

**Preparation Plan
for the
Moab Field Office
Resource Management Plan**

RECOMMENDED:

Maggie Wyatt

Maggie Wyatt, Field Office Manager

8/27/02

Date

APPROVED:

Sally Wisely

Sally Wisely, Utah State Director

9/24/02

Date

**Prepared by the
Moab Field Office**

August 23, 2002

TABLE OF CONTENTS

General Status Map of the Moab Field Office.....	iii
A. INTRODUCTION.....	1
1. Background.....	1
2. Purpose and Need	2
3. Relationship to Other Programs, Plans, or Policies.....	3
B. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION PROCESS AND INTEREST GROUPS.....	5
C. PRELIMINARY PLANNING CRITERIA.....	8
D. PRELIMINARY PLANNING ISSUES AND MANAGEMENT CONCERNS.....	10
1. Air Quality.....	11
2. Cultural, Paleontology, and Natural History	11
3. Fire Management.....	11
4. Woodland Harvest and Management	12
5. Hazardous Sites, Materials, and Wastes	12
6. Lands and Realty	12
7. Rangeland Management and Health/Rehabilitation	12
8. Minerals Management	13
9. Off-Highway Vehicle Use.....	13
10. Recreation.....	13
11. Riparian Resources	14
12. Socio-economic	14
13. Vegetation and Special Status Plants.....	15
14. Visual Resources	15
15. Watersheds and Water Quality	15
16. Wilderness	16
17. Wild and Scenic Rivers	16
18. Special Management Areas	16
19. Wildlife Habitat and Special Status Species Management.....	17
E. DATA AND GIS NEEDS	17
F. PARTICIPANTS IN THE PROCESS (Planning Team).....	19
G. FORMAT AND PROCESS FOR THE PLAN.....	20
H. PLAN PREPARATION SCHEDULE.....	22
Table 1 – Moab Field Office Plan Preparation Schedule	23
I. BUDGET	25
Table 2 – Expected Budget Costs for Preparation of the Moab Field Office RMP	26

APPENDICES30

APPENDIX A: PUBLIC PARTICIPATION SCHEDULES31

APPENDIX B: CONTACT/COMMENT DOCUMENTATION34

APPENDIX C: GEOSPATIOAL DATA DEVELOPMENT35

APPENDIX D: PRE-PLAN DATA STATUS40

APPENDIX E: PRELIMINARY DEIS FORMAT AND CONTENT OUTLINE.....49

GENERAL STATUS MAP
OF THE
MOAB FIELD OFFICE

PREPARATION PLAN
FOR THE
MOAB FIELD OFFICE
RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PLAN

A. INTRODUCTION

1. Background

The Moab Field Office proposes to prepare a new Resource Management Plan (RMP) that will cover the area previously covered by the Grand Resource Area RMP. The Grand Resource Area RMP was approved in 1985.

Significant changes have taken place since the Grand Resource Area RMP was approved in 1985. Resource conflicts have arisen with a substantial increase in recreational use and oil and gas leasing and development. Changes in the RMP are necessary for VRM management categories, OHV management categories, cultural resource management, oil and gas leasing categories, wilderness inventory areas, ACECs, Wild and Scenic River suitability, and special recreation use areas. New data is available for bighorn sheep, antelope, and Mexican spotted owl habitats and restrictions to land use actions are necessary. In addition, the Reasonable Foreseeable Development scenario for oil and gas requires updating which could expedite the processing of oil and gas permitting.

The Moab Field Office (MFO) is situated in the canyon, plateau, and desert areas of the Colorado Plateau physiographic province. It is located in southeastern Utah and encompasses all of Grand County and the northern portion of San Juan County. Geographically, the MFO is bounded by the Book Cliffs to the north, the Utah-Colorado state line to the east, Harts Point and Lisbon Valley to the south, and the Green River to the west. Major waterways include the Colorado River, the Dolores River, and the Green River. Elevations within the planning area range from about 13,000 feet on the La Sal Mountains to about 3,900 feet at Mineral Bottom along the Colorado River.

