




US Department of the Interior

Bureau of Land Management
Grand Junction Field Office, Colorado
January 2010 – updated August 2012



Grand Junction Field Office Resource Management Plan Revision

Areas of Critical Environmental Concern Report on the Application of the Relevance and Importance Criteria



**Grand Junction Field Office Resource Management Plan Revision
Areas of Critical Environmental Concern
Report on the Application of the Relevance and Importance Criteria**

January 2010
(Updated August 2012)

Prepared by:

United States Department of the Interior
Bureau of Land Management
Grand Junction Field Office

Approval:



Catherine Robertson
Catherine Robertson
Grand Junction Field Manager
Grand Junction, Colorado

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Section	Page
SUMMARY	1
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. REQUIREMENTS FOR ACEC DESIGNATION	4
III. SPECIAL MANAGEMENT ATTENTION	8
IV. EVALUATION PROCESS	8
V. LIST OF PREPARERS.....	52

APPENDICES

- A Maps of ACECs Recommended for Further Analysis in the Draft RMP

TABLES

	Page
1 Proposed ACECs Found to Meet the Relevance and Importance Criteria.....	5
2 Relevance and Importance Criteria Evaluation for Existing and Proposed ACECs.....	10
3 List of Preparers.....	52

FIGURES

Page

1	Proposed ACECs.....	3
2	ACECs Recommended for Analysis in the Draft RMP.....	7

FIGURES (*Appendix A*)

A-1	Atwell Gulch
A-2	Badger Wash ACEC and Expansion
A-3	Colorado River Riparian
A-4	Coon Creek
A-5	Coon Hollow/South Shale Ridge
A-6	Dolores River Riparian
A-7	Glade Park-Piñon Mesa
A-8	Gunnison River Riparian
A-9	Hawxhurst Creek
A-10	Indian Creek
A-11	John Brown Canyon
A-12	Juanita Arch
A-13	Mt. Garfield
A-14	Nine-mile Hill Boulders
A-15	The Palisade ACEC/ONA and Expansion
A-16	Plateau Creek
A-17	Prairie Canyon
A-18	Pyramid Rock ACEC/RNA and Expansion
A-19	Reeder Mesa
A-20	Roan and Carr Creeks
A-21	Rough Canyon ACEC/RNA and Expansion
A-22	Sinbad Valley
A-23	Unaweep Seep ACEC/RNA and Expansion

ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS.....Full Phrase

ACEC	Area of Critical Environmental Concern
BLM	United States Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management
CDOW	Colorado Division of Wildlife
CFR	Code of Federal Regulations
CNHP	Colorado Natural Heritage Program
FLPMA	Federal Land Policy and Management Act
GJFO	Grand Junction Field Office
NCA	National Conservation Area
ONA	outstanding natural area
RMP	Resource Management Plan
RNA	research natural area
SRMA	special recreation management area
USC	United States Code

This page intentionally left blank.

SUMMARY

As part of the United States Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management (BLM), Grand Junction Field Office (GJFO) Resource Management Plan (RMP) revision, the GJFO Interdisciplinary Team analyzed whether proposed Areas of Critical Environmental Concern (ACECs) met the relevance and importance criteria. The Interdisciplinary Team analyzed 51 proposed ACECs (existing, internally, and externally proposed) (**Figure 1**, Proposed ACECs) and found that 23 met the relevance and importance criteria, for a total of 167,146 acres (**Table 1**, Proposed ACECs Found to Meet the Relevance and Importance Criteria; **Figure 2**, ACECs Recommended for Analysis in the Draft RMP). Note that expansions of existing and proposed ACECs are counted as one ACEC in the above totals. Three external proposals, one existing ACEC, and one internal proposal were for areas within either the Dominguez-Escalante or McInnis Canyon National Conservation Areas (NCAs), which are outside of the decision area for this RMP; therefore, the areas were not assessed as part of this report.


The areas found to meet both the relevance and importance criteria will be identified as potential ACECs and will be fully considered for designation and management in the RMP (BLM Manual 1613.2.21). See **Appendix A**, Maps of ACECs Recommended for Further Analysis in the Draft RMP, for maps of recommended ACECs. For the areas found not to meet the relevance and importance criteria, “the management prescriptions which are eventually established in the plan for such areas shall reflect consideration of the identified values.”

This report was completed in January 2010. Since that time the BLM has made the following changes: 1. Found an additional staff-proposed area that meets the relevance and importance criteria (i.e., Plateau Creek); 2. Found, based on updated monitoring data, that the Rapid Creek area does not meet the relevance and importance criteria; and 3. Included additional discussion of areas proposed by the public for special recreation management.

I. INTRODUCTION

As part of the process for developing the Grand Junction RMP revision, the GJFO Interdisciplinary Team reviewed all BLM-managed lands in the planning areas to determine whether any areas should be considered for designation as ACECs. The Federal Land Policy and Management Act (FLPMA) requires that priority shall be given to the designation and protection of ACECs. ACECs are defined in FLPMA Section 103(a) (43 United States Code [USC] 1702) and in 43 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) 1601.0-5(a) as “areas within the public lands where special management attention is required (when such areas are developed or used or where no development is required) to protect and prevent irreparable damage to important historic, cultural, or scenic values, fish and wildlife resources or other natural systems or processes, or to protect life and safety from natural hazards.” The following analysis and the resultant

findings for ACEC relevance and importance criteria has been performed pursuant to FLPMA Section 202(c)(3) (43 USC 1712), 43 CFR 1610.7-2, and BLM Manual 1613, *Areas of Critical Environmental Concern*.



Proposed ACECs
 Grand Junction Field Office, Colorado



No warranty is made by the Bureau of Land Management as to the accuracy, reliability, or completeness of these data. Original data were compiled from various sources. This information may not meet National Map Accuracy Standards. This project was developed through digital means and may be updated without notice.

Figure I

II. REQUIREMENTS FOR ACEC DESIGNATION

To be eligible for designation as an ACEC, an area must meet the relevance and importance criteria described in 43 CFR 1610.7-2 and BLM Manual 1613, and need special management. The determinations in this report deal strictly with the relevance and importance criteria, and not special management attention.

Relevance and importance are defined as follows:

Relevance: There shall be present a significant historic, cultural, or scenic value, a fish or wildlife resource or other natural system or process, or natural hazard.

Importance: The above described value, resource, system, process, or hazard shall have substantial significance and value, which generally requires qualities of more than local significance and special worth, consequence, meaning, distinctiveness, or cause for concern. A natural hazard can be important if it is a significant threat to life or property.

Relevance

An area meets the relevance criterion if it contains one or more of the following:

1. A significant historic, cultural, or scenic value (including but not limited to rare or sensitive archeological resources and religious or cultural resources important to Native Americans).
2. A fish and wildlife resource (including but not limited to habitat for endangered, sensitive, or threatened species or habitat essential for maintaining species diversity).
3. A natural process or system (including but not limited to endangered, sensitive, or threatened plant species; rare, endemic, or relic plants or plant communities that are terrestrial, aquatic, or riparian; or rare geological features).
4. Natural hazards (including but not limited to areas of avalanche, dangerous flooding, landslides, unstable soils, seismic activity, or dangerous cliffs). A hazard caused by human action might meet the relevance criteria if it is determined through the resource management planning process to have become part of a natural process.

Importance

An area meets the importance criterion if it meets one or more of the following:

1. Has more than locally significant qualities that give it special worth, consequence, meaning, distinctiveness, or cause for concern, especially compared to any similar resource.


2. Has qualities or circumstances that make it fragile, sensitive, rare, irreplaceable, exemplary, unique, endangered, threatened, or vulnerable to adverse change.
3. Has been recognized as warranting protection to satisfy national priority concerns or to carry out the mandates of FLPMA.
4. Has qualities that warrant highlighting to satisfy public or management concerns about safety and public welfare.
5. Poses a significant threat to human life and safety or to property.

Table I
Proposed ACECs Found to Meet the
Relevance and Importance Criteria

ACEC	Acres
Atwell Gulch (staff and public proposed)	6,135
Badger Wash ACEC (existing)	1,891
<i>Badger Wash ACEC Alternative (staff proposed)</i>	355
Colorado River Riparian (staff proposed)	879
Coon Creek (staff and public proposed)	110
Coon Hollow/South Shale Ridge (staff and public proposed)	27,345
Dolores River Riparian (staff proposed)	7,433
Glade Park-Piñon Mesa (public proposed)	27,056
Gunnison River Riparian (staff proposed)	457
Hawxhurst Creek (staff and public proposed)	864
Indian Creek (staff proposed)	1,746
John Brown Canyon (public proposed)	1,416
Juanita Arch (staff and public proposed)	1,624
Mt. Garfield (staff proposed)	5,695
Nine-mile Hill Boulders (staff proposed)	87
The Palisade ACEC/Outstanding Natural Area (ONA) (existing)	26,951
<i>The Palisade ACEC/ONA Expansion (staff proposed)</i>	5,330
Plateau Creek (staff proposed)	223
Prairie Canyon (public proposed)	6,866
Pyramid Rock ACEC/Research Natural Area (RNA) (existing)	551
<i>Pyramid Rock ACEC/RNA Expansion (staff proposed)</i>	706
Reeder Mesa (staff and public proposed)	474
Roan and Carr Creeks (staff and public proposed)	33,694
Rough Canyon ACEC/RNA (existing)	2,737

Table I
Proposed ACECs Found to Meet the
Relevance and Importance Criteria

ACEC	Acres
<i>Rough Canyon ACEC/RNA Expansion (staff proposed)</i>	41
Sinbad Valley (public proposed)	6,399
UnawEEP Seep ACEC/RNA (existing)	78
<i>UnawEEP Seep ACEC/RNA Expansion (public proposed)</i>	6
Total	167,149



ACECs Recommended for Analysis in the Draft RMP
 Grand Junction Field Office, Colorado



No warranty is made by the Bureau of Land Management as to the accuracy, reliability, or completeness of these data. Original data were compiled from various sources. This information may not meet National Map Accuracy Standards. This project was developed through digital means and may be updated without notice.

