

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT UTAH STATE OFFICE		Date: September 2015
LAND USE PLAN EVALUATION REPORT TITLE PAGE		
Plan Title: Kanab Field Office Approved Resource Management Plan		
Periodic Evaluation Number: I		
Dates Conducted: June 9-10, 2015		
Conducted By: BLM, Utah State Office		
TEAM MEMBERS		
Name	Title	
Julie Carson	Planning and Environmental Specialist Utah State Office	
Skye Sieber	Planning and Environmental Coordinator Utah State Office	
Assistance Provided by:		
Harry Barber	Field Office Manager Kanab Field Office	
Keith Rigtrup	District Planning and Environmental Coordinator Color Country District	
Submitted by:		Date
Kanab Field Office		

1. Introduction

In October 2008, the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) signed a Record of Decision for the Kanab Field Office Approved Resource Management Plan (RMP). Prior to the 2008 plan revision, the Kanab Field Office (KFO) managed resources under five different land use plans and emergency OHV restriction orders. The 2008 RMP establishes resource allocations and management direction for 554,000 acres of BLM-administered land and an additional 167,000 acres of Federal mineral estate within Kane and Garfield counties in southern Utah.

1.1. Purpose

BLM planning regulations require established intervals and standards for monitoring and evaluation of plans (43 CFR 1610.4-9). The BLM land use planning handbook (H-1601-1, V.B.) articulates these intervals and standards:

Evaluation is the process of reviewing the land use plan and the periodic plan monitoring reports to determine whether the land use plan decisions and NEPA analysis are still valid and whether the plan is being implemented. Land use plans are evaluated to determine if: (1) decisions remain relevant to current issues; (2) decisions are effective in achieving (or making progress toward achieving) desired outcomes; (3) any decisions need to be revised; (4) any decisions need to be dropped from their consideration; and (5) any areas require new decisions. [T]he plan should be periodically evaluated (at a minimum every 5 years) as documented in an evaluation schedule.

This report is the first periodic evaluation of the Kanab RMP and fulfills BLM's duties under 43 CFR 1610.4-9. Based on workload in the field office, BLM's Washington Office granted an extension for completion of the first periodic evaluation for the Kanab RMP from Fiscal Year 2013 to Fiscal Year 2015 (September 30, 2015).

1.2. Methodology

The RMP evaluation team included Julie Carson (Utah State Office) and Skye Sieber (Utah State Office) with coordination and support provided by Keith Rigtrup (Color Country District Office). The team met at the KFO in Kanab, Utah on June 9, 2015 to conduct interviews with field office staff. On June 10, the team visited select sites within the field office planning area that demonstrated implementation of RMP goals, objectives, and management actions. A close-out conference call with the field office was held on September 9, 2015. Resource specialists who helped review and evaluate the RMP are listed in Appendix A.

The Utah State Office developed questions to evaluate the effectiveness, consistency, and conformance of the plan with regard to current BLM policies and initiatives. Recent policies and initiatives considered in this periodic evaluation are listed below. The evaluation questions, along with field office staff responses, are attached in Appendix B. The results are summarized in Sections 2 and 3 of this report. Recent policies and initiatives considered in this periodic evaluation include:

- Renewable energy;
- Priority corridors;
- Leasing reform;
- Climate change;
- Sage-grouse habitat conservation; and
- Regional mitigation.

Additionally, the State Office compiled all management actions from the RMP into a spreadsheet to

facilitate a systematic review of each decision. Responses from this review (attached in Appendix C) informed recommendations for plan maintenance or amendments. The evaluation questions and spreadsheet were sent to the field office manager and resource specialists prior to the evaluation team's visit in Kanab. The questionnaires and subsequent interviews address the evaluation process outlined in the BLM land use planning handbook (H-1601-1, V.B.1.)

1.3. Plan Amendments and Maintenance

Since the Record of Decision was signed in October 2008, the Kanab RMP has been amended twice. First, the West-wide Energy Corridor Programmatic EIS and Approved Plan Amendment (January 2009) designated one energy right-of-way corridor within the KFO planning area as per Section 368 of the Energy Policy Act. Second, the Solar Energy Development PEIS and ROD signed in October 2012 designated 18,633 acres as a "variance area" (potentially available for utility-scale solar energy development outside of a solar energy zone). Additionally one maintenance action has been completed, correcting 34 grammatical, formatting and typographical errors throughout the document prior to final printing and binding of the plan in spring 2009.

2. Results by Resource Topic

The results of the evaluation are organized below by resource topics. Detailed responses from field office specialists can be found in Appendix B and C.

2.1. Air, Water and Soil Resources

Goals, objectives, and management actions related to air quality, soil, and water resources were determined to be adequate. Rather than including a set of stand-alone Riparian decisions, the Kanab RMP incorporates direction for riparian areas under the broader Vegetation category. The RMP also includes goals, objectives and management actions to address Drought and Natural Disasters. In regards to prioritizing land treatments by fifth-field watersheds to manage soil resources (SOL-3), KFO staff pointed out that there is a watershed plan for the Upper Sevier River; the Kanab Creek watershed plan is in progress and the Upper Virgin River does not yet have a plan.

2.2. Cultural and Paleontological Resources

Implementation of some decisions has been a challenge due to lack of dedicated staffing or funding. For example, funding requests to complete a regional Class I cultural resources inventory (covering multiple field offices) have yet to be approved. The field office has not yet established a comprehensive cultural resources monitoring program (CUL-11); however sites that are known to be popular for public visitation are identified on maps, brochures, and other media. To help foster lasting stewardship, the field office prioritizes interpretation for local residents over general public awareness. However, lack of funding continues to hamper the field office's ability to proactively research, protect, or inventory new cultural resources. KFO staff noted that the Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument successfully developed an agreement with Native American tribes to protect and maintain tribal access to sacred sites and traditional cultural properties and serves as a good model for them to replicate.

2.3. Fish, Wildlife and Special Status Species

The KFO staff noted that the yellow-billed cuckoo was recently listed as threatened by the USFWS and a recovery plan is pending; however, the planning area does not contain any critical habitat for this listed species. During the evaluation, a number of decisions related specifically to greater sage-grouse were flagged for further review and modification once the Utah greater sage-grouse resource management plan amendment is approved.

2.4. Fire, Forests and Vegetation

The KFO staff pointed out that 150,000 acres have been analyzed and approved for vegetation treatments through the NEPA process and approximately 30,000 acres have been treated to date. On June 10, 2015, the RMP evaluation team visited a vegetation treatment area along the Skutumpah Creek road where juniper and pinyon pine were removed the previous year and reseeded with a native plant mix. Development of a Forest Woodland Management Plan for the planning area has not yet begun, in part due to lack of dedicated funding and staff. This future plan should include desired future conditions for health and distribution of forest resources, categorized by forest type.

2.5. Lands and Realty

The KFO staff noted that the 24 kV size limit imposed for burying new or reconstructed utility lines is overly restrictive (LAR-7); whereas only requiring non-reflective wire on powerlines greater than 230 kV (LAR-9) is overly permissive. KFO staff also pointed out that while LAR-2 restricts the height of communication site towers to less than 200 feet, all existing towers in the planning area are currently less than 100 feet and the office would continue advocating this lower height limit. The field office is currently in the process of updating all four communication site plans.

2.6. Livestock Grazing

To support related vegetation decisions and targets, GRA-17 establishes priority areas for land health treatments by grazing allotment. To date, South Canyon, Spry, and Bald Knoll allotments have been treated; Sandy Creek, Circleville Cove, and Buck Knoll allotment treatments are in progress; and Limestone Canyon and Yellowjacket allotment treatments are planned for Fiscal Year 2016. The KFO is currently working with the State of Utah to perform a grazing study on the North Fork of the Virgin River to better understand high *E. coli* levels found in the river. The KFO does not manage any wild horse and burro areas.

2.7. Minerals and Energy

Specific areas recommended for withdrawal from locatable mineral entry (MIN-13) are pending and in progress. A reasonable foreseeable development (RFD) scenario was developed for leasable minerals and is unlikely to be exceeded in the near future due to the low level of interest and development potential. The RMP does not contain an RFD for other mineral resources and KFO staff noted that demand for sand could increase in the future based on its use in hydraulic fracturing. The Kanab RMP also contains management actions addressing abandoned mine lands under Public Safety (HAZ).

2.8. Recreation and Travel Management

The Kanab RMP designates six special recreation management areas (SRMA) and REC-3 commits to developing an activity-level plan for each one; however, these have not yet been completed due to lack of dedicated funding. In the RMP, travel management related decisions are separated into three types: general transportation-travel management, area categories, and OHV route designations. The plan level travel decisions adequately allocate areas located within the field office as open/limited/closed to motorized use. A number of existing routes were discovered after the RMP was signed that need to be identified in the travel plan. From an enforcement perspective, KFO staff noted that limiting dispersed camping vehicle parking to within 150 feet of designated routes (REC-27) has been challenging. Similarly, public OHV and mountain bike travel is allowed on 25 miles of designated inventoried ways within Moquith Mountain WSA; however, REC-41 does not allow similar *commercial* OHV and mountain bike tours within the same area and the field office may want to consider amending this decision to promote equitable access.

2.9. Visual Resources and Special Designations

In the Kanab RMP, special designations fall under one of the following categories of decisions: Wilderness, Wild and Scenic Rivers, Wilderness Study Areas, Areas of Critical Environmental Concern, and Other Designations (i.e. Old Spanish National Historic Trail). Goals, objectives, and management actions for each of these program areas were determined to be adequate. The KFO staff noted that development of an activity plan for the Old Spanish National Historic Trail is underway.

As per the 2008 Record of Decision for the RMP (p. 28), BLM decided that *non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics* will be referred to as *BLM natural areas*. This new, simpler reference was chosen to distinguish between formal designations (e.g. Wilderness and other listed above) and a discretionary management category. *BLM natural areas* are managed to protect, preserve, and maintain values of primitive recreation and the appearance of naturalness and solitude. For consistency, the RMP evaluation team recommends that '*BLM natural areas*' terminology be added to the RMP where appropriate via plan maintenance.

3. General Findings

The plan is relatively new and the demographic and resource issues that drove its creation and resulting decisions are applicable today. For the most part, plan decisions also remain relevant to more recent BLM policies and initiatives.

3.1. Renewable Energy

Decisions LAR-25 and LAR-26 accommodate wind and solar energy development. The Kanab RMP FEIS did not identify any areas with medium to high geothermal development potential within the planning area and the Geothermal Leasing PEIS and ROD (December 2008) projected 0 megawatts of geothermal production within the Kanab planning area by year 2025.

3.2. Priority Corridors

There is one designated Section 368 energy corridor (116-206) within the Kanab planning area, which primarily follows US Highway 89. The RMP decisions LAR-4 through LAR-10 provide management direction for ROWs and ROW corridors and Special Status Species (SSS) decisions provide management direction to protect threatened Utah prairie dog and its habitat within this corridor.

3.3. Leasing Reform

Surface stipulations applicable to oil and gas leasing, as well as other surface disturbing activities, are outlined in Appendix 3 and considered the least restrictive to protect resources. There are no planned lease sales and given the low level of interest and development potential of leasable minerals in the area, the need for developing a master leasing plan is also low.

3.4. Climate Change

Drought and Natural Disasters (DND) decisions emphasize appropriate management responses when natural resources may be affected by drought, insects, diseases, or natural disasters. Furthermore, Special Status Species (SSS) and Fish and Wildlife (WL) decisions that minimize habitat fragmentation and maintain connectivity help support climate adaptation for wildlife species by keeping pathways open for movement.

3.5. Sage-Grouse Habitat Conservation

As a result of the forthcoming Utah Greater Sage-Grouse Resource Management Plan Amendment, new decisions and/or allocations will be added (or existing ones modified) under the management areas of special status species, fire, vegetation, grazing, minerals, lands and realty, recreation, and travel management. Once the approved plan amendment ROD is signed, the State Office will be assisting field offices with creating an LUP amendment /maintenance sheet catered to each affected land use plan.

3.6. Regional Mitigation

In addition to new decisions, the greater sage-grouse plan amendment commits to regional mitigation, which will strategically identify mitigation sites and measures that provide a net conservation gain to the species in Utah. Furthermore, decisions SSS-10 and WL-32 commit to “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, in accordance with current guidance.”

4. Recommendations

Based on the findings, the evaluation team determined two different types of recommendations:

- Areas in which additional action is needed in order to implement RMP objectives and decisions
- Suggested plan maintenance actions or amendments

4.1. Additional Actions

4.1.1. Implementation-Level Planning

Since the plan was approved, much work has gone into implementing actions to meet various RMP goals and objectives. Areas of effort include vegetation treatments, updating communication site plans, conducting a grazing study on the North Fork of the Virgin River, and development of both the Old Spanish National Historic Trail activity plan (which spans several field offices) and Kanab Creek watershed plan. In order to ensure other goals and objectives are met, the following implementation-level plans still need to be completed: activity plans for all six SRMAs, an Upper Virgin River watershed plan, a Forest Woodland Management Plan, a Class I cultural resources inventory, and development of a comprehensive cultural resources monitoring program.

4.1.2. Data and Effectiveness Monitoring

The RMP Monitoring Plan (Appendix 15) was reviewed and all monitoring requirements were verified as current and achievable. In some instances, there is a reference to report monitoring in an “Annual Program Summary and Planning Update.” Based on review of other RMPs completed in 2008, the RMP evaluation team recommends clarifying this language in all plans and adding a reference to “*workload accomplishment reporting*,” which is a method that many resource programs are currently using to collect and report monitoring results. Continued monitoring will be necessary to gauge the effectiveness of implementing plan decisions.

4.1.3. Budget and Staffing

During the evaluation, staff noted that many of the outstanding implementation-level plans are the result of a lack of dedicated staff or funding. Implementation-level plans are classified as “one-time decisions” in the RMP and are prioritized as part of the BLM budget process. A five-year Implementation Plan/Framework spreadsheet that establishes time frames and priorities for completion of “one-time” decisions in the approved RMP was developed in 2009 but has not been updated since its creation. To

assist managers and staff in the annual budget planning process, the evaluation team suggests that KFO staff update this spreadsheet or develop a similar tool to help track RMP implementation accomplishments and outstanding commitments.

4.1.1. Maintaining Plan Updates

Over the life of the RMP, changes to language and decisions in the RMP are documented on “LUP Amendment/Maintenance Sheets.” An LUP amendment/maintenance sheet is needed to document allocations and decisions resulting from both the west-wide energy corridor and solar plan amendments (see Section 1.3). Updated text attributed to amendments and plan maintenance is not reflected in the body of the RMP. To help ensure that BLM staff are referring to the most up-to-date RMP language, the evaluation team recommends that the Field Office maintain an electronic “redline” or annotated version of the plan that clearly shows these changes. The annotated RMP should also be published to the Field Office webpage to further ensure that BLM staff in other offices, as well as interested publics, are referencing the most current plan.

4.2. Suggested plan maintenance and amendments

The following table summarizes updates to the plan recommended by field office staff and the evaluation team during their review. A majority of updates are likely to be accomplished via plan maintenance as they reflect minor data changes or help refine, document, or clarify previously approved decisions. Known future updates have also been identified based on knowledge of other current planning or litigation. An initial suggestion regarding plan maintenance or amendment is provided; however the appropriate method for incorporating changes must be determined from the details of each case.

Suggested Change	Affected Decision(s)	Suggested Method
Change wording to be inclusive of all 303 listings.	WAT-11	Maintenance
Add: or most current policy to accommodate future updates to cited references.	VEG-5; SSS-5, 10,18, 23, 30, 31; WL-7; CUL-4	Maintenance
Clarify management for the Narrows (North Fork of the Virgin River).	VEG-11	Maintenance
Typographical error: note that decision inadvertently left out of the plan; reserve for future use.	SSS-59	Maintenance
Typographical error: there are two decisions labeled WL-30. Remove the <i>first</i> WL-30 heading and combine management direction text with preceding WL-29.	WL-30	Maintenance
State Protocol has been superseded by an MOU. Update decision/reference to reflect this change.	CUL-3	Maintenance
Add: (BLM natural areas) wherever <i>non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics</i> is mentioned.	<u>Non-WSA Lands with Wilderness Characteristics (WC)</u> and elsewhere	Maintenance
Replace <i>same as decision in the Fish and Wildlife section</i> with See WL-16 to provide a more direct reference.	GRA-12	Maintenance

Suggested Change	Affected Decision(s)	Suggested Method
Clarify whether decision applies to ACECs.	LAR-4 and 5	Maintenance
Remove decision from the plan (all listed parcels were classified in 1970 and cancelled in 1982).	LAR-11	Maintenance
Clarify by adding full legal citation of the "Cotter" decision: <i>Utah v. Andrus</i> , 486 F. Supp. 995 (D. Utah 1979).	LAR-24	Maintenance
To clarify, change: <i>to OHV designations with designated routes</i> .	MIN-6	Maintenance
Change phrase <i>wildland fire use</i> to use of wildland fire (as per NWCG. Oct. 2014. Glossary of Wildland Fire Terminology PMS 205).	VEG-32 and 33; FIRE-3, 4, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14	Maintenance
Update all references to the <i>IMP</i> to the new BLM MS-6330 (Management of Wilderness Study Areas).	GRA-8; REC-9, 10, 11, 12; TRR-5; ACEC-3; WSR-6, 7, 8, 9, 10; WSA-2 and 4	Maintenance
Add Old Spanish before <i>National Historic Trail</i> .	OD-2	Maintenance
Appendix 5 incorrectly combines parcels considered for disposal from all alternatives in the EIS. Update with parcels under Alternative B (Preferred) from the DEIS .	Appendix 5	Maintenance
Reword decisions for clarity.	HAZ-3, HAZ-4	Maintenance
Update travel plan with existing routes discovered after the plan was signed.	Travel Plan and/or Map 10	Maintenance
Add: or workload accomplishment reporting after <i>Annual Program Summary and Planning Update</i>	Monitoring sections	Maintenance
Note: There is no requirement or commitment to undertake suggested amendments.		
Review/modify/replace/add decisions as needed once the Utah Greater Sage-Grouse Resource Management Plan Amendment is approved.	VEG-31; SSS-9, 41, 53, 54, 55, 57, 58	Known Future Maintenance
Add reference to Yellow-Billed Cuckoo Recovery Plan once available.	SSS-49 and 52	Known Future Maintenance
Update acreages and map if the Alton Coal Tract Lease is approved.	MIN-9	Possible Future Maintenance
Note: There is no requirement or commitment to undertake suggested amendments.		
Areas listed are currently open to <i>public</i> OHV and mountain bike use. Modify the decision to either: (1) also be open to <i>commercial</i> OHV/bike use; or (2) close to all use, i.e. public and commercial. See WSA-7 (designated open routes) for related issue.	REC-41	Amendment
Section focuses on Abandoned Mine Lands. Consider new decisions for spills and garbage dumps, etc.	<u>Public Safety (HAZ)</u>	Amendment

Appendix A: Interdisciplinary Review Team

Kanab Field Office / Color Country District Staff

Dan Alberts	<i>GIS Specialist</i>
Harry Barber	<i>Field Manager</i>
Lisa Church	<i>Wildlife Biologist</i>
Mark Foley	<i>Realty Specialist</i>
Carson Gubler	<i>Rangeland Management Specialist</i>
James Holland	<i>Geologist</i>
John Reese	<i>Rangeland Management Specialist</i>
Keith Rigtrup	<i>Planning and Environmental Coordinator</i>
Clay Stewart	<i>Recreation Planner</i>
Matt Zweifel	<i>Archeologist</i>

