:</p> <p>Prevent Irreparable Damage</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Allow no uses that would cause irreparable damage to relevant and important values. <p>Mule Deer</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Suppress wildfire in crucial mule deer winter range to protect important browse species. <p>Travel Management</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Close to OHV use. <p>Lands and Realty</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Retain ACEC in public ownership. Acquire inholdings from willing sellers. Avoid granting new ROWs. <p>Minerals</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recommend withdrawing from mineral entry. 	<p>Designate the Rainbow Hills area as an ACEC for protection of relevant and important values, including mule deer habitat, natural systems, and SSS, including Utah phacelia, Arapien stickleaf, Ward's penstemon, rainbow rabbitbrush, Sigurd townsendia, and Glenwood milkvetch (Map 2-46). Special management for protection of these values includes:</p> <p>Prevent Irreparable Damage</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Allow no uses that would cause irreparable damage to relevant and important values. <p>Mule Deer</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Suppress wildfire in crucial mule deer winter range to protect important browse species. <p>Travel Management</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Close to OHV use. <p>Lands and Realty</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Retain ACEC in public ownership. Acquire inholdings from willing sellers. Avoid granting new ROWs. <p>Minerals</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Allow leasing with NSO to protect special status and endemic plants and the naturally functioning system from major human disturbances. 	<p>Issue: Designation and Management of Potential Sevier Canyon ACEC (8,900 acres)</p>	<p>Designate the Sevier Canyon area as an ACEC for protection of relevant and important values, including mule deer habitat, riparian, and SSS values (Map 2-46). Special management for Alternative A and the Proposed RMP</p>
Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Proposed RMP	Alternative C	Alternative D
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do not designate the Sevier Canyon ACEC. Manage the Sevier Canyon area in accordance with the existing LUP (Alternative N) and in a manner identified under other resource headings for Alternative A and the Proposed RMP. 				

Table 2-21. Areas of Critical Environmental Concern Decisions

Issue: Designation and Management of Potential Thousand Lakes Bench ACEC (500 acres)				
Management Actions				
Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Proposed RMP	Alternative C	Alternative D
			Designate the Thousand Lakes Bench area as an ACEC for protection of relevant and important values, including cultural resources, special status plants, and riparian areas (Map 2-46). Special management for protection of these values includes:	
			Prevent Irreparable Damage	
			• Allow no uses that would cause irreparable damage to relevant and important values.	
			Cultural Resources	
			• Reduce vandalism of cultural resources by increasing public awareness of their value, increasing law enforcement presence and, if necessary, fencing or otherwise directly protecting important sites. Fencing or other surface disturbing activities would not be allowed in non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics under Alternative D.	
RMP.			protection of these values includes:	
			Prevent Irreparable Damage	
			• Allow no uses that would cause irreparable damage to relevant and important values.	
			Fire and Fuels Management	
			• Suppress wildfire in crucial mule deer winter range to protect important browse species.	
			Travel Management	
			• Limit OHV use to designated routes.	
			• Limit OHVs seasonally (December 15 through April 15) to protect mule deer habitat.	
			Lands and Realty	
			• Retain ACEC in public ownership.	
			• Acquire inholdings from willing sellers.	

Table 2-21. Areas of Critical Environmental Concern Decisions

Issue: Designation and Management of Potential Special Status Species ACEC (15,100 acres)					
Management Actions					
Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Proposed RMP	Alternative C	Alternative D	
					Designate the Special Status Species ACEC to protect relevant and important SSS values (Map 2-46). Special management for protection of these values includes:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do not designate the Special Status Species ACEC. • Manage the Special Status Species ACEC area in accordance with existing LUPs (Alternative N) and in the manner identified under other resource headings for Alternative A and the Proposed RMP. • Manage SSS and their habitats in coordination with the USFWS, UDWWR, and other resource management agencies. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limit OHVs to designated routes to protect cultural resources, riparian areas, and special status plants. During management plan development for this ACEC, OHV route designations would be reviewed and revised if necessary (with appropriate NEPA review) to protect these relevant and important values. Under Alternative D, close non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics to OHV use. 	<p>Prevent Irreparable Damage</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allow no uses that would cause irreparable damage to relevant and important values. <p>Vegetation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Avoid or mitigate impacts to SSS and their habitats when conducting vegetative treatments. <p>Special Status Species</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase law enforcement patrols to deter collecting and poaching. <p>Recreation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If monitoring shows that adverse impacts are or could occur to SSS, limit recreation use as necessary. <p>Travel Management</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limit OHVs to designated routes in SSS habitat. During management plan development for this ACEC, OHV route designations would be reviewed and revised if 			

Table 2-21. Areas of Critical Environmental Concern Decisions

	necessary (with appropriate NEPA review) to protect these SSS.
Lands and Realty	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Retain SSS documented locations in public ownership.• Where determined necessary to acquire important habitat for SSS, pursue acquisition of non-federal lands from willing sellers.• Avoid granting ROWs and other land use authorizations that would affect SSS and their habitats.
Minerals	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Manage SSS areas as open to oil and gas leasing subject to CSU and/or timing limitations.• Manage SSS areas as open to disposal of mineral materials subject to CSU and/or timing limitations.

2.6.4 Transportation

Table 2-22. Transportation Facilities Decisions

Desired Outcomes (Goals and Objectives)	
Issue: Management of Transportation Facilities	Management Actions
Common to the Proposed RMP and Draft RMP Alternatives	
Provide a safe and effective transportation system across public lands.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per the State of Utah v. Andrus, Oct. 1, 1979 (Cotter Decision), the BLM would grant the State of Utah reasonable access to state lands for economic purposes, on a case-by-case basis. • Continue to support Sanpete, Sevier, Piute, Garfield and Wayne counties and the State of Utah in providing a network of roads for movement of people, goods, and services across public lands. • Review requests for administrative access on a case-by-case basis. • Develop, implement, and maintain cooperative agreements with counties and the State of Utah for maintenance of the transportation system. • Require reclamation of redundant road systems and/or roads that no longer serve their intended purpose in order to reduce road density and reduce habitat fragmentation. • Manage designated scenic byway and backway corridors for the purposes for which they were designated. • Coordinate with the NPS and the State of Utah for management and interpretation of scenic byway and backway corridors. • Install directional, informational, regulatory, and interpretive signs at appropriate locations throughout the planning area. • There are a number of locations throughout the RFO that are commonly known and consistently used for aircraft landing and departure activities that, through such casual use, have evolved into backcountry airstrips (the definition contained in Section 345 of Public Law 106-914, the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriation Act of 2001). In accordance with that law, require full public notice, consultation with local and state government officials, the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), and compliance with all applicable laws, including NEPA, when considering any closure of an aircraft landing strip.