Figure 2

III. SPECIAL MANAGEMENT ATTENTION

Special management attention refers to “management prescriptions developed during preparation of an RMP or amendment expressly to protect the important and relevant values of an area from the potential effects of actions permitted by the RMP, including proposed actions deemed to be in conformance with the terms, conditions, and decisions of the RMP.” Thus, these are management measures that would not be necessary and prescribed if the relevant and important values were not present.

A management prescription is considered to be special if it is unique to the area involved and includes terms and conditions specifically to protect the values occurring within the area. BLM Manual 1613 includes the following guidance on incorporating management prescriptions for potential ACECs into appropriate alternatives:

During the formulation of alternatives, management prescriptions for potential ACECs are fully developed. Management prescriptions will generally vary across the plan alternatives. If there is no controversy or issues raised regarding the management of a potential ACEC, it may not be necessary to develop a range of management alternatives. In other words, management prescriptions may not vary significantly across alternatives. A potential ACEC (or portion thereof) must be shown as recommended for designation in any or all alternatives in the Draft RMP in which special management attention is prescribed to protect the resource or to minimize hazard to human life and safety. Because special management attention must be prescribed in at least one plan alternative, each potential ACEC will appear as a recommended ACEC in at least one plan alternative. Designation is based on whether or not a potential ACEC requires special management attention in the selected plan alternative (i.e. preferred alternative).

IV. EVALUATION PROCESS

In compiling a list of areas to be analyzed in this report, the BLM Interdisciplinary Team followed the guidance set forth in BLM Manual 1613 and considered:

1. Existing ACECs;
2. Areas recommended for ACEC consideration (internal and external nominations);
3. Areas identified through inventory and monitoring; and
4. Adjacent designations of other federal and state agencies.

ACECs may be nominated by BLM staff, other agencies, or members of the public at any time. During the RMP revision scoping process, the GJFO solicited nominations and comments from the public and other agencies. A map of special

designation areas was distributed at the scoping meetings and made available on the RMP website: <http://www.blm.gov/col/st/en/fo/gjfo/rmp.html>.

As part of the formal outreach process, the BLM received nominations from the Colorado Natural Heritage Program (CNHP) and the Center for Native Ecosystems. The BLM staff also reviewed information from BLM inventories, the Colorado Division of Wildlife (CDOW) species of concern data, and other reports to ensure that all potentially relevant and important values within the planning areas were considered. In evaluating the large number of biological proposals, the BLM determined an area met the relevance criteria for fish and wildlife or natural processes or systems if it contained any special status species (listed, candidate, or BLM sensitive species). If it did not contain a special status species, it met the criteria if it contained species or plant communities that were either ranked G1, G2, S1, or S2 by CNHP. The CNHP rankings are defined as follows:

- G1/S1: Critically imperiled globally or statewide. Species or community is at very high risk of extinction due to extreme rarity (often five or fewer populations), very steep declines, or other factors.
- G2/S2: Imperiled globally or statewide. Species or community is at high risk of extinction due to very restricted range, very few populations (often 20 or fewer), steep declines, or other factors.

The maps of ACECs recommended for analysis in the Draft RMP are included in **Appendix A** and are for those areas that were found to meet the relevance and importance criteria. The size and management prescriptions for each ACEC may vary by alternative to reflect a balance between the goals and objectives of the alternative and values being protected (BLM Manual 1613.2.22.B.1-2). **Table 2**, Relevance and Importance Criteria Evaluation for Existing and Proposed ACECs, summarizes the proposed ACECs evaluated, the values assessed, and whether the criteria were met (including supporting information).

Table 2
Relevance and Importance Criteria Evaluation for Existing and Proposed ACECs

Name of ACEC Existing or Proposed	Values Assessed	Relevance Criteria <i>see Section II for Relevance Criterion</i>	Importance Criteria <i>see Section II for Importance Criterion</i>	Carried Forward for Analysis?	Comments	1987 RMP Acres	Proposed Acres¹ <i>includes acres from 1987 RMP</i>	Acres Carried Forward¹
4A Ridge <i>Public Proposed</i>	Riparian Habitat	3	2	No	Included in staff proposed Roan and Carr Creeks boundary. Areas to the south and west appear to contain an even greater amount of the Piceance bladderpod (<i>Lesquerella parviflora</i>).	0	19,082	<i>See proposed Roan and Carr Creeks ACEC.</i>
	Plants	3	2					
	Wildlife	2	None					
	Plants	3	None					
Atwell Gulch <i>Staff and Public Proposed</i>	Wildlife	2	2	Yes <i>with modified boundaries</i>	Meets the relevance criteria for Cultural and scenic values, fish and wildlife resources, and a natural system supporting rare plants. The importance criteria for more than locally significant qualities for plants and has qualities that make it sensitive, rare and vulnerable to adverse change. BLM sensitive and federally listed rare plant species: Colorado hookless cactus, DeBeque milkvetch, and Naturita milkvetch. Four different monitoring sites are established for DeBeque milkvetch and Colorado hookless cactus. Atwell Gulch contains the largest known concentration of DeBeque milkvetch in the GJFO. This area provides a migratory	0	26,450	6,135
	Plants	3	1 and 2					
	Scenic	1	2					
	Cultural	1	1 and 2					

Table 2 (continued)
Relevance and Importance Criteria Evaluation for Existing and Proposed ACECs

Name of ACEC Existing or Proposed	Values Assessed	Relevance Criteria <i>see Section II for Relevance Criterion</i>	Importance Criteria <i>see Section II for Importance Criterion</i>	Carried Forward for Analysis?	Comments	1987 RMP Acres	Proposed Acres¹ <i>includes acres from 1987 RMP</i>	Acres Carried Forward¹
					<p>corridor and wintering habitat for a significant portion of bighorn sheep (<i>Ovis Canadensis</i>) and mule deer (<i>Odocoileus hemionus</i>) herds in this area and includes habitat nominated by CDOW as important.</p> <p>This area has the presence of significant cultural resources and the potential for additional sites to be identified, especially those associated with the Ute period, is high. The proposed ACEC lies between two historic trails/roads, the DeBeque Cutoff Road and the Sunnyside Road and surveys have demonstrated a high density of cultural resources. This area has the potential to contain a regionally important trail.</p>			
Badger Wash ACEC	Hydrological	3	2	Yes	Meets the relevance criteria for a natural system and importance criteria for sensitive plants and to satisfy national priority concerns. The staff-proposed boundary creates improved management for the ACEC.	1,891	2,848	2,246
	Plants	3	1 and 2					
Existing Staff Proposed	Wildlife	2 and 3	2					

Table 2 (continued)
Relevance and Importance Criteria Evaluation for Existing and Proposed ACECs

Name of ACEC Existing or Proposed	Values Assessed	Relevance Criteria <i>see Section II for Relevance Criterion</i>	Importance Criteria <i>see Section II for Importance Criterion</i>	Carried Forward for Analysis?	Comments	1987 RMP Acres	Proposed Acres ¹ <i>includes acres from 1987 RMP</i>	Acres Carried Forward ¹
					<p>The ACEC meets the relevance and importance criteria for a natural system that supports sensitive plants and ongoing hydrologic research. Rare plants include grand buckwheat (<i>Eriogonum contortum</i>) and Ferron's milkvetch (<i>Astragalus musiniensis</i>). Also contains rare plant species cliffdweller's cryptantha (<i>Cryptantha elata</i>) and Gardner's saltbrush/salina wildrye (<i>Atriplex gardneri/Elymus slaina</i>).</p> <p>The Badger Wash watershed was withdrawn for experimental purposes, scientific research, and studies by Executive Order 10355 in 1952. The Badger Wash ACEC was put in place to protect these values, particularly the hydrologic studies examining the effects of grazing on runoff, sediment, and salinity on this Mancos Shale landscape prevalent in western Colorado and Utah. Studies have occurred since 1953 and published reports are available. Cooperative hydrologic studies are ongoing,</p>			

Table 2 (continued)
Relevance and Importance Criteria Evaluation for Existing and Proposed ACECs

Name of ACEC Existing or Proposed	Values Assessed	Relevance Criteria <i>see Section II for Relevance Criterion</i>	Importance Criteria <i>see Section II for Importance Criterion</i>	Carried Forward for Analysis?	Comments	1987 RMP Acres	Proposed Acres ¹ <i>includes acres from 1987 RMP</i>	Acres Carried Forward ¹
					supported by the BLM, US Geological Survey, and US Bureau of Reclamation. Meets the relevance criteria for a natural system and importance criteria for sensitive plants and to satisfy national priority concerns.			
Badger Wash Potential <i>Public Proposed</i>	Fish	None	None	No	Meets the relevance criteria for rare plants in isolated areas and wildlife supporting habitat for burrowing owls. As proposed the site does not meet the importance criteria because it is overly broad and all areas contained within the proposal are not considered unique compared to other habitat within the range of the species. A portion of this site (355 acres) will be carried forward in the proposed Badger Wash ACEC expansion. The proposed area contains designated release sites for the Mesa County Prairie Dog Relocation project; however these sites do not meet the relevance and importance criteria. The area does not meet the relevance or importance criteria for fish bearing			

Table 2 (continued)
Relevance and Importance Criteria Evaluation for Existing and Proposed ACECs

Name of ACEC Existing or Proposed	Values Assessed	Relevance Criteria <i>see Section II for Relevance Criterion</i>	Importance Criteria <i>see Section II for Importance Criterion</i>	Carried Forward for Analysis?	Comments	1987 RMP Acres	Proposed Acres¹ <i>includes acres from 1987 RMP</i>	Acres Carried Forward¹
					streams or bald eagles (<i>Haliaeetus leucocephalus</i>) as the proposed areas do not contain fish bearing streams or bald eagle habitat.			
Bangs Canyon and Dominguez North <i>Public Proposed</i>	Cultural	1	None	No	The area as originally proposed is now split by the Dominguez – Escalante NCA, forming two small polygons on the west side of Highway 141 along East Creek. It is within Area 6 of the Bangs Canyon Special Recreation Management Area (SRMA). Meets the relevance criteria for the presence of significant cultural resources. Does not meet importance criteria because these resources do not have more than locally significant qualities. Sites that are culturally affiliated with the Ute within this area may best be managed for Traditional or Public Use with a management goal of long term protection and interpretation.			
Buzzard Creek Potential	Fish Wildlife	2 2	None None	No	Meets the relevance criteria for fish and wildlife resource providing habitat	0	2,520	0