The MFO contains historical communities, diverse terrain, scenic landscapes, and recreational attractions that figure prominently in the settlement, history, culture, and recreational enjoyment of Southern Utah. Most of the traditional occupational pursuits historically associated with Utah can be found such as farming, ranching, mining, tourism, retail trade, transportation, and construction. Major transportation routes include Interstate 70; U.S. Highway 191; and State Routes 279 (Potash State Scenic Byway), 128 (Colorado River State Scenic Byway), and 313 (Dead Horse Mesa State Scenic Byway).

There are about 2,454,891 acres of land within the MFO boundary of which there are about 1,852,885 acres of public lands administered by the BLM. The Vernal Field Office (BLM) administers all resources for about 33,331 acres of public lands at the top of the Book Cliffs on the northern end of the MFO leaving a total of about 1,819,554 acres of public land to be included in the RMP. The MFO also administers grazing on about 40,653 acres of public lands in Colorado as part of an agreement with the Grand Junction Field Office (BLM). Within the MFO, the Grand Junction Field Office and the Manti-La Sal National Forest (U.S. Forest Service) administer grazing on a total of 79,581 acres of public lands.

About 7 communities are located within the planning area. The MFO shares common boundaries with Canyonlands National Park and the BLM Vernal, Price, Monticello, and Grand Junction Field Offices. Arches National Park, the La Sal Mountains of the Manti-La Sal National Forest, Dead Horse Point State Park, and the Uintah/Ouray Indian Reservation are contained within the planning area.

2. Purpose and Need

Since completion of the Grand Resource Area RMP in 1985, considerable changes have occurred within the planning area. Heightened public awareness, increased public demand for use of the lands, and increases in conflict between competing resource values and land uses continue to challenge BLM's management goals and objectives. The MFO is facing a wide variety of issues affecting local communities, regional and state interests, and the health of our natural resources.

It is anticipated that the new land use plan will require changes in many of the prior RMP decisions related to the management of public lands. There are a number of new issues, higher levels of controversy around existing issues, and new (unforeseen) public land uses and concerns that have arisen over the years which were not included or were not adequately addressed in the existing plans.

The purpose of the land use plan will be to establish guidance, objectives, policies, and management actions for public lands administered by the MFO. The plan will be comprehensive in nature and will resolve or address issues within the MFO jurisdictional boundaries which are identified through agency, interagency, and public scoping efforts. The plan should explain or identify the current management situations, desired future conditions to be maintained or achieved, management actions necessary to achieve objectives, and a schedule and a cost estimate for implementing the actions for achieving those goals.

The land use plan will address and integrate, to the degree possible, all BLM, Forest Service, Park Service, and local government management plans related to management of the lands in or adjacent to the public lands managed by the MFO.

In addition to the purposes described above, the new land use plan will also fulfill requirements and obligations set forth by the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), the Federal Land Policy and Management Act (FLPMA), and BLM land use planning policy.

The Pre-Plan provides the general blueprint for how the MFO RMP will be developed. It is our intention that the Pre-Plan dynamic and our RMP preparation strategy may be modified as unforeseen situations arise.

The purpose of this Pre-Plan is to:

- Document the planning area boundaries covered by the MFO Resource Management Plan;
- Identify the preliminary issues to be resolved and the planning criteria that will be used to address them;
- Document the scope, complexity, major responsibilities and requirements for the planning effort;
- Establish the internal and external coordination for the agencies involved;
- Identify a completion schedule and budget; and
- Establish and identify the public participation process.

3. Relationship to Other Programs, Plans, or Policies

This planning process will recognize the many ongoing programs, plans, and policies that are being implemented in the planning area by other land managers and interested governments. The BLM will seek to be consistent with or complimentary to other management actions. Whenever possible, valid resource decisions and management prescriptions would be carried forward into the planning process.