2.6.5 Health and Safety

Table 2-23. Health and Safety

Desired Outcomes (Goals and Objectives)	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strive to ensure that human health and safety concerns on public lands remain a major priority. • Mitigate or eliminate all hazardous or potentially hazardous sites and situations, including hazardous materials, hazardous or solid wastes, abandoned mine sites, abandoned well sites, and other potential hazards on public lands. • Minimize or eliminate the potential for intentional or accidental releases of hazardous materials or wastes and solid wastes onto public lands. 	<p>Issue: Management of Abandoned Mine Lands</p> <p>Management Actions</p> <p>Common to the Proposed RMP and Draft RMP Alternatives</p> <p>In conformance with BLM's long-term strategies and National Policies regarding Abandoned Mine Lands (AML), work with state agencies toward identifying and addressing physical safety and environmental hazards at all AML sites on public lands. To accomplish this long-term goal, establish the following criteria to assist in determining priorities for site and area mitigation and reclamation.</p> <p>Use the following criteria to establish physical safety hazard program priorities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The highest priority of the AML physical safety program would be cleaning up those AML sites where (a) a death or injury has occurred, (b) the site is situated on or in immediate proximity to developed recreation sites and areas with high visitor use, and (c) upon formal risk assessment, a high or extremely high risk level is indicated. • AML would be factored into future recreation management area designations, land use planning assessments, and all applicable use authorizations. • Sites listed or eligible for listing would be entered in the Abandoned Mine Site Cleanup Module of Protection and Response Information System. • AML hazards should be, to the extent practicable, mitigated or remediated on the ground during site development. <p>The criteria that would be used to establish water-quality based AML program priorities are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Watersheds identified by the state as a priority based on (a) one or more water laws or regulations; (b) a threat to public health or safety; and (c) a threat to the environment • Projects reflecting a collaborative effort with other land managing agencies • Sites listed or eligible for listing in the Abandoned Mine Site Cleanup Module of the Protection and Response Information System • Projects that would be funded by contributions from collaborating agencies. <p>The State Multi-Year Work Plan would be maintained and updated as needed to reflect current policies for identifying program physical safety and water quality AML sites priorities for reclamation or remediation.</p>

Issue: Management of Hazardous Materials	
Management Actions	Common to the Proposed RMP and Draft RMP Alternatives
	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Identify and clean up unauthorized dumping sites and hazardous materials spills in the RFO as required to comply with applicable state, local, and federal laws and regulations.• Clean up and restore areas known to have hazardous materials, hazardous wastes, or solid wastes. Areas that have been cleaned up and restored would be maintained and monitored.• Actively seek responsible parties to reimburse hazardous materials cleanup costs.

2.7 IMPACTS SUMMARY TABLE

Table 2-24 provides a summary of impacts that would occur from implementing the five alternatives described in this chapter. Chapter 4 provides more detailed impact analysis.

Table 2-24. Summary Comparison of Impacts

Resource	Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Proposed RMP	Alternative C	Alternative D
Air Quality	None of the proposed decisions in Chapter 2 would have a major impact on air quality. Rather, it is more likely that impacts to air quality within the planning area would result from activities on private lands, including growth of cities and towns, increased vehicle traffic on highways and roads, and industrial development (e.g., coal-fired power plants). The public land activity likely to have the greatest impact on air quality would be wildland fire and fuels management, which varies by alternative as shown below.	The types of impacts experienced under these alternatives would be similar to those described for Alternative N except that under Alternatives A and the Proposed RMP, treatments would average 73,600 acres annually with a maximum acreage limit set over the life of the plan (up to 1,472,000 acres). In contrast with Alternative N, Alternatives A and the Proposed RMP would potentially decrease the level of suppression being used on wildfires through AMR, a strategy to meet Fire Management Unit (FMU) objectives. In the short term, more acres could burn and smoke and particulate emissions could increase. In the long term, the potential for severe and uncontrollable types of wildfires would be predicted to decrease, enabling BLM to manage wildfire and associated emissions more effectively. In the short term, smoke management is a critical component of wildland fire use planning, and it is considered in developing the management response for each wildland fire use event.	The types of impacts experienced under these alternatives would be similar to those described for Alternative A and the Proposed RMP except that under Alternatives C and D, the average annual treatment acres (26,000) and maximum acreage over the life of the plan (520,000) would be less. Similar to Alternative A and the Proposed RMP, Alternatives C and D would potentially decrease the level of suppression being used on wildfires through adoption of AMR (including smoke management considerations). In the short term, relying on prescribed fire as the main fuels management tool would likely increase the acres burned by wildfires and accompanying smoke and particulate emissions compared with Alternative A and the Proposed RMP. In the long term, the potential for severe and uncontrollable types of wildfires may decrease but not as much as under Alternative A and the Proposed RMP because of the limitations on fuels treatments. The consequent impacts to air quality could be greater than under Alternative A and the Proposed RMP but less than under Alternative N.	The potential for impacts to soils under the Proposed RMP would be less than under Alternatives N or A but greater than under Alternatives C or D or	The potential for impacts to soils under Alternative C would be less than under Alternatives N and A and the Proposed RMP but greater than under Alternative D.
Soil Resources	The potential for impacts to soils under Alternative N would be greatest among all the alternatives, due to:				The potential for impacts to soils would be least under Alternative D because of limitations on surface disturbing activities resulting from:

Resource	Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Proposed RMP	Alternative C	Alternative D
Soil Resources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Allowing cross-country OHV use on 77 percent of the RFO Allowing oil and gas leasing on 78 percent of the RFO Designating 75 percent of the RFO as VRM Classes III or IV. Designating 75 percent of the RFO as VRM Classes III or IV Designating 79 percent of the RFO as VRM Classes III or IV Recommending no ACECs or suitable WSRs. 	<p>the Proposed RMP because of the potential for surface disturbing activities resulting from:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Allowing cross-country OHV use on 21 percent of the RFO Allowing oil and gas leasing on 79 percent of the RFO Designating 79 percent of the RFO as VRM Classes III or IV Recommending no ACECs or suitable WSRs. 	<p>Alternatives C and D because of limitations on surface disturbing activities resulting from:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Allowing cross-country OHV use on less than 1 percent of the RFO Closing to leasing or allowing NSO on 28 percent of the RFO Designating 33 percent of the RFO as VRM Classes I or II Recommending one eligible WSR segment as suitable. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> under Alternative D because of limitations on surface disturbing activities resulting from: Allowing no cross-country OHV use Closing to oil and gas leasing or allowing NSO on 57 percent of the RFO Designating 56 percent of the RFO as VRM Classes I or II In addition to existing withdrawals, recommending withdrawal of 35 percent of the RFO from mineral entry Designating all potential ACECs Recommending all eligible WSR segments as suitable. Protecting all non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Allowing no cross-country OHV use Closing to oil and gas leasing or allowing NSO on 57 percent of the RFO Designating 56 percent of the RFO as VRM Classes I or II In addition to existing withdrawals, recommending withdrawal of 35 percent of the RFO from mineral entry Designating all potential ACECs Recommending all eligible WSR segments as suitable. Protecting all non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics.
Water Resources				<p>Surface disturbing activities would be restricted within the 100-year floodplain or 330 feet on either side from the centerline, whichever is greater, of all waters, which would protect water sources, although less than under Alternatives N, C, or D.</p>	<p>Surface disturbing activities would be restricted within 660 feet of all waters, which would protect water sources more than under Alternatives N and A and the Proposed RMP.</p>