Table 2 (continued)
Relevance and Importance Criteria Evaluation for Existing and Proposed ACECs

Name of ACEC Existing or Proposed	Values Assessed	Relevance Criteria <i>see Section II for Relevance Criterion</i>	Importance Criteria <i>see Section II for Importance Criterion</i>	Carried Forward for Analysis?	Comments	1987 RMP Acres	Proposed Acres¹ <i>includes acres from 1987 RMP</i>	Acres Carried Forward¹
<i>Public Proposed</i>	Plants	3	None		for lynx (<i>Lynx Canadensis</i>) and boreal toad (<i>Bufo boreas</i>) as well as fish bearing streams. In addition, the area may meet the relevance criteria by providing habitat for the foothills riparian shrubland, and narrowleaf cottonwood riparian forest plant communities. Does not meet importance criteria because the proposed area consists of several very small parcels of BLM-managed land that do not significantly contribute to the conservation of the species and are therefore not regionally significant.			
Cactus Park	Paleontological	N/A	N/A	N/A	ACEC is within the Dominguez-Escalante NCA; therefore it is beyond the scope of this planning effort.	0	139	0
<i>Public Proposed</i>	Plants	N/A	N/A					
Colorado River Riparian (Palisade to DeBeque)	Fish	2 and 3	2	Yes	Meets the relevance criteria for scenic, threatened, and endangered fish resources and a natural system. The importance criteria for qualities that is sensitive and vulnerable to adverse change for riparian habitat supporting stream bank stability and designated	0	1,195	879
	Wildlife	2 and 3	2					
	Scenic	1	2					
	Riparian Habitat	3	1 and 2					
	Plants	3	None					

Table 2 (continued)
Relevance and Importance Criteria Evaluation for Existing and Proposed ACECs

Name of ACEC Existing or Proposed	Values Assessed	Relevance Criteria <i>see Section II for Relevance Criterion</i>	Importance Criteria <i>see Section II for Importance Criterion</i>	Carried Forward for Analysis?	Comments	1987 RMP Acres	Proposed Acres ¹ <i>includes acres from 1987 RMP</i>	Acres Carried Forward ¹
					<p>critical habitat for threatened and endangered fish species.</p> <p>The area was surveyed by CNHP and found to contain Global Rank G2 Rio Grande cottonwood/ skunkbrush (<i>Populus deltoides ssp. wislizeni/Rhus trilobata</i>) riparian forest and Global Rank G3 roundtail chub.</p> <p>The US Fish and Wildlife Service designated the Colorado River up to its 100 year floodplain as critical habitat for the Colorado pikeminnow (<i>Ptychocheilus lucius</i>) (federally endangered, state threatened), razorback sucker (<i>Xyrauchen texanus</i>) (federally and state endangered), bonytail chub (<i>Gila elegans</i>) (federally and state endangered), and humpback chub (<i>Gila cypha</i>) (federally endangered, state threatened). Native, non-listed fish species sympatric with the listed fish species include the flannelmouth sucker (<i>Catostomas latipinnis</i>), bluehead sucker (<i>Catostomus discobolus</i>), roundtail chub (designated a state</p>			

Table 2 (continued)
Relevance and Importance Criteria Evaluation for Existing and Proposed ACECs

Name of ACEC Existing or Proposed	Values Assessed	Relevance Criteria <i>see Section II for Relevance Criterion</i>	Importance Criteria <i>see Section II for Importance Criterion</i>	Carried Forward for Analysis?	Comments	1987 RMP Acres	Proposed Acres¹ <i>includes acres from 1987 RMP</i>	Acres Carried Forward¹
					Species of Special Concern), and speckled dace (<i>Rhinichthys osculus</i>). The Colorado River is designated critical habitat for threatened and endangered fish species and roost/nesting habitat for bald eagles and great blue herons (<i>Ardea herodias</i>). While the proposed ACEC contains significant cottonwood/willow communities that are extremely important to wildlife and riparian values, the ACEC is not known to contain any rare plant species.			
Coon Creek <i>Staff Proposed</i>	Fish	1	1, 2	Yes	Meets the relevance criteria for fish. Meets the importance criteria for having more than locally significant qualities and qualities that make it fragile, sensitive, rare, exemplary, and vulnerable to adverse change. The creek contains a population of rare native cutthroat trout (<i>Oncorhynchus clarkii</i>).	0	110	110
Coon Hollow/South	Plants	3	1 and 2	Yes	Meets the relevance criteria for wildlife resources, natural system	0	59,701	27,345
	Scenic	1	2					

Table 2 (continued)
Relevance and Importance Criteria Evaluation for Existing and Proposed ACECs

Name of ACEC Existing or Proposed	Values Assessed	Relevance Criteria <i>see Section II for Relevance Criterion</i>	Importance Criteria <i>see Section II for Importance Criterion</i>	Carried Forward for Analysis?	Comments	1987 RMP Acres	Proposed Acres¹ <i>includes acres from 1987 RMP</i>	Acres Carried Forward¹
Shale Ridge Staff and Public Proposed	Wildlife	2	I		supporting plants, and significant scenic values. Meets the importance criteria for more than locally significant importance to plants and has qualities that make it fragile, sensitive, irreplaceable, threatened, and vulnerable to adverse change. The area has known populations of Colorado hookless cactus, Naturita milkvetch, adobe thistle, as well as critical winter range for deer and elk.			
Cow Ridge Potential Public Proposed	Wildlife	2	None	No	Meets the relevance criteria for natural processes or systems because it supports multiple A-ranked (excellent quality) occurrences of two BLM sensitive plants, Piceance bladderpod and Roan Cliffs blazingstar (<i>Mentzelia rhizomata</i>) and provides potential habitat for greater sage-grouse (<i>Centrocercus urophasianus</i>), a BLM sensitive species. Does not meet the importance criteria because it is not unique when compared to other sage-grouse habitat located within the Parachute-Piceance-	0	25,777	0
	Rare Plants	3	None					

Table 2 (continued)
Relevance and Importance Criteria Evaluation for Existing and Proposed ACECs

Name of ACEC Existing or Proposed	Values Assessed	Relevance Criteria <i>see Section II for Relevance Criterion</i>	Importance Criteria <i>see Section II for Importance Criterion</i>	Carried Forward for Analysis?	Comments	1987 RMP Acres	Proposed Acres¹ <i>includes acres from 1987 RMP</i>	Acres Carried Forward¹
					Roan population. While the proposed ACEC meets the importance criteria for more than locally significant qualities because the bladderpod and blazingstar sites are of excellent quality and are vulnerable to adverse change, the proposed site is overly broad and fragmented.			
Dolores River Canyon- Sewemup Mesa Potential ACEC <i>Public Proposed</i>	Fish	2 and 3	I and 2	No	Meets the relevance criteria for wildlife resource and a natural system.	0	33,308	<i>See proposed Dolores River Riparian, Sinbad Valley, and Juanita Arch ACECs</i>
	Wildlife	2 and 3	I and 2		Meets the importance criteria having potential for more than locally significant wildlife qualities making the area sensitive for rare plants and are vulnerable to adverse change.			
	Plants	3	I and 2		Area does not meet the relevance and importance criteria since it does not contain lynx habitat, though it may provide a movement corridor into the forests of Utah although there is no evidence supporting use of the area by lynx.			
					Several peregrine falcon (<i>Falco peregrinus</i>) eries occur along the Dolores River with densities of eries			

Table 2 (continued)
Relevance and Importance Criteria Evaluation for Existing and Proposed ACECs

Name of ACEC Existing or Proposed	Values Assessed	Relevance Criteria <i>see Section II for Relevance Criterion</i>	Importance Criteria <i>see Section II for Importance Criterion</i>	Carried Forward for Analysis?	Comments	1987 RMP Acres	Proposed Acres ¹ <i>includes acres from 1987 RMP</i>	Acres Carried Forward ¹
					<p>suggesting the area is more than locally significant. The area along the Dolores River meets the relevance and importance criteria for the peregrine falcon; however these areas are more accurately covered by the Dolores River riparian proposal.</p> <p>Multiple BLM sensitive plants (Kachina daisy [<i>Erigeron kachinensis</i>], Eastwood's monkeyflower [<i>Mimulus eastwoodiae</i>], San Rafael milkvetch, Dolores River skeleton plant, horseshoe milkvetch, Grand Junction milkvetch, and Gypsum cateye) occur in the area. Most areas containing sensitive plants are covered in the proposed Dolores River Riparian and Sinbad Valley ACECs.</p>			
Dolores River Riparian	Fish	2 and 3	2	Yes	The area meets the relevance and importance criteria for wildlife because CDOW considers the bluehead sucker population within this stretch of river outstanding on a regional scale. Several peregrine falcon eyries occur along the Dolores River the density of eyries suggests the area is more than locally	0	3,635	7,433
Staff Proposed	Wildlife	2 and 3	1 and 2					
	Scenic	1	2					
	Riparian Habitat	3	1 and 2					
	Plants	3	1 and 2					

Table 2 (continued)
Relevance and Importance Criteria Evaluation for Existing and Proposed ACECs