The following plans affected by our planning area will be reviewed for decisions or issues/management prescriptions that need to be carried forward or addressed in the new planning effort:

County Land Use Plans

- Grand County General Plan, 1996
- San Juan County Master Plan, 1996

Other Federal Plans

- Manti-La Sal National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan, 1986
- Arches National Park General Management Plan, 1989
- Canyonlands National Park General Management Plan, 1974
- Colorado Canyons National Conservation Area Management Plan, in planning process

Grand Resource Area RMP Amendments

- Livestock grazing use adjustments, 1987
- Allow bighorn sheep habitat, 1989
- Provide for sale, 1986
- Provide for exchanges, acquisitions, and disposals, 1989
- Livestock grazing use adjustments, 1995
- Three Rivers Withdrawal, draft

Minerals Plans

- Grand Resource Area RMP Oil and Gas Supplemental Environmental Assessment, 1988

Recreation/Wilderness Management Plans

- Colorado Riverway Recreation Area Management Plan, 1992
- Ken's Lake Emergency Plan, 1996
- Sand Flats Recreation Management Plan, 1994
- Utah Wilderness Inventory, 1999
- Utah's Colorado Riverway Special Management Recreation Area Amendment 1, 2001
- Mill Creek Canyon Management Plan, 2001
- Labyrinth Rims – Gemini Bridges Recreation Area including the Dead Horse Mesa Scenic Byway, draft
- Canyon Rims Recreation Area Management Plan, draft
- Utah Rims Recreation Area Management Plan, draft

Endangered Species Recovery Plans

- Black Footed Ferret Recovery Plan, 1978
- Northern States Bald Eagle Recovery Plan, 1983
- The Recovery Implementation Plan for the Endangered Fish Species in the Upper Colorado River Basin, 1987
- Bonytail Chub Recovery Plan, 1990
- Humpback Chub Recovery Plan, 1990

- Colorado Squawfish Recovery Plan, 1991
- Mexican Spotted Owl Recovery Plan, 1995
- Southwest Willow Flycatcher Recovery Plan, 2001

Existing Environmental Impact Statements (EIS)

- P.R. Spring Combined Hydrocarbon Lease Conversion EIS, 1985
- Utah BLM Statewide Wilderness EIS, 1990
- Lisbon Valley Copper Project EIS, 1997
- Questar, Williams, & Kern River Pipeline Project EIS, 2001

B. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION PROCESS AND INTEREST GROUPS

The key factor in a successful planning effort is our ability to provide an open and honest environment in which to meaningfully involve the public throughout the planning process. The BLM will actively seek to involve the public in a manner that will foster long term relationships, and build ownership in the management of public lands (Appendix A). A variety of methods will be used throughout this process. At a minimum, the following actions will be taken to facilitate public involvement in this process.

1. Identify Preliminary Issues, Concerns, and Planning Criteria:

- Publish Notice of Intent
- Provide notices in media (newspaper, radio, TV, etc.)
- Develop interactive web site
- Pursue public outreach strategies to reach the multitude of non-local constituents who visit the Moab area.
- Develop mailing list, database, and tracking system for comments
- Publish regular Planning Bulletins
- Host Planning Orientation/Scoping Meetings
- Build upon existing collaborative workgroups
- Use professional facilitators to enhance public and BLM interactions
- Maintain an open scoping period for public involvement throughout the preliminary phases of the planning process.
- Provide for standardized comment input forms to enhance public input

2. Inventory and Data Collection

- Invite the public to review existing data and recommend new data needs, or provide data.
- Work with Federal Leadership Forum in accordance with existing MOU.
- Ensure excellent coordination with agencies having jurisdictional expertise in data collection efforts.

3. Alternative Formulation

- Utilize public input to clarify issues in the formulation of alternatives.
- Provide public feed back via Planning Bulletins, open houses, and interactive web site.
- Provide for a variety of public involvement opportunities including; written correspondence, e-mail, web site, public contact representatives.
- Invite the public to discuss options for analysis and methodologies used in development of the EIS.

4. Publish Draft EIS/Draft RMP

- Provide for a minimum 90 day comment period on the DEIS, allowing for a variety of feedback mechanisms.
- Host open houses for informational and comment purposes.