Resource	Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Proposed RMP	Alternative C	Alternative D
	Allowing cross-country OHV use on 77 percent of the RFO and designating 4,315 miles of routes with 539 stream crossings would result in the greatest potential for impacts to water resources.	Allowing cross-country use on 21 percent of the RFO and designating 4,312 miles of routes with 443 stream crossings would have less potential for impacts to water resources than Alternative N, but greater than under the Proposed RMP and Alternatives C and D.	Allowing cross-country OHV use on less than 1 percent of the RFO would reduce potential impacts compared with Alternatives A and the Proposed RMP, and would be similar to impacts under Alternatives C and D. There would be 4,277 miles of designated routes with 400 stream crossings, which would have greater potential for impacts to water resources than under Alternatives C and D.	No cross-country OHV use would be allowed, which would be similar to the Proposed RMP and Alternative D. The potential for impacts to water resources under Alternative C would be less than under Alternatives N and A and the Proposed RMP but greater than under Alternative D because of the designation of only 3,192 miles of routes with 273 stream crossings.	As in Alternative C, no cross-country OHV use would be allowed. The potential for impacts to water resources would be least under Alternative D because of the designation of only 3,043 miles of routes with 266 stream crossings.
Vegetation	Managing fire using a full suite of tools would allow for the graduated movement to a more ecologically sustainable condition and reduction of hazardous fuels. Continuing minimal treatments on a case-by-case basis could continue the existing trend of pinyon-juniper woodland encroachment and increase the risk of large or intense wildfires. Vegetation across a large portion of the RFO (77 percent) would continue to be subject to potential impacts from cross-country OHV use.	Adopting an appropriate management response strategy to wildfire would reduce pinyon-juniper woodland encroachment and decrease the risk of large or intense wildfires and their effects on vegetation. Vegetation on 21 percent of the RFO would continue to be subject to potential impacts from cross-country OHV use, less than under Alternative N but more than under the Proposed RMP and Alternatives C and D. Options for managing vegetation would be greatest under Alternative A because it would provide the most tools for managing	Adopting an appropriate management response strategy to wildfire would reduce pinyon-juniper woodland encroachment and decrease the risk of large or intense wildfires (same as under the Proposed RMP and Alternatives A and D). There would be no areas open for cross-country OHV use, eliminating these impacts to vegetation. Alternative C would protect existing vegetation from disturbance because of its restrictions on VRM, OHVs, and vegetation management tools. However, it would provide less flexibility for vegetation management	Adopting an appropriate management response strategy to wildfire would reduce pinyon-juniper woodland encroachment and decrease the risk of large or intense wildfires (same as under Alternative A and C and the Proposed RMP). There would be no areas open for cross-country OHV use, eliminating these impacts to vegetation. Alternative D would best protect existing vegetation from disturbance because of its restrictions on VRM, OHVs, and vegetation management tools. However, it would provide the least flexibility for vegetation	

Resource	Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Proposed RMP	Alternative C	Alternative D
	vegetation and the fewest restrictions.	would reduce opportunities for vegetation management in some areas.	than under Alternative N and A and the Proposed RMP because some of these same restrictions could limit the effective management of pinyon-juniper woodland and sagebrush-steppe vegetation communities.	management among the alternatives because some of these same restrictions could limit the effective management of pinyon-juniper woodland and sagebrush-steppe vegetation communities.	
	Surface disturbing activities are the primary cause of adverse impacts to riparian resources. Conversely, proposed decisions to limit surface disturbing activities would help protect riparian resources. Significant impacts to riparian resources would not be anticipated under any of the alternatives. Under all alternatives, actions in riparian areas would be guided by the Utah Riparian Management Policy and the decisions made through this planning effort.	Impacts would be similar to those under Alternative N except that the size of the buffer zone in which no surface disturbance would be allowed is within the 100-year floodplain or 330 feet on either side from the centerline, whichever is greater. Thus, Alternative A and the Proposed RMP would protect a smaller area around the riparian/wetland zones from surface disturbance than under Alternative N. However, projects to improve habitat conditions within these riparian zones could still be performed, even within the buffer zone.	The types of impacts experienced as a result of riparian management would be similar to those described for Alternative N except that the size of the buffer zone in which no surface disturbance would be allowed would be 660 feet on each side of the riparian area. Thus, these alternatives would protect a larger area around the riparian/wetland zones from surface disturbing activities than under Alternatives N or A, or the Proposed RMP.	The potential for impacts to riparian resources under Alternative C would be less than under Alternatives N and A and greater than under Alternatives C and D because of limitations on surface disturbing activities resulting from:	The potential for impacts to riparian resources would be least under Alternative D because of limitations on surface disturbing activities resulting from:
Vegetation—Riparian	The potential for impacts to riparian resources under Alternative N would be greatest among all the alternatives, due to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allowing cross-country OHV use on 77 percent of the RFO • Allowing 539 stream crossings from OHV routes. 	The potential for impacts to riparian resources under the Proposed RMP would be less than under Alternatives N or A, but greater than under Alternatives C or D because of the potential for surface disturbing activities resulting from: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allowing cross-country OHV use on less than 1 percent of the RFO • Allowing 443 stream crossings 	The potential for impacts to riparian resources under Alternative C would be less than under Alternatives N and A and greater than under Alternative D because of limitations on surface disturbing activities resulting from: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allowing cross-country OHV use on 21 percent of the RFO • Allowing 400 stream crossings 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allowing no cross-country OHV use • Allowing 273 stream crossings 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allowing no cross-country OHV use • Allowing 266 stream crossings from OHV routes • Closing to oil and gas leasing or allowing NSO on

Resource	Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Proposed RMP	Alternative C	Alternative D
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> from OHV routes Recommending no ACECs or suitable WSRs. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Closing to leasing or allowing NSO on 28 percent of the RFO Designating 33 percent of the RFO as VRM Classes I or II. Recommending one eligible WSR as suitable Designating two ACECs (2,530 acres). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> from OHV routes Closing to oil and gas leasing or allowing NSO on 35 percent of the RFO Designating 32 percent of the RFO as VRM Classes I or II. In addition to existing withdrawals, recommending withdrawal of 35 percent of the RFO from mineral entry Designating all potential ACECs Recommending all eligible WSRs as suitable Designating all potential ACECs Recommending all eligible WSRs as suitable. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> from OHV routes Closing to oil and gas leasing or allowing NSO on 35 percent of the RFO Designating 56 percent of the RFO as VRM Classes I or II In addition to existing withdrawals, recommending withdrawal of 35 percent of the RFO from mineral entry Designating all potential ACECs Recommending all eligible WSRs as suitable Protecting all non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 56 percent of the RFO Designating 56 percent of the RFO as VRM Classes I or II In addition to existing withdrawals, recommending withdrawal of 35 percent of the RFO from mineral entry Designating all potential ACECs Recommending all eligible WSRs as suitable Protecting all non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics.
Vegetation—Invasive, Non-Native Species			<p>Alternatives N, A, and the Proposed RMP would allow a full range of weed control methods (mechanical, biological, manual, fire, and chemical) to be used and would afford the best opportunity for controlling weeds.</p> <p>Weed seeds are often transported from one place to another on the tires and undercarriages of vehicles. Allowing motorized access into more areas and on more routes would increase the potential for expanding noxious weeds infestations; limiting access decreases the potential.</p>	<p>Alternatives C and D would preclude the use of mechanical, manual, and chemical methods. Control of some noxious weeds under these alternatives would not be possible in some areas because of lack of suitable substitute treatments, potentially allowing the weeds to spread.</p>	<p>The potential for the spread of weeds by vehicles under Alternative A would be less than under Alternatives N and A but greater than under the Proposed</p> <p>The potential for the spread of weeds by vehicles under the Proposed RMP would be less than under Alternatives N and A and greater than Alternatives N and A and the Proposed RMP but</p> <p>The potential for the spread of weeds by vehicles under Alternative C would be less than under Alternatives N and A and the Proposed RMP but</p> <p>The potential for the spread of weeds by vehicles under Alternative D would be least among all alternatives because no cross-country OHV use</p>