Appendix B: Evaluation Questions

Question	Response	Action
Are the leasing restrictions and stipulations affecting energy and renewable energy development (Oil & Gas, Geothermal, Solar, and Wind) appropriate to protect critical resources and special areas or are there additional restrictions or stipulations that are needed to protect resources? Identify the additional restrictions required.	Sufficient	No change
Is there a Reasonable Foreseeable Development (RFD) scenario for implementing fluid minerals energy-related exploration and development in the planning area? If so, then:	Yes	No change
a. Is it appropriate for the level of activity occurring now and projected in the near term (3-5 years)?	Yes	No change
b. Is it appropriate for the level of activity projected in the long term (20 years)?	Yes	No change
c. Has the RFD been exceeded or could be exceeded within the lifespan of the RMP?	No	No change
d. Does the RFD consider potential new discoveries from developing tight shale formations with new hydraulic fracturing and horizontal drilling technologies?	No known reserves	No change
e. Was the RFD used as the basis for determining cumulative impacts in the RMP/EIS?	Yes	No change
Does the RMP contain an appendix outlining typical BMPs that will be used for fluid mineral development?	Yes (A1-3)	No change
Were the least restrictive constraints selected that meet the resources protection objective?	Yes	No change
Does the RMP provide direction and flexibility to accommodate oil & gas and renewable energy development?		
Are there constraints in the RMP that would affect or delay issuing Rights-of-Way for oil & gas, geothermal, wind or solar energy development?	1. yes 2. no	No change
Are there restrictions that should be eliminated or modified because they no longer are needed/appropriate, or are there other protective mechanisms in place that supersede their use, or are there industry technological changes that make the restriction(s) unnecessary?	No	No change
Are there RFDs outlined in the RMP for other mineral resources, such as locatable or salable? If so, is level of activity commensurate with the RFD?	No. Frack sands may increase in the future.	No change
Does the RMP address how the RFD scenario(s) will be kept up to date?	No; but no foreseeable case where the RFD would be exceeded.	No change
Does the RMP describe criteria for the application of appropriate stipulations for fluid minerals, along with criteria for the waiver, exception, or modification of the stipulation?	Yes (Appendix 3).	No change
Does the RMP incorporate sustainable development concepts or objectives relative to post-mining uses?	Yes (Appendix 15 and other applicable laws - SMCRA).	No change
Does the RMP ensure access to sand and gravel to support infrastructure and communities?	Yes	No change
Monitoring	Verified all Minerals and Energy monitoring requirements are current and achievable.	No change

Question	Response	Action
Is the RMP's policy statement for managing hazardous materials and wastes up to date?	No - doesn't discuss	No change
Does the RMP identify an inventory of hazardous materials sites, including FUD (Formerly Used Defense) sites, and outline objectives for management and disposal of known or potential future hazardous materials sites?	No	No change
Is the RMP's policy statement for managing Abandoned Mine Lands (AML) up to date?	Yes	No change
Does the RMP address identification, inventory and closure actions for Abandoned Mine Lands?	Yes	No change
Monitoring	Monitoring dealt with on a case-by-case basis	No change

Question	Response	Action
Do the RMP land tenure decisions provide for consolidating land ownership? If no, please explain.	Yes (LAR-17, bullet 4)	No change
Does the RMP include a Table or Map identifying Land and Mineral Ownership in the Planning Area, or something comparable, clearly identifying jurisdiction over various lands or interests in lands?	Yes (Map 1)	No change
Does the RMP identify specific lands, described by legal description as potentially suitable for disposal by sale or exchange? Does the RMP identify acquisition areas such as NCAs, wilderness areas, or other high resource lands, should they become available from a willing seller? Do these areas reflect current resource priorities for landownership adjustments (i.e. sage grouse habitat, mule deer winter range, etc.)? List any new priority areas not described in the RMP.	Yes. Yes (LAR-17). Yes	Correct Appendix 5
How are planning decisions in the RMP being applied to newly-acquired lands? Is future BLM management of the lands or interests in lands addressed in the EIS for the acquisition/exchange?	Yes, "manage same as adjacent"	No change
Does the RMP identify right-of-way corridors, avoidance areas, and exclusion areas? For avoidance areas, does the plan outline the terms and conditions that must be met in order for a right-of-way to be granted?	Yes (LAR-4, LAR-5)	No change
Does the RMP address the policies and actions under Executive Order (EO) 13211 of May 18, 2001 (President's National Energy Policy) toward expediting the supply and availability of energy in your RMP area?	Yes (Lands and Realty Goals and Objective)	No change
Does the RMP identify proposed land withdrawals? Does the RMP identify both previous and new land withdrawals?	Yes. No.	No change
How are planning decisions being applied to lands returned to the public domain from relinquished withdrawals, where administrative jurisdiction is or will likely be returned to the BLM?	Yes (LAR-13 and LAR-16)	No change
Monitoring	Verified all lands and realty monitoring requirements are current and achievable	No change

Question	Response	Action
Does the RMP identify air quality standards and, if appropriate, provide examples of prescriptive management practices to achieve them?	Yes - refers to CAA	No change
Does the RMP recognize the State's authority to regulate air quality impacts and establish emission standards?	Yes (goals and objectives)	No change
Does the RMP address impairment of visibility in federal and state Class I areas, including those which may be affected in adjacent states?	Yes	No change
Does the RMP identify existing non-attainment areas, state implementation plans (SIP), tribal implementation plans (TIP) when available, and measures/actions to meet conformity with SIP/TIPs?	N/A	No change
Was air quality modeling done for the RMP? If so, was the modeling qualitative or quantitative? Briefly describe the model used.	Air Emissions Inventory - looked at all activities authorized by RMP and estimated overall emissions. No modeling used.	No change
Based upon the information derived from modeling and/or monitoring, are air quality standards being met? If not, what management actions or mitigation measures are prescribed?	Standards are being met. RFD = 90 wells over 20 years. Yes, MOU states EPA/BLM/FS will work together and agree on process to evaluate air impacts related to O&G development.	No change
Is the plan consistent with the June 2011 Air Quality MOU for Oil and Gas projects?		No change
Monitoring	Verified all Air Quality monitoring requirements are current and achievable.	No change

Question	Response	Action
Does the RMP evaluate the availability of water and/or the need to develop additional water sources needed to manage wild horses and burros, livestock, wildlife, recreation, habitat and other beneficial uses allowed under state water law?	Yes (WAT-14 discusses applying for water rights; WL-20 discusses constructing water developments).	No Change
Does the RMP evaluate the availability of water within the plan area for fire suppression or other emergency needs?	Yes	No Change
Does the RMP contain prescriptions for and identify methods of application(s) for emergency fire rehabilitation/restoration?	Prescriptions are developed through NEPA process; RMP supports the process.	No Change
Does the RMP identify Bureau water rights policy, voluntary conformance with state water law, and provisions to perfect and protect sufficient water rights to meet land management activities (BLM 7250 Manual and Utah Water Rights Policy)?	Yes. WAT-14 covers this issue.	No Change
Monitoring	Verified all Water Resources monitoring requirements are current and achievable.	No Change

Question	Response	Action
Does the RMP discuss water quality, water quantity, and current or foreseeable beneficial uses in the planning area?	Water quality: yes. Water quantity: not specifically. Current or foreseeable beneficial uses: not yet. (Wat-14)	No Change
Does the RMP identify State water quality standards or establish water quality objectives where State standards are nonexistent? (BLM 7240 manual).	Yes (1,2)	No Change
Does the RMP identify area wide use restrictions and/or Best Management Practices to meet water quality requirements?	Yes (4, 13)	No Change
Are there any impaired water bodies in the planning area identified on the State of Utah's list (303d)? Are any impaired water bodies linked to public land use?	Yes (11) / change to include all 303(d) waters. Upper Sevier - TDS / runoff. North Fork - yes.	No Change
Does the RMP set objectives for the restoration of identified impaired waters?	Yes (2, 7, 9).	No Change
As appropriate, does the RMP refer to the state's Report on Water Quality (305b)?	Yes (1,6).	No Change
In view of the Unified Federal Policy and other provisions of the Clean Water Act, are there opportunities or needs to identify priority watersheds, or watersheds in need of special protection?	Yes. (11 would cover as well - 303 list becomes priority.)	No Change
Does the RMP recognize wellhead/source water protection areas and specify land-use restrictions to limit water quality degradation?	Yes (13,4,5).	No Change
Are management decisions prescribed on a watershed level? Explain.	Yes (all step-down NEPA happens on the watershed level).	No Change
Monitoring	Verified all Water Resources monitoring requirements are current and achievable.	No Change

Question	Response	Action
Does the RMP require the use of Proper Functioning Condition surveys to assess functionality of riparian areas?	Yes (10).	No change
Are there general goals to maintain functional riparian areas at PFC and to improve the condition of areas that are functioning-at-risk or non-functional so that such areas may achieve PFC?	Yes	No change
Does the RMP include objectives/management actions needed to achieve goals described under #2 (actions might also be described under other management areas such as vegetation, soils, sensitive species, etc.)?	Yes	No change
Are measures required to collect quantitative monitoring data and additional PFC surveys to evaluate effectiveness of stated management actions?	Yes (13,8)	No change
Monitoring	Covered in the Vegetation section Appendix 15.	No change

Question	Response	Action
Are soil survey data described and used to assess the suitability/capability of landscapes to achieve RMP objectives?	No soil survey existed at the time of RMP. Soil survey data held by NRCS has not yet been published.	No Change
Are soil survey data used to set priorities for restoration/rehabilitation and to guide development of site-specific prescriptions?	Yes	No Change
Are soil survey data used to identify erosion hazards or erodible classes throughout the planning area?	Yes	No Change
Does the RMP utilize or address the use of Ecological Site Descriptions for determining ecological site conditions and treatment options?	Not currently included in the plan.	No Change
Monitoring	Verified all Soil Resources monitoring requirements are current and achievable.	No Change

Question	Response	Action
Does the RMP provide adequate direction and flexibility for the District/Field Office to plan and implement vegetation treatment projects under programs such as the Watershed Restoration Initiative (WRI) and Healthy Landscapes?	Yes	No change
Does the RMP identify desired future conditions of vegetation resources for land management objectives?	Yes	No change
Does the RMP designate priority plant species and habitats, including special status species and populations of plants? List any priority species and habitats.	Critical habitat for milkweed designated, pincushion designated (yes).	No change
Does the RMP contain strategies to conserve threatened or endangered and special status plant species, including listed species and species proposed for listing?	Yes. Located in goals and objectives.	No change
Are the RMP decisions consistent with objectives and recommended actions in recovery plans, conservation agreements, and applicable biological opinions for threatened and endangered species?	Yes	No change
Does the RMP provide management direction to address the introduction and spread of noxious and invasive species?	Yes	No change
Is there a current inventory of noxious or invasive species for the planning area?	Yes	No change
Monitoring	Verified all Vegetation monitoring requirements are current and achievable.	No Change

Question	Response	Action
Does the RMP identify desired future conditions for health and distribution of forest resources (broken down by forest type)?	Yes, but its not broken down by forest type. Note: there is not a wide variety of forest types on KFO	Incorporate into the Woodland Management Action Plan
Does the RMP address old-growth features of the forest and woodland habitat types? Is management direction provided on how to maintain or contribute to the restoration of old growth forests?	Yes (see VEG-4)	No change
Does the RMP identify characteristics of healthy forest conditions for forest/woodland types?	Yes (see Vegetation goals and objectives)	No change
Does the RMP identify resources available for woodland product harvest and identify sustainable harvest levels in those areas?	Yes	No change
Does the RMP identify areas where commercial and/or non-commercial harvesting is open, restricted or withdrawn from commercial activities?	Yes	No change
Does the RMP comply with the objectives outlined in the Healthy Forest Initiative and the Healthy Forests Restoration Act?	Yes	No change
Does the RMP support utilization of biomass across broad landscapes and is it consistent with policy?	Yes	No change
Monitoring	Verified all Forestry and Woodland Products monitoring requirements are current and achievable.	No change

Question	Response	Action
Does the plan provide adequate direction and flexibility to implement actions to maintain or restore healthy rangelands in Utah?	Yes	No change
Does the RMP incorporate the Utah Standards and Guidelines for Rangeland Health for livestock grazing management? Does the RMP apply the standards to all programs and uses?	Yes and yes.	No change
Does the RMP identify lands available or not available for livestock grazing? Have the criteria for identifying lands available for grazing changed since the RMP was completed?	Yes, lands have been identified as available or not available for livestock grazing; no, the criteria have not changed.	No change
Monitoring	Verified all Livestock Grazing monitoring requirements are current and achievable.	No change

Question	Response	Action
How well do the Fire Planning Units (FPU) match up with FPU of adjoining BLM districts in Utah, and adjoining states?	Well	No change
In cases where FPU do not match, is there sufficient rationale to validate the FPU boundaries for the planning area?	Does not apply	No change
Does the RMP present any constraints or issues relative to complying with the Wildland Fire Policy? If so, please explain.	No	No change
Does the RMP present any constraints to approving biomass utilization or stewardship projects for energy production, commercial and/or non-commercial uses (e.g., public woodcutting, commercial, co-generation energy production, etc.)?	No	No change
Does the RMP conform to current policies on Fire Management Planning for identifying fire management units (FMU)?	Yes	No change
Does the RMP provide objectives for appropriate use of managed fire for resource benefit?	Yes, see Table 1 Desired Wildland Fire Condition	No change
Monitoring	fuels shop in Cedar City documents condition class Y as part of their annual Fuels Review	No change

Question	Response	Action
Does the RMP address special cultural and paleontological resource issues, including traditional cultural properties and NRHP-eligible or listed districts or sites that may affect the location, timing, or method of development or use of other resources in the planning area?	Yes	No change
Does the RMP refer to requirements for consultation under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act and other laws and directives for with tribal governments, including general timeframes for completing consultation?	Yes	No change
Does the RMP adequately describe or summarize the extent and type of significant archaeological resources known and assign cultural resources to the use categories specified in BLM Manuals?	Yes	No change
Does the RMP fully protect significant cultural and paleontological resources through special designations? Do route and area travel designations in the RMP address cultural and paleontological resource needs and protection?	Yes. Cottonwood Canyon ACEC (cultural is a big part). Yes (class ii and class iii surveys).	No change No change
Does the RMP allow for the definition and management of Traditional Cultural Properties?	Yes	No change
Does the RMP address land use applications that may affect cultural and paleontological resources, including tribal resources?	Yes	No change
Are the decisions in the RMP based on adequate cultural and paleontological resource data as specified in BLM Planning Guidance? Is a new Class I overview needed?	Yes and yes (a new Class I overview needed).	No change
Does the RMP include goals of identifying, preserving, and protecting significant cultural and paleo resources and ensuring that they are available for present and future use?	Yes	No change
Does the RMP include the stated goal of reducing threats and resolving potential conflicts by ensuring compliance with NHPA Section 106 and Paleontological Resource Protection Act?	NHPA section 106: yes; PRPA compliance needs to be updated.	No change
Monitoring	Verified all Cultural/Paleo Resources monitoring requirements are current and achievable.	No change

Question	Response	Action
Do all special management designations have clear management objectives? If not, explain.	Yes	No change
Does the planning area have overlapping special management designations and if so, are the management objectives conflicting with one another? This could include an ACEC or SRMA overlapping a WSA, or various OHV designations within a single management area.	Yes (Cottonwood Canyon overlaps with WSA). No conflict	No change
Does the District have designated wilderness? If so, has a wilderness management plan completed?	Yes, yes	No change
Are there citizen-proposed wilderness areas identified in the planning area. If so, describe.	Yes (Red Rock Wilderness)	No change
Does the RMP state clearly that Wilderness Study Areas will be managed under the “Interim Management Policy (IMP) for Lands under Wilderness Review” (H-8550-1) or BLM Manual 6330 “Management of Wilderness Study Areas”?	Most references are to the IMP, which has been superseded by a more current manual.	Update all IMP references to wilderness manual
Has the District wilderness characteristics inventory been updated since the original inventory?	Yes	No change
Does the RMP identify lands with wilderness characteristics and apply management constraints to some lands identified as possessing wilderness characteristics?	Yes	No change
Are allocations appropriate for areas with wilderness characteristics that have been designated for protection of the wilderness values?	Yes	No change
Do planning decisions identify wilderness study areas as either designated or closed to OHV use? Do planning decisions identify OHV use within Wilderness Study Areas as limited to “designated” ways or “closed to OHV use”?	Yes	No change
Are wild and scenic river studies completed for the planning area which identify and evaluate river segments to determine eligibility, tentative classification, protection requirements, and suitability?	Yes	No change
For public lands along streams identified as potentially suitable for inclusion in the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System, have interim management measures been established?	Yes	No change

Question	Response	Action
Does the RMP contain a separate section on managing National Historic Trails as specified by BLM Manual 6280?	Yes The RMP covers this under the Other Designations section on page 128. The Old Spanish Trail is mentioned by name and it is clear BLM will be a participant in establish Historic Trail Corridors as necessary.	No change No change
Does the RMP establish National Historic Trail Management Corridors as specified by BLM Manual 6280, or address how such corridors will be established in the future?	Yes, in progress	No change
Are there National Historic Trails designated on the District? If so, has a comprehensive trail management plan been completed? Are there objectives and management actions identified through either the RMP or the comprehensive management plan, for high priority trail segments or segments eligible or listed on the NHRP?	Yes	No change
Is the plan consistent with updated National Conservation Lands policies?	Yes	No change
Does the RMP address Area of Critical Environmental Concern (ACECs)?	Yes	No change
Does the RMP outline management objectives and restrictions that would apply to the ACECs?	Yes	No change
Have management plans been developed for designated ACECs that identify objectives and management actions? Does the plan identify protective management for relevance and importance values?	Part of RMP; there are no separate management plans for ACECs.	No change
If the RMP says that activity (implementation) plans will be developed for Special Designations such as ACECs, Wild & Scenic Rivers, Wilderness or National Scenic & Historic Trails; have these plans been completed? If the RMP say that activity plans will be developed for other designated management areas such as SRMAs, Back Country Byways, OHV use areas, etc...; have these plans been completed? If so, list the name of the plan and date it was completed.	Yes, Old Spanish National Historic Trail. Activity plan has been started.	No change
Monitoring	Verified that all monitoring requirements for non-WSA lands with Wilderness Characteristics; ACECs; Wild and Scenic Rivers; Wilderness; Wilderness Study Areas; and Other Designations are current and achievable.	No change

Question	Response	Action
Does the RMP identify the allowable kinds and levels of recreational use to protect or conserve other resource values in the planning area? List any limitations or restrictions on recreational activities to protect or conserve other resource values.	Yes (e.g. group size limits, buffers for riparian, designated roads)	No change
Does the RMP identify allowable kinds and level of land uses to sustain recreational values? List any limitations or restrictions on land uses to sustain recreational values.	Yes (e.g. no grazing in campgrounds, mining restrictions)	No change
Have the Recreation Management issues changed since the RMP was completed? If yes, how are those issues being handled?	No	No change
Are all public lands clearly designated as SRMAs, ERMA's, or public lands not designated as recreation management areas?	Yes	No change
Does the RMP identify recreation setting characteristics? Are recreation management zones identified for SRMAs (wherever necessary)?	Yes	No change
Does the RMP include management objectives for the specific recreation opportunities to be produced in both SRMAS and ERMA's?	Yes (e.g. activities identified by SRMA)	No change
Are there significant cave resources present? If yes, are specific management goals outlined for the preservation or protection of significant cave resources?	No	No change
Monitoring	Verified that all monitoring requirements for Recreation are current and achievable.	No change