5. Publish Final EIS/Proposed RMP

- Notify public of FEIS.
- Welcome informal comment or involvement during this period.
- Initiate public protest period.
- Initiate Governor's Consistency Review.

Affected Interests – Who Will be Involved

A wide variety of people, agencies, and organizations will become involved with this planning process. All comments will be noted and recorded (Appendix B). Known participants will include but are not limited to:

1. Governor's Consistency/Resources Development Coordinating Committee (RDCC)

Coordination of Utah State concerns is handled through the State RDCC. Membership on this committee includes representatives from all the major State agencies. Their job is to review actions that impact State lands including RMP's and other major BLM actions. The RDCC is the reviewing authority for the Governor's consistency review. Presentations of the Draft and Final RMP/EIS will be made to RDCC at the time of release to the public.

2. Indian Tribe Coordination

The BLM will contact Indian tribal councils and the Bureau of Indian Affairs to initiate coordination for areas of common interest and concern. Contacts will include the Zuni Pueblo, the Navajo Nation, the Ute Indian Tribe, the Ute Mountain Ute Tribe, the White Mesa Ute Tribe, and the Hopi Tribe.

3. County and Association of County Governments Coordination

The counties have been active in past BLM planning efforts. County Commissions will be briefed on the RMP process and the preliminary issues identified by the ID Team and will be encouraged to participate in the planning process.

4. Other Federal Agency Coordination

The BLM will work with the Forest Service, Fish and Wildlife Service, Environmental Protection Agency, Bureau of Reclamation, Bureau of Indian Affairs, National Park Service, and other federal agencies in matters of joint concern.

5. Coordination with other BLM Field Offices

All adjacent BLM Field Offices will be contacted and briefed on the new planning effort. Land Use Plans for other BLM offices in Utah will be reviewed and every effort made to be consistent with decisions in these plans. The BLM will coordinate with the Colorado Canyons National Conservation Area (CCNCA) regarding cooperative recreation and wildlife management across state lines.

6. State Land Management Coordination

The State of Utah has responsibility for the management of certain lands within the planning area boundary. The State School and Institutional Trust Lands Administration (SITLA) and the Utah Division of Forestry, Fire and State Lands are responsible for School Trust Lands and sovereign lands, and the Utah Division of Parks and Recreation is responsible for the management of State Parks and Recreation sites. The Utah Division of Wildlife Resources is responsible for lands owned by them and manages wildlife on public lands. The Division of Oil, Gas and Mining is the State agent for SITLA lands regarding minerals. Close coordination with all of these agencies will be a matter of standard operating procedure. The BLM will also coordinate closely with the State Historic Preservation office in compliance with the state protocol for archaeology and cultural resource values. Additionally, the State of Colorado Division of Wildlife will be contacted pertaining to cooperative wildlife management across state lines and associated with the CCNCA.

7. Interest Groups and Other Organizations

There are many groups that will play an active role in the RMP process. They will be included on mailing lists along with interested citizens. Special meetings may be held to address specific concerns of interest groups. These groups will include: environmental organizations, industry interests, grazing permittees,

private land owners, local and regional news media, sportsmen and wildlife groups, ATV users and groups, and other individuals and groups that will be identified during the scoping process.

8. Congressional Delegation

Keep appropriate Congressional delegation informed of key issues and meetings.

9. Advisory Committee

The Utah Resource Advisory Council (RAC) provides advice to the BLM on resource issues in Utah. The RAC will be consulted early in the preparation process.

C. PRELIMINARY PLANNING CRITERIA

Planning criteria are the constraints or ground rules that guide and direct the development of the plan, and determine how the planning team approaches the development of alternatives and ultimately, selection of a Preferred Alternative. They ensure that plans are tailored to the identified issues and ensure that unnecessary data collection and analyses are avoided. They focus on the decisions to be made in the plan and achieve the following:

- Provide an early, tentative basis for inventory and data collection needs.
- Enable the manager and staff to develop a preliminary planning base map delineating geographic analysis units.

Note: These criteria are preliminary at this stage of the planning and will undoubtedly be modified as the public becomes more fully involved.