Resource	Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Proposed RMP	Alternative C	Alternative D
	allowed on 77 percent of the RFO and 10 percent would be closed to OHV use.	RMP or Alternatives C or D because cross-country OHV use would be allowed on less than 1 percent of the RFO and no areas would be closed to OHV use.	C or D because cross-country OHV use would be allowed on less than 1 percent of the RFO and 10 percent would be closed to OHV use.	greater than Alternative D because no cross-country OHV use would be allowed and 32 percent of the RFO would be closed to OHV use.	would be allowed and 54 percent of the RFO would be closed to OHV use.
Cultural Resources	All permitted activities regulated by BLM are subject to the legal and policy protections and mitigation afforded cultural resources. Unregulated uses that could affect cultural resources include dispersed recreation, and OHV use in areas designated as open. Special designations such as WSAs, ACECs, and WSRs, and decisions to protect, preserve, and maintain the wilderness characteristics associated with non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics (Proposed RMP and Alternative D) would have a largely beneficial impact on cultural resources because the management prescriptions associated with those designations limit surface disturbing activities.	The potential for inadvertent impacts to cultural resources under Alternative A would be less than under Alternative N but greater than the Proposed RMP or Alternatives C or D because of the potential for surface disturbing activities resulting from: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Allowing cross-country OHV use on 77 percent of the RFO• Allowing oil and gas leasing on 78 percent of the RFO• Designating 75 percent of the RFO as VRM Classes III or IV.	The potential for inadvertent impacts to cultural resources under the Proposed RMP would be less than under Alternatives N or A but greater than Alternatives C and D because of limitations on surface disturbing activities resulting from: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Allowing cross-country OHV use on 21 percent of the RFO• Allowing oil and gas leasing on 79 percent of the RFO• Designating 79 percent of the RFO as VRM Classes III or IV• Recomending no ACECs or suitable WSRs.	The potential for inadvertent impacts to cultural resources under Alternative C would be less than under Alternatives N and A and the Proposed RMP but greater than under Alternative D because of limitations on surface disturbing activities resulting from: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Allowing cross-country OHV use on less than 1 percent of the RFO• Closing to leasing or allowing NSO on 28 percent of the RFO• Designating 33 percent of the RFO as VRM Classes I or II• Recomending one eligible WSR as suitable.	The potential for inadvertent impacts to cultural resources would be least under Alternative D because of limitations on surface disturbing activities resulting from: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Allowing no cross-country OHV use or allowing NSO on 57 percent of the RFO• Closing to leasing or allowing NSO on 35 percent of the RFO• Designating 32 percent of the RFO as VRM Classes I or II• In addition to existing withdrawals, recommending withdrawal of 35 percent of the RFO from mineral entry• Designating all

Resource	Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Proposed RMP	Alternative C	Alternative D
Paleontological Resources	<p>All permitted activities regulated by BLM are subject to the legal and policy protections and mitigation afforded paleontological resources. Impacts on paleontological resources occur from natural weathering and erosion, surface disturbing activities, excavation, and theft or vandalism. Unregulated uses that could affect paleontological resources include dispersed recreation, and OHV use in areas designated as open. Special designations, such as WSAs, ACECs, and WSRs, and decisions to protect, preserve, and maintain wilderness characteristics associated with non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics (Proposed RMP and Alternative D) would have a largely beneficial impact on paleontological resources because the management prescriptions associated with them would limit surface disturbing activities.</p> <p>The potential for inadvertent impacts to paleontological resources under Alternative N would be greatest among all the alternatives, due to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allowing cross-country OHV use on 77 percent of the RFO • Allowing oil and gas leasing on 78 percent of the RFO • Designating 75 percent of the RFO as VRM Classes III or IV. 	<p>The potential for inadvertent impacts to paleontological resources under the Proposed RMP would be less than under Alternatives N or A but greater than under Alternatives C and D because of limitations on surface disturbing activities resulting from:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allowing cross-country OHV use on 21 percent of the RFO • Allowing oil and gas leasing on 79 percent of the RFO • Designating 79 percent of the RFO 	<p>withdrawal of 8 percent of the RFO from mineral entry</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Designating all potential ACECs • Recommending all eligible WSRs as suitable. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommending all eligible WSRs as suitable. 	<p>potential ACECs</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommending all eligible WSRs as suitable • Protecting, preserving, and maintaining all non-WSA with wilderness characteristics.

Resource	Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Proposed RMP	Alternative C	Alternative D
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> as VRM Classes III or IV Recommending no ACECs or suitable WSRs. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> as VRM Classes I or II Recommending one eligible WSR as suitable. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In addition to existing withdrawals, recommending withdrawal of 8 percent of the RFO from mineral entry Designating all potential ACECs Recommending all eligible WSRs as suitable. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Designating all potential ACECs Recommending all eligible WSRs as suitable. Protecting, preserving, and maintaining all non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics.
				<p>Under Alternative A, 21 percent of the RFO would be designated VRM Classes I or II, providing the least protection for scenic resources among the alternatives.</p> <p>Under Alternative N, 25 percent of the RFO would be designated VRM Classes I or II. This would provide more protection for scenic resources than under Alternative A and less than under the Proposed RMP and Alternatives C and D.</p>	<p>Under Alternative C, 32 percent of the RFO would be designated VRM Classes I or II. This would provide more protection for scenic resources than under Alternatives N or A and less than under Alternatives C and D.</p> <p>Under Alternative D, 35 percent of the RFO would be withdrawn from mineral entry.</p>
Visual Resources				<p>Under Alternative A, 21 percent of the RFO would be open to cross-country OHV use. The potential for impacts to scenic resources from OHV use would be less than under Alternative N, but greater than under the Proposed RMP and Alternatives C and D.</p>	<p>No cross-country OHV use would be allowed, eliminating the potential for impacts to scenic resources from OHV use. Alternatives C and D would provide the greatest protection for scenic resources.</p>
Special Status Species				The implementation of decisions that would have the greatest potential adverse effects on SSS would be actions that allow surface disturbing activities. The implementation of decisions that would have the greatest potential beneficial effects to SSS would be actions	

Resource	Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Proposed RMP	Alternative C	Alternative D
	<p>that would directly protect SSS and their habitat or indirectly protect SSS through surface restrictions. These actions would include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SSS management • Protecting, preserving, and maintaining non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics • Special Designations (ACECs, WSRs, WSAs) • Visual Resource Management Class I or II designations. 	<p>The potential for impacts to SSS under Alternative N would be greatest among all the alternatives, due to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allowing cross-country OHV use on 77 percent of the RFO • Maintaining minimal restrictions on other surface disturbing activities. 	<p>The potential for impacts to SSS under Alternative A would be less than under Alternative N but greater than under the Proposed RMP or Alternatives C or D because of the potential for surface disturbing activities resulting from:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allowing cross-country OHV use on 21 percent of the RFO • Maintaining minimal restrictions on other surface disturbing activities • Recommending no ACECs or suitable wild and scenic rivers. 	<p>The potential for impacts to SSS under the Proposed RMP would be less than under Alternatives N or A, but greater than under Alternatives C and D because of limitations on surface disturbing activities resulting from:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allowing cross-country OHV use on less than 1 percent of the RFO • Closing to leasing or allowing NSO on 28 percent of the RFO • Designating 33 percent of the RFO as VRM Classes I or II • Recommending one eligible WSR as suitable • Designating two ACECs (2,530 acres). 	<p>The potential for impacts to SSS under Alternative C would be less than under Alternatives N and A and the Proposed RMP but greater than under Alternative D because of limitations on surface disturbing activities resulting from:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allowing no cross-country OHV use • Closing to oil and gas leasing or allowing NSO on 35 percent of the RFO • Designating 56 percent of the RFO as VRM Classes I or II • In addition to existing withdrawals, recommending withdrawal of 35 percent of the RFO from mineral entry • Designating all potential ACECs • Recommending all eligible WSRs as suitable • Protecting, preserving, and