Question	Response	Action
Does the RMP identify all public lands as; open, limited, or closed to OHV use?	Yes, by polygon	No change
Are the OHV designations still meeting resource objectives?	Yes	No change
Does the RMP outline travel prescriptions under each designation?	Yes	No change
Have implementation level travel plans been completed? If not, does the RMP provide a mechanism to complete an implementation plan? Explain.	Yes (roads numbered, signed, mapped, published)	There are a number of existing routes discovered after the plan was signed that need to be incorporated into (identified in) the travel plan.
Is the plan consistent with updated TTM policy/manual?	Yes	No change
Monitoring	Verified that all monitoring requirements for Travel and Transportation Management are current and achievable.	No change

Question	Response	Action
Does the RMP identify visual resource management classes?	Yes	No change
Do the VRM management classes consider the relationships between the visual resource inventory values and resource allocations?	Yes	No change
Are the constraints imposed by the VRM classes appropriate for protecting sensitive resources and managing development?	Yes, errs on side of more strict The RMP includes VRM classes. Visual resource inventory was completed for Kanab FO between 2010-2012.	No change No change
Does the RMP include visual resource inventory classes and visual resource management classes?	Verified that all monitoring requirements for Visual Resources are current and achievable.	No change
Monitoring	This is discussing the necessity to ensure approved projects apply the mitigation measures for VRM during the construction phase.	No change
"The number of areas/projects monitored for compliance with WRM objectives will be reported in the Annual Program summary" (Appendix 15, p. A15-4)		

Question	Response	Action
Do the designated Herd Management Areas (HMA) in the RMP contain adequate water and forage to maintain the Appropriate Management Level (AML) and achieve a thriving ecologic balance?		N/A
Do the existing populations in HMA's confine their use within the HMA?		N/A
Are there opportunities to expand HMA's where WH&B populations regularly stray from the HMA?	No Wild Horses or Burros in the KFO planning area	N/A
Are there HMA's where conditions are such (ecological, animal health, public safety, etc.) that the population should be removed and the HMA returned to Herd Area status?		N/A
Does the RMP identify guidelines and criteria to limit population growth within the HMA		N/A

Question	Response	Action
Does the RMP identify priority wildlife species and habitats?	Yes	No change
Are there management plans or prescriptions in place for priority habitats?	Yes	No change
Does the RMP contain measurable objectives for desired wildlife habitat conditions for major habitat types?	Yes	No change
Are the Western Association of the Fish and Wildlife Agency (WAFWA) guidelines for wildlife (sage grouse, mule deer, bighorn sheep, etc.) incorporated into the RMP?	Yes	No change
Does the RMP provide adequate direction to protect migratory birds and their associated habitat?	Yes	No change
Does the RMP provide adequate direction to protect raptors and their associated habitat?	Yes	No change
Has the RMP undergone Section 7 consultation for all listed species within the planning area?	Yes	No change
Are RMP decisions consistent with the supporting Biological Assessments, Biological Opinions, and Recovery Plans? If not, explain.	Yes	No change
Does the RMP contain strategies to conserve threatened or endangered and special status species, including listed species, species proposed for listing, and BLM sensitive species?	Yes. Cuckoo has since been listed but Kanab FO does not have any critical habitat	No change
Does the RMP provide direction to manage priority wildlife, fish, T&E, rare plants, including transplant, augmentations, seasonal restrictions, guidelines, etc.?	Yes	No change
Does the RMP provide objectives and actions for containing the potential spread of wildlife diseases, such as adequate separation between domestic and wild species; or white nose syndrome?	Yes	No change
Does the RMP contain effective strategies for no net loss threatened or endangered, special status or sensitive species?	Yes	No change
Does the RMP include use of the State Wildlife Action Plan? Does the RMP include consideration of climate adaptation for T&E, and BLM sensitive species (i.e. keeping pathways open for movement to refugia, etc.)?	The KFO RMP does not specifically incorporate by reference the State Wildlife Action Plan, however the RMP has been determined to be consistent.	No change
Monitoring	Verified all Fish and Wildlife monitoring requirements are current and achievable.	No change

Question	Response	Action
Does the RMP incorporate BLM's Wind Energy Development Policy? If not, how is wind energy being addressed?	Yes (LAR-25)	No change
Does the RMP incorporate the allocations and stipulations developed through the National Wind, Solar, and Geothermal PEISs? If not explain:	No geothermal in KFO planning area. 2010 Solar PEIS amended Kanab RMP: 18,633 acres identified as potentially available for utility-scale solar energy development outside of a solar energy zone (i.e., variance areas). Management decisions for supporting linear infrastructure, including available lands, are defined in the existing Kanab RMP.	No change
Does the RMP reference the DOE/BLM publication of February 2003 on Assessing the Potential for Renewable Energy on public land? If not, how is renewable energy being addressed?	No. Lands and Realty Goals and Objectives address renewable energy.	No change
Does the RMP incorporate the Solar Energy Development Policy (IM 2007-097 updated to IM 2011-003 and extended to 9/30/15)? If not, how is solar energy addressed?	Solar addressed in LAR-26 LAR-8 (non-electrocution standards for raptors). SSS-14. Raptor guidelines developed in 1999, updated in 2002 and doesn't address renewable specifically.	No change
Does the RMP address or incorporate the Fish and Wildlife Service Bald and Golden Eagle Guidelines with respect to renewable energy development? If not, how are these guidelines being addressed?	Not specifically referenced. LAR-25 addresses Wind PEIS	No change
Does the RMP reference the 2008 BLM/DOD Wind Energy Protocol? If not, explain:		
Does the RMP address transmission issues and identify transmission corridors? If corridors are identified, do they adequately match corridors established on the other side of the boundaries (i.e. does the corridor extend beyond the boundary of the RMP into the jurisdiction of the next RMP, and are they consistent across boundaries with respect to corridor widths, requirements, etc.)?	Yes (Lands and Realty Goals and Objective, bullet 8)	No change

Question	Response	Action
Does the RMP provide for orderly corridor planning to meet current National needs and technological trends?	One identified corridor (Highway 89)	No change
Does the RMP adequately consider ROW corridors, ROW use areas, and other ROW issues as outlined in IM 2002-196 Right of Way Management – Land Use Planning (6/26/02)?	Yes (LAR-4 through LAR-10)	No change
Does the scope of designated corridors within the planning area accommodate existing, compatible, proposed and/or new uses?	Yes	No change
Do designated corridors have appropriate width given potential and existing uses or energy demand?	Yes	No change
Are there resource management objectives for TES for designated corridors?	Yes (Utah Prairie Dog)	No change
Are there vegetation management objectives identified specifically within designated corridors that provide for sustainability of habitat while accommodating long-term maintenance of rights of way within the corridor?	No vegetation management objectives specific to corridors.	No change

Question	Response	Action
Does the RMP address the intent of WO-IM-2012-117 leasing reform? I.E: a) Standardized Stipulations; b) Master Leasing Plans; c) Lease sale parcel review process?	surface stipulations applicable to oil and gas leasing, as well as other surface disturbing activities, are outlined in Appendix 3. RFD was developed for leasable minerals; relatively low level of interest and development potential	No change

Question	Response	Action
Does the RMP address mitigation and monitoring in such a way to meet the Regional Mitigation objectives as identified in BLM 1794 Manual [draft] on Regional Mitigation? If not, does the plan require maintenance to incorporate the new 1794 Manual?	BLM Manual 1794 is still in draft form.	No change

Question	Response	Action
Does the RMP recognize the 2009 BLM Air Quality Manual (MS 7300) and assess climate change as required by Secretarial Order 3289-I and Departmental Manual 523 DMI (dated 12/20/2012)?	No. Rough analysis done in EIS.	No change
Does the RMP analysis address greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions for affected resource programs such as fluid mineral production or other activities with GHG generating potential?	No	No change
Does the RMP analysis address climate change effects and adaptation measures on natural resources? Explain: Has the planning area been inventoried for terrestrial or subsurface carbon sequestration potential?	No - no observations of changes to resources. No	No change No change
Are there areas of terrestrial or subsurface carbon sequestration potential in the planning area as evidenced by applications to explore or develop?	No	No change
Kanab RMP includes monitoring for Drought and Natural Disasters (Appendix 15, p. A15-4)	Monitoring requirements are achievable.	No change

Question**Response****Action**

Does the RMP provide adequate policy to preserve or enhance sage-grouse habitat and implement sage-grouse conservation planning? [Note: Greater-sage grouse in Richfield, Kanab, Vernal, and Price planning areas; Gunnison sage-grouse in Moab and Monticello planning areas.]

Utah GRSG ARPMA will amend KFO RMP for sage-grouse

Plan on future LUP amendment/maintenance sheet to document changes

Question	Response	Action
Is the RMP geospatial data in digital format? If not, is it in hardcopy and do you know where the spatial data is located?	Yes	No change
Does the geospatial data meet BLM National data standards where they exist?	Yes	No change
Is the geospatial planning data managed and archived according to WO IM 2003-238?	It was archived by the UTSO and KFO has a copy with admin record	No change
Is the RMP selected alternative geospatial data incorporated into the corporate data for the State and District?	As data calls from the UTSO happen	No change
Does the geospatial data for the RMP have metadata? If so, is this metadata up to date and maintained? If there is no metadata, explain:	There was metadata created for the final RMP data. There has been almost no changes to the data so the data is considered to be up to date.	No change

Question	Response	Action
Are management actions outlined in the plan in the plan being implemented?	Yes, contingent on funding and staff.	No change
Does the RMP have an implementation schedule and is it current?	Kanab RMP Implementation Framework worksheet dated July 14, 2009	Update or develop new schedule
Is the rate and degree to which plan implementation is being completed meeting the goals and objectives of the RMP?	Yes	No change
Are management actions (decisions implemented) effective in achieving management goals and objectives?	Yes	No change

Question	Response	Action
Are there major changes in the related plans of other agencies (including tribal, state and county) since the RMP was approved which are resulting in RMP direction to be inconsistent with the direction contained in those plans? None noted		No change

Question	Response	Action
Are there new data or analyses that significantly affect the planning decisions or validity of the NEPA analysis?	Not at this time	No change
Are there unmet needs or new opportunities that can best be met through a plan amendment or revision, or will current management be sufficient?	Suggested amendments noted in the evaluation report.	No change
Are new inventories warranted pursuant to the BLM's duty to maintain inventories on a continuous basis (FLPMA Section 201)?	Required inventories are on-going	No change
Based on this evaluation, is there sufficient cause to warrant amendment or revision of the RMP to accommodate implementation of National and State priorities and initiatives? If so, identify the program area(s) which warrant plan modification and the initiative/priorities affected.	No	No change
Based on new information or circumstances, is there sufficient cause to warrant completing supplemental NEPA analyses or RFDs to keep the RMP current? If so, identify the specific program areas which require focused supplemental analysis or RFDs.	No	No change

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
<i>Air Quality</i>						
AQ-1	Manage air quality in accordance with the air quality standards prescribed by federal, state, and local laws, regulations, and policies including the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Applicable National Ambient Air Quality Standards • Applicable National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants • State or tribal implementation plans • Prevention of Significant Deterioration (PSD), if applicable • Conformity analyses and determinations • Regional haze regulations, including visibility impacts on mandatory federal Class I areas • Utah Smoke Management Plan. 	x				
AQ-2	Comply with the Clean Air Act through the application of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process on a case-by-case basis.	x				
AQ-3	Comply with Utah Administrative Code Regulation R307-205, which prohibits the use, maintenance, or construction of roadways in disturbed areas without taking appropriate dust abatement measures. Compliance would be obtained through site-specific stipulations identified on a case-by-case basis for new projects and through the use of dust abatement	x				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	control techniques in problem areas.					
AQ-4	Mitigate actions that compromise ambient air quality standards or visibility within the Class I air areas.	x				
AQ-5	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.	x				
AQ-6	BLM will continue to work cooperatively with the Utah Airshed Group to manage emissions from wildland and prescribed fire activities.					Federal and state land managers and the DAQ signed an MOU and formed a management group called the Utah Airshed Oversight Group, whose function is to manage, oversee and evaluate Utah's Smoke Management Plan (1999). The group meets at least annually to conduct necessary business, discuss smoke issues, and to recommend necessary amendments to the management plan.
AQ-7	National Ambient Air Quality Standards are enforced by the Utah Department of Environmental Quality, Division of Air Quality,	x				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	with Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) oversight. Special requirements to reduce potential air quality impacts will be considered on a case-by-case basis in processing land use authorizations.					
AQ-8	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.	x				
AQ-9	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.	x				
<i>Soil Resources</i>						
SOL-1	Implement BMPs designed to minimize impacts on soils from ground disturbing activities, as appropriate (Appendix 1).	x				
SOL-2	Reduce soil loss on watersheds by performing appropriate land treatments (Map 5).	x				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
SOL-3	Land treatments would be prioritized in the following fifth-field watersheds: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Upper Sevier River Watershed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Pass Creek/Sevier River - City Creek/Sevier River - Bear Creek/Sevier River. • Upper Virgin River/Kanab Creek Watersheds: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Muddy Creek - Upper Kanab Creek - Skutumpah/Mill Creek. 	x				Upper Sevier River Watershed has a plan; Upper Virgin River does not yet have a plan; Kanab Creek Watershed plan is in progress.
SOL-4	Initiate reclamation of surface disturbances, where appropriate, during or upon completion of the authorized project.	x				
SOL-5	Close and reclaim temporary roads upon completion of the project that required the roads.	x				
SOL-6	Remove and reclaim facilities or improvements no longer necessary or desirable, provided no historic properties are affected.	x				
SOL-7	Identify areas of “fragile soils” during preparation of project-level plans, as well as necessary mitigation measures to minimize risks and degradation.	x				
SOL-8	Develop and implement site-specific restrictions and/or mitigations for activities proposed in fragile soil areas on a case-by-case basis. Surface disturbing activities must be approved by the BLM before construction and maintenance is authorized.	x				
SOL-9	Allow surface disturbance in fragile soil areas	x				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	as long as impacts would be mitigated or disturbance would be beneficial to rangeland health.					
SOL-10	Preclude cross-country OHV use in areas identified as fragile soils to minimize soil loss and salinity of water runoff.	x				
SOL-11	Allow land treatments (i.e., vegetation treatment and soil stabilization) in fragile soil areas where such treatment would reduce erosion and restore watersheds.	x				
SOL-12	Manage land uses according to the Standards for Rangeland Health (Appendix 16) to maintain or improve soil conditions.	x				
SOL-13	Incorporate BMPs and soil protection measures into developments on sensitive soils. Measures to stabilize soils and minimize surface water runoff would be required for slopes greater than 15 percent, both during project activities and following project completion.	x				
Water Resources						
WAT-1	Monitor water quality in coordination with the State Division of Water Quality to determine if progress toward meeting water quality standards and watershed objectives is being achieved.	x				
WAT-2	Monitor the management activities to determine if progress toward meeting watershed objectives is being achieved. Make appropriate adjustments where and when necessary to ensure progress toward meeting watershed objectives.	x				
WAT-3	Implement BMPs designed to protect water quality	x				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	for all ground disturbing activities (Appendix 1).					
WAT-4	Provide for the improvement and protection of water quality of the culinary water supply for Fredonia, Arizona, by limiting livestock grazing and OHV use above the legally approved water collection points for the city in Cottonwood and South Fork Indian Canyons.	x				
WAT-5	Identify public water systems with surface water or groundwater sources (i.e., 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.	x				
WAT-6	Coordinate with local, state, tribal, and federal authorities on water- and riparian-related issues.	x				
WAT-7	Implement BMPs designed to improve vegetation cover and reduce soil erosion for surface disturbing activities, especially with regard to sources of saline sediments in the Colorado River Basin (Appendix 1). Coordinate with the Virgin River Management Plan Watershed Advisory Committee (and other applicable committees for other Colorado River tributaries) to reduce salinity.	x				
WAT-8	Improve watershed health by performing appropriate land treatments (Map 5).	x				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
WAT-9	Land treatments would be prioritized in the following fifth-field watersheds: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Upper Sevier River Watershed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Pass Creek/Sevier River - City Creek/Sevier River - Bear Creek/Sevier River • Upper Virgin River/Kanab Creek Watersheds: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Muddy Creek - Upper Kanab Creek - Skutumpah/Mill Creek. 	x				
WAT-10	Continue to cooperatively implement the Upper Sevier River Watershed Management Plan with the Upper Sevier Watershed Committee.	x				
WAT-11	Manage the Sevier River in accordance with the total maximum daily load (TMDL) and Upper Sevier River Watershed Management Plan.		x			Change wording to be more general, to include all 303 listings.
WAT-12	Avoid or minimize impacts on water quality through the application of specific mitigation measures identified in activity-level plans.	x				
WAT-13	Manage oil and gas leasing as open to leasing subject to moderate constraints to protect culinary water supply as directed by the Land Use Agreement for Kanab City Existing Wells in the following sections: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • T 42 S R 6 W Sections 19, 31 • T 42 S R 7 W Sections 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 34, 35. In these areas (1) oil and gas well placement would be relocated to eliminate potential	x				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	contamination sources or pollution sources, and/or (2) design standards would be implemented to prevent contaminated discharges to groundwater.					
WAT-14	Cooperate with the State Division of Water Rights and apply for state water rights to meet resource objectives, as necessary.	x				
WAT-15	Cooperate with the Utah Division of Water Quality; Utah Division of Oil, Gas, and Mining; and affected water users to address permitting requirements for any proposed treatment, surface discharge, or underground injection of water produced during mineral exploration and production (Utah Administrative Rule R649-5, Underground Injection Control of Recovery Operations and Class II Injection Wells).	x				
WAT-16	Apply coalbed natural gas BMPs to preserve groundwater quality (Appendix 1).	x				
WAT-17	Encourage treatment (as needed) and onsite or offsite beneficial use of produced water, so long as that water is of adequate quality and the rate of use does not cause adverse impacts on other resources. If treatment of produced water is not practical, require reinjection or offsite disposal.	x				
WAT-18	Do not allow surface discharge of produced water in the Colorado River Basin.	x				
Vegetation						
VEG-1	Apply Standards for Rangeland Health (Appendix 16) to all rangelands.	x				
VEG-2	Apply Guidelines for Grazing Management on	x				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	BLM Lands in Utah (BLM 1997a) and Guidelines for Recreation Management for Public Lands in Utah [BLM no date] for maintenance and rehabilitation of rangelands.					
VEG-3	Rehabilitation target would be to manage for 51 percent or higher of Potential Natural Community (PNC) unless site-specific management objectives for other resources dictate otherwise (e.g., special status species adapted to 0 percent to 25 percent of PNC).	x				
VEG-4	Identify, maintain, and restore forest and woodland old-growth stands to a pre-fire suppression condition. Adopt the U.S. Forest Service (USFS) old-growth definitions and identification standards as per the USFS document Characteristics of Old-Growth Forests in the Intermountain Region (Hamilton 1993). In instances where the area of application in the previous document does not apply (for example, Pinus edulis), use the document Recommended Old-Growth Definitions and Descriptions, USDA Forest Service Southwestern Region (USFS 1992).	x				
VEG-5	Maintain and/or enhance riparian areas (Utah Riparian Management Policy 2005) through project design features and/or stipulations that protect riparian resources.		x			Add: “or most current policy” within parentheses.
VEG-6	Consult with water rights holders when rights-of-way (ROW) are renewed or amended to determine if water necessary to prevent riparian and aquatic degradation could be left in-stream through design	x				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	or operation stipulations.					
VEG-7	Analyze proposed new or amended ROWs for water diversions to determine the amount of water that must be retained to prevent riparian and aquatic degradation. Incorporate design and operation stipulations as necessary to protect riparian and aquatic resources.	x				
VEG-8	Monitor riparian conditions, as needed, for any surface disturbing activity that could affect riparian areas.	x				
VEG-9	Retain riparian areas in the public ownership unless it can be clearly demonstrated that specific sites cannot be managed in an effective manner by the BLM or through agreements. Exchanges involving public land containing riparian areas would generally not be allowed unless it could be shown that parcels containing superior public values are being acquired or that existing riparian areas would be enhanced.	x				
VEG-10	Prioritize monitoring in functioning at-risk and then non-functioning riparian areas. Additional monitoring would occur on an as-needed basis (e.g., to assess impacts of specific projects or to establish reference conditions).	x				
VEG-11	Prioritize rehabilitation efforts and management adjustments in functioning at-risk and then non-functioning riparian areas where livestock grazing has been determined to be a significant contributing factor. As opportunities arise (e.g., cooperative proposals), actions would also be	x				The Kanab Field Office is currently working with the State of Utah to perform and intense grazing study on the North fork of the