Preliminary Planning Criteria:

- This plan will recognize the existence of valid existing rights.
- Lands covered in the RMP will be public lands, including split estate lands, managed by the BLM. Decisions on lands not managed by the BLM will not be made in the RMP.
- The BLM will use a collaborative and multi-jurisdictional approach, where possible, to jointly determine the desired future condition of Public Lands.
- As described by law and policy, the BLM will strive to ensure that its management prescriptions are consistent as possible to other planning jurisdictions within the planning area boundaries.

- Final management prescriptions will consider a range of alternatives that focus on the relative values of resources and ensure responsiveness to the issues and not the combination of uses that will give the greatest economic return or output.
- Sensitive watersheds will be identified and watershed conditions determined, in particular on Utah Category One (A, B, and C) watersheds and those HUC-8 sub-basins ranked highest in the Utah Interagency Colorado River Salinity Ranking Process (BLM, NRCS, USGS, BOR).
- The socioeconomic impacts of the alternatives will be addressed. This will include demographic, economic, social, fiscal, and land use patterns.
- The BLM will use current scientific information, research, technologies, and results of inventory, monitoring, and coordination to determine appropriate local, and regional management strategies that will enhance or restore impaired ecosystems.
- Direction provided by the 2001 Federal Wildland Fire Policy will be incorporated into the planning process. Planning will be consistent with the national Fire Plan.
- Management of existing Wilderness Study Areas (WSAs) and new WSAs established through planning will be guided by the Interim Management Policy (IMP) for Lands Under Wilderness Review. Land use allocations made for WSAs must be consistent with the IMP and with other laws, regulations, and policies related to WSA management. The RMP must also address how these lands would be managed if released by Congress from WSA status. If areas are designated as wilderness by Congress, they will be managed to preserve their wilderness values, according to applicable laws and policy. Section 202 WSAs and citizens wilderness proposals will be addressed consistent with current policy.
- Comprehensive Land Health Standards will apply to all activities and uses and will generally be evaluated on a watershed basis. Adjustments to current livestock grazing or wildlife forage allocations would be considered in accordance with Rangeland Health Standards and Guides. Standards and guides would be applicable to all alternatives.
- Baseline Reasonable Foreseeable Development (RFD) scenarios will be developed and portrayed based on historical, existing, and projected levels for all programs.
- The BLM will coordinate with Indian Tribes to identify sites, areas, and objects important to their cultural and religious heritage.
- Paleontological and cultural resources will be evaluated for use allocations, if appropriate, including provisions for interpretation, preservation, conservation, and enhancement.

- The decisions of this plan will comply with the Endangered Species Act and follow interagency agreements with the USFWS regarding the Section 7 Consultation Process.
- Areas potentially suitable for Areas of Critical Environmental Concern (ACECs) and other special management designations will be identified and brought forward for analysis in the RMP.
- All river segments will be considered and determinations of eligibility, suitability, tentative classification, and protective management will be made in accordance with Section 5 (d) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act and BLM Manual 8351. Public nominations will be requested.
- Vegetation management objectives will be developed for specific areas. Limits will be identified on the type and amount of disturbance that will be allowed before mitigation is required.
- Management actions will be responsive to the issues, concerns, and opportunities identified for resolution in this plan.
- Decisions regarding off-highway vehicle driving will be consistent with the BLM's National OHV Strategy.

D. PRELIMINARY PLANNING ISSUES AND MANAGEMENT CONCERNS

Significant change has taken place since completion of the current LUP's. Communities have grown, and resource development has expanded significantly while at the same time regard for environmental conservation and protection is becoming a major concern. The MFO is facing a wide variety of issues affecting local communities, regional, and state interests and the health of our natural resources.

Planning issues can generally be stated as resource management problems and opportunities that BLM needs to address to ensure as an agency it is fulfilling its multiple use resource management mission. Issues may be identified by local, state or national needs, or may reflect conditions specific to the MFO. Identified issues are subject to change throughout the planning process as new conditions are identified and the public becomes more fully involved.