Resource	Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Proposed RMP	Alternative C	Alternative D
				suitable.	maintaining all non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics.
	Under Alternative N, managing fire using a full suite of tools would allow for the graduated movement to a more ecologically sustainable condition and reduction of hazardous fuels. However, continuing minimal treatments on a case-by-case basis could contribute to fuel loading, setting the stage for catastrophic fires, and consequent loss of wildlife habitat. Current forage allocations would continue, providing no additional benefits to wildlife. Seventy-seven percent of the lands managed by the RFO would remain open to cross-country OHV use, leaving wildlife vulnerable to displacement and harassment and habitat susceptible to degradation.	Under Alternative A, implementing an appropriate management response strategy would allow the use of wildland fire as a vegetation management tool, benefiting wildlife species and habitat (same as Alternatives A and the Proposed RMP). Only prescribed fire and other natural means would be used to manage fuel and other vegetation, limiting options for treatment that in some cases might not be effective, reducing the benefit to wildlife compared with Alternatives A and the Proposed RMP. None of the lands managed by the RFO would remain open to cross-country OHV use, eliminating the possibility of displacement, harassment, and habitat degradation. Establishing the Henry Mountains ACEC for bison and mule deer values would recognize the relevance and importance of these resources and provide special management emphasis to enhance them.	Under the Proposed RMP, implementing an appropriate management response strategy would allow the use of wildland fire as a vegetation tool, benefiting wildlife species and habitat (same as Alternative A). A full range of tools would be available for fuels management and other vegetation treatments, allowing the greatest flexibility to enhance wildlife habitats. Current forage allocations would continue, providing no additional benefits to wildlife. Twenty-one percent of the lands managed by the RFO would remain open to cross-country OHV use, reducing the potential for wildlife displacement and harassment, and habitat degradation compared with Alternatives N and A.	The Proposed RMP would balance the impacts of development with the need to protect fish, wildlife, and their habitats.	Alternatives C and D, with their special designations and emphasis on conservation, would be most beneficial to fish, wildlife, and their habitats.
Wild Horses and Burros	The preliminary AML for the wild burros would	Establishing a formal	The wild burro AML would be the largest of the		

Resource	Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Proposed RMP	Alternative C	Alternative D
Burros	<p>maintain a viable population. Forage allocations are sufficient for the wild burros in the northern portions of the HMA; however, there could be competition for forage resources in the southern portions. The potential for displacement of wild burros from OHV use exists.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Maintaining State of Utah air quality standards could result in fewer acres burned using prescribed fires or wildland fire use because NAAQS could be exceeded. If the air quality of Class I airsheds were adversely affected, wildland fire use and prescribed fires could be suspended. Consideration of regional haze could increase the restrictions on wildland fire use or prescribed fire. Managing WSAs under the IMP precludes the use of mechanical (chaining, harrowing) and manual (chainsaw) fuels reduction treatments. This could limit the ability to maintain or restore properly functioning vegetation and reduce hazardous fuels in WSAs, including those in the Dirty Devil, Horseshoe Canyon, and Henry Mountains areas. 	<p>wild burro AML would maintain the viability of the population and result in the long-term maintenance of wild burro habitat components. The Proposed RMP could eliminate habitat competition between livestock and wild burros, but displacement from OHV use would continue. None of the impacts are anticipated to be significant.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Allowing use of a full range of vegetation management tools, including mechanical, biological, manual, prescribed and wildland fire use, and chemical (herbicides) would complement the ability to maintain and restore properly functioning vegetation and reduce hazardous 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Allowing use of a full range of vegetation management tools, including mechanical, biological, manual, prescribed and wildland fire use, and chemical (herbicides) would complement the ability to maintain and restore properly functioning vegetation and reduce hazardous 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Restrictions on the use of non-fire treatments which would limit the ability to maintain or restore properly functioning vegetation and reduce hazardous fuels in some areas. Proposed decisions for visual resource management could preclude some types of treatments within the 21

Fire and Fuels Management

Resource	Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Proposed RMP	Alternative C	Alternative D
	<p>affect the design of non-fire treatment projects, particularly within the 25 percent of the RFO designated as VRM Class II.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposed decisions for visual resource management could preclude some types of treatments within the 21 percent of the RFO designated as VRM Class I, less than under Alternative N. 	<p>fuels.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposed decisions for visual resource management could preclude some types of treatments within the 21 percent of the RFO designated as VRM Class I and affect the design of non-fire fuels treatment projects, particularly in VRM Class II areas (11 percent) in the Henry Mountains and near the towns of Torrey, Grover, and Teasdale. 	<p>fuels.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposed decisions for visual resource management could preclude some types of treatments within the 21 percent of the RFO designated as VRM Class I and affect the design of non-fire fuels treatment projects, particularly in VRM Class II areas (12 percent) in the Henry Mountains and near the towns of Torrey, Grover, and Teasdale. 	<p>percent of the RFO designated as VRM Class I and affect the design of non-fire fuels treatment projects, particularly in VRM Class II areas (3 percent) in the Henry Mountains and near the towns of Torrey, Grover, and Teasdale.</p> <p>Alternative D would restrict treatment projects on the greatest amount of acres.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposed management direction for suppressing wildfires in the Fremont Gorge/Cockscomb, Henry Mountains, Kingston Canyon, Parker Mountain, and Sevier Canyon ACECs could limit the ability to maintain or restore properly functioning vegetation and reduce hazardous fuels. 	<p>percent of the RFO designated as VRM Class I and affect the design of non-fire fuels treatment projects, particularly in VRM Class II areas (11 percent) in the Henry Mountains and near the towns of Torrey, Grover, and Teasdale.</p> <p>Alternative D would restrict treatment projects on the greatest amount of acres.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposed management direction for suppressing wildfires in the Fremont Gorge/Cockscomb, Henry Mountains, Kingston Canyon, Parker Mountain, and Sevier Canyon ACECs could limit the ability to maintain or restore properly functioning vegetation and reduce hazardous fuels. • Protecting, preserving, and maintaining the non-WSA lands

Resource	Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Proposed RMP	Alternative C	Alternative D
				<p>fuels.</p> <p>with wilderness characteristics would preclude the use of mechanical (chaining, harrowing) and manual (chainsaw) fuels reduction treatments on these lands. This could limit the ability to maintain or restore properly functioning vegetation and reduce hazardous fuels in some areas, such as parts of the Henry Mountains.</p>	<p>Impacts to non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics would be less than Alternatives N and A and greater than Alternatives C and D:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nine-six percent of these lands would be open to cross-country OHV use. • Eight-five percent of these lands would be open to oil and gas leasing with standard stipulations. • Thirteen percent of these lands would be open to oil and gas leasing with moderate <p>Impacts to the non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics would be less than Alternatives N and A and the Proposed RMP but greater than Alternative D:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Less than 1 percent of these lands would be open to cross-country OHV use. • Thirty-two percent of these lands would be open to cross-country OHV use. • Forty-eight percent of these lands would be open to oil and gas leasing with standard stipulations. • Fifty-two percent of these lands would be open to oil and gas <p>Impacts to non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics would be the least among the alternatives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None of these lands would be open to cross-country OHV use. • All of the non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics would be open to oil and gas leasing subject to major constraints (NSO). • Two percent of <p>Impacts to non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics would be open to oil and gas leasing.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Thirty-nine of these lands would be open to oil and gas • All would be designated Class I

Resource	Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Proposed RMP	Alternative C	Alternative D
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • One percent of these lands would be open to oil and gas leasing with major constraints (NSO). 	be open to oil and gas leasing with moderate constraints.	these lands would be recommended for withdrawal from mineral entry.	leasing with moderate constraints. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • One percent of these lands would be recommended for withdrawal from mineral entry. 	VRM.
	Alternative N would continue restrictions on timber harvesting and commercial woodland product sales included in current management plans. The potential production of forest and woodland resources would likely be less than under Alternatives A and the Proposed RMP but more than under Alternatives C and D.	Alternative A would allow timber sales, woodland products harvesting, and seed and live plant collecting on the most acres with the most tools and fewest restrictions among the alternatives. Alternative A would provide the greatest availability of forest and woodland products and the greatest opportunities to restore, maintain, and improve forest and woodland health.	The Proposed RMP would allow timber sales, woodland products harvesting, and seed and live plant collecting with the same tools as Alternative A but on slightly fewer acres because of the addition of one suitable WSR corridor that would be restricted and decisions to protect, preserve, and maintain the wilderness characteristics associated with non-WSA lands with wilderness.	Under Alternative C, commercial timber sales would be precluded, greatly diminishing the availability of timber products for commercial use. Woodland products harvesting and seed and live plant collecting would be the same as Alternatives A and the Proposed RMP but on fewer acres because of restrictions in all 12 suitable WSR corridors. The potential production of forest and woodland products and potential forest and woodland health would be less than under Alternatives A and the Proposed RMP, similar to that under Alternative N, but more than under Alternative A but more than under Alternatives N, C or D.	Under Alternative D, commercial timber sales would be precluded, and no commercial or non-commercial use of forest and woodland products or seed and live plants would be allowed within suitable WSR corridors and non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics. Alternative D would result in the least production of forest and woodland products and could result in the greatest impacts to forest and woodland health.
Livestock Grazing			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Oil and gas development could reduce land available for livestock grazing under all alternatives by a maximum of 3,080 acres based on the Reasonably Foreseeable Development (RFD) Scenario for Oil and Gas, equating to a loss of 385 AUMs and possibly affecting the viability of some allotments. • Increasing recreational use could increase conflicts between recreationists and livestock. 		