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	taken to initiate recovery and rehabilitation within the site's potential in non-functioning riparian areas.					Virgin river to address high E. coli levels found in the river.
VEG-12	Emphasize management of uses rather than structural efforts when rehabilitating degraded riparian areas.	x				
VEG-13	As necessary and appropriate (indicated by monitoring results and interdisciplinary analysis), livestock numbers, seasons of use, and grazing systems would be modified when necessary to meet riparian objectives.	x				
VEG-14	Existing and new water developments would be maintained and/or managed to reduce detrimental impacts on riparian areas (i.e., dewatering) and to change grazing management within riparian areas when grazing has been identified as a significant contributing factor.	x				
VEG-15	Fencing, erosion control structures, and vegetation treatments would each be an option where changes in use would not meet management objectives within the desired time frame.	x				
VEG-16	Do not allow new surface disturbing activities within 330 feet of riparian/wetland areas unless it could be shown that (1) there are no practical alternatives, (2) all long-term impacts could be fully mitigated, or (3) the activity would benefit and enhance the riparian area.	x				
VEG-17	Maintain sufficient water, to the extent possible, to sustain native flora and fauna when developing/redeveloping springs. Return unused or	x				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	overflow water to its original drainage.					
VEG-18	Permit commercial seed collection. Areas and species available for commercial collection would be determined on a case-by-case basis as climatic conditions allow, in accordance with statewide guidance and policy.	x				
VEG-19	Allow vegetation materials use (excluding seed collection, which is addressed above; pine nut harvest; and forest and woodland products) and collection in specified areas identified by permit on a case-by-case basis as climatic conditions allow.	x				
VEG-20	Allow the collection/harvesting of vegetative materials in riparian areas in proper functioning condition on a case-by-case basis as climatic conditions allow.	x				
VEG-21	Allow Native American non-commercial traditional use of vegetation products for the collection of herbs, medicines, traditional use items, or items necessary for traditional, religious, or ceremonial purposes, through permits.	x				
VEG-22	Implement noxious weed and invasive species control actions as per national guidance and local weed management plans in cooperation with state and federal agencies, affected counties, adjoining private land owners, and other interests directly affected.	x				
VEG-23	Apply approved weed control methods to all invasive species in an integrated weed management program (including preventive	x				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	management; education; and mechanical, biological, wildland or prescribed fire, and chemical techniques).					
VEG-24	Use minimum tool analysis (in designated wilderness) or the non-impairment standard (in WSAs) to identify vegetation treatment methods and approved herbicides to treat invasive plants such as tamarisk and Russian olive for the purpose of restoring ecological conditions and functions.	x				
VEG-25	Require certified weed-free feed for all stock to limit the introduction and spread of noxious weeds and other undesirable species.	x				
VEG-26	Manage relict plant communities and hanging gardens to maintain and enhance the biological diversity and health of these areas.	x				
VEG-27	Restrict surface occupancy (NSO) for surface disturbing activities to protect relict vegetation at Diana's Throne and Elephant Butte.	x				
VEG-28	Recommend Diana's Throne and Elephant Butte for withdrawal from mineral entry.	x				Note: Low priority compared to other areas
VEG-29	Protect hanging gardens by implementing the no surface disturbance actions identified in the Riparian section of this chapter.	x				
VEG-30	Treat sagebrush steppe communities to restore natural disturbance processes and a healthy, diverse mosaic of different height and age structures with components of native grasses and forbs and an appropriate pinyon-juniper component for a given ecological site. Mosaics may include stands of young and old sagebrush,	x				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	openings (ranging from bare ground to short or sparse vegetation to high-density grasslands), wet meadows, seeps, healthy streamside (riparian) vegetation, and other interspersed shrub and woodland habitats.					
VEG-31	Follow the Connelly guidelines (Connelly et al. 2000) for vegetation treatment prescriptions for projects occurring in occupied and/or historic Greater sage-grouse habitat. Adjust and/or modify these guidelines with cooperators (e.g., Utah Division of Wildlife Resources [UDWR], local sage-grouse working group, and Utah Partners for Conservation and Development, as necessary, within the range of variability described in the appropriate ecological site description.		x			Will be amended by GRSG LUPA
VEG-32	Limit acres of vegetation treatments (e.g., wildlife habitat treatments, watershed treatments, livestock rangeland treatments, fuels treatments, and stewardship contracting) to an annual average of no more than 22,300 acres (446,000 acres over the life of the plan).		x			Change “wildland fire use” to “use of wildland fire” (NWCG. Oct. 2014. <i>Glossary of Wildland Fire Terminology PMS 205</i>) 150,000 acres NEPA approved. Since the plan was signed in 2008 the FO has completed 30,936 acres of treatment.
VEG-33	Use the full range of upland vegetation treatment methods and tools (i.e., prescribed	x				Change “wildland fire use” to “use of

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	fire, mechanical, chemical, biological, woodland product removal, and wildland fire use).					wildland fire”
VEG-34	Vegetation treatments may be authorized where protection of sensitive resources would be ensured.	x				
VEG-35	Focus restoration or vegetation treatment projects based on the following factors: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Restore areas functioning at less than 51 percent of PNC • Restore areas with noxious weed and/or non-native invasive plants • Maintain previously treated areas • Achieve other objectives identified in this RMP • Restore special status species habitats to achieve long-term conservation and recovery objectives • Achieve rangeland health objectives. 	x				
VEG-36	Manage areas with ponderosa pine to maintain the stand health through use of stand health exams, vegetation treatments, wildland fire, and prescriptions on permitted activities on a case-by-case basis. Manage stands to be predominantly park like, resilient to low-intensity fire, and have normally expected levels of mortality.	x				
VEG-37	Focus treatment objectives in ponderosa pine vegetation communities on restoring natural disturbance processes such as fire; increasing vegetative ground cover of native grasses, forbs,	x				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	and shrubs; and removing invasive, non-native species.					
<i>Special Status Species (Threatened, Endangered, and Sensitive)</i>						
SSS-1	Implement Recovery Plan, Conservation Agreement, and Strategy decisions to increase populations and improve habitat of special status species, including federally listed species, by enhancing, protecting, and restoring occupied and potential habitat.	x				
SSS-2	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.	x				
SSS-3	Develop and implement monitoring and conservation measures for listed and non-listed special status species and their habitats where land use and human disturbances have been identified as having potential for adverse impacts.	x				
SSS-4	Incorporate USFWS references for listed species, designated critical habitat, down-listed or de-listed species, and non-listed special status species into management actions authorized within the decision area.	x				
SSS-5	Work with the UDWR to implement the Utah Comprehensive Wildlife Conservation Strategy (UDWR 2005a) to coordinate management actions that would conserve native species and prevent the need for additional listings (WO IM 2006-114).		x			Change to “most current policy”

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
SSS-6	Apply lease notices and conservation measures (Appendix 9) to leases and other applicable activities occurring in special status species habitat.	x				
SSS-7	Avoid, control, or regulate surface disturbing and disruptive activities on a case-by-case basis to minimize impacts on identified crucial habitat for sensitive species for the purpose of protecting these species and their associated habitats.	x				
SSS-8	Should special status species be found, temporarily stop surface disturbing and disruptive activities until species-specific protective and/or mitigative measures are developed and implemented, in consultation with USFWS and/or UDWR when applicable.	x				
SSS-9	Apply BMPs to avoid or reduce fragmenting habitat, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Collocating communication and other facilities • Employing directional drilling for oil and gas • Using topographic and vegetative screening to reduce the influence of intrusions. 		x			Will be amended by Utah GRSG LUPA
SSS-10	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 offsite, or in accordance with current guidance.		x			Reference “most current” regional mitigation policy
SSS-11	Implement conservation measures (Appendix 9)	x				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	on actions affecting bald eagles or their habitat.					
SSS-12	Do not authorize future ground disturbing activities within ½ mile of active bald eagle nest sites year-round. Deviations may be made only after appropriate levels of consultation and coordination with USFWS.	x				
SSS-13	Manage stands of ponderosa pine for winter roosting sites for bald eagles and nesting sites for other raptors (see Vegetation section for specific management).	x				
SSS-14	Use BMPs (Appendix 2) to implement raptor guidelines established by USFWS.	x				
SSS-15	Work with UDWR to identify locations for all known special status raptor species nests, roost sites, and winter roost sites on or within ½ mile of BLM lands.	x				
SSS-16	Prohibit surface disturbing activities within ½ mile around special status raptor species nest sites during the following time periods: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mar 1–Aug 1: Ferruginous hawk • Mar 1–Aug 15: N. Goshawk. 	x				
SSS-17	Prohibit surface disturbing activities within ¼ mile around special status raptor species nest sites during the following time periods: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mar 1–Aug 1: Short-eared owl • Mar 1–Aug 31: Burrowing owl. 	x				
SSS-18	Comply with Suggested Practices for Raptor Protection on Power Lines: The State of the Art in 2006 (Avian Power Line Interaction Committee 2006) and Avian Protection Plan		x			Add “or most current direction”

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	(APP) Guidelines (Avian Power Line Interaction Committee and USFWS 2005) for new powerline construction (including upgrades and reconstruction) to prevent electrocution of raptors.					
SSS-19	Protect unoccupied special status species raptor nests in compliance with BLM's raptor BMPs (Appendix 2).	x				
SSS-20	Avoid disruptive activities in California condor communal roosting or nesting areas. Appropriate measures would depend on whether the proposed activity is temporary or permanent, and whether it occurs within or outside the condor nesting season. (A temporary action is completed outside of the breeding season, leaving no permanent structures and resulting in no permanent habitat loss. A permanent action continues for more than one breeding season and/or causes a loss of condor habitat or displaces condors through disturbances, i.e., creation of a permanent structure.)	x				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
SSS-21	Apply the following avoidance and minimization measures: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Surveys could be required prior to implementation of a proposed action to determine presence/absence if information suggests birds could be present. Surveys must be conducted by qualified individuals, be conducted according to protocol, and be acceptable to the BLM. • Preclude disruptive activities within 1 mile of a California condor nest site during the breeding season. • Monitor recreation uses within 1 mile of condor nest sites and temporarily restrict activities if necessary to protect the condor. • Preclude special use permit group events within 1 mile of condor nest sites during the breeding season. • Preclude placement of new permanent structures or roads within 1 mile of condor nest sites. 	x				
SSS-22	Implement conservation measures (Appendix 9) on actions affecting Utah prairie dogs or their habitat.	x				
SSS-23	Permit no surface disturbing activities or surface occupancy within ½ mile of active, suitable (currently inactive), or potential reintroduction (BLM 2002b) Utah prairie dog habitats/sites.		x			Reference most current policy

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	Seismic activities would avoid these areas, particularly during the active season (April 1 to September 30).					
SSS-24	Allow introduction, augmentation, restocking, translocations, transplantation, and/or reestablishments of special status species in cooperation and collaboration with USFWS, UDWR, and other agencies as necessary, subject to guidance provided by BLM's 6840 policy and by existing or future memoranda of understanding (MOU).	x				
SSS-25	Require deterrent devices designed to prevent raptors from perching on powerline structures on all new construction (including upgrades and reconstruction) to discourage predation on Utah prairie dogs.	x				
SSS-26	Reroute renewed or amended ROWs on public land that have the potential to disturb active and inactive Utah prairie dog colonies.	x				
SSS-27	Preclude cross-country OHV use in occupied or inactive Utah prairie dog colonies.	x				
SSS-28	Allow for the treatment of plague and other diseases that may impact Utah prairie dogs.	x				
SSS-29	Implement conservation measures (Appendix 9) on actions affecting MSOs or their habitat.	x				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
SSS-30	<p>Restrictions (from the Utah Field Office Guidelines for Raptor Protection From Human and Land Use Disturbances [Appendix 2]) include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Permit no surface disturbing activities from March 1 to August 31 in PACs, breeding habitats, or designated critical habitat to avoid disturbance to breeding MSOs. • If a disruptive or surface disturbing action occurs entirely outside of the MSO breeding season (March 1 to August 31) and leaves no permanent structure or permanent habitat disturbance, the action may proceed without an occupancy survey. Land disposal actions would require breeding season surveys (see Lands and Realty management actions). • If disruptive actions would occur during the season restriction (March 1 to August 31), surveys according to USFWS protocol for MSOs would be required prior to commencement of activities. If MSOs are detected, activities should be delayed until after the seasonal restriction. 		x			Reference most current recovery plan
SSS-31	Retain, where appropriate, large down logs, large trees (generally greater than 24 inches in diameter at breast height [DBH]), and snags as		x			Reference most current recovery plan

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	prey habitats in occupied and suitable MSO habitat.					
SSS-32	Allow fuels treatments and prescribed fire on a case-by-case basis to reduce fire hazard and improve habitat condition for MSO prey.	x				
SSS-33	Meet or make significant progress toward meeting BLM Utah's Standards for Rangeland Health in protected and restricted (as defined in recovery plan) MSO habitats.	x				
SSS-34	Prohibit new recreation facilities or trails within PACs. Continue maintenance restrictions and seasonal closure (March 1 to August 31) of existing facilities. Comply with conservation measures in Appendix 9.	x				
SSS-35	Limit special recreation permit (SRP) group size to 12 or fewer according to the recovery plan in protected and restricted (as defined in the recovery plan) MSO habitat.	x				
SSS-36	Monitor stream habitat to detect changes every 5 to 10 years in streams with historic or currently occupied habitat, in cooperation with UDWR.	x				
SSS-37	Maintain or improve stream habitat for those locations with historic or currently occupied habitat identified in cooperation with UDWR. Maintain, improve, or provide missing habitat components using appropriate habitat improvement techniques.	x				
SSS-38	Surveys would be required prior to surface disturbance unless species presence and distribution information is complete and available.	x				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	Surveys would be conducted by a BLM-approved botanist. In the event species presence is verified, the project proponent may be required to modify operational plans, at the discretion of the authorized officer, to include appropriate protection and/or avoidance measures or practices for the minimization of impacts on listed and candidate plants and their habitats.					
SSS-39	Initiate Section 7 consultation with USFWS for any planned or authorized activity that is determined to have the potential to result in an impact on listed and candidate plants and their habitats.	x				
SSS-40	Implement the Siler’s pincushion cactus recovery plan.	x				
SSS-41	Manage oil and gas leasing as open subject to moderate constraints (CSU) in federally listed and candidate plant species occupied and suitable habitat. In these areas, well placement would be located to not adversely affect the species or their habitats.		x			Utah GRS LUPA may be amending this
SSS-42	Limit species for rehabilitation and emergency stabilization in federally listed and candidate species habitat to species that would not inhibit the listed or candidate species.	x				
SSS-43	Implement applicable portions of the Welsh’s Milkweed (<i>Asclepias welshii</i>) Recovery Plan. Consider new scientific information obtained since completion of the recovery plan. Include this information and management guidance in a joint	x				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	management plan to be prepared by the BLM and the State of Utah.					
SSS-44	Close approximately 790 acres of designated critical milkweed habitat on the BLM-administered portion of the Coral Pink Sand Dunes to OHV use.	x				
SSS-45	Manage oil and gas leasing as open subject to major constraints (NSO) in Welsh's milkweed designated critical habitat.	x				
SSS-46	Implement the conservation actions identified in the Conservation Agreement and Strategy for the Coral Pink Sand Dunes Tiger Beetle, as amended.	x				
SSS-47	Maintain the established 370-acre tiger beetle conservation area on BLM-administered lands in the northeast corner of the sand dunes.	x				
SSS-48	Implement conservation measures (Appendix 9) on actions affecting Southwestern willow flycatcher or its habitat.	x				
SSS-49	Manage for regeneration and multiple age classes in cottonwood/willow vegetation in yellow-billed cuckoo and Southwestern willow flycatcher habitat.		x			Cuckoo has been listed. Need to reference new cuckoo recovery plan.
SSS-50	Identify sites where Southwestern willow flycatcher habitat restoration (i.e., occupied, suitable, and potentially suitable sites) is warranted. Prioritize riparian restoration in Southwestern willow flycatcher habitat consistent with riparian rehabilitation decisions in the Water section.	x				
SSS-51	Prohibit surface disturbing activities within ¼	x				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	mile of occupied breeding habitat from May 1 to August 15.					
SSS-52	Where possible, collocate roads, new trails, and ROWs and develop stream crossings at right angles to yellow-billed cuckoo and Southwestern willow flycatcher habitat to minimize impacts.	x				
SSS-53	Implement the most current UDWR Strategic Management Plan for Sage-Grouse (UDWR, 2002 and its future revisions), the BLM National Sage-Grouse Habitat Conservation Strategy (BLM, 2004), and recommendations from local sage-grouse working groups to protect, maintain, enhance, and restore Greater sage-grouse populations and habitat.		x			Will be amended/updated with Utah GRSG LUPA
SSS-54	All surface disturbing activities would be prohibited within ½ mile of Greater sage-grouse leks on a year-round basis. Oil and gas leasing would be open subject to major constraints (NSO).		x			Will be amended/updated with Utah GRSG LUPA
SSS-55	Allow no surface disturbing or otherwise disruptive activities within 2 miles of Greater sage-grouse leks from March 15 to July 15 to protect nesting and brood rearing habitat. Oil and gas leasing would be open subject to a controlled surface use and timing stipulation.		x			Will be amended/updated with Utah GRSG LUPA
SSS-56	Allow no surface disturbing or otherwise disruptive activities within Greater sage-grouse winter habitat from December 1 – March 14. Oil and gas leasing would be open subject to a controlled surface use and timing stipulation.		x			Will be amended/updated with Utah GRSG LUPA
SSS-57	See Appendix 3 for exceptions, modifications, or		x			Will be