Planning issues identify concerns that:

- Present unresolved questions regarding allocation of a specific resource.
- Present major land use conflicts regarding management or maintenance of a base resource.
- Can be resolved by the BLM within the life of the plan.

The following preliminary planning issues were identified by MFO during an evaluation conducted in March 2002. A copy of this evaluation is available for review at the MFO. The evaluation consisted of a review of the Grand RMP

Note: These issues are preliminary and may be modified, deleted, or added to, through the scoping process.

1. **Air Quality:** In conducting this regional planning effort, the BLM will ensure compliance with all applicable local, state, tribal, and Federal air quality laws, statues, regulations, standards, and implementation plans. Mandatory Federal PSD Class I areas are located within the study area (Arches National Park) with an additional mandatory Federal PSD Class I area nearby (Canyonlands National Park). Baseline data to address potential air quality impacts is needed for the RMP process. Monitoring data collected by the NPS should be utilized.
2. **Cultural, Paleontology, and Natural History:**
 - This planning effort will take into consideration all new laws, regulations, manuals, and program guidance for cultural and paleontological resources in the planning area.
 - This planning effort will seek to actively consult with and fully address concerns and recognize values important to Indians in compliance with all current laws, regulations, policies, and strategies. These will include guidance, tribal government sovereignty, and orientation between governments. Concerns to Indians typically involve archaeology sites, traditional cultural property, prehistoric travel routes, rock art sites, sacred waterways of the Colorado and Green Rivers, and perennial streams.
 - The Class I Overview is out of date and upgrades are necessary to appropriately address cultural and paleontological resource issues.
 - This planning effort will seek to provide a more active and educational forum for the management of these cultural and paleontological resources including consideration of values, for science, education, recreation, research.
3. **Fire Management:** Associated with the urban interface issues, is the ongoing concern related to wildfire risk. At issue are the types of fuels and the proximity of those types of fuels to homes. This planning effort will also address appropriate fire management actions including areas where fire is not desired, where fire can be used as a resource management tool for habitat restoration, and where fuel reductions are necessary as required by the 2001 Federal Wildland Fire Policy.

4. **Woodland Harvest and Management:** There is an increased demand for forest and vegetative harvests in the FO. This demand includes commercial harvests of timber, Christmas tree cutting, and collection of native grass and brush seeds. The RMP will address areas available for harvest, management practices, and allowable harvest levels for sustained-yield.
5. **Hazardous Sites, Materials, and Wastes:** Where appropriate, the RMP will address hazardous materials issues. The inventory of hazardous sites will be updated, such as abandoned mine sites, and management plans developed primarily in existing and proposed recreation areas so the hazards can be eliminated.
6. **Lands and Realty:** Increased demand for public lands dictates updates to the old RMP. The plan revision will ensure that the following are appropriately addressed:
 - Up to date land ownership.
 - Transportation planning, complete Travel Route Inventory.
 - Potential for an additional utility right-of-way corridor (including avoidance and exclusion areas, and coordination with neighboring BLM and other tribal or agency jurisdictions).
 - Ensuring access to public lands.
 - Proposals for land tenure adjustments will be evaluated in the context of facilitating resource management objectives.
 - Review recent land tenure adjustments or ownerships and management agreements that were not addressed in the Grand RMP.
 - Direct management of acquired lands.
 - Review current withdrawals and consider additional withdrawals for resource protection.
 - Wind energy and other potential renewable energy sites.
7. **Rangeland Management and Health/Rehabilitation:** The proposed plan revision will address the following factors affecting rangeland management:
 - Incorporate all Standards for Rangeland Health and Guidelines for Grazing Management into the RMP.
 - Apply standards to all activities.
 - The plan revision will identify best management practices and rehabilitation techniques to assure properly functioning ecosystems. Criteria and guidelines for rehabilitation will be coordinated across all programs.
 - Incorporate in the plan Bureau policy regarding native versus introduced species for rangeland rehabilitation.

- Update changes in grazing management occurring since the last planning effort due to allotment evaluations, voluntary relinquishments or changes in allotment acreage.
- Evaluate current forage allocations for wildlife and livestock.

8. Minerals