Resource	Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Proposed RMP	Alternative C	Alternative D
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increasing OHV use could increase conflicts between OHVs and livestock in some areas. <p>Decisions likely to affect grazing opportunities include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Continuing to allow cross-country OHV use on 77 percent of the RFO. 	<p>Decisions likely to affect grazing opportunities include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Allowing cross-country OHV use on 21 percent of the RFO Disposing of 13,400 acres of public land (Section 203 sales) that would reduce available AUMs and could affect the viability of some allotments. Disposing of 13,400 acres of public land (Section 203 sales) that would reduce available and could affect the viability of some allotments. 	<p>Decisions likely to affect grazing opportunities include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Disposing of 13,400 acres of public land (Section 203 sales) that would reduce available AUMs and could affect the viability of some allotments. Under the Proposed RMP, 600 AUMs would be allocated to burros in the Canyonlands HMA, to meet an AML upper limit of 100. 	<p>Under Alternatives C and D, decisions likely to affect grazing opportunities include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fewer acres identified for vegetation treatment than Alternatives A and the Proposed RMP. Limitations on the use of chemicals (pesticides and herbicides) for treating noxious weed and insect pest problems. 	<p>Under Alternatives C and D, decisions likely to affect grazing opportunities include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fewer acres identified for vegetation treatment than Alternatives A and the Proposed RMP. Limitations on the use of chemicals (pesticides and herbicides) for treating noxious weed and insect pest problems.
Recreation	<p>Alternative N would provide the greatest opportunities for motorized recreation uses and would cause the greatest adverse impacts to non-motorized uses. Seventy-seven percent of the RFO would continue to be open to cross-country OHV use, and 4,315 miles of routes would continue to be open to motor vehicles, the most under any of the alternatives. One SRM/A (managed</p>	<p>Alternative A would provide fewer opportunities for motorized recreation than Alternative N, but more than the Proposed RMP and Alternatives C and D. Twenty-one percent of the RFO would be open to cross-country OHV use. The open areas include those currently used for cross-country travel, plus additional areas for growth. OHV use in 79 percent of the RFO would be limited to</p>	<p>The Proposed RMP would provide a balance of motorized and non-motorized recreation opportunities. It would provide fewer opportunities for motorized recreation than Alternatives N and A, but more than Alternatives C and D. Less than 1 percent of the RFO would be open to cross-country OHV use; however, the four open areas, Big Rocks, Factory Butte, Glenwood, and Aurora,</p>	<p>Alternative C would provide more opportunities for non-motorized recreation than under Alternatives N and A and the Proposed RMP and more opportunities for motorized recreation than under Alternative D. No areas would be open to cross-country OHV use. OHVs would be limited to designated routes on 68 percent of the RFO. Designated routes would total 3,192 miles, 73 percent of the routes open under Alternative</p>	<p>Alternative D would provide the greatest opportunities for non-motorized recreation, the fewest opportunities for motorized recreation uses, and have the greatest adverse impact on motorized users. No areas would be open to cross-country OHV use. OHVs would be limited to designated routes on 46 percent of the RFO. Designated routes would total 3,043 miles, 71 percent of the routes open under Alternative</p>

Resource	Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Proposed RMP	Alternative C	Alternative D
	by the Fillmore FO) would continue, but no new SRMAs would be established. There would be no VRM Class I areas, and 25 percent of the RFO would be managed as VRM Class II, which supports primitive and semi-primitive recreation opportunities. Seventy-five percent of the RFO would be managed as VRM Classes III and IV supporting all types of recreation, including motorized use. Conflicts between motorized and non-motorized users would continue, and adverse effects on primitive and semi-primitive recreation settings would continue to increase.	designated trails. Designated routes would total 4,312 miles, essentially the same as those open under Alternative N. No areas would be closed to OHVs. The Dirty Devil SRMA would provide opportunities for primitive and semi-primitive motorized and non-motorized recreation; the Factory Butte, Sahara Sands and Big Rocks SRMAS would provide opportunities for cross-country OHV use; and the Otter Creek SRMA would provide opportunities for dispersed camping.	are the areas currently most used by riders. OHVs would be limited to designated trails on 90 percent of the RFO's land. Designated routes would total 4,277 miles. Ten percent of the lands managed by the RFO would be closed to OHVs. The Henry Mountains, Capitol Reef Gateway, Dirty Devil, and Sevier Canyon SRMAs would provide opportunities for primitive, semi-primitive motorized and non-motorized recreation.	routes open under Alternative N. Thirty-two percent of the lands managed by the RFO would be closed to OHVs. The Henry Mountains, Capitol Reef Gateway, Dirty Devil, and Sevier Canyon SRMAs would provide opportunities for primitive, semi-primitive motorized and non-motorized, and roaded natural recreation.	N. Fifty-four percent of the RFO would be closed to OHVs. Seven SRMAs would be established to provide opportunities for primitive, semi-primitive motorized and non-motorized recreation. Portions of two of these SRMAs would provide some areas with opportunities for dispersed recreation. Fifty-six percent of the RFO would be designated as VRM Classes I and II supporting primitive and semi-primitive recreation; 44 percent would be designated as VRM Classes III and IV supporting all types of recreation, including motorized use. While Alternative D would reduce adverse effects on primitive and semi-primitive recreation settings, conflicts between motorized and non-motorized users could be exacerbated because of the limited opportunities for motorized use.

Resource	Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Proposed RMP	Alternative C	Alternative D
Travel Management	Management decisions that involve changes to miles of roads open for public or administrative use, number of acres open to off-road travel, or specific travel restrictions (vehicle size, season restrictions, etc.) would affect access into and across the RFO.	Under Alternative A, open motorized use areas would be reduced to 21 percent, with the remainder of the RFO limited to designated routes (4,312 miles). Alternative A provides fewer acres for unrestricted motorized use than Alternative N, but more than under the Proposed RMP and Alternatives C and D. The miles of routes available would only be reduced by 3 miles from Alternative N. SRMA management within 49 percent of the open areas could enhance the open motorized experiences in those areas. No areas would be closed under Alternative A.	Under the Proposed RMP, open motorized use would be reduced significantly compared with Alternatives N and A, to less than 1 percent, which would affect motorized use and access. Limited acres would be 90 percent, the most under any alternative. Motorized use would be allowed on 4,277 miles of routes, which would be less than under Alternatives N and A, but more than under Alternatives C and D. SRMA management within 86 percent of the open areas could enhance the open motorized experiences in those areas.	Under Alternative C, no open motorized use areas would be designated, eliminating cross-country travel. Access would be allowed in 68 percent of the RFO with use limited to designated routes (3,192 miles). The acres and miles of routes available for travel would be less than under Alternatives N and A and the Proposed RMP, but more than Alternative D. Access would be restricted within 54 percent of the RFO designated as closed for the least of any of the alternatives.	Under Alternative D, no open motorized use areas would be designated, eliminating cross-country travel. Access would be allowed in 46 percent of the RFO with use limited to designated routes (3,043 miles). The acres and miles of routes available for travel would be the least of any of the alternatives. Access would be restricted within 54 percent of the RFO designated as closed for the protection of WSAs, WSR corridors, non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics, ACECs, and SRMAs. The potential for impacts from closed areas would be greater than under Alternatives N and A, but less than under Alternative D.
Lands and Realty	Under Alternative N, 280	One hundred and eighteen parcels totaling 13,400		No lands would be identified as available for sale	