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	waivers.					amended/updated with Utah GRSG LUPA
SSS-58	Prioritize habitat vegetation treatments to maintain and/or improve habitat function in the following areas (Map 5): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sage-grouse nesting and brood-rearing habitat • Sage-grouse winter range. 		x			Will be amended/updated with Utah GRSG LUPA
SSS-59	[there is no SSS-59 in the RMP]					Note that numbering is out of order.
SSS-60	Apply restrictions (e.g., avoidance or mitigation) to surface disturbing and disruptive activities on a case-by-case basis in occupied and potential pygmy rabbit habitat for the protection of this species and its associated habitat. Site-specific NEPA documentation would address restrictions around pygmy rabbit habitat.	x				
SSS-61	Consider and implement the appropriate guidelines and management recommendations presented in current and future species recovery or conservation plans (as revised), or alternative management strategies developed in consultation with USFWS and/or UDWR.	x				
<i>Fish and Wildlife</i>						
WL-1	Consider the USFWS BCC and the Utah PIF Priority Species to identify and conserve priority nesting habitats for migratory birds.	x				
WL-2	Use Best Management Practices for Raptors and Their Associated Habitats in Utah (Appendix 2) to guide raptor management, using seasonal and	x				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	spatial buffers and mitigation to maintain and enhance raptor nesting, foraging, and roosting habitat while allowing other resource uses to occur.					
WL-3	Work cooperatively with other agencies, such as UDWR or Utah Partners for Conservation and Development, to identify and manage habitat for non-listed fish and wildlife species.	x				
WL-4	Allow, initiate, and/or participate in scientific research of species and their habitats.	x				
WL-5	Complete and assist with inventories and map current occupied and potential habitats for species.	x				
WL-6	Conduct habitat improvement treatments for species in accordance with current species-specific guidelines and local working group prescriptions.	x				
WL-7	Prioritize Bird Habitat Conservation Areas identified in the Coordinated Implementation Plan for Bird Conservation in Utah (IWJV 2005, as updated) for conducting bird habitat conservation projects through cooperative funding initiatives such as the Intermountain West Joint Venture.		x			Add “most current direction”
WL-8	Coordinate predator management with U.S. Department of Agriculture Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service/Wildlife Services and UDWR in accordance with the guidance provided in the existing MOU with Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service/Wildlife Services.	x				
WL-9	Maintain existing vegetation treatments that	x				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	benefit wildlife.					
WL-10	Prioritize habitat vegetation treatments to maintain and/or improve habitat function in areas of crucial mule deer winter range (Map 5).	x				
WL-11	Road crossings of water bodies that support fish would be designed to provide for fish passage.	x				
WL-12	Preclude surface disturbing activities in crucial mule deer and elk winter range from November 15 to April 15 unless the activity would improve mule deer or elk habitat.	x				
WL-13	Preclude oil and gas exploration and development and ROW construction/reconstruction in identified big game migration and transitional ranges from October 1 to November 15.	x				
WL-14	Limit OHV use to designated routes.	x				
WL-15	Preclude surface disturbing activities in crucial Desert bighorn sheep habitat during lambing season (April 15 to June 15) (Bighorn Institute 2008).	x				
WL-16	Do not authorize changes in kind of livestock to sheep or goats within 9 miles of Desert bighorn sheep habitat.	x				
WL-17	Preclude surface disturbing activities in crucial pronghorn habitat from May 15 through June 15 during fawning season.	x				
WL-18	Require wildlife-passable fences, consistent with the species found in the area, and essential for effective range management or other administrative functions.	x				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
WL-19	Continue to work with UDWR and conservation organizations to establish additional water developments, subject to NEPA consideration, and maintain existing water developments to improve wildlife distribution and encourage habitat use by native wildlife species and introduced non-native species.	x				
WL-20	Authorize construction of wildlife habitat improvement projects (including water developments and vegetation treatments) to meet wildlife goals and objectives, provided that the project complies with NEPA, ESA, and other applicable laws and policies.	x				
WL-21	Retain crucial wildlife habitat in public ownership, unless the land tenure adjustment would meet one or more of the land tenure adjustment criteria identified in Lands and Realty management.	x				
WL-22	Develop present use area water needs for wildlife as capabilities exist; maintain water throughout the spring and fall in existing and new livestock range improvements (e.g., tanks and pipelines).	x				
WL-23	Manage livestock grazing in riparian areas/fisheries habitat according to the Utah Guidelines for Grazing Management. Livestock grazing in riparian areas/fisheries habitat would be evaluated through compliance with the Standards for Rangeland Health.	x				
WL-24	Minor adjustments to crucial wildlife habitat boundaries periodically made by UDWR would be accommodated through plan maintenance.	x				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
WL-25	Implement raptor guidelines associated with level of duration of activities established by USFWS.	x				
WL-26	Guide raptor habitat management by use of Best Management Practices for Raptors and Their Associated Habitats in Utah (Romin and Muck 2002, as amended) and BLM's raptor BMPs (Appendix 2) using seasonal and spatial buffers and mitigation to maintain and enhance raptor nesting, foraging, and roosting habitat while allowing other resource uses to occur.	x				
WL-27	Prohibit disruptive activities within 1 mile of peregrine falcon nest sites from February 1 to August 31.	x				
WL-28	Prohibit disruptive activities to nesting raptors within ½ mile of raptor nests during the following time periods: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Jan 1–Aug 31: golden eagle • Mar 15–Aug 15: red-tailed hawk • Mar 15–Aug 31: Cooper's hawk, sharp-shinned hawk • Mar 1–Aug 31: Swainson's hawk • Apr 1–Aug 15: Northern harrier • Apr 1–Aug 31: merlin, osprey • May 1–Aug 15: Turkey vulture. 	x				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
WL-30	Prohibit disruptive activities to nesting raptors within ¼ mile of a raptor nest during the following time periods: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dec 1–Sep 31: Great-horned owl • Feb 1–July 31: boreal owl • Feb 1–Aug 15: long-eared owl • Mar 1–Aug 15: W. screech owl • Mar 1–Aug 31: N. saw-whet owl • Apr 1–Aug 1: N. pygmy owl • Apr 1–Aug 31: prairie falcon • Apr 1–Sep 30: Flammulated owl. 		x			Out of order. Drop # heading and combine with WL-28.
WL-29	Protect unoccupied raptor nests in compliance with BLM’s raptor BMPs (Appendix 2) yet allow for permanent (long-term) facilities and structures to be constructed within the spatial buffer zone, identified above by alternative, outside of the breeding season as long as they would not cause the nest site to become unsuitable for future nesting. Non-permanent (short-term) activities would be allowed within the spatial buffer of nests during the nesting season as long as those activities are shown to be non-impacting to nesting raptors.	x				
WL-30	Allow introduction, translocation, transplantation, restocking, augmentation, and reestablishment of native and naturalized fish and wildlife species in cooperation and collaboration with UDWR, subject to guidance provided by BLM’s 1745 policy and by existing or future MOUs with UDWR.	x				See notes on WL-30 above.

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
WL-31	Allocate 11,045 AUMs to wildlife as shown in the grazing allotment forage allocation table (appendix 14)	x				
WL-32	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 offsite, or in accordance with current guidance.	x				
<i>Wildland Fire Ecology</i>						
FIRE-1	The September 2005 completion of the Finding of No Significant Impact and Decision Record (UT-USO-04-01) for the Utah Land Use Plan Amendment for Fire and Fuels Management amended the wildland fire ecology portions of the existing LUPs. No significant changes in resource condition, data, or policy have become available since completion of this amendment. Therefore the decisions from the 2005 document have been brought forward in their entirety into the Approved RMP under the Wildland Fire Ecology header.	x				
FIRE-2	The appropriate management response would be applied to all wildland fires, emphasizing firefighter and public safety and considering suppression costs, benefits, and values to be protected. The appropriate management response would be consistent with resource objectives, standards, and guidelines. Response to wildland fire would be based on ecological and social costs and benefits of the fire. The	x				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<p>circumstances under which the fire occurs and the likely consequences to firefighter and public safety and welfare, natural and cultural resources, and values to be protected would dictate the appropriate management response to the fire. Fire Management Unit objectives (as included in the FMP) would further guide the appropriate management response.</p>					
FIRE-3	<p>Wildland fire would be used to protect, maintain, and enhance resources and, when possible, would be allowed to function in its natural ecological role. Areas where wildland fire use is appropriate and not appropriate are identified in Table 1. The FMP would provide further operational guidance for wildland fire use.</p>		x			<p>Change “wildland fire use” to “use of wildland fire” (NWCG. Oct. 2014. <i>Glossary of Wildland Fire Terminology PMS 205</i>)</p>
FIRE-4	<p>To reduce risks and to restore ecosystems, the following fuels management tools would be allowed: wildland fire use; prescribed fire; and mechanical, chemical, seeding, and biological actions. As conditions allow, the BLM would employ the least intrusive method over more intrusive methods. For example, wildland fire use is the preferred method of treatment. Where wildland fire use is not feasible, prescribed burning would be the preferred method. Where prescribed burning is not feasible, non-fire fuels treatments would become the preferred method of treatment.</p>		x			<p>Change “wildland fire use” to “use of wildland fire” (NWCG. Oct. 2014. <i>Glossary of Wildland Fire Terminology PMS 205</i>)</p>
FIRE-5	<p>Work with partners in the WUI in wildland firefighting, hazardous fuels reduction, cooperative fire prevention education, and</p>	x				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<p>technical assistance. Unauthorized wildland fire ignitions would be prevented through coordination with partners and affected groups and individuals. The full range of prevention and mitigation activities would be used: personal contacts, mass media, education programs, and signage.</p>					
FIRE-6	<p>The following Emergency Stabilization and Rehabilitation actions (after wildfire suppression) and restoration for planned actions may be used to reduce potential for soil erosion and invasive species spread: seeding or planting native and/or non-native species; applying approved herbicides; implementing soil stabilization measures (e.g., stabilization structures and mulches); protecting cultural resources; repairing or replacing facilities; fencing, herding, or removing livestock; and resting allotments. Specific actions could include brush/tree chopping; contour tree felling; silt catchments; waddles, straw, or fabric silt traps; mulching; drill seeding; aerial seeding; aerial seeding followed by mechanical seed covering (chaining, harrowing, or other mechanical means); planting seedlings; fence construction or rebuilding; road/trail maintenance or closures; cattle guards; road culvert installation or cleaning; water bars; sign installation and maintenance; herbicidal or mechanical weed treatments; weather station installation and maintenance; and repairing or</p>	x				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	rebuilding of minor facilities (e.g., cross-fencing, wildlife structures, recreational facilities).					
FIRE-7	Monitoring actions would be undertaken to determine results from fire management decisions and actions. Monitoring results would be used in determining the need for further amendment or revisions.	x				
FIRE-8	Fires would be suppressed at minimum cost, considering firefighter and public safety, benefits, and values to be protected, consistent with resource objectives.	x				
FIRE-9	The BLM would provide a consistent, safe, and cost-effective fire management program through appropriate planning, staffing, training, equipment, and management.	x				
FIRE-10	Wildland fire would be used to protect, maintain, and enhance resources and, when possible, would be allowed to function in its natural ecological role. However, due to resource conditions and proximity to values at risk, fire cannot be allowed to resume its natural role on public lands. The DWFC is that as lands are transitioned from a higher FRCC to a lower FRCC, the applicability of wildland fire use would increase. Therefore, fire managers would periodically assess the FRCC following changes in vegetation due to management actions and natural changes. This alternative authorizes wildland fire use as a tool, when appropriate, to reach the DWFC.		x			Change “wildland fire use” to “use of wildland fire” (<i>NWCG. Oct. 2014. Glossary of Wildland Fire Terminology PMS 205</i>)

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
FIRE-11	Wildland fire use would be an appropriate management response to naturally ignited wildland fires to accomplish specific resource management objectives in predefined designated areas. Operational management of wildland fire use is described in the Wildland Fire Implementation Plan. This alternative attempts to in general clarify the types of areas that are not suitable for wildland fire use while leaving other areas open for possible wildland fire use.		x			Change “wildland fire use” to “use of wildland fire” (NWCG. Oct. 2014. Glossary of Wildland Fire Terminology PMS 205)
FIRE-12	Although specific areas for wildland fires use would be identified in the FMPs, wildland fire use may be authorized for all areas, except when the following resources and values may be negatively impacted and there are no reasonable Resource Protection Measures to protect such resources and values: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WUI areas • Areas that are known to be highly susceptible to post-fire cheatgrass or invasive weed invasion • Important terrestrial and aquatic habitats • Non-fire adapted vegetation communities • Sensitive cultural resources • Areas of soil with high or very high erosion hazard • Class I air-shed areas and particulate matter (less than 10 microns in 		x			Change “wildland fire use” to “use of wildland fire” (NWCG. Oct. 2014. Glossary of Wildland Fire Terminology PMS 205) Change “FMPs” to “FMP”

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<p>diameter) (PM10) non-attainment areas</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative sites • Developed recreation sites • Communication sites • Oil, gas, and mining facilities • Above-ground utility corridors • High-use travel corridors, such as interstates, railroads, and/or highways. 					
FIRE-13	<p>The appropriate management response for areas containing these resources or values may be wildland fire use, but Resource Protection Measures would be necessary to protect these values if they are threatened. Additional protection actions may include employing strategies and tactics to avoid these values (e.g., using fire retardant to reduce fire spread in certain areas). In fire situations where these resources or values would not be impacted, wildland fire use may still not be employed due to other parameters</p>		x			<p>Change “wildland fire use” to “use of wildland fire” <i>(NWCG. Oct. 2014. Glossary of Wildland Fire Terminology PMS 205)</i></p>

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<p>(weather, personnel availability, etc.). In these situations, the appropriate management response—from aggressive initial action to monitoring—would be used. The DWFC would be to restore fire to ecosystems when feasible; therefore, fuel treatments should focus on protecting the resources and values listed above so future wildland fire use actions could be more easily implemented.</p>					
FIRE-14	<p>Current BLM regulations do not allow for funding of emergency stabilization or rehabilitation actions following wildland fire use. Utah BLM land managers often prefer to evaluate a fire after it occurs to determine if there is a need for any post-fire rehabilitation or stabilization. The inability to rehabilitate or stabilize burned areas following wildland fire use restricts some acres from being considered by BLM managers for wildland fire use.</p>		x			<p>Change “wildland fire use” to “use of wildland fire” (<i>NWCG. Oct. 2014. Glossary of Wildland Fire Terminology PMS 205</i>)</p>
FIRE-15	<p>All prescribed fire acres would be for a primary purpose of hazardous fuels reduction or community protection from fires. While these acres would likely also accomplish other resource objectives, this plan aims to directly analyze effects from fire management decisions.</p>	x				
FIRE-16	<p>All non-fire treatment acres would be for a primary purpose of hazardous fuels reduction or community protection from fires. While these acres would likely also accomplish other resource objectives, this plan aims to directly analyze</p>	x				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	effects from fire management decisions.					
FIRE-17	Protection of human life is the primary priority. Setting priorities among protecting human communities and community infrastructure, other property and improvements, and natural and cultural resources would be based on human health and safety, the values to be protected, and the costs of protection. Priorities for all aspects of fire management decisions and actions would be based on the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WUI • Maintain existing healthy ecosystems • High priority sub-basin (Hydrologic Unit Code [HUC] 4) or watershed (HUC 5) • Special status species • Cultural resources and cultural landscapes. 	x				
FIRE-18	Resource Protection Measures for fire management practices to protect natural or cultural resource values are described in Appendix 8 (obtained from the Utah Land Use Plan Amendment for Fire and Fuels Management Finding of No Significant Impact and Decision Record).	x				
<i>Cultural Resources</i>						
CUL-1	Mitigate adverse impacts on cultural resources resulting from authorized surface disturbing activities.	x				
CUL-2	Mitigate and/or preserve cultural and historic	x				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	values on cultural properties eligible for National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) listing.					
CUL-3	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 National Cultural Programmatic Agreement.		x			Note: State Protocol has been superceded by an MOU. Update to reference this change.
CUL-4	Complete cultural resources inventories prior to allowing permitted surface disturbing activities, excluding those areas and circumstances identified in BLM-M-8110.23, UT-BLM-H-8110 Section II.C, and UT-BLM-H-8110 Appendix 1.	x				Handbook #s are still accurate
CUL-5	Continue geographic and archaeological scientific inventories based on imminent threats from natural or human-caused deterioration, on potential conflict with other resource uses, and for compliance with NHPA Section 110.	x				
CUL-6	Update the Class I cultural resources inventory every 10 years.	x				Regional approach (multi FO) not approved for FY15 funding; offices will try again in FY16.
CUL-7	Provide opportunities for local interpretation (for local population) of cultural resources and public education (for general resource users).	x				Whenever possible, emphasis is placed on completing interpretive work.
CUL-8	Use proactive research, protection, and inventories involving universities, avocational and service groups, site stewards, tribes, and	x				Funding is an issue to accomplish this.

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	community outreach to gain a better understanding of cultural resources and preserve them for present and future study and use.					
CUL-9	Consider land acquisitions from willing parties to preserve cultural resources, as appropriate (as identified in criteria #2 (LAR-19) for land tenure adjustments in the lands and realty decisions).	x				
CUL-10	Preclude surface disturbing activities within ¼ mile or within the visual horizon, whichever is closer, of cultural sites where landscape association contributes to eligibility for the NRHP. Unevaluated portions of the setting would be managed as contributing until a cultural inventory and evaluation is completed and the setting is determined to be contributing or non-contributing.	x				
CUL-11	<p>Establish a comprehensive monitoring program emphasizing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cultural sites that have been previously identified as being impacted (e.g., from vandalism, erosion, grazing, or other) • Cultural sites identified on maps, brochures, or other media that bring the site into public awareness • Sites that are known to be popular for public visitation (e.g., public use site) • A representative sample of sites known to be prone to impacts from predictable sources (e.g., vandalism, 	x				<p>Not yet started due to lack of dedicated personnel/funding.</p> <p>Bullets 2 and 3 are on-going.</p> <p>Currently concentrating on known sites.</p>

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	recreation, grazing, or development).					
CUL-12	<p>Allocate and manage cultural resource sites for scientific, public, conservation, traditional, and experimental uses and discharged from management categories described in BLM-M-8110.4 as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • South Fork Indian Cave (42Ka1576), Helldive Canyon (42Ka1695), and Mansard (42Ka4427) would be placed in the Public Use category. • Sites identified as Native American Traditional Cultural Properties would be placed in the Traditional Use category. • All other sites considered eligible to the NRHP would be placed in the Most Appropriate Use category. 	x				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
CUL-13	<p>Sites would be included in the Discharged from Management category if both of the following conditions are met and documented:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The BLM and the SHPO have formally agreed that the site is not eligible for listing on the NRHP. • The site has no value for other cultural uses (as described in BLM-M-8110.4). 	x				
CUL-14	<p>Allocations should be reevaluated and revised by site or area when circumstances change or when new data becomes available. Consult with the SHPO and Native American tribes as appropriate.</p>	x				
CUL-15	<p>Prioritize new field inventories (Class II or III) directed by NHPA Section 110 as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recreation areas identified for public use (i.e., OHV open areas) • 100 feet (30 meters) (depending on topography) on either side from the centerline of designated OHV routes • Areas of special cultural designation (ACECs, National Register sites, etc.) that have not been fully inventoried • Resources eligible for the NRHP at a national level of significance that have not been fully inventoried • Road systems—100 feet (30 meters) (depending on topography) on either side from the centerline of road 	x				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Areas lacking existing inventories (large areas with no inventory data) • 5-mile vulnerability zones surrounding cities and towns • Hiking/equestrian trails. 					
CUL-16	Identify and manage traditional cultural properties in coordination with Native American tribes.	x				
CUL-17	Work with Native American tribes to ensure compliance with NAGPRA, when needed.	x				
CUL-18	Work with Native American tribes to protect their rights including access to sacred sites and traditional cultural areas. Accommodate tribal access to sacred sites and traditional cultural properties when planning and implementing land uses. Prevent or mitigate physical damage or intrusions that might impede use of sacred sites and traditional cultural properties.	x				Would like to replicate agreement(s) developed for GSENM for KFO.
CUL-19	Establish and maintain agreements with all Native American tribes interested in specific projects or areas on which they wish to consult.	x				
CUL-20	Allow Native American non-commercial	x				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	traditional use of vegetation and forest and woodland products for the collection of herbs, medicines, traditional use items, or items necessary for traditional, religious, or ceremonial purposes, through permits.					
<i>Paleontological Resources</i>						
PAL-1	Monitor the highest priority scientifically significant paleontological sites for trend and condition.	x				
PAL-2	Require on-the-ground paleontological inventories (field surveys) prior to permitting surface disturbing activities in paleontological Class I areas. Require paleontological assessments (formal analysis of existing data) prior to permitting surface disturbing activities in paleontological Class II areas.	x				
PAL-3	Allow surface collection (as defined in BLM Manual 8270) of common invertebrate and botanical paleontological resources for personal (non-commercial) use without permits unless such resources are of critical scientific or recreational value and need to be protected, or where collection is incompatible with other resource protection.	x				
PAL-4	Consult/coordinate with other local, state, and federal land agency paleontological resource specialists (if available) before undertaking significant ground disturbing activities in Class I areas to ensure protection of adjacent resources.	x				
PAL-5	Conduct non-Section 106 proactive inventories	x				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	intermittently as resources allow.					
PAL-6	Prioritize paleontological resource inventories in the following areas (Map 24): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High resource potential • Medium resource potential • Low resource potential. 	x				
PAL-7	Provide opportunities for local interpretation of paleontological resources.	x				
PAL-8	When appropriate, target fossil sites with high scientific value for excavation and curation either by the BLM or by an 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, periodic monitoring should be conducted to document the integrity of the site until complete collection is accomplished.	x				
PAL-9	Monitor high-significance (scientific or interpretive) sites with fossil resources that are not feasible or desirable to excavate or collect when possible to document their condition. Frequency of monitoring action for identified sites would be determined by the physical nature of the resource and potential threats.	x				
PAL-10	Develop onsite or community-based interpretation for significant sites/specimens to foster an appreciation for the unique nature of the resource and to create opportunities for public access to such resources.	x				
Visual Resources						