Name of ACEC Existing or Proposed	Values Assessed	Relevance Criteria <i>see Section II for Relevance Criterion</i>	Importance Criteria <i>see Section II for Importance Criterion</i>	Carried Forward for Analysis?	Comments	1987 RMP Acres	Proposed Acres¹ <i>includes acres from 1987 RMP</i>	Acres Carried Forward¹
					significant. Multiple BLM sensitive plants (Kachina daisy, Eastwood's monkeyflower, San Rafael milkvetch, Dolores River skeleton plant, horseshoe milkvetch, Grand Junction milkvetch, and Gypsum cateye) occur in the area.			
Dominguez North-Bangs Canyon ONA <i>Public Proposed</i>	Cultural	1	None	No	Does not meet the relevance and importance criteria for ACEC designation since part of the proposed area is not within the planning area. This proposed area is within both the Dominguez–Escalante NCA and Bangs Canyon SRMA. Recreational values identified will be analyzed in the Recreation section of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement. The areas' most critical to wildlife and cultural are included in the Rough Canyon ACEC and expansion.	0	109,975	<i>See existing Rough Canyon ACEC and proposed expansion</i>
	Recreation	None	None					
	Wildlife	2	1 and 2					
East Salt Creek Potential ACEC <i>Public Proposed</i>	Fish	2	2	No	The areas within this proposal that meet the relevance and importance criteria are included in the proposed	0	21,046	<i>See proposed Roan and Carr Creeks and Sinbad</i>
	Wildlife	2	1 and 2					
	Plants	3	1					

Table 2 (continued)
Relevance and Importance Criteria Evaluation for Existing and Proposed ACECs

Name of ACEC Existing or Proposed	Values Assessed	Relevance Criteria <i>see Section II for Relevance Criterion</i>	Importance Criteria <i>see Section II for Importance Criterion</i>	Carried Forward for Analysis?	Comments	1987 RMP Acres	Proposed Acres ¹ <i>includes acres from 1987 RMP</i>	Acres Carried Forward ¹
					<p>Roan and Carr Creeks.</p> <p>Meets the relevance criteria for a natural process or system which supports the BLM sensitive plant species Piceance bladderpod. The area contains A-ranked (excellent quality) occurrences of the bladderpod. In addition to the bladderpod, the site also contains hanging garden sullivantia (<i>Sullivantia hapemanii</i> var. <i>pupusii</i>) and narrowleaf cottonwood/skunkbrush (<i>Populus angustifolia/Rhus trilobata</i>) communities. Meets the importance criteria because the bladderpod is vulnerable to adverse change.</p> <p>Meets the relevance criteria for wildlife resource (sage-grouse) because it contains occupied, potential, and vacant/unknown greater sage-grouse habitat. Does not meet importance criteria because these areas are small portions of the currently occupied range of the Parachute-Piceance-Roan population of the greater sage-grouse and are not locally significant.</p>			Valley ACECs

Table 2 (continued)
Relevance and Importance Criteria Evaluation for Existing and Proposed ACECs

Name of ACEC Existing or Proposed	Values Assessed	Relevance Criteria <i>see Section II for Relevance Criterion</i>	Importance Criteria <i>see Section II for Importance Criterion</i>	Carried Forward for Analysis?	Comments	1987 RMP Acres	Proposed Acres¹ <i>includes acres from 1987 RMP</i>	Acres Carried Forward¹
					The proposed ACEC does not contain lynx habitat. Upper Roan and Carr creeks meet the relevance and importance criteria for rare native cutthroat trout because they contain populations of the species. However, these areas are included in the Roan and Carr Creeks proposed ACEC.			
Fruita Paleontological Site ACEC/RNA <i>From 1987 RMP Public proposed</i>	Geologic	N/A	N/A	N/A	Former ACEC is within the McInnis Canyon NCA; therefore it is beyond the scope of this planning effort.	280	280	0
Gateway <i>Public Proposed</i>	Plants	3	1 and 2	No	Meets the relevance criteria for fish and wildlife and a natural system.	0	11,675	<i>See proposed John Brown Canyon, Palisade ONA Expansion, and Dolores River Riparian ACECs</i>
	Fish	2	1 and 2		Meets the importance criteria having qualities that are more than locally significant and vulnerable to adverse change.			
	Wildlife	2	2		Wildlife values are analyzed in proposed John Brown Canyon, Palisade ONA Expansion, and Dolores			

Table 2 (continued)
Relevance and Importance Criteria Evaluation for Existing and Proposed ACECs

Name of ACEC Existing or Proposed	Values Assessed	Relevance Criteria <i>see Section II for Relevance Criterion</i>	Importance Criteria <i>see Section II for Importance Criterion</i>	Carried Forward for Analysis?	Comments	1987 RMP Acres	Proposed Acres¹ <i>includes acres from 1987 RMP</i>	Acres Carried Forward¹
					River Riparian ACECs. Plant values are analyzed in proposed Palisade ACEC/ONA expansion.			
Glade Park-Piñon Mesa <i>Public Proposed</i>	Fish Wildlife Plants	None 2 and 3 None	None 2 None	Yes <i>with modified boundaries</i>	Meets the relevance criteria for wildlife resource (Gunnison sage-grouse). Meets the importance criteria for sensitive and vulnerable to adverse change. The proposed ACEC does not contain lynx or bald eagle habitat. Contains a significant portion of occupied and potential habitat for the Piñon Mesa population of the Gunnison sage-grouse. The proposed ACEC is not known to contain any rare plants.	0	19,942	27,056
Granite Creek <i>Public Proposed</i>	None	None	None	No	There were no specific values associated with this ACEC proposal, but was recommended for ACEC designation as: <i>Granite Creek is definitely worthy of immediate protection and oversight, as subtle incursions into that area portend an impending loss of natural values.</i>	0	8,147	0

Table 2 (continued)
Relevance and Importance Criteria Evaluation for Existing and Proposed ACECs

Name of ACEC Existing or Proposed	Values Assessed	Relevance Criteria <i>see Section II for Relevance Criterion</i>	Importance Criteria <i>see Section II for Importance Criterion</i>	Carried Forward for Analysis?	Comments	1987 RMP Acres	Proposed Acres¹ <i>includes acres from 1987 RMP</i>	Acres Carried Forward¹
Greater Demaree SRMA <i>Proposed by public as a Special Recreation Management Area (SRMA). Proposal did not include any information regarding relevant and important values for ACEC designation</i>	Recreation	None	None	No	Does not meet the relevance and importance criteria for ACEC designation. Does not meet the criteria for SRMA designation (recreation demand and issues, recreation setting characteristics, resolving use/user conflicts, compatibility with other resource uses and resource protection needs). Portions of the proposed area contain wilderness characteristics (Spring Canyon, Spink Canyon, East Demaree units).	0	81,512	0
Greater Granite Creek SRMA <i>Proposed by public as a Special Recreation Management Area (SRMA).</i>	Recreation	None	None	No	Does not meet the relevance and importance criteria for ACEC designation. Does not meet the criteria for SRMA designation (recreation demand and issues, recreation setting characteristics, resolving use/user conflicts, compatibility with other resource uses and resource protection needs).	0	42,673	0

Table 2 (continued)
Relevance and Importance Criteria Evaluation for Existing and Proposed ACECs

Name of ACEC Existing or Proposed	Values Assessed	Relevance Criteria <i>see Section II for Relevance Criterion</i>	Importance Criteria <i>see Section II for Importance Criterion</i>	Carried Forward for Analysis?	Comments	1987 RMP Acres	Proposed Acres¹ <i>includes acres from 1987 RMP</i>	Acres Carried Forward¹
<i>Proposal did not include any information regarding relevant and important values for ACEC designation</i>					Portions of the proposed area are included in other areas that do meet the criteria for ACEC designation (The Palisade, Glade Park-Pinyon Mesa proposed ACECs); for SRMA designation (Dolores River Canyon proposed SRMA/ERMA); or contain wilderness characteristics (Lumsden Canyon unit).			
Gunnison Gravels ACEC/RNA <i>Existing</i>	Geologic	N/A	N/A	N/A	ACEC is within the Dominguez-Escalante NCA; therefore it is beyond the scope of this planning effort.	40	40	0
Gunnison River Potential ACEC <i>Public Proposed</i>	Fish Wildlife Plants	2 and 3 2 3	2 2 2	No	Meets the relevance criteria for threatened and endangered fish and wildlife resources and a natural system. The importance criteria for qualities that is sensitive and vulnerable to adverse change for riparian habitat supporting stream bank stability and designated critical habitat for threatened and endangered fish species. The areas of this proposal that meet the relevance and importance criteria	0	42,066	<i>See proposed Gunnison River Riparian ACEC</i>

Table 2 (continued)
Relevance and Importance Criteria Evaluation for Existing and Proposed ACECs

Name of ACEC Existing or Proposed	Values Assessed	Relevance Criteria <i>see Section II for Relevance Criterion</i>	Importance Criteria <i>see Section II for Importance Criterion</i>	Carried Forward for Analysis?	Comments	1987 RMP Acres	Proposed Acres¹ <i>includes acres from 1987 RMP</i>	Acres Carried Forward¹
					for listed fish are covered by the staff proposed Gunnison River Riparian ACEC.			
Gunnison River Riparian Staff Proposed	Fish	2 and 3	1 and 2	Yes	Meets the relevance criteria for threatened and endangered fish and wildlife resources and a natural system. The importance criteria for qualities that is sensitive and vulnerable to adverse change for riparian habitat supporting stream bank stability and designated critical habitat for threatened and endangered fish species. The Colorado hookless cactus (federally threatened) is known to inhabit the alluvial benches of the Gunnison River. Results from a rare plant inventory (which is currently in progress), will determine the importance of this area. The CDOW manages the lower Gunnison and Colorado Rivers within the planning area for native, listed, and non-listed aquatic species. The area contains roundtail chub, which has a	0	1,962	457
	Riparian Habitat	3	2					
	Plants	3	2					
	Wildlife	2	2					

Table 2 (continued)
Relevance and Importance Criteria Evaluation for Existing and Proposed ACECs

Name of ACEC Existing or Proposed	Values Assessed	Relevance Criteria <i>see Section II for Relevance Criterion</i>	Importance Criteria <i>see Section II for Importance Criterion</i>	Carried Forward for Analysis?	Comments	1987 RMP Acres	Proposed Acres¹ <i>includes acres from 1987 RMP</i>	Acres Carried Forward¹
					<p>CNHP Global Rank of G3.</p> <p>The US Fish and Wildlife Service designates this segment of the Gunnison River as critical habitat for the Colorado pikeminnow (federally endangered, state threatened), razorback sucker (federally and state endangered), bonytail chub (federally and state endangered), and humpback chub (federally endangered, state threatened). Native and non-listed fish species sympatric with the listed fish species include the flannelmouth sucker, bluehead sucker, roundtail chub (designated a state Species of Special Concern), and speckled dace.</p> <p>The area provides roosting habitat and connectivity to river habitats upstream for bald eagles and blue herons.</p>			
Hawxhurst Creek <i>Staff Proposed</i>	Fish	I	I, 2	Yes	<p>Meets the relevance criteria for fish.</p> <p>Meets the importance criteria for having more than locally significant qualities and qualities that make it fragile, sensitive, rare, exemplary, and vulnerable to adverse change.</p>	0	864	864