Resource	Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Proposed RMP	Alternative C	Alternative D
	acres would be identified as available for FLPMA Section 203 sales. Inholdings within the wilderness study areas and four existing ACECs would be priorities for acquisition.	acres would be available for sale under FLPMA Section 203. These sales would improve the manageability of the public land estate by disposing of parcels isolated and/or difficult to manage and could provide opportunities for community expansion. Conversely, grazing land, open space, wildlife habitat and land available for other public land uses would be lost. Inholdings within the WSAs (under Alternative A and the Proposed RMP), one suitable WSR corridor and two areas of critical environmental concern would be priorities for acquisition (the Proposed RMP only).	The potential for impacts to ROWs under Alternative N would be greater than under Alternative A, but less than under the Proposed RMP and Alternatives C, and D, because of management of avoidance/exclusion areas for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WSAs • Areas closed to oil and gas leasing. • ACECs • Suitable WSR corridor • Non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics • Areas closed to oil and gas leasing with NSO stipulations. 	The potential for impacts to ROWs under the Proposed RMP would be greater than under Alternatives N, A, but less than under Alternatives C and D, because of management of avoidance/exclusion areas for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WSAs • ACECs • Suitable WSR corridor • Non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics • Areas closed to oil and gas leasing with NSO stipulations. 	under FLPMA Section 203; hence there would be no beneficial or adverse impacts. Inholdings within the WSAs, 12 suitable WSR corridors, and 16 areas of critical environmental concern would be priorities for acquisition, the most among the alternatives.
Leasable Minerals	Seventy-eight percent of the RFO would be open to oil and gas leasing,	Seventy-nine percent of the RFO would be open to oil and gas leasing,	Seventy-nine percent of the RFO would be open to oil and gas leasing,	Seventy-two percent of the RFO would be open to oil and gas leasing,	Forty-five percent of the RFO would be open to oil and gas leasing,

Resource	Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Proposed RMP	Alternative C	Alternative D
Locatable Minerals	providing slightly less opportunity than under Alternatives A and the Proposed RMP and more opportunity than under Alternatives C or D.	(similar to Alternative A). However, more acres would be under CSU and timing stipulations. Fewer acres would be open under standard stipulations.	providing less opportunity than under Alternatives N and A and the Proposed RMP and more opportunity than under Alternative D.	providing the least opportunity for oil and gas leasing among the alternatives.	providing the least opportunity for oil and gas leasing among the alternatives.
Salable Minerals	Under all alternatives, 154,700 acres (7 percent of the RFO) currently withdrawn from mineral entry would remain withdrawn, precluding opportunities for mining on those lands. Under Alternative N, 14,780 acres are proposed for withdrawal from mineral entry. Mining opportunity would be less than under Alternative A but greater than under the Proposed RMP and Alternatives C or D.	Under Alternative A, no additional lands are proposed for withdrawal from mineral entry, providing the greatest opportunity for mining.	Under the Proposed RMP, 21,500 acres are proposed for withdrawal from mineral entry. Mining opportunity would be less than under Alternatives N or A but greater than under Alternatives C or D.	Under Alternative C, 176,400 acres are proposed for withdrawal from mineral entry. Mining opportunity would be less than Alternatives N and A or the Proposed RMP but greater than under Alternative D.	Under Alternative D, 749,200 acres are proposed for withdrawal from mineral entry. Mining opportunity would be the least among the alternatives.
Wilderness Study Areas	Seventy-eight percent of the RFO would be open to mineral material disposal, providing slightly less opportunity than under Alternatives A and the Proposed RMP and more opportunity than under Alternatives C or D.	Seventy-nine percent of the RFO would be open to mineral material disposal, providing the greatest opportunity for the disposal of mineral materials among the alternatives.	Seventy-nine percent of the RFO would be open to mineral material disposal, which is virtually identical to that proposed under Alternative A.	Seventy-two percent of the RFO would be open to mineral material disposal, providing less opportunity than under Alternatives N and A and the Proposed RMP and more opportunity than under Alternative D.	Forty-five percent of the RFO would be open to mineral material disposal, providing the least opportunity for disposal of mineral materials among the alternatives.
	Under all alternatives, WSA management is guided primarily by BLM Handbook H-8550-1, <i>Interim Management Policy for Lands under Wilderness Review</i> . The IMP directs that WSAs are managed not to impair their suitability for preservation as wilderness. Additionally, BLM policy requires that WSAs be closed to oil and gas leasing and designated as VRM Class I. Collectively, this management direction protects the wilderness characteristics of the WSAs.	Under all alternatives, WSA management is guided primarily by BLM Handbook H-8550-1, <i>Interim Management Policy for Lands under Wilderness Review</i> . The IMP directs that WSAs are managed not to impair their suitability for preservation as wilderness. Additionally, BLM policy requires that WSAs be closed to oil and gas leasing and designated as VRM Class I. Collectively, this management direction protects the wilderness characteristics of the WSAs.	All WSAs would be designated as limited to OHV use, and 51.6 miles of ways would be designated as open to motorized vehicles, the most of any alternative.	Area designations under the Proposed RMP would be the same as Alternative N. An additional 2.5 miles of ways would be designated as open to	All WSAs would be closed to motorized use, which would preclude impacts to wilderness characteristics from motorized vehicles.

Resource	Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Proposed RMP	Alternative C	Alternative D
	<p>solitude and opportunities for primitive recreation in areas adjacent to the open ways. The rugged terrain of these areas has presented a barrier to vehicle intrusions in the past and would likely continue to do so in the future, although advancing vehicle technology could allow vehicles to enter and affect areas they have not been able to access in the past.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The continued use of these ways would be conditioned on non-impairment of wilderness suitability. The continued use of these ways would be conditioned on non-impairment of wilderness suitability. 	<p>The potential impacts to naturalness and solitude from vehicle intrusions would be the greatest among the alternatives.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The continued use of these ways would be conditioned on non-impairment of wilderness suitability. The continued use of these ways would be conditioned on non-impairment of wilderness suitability. 	<p>motor vehicle use (44.0 miles total), resulting in more potential impacts to wilderness characteristics than under Alternatives N, C, and D but less than Alternative A.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The continued use of these ways would be conditioned on non-impairment of wilderness suitability. 		
Wild and Scenic Rivers		<p>Under all alternatives, all or parts of seven eligible rivers totaling 98 river miles are within WSAs, including most of the Dirty Devil River and its side drainages. This represents 73 percent of the eligible river miles. The outstandingly remarkable values of these river segments would be protected by WSA management, which would preclude oil and gas leasing, designate them as VRM1 (under Alternative A, the Proposed RMP, Alternative C, and Alternative D), and otherwise protect the values as prescribed by the IMP.</p>	<p>There would be no impacts to outstandingly remarkable values because no suitability determination would be made and all eligible river segments would be protected.</p>	<p>There could be potential impacts to the outstandingly remarkable values of eligible segments outside WSAs because no eligible river segments would be recommended as suitable.</p>	<p>Under Alternatives C and D, all eligible river segments (135 miles) would be recommended as suitable, precluding impacts to outstandingly remarkable values.</p>