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
VRM-1	Designate the following acreages for the objectives defined for each VRM class (Map 6): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Class I: 76,000 acres • Class II: 99,600 acres • Class III: 205,500 acres • Class IV: 172,900 acres. 	x				
VRM-2	WUI areas would be in VRM Class III or IV.	x				
VRM-3	To the extent practicable, bring existing visual contrasts into VRM class conformance as the opportunity arises.	x				
<i>Non-WSA Lands with Wilderness Characteristics</i>						
WC-1	Manage the following non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics (27,770 acres, Map 7) specifically to protect, preserve, and maintain their wilderness characteristics: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • East of Bryce (850 acres) • Moquith Mountain (9,600 acres) • Orderville Canyon (2,700 acres) • Parunuweap Canyon (120 acres) • Upper Kanab Creek (14,500 acres) 	x				
WC-2	Protect, preserve, and maintain wilderness characteristics through the following prescriptions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Designate as VRM Class II (Map 6). • Close to commercial and personal-use forest and woodland product harvest (e.g., pole, post, firewood cutting, Christmas trees, seed collection, and wildings) except for incidental collection for onsite campfire use and administrative 	x				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<p>purposes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limited to designated routes (Map 10). • Avoid new ROWs (linear, communication sites, and wind and solar projects) (Map 11). • Retain public lands in federal ownership • Close to mineral material disposals (Map 16). • Open to fluid mineral leasing with major constraints (NSO) (Map 14). 					
<i>Drought and Natural Disasters</i>						
DND-1	<p>Coordinate appropriate management responses with affected parties when natural resources may be affected by drought, insects, diseases, or natural disasters. A variety of emergency or interim actions may be necessary to minimize land health degradations such as reduced forage allocations, reductions in the number of livestock and/or wildlife, increased mitigation measures to ensure reclamation, and limitations on energy field activities and recreational uses.</p>	x				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
DND-2	<p>Incorporate current Utah BLM Standards for Rangeland Health, as appropriate, across all resource programs. Management prescriptions in the form of constraints to use, terms and conditions, and stipulations may be needed to sustain rangeland health and viability. Management prescriptions will consider the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Surface disturbing activities—These will be closely monitored to ensure compliance with authorizations and permit’s conditions of approval or terms and conditions. Action minimizing new surface disturbance, allowed by regulations, and actions ensuring successful reclamation, will be emphasized. During periods of drought, the BLM could require additional actions such as changes to standard seed mix compositions, amount, and/or method of application. Additionally, methods to ensure successful revegetation following disturbance could include hydromulching, installation of drip irrigators, and fencing to exclude ungulate grazing/browsing. • Livestock grazing—During periods of prolonged drought use will be allowed in both quantity and timing 	x				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<p>that will not result in a downward shift in rangeland health and/or production. The BLM will work cooperatively to effect a grazing strategy specific to a grazing permittee's individual grazing allotment(s) and make changes to the grazing authorizations, as appropriate, in accordance with the grazing regulations. In the case of drought, the BLM could temporarily close the range, or portions of it, to livestock grazing.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wildlife management—During periods of prolonged drought to the extent that vegetation monitoring indicate that habitat for wildlife ungulate populations cannot be sustained and overall animal health is compromised, the BLM will enter into discussions with the UDWR regarding herd numbers and overall management options to combat the effects of drought. • Recreation—During periods of prolonged drought, the BLM, in cooperation with local and state fire management agencies, will limit campfires to established fire rings or fully contained fires. The last resort 					

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<p>will be to close the public lands to campfires of any kind.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> OHVs—Off-highway/road vehicle use during periods of prolonged drought could be further restricted, or if site-specific conditions warrant, closure to OHVs could be implemented to minimize vehicle-induced injury or damage to rangeland and/or woodland resources and to minimize the potential of spark-caused fires. 					
<i>Forestry and Woodland Products</i>						
FOR-1	Permit commercial timber harvest on a case-by-case basis for the purposes of promoting or sustaining forest health.	x				
FOR-2	Permit commercial and non-commercial harvest of green or dead pinyon and juniper woodland products (e.g., cedar posts, Christmas trees, fuel wood, and biomass utilization) areawide unless otherwise designated or stipulated. Permit harvest of other woodland species on a case-by-case basis.	x				
FOR-3	Close WSAs and non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics to woodland product harvest, except for incidental collection for onsite campfire use and administrative purposes.	x				
FOR-4	Permit harvesting of woodland products in	x				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	riparian areas in proper functioning condition on a case-by-case basis for the maintenance and/or improvement of riparian ecosystems.					
FOR-5	Prohibit the removal of ponderosa pine for Christmas trees.	x				
FOR-6	Develop a Forest Woodland Management Plan as required in the Utah Forest and Woodland Management Action Plan.	x				Has not yet been started.
FOR-7	Allow Native American non-commercial traditional use of forest and woodland products for the collection of herbs, medicines, traditional use items, or items necessary for traditional, religious, or ceremonial purposes, through permits.	x				
<i>Livestock Grazing</i>						
GRA-1	Manage livestock grazing allotments within the decision area as available for livestock grazing.	x				
GRA-2	Use an interdisciplinary allotment evaluation process to provide specific guidance and actions for managing livestock grazing.	x				
GRA-3	Allocate long-term increases and decreases in forage on a case-by-case basis based on an allotment-specific analysis through the NEPA process.	x				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
GRA-4	<p>Allocate forage for livestock as noted in the grazing allotment forage allocation table (Appendix 14), except as noted below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Close the Water Canyon Allotment to livestock grazing for the life of the plan in order to protect the Fredonia City Culinary water supply. • In order to have the RMP accurately reflect current management, combine the Lydia’s Canyon Allotment with the adjacent Lydia Allotment. The resulting Lydia Allotment would be available for livestock grazing with no additional livestock AUMs. • Maintain existing forage allocations on the Lower North Fork Allotment. • Maintain existing forage allocations on the Zion Park Allotment. • In order to have the RMP accurately reflect current management, combine the Sawmill Allotment with the adjacent South Canyon Allotment. The resulting South Canyon Allotment would be available for livestock grazing with no additional livestock AUMs. 	x				Reviewed Appendix 14 table - no changes needed.
GRA-5	Manage livestock grazing according to the Guidelines for Grazing Management on BLM Lands in Utah (BLM 1997a), implementing these guidelines when authorizing livestock	x				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	grazing use and related activities.					
GRA-6	Use livestock grazing to enhance ecosystem health and/or help accomplish resource objectives (e.g., noxious/invasive weed control and hazardous fuel reduction) on allotments where authorized by the authorized officer on a case-by-case basis.	x				
GRA-7	Consider requests for changes in kind of livestock on a case-by-case basis (except as outlined below), and after review evaluate potential impacts on riparian and upland vegetation and other resource uses.	x				
GRA-8	Allow motorized access to range improvements within WSAs according to the <i>Interim Management Policy for Lands Under Wilderness Review (IMP)</i> .		x			Change “interim LWC policy” to WSA and Wilderness Manuals 6330 and 6340.
GRA-9	Design grazing systems and range improvements to achieve and maintain healthy rangelands.	x				
GRA-10	Analyze conversions in kind of livestock (such as from sheep to cattle) in light of the Standards for Rangeland Health. Allow conversion where they would not be adverse to achieving a standard, or they would not be in conflict with other decisions in this plan.	x				
GRA-11	Limit allocation of AUMs to the following kinds of livestock: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Domestic cattle • Horses • Sheep • Goats. 	x				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
GRA-12	Do not authorize changes in kind of livestock to sheep or goats within 9 miles of Desert bighorn sheep habitat (same as decision in the Fish and Wildlife section).	x				Consider updating “same as decision in the Fish and Wildlife section” to “See WL-16.”
GRA-13	A grazing permittee may voluntarily relinquish in writing all or a percentage of the grazing preference that is attached to the base property they own for any reason they may choose. This action would not require consent or approval by the BLM or any other entity. The BLM would not be a party to or accept any contingencies or conditions associated with a relinquishment that would require future BLM action(s) such as discontinuing livestock grazing. Once the preference and associated permitted use has been relinquished in whole or in part, it would remain available for application for preference and a grazing permit. However, upon relinquishment, the BLM may determine through a site-specific evaluation and associated NEPA analysis that the public lands within a grazing allotment are better used for other purposes, such as recreation, wildlife, watershed for a culinary water source, disposal, etc. or a combination of these and/or other uses. Grazing may then be discontinued on the allotment through an amendment to the existing RMP or a new RMP effort. Any decision issued concerning discontinuance of livestock grazing on federal lands would not be	x				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<p>permanent and would be subject to reconsideration during subsequent revision or amendment of the RMP. The evaluation and associated NEPA analysis may also determine that resource conditions are such that livestock grazing should be temporarily discontinued until site-specific resource objectives have been achieved. This evaluation and NEPA analysis would include a narrative with an evaluation time frame and process identified, indicating that once the objectives have been achieved the BLM would reconsider application(s) for grazing use.</p>					
GRA-14	<p>Give emphasis to changes in grazing management practices (e.g., changing season of use and fencing) before reducing AUMs on allotments to resolve conflicts with other uses.</p>	x				
GRA-15	<p>Suspend authorization of AUMs in areas of intensive surface disturbance (such as surface coal mining) until rehabilitation is complete.</p>	x				
GRA-16	<p>Complete land treatments to maintain or provide additional AUMs needed to meet the demand for livestock forage and divide the AUMs proportionally among all operators within the affected allotments.</p>	x				
GRA-17	<p>Prioritize treatments on the following allotments (Map 5):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • South Canyon • Sethy's Canyon • Sandy Creek • Sanford Bench 	x				<p>Completed to date: South Canyon Spry Bald Knoll</p> <p>Progress to date:</p>

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sugar Knoll • Spring Hollow • Circleville Cove • Kane Spring (non-WSA portion) • Buck Knoll • Spencer Bench • Clay Flat • Harris Flat • Three Mile • Limestone Canyon • Spry • Chris Spring • Big Flat • Limekiln Creek • Poverty Flat (non-WSA portion) • Roller Mill • Oak Spring • Yellowjacket (non-WSA portion) • Dog Valley • Bald Knoll • Alton Cove • Coop Creek • Areas that are not achieving Standards for Rangeland Health. 					<p>Sandy Creek Circleville Cove Buck Knoll</p> <p>Planned for FY16: Limestone Canyon Yellowjacket</p>
Recreation						
REC-1	<p>Identify the following Recreation Management Areas (RMA) (Map 8):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Kanab Community SRMA (community) (33,100 acres) • Paria SRMA (destination) (21,200 	x				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	acres) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Moquith Mountain SRMA (community) (15,000 acres) • Orderville Canyon SRMA (undeveloped) (1,950 acres) • North Fork Virgin River SRMA (undeveloped) (1,050 acres) • Escalante SRMA (community) (22,800 acres) • Kanab Field Office Extensive Recreation Management Area (ERMA) (458,900 acres). 					
REC-2	Recreation management direction for each SRMA is outlined in Appendix 4. This includes direction for the following recreation management components: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recreation Niche • Recreation Management Objectives • Primary Activities • Experiences • Benefits • Setting Character Conditions. 	x				
REC-3	Develop SRMA management plans that identify site-specific development needs to achieve recreation benefits, experiences, and objectives.	x				Have not yet completed due to funding.
REC-4	Portions of the decision area not identified as an SRMA will be identified as an ERMA. ERMAs will receive only custodial management (which addresses only activity opportunities) of visitor health and safety, user conflict, and resource	x				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	protection issues with no activity-level planning. Therefore, actions within ERMA's will generally be implemented directly from LUP decisions.					
REC-5	<p>OHV RMZ (18,500 acres)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recreation Niche: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Close-to-town OHV travel in an exceptionally scenic setting with a variety of trails for different skill levels. • Primary Activities: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Driving OHVs, viewing scenery and wildlife, photography, spending time with friends and family, and participating in and/or viewing competitive/organized events. <p>Required Management:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • OHV: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Minimal designated routes to access RMZ and provide a variety of OHV opportunities • VRM: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Class III • Minerals: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Open to oil and gas leasing subject to major constraints (NSO) • Facilities: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Provide support facilities for recreation experience. 	x				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
<p>REC-6</p>	<p>Non-Motorized RMZ (14,600 acres)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recreation Niche: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Town-accessible hiking and equestrian trail network offering outstanding views and varied terrain. • Primary Activities: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Hiking, rock-scrambling, viewing scenery and wildlife, photography, equestrian, spending time with friends and family, and participating in and/or viewing competitive/organized events. <p>Required Management (outside the Moquith Mountain non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics area) (10,700 acres):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • OHV: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Limit to designated routes to access trail heads • VRM: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Class II • Minerals: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Open to oil and gas leasing subject to major constraints (NSO) • Facilities: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Provide support facilities for recreation experience. <p>Required Management (inside the Moquith Mountain non-WSA lands with wilderness</p>	<p>x</p>				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<p>characteristics area) (3,900 acres):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Designate as VRM Class II. • Close to commercial and personal-use forest and woodland product harvest (e.g., pole, post, firewood cutting, Christmas trees, seed collection, and wildings) except for incidental collection for onsite campfire use and administrative purposes. • Limited to designated routes. • Avoid new ROWs (linear, communication sites, and wind and solar projects). • Retain public lands in federal ownership • Close to mineral material disposals. • Open to fluid mineral leasing with major constraints (NSO). 					

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
REC-7	<p>Canyon RMZ (1,100 acres)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recreation Niche: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - World-class wilderness trekking adventure viewing deeply entrenched slickrock canyon and associated slot canyon features. • Primary Activities: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Hiking and scrambling, backpacking, canyoneering, outdoor photography, camping, viewing scenic vistas, viewing cultural sites, and wilderness exploration. • Required Management: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Manage according to the management actions for the Paria Canyon-Vermilion Cliffs Wilderness 	x				
REC-8	<p>Uplands RMZ (20,100 acres)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recreation Niche: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Unique, world-class primitive and backcountry adventure recreation viewing unique upland geologic features. • Primary Activities: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Hiking and scrambling, outdoor photography, viewing wildlife and scenic vistas, wilderness exploration, equestrian, and camping. 	x				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<p>Required Management:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Manage according to the management actions for the Paria Canyon-Vermilion Cliffs Wilderness 					
REC-9	<p>Dunes RMZ (1,000 acres)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recreation Niche: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Unique, scenic, and expansive sand dunes OHV opportunities. • Primary Activities: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Driving among sand dunes, camping along dune fringes, photography, and spending time with friends and family. <p>Required Management (the Dunes RMZ is entirely within the Moquith Mountain WSA):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • According to IMP • OHV: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Open beyond vegetated and conservation areas. All vehicles on the dunes are required to stay at least 10 feet from vegetation. • VRM: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Class I. • Facilities: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Provide support facilities for recreation experience. <p>Dry Lakebed :</p>	x				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No dumping of grey water or black water from RV units. • Firepans required for all open fires, and firewood must be packed in from outside the SRMA. • No digging of holes or pits. • No construction of fire-rings. • All trash and fire residue must be packed out and not left in the SRMA. 					
REC-10	<p>Non-Dunes Wooded RMZ (14,000 acres)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recreation Niche: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Scenic and extensive OHV trail network accessing vistas, overlooks, flora and fauna, and cultural sites. • Primary Activities: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Driving OHVs; viewing flora/fauna, geology, and cultural sites; hiking; equestrian; camping; hunting; photography; and spending time with friends and family. <p>Required Management (the Non-Dunes Wooded RMZ is partially inside the Moquith Mountain WSA) (10,600 acres):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • According to IMP • OHV: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Limit to designated routes to 	x				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<p>access trail heads</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • VRM: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Class I. • Facilities: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Provide support facilities for recreation experience. <p>Required Management (the Non-Dunes Wooded RMZ is partially inside the Cottonwood Canyon ACEC) (3,700 acres):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • OHV: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Limit to designated routes to access trail heads • VRM: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Class II. • Minerals: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Open to oil and gas leasing subject to major constraints (NSO), recommend withdrawing from mineral entry, close to mineral material disposals • Facilities: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Provide support facilities for recreation experience. <p>Required Management (for the remainder of the Non-Dunes Wooded RMZ):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • OHV: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Limit to designated routes to access trail heads • VRM: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Class III 					

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minerals: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Open to oil and gas leasing subject to major constraints (NSO) • Facilities: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Provide support facilities for recreation experience. <p><u>Ponderosa Grove Campground</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No dumping of grey water or black water from RV units. • No fires outside of established campsite fire grates. • No digging of holes or pits. 					
REC-11	<p><i>Orderville Canyon SRMA</i> Market Strategy: Undeveloped (1,950 acres)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recreation Niche: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Spectacular, primitive riparian canyon travel with abundant geologic formations and diverse flora and fauna. • Primary Activities: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Canyoneering, hiking, backpacking, hunting, camping, outdoor photography, viewing nature and wildlife, equestrian, and studying geology. <p>Required Management (the Orderville Canyon</p>	x				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<p>SRMA is entirely within the Orderville Canyon WSA and 500 acres of the SRMA are within the Orderville Canyon suitable “wild” segment):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • According to IMP • OHV: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Limit to designated routes except closed to OHV use within the 500 acres of the Orderville Canyon suitable “wild” segment • VRM: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Class I • Facilities: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Provide support facilities for recreation experience. 					
REC-12	<p>North Fork Virgin River SRMA Market Strategy: Undeveloped (1,050 acres)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recreation Niche: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Spectacular, primitive riparian canyon travel with abundant geologic formations and diverse flora and fauna. • Primary Activities: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Canyoneering, hiking, backpacking, hunting, camping, outdoor photography, viewing nature and wildlife, equestrian, and studying geology. <p>Required Management (the North Fork Virgin</p>	x				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<p>River SRMA is entirely within the North Fork Virgin River WSA and 200 acres of the SRMA are within the North Fork Virgin River suitable “wild” segment):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • According to IMP • OHV: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Limit to designated routes except closed to OHV use within the 200 acres of the North Fork Virgin River suitable “wild” segment • VRM: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Class I • Facilities: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Provide support facilities for recreation experience. 					

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
REC-13	<p>Escalante SRMA Market Strategy: Community (22,800 acres)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recreation Niche: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Town-accessible OHV touring, mountain biking, and hiking/equestrian trail networks offering outstanding views and varied terrain. • Primary Activities: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - OHV touring, mountain biking, hiking, rock-scrambling, viewing scenery and wildlife, photography, equestrian, spending time with friends and family, and participating in and/or viewing competitive/organized events. <p>Required Management:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • OHV: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Limit to designated routes • VRM: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Class III • Minerals: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Open to leasing subject to standard terms and conditions • Facilities: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Provide support facilities for recreation experience. 	x				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
REC-14	<p>Kanab Field Office ERMA (458,900 acres)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Primary Activities: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - OHV touring; hiking; picnicking; backpacking; hunting; fishing; camping; equestrian; outdoor photography; viewing geologic features, nature, and wildlife; and participating in and/or viewing competitive/organized events. <p>Required Management:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Facilities: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Provide support facilities for recreation experience. 	x				
REC-15	Develop recreation sites and facilities needed to accommodate users, facilitate recreational uses of public lands, and protect resources.	x				
REC-16	Implement the necessary safety measures to protect visitors in the Coral Pink Sand Dunes/Moquith Mountain area through coordination between the BLM and the State of Utah. Emphasis would be placed on minimizing interaction between motorized and non-motorized uses on the sand dunes, as well as enforcement of existing state and federal laws and policies. The existing OHV trails adjacent to Hancock Road would be closed. BLM and State Park personnel would continue to cooperate with local authorities on law enforcement matters.	x				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
REC-17	Regulate rock climbing within 300 feet of cultural sites. Climbing routes that impact cultural resource sites will generally not be allowed, and climbing routes designed to access cultural resource sites will not be allowed unless under permit for scientific investigation.	x				
REC-18	No person or persons should occupy one area on BLM lands within the decision area for longer than 14 consecutive days in any 28-day period; however, extensions beyond the 14-day length of stay could be authorized for permitted uses on a case-by-case basis. Any site on public land within 30 air miles constitutes the same area for the purpose of this management decision.	x				
REC-19	Close areas to rock climbing within the distance and time restrictions identified in the management of raptor habitat decisions.	x				
REC-20	Use the minimum necessary signage to provide for public safety and information or to control unauthorized use.	x				
REC-21	Design facilities to be compatible with the local landscapes and recreation experience.	x				
REC-22	Management responses to unacceptable resource and/or social conditions will range from least restrictive methods (e.g., information and education) to most restrictive (e.g., visitor limits, supplemental rules, or restrictions). Where feasible, the least restrictive methods will be the first priority. (Recognize that various levels of regulations and limits are necessary. Restrictions	x				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	and limitations on public uses should be as small as possible without compromising the primary goal.) Use on-the-ground presence as a tool to protect public lands.					
REC-23	Developed recreation sites will be recommended for withdrawal from mineral entry, closed to mineral material disposal, and open to oil and gas leasing subject to major constraints (NSO).	x				
REC-24	Developed recreation sites will be fenced to exclude grazing use.	x				
REC-25	Identify areas for rock crawling where impacts could be minimized or eliminated and where such use would be compatible with other resource goals and objectives.	x				
REC-26	Allow dispersed camping throughout the decision area without permit, unless specified in the plan.	x				
REC-27	Limit vehicle parking for dispersed camping within 150 feet of designated routes.	x				Note: enforcement has been challenging to date.
REC-28	Provide information regarding recreation opportunities, interpretation of natural and human history, and specific rules and regulations pertaining to use of public lands to visitors.	x				
REC-29	Provide education and outreach programs such as Tread Lightly or Leave No Trace.	x				
REC-30	Provide information on the area's cultural and natural resources through outreach programs (e.g., organizations, schools, and partnerships) to build emotional, intellectual, and recreational ties with	x				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	the area.					
REC-31	Public information will be provided only for those cultural sites designated for public use.	x				See CUL-12
REC-32	Coordinate with local communities and other groups to foster heritage tourism throughout the decision area.	x				
REC-33	Allow use of non-motorized wheel carriers to retrieve game kills outside of WSAs.	x				
REC-34	Acquire legal access to areas of high recreation interest from willing parties.	x				
REC-35	Impacts on night sky would be considered and mitigated through the application of specific mitigation measures (e.g., down lighting and low-level lighting) identified in activity-level planning and NEPA review. See also Lands and Realty restrictions on the use of strobe lights.	x				
REC-36	Impacts to soundscapes around national parks would be considered and mitigated through the application of specific mitigation measures identified in activity-level planning and NEPA-level review.	x				Most lands adjacent to Zion NP are WSA.

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
REC-37	Issue SRPs after evaluation of the various factors including the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use conforms to the recreation goals and objectives outlined in the Resource Management Plan • Nature of proposed event or activity (i.e., commercial versus competitive) • Size (acreage) and sensitivity of land and resources affected (ACEC, WSA, VRM) • Compatibility with other uses, activities, and visitors in that area • Proposed number of participants and group size • Associated vehicle and equipment • Time (daily, seasonally) and duration of proposed use • Potential social impacts (crowding, group encounters, conflicting activities, and/or experiences) • Specific resources impacted (e.g., wildlife, cultural, paleontology, visual, riparian, soil, air, and water) • Rehabilitation and monitoring needs and feasibility • Support needs (people, equipment, supplies, vehicles) • Safety issues. 	x				
REC-38	Vending will be authorized in conjunction with organized events when it directly supports the	x				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	recreation experience and is appropriate to support the experience and setting as outlined in the Resource Management Plan and when the vending is necessary to support resource protection or appropriate recreation use.					
REC-39	Vending along scenic byways and backways would be coordinated with the Scenic Byway coordination committees and local government and highway authorities.	x				
REC-40	In protected and restricted MSO habitat, limit SRP group size to no more than 12 according to recovery plan.	x				
REC-41	Prohibit OHV or mountain bike tours in the following areas: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Where compliance with the Utah Riparian Policy would not be achieved • The loop within Moquith Mountain WSA • The Elephant Cove Way within Parunuweap WSA. 			x	x	These areas are currently open to public OHV and mountain bike use. Either open to commercial OHV/bike use or close to all (public and commercial). See WSA-7 (designated open routes).
REC-42	Limit camping associated with SRPs to areas beyond 200 feet of riparian areas unless specific campsites are required during permitting. Approval of these specific campsites would be considered on a case-by-case basis.	x				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
REC-43	Group size would be limited to 12 people total (including tour guides) in the following areas: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wetlands/riparian zones • WSAs • Designated critical habitat for special status species. 	x				
REC-44	Group size would be limited to 25 people total in the remainder of the decision area, with permits for groups of more than 25 people being considered on a case-by-case basis in areas where resources would not be damaged.	x				
REC-45	SRPs will be subject to the following restrictions unless specifically authorized: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No collection of natural resources (not including firewood for personal onsite use). • No SRP activities will be authorized in bald eagle winter roost areas from November 15 through March 15 during critical roosting hours (from 1 hour after sunset to 9 a.m.). • If surveys reveal the presence of nesting Southwestern willow flycatchers, authorize no SRP activities in these locations between May 15 and June 30. • No Greater sage-grouse lek areas will be advertised by SRP holders or the BLM. • Implement seasonal/area closures 	x				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	during Greater sage-grouse breeding (March 1 to April 30) and/or wintering (November 1 to February 28) seasons if BLM biologists determine that breeding or wintering is being impacted by SRP activities.					
<i>Transportation-Travel Management Area Categories</i>						
TRC-1	Management of motorized access would balance protection of resources while providing for resource use needs. Area designations would be as follows (Map 9): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Open to cross-country OHV use: 1,000 acres • Limited to designated routes: 528,000 acres • Closed to OHV use: 25,000 acres. • See Recreation section for specific management of OHV use in SRMAs. 	x				
TRC-2	Designate the following managed open areas: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Moquith Mountain SRMA: Dunes RMZ beyond vegetated and conservation areas • DD Hollow topsoil pit. 	x				
TRC-3	Management of OHV use in areas not designated as open or closed would be limited to designated routes (528,000 acres) (Map 9).	x				
TRC-4	Designated routes on the north side of Pugh Canyon are closed annually to motorized use	x				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	between February 1 and August 31 if a breeding pair of raptors is using the area (to protect the reproductive success of a breeding pair of raptors). If no nesting behavior is initiated prior to June 1, a BLM authorized officer could open the route to motorized use. During the remainder of the year OHV use will be limited to designated routes.					
TRC-5	Designate the following areas as closed to OHV use: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Paria SRMA—both RMZs • Designated wilderness (by Congressional designation) • In and through islands of vegetation in Welsh’s milkweed designated critical habitat (790 acres) • Suitable “wild” river corridors. 	x				
<i>Transportation-Travel Management OHV Route Identification</i>						
TRR-1	Manage inventoried routes as follows (Map 10): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Open to motorized vehicle use: 1,402 miles • Limited (closed seasonally) to motorized vehicle use: 2 miles • Closed to motorized vehicle use: 76 miles. 	x				
TRR-2	Consideration of route and trail modifications (new or existing) will be conducted on a case-by-case basis in accordance with resource/use objectives and after appropriate NEPA review and analysis (Appendix 7).	x				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
TRR-3	Where the authorized officer determines that OHVs are causing or would cause considerable adverse impacts, the authorized officer shall close or restrict such areas. Local highway authorities would be consulted as appropriate. The public would be notified.	x				
TRR-4	BLM could impose limitations on the 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.	x				
TRR-5	Where routes 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) 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.		x			Need to update IMP reference to new wilderness manuals.
<i>Transportation-Travel Management</i>						

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
TRV-1	Coordinate transportation planning with Kane and Garfield counties.	x				
TRV-2	The BLM would continue to repair, maintain, and rehabilitate routes to maintain existing route conditions. Route modifications (new facilities or expansion of existing facilities) would be determined on a case-by-case basis in accordance with resource/use objectives and after appropriate NEPA review and analysis.	x				
TRV-3	Pursue maintenance agreements with highway authorities in the decision area.	x				
TRV-4	BLM, in preparing its RMP designations and its implementation-level travel management plans, is following policy and regulation authority found at 43 CFR 8340, 43 CFR 8364, and 43 CFR 9268.	x				
TRV-5	As per the State of Utah v. Andrus, October 1, 1979 (Cotter Decision), BLM would grant the State of Utah reasonable access to state lands for economic purposes on a case-by-case basis.	x				
<i>Lands and Realty</i>						
LAR-1	Prepare communication site plans for all existing communication sites before any new types of uses or new facilities would be authorized on the site. Site plans would be prepared for all new communication sites before any development of the site(s) would be authorized.	x				In process of updating four communication site plans.
LAR-2	Evaluations for the siting and construction of communications towers will take into account potential impacts on migratory birds. Measures to avoid and minimize impacts would be considered	x				Note: all existing communication site towers are less than 100 feet.

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	during design, including avoiding known bird migration corridors, eliminating guy wires, restricting height of towers to less than 200 feet, and installing minimum lighting with use of white strobe lights rather than red (strobe or non-strobe) lights. The addition of new communications devices on existing towers will be considered where it is practical and does not present a safety or operational risk.					
LAR-3	Require a feasibility study and site plan for new communications locations.	x				
LAR-4	Exclude new ROWs (including communication sites) (75,700 acres) in the following areas (Map 11): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WSAs • Wilderness areas • Suitable WSR corridors with a tentative classification of “wild” or “scenic.” 		x			Need to clarify if this covers ACECs.
LAR-5	Avoid new ROWs (51,570 acres) in the following areas (Map 11): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The five non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics managed to protect, preserve, and maintain those characteristics (27,700 acres) • Within ½ mile of active, suitable (currently inactive) Utah prairie dog habitats and within potential reintroduction sites. 		x			Need to clarify if this includes ACECs.
LAR-6	Preference would be to locate ROW	x				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	developments in common (within existing ROWs/disturbance areas).					
LAR-7	Consider burying new and reconstructed utility lines (including powerlines up to 24 kilovolts [kV]) unless: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Visual quality objectives can be met without burying • Geologic conditions make burying infeasible • Burying would produce greater long-term site disturbance. 		x			Note: 24kV seems small
LAR-8	New and reconstructed powerlines must meet non-electrocution standards for raptors. If electrocution or line strike issues develop with existing powerlines, corrective actions to meet these non-electrocution standards would be taken.	x				
LAR-9	Construct powerlines greater than 230 kV using non-reflective wire. Towers would be constructed using non-reflective material. Powerlines would not be high-lined unless no other location exists.		x			Note: 230kV seems large
LAR-10	Linear crossings, such as pipelines, utilities, or roads, across riparian areas and/or ephemeral channels would be considered on a case-by-case basis to protect the above areas. Surface disturbing activities would be avoided on unstable areas, such as landslides, and slumps.	x				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
LAR-11	<p>Request the cancellation of the Classification and Multiple Use Act of 1964 classifications segregating the following lands from all forms of appropriation including mineral location:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Township 42 S, Range 7 W, Sec. 4, Lots 5, 6, 11, and 12 (140.05 acres) • Township 43 S, Range 7 W, Sec. 7, NE1/4 (160 acres) • Township 43 S, Range 7 W, Sec. 14, SE1/4 (160 acres) • Township 43 S, Range 7 W, Sec. 17, NW1/4, SE1/4SE1/4 (200 acres) • Township 43 S, Range 8 W, Sec. 13, NW1/4NW1/4 (40 acres) • Township 43 S, Range 8 W, Sec. 14, NE1/4NE1/4 (40 acres). <p>The values for which these lands were classified would be reviewed and if they still warrant protection, specific protective withdrawals under FLPMA Section 204 would be obtained prior to the cancellation of the existing classifications.</p>			x		These were classified November 3, 1970 and cancelled April 15, 1982 (Fed. Reg. V.47 N.3).
LAR-12	Review existing withdrawals on a case-by-case basis. Determine whether the use is consistent with the intent of the withdrawal and whether the withdrawal should be continued, modified, revoked, or terminated.	x				
LAR-13	Manage land becoming unencumbered by withdrawals in a manner consistent with adjacent or comparable public land within the planning area.	x				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
LAR-14	Limit the size of proposed withdrawals to the minimum acreage consistent with the demonstrated need.	x				
LAR-15	<p>In addition to the 24,591 acres withdrawn, recommend the following areas (9,500 acres) for withdrawal from mineral entry (Map 12):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cottonwood Canyon ACEC • Developed recreation sites • Suitable “wild” river corridors • Suitable “scenic” river corridors • Relict vegetation areas (Diana’s Throne and Elephant Butte). 	x				
LAR-16	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. A notice of termination and opening order would be published to notify the public when and to what extent the land will be opened, consistent with planning decisions. Land on which a classification or segregation has been terminated would be managed in a manner consistent with adjacent or comparable public land within the planning area.	x				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
LAR-17	<p>Public lands, in order to be considered for any form of land tenure adjustment (including exchanges, in-lieu selections, desert land entries, R&PP, easement acquisitions, etc.), except for FLPMA Section 203 sales, must meet one or more of the following criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is in the public interest; accommodates the needs of state, local, or private entities, including for the economy and community growth and expansion; and is in accordance with other land use goals, objectives, and planning decisions • Results in 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, special status species 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 	x				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Results in the acquisition of lands that serve a national priority as identified in national policy directives. 					
LAR-18	Habitat for listed threatened, endangered, and candidate species would be retained in federal ownership unless land tenure adjustments would result in a net increase of habitat. All actions involving listed species or their habitat would result in the proper consultation with USFWS. Land tenure adjustments may be considered with the State of Utah and others after consultation with and concurrence by USFWS.	x				
LAR-19	Retain non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics in federal ownership where identified to protect, preserve and maintain their wilderness characteristics.	x				
LAR-20	Lands with mining claims could be considered for disposal if the following apply: (1) the new surface owner is the mining claimant, or (2) the new surface owner agrees to accept the surface with the claim encumbrance.	x				
LAR-21	Approximately 6,000 acres of public land would be available for FLPMA Section 203 sales with NEPA compliance and consistent with other decisions in this RMP (Map 13; Appendix 5).		x			Appendix 5 list is wrong in ROD. Should be from Alternative B (preferred).
LAR-22	Manage oil and gas with NSO stipulations on	x				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	R&PP leases. If these sites are no longer required, they would be managed as are adjacent lands.					
LAR-23	Give land exchanges with the State of Utah priority consideration to resolve inholdings issues.	x				
LAR-24	As per the Cotter Decision, reasonable access to state lands would be authorized for economic purposes.		x			Add full legal citation of the “Cotter” decision: <i>Utah v. Andrus</i> , 486 F. Supp. 995 (D. Utah 1979).
LAR-25	Adopt programmatic policies and BMPs in the Wind Energy Development Program identified in Record of Decision for Implementation of a <i>Wind Energy Development Program and Associated Land Use Plan Amendments (BLM 2005e)</i> .	x				
LAR-26	Consider proposals for ROWs for wind and solar energy development throughout the decision area with the following exceptions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Designated wilderness • WSAs • ACECs • Suitable WSR corridors. 	x				
LAR-27	Filming may be authorized throughout the decision area after site-specific NEPA analysis is completed.	x				
<i>Minerals and Energy</i>						
MIN-1	Close public lands or federal mineral estate within incorporated municipalities to mineral leasing in accordance with the Mineral Leasing Act (30 United States Code [U.S.C.] 181 and 43 CFR 3100.0-3(a)(2)(iii) and 3100.0-3(b)(2)(ii)).	x				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
MIN-2	Exceptions, waivers, or modifications to stipulations on oil and gas leases and other surface disturbing activities may be considered on a case-by-case basis in accordance with Appendix 3 guidelines.	x				
MIN-3	Manage the following sites as open to leasing subject to major constraints (NSO): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cemeteries • Landfills, existing and closed • Lands managed under R&PP Act leases • Developed recreation sites • Airports • Federal facilities. 	x				
MIN-4	Manage fluid mineral leases as shown on Map 14: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Open to leasing subject to standard terms and conditions: 95,400 acres • Open to leasing subject to moderate constraints (seasonal and CSU): 296,200 acres • Open to leasing subject to major constraints (NSO): 83,400 acres • Closed to leasing: 79,000 acres. 	x				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
MIN-5	<p>In accordance with an UDEQ-DAQ letter dated June 6, 2008, (see Appendix 10) requesting implementation of interim nitrogen oxide control measures for compressor engines; BLM will require the following as a Lease Stipulation and a Condition of Approval for Applications for Permit to Drill:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All new and replacement internal combustion oil and gas field engines of less than or equal to 300 design-rated horsepower must not emit more than 2 gms of NOX per horsepower-hour. This requirement does not apply to oil and gas field engines of less than or equal to 40 design-rated horsepower. • All new and replacement internal combustion oil and gas field engines of greater than 300 design rated horsepower must not emit more than 1.0 gms of NOX per horsepower-hour. 		x			Verified with Colin Schwartz that the UDEQ-DAQ letter is still the current guidance (which is actually national guidance). Check back for updates in 2017
MIN-6	Limit vehicular use for necessary tasks, such as geophysical exploration including project survey and layout, to OHV designations. Exceptions may be granted by permit on a case-by-case basis.		x			Change “to OHV designations” to “designated routes.”
MIN-7	Allow geophysical operations consistent with existing regulations and policies and subject to constraints in areas with special designations (WSA, ACEC, WSR segments tentatively	x				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	classified as “wild” or “scenic”) as determined through site-specific NEPA analysis.					
MIN-8	Lease geothermal resources consistent with oil and gas leasing stipulations and consistent with other resource objectives.	x				
MIN-9	Approximately 35,538 acres (Map 15) are determined to be unsuitable for surface mining and surface operations incident to an underground mine as stated in 43 CFR 3400.0-5(mm) based on the 20 criteria identified in Appendix 6.		x			Alton Lease will change the acreage numbers and the map.
MIN-10	Additional areas could be found unsuitable based on site-specific analysis (Appendix 6).	x				
MIN-11	Incorporate erosion control stipulations in mining plans for surface mining disturbance as per Surface Mining Control Reclamation Act regulations.	x				
MIN-12	Allow location, exploration, and development of locatable minerals on public lands except where withdrawn. Evaluate operations for exploration and development in the context of its requirement to prevent unnecessary and undue degradation of other resources.	x				
MIN-13	In addition to the 24,591 acres withdrawn, recommend withdrawing the following areas (9,500 acres) from mineral entry (Map 12): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cottonwood Canyon ACEC • Developed recreation sites • Suitable “wild” river corridors • Suitable “scenic” river corridors • Relict vegetation areas (Diana’s 	x				Pending and in progress.

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	Throne and Elephant Butte).					
MIN-14	Allow mineral material disposals on a case-by-case basis subject to site-specific environmental analysis excluding the following areas (105,000 acres) (Map 16): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cottonwood ACEC • Relict Vegetation (Diana’s Throne and Elephant Butte) • WSAs • Non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics • Paria Canyon–Vermilion Cliffs Wilderness area (closed to mineral material disposals by congressional designation) • Suitable “wild” river corridors • Suitable “scenic” river corridors • Developed recreation sites. 	x				
MIN-15	Incorporate erosion control and rehabilitation stipulations into mining plans.	x				
<i>Areas of Critical Environmental Concern</i>						
ACEC-1	Include stipulations for permitted actions within the designated ACEC to ensure relevant and important values, resources, processes, systems,	x				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	and hazards are protected or managed for.					
ACEC-2	<p>Designate and manage the 3,800 acres as the Cottonwood Canyon ACEC (Map 17). Manage the relevant and important values as follows:</p> <p>Scenic:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Designate as VRM Class II • Limit OHV use to designated routes • Open to oil and gas leasing subject to major constraints (NSO) • Recommend withdrawing from mineral entry • Close to mineral material disposals. <p>Cultural:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Monitor specific sites on a regular basis • Retain all lands and interests in land in federal ownership • Work with the School and Institutional Trust Lands Administration (SITLA) to acquire state inholdings. <p>Hazard/Safety/Public Welfare:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Close the Water Canyon Allotment (48 AUMs) to livestock grazing in order to protect the Fredonia City Culinary water supply for the life of the plan. 	x				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
<p>ACEC-3</p>	<p>Approximately 2,400 acres (63 percent) of the Cottonwood Canyon ACEC are inside the Moquith Mountain WSA. The relevant and important values in this portion of the ACEC would be managed according to the IMP and the following management prescriptions:</p> <p>Scenic:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Designate as VRM Class I • Limit OHV use to designated routes • Recommend withdrawing from mineral entry <p>Cultural:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For purposes of Cultural Resources: Monitor specific sites on a regular basis • Retain all lands and interests in land in federal ownership • Work with the School and Institutional Trust Lands Administration (SITLA) to acquire state inholdings. <p>Hazard/Safety/Public Welfare:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Close the Water Canyon Allotment (48 AUMs) to livestock grazing in order to protect the Fredonia City Culinary water supply for the life of the plan. 		x			<p>Correct IMP reference to new wilderness manual.</p>
<p><i>Wild and Scenic Rivers</i></p>						

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
WSR-1	<p>Management to protect the river segments would be provided in the following ways:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Free-flowing values: The free-flowing characteristics of river segments would not be modified to allow stream impoundments, diversions, channelization, and/or rip-rapping to the extent the BLM is authorized under law. • Outstandingly Remarkable Values: Each river segment would be managed to protect identified ORVs and, to the extent practicable, such values would be enhanced. • Tentative Classification: Management and development of the river and its corridor would not be modified to the degree that its tentative classification would be affected. A river segment's tentative classification would not be changed due to modification from "wild" to "scenic" or from "scenic" to "recreational." 	x				
WSR-2	<p>Protective management would apply to BLM lands within the river corridor, which does not exceed "more than 320 acres of land per mile measured from the ordinary high water mark on both sides of the river" (16 U.S.C. 1274(b)). The corridors may vary on either side of the river and</p>	x				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	be narrower or wider to protect ORVs, but the total corridor widths may not exceed 320 acres (half of a mile or 2,640 feet wide) per river mile.					
WSR-3	Protective interim management of suitable rivers would not involve assertion of federal reserved water rights.	x				
WSR-4	Manage rivers determined suitable for congressional designation into the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System (NWSRS) in a manner that would protect their ORVs, free-flowing nature, and tentative classification, in accordance with protective management for the river corridors.	x				
WSR-5	Six eligible river segment corridors (Map 18) would be determined suitable for WSR designation (5,530 acres/30 miles), with the tentative classifications of “wild” (4,570 acres/25 miles) or “scenic” (960 acres/5 miles).	x				
WSR-6	Suitable—Wild Manage the portion of the North Fork Virgin River (segment 48-49) suitable “wild” river segment inside the North Fork WSA to protect the tentative classification and ORVs through the following specific management prescriptions (within ¼ mile of each side of the river or the viewshed from the river, whichever is less): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • According to the IMP • VRM: Class I • Recommend for withdrawal from 		x			Correct IMP reference to new wilderness manual.

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<p>locatable mineral entry</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Motorized Travel: Closed to OHV use • ROW exclusion area. <p>Manage the portion of the North Fork Virgin River (segment 48-49) suitable “wild” river segment outside the WSA to protect the tentative classification and ORVs through the following specific management prescriptions (within ¼ mile of each side of the river or the viewshed from the river, whichever is less):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • VRM: Class I • Minerals: Close to oil and gas leasing, recommend for withdrawal from locatable mineral entry, and close to mineral material disposal • Motorized Travel: Close to OHV use • ROW exclusion area. 					
WSR-7	<p>Suitable—Scenic</p> <p>Manage the East Fork Virgin River (segment 37-40a) suitable “scenic” river segment inside the Parunuweap WSA to protect the tentative classification and ORVs through the following specific management prescriptions (within ¼ mile of each side of the river or the viewshed from the river, whichever is less):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • According to the IMP • VRM: Class I 		x			Correct IMP reference to new wilderness manual.

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommend for withdrawal from locatable mineral entry • Motorized Travel: Limit to designated routes • ROW exclusion area. 					
WSR-8	<p>Suitable—Wild</p> <p>Manage the East Fork Virgin River (segment 40a-41) suitable “wild” river segment inside the Parunuweap WSA to protect the tentative classification and ORVs through the following specific management prescriptions (within ¼ mile of each side of the river or the viewshed from the river, whichever is less):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • According to the IMP • VRM: Class I • Recommend for withdrawal from locatable mineral entry • Motorized Travel: Close to OHV use • ROW exclusion area. 	x				<p>This section of river was found suitable for designation as a WSR. If designation ever happens the portion of river bed which is currently used as an open "way" would be closed to motorized travel.</p>
WSR-9	<p>Suitable—Wild</p> <p>Manage the portion of the Orderville Gulch (Esplin Gulch) (segment 44-45) suitable “wild” river segment inside the Orderville Canyon WSA to protect the tentative classification and ORVs through the following specific management</p>		x			<p>Correct IMP reference to new wilderness manual.</p>

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<p>prescriptions (within ¼ mile of each side of the river or the viewshed from the river, whichever is less):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • According to the IMP • VRM: Class I • Recommend for withdrawal from locatable mineral entry • Motorized Travel: Close to OHV use • ROW exclusion area. <p>Manage the portion of the Orderville Gulch (Esplin Gulch) (segment 44-45) suitable “wild” river segment outside the Orderville Canyon WSA to protect the tentative classification and ORVs through the following specific management prescriptions (within ¼ mile of each side of the river or the viewshed from the river, whichever is less):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • VRM: Class I • Minerals: Close to oil and gas leasing, recommend for withdrawal from locatable mineral entry, and close to mineral material disposal • Motorized Travel: Close to OHV use • ROW exclusion area. 					

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
<p>WSR-10</p>	<p>Suitable—Wild Manage the portion of the Meadow Creek/Mineral Gulch (segment 33-35, 35-38) suitable “wild” river segment inside the Parunuweap WSA to protect the tentative classification and ORVs through the following specific management prescriptions (within ¼ mile of each side of the river or the viewshed from the river, whichever is less):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • According to the IMP • VRM: Class I • Recommend for withdrawal from locatable mineral entry • Motorized Travel: Close to OHV use • ROW exclusion area. <p>Manage the portion of the Meadow Creek/Mineral Gulch (segment 33-35, 35-38) suitable “wild” river segment outside the Parunuweap WSA to protect the tentative classification and ORVs through the following specific management prescriptions (within ¼ mile of each side of the river or the viewshed from the river, whichever is less):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • VRM: Class I • Minerals: Close to oil and gas leasing, recommend for withdrawal from locatable mineral entry, and close to mineral material disposal • Motorized Travel: Close to OHV use • ROW exclusion area. 		<p>x</p>			<p>Correct IMP reference to new wilderness manual.</p>

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
WSR-11	<p>Suitable—Wild ORVs in the Paria River would be preserved through the following management approach (from the Final Arizona Statewide Wild and Scenic Rivers Study Report/Record of Decision [BLM 1997b], which determined eligibility for the Paria River and is carried forward in this document):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Developed campgrounds, interpretive centers, or administrative headquarters within the river corridor would be prohibited. Simple comfort and convenience facilities would be permitted. • New electric transmission lines, natural gas lines, water lines, and other ROWs would be prohibited. • Woodcutting would not be permitted except where needed to clear trails, for visitor safety, or to control fire. • Livestock grazing would be managed to protect ORVs within the area. • No new flood control dams, levees, or other water works would be permitted. • Hydroelectric power facilities would be prohibited. • All water supply dams and major diversions would be prohibited. • Construction of new routes for 	x				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	motorized travel would be prohibited.					
WSR-12	Allow other activities within the suitable river segment corridors on a case-by-case basis as long as their ORVs, free-flowing nature, and tentative classification would be protected. See BLM Manual-8351, Section 5, for implementation guidance.	x				
WSR-13	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 NWSRS. Besides applying consistent criteria across agency jurisdictions, the joint study would avoid piecemealing 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	x				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<p>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>					
WSR-14	<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 Approved 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. 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>	x				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
WSR-15	<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 NWSRS does not create new water rights for the BLM. Federal reserved water rights for new components of the NWSRS are established at the discretion of Congress. If water is reserved by Congress when a river component is added to the NWSRS, 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 McCarren 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</p>	x				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	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.					
Wilderness						
DW-1	Manage the Paria Canyon–Vermilion Cliffs Wilderness cooperatively with Arizona BLM.	x				
DW-2	Implement the Paria Canyon–Vermilion Cliffs Wilderness Management Plan.	x				
DW-3	The wilderness character of the Paria Canyon–Vermilion Cliffs Wilderness would be protected and enhanced.	x				
DW-4	Maintain the current group size and visitor use limits required for use in Paria Canyon, subject to adaptive management decisions deemed necessary through monitoring and evaluation of resources and social conditions.	x				
DW-5	Restore lands within the wilderness area where ecological integrity is outside the range of natural variability and where compatible with wilderness objectives.	x				
DW-6	Restore ecological functions and structure in wilderness using the minimum tool requirement	x				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	standard for BLM wilderness areas and the best mix of chemical, biological, or mechanical means with fire and natural processes.					
DW-7	For fire and fuels management, the use of earth-moving equipment must be authorized by the Field Office Manager.	x				
DW-8	Fire management actions will rely on the most effective methods of suppression that are least damaging to wilderness values, other resources, and the environment while requiring the least expenditure of public funds.	x				
DW-9	A resource advisor will be consulted when fire occurs in the wilderness.	x				
DW-10	Use natural processes to restore areas of preexisting human imprints. Where proactive restoration of wilderness conditions is desirable, require the minimum requirement standards; plans to address restoration of preexisting human impacts may be required.	x				
DW-11	Ensure that any change in the landscape is very low.	x				
DW-12	Manage to protect or restore the natural quiet and natural soundscapes of the area.	x				
DW-13	Prohibit all motorized vehicles, motorized equipment, aircraft landing, and other forms of mechanical transport (including mountain bikes and wheeled game carriers). Exceptions may be authorized per the Wilderness Act Section 4(d) when it is: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Necessary to meet minimum 	x				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	requirements for the administration of the area <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Required in emergencies involving the health and safety of persons within the areas • For the exercise of a private existing right or other special provision. 					
Wilderness Study Areas						
WSA-1	Planning decisions in this RMP will not affect the existence of or recommendations on WSAs identified as a result of inventory conducted under Section 603 of FLPMA and awaiting action by Congress. Further, although the formal Section 603 wilderness review process was determined to have expired on October 21, 1993, BLM may and will continue to inventory public lands for resource values including wilderness characteristics on lands that have not been reviewed, or where new information is provided that shows additional inventory is necessary. However, additional Wilderness Study Areas will not be designated through this planning process.	x				
WSA-2	Manage all WSAs according to the IMP (BLM Manual Handbook H-8550-1) until legislation is enacted to either designate the areas as wilderness or release them for uses other than wilderness.		x			Correct IMP reference to new wilderness manual.
WSA-3	Only Congress can release a WSA from wilderness consideration. Should any WSA, in whole or in part, be released from wilderness	x				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<p>consideration, such released lands will be managed in accordance with the goals, objectives, and management prescriptions established in this RMP, unless otherwise specified by Congress in its releasing legislation. BLM will examine proposals in the released areas on a case-by-case basis but will defer all actions that are inconsistent with RMP goals, objectives, and prescriptions until it completes a land use plan amendment. Because any released lands will continue to be managed consistent with the prescriptions identified in this plan unless and until the plan is amended, no separate analysis is required to address impacts to released lands.</p>					
WSA-4	<p>Where routes 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) 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.</p>	x				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks																															
WSA-5	Designate WSAs as VRM Class I.	x																																			
WSA-6	<p>Manage OHV area designation in WSAs as shown in Table 2 and on Map 9:</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>WSA</th> <th>OHV</th> <th>Acres</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Canaan Mountain</td> <td>Limited</td> <td>4,300</td> </tr> <tr> <td rowspan="2">Acquired Land Managed as Part of the Canaan</td> <td>Limited</td> <td>600</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Closed</td> <td>400</td> </tr> <tr> <td rowspan="2">Moquith Mountain</td> <td>Limited</td> <td>13,800</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Open</td> <td>1,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td rowspan="2">North Fork Virgin River</td> <td>Closed</td> <td>200</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Limited</td> <td>850</td> </tr> <tr> <td rowspan="2">Orderville Canyon</td> <td>Closed</td> <td>500</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Limited</td> <td>1,450</td> </tr> <tr> <td rowspan="2">Parunuweap Canyon</td> <td>Closed</td> <td>6,200</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Limited</td> <td>24,600</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	WSA	OHV	Acres	Canaan Mountain	Limited	4,300	Acquired Land Managed as Part of the Canaan	Limited	600	Closed	400	Moquith Mountain	Limited	13,800	Open	1,000	North Fork Virgin River	Closed	200	Limited	850	Orderville Canyon	Closed	500	Limited	1,450	Parunuweap Canyon	Closed	6,200	Limited	24,600					
WSA	OHV	Acres																																			
Canaan Mountain	Limited	4,300																																			
Acquired Land Managed as Part of the Canaan	Limited	600																																			
	Closed	400																																			
Moquith Mountain	Limited	13,800																																			
	Open	1,000																																			
North Fork Virgin River	Closed	200																																			
	Limited	850																																			
Orderville Canyon	Closed	500																																			
	Limited	1,450																																			
Parunuweap Canyon	Closed	6,200																																			
	Limited	24,600																																			
WSA-7	Designate 25.0 miles of inventoried ways in WSAs (Moquith Mountain–8.5 miles; Parunuweap Canyon–15.9 miles; Orderville Canyon–0.6 miles) for OHV use (Map 10).	x				See REC-41																															
Other Designations																																					
OD-1	Cooperate with state and local authorities to implement the purposes of designation.	x																																			
OD-2	Work with the BLM and National Park Service (NPS) planning team in the development of a comprehensive management plan for the National Historic Trail.		x			Add “Old Spanish” before National Historic Trail.																															

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
OD-3	Prepare an Activity (Trail) Plan for the Old Spanish National Historic Trail to identify specific on-the-ground actions that would be taken to implement the goals and objectives of the Trail.	x				
OD-4	Work in cooperation with Utah State Parks and Recreation, Garfield County, Old Spanish Trail Association, and the NPS on interpretive and recreation opportunities for this segment: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide interpretive information at appropriate locations (e.g., kiosks, road junctions, Garfield County line) • Retain public lands in federal ownership • Limit OHV use to designated routes • Manage for VRM objectives (VRM Class II in Circleville Canyon and VRM Class III and Class IV elsewhere). 	x				
OD-5	Work in cooperation with Utah State Parks and Recreation, Kane County, Old Spanish Trail Association, and the NPS on interpretive and recreation opportunities for [Highway 89, Kane County] segment: Provide interpretive information at appropriate locations (e.g., kiosks, road pullouts, Kane County line).	x				
Public Safety						
HAZ-1	In conformance with the BLM’s long-term strategies and national policies regarding Abandoned Mine Lands (AML), this RMP	x				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<p>recognizes the need to work with our partners toward identifying and addressing physical safety and environmental hazards at all AML sites on public lands. To accomplish this long-term goal, the criteria discussed in the following paragraphs would be established to assist in determining priorities for site and area mitigation and reclamation.</p>					
HAZ-2	<p>The criteria that would be used to establish physical safety hazard program priorities are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The AML physical safety program's highest priority would be cleaning up those AML sites where <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (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. • The site is listed or is eligible for listing in the Abandoned Mine Site Cleanup Module of the Protection and Response Information System. • AML hazards should be, to the 	x				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No				
	extent practicable, mitigated or remediated on the ground during site development.					
HAZ-3	<p>The criteria that would be used to establish water quality-based AML program priorities are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site has identified the watershed as a priority based on (a) one or more water laws or regulations, (b) threat to public health or safety, and (c) threat to the environment. • The project reflects a collaborative effort with other land management agencies. • The site is listed or is eligible for listing in the Abandoned Mine Site Cleanup Module of the Protection and Response Information System. • The project would be funded by contributions from collaborating agencies. 		x			Reword for clarity
HAZ-4	Maintain the State Multi-Year Work Plan and update as needed to reflect current policies for identifying program physical safety and water quality AML site priorities for reclamation and remediation.		x			Reword for clarity
HAZ Section	<i>[Focused on abandoned mine lands]</i>				x	Consider new decisions for spills and garbage dumps, etc.