Table 2 (continued)
Relevance and Importance Criteria Evaluation for Existing and Proposed ACECs

Name of ACEC Existing or Proposed	Values Assessed	Relevance Criteria <i>see Section II for Relevance Criterion</i>	Importance Criteria <i>see Section II for Importance Criterion</i>	Carried Forward for Analysis?	Comments	1987 RMP Acres	Proposed Acres ¹ <i>includes acres from 1987 RMP</i>	Acres Carried Forward ¹
					The creek contains a population of rare native cutthroat trout (<i>Oncorhynchus clarkii</i>)			
Indian Creek Staff Proposed	Cultural	I and 3	I and 2	Yes	Meets the relevance criteria for the presence of significant cultural resource values and the presence of a natural process or system. The importance criteria for more than locally significant qualities and qualities that make it fragile, sensitive, unique, and vulnerable to adverse change. This area straddles approximately three miles of Indian Creek, a tributary to the Gunnison River that has both significant preservation of Holocene to Late Pleistocene deposits that have yielded Paleoindian artifacts and an accessible yet relatively undisturbed area that provides a unique geomorphological research area. These are eligible for nomination to the National Register of Historic Places under criterion "d," as sites that have yielded and should continue to yield significant information on the	0	1,747	1,746

Table 2 (continued)
Relevance and Importance Criteria Evaluation for Existing and Proposed ACECs

Name of ACEC Existing or Proposed	Values Assessed	Relevance Criteria <i>see Section II for Relevance Criterion</i>	Importance Criteria <i>see Section II for Importance Criterion</i>	Carried Forward for Analysis?	Comments	1987 RMP Acres	Proposed Acres¹ <i>includes acres from 1987 RMP</i>	Acres Carried Forward¹
					prehistory and history of the area. Distinct stratified deposits representing the full range of human occupation are present with an emphasis on Late Paleoindian, Middle Archaic, and Ute cultures, and climate research (paleoenvironmental) indicates that these deposits correspond to regional periods of increased moisture.			
John Brown Canyon <i>Public Proposed</i>	Wildlife	2	1	Yes	Meets the relevance criteria for fish and wildlife resource. Meets the importance criteria for qualities that are sensitive. Ponderosa pine (<i>Pinus ponderosa</i>) stands (located at the head of John Brown Canyon and extending somewhat north and south from there) constitute the northern most range of the Grace's warbler (<i>Dendroica graciae</i>). Habitat for this warbler is scarce within the planning area.	0	1,417	1,416

Table 2 (continued)
Relevance and Importance Criteria Evaluation for Existing and Proposed ACECs

Name of ACEC Existing or Proposed	Values Assessed	Relevance Criteria <i>see Section II for Relevance Criterion</i>	Importance Criteria <i>see Section II for Importance Criterion</i>	Carried Forward for Analysis?	Comments	1987 RMP Acres	Proposed Acres¹ <i>includes acres from 1987 RMP</i>	Acres Carried Forward¹
Juanita Arch	Geologic	3	2	Yes	Meets the relevance criteria for geologic and plants for a natural process. Meets the importance criteria for having more than locally significant qualities and qualities that make it rare, irreplaceable, exemplary, and unique. Juanita arch is classified as the only natural bridge in the state of Colorado, thus making this a unique geologic feature to the region. The rare plant, Grand Junction milkvetch, also occurs in this area.	0	1,950	1,624
Staff and Public Proposed	Plants	3	1					
Knight/Owens Hadrosaurid Locality	Paleontological	No	No	No	Does not meet the relevance criteria for a natural process or system, and does not have significant paleontological values. Does not meet the importance criteria for more than locally significant qualities as a World Class Paleontological Research and publicly interpreted visitation location. A disarticulated juvenile Hadrosaur was collected and studied in the late 1980s. There were also fossilized remains of a Pliosaur and Mosasaurs as well as Pyritized inverts and large	0	40	0
Staff Proposed								

Table 2 (continued)
Relevance and Importance Criteria Evaluation for Existing and Proposed ACECs

Name of ACEC Existing or Proposed	Values Assessed	Relevance Criteria <i>see Section II for Relevance Criterion</i>	Importance Criteria <i>see Section II for Importance Criterion</i>	Carried Forward for Analysis?	Comments	1987 RMP Acres	Proposed Acres ¹ <i>includes acres from 1987 RMP</i>	Acres Carried Forward ¹
					concretions nearby this site. However, a BLM survey was conducted recently and no fossils were found.			
Logan Wash <i>Public Proposed</i>	Fish	2 and 3	None	No	<p>Meets the relevance criteria for a natural system containing sensitive habitat for plants. Meets the importance criteria for having more than locally significant qualities and qualities of sensitive and rare plants. The proposed area does not contain lynx habitat.</p> <p>The southern tip of the proposed ACEC contains a portion of the critical habitat designated for the four listed fish species on the Colorado River; however this area is small and surrounded by private land and not carried forward for further analysis.</p> <p>The proposed ACEC is adjacent to Roan Creek, a fish bearing stream, however BLM segments are small and do not meet the relevance and importance criteria.</p> <p>The proposed ACEC contains some potential and occupied greater sage-</p>	0	14,514	<i>See proposed Colorado River Riparian ACEC</i>
	Wildlife	2 and 3	None					
	Plants	3	I and 2					

Table 2 (continued)
Relevance and Importance Criteria Evaluation for Existing and Proposed ACECs

Name of ACEC Existing or Proposed	Values Assessed	Relevance Criteria <i>see Section II for Relevance Criterion</i>	Importance Criteria <i>see Section II for Importance Criterion</i>	Carried Forward for Analysis?	Comments	1987 RMP Acres	Proposed Acres ¹ <i>includes acres from 1987 RMP</i>	Acres Carried Forward ¹
Mt. Garfield	Scenic	I	I and 2	Yes	<p>grouse habitat; however the amount of occupied habitat included in the proposed ACEC is not significant for the Parachute-Piceance-Roan population and therefore does not meet the importance criteria.</p> <p>The proposed area meets the criteria for both relevance and importance by containing numerous BLM sensitive plants, one federally threatened plant, and possibly two federal candidate species. The rare plant species found within this landscape include, but are not limited to: DeBeque milkvetch, adobe thistle, Naturita milkvetch, Roan Cliffs blazingstar, Colorado hookless cactus (threatened), Parachute penstemon (<i>Penstemon debilis</i>) (candidate), and DeBeque phacelia (candidate). The majority of the known plants are vulnerable to adverse change. The proposed ACEC area is heavily fragmented by energy development infrastructure.</p>	0	5,695	5,695

Table 2 (continued)
Relevance and Importance Criteria Evaluation for Existing and Proposed ACECs

Name of ACEC Existing or Proposed	Values Assessed	Relevance Criteria <i>see Section II for Relevance Criterion</i>	Importance Criteria <i>see Section II for Importance Criterion</i>	Carried Forward for Analysis?	Comments	1987 RMP Acres	Proposed Acres ¹ <i>includes acres from 1987 RMP</i>	Acres Carried Forward ¹
<i>Staff Proposed</i>					and importance criteria as irreplaceable (locally significant qualities/meaning). Meets the importance criteria for having more than locally significant qualities and fragile qualities. Mt. Garfield is an iconic land feature within the Grand Valley region of the field office, often used as a symbolic feature of Grand Junction. The Mt. Garfield area was designated in the 1987 RMP as VRM Class I.			
Nine-mile Hill Boulders <i>Staff Proposed</i>	Paleontological	3	2	Yes	Meets the relevance criteria for a natural process or system, and has significant paleontological values. Meets the importance criteria for qualities sensitive and exemplary as a World Class Paleontological Research and publicly interpreted visitation location. Pull-off areas between guard railings have a well-preserved theropod femur mold and other bone molds from the Burro Canyon Formation. There are also petrified wood stumps and	0	87	87

Table 2 (continued)
Relevance and Importance Criteria Evaluation for Existing and Proposed ACECs

Name of ACEC Existing or Proposed	Values Assessed	Relevance Criteria <i>see Section II for Relevance Criterion</i>	Importance Criteria <i>see Section II for Importance Criterion</i>	Carried Forward for Analysis?	Comments	1987 RMP Acres	Proposed Acres¹ <i>includes acres from 1987 RMP</i>	Acres Carried Forward¹
					impressions of other dinosaur bones nearby.			
North Desert	Wildlife	2	None	No	Meets the relevance criteria for wildlife resources and a natural system. Does not meet importance criteria because wildlife habitat is not regionally significant. These areas provide habitat for the burrowing owl; however they are not regionally significant. The boundary proposed was fragmented into four distinct areas, making management difficult. Meets the relevance criteria, but does not meet the importance criteria for rare plants. While the BLM special status plant species grand buckwheat may occur in the proposed ACEC, records indicate that very little buckwheat has been recorded in this area.	0	2,407	0
Public Proposed	Plants	3	None					
The Palisade ACEC/ONA and Expansion	Plants	3	1 and 2	Yes	Meets the relevance criteria for scenic values and a natural system supporting rare plants. Meets the importance criteria for more than locally significant	26,951	32,334	32,281
	Wildlife	2	2					
	Scenic	1	2					

Table 2 (continued)
Relevance and Importance Criteria Evaluation for Existing and Proposed ACECs

Name of ACEC Existing or Proposed	Values Assessed	Relevance Criteria <i>see Section II for Relevance Criterion</i>	Importance Criteria <i>see Section II for Importance Criterion</i>	Carried Forward for Analysis?	Comments	1987 RMP Acres	Proposed Acres¹ <i>includes acres from 1987 RMP</i>	Acres Carried Forward¹
Existing Staff Proposed					<p>qualities and has qualities that make it fragile, irreplaceable, and vulnerable to adverse change.</p> <p>Recent plant inventories completed by CNHP have recorded rare plants around the base of the Palisade, and across the Dolores River. A larger area is needed to cover newly discovered plants, and to provide protection should the Wilderness Study Area designation change. Plants known to occur around the base of the Palisade, and across the Dolores River include: Dolores River skeleton plant (<i>Lygodesmia doloresensis</i>), San Rafael milkvetch (<i>Astragalus rafaensis</i>), horseshoe milkvetch (<i>Astragalus equisolensis</i>), Fisher Tower's milkvetch (<i>Astragalus piscator</i>), tufted green gentian (<i>Frasera paniculata</i>), and osterhouts catseye (<i>Cryptantha osterhoutii</i>).</p> <p>Expanded area would protect nesting areas for peregrine falcons.</p>			
Persigo Wash	Fish	None	None	No	The criteria for relevance have not	0	5,532	0

Table 2 (continued)
Relevance and Importance Criteria Evaluation for Existing and Proposed ACECs

Name of ACEC Existing or Proposed	Values Assessed	Relevance Criteria <i>see Section II for Relevance Criterion</i>	Importance Criteria <i>see Section II for Importance Criterion</i>	Carried Forward for Analysis?	Comments	1987 RMP Acres	Proposed Acres¹ <i>includes acres from 1987 RMP</i>	Acres Carried Forward¹
Potential	Wildlife	None	None		<p>been met for cultural resources, fish and wildlife resources and a natural system. The criteria for importance have not been met, since the habitat within the proposed ACEC area is not of regional significance or has qualities of sensitivity.</p> <p>Previous cultural surveys have not indicated the presence of significant historic or cultural values nor are there cultural resources present of significant quality compared to similar resources in GJFO.</p> <p>The proposed area does not contain any fish bearing streams. The area contains artificial kit fox structures and includes the area with the last known den for kit fox in the field office, however these areas do not meet the importance criteria because kit fox have not been documented using the artificial structures nor have they been documented in the area in the past 10 years. Prairie dog release sites for the Mesa County Prairie Dog Relocation</p>			
Public Proposed	Plants	None	None					
	Cultural	None	None					

Table 2 (continued)
Relevance and Importance Criteria Evaluation for Existing and Proposed ACECs

Name of ACEC Existing or Proposed	Values Assessed	Relevance Criteria <i>see Section II for Relevance Criterion</i>	Importance Criteria <i>see Section II for Importance Criterion</i>	Carried Forward for Analysis?	Comments	1987 RMP Acres	Proposed Acres¹ <i>includes acres from 1987 RMP</i>	Acres Carried Forward¹
					group occur in the area but they are not regionally significant for the species and therefore do not meet the importance criteria. While some grand buckwheat is known to occur in the Mancos shale 'badlands' north to the town of Fruita, this area does not represent an outstanding occurrence, in size or quality.			
Plateau Creek <i>Staff Proposed</i>	Fish	2	1, 2, 3	Yes	Meets Relevance and Importance Criteria for BLM sensitive fish species. Protection would help implement the Range-Wide Conservation Agreement and Strategy to avoid federal listing under Endangered Species Act.	N/A	223	223
Prairie and South Canyons <i>Public Proposed</i>	Wildlife	None	None	No	The proposed ACEC does not contain lynx habitat. The area proposed contains several fragmented pieces, which makes potential management difficult.	0	6,081	0
Prairie Canyon (renamed from	Wildlife	2 and 3	2	Yes <i>with modified</i>	Meets the relevance criteria for wildlife resources and a natural system supporting breeding habitat for a	0	19,853	6,866
	Plants	3	1					

Table 2 (continued)
Relevance and Importance Criteria Evaluation for Existing and Proposed ACECs

Name of ACEC Existing or Proposed	Values Assessed	Relevance Criteria <i>see Section II for Relevance Criterion</i>	Importance Criteria <i>see Section II for Importance Criterion</i>	Carried Forward for Analysis?	Comments	1987 RMP Acres	Proposed Acres ¹ <i>includes acres from 1987 RMP</i>	Acres Carried Forward ¹
Baxter Ridge) Public Proposed				<i>boundaries</i>	<p>variety of species and core habitat rare plants. Meets the importance criteria for supporting a unique assemblage of species that is of more than local significance and qualities that make it fragile and vulnerable to adverse change to rare plants.</p> <p>The area provides a breeding habitat for the burrowing owl (<i>Athene cunicularia</i>), long-billed curlew (<i>Numenius americanus</i>), sage sparrow (<i>Amphispiza belli</i>), kit fox (<i>Vulpes macrotis</i>), long-eared owl (<i>Asio otus</i>), Scott's oriole (<i>Icterus parisorum</i>), and white-tailed prairie dog (<i>Cynomys leucums</i>).</p> <p>The proposed boundary was very large and has been modified to include only core habitat for the species. The entire area could be considered for wildlife emphasis management.</p> <p>The area contains habitat for grand buckwheat, a rare plant within the planning area.</p>			
Pyramid Rock	Plants	3	1 and 2	Yes	Meets the relevance criteria for the	551	1,265	1,257

Table 2 (continued)
Relevance and Importance Criteria Evaluation for Existing and Proposed ACECs

Name of ACEC Existing or Proposed	Values Assessed	Relevance Criteria <i>see Section II for Relevance Criterion</i>	Importance Criteria <i>see Section II for Importance Criterion</i>	Carried Forward for Analysis?	Comments	1987 RMP Acres	Proposed Acres ¹ <i>includes acres from 1987 RMP</i>	Acres Carried Forward ¹
ACEC/RNA Existing Staff Proposed	Cultural	1	1 and 2		<p>presence of significant cultural resource values that are important to Native Americans and the presence of a natural process or system that protects these resources. Meets the importance criteria because it has more than locally significant qualities compared to other resources in the planning area and these resources are rare, exemplary, unique, and vulnerable to adverse change.</p> <p>The proposed expansion makes the boundary of the existing ACEC more clearly defined by using existing roads or natural landform features. It also increases the area to accommodate better management and adequately protect sensitive plants and cultural resources.</p> <p>Rare plants known to occur within the existing ACEC are: Colorado hookless cactus (formerly Uinta Basin hookless cactus) (<i>Sclerocactus glaucus</i>), DeBeque phacelia (<i>Phacelia scopulina</i> var. <i>submutica</i>), DeBeque milkvetch</p>			

Table 2 (continued)
Relevance and Importance Criteria Evaluation for Existing and Proposed ACECs

Name of ACEC Existing or Proposed	Values Assessed	Relevance Criteria <i>see Section II for Relevance Criterion</i>	Importance Criteria <i>see Section II for Importance Criterion</i>	Carried Forward for Analysis?	Comments	1987 RMP Acres	Proposed Acres¹ <i>includes acres from 1987 RMP</i>	Acres Carried Forward¹
					(<i>Astragalus debequaeus</i>), <i>Naturita</i> milkvetch (<i>Astragalus naturitensis</i>), adobe thistle (<i>Cirsium perplexans</i>), and aromatic Indian breadroot. The existing ACEC is a research site for Denver Botanic Gardens.			
Rabbit Valley-Rattlesnake Canyon Potential ACEC <i>Public Proposed</i>	Fish Wildlife Plants	N/A N/A N/A	N/A N/A N/A	N/A	ACEC is within the McInnis Canyon NCA; therefore it is beyond the scope of this planning effort.	0	18,276	0
Rapid Creek (renamed from Orchard Mesa Potential ACEC) <i>Public Proposed</i>	Fish Wildlife Plants	2 and 3 None 3	1 and 2 None None	No	During BLM's initial review of the area, it was believed that the portion of the proposed ACEC that includes Rapid Creek contained rainbow trout (<i>Oncorhynchus mykiss</i>), cutthroat trout (<i>Oncorhynchus clarki</i>), and roundtail chub (<i>Gila robusta</i>). The boundary was modified to encompass Rapid Creek without the other outlying areas of the original proposal. Upon further analysis and sampling it was determined that Rapid Creek does not contain these species. Therefore the proposed ACEC does not meet the	0	13,392	220

Table 2 (continued)
Relevance and Importance Criteria Evaluation for Existing and Proposed ACECs

Name of ACEC Existing or Proposed	Values Assessed	Relevance Criteria <i>see Section II for Relevance Criterion</i>	Importance Criteria <i>see Section II for Importance Criterion</i>	Carried Forward for Analysis?	Comments	1987 RMP Acres	Proposed Acres ¹ <i>includes acres from 1987 RMP</i>	Acres Carried Forward ¹
					<p>relevance or importance criteria for fish. A portion of the proposed ACEC near Vincent Reservoir contains a small portion of potential lynx habitat, however these parcels are not significant for the species and therefore do not meet the importance criteria.</p> <p>While Horse Mountain, and the Orchard Mesa Potential Conservation Area contain recorded cacti locations, so few have been recorded in this area that it is not considered significant for the Colorado hookless cactus, and thus does not meet the importance criteria. The BLM special status plant species, narrowstem gilia (<i>Gilia stenothysra</i>), is also known to occur at the base of the Bookcliffs; however the known population size in this area is not considered significant.</p>			
Rattlesnake Canyon <i>Public Proposed</i>	Plants	N/A	N/A	N/A	ACEC is within the McInnis Canyon NCA; therefore it is beyond the scope of this planning effort.	0	4,628	0

Table 2 (continued)
Relevance and Importance Criteria Evaluation for Existing and Proposed ACECs

Name of ACEC Existing or Proposed	Values Assessed	Relevance Criteria <i>see Section II for Relevance Criterion</i>	Importance Criteria <i>see Section II for Importance Criterion</i>	Carried Forward for Analysis?	Comments	1987 RMP Acres	Proposed Acres¹ <i>includes acres from 1987 RMP</i>	Acres Carried Forward¹
Reeder Mesa Staff and Public Proposed	Plants	3	2	Yes	The portion of the proposed ACEC which includes Reeder Mesa contains a Colorado hookless cactus study site. The cactus is thought to have crossed with smallflower fishhook cactus (<i>Sclerocactus parviflorus</i>) resulting in a hooked central spine. Genetic studies are ongoing. This area of the proposed ACEC meets the importance criteria.	0	474	474
Roan and Carr Creeks Staff and Public Proposed	Riparian Habitat	3	2	Yes	Meets the relevance criteria for fish and wildlife resource and a natural system. Meets the importance criteria for having more than locally significant qualities and qualities that make it fragile, sensitive, rare, exemplary, and vulnerable to adverse change. CDOW manages and designates portions of Roan and Carr Creek drainages for genetically pure native cutthroat trout. Therefore the area meets the relevance and importance criteria for fish. CDOW performs successful spawn-	0	40,722	33,694
	Fish	2 and 3	1 and 2					
	Wildlife	None	None					
	Plants	2	None					

Table 2 (continued)
Relevance and Importance Criteria Evaluation for Existing and Proposed ACECs

Name of ACEC Existing or Proposed	Values Assessed	Relevance Criteria <i>see Section II for Relevance Criterion</i>	Importance Criteria <i>see Section II for Importance Criterion</i>	Carried Forward for Analysis?	Comments	1987 RMP Acres	Proposed Acres¹ <i>includes acres from 1987 RMP</i>	Acres Carried Forward¹
					<p>take operations in these drainages, utilizing such to develop hatchery broodstock. Successful rearing of these fish in the hatchery results in stocking pure cutthroat trout in other waters in Colorado.</p> <p>BLM sensitive plant Piceance bladderpod and the sun-loving meadowrue (<i>Thalictrum heliophilum</i>) occur with the area; however, the proposed ACEC boundary does not contain the largest, nor most robust, bladderpod populations in the planning area.</p>			
Rough Canyon ACEC/RNA	Plants	3	I	Yes	<p>Meets the relevance criteria for the presence of significant cultural resources and resources important to Native Americans, wildlife resources, a natural system, and natural hazards.</p> <p>Meets the importance criteria for more than locally significant with cultural resources that are unique and vulnerable to adverse change.</p> <p>Expansion makes the boundary of this ACEC clearly defined by existing roads</p>	2,737	2,778	2,778
	Wildlife	2	I and 2					
Existing	Scenic	I	None					
Staff Proposed	Cultural	I	I and 2					
	Geologic	I	I and 2					

Table 2 (continued)
Relevance and Importance Criteria Evaluation for Existing and Proposed ACECs

Name of ACEC Existing or Proposed	Values Assessed	Relevance Criteria <i>see Section II for Relevance Criterion</i>	Importance Criteria <i>see Section II for Importance Criterion</i>	Carried Forward for Analysis?	Comments	1987 RMP Acres	Proposed Acres¹ <i>includes acres from 1987 RMP</i>	Acres Carried Forward¹
					<p>or natural landform features, increases area to accommodate better management of Gunnison sage-grouse (<i>Centrocercus minimus</i>) and adequately protect cultural resources.</p> <p>Federally listed spineless hedgehog cactus (<i>Echinocereus triglochidiatus</i> var. <i>inermis</i>) and BLM sensitive Grand Junction milkvetch (<i>Astragalus linifolius</i>) are found within the area. Grand Junction milkvetch. The rare plant Eastwood's deserparsley (<i>Lomatium eastwoodiae</i>) also occurs in the area.</p> <p>This area has some of the highest cultural densities in the planning area. The expansion would complement the management of cultural resources in the existing Rough Canyon ACEC.</p> <p>The area has unique and complex geologic structure displaying a large monocline and fault zones.</p>			
Sinbad Valley	Geologic	3	2	Yes	Meets the relevance criteria for significant cultural values, historic landscape values and a natural system	0	7,184	6,399
Staff and Public	Scenic	1	None					
Proposed	Cultural	1	2					

Table 2 (continued)
Relevance and Importance Criteria Evaluation for Existing and Proposed ACECs

Name of ACEC Existing or Proposed	Values Assessed	Relevance Criteria <i>see Section II for Relevance Criterion</i>	Importance Criteria <i>see Section II for Importance Criterion</i>	Carried Forward for Analysis?	Comments	1987 RMP Acres	Proposed Acres ¹ <i>includes acres from 1987 RMP</i>	Acres Carried Forward ¹
Plants	3	1 and 2			<p>supporting rare plants. Meets the importance criteria for more than locally significant qualities and qualities that are sensitive, rare, and unique.</p> <p>Portions of Sinbad Valley that occur on BLM property contain a broad oval depression that is the exposed core of a breached anticline. As the salt (halite) layer in the center of the anticline was exposed to weathering and quickly dissolved, the entire structure collapsed on itself, leaving a valley floor ringed by faults and inward-facing escarpments on the valley rim. Rocks exposed in Sinbad Valley range in age from Pennsylvanian in the lower slopes and valley floor, to Lower Cretaceous in the upper part of the outer rim. The rim includes dramatic exposures of Wingate and Entrada sandstones.</p> <p>Recent rare plant surveys have mapped populations of the newly described and extremely rare Gypsum cateye (<i>Cryptantha gypsophila</i>). This</p>			

Table 2 (continued)
Relevance and Importance Criteria Evaluation for Existing and Proposed ACECs

Name of ACEC Existing or Proposed	Values Assessed	Relevance Criteria <i>see Section II for Relevance Criterion</i>	Importance Criteria <i>see Section II for Importance Criterion</i>	Carried Forward for Analysis?	Comments	1987 RMP Acres	Proposed Acres¹ <i>includes acres from 1987 RMP</i>	Acres Carried Forward¹
					<p>area meets the relevance criteria for the presence of significant cultural resources, historic landscape values, and resources important to Native Americans.</p> <p>Cultural Resource surveys within Sinbad Valley have resulted in recording sites important to the Ute Tribe, including wickiup camps and trails. Alignment and local historical accounts make it likely that the Ute trail, unique because of distinctive travois tread, continues into the proposed ACEC. Plant resources important to the Ute are also present in a high density that may be attributable to historic cultural practices. Traditional use and heritage resources are more than locally significant and give this area special meaning to the Native Americans who traditionally used the area. Ute trails are exemplary to connecting modern visitors to this historic landscape.</p>			
Sinbad Valley	Recreation	None	None	No	Does not meet the relevance and	0	42,731	0

Table 2 (continued)
Relevance and Importance Criteria Evaluation for Existing and Proposed ACECs

Name of ACEC Existing or Proposed	Values Assessed	Relevance Criteria <i>see Section II for Relevance Criterion</i>	Importance Criteria <i>see Section II for Importance Criterion</i>	Carried Forward for Analysis?	Comments	1987 RMP Acres	Proposed Acres¹ <i>includes acres from 1987 RMP</i>	Acres Carried Forward¹
SRMA <i>Proposed by public as a Special Recreation Management Area (SRMA). Proposal did not include any information regarding relevant and important values for ACEC designation</i>					importance criteria for ACEC designation. Does not meet the criteria for SRMA designation (recreation demand and issues, recreation setting characteristics, resolving use/user conflicts, compatibility with other resource uses and resource protection needs). Portions of the proposed area do meet the criteria for ACEC designation (Sinbad Valley, Dolores River Riparian, John Brown Canyon proposed ACECs), or SRMA designation (Dolores River Canyon proposed SRMA/ERMA)			
South Shale Ridge-Cow Ridge RNA <i>Public Proposed</i>	Recreation	None	None	No	Portions of this proposal are included in the Coon Hollow/South Shale Ridge and Pyramid Rock ACECs and are being carried forward for further analysis. Areas in the Cow Ridge region are not being carried forward for further analysis because they do not meet the relevance and importance criteria.	0	59,702	<i>See proposed Coon Hollow/South Shale Ridge and Pyramid Rock ACECs</i>
South Shale	Wildlife	2	I	No	Portions of this proposal are included	0	47,341	<i>See proposed</i>

Table 2 (continued)
Relevance and Importance Criteria Evaluation for Existing and Proposed ACECs

Name of ACEC Existing or Proposed	Values Assessed	Relevance Criteria <i>see Section II for Relevance Criterion</i>	Importance Criteria <i>see Section II for Importance Criterion</i>	Carried Forward for Analysis?	Comments	1987 RMP Acres	Proposed Acres¹ <i>includes acres from 1987 RMP</i>	Acres Carried Forward¹
Ridge Potential ACEC <i>Public Proposed</i>	Plants	3	I and 2		in the Coon Hollow/South Shale Ridge and Pyramid Rock ACECs and are being carried forward for further analysis. Areas in the Cow Ridge region are not being carried forward for further analysis because they do not meet the relevance and importance criteria.			<i>Coon Hollow/South Shale Ridge and Pyramid Rock ACECs</i>
Unaweep-Maverick Canyon SRMA <i>Proposed by public as a Special Recreation Management Area (SRMA). Proposal did not include any information regarding relevant and important values for ACEC designation</i>	Recreation	None	None	No	Does not meet the relevance and importance criteria for ACEC designation. Does not meet the criteria for SRMA designation (recreation demand and issues, recreation setting characteristics, resolving use/user conflicts, compatibility with other resource uses and resource protection needs). Portions of the proposed area do meet the criteria for ACEC designation (Dolores River Riparian, Juanita Arch proposed ACECs); for SRMA designation (Dolores River Canyon proposed SRMA/ERMA); or contain wilderness characteristics (Unaweep and Maverick units).	0	29,917	0

Table 2 (continued)
Relevance and Importance Criteria Evaluation for Existing and Proposed ACECs

Name of ACEC Existing or Proposed	Values Assessed	Relevance Criteria <i>see Section II for Relevance Criterion</i>	Importance Criteria <i>see Section II for Importance Criterion</i>	Carried Forward for Analysis?	Comments	1987 RMP Acres	Proposed Acres¹ <i>includes acres from 1987 RMP</i>	Acres Carried Forward¹
UnawEEP Seep ACEC/RNA	Fish and Wildlife	2 and 3	2	Yes	<p>Meets the relevance criteria for wildlife and a natural system that supports the UnawEEP fritillary butterfly (<i>Speyeria nokomis</i>). The importance criteria for more than locally significant qualities and the wetland complex is fragile, sensitive, rare, irreplaceable, unique, and very vulnerable to adverse change for wildlife and rare plants.</p> <p>The UnawEEP Seep is an existing natural area recognized by the State of Colorado that possesses habitat for the UnawEEP fratillary butterfly, which depends on a unique wetland complex comprised of twenty seeps occurring in concentration on a hillside in UnawEEP Canyon and a research location for giant helleborine (<i>Epipactus gigantea</i>). Large wetland complexes are extremely rare within the GJFO, particularly undisturbed sites such as this that support a large diversity of plants and animals.</p>	78	84	84
<i>Public Proposed</i>	Plants	3	1 and 2					
	Riparian Habitat	3	1 and 2					
	Hydrologic	3	2					
UnawEEP Seep	Wildlife	2	2	No	Portions of the proposed ACEC are	78	23,108	<i>See existing</i>

Table 2 (continued)
Relevance and Importance Criteria Evaluation for Existing and Proposed ACECs

Name of ACEC Existing or Proposed	Values Assessed	Relevance Criteria <i>see Section II for Relevance Criterion</i>	Importance Criteria <i>see Section II for Importance Criterion</i>	Carried Forward for Analysis?	Comments	1987 RMP Acres	Proposed Acres¹ <i>includes acres from 1987 RMP</i>	Acres Carried Forward¹
Potential ACEC <i>Public Proposed</i>	Hydrologic	3	2		within both the existing UnawEEP Seep and Palisade ACEC and are being analyzed separately. Areas outstanding do not meet the relevance and importance criteria and are not being carried forward for further analysis.			<i>UnawEEP Seep and Palisade ACECs</i>

¹Acres include proposed expansions.

V. LIST OF PREPARERS


Table 3
List of Preparers

Name	Role/Responsibility
<i>Bureau of Land Management – Grand Junction Field Office</i>	
Matt Anderson	RMP/EIS Project Manager
Jim Dollerschell	Rangeland Management Specialist, Wild Horses
Collin Ewing	RMP/EIS Project Manager
Robert Fowler	Rangeland Management Specialist, Riparian
Scott Gerwe	Geology
Robin Lacy	Realty Specialist
Aline LaForge	Archaeologist
Alissa Leavitt-Reynolds	Archaeologist
Anna Lincoln	Ecologist
Jacob Martin	Rangeland Management Specialist, Forester
Heidi Plank	Wildlife Biologist
Catherine Robertson	Field Manager
Christina Stark	Natural Resource Specialist
Mark Taber	Weeds
Aaron Young	GIS Specialist
<i>Contractor – Environmental Management and Planning Solutions, Inc.</i>	
David Batts	Project Management
Drew Vankat	Project Management, QA/QC
Marcia Rickey	GIS Specialist
Jennifer Whitaker	Project Management, QA/QC
Kate Krebs	Technical Review, Document Production

Appendix A

Maps of ACECs Recommended for Further Analysis
in the Draft RMP

This page intentionally left blank.




Atwell Gulch

Grand Junction Field Office, Colorado



No warranty is made by the Bureau of Land Management as to the accuracy, reliability, or completeness of these data. Original data were compiled from various sources. This information may not meet National Map Accuracy Standards. This project was developed through digital means and may be updated without notice.

Figure A-1




Badger Wash ACEC and Expansion

Grand Junction Field Office, Colorado



No warranty is made by the Bureau of Land Management as to the accuracy, reliability, or completeness of these data. Original data were compiled from various sources. This information may not meet National Map Accuracy Standards. This project was developed through digital means and may be updated without notice.

Figure A-2




Colorado River Riparian
Grand Junction Field Office, Colorado



No warranty is made by the Bureau of Land Management as to the accuracy, reliability, or completeness of these data. Original data were compiled from various sources. This information may not meet National Map Accuracy Standards. This project was developed through digital means and may be updated without notice.

Figure A-3




Coon Creek
Grand Junction Field Office, Colorado



No warranty is made by the Bureau of Land Management as to the accuracy, reliability, or completeness of these data. Original data were compiled from various sources. This information may not meet National Map Accuracy Standards. This project was developed through digital means and may be updated without notice.

Figure A-4




Coon Hollow/South Shale Ridge
 Grand Junction Field Office, Colorado



No warranty is made by the Bureau of Land Management as to the accuracy, reliability, or completeness of these data. Original data were compiled from various sources. This information may not meet National Map Accuracy Standards. This project was developed through digital means and may be updated without notice.

Figure A-5




Dolores River Riparian
Grand Junction Field Office, Colorado



No warranty is made by the Bureau of Land Management as to the accuracy, reliability, or completeness of these data. Original data were compiled from various sources. This information may not meet National Map Accuracy Standards. This project was developed through digital means and may be updated without notice.

Figure A-6




Glade Park-Piñon Mesa
Grand Junction Field Office, Colorado



No warranty is made by the Bureau of Land Management as to the accuracy, reliability, or completeness of these data. Original data were compiled from various sources. This information may not meet National Map Accuracy Standards. This project was developed through digital means and may be updated without notice.

Figure A-7




Gunnison River Riparian
Grand Junction Field Office, Colorado



No warranty is made by the Bureau of Land Management as to the accuracy, reliability, or completeness of these data. Original data were compiled from various sources. This information may not meet National Map Accuracy Standards. This project was developed through digital means and may be updated without notice.

Figure A-8




Hawxhurst Creek
 Grand Junction Field Office, Colorado



No warranty is made by the Bureau of Land Management as to the accuracy, reliability, or completeness of these data. Original data were compiled from various sources. This information may not meet National Map Accuracy Standards. This project was developed through digital means and may be updated without notice.

Figure A-9




Indian Creek
Grand Junction Field Office, Colorado



No warranty is made by the Bureau of Land Management as to the accuracy, reliability, or completeness of these data. Original data were compiled from various sources. This information may not meet National Map Accuracy Standards. This project was developed through digital means and may be updated without notice.

Figure A-10




John Brown Canyon
Grand Junction Field Office, Colorado



No warranty is made by the Bureau of Land Management as to the accuracy, reliability, or completeness of these data. Original data were compiled from various sources. This information may not meet National Map Accuracy Standards. This project was developed through digital means and may be updated without notice.

Figure A-11




Juanita Arch
Grand Junction Field Office, Colorado



No warranty is made by the Bureau of Land Management as to the accuracy, reliability, or completeness of these data. Original data were compiled from various sources. This information may not meet National Map Accuracy Standards. This project was developed through digital means and may be updated without notice.

Figure A-12




Mt. Garfield
Grand Junction Field Office, Colorado



No warranty is made by the Bureau of Land Management as to the accuracy, reliability, or completeness of these data. Original data were compiled from various sources. This information may not meet National Map Accuracy Standards. This project was developed through digital means and may be updated without notice.

Figure A-13




Nine-mile Hill Boulders
Grand Junction Field Office, Colorado



No warranty is made by the Bureau of Land Management as to the accuracy, reliability, or completeness of these data. Original data were compiled from various sources. This information may not meet National Map Accuracy Standards. This project was developed through digital means and may be updated without notice.

Figure A-14




The Palisade ACEC/ONA and Expansion

Grand Junction Field Office, Colorado



No warranty is made by the Bureau of Land Management as to the accuracy, reliability, or completeness of these data. Original data were compiled from various sources. This information may not meet National Map Accuracy Standards. This project was developed through digital means and may be updated without notice.

Figure A-15




Plateau Creek
Grand Junction Field Office, Colorado



No warranty is made by the Bureau of Land Management as to the accuracy, reliability, or completeness of these data. Original data were compiled from various sources. This information may not meet National Map Accuracy Standards. This project was developed through digital means and may be updated without notice.

Figure A-16




Prairie Canyon
Grand Junction Field Office, Colorado



No warranty is made by the Bureau of Land Management as to the accuracy, reliability, or completeness of these data. Original data were compiled from various sources. This information may not meet National Map Accuracy Standards. This project was developed through digital means and may be updated without notice.

Figure A-17




Pyramid Rock ACEC/RNA and Expansion
Grand Junction Field Office, Colorado



No warranty is made by the Bureau of Land Management as to the accuracy, reliability, or completeness of these data. Original data were compiled from various sources. This information may not meet National Map Accuracy Standards. This project was developed through digital means and may be updated without notice.

Figure A-18




Reeder Mesa
Grand Junction Field Office, Colorado



No warranty is made by the Bureau of Land Management as to the accuracy, reliability, or completeness of these data. Original data were compiled from various sources. This information may not meet National Map Accuracy Standards. This project was developed through digital means and may be updated without notice.

Figure A-19




Roan and Carr Creeks
Grand Junction Field Office, Colorado



No warranty is made by the Bureau of Land Management as to the accuracy, reliability, or completeness of these data. Original data were compiled from various sources. This information may not meet National Map Accuracy Standards. This project was developed through digital means and may be updated without notice.

Figure A-20




Rough Canyon ACEC/RNA and Expansion
Grand Junction Field Office, Colorado



No warranty is made by the Bureau of Land Management as to the accuracy, reliability, or completeness of these data. Original data were compiled from various sources. This information may not meet National Map Accuracy Standards. This project was developed through digital means and may be updated without notice.

Figure A-21




Sindbad Valley
Grand Junction Field Office, Colorado



No warranty is made by the Bureau of Land Management as to the accuracy, reliability, or completeness of these data. Original data were compiled from various sources. This information may not meet National Map Accuracy Standards. This project was developed through digital means and may be updated without notice.

Figure A-22



UnawEEP Seep ACEC/RNA and Expansion
Grand Junction Field Office, Colorado



No warranty is made by the Bureau of Land Management as to the accuracy, reliability, or completeness of these data. Original data were compiled from various sources. This information may not meet National Map Accuracy Standards. This project was developed through digital means and may be updated without notice.

Figure A-23

This page intentionally left blank.