Resource	Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Proposed RMP	Alternative C	Alternative D
	<p>Continue designation and management of the four existing ACECs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • North Caineville Mesa • South Caineville Mesa • Gilbert Badlands • Beaver Wash Canyon. <p>Decisions under Alternative N could pose a threat of irreparable harm to relevant and important values in the following potential ACECs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Badlands (that portion outside the existing South Caineville and Gilbert Badlands ACECs) • Bull Creek 	<p>No ACECs would be designated under Alternative A, with no special management prescriptions for the relevant and important values. Other decisions under Alternative A could pose a threat of irreparable harm to relevant and important values.</p> <p>Decisions under Alternative N could pose a threat of irreparable harm to relevant and important values in the following potential ACECs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Badlands (that portion outside the existing South Caineville and Gilbert Badlands ACECs) • Bull Creek 	<p>The North Caineville Mesa and Old Woman Front would be designated as ACECs and special management prescriptions would apply to these areas under the Proposed RMP.</p> <p>Resource decisions under the Proposed RMP, as well as existing laws, rules, and regulations would protect the relevant and important values of the remaining potential ACECs. Management decisions that provide protection to relevant and important values include, but are not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • VRM Class I and II designation for Class A scenery 	<p>All potential ACECs would be designated under Alternatives C and D. Consequently, decisions under Alternatives C and D would pose no threat of irreparable harm to any relevant and important values in any of the potential ACECs.</p>	

Resource	Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Proposed RMP	Alternative C	Alternative D
ACECs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dirty Devil/North Wash (that portion outside the existing Beaver Wash Canyon ACEC) • Fremont Gorge/Cockscomb • Henry Mountains • Horseshoe Canyon • Kingston Canyon • Little Rockies • Lower Muddy Creek • Old Woman Front • Parker Mountain • Quitchupah • Rainbow Hills • Sevier Canyon • Thousand Lake Bench • Special Status Species. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Special management to protect SSS • Special management to protect fish and wildlife and their habitats • Non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics • Closing or limiting OHV use to designated routes, except in small managed open areas • More oil and gas leases subject to moderate or major constraints • Other management prescriptions, such as those for WSR and WSAs. 	<p>The Proposed RMP seeks to provide a balanced approach to resource management. Managing 78,600 acres of non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics to protect, preserve, and maintain their wilderness characteristics, 5 miles of WSR segments, and more ACEC areas than Alternative N.</p>	<p>Alternative C would allow for resource uses for economic benefits while increasing protection of natural values. Employment and income associated with motorized access, commodity development, and resource extraction could cause a slight increase in employment and income in the local economy compared to Alternative N.</p>	<p>Alternative D would allow for resource uses for economic benefits while maximizing protection of natural values, including 1,160,500 acres of the study area unavailable for oil and gas leasing and 682,600 acres of non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics.</p>
Socioeconomic Environment	Alternative N would continue current management practices. It would continue to allow commodity development and resource extraction to occur at current trends supporting jobs and associated income in the local economy. Continued development of minerals would also				

Resource	Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Proposed RMP	Alternative C	Alternative D
	<p>provide tax revenues to the State of Utah and local government entities.</p> <p>Alternative N continues most current land management policies and practices, which would be welcomed by some users in and beyond the socioeconomic study area but found less desirable by many others, who see a variety of adverse impacts and foregone opportunities under current management.</p> <p>Specifically, most of the RFO (77%) would be open for OHV use throughout 1,636,400 acres that could continue to provide ample opportunities for motorized recreation while resulting in increased user conflicts between those interested in motorized recreation and those interested in preservation and non-motorized recreation. It is likely that given current trends, conflicts between these and other resource users would increase.</p>	<p>Additionally, slightly increased mineral development could provide additional tax revenues to the State of Utah and local government entities and could result in increased demands on community services.</p> <p>Existing conflicts between conservation-minded individuals and groups and the pro-development community are expected to rise with increases expected in commodity and resource extraction. In addition, conflicts between certain types of recreationists (motorized and non-motorized) and livestock grazing are expected to continue. Alternative A's limitations to 449,000 acres open to OHV use could produce some impacts on local custom and culture such as some motorized recreation users of BLM lands could be restricted. At the same time provision of increased facilities and no WSR or ACEC designations would improve some recreational experiences for many motorized recreation users and could reduce some</p>	<p>Alternative A (but less than Alternative N) could affect employment and income associated with motorized access, commodity development, and resource extraction. However, employment and income levels are expected to be similar to Alternative A.</p> <p>Additionally, tax revenue from mineral development could be slightly less than Alternative A.</p> <p>Existing conditions and social trends would generally remain the same. Conflicts between conservation-minded individuals and groups and the pro-development community are expected to decline in some areas where resource extraction is restricted.</p> <p>The Proposed RMP would have some favorable impacts on individuals and groups who favor preservation over resource development compared to Alternative A.</p> <p>Specifically management of SRMAs areas would improve some recreational experiences for many non-motorized recreation users and could reduce some</p>	<p>increased restrictions on use of the public lands and harvesting of natural resources. However, businesses that rely on more primitive land uses would benefit.</p> <p>Additionally, restricting mineral development is expected to provide decreased tax revenues to the State of Utah and local government entities, compared to Alternative N.</p> <p>Alternative C could have some adverse impacts on individuals and groups who favor resource development over preservation.</p> <p>Alternative C would somewhat favor persons and groups interested in non-motorized recreation and preservation of habitat, ecosystem, visual, and similar values of natural landscapes from special designations for 135 miles of WSR segments and 886,810 acres of ACECs. However, opportunities for commodity and mineral development, motorized recreation (including 2,601 miles of designated routes of OHV use), and other more traditional uses of</p>	<p>Employment and income associated with motorized access, commodity development, and resource extraction could experience the most affects compared to all the other alternatives because of increased restrictions on use of the public lands and harvesting of natural resources. However, businesses that rely on more primitive land uses would benefit the most from Alternative D.</p> <p>Additionally, restricted mineral development of oil and gas could provide the greatest decrease in tax revenues to the State of Utah and local government entities including slightly reduced state revenues from potential losses to SITLA.</p> <p>Alternative D would have more pronounced adverse impacts on individuals and groups who favor resource development over preservation. Alternative D would most favor persons and groups interested in non-motorized recreation and preservation of habitat, ecosystem, visual, and similar values of natural landscapes from special designations for 135 miles of WSR segments and 886,810 acres of ACECs. However, opportunities for commodity and mineral development, motorized recreation (including 2,601 miles of designated routes of OHV use), and other more traditional uses of</p>

Resource	Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Proposed RMP	Alternative C	Alternative D
	conflicts with non-motorized users. Alternative A would include land and vegetation treatments to increase livestock forage availability that would be welcomed by livestock grazing interests.	conflicts with motorized users. In addition, conflicts between certain types of recreationists (motorized and non-motorized) and livestock grazing are expected to decline in some areas.	BLM lands would still exist. Impacts are not expected to affect government services.	BLM lands would still exist. Impacts are not expected to affect government services.	landscapes. However, opportunities for commodity and mineral development, motorized recreation, and other more traditional uses of BLM lands would still exist. Impacts are not expected to affect government services.
Socioeconomic Environment	Livestock grazing would continue to generate some economic benefits from livestock operations (depending on available AUMs), and social values of ranching would continue.				
Environmental Justice	There are no environmental justice populations in the socioeconomic study area, and actions required to identify and mitigate impacts to such populations are not required.				
Health and Safety	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None of the land allocations or prescriptions proposed in Chapter 2 would affect BLM's ability to deal with hazardous and solid wastes within the RFO. • None of the management actions proposed in Chapter 2 would increase public exposure to the risks associated with abandoned mines within the RFO. 				

This page intentionally left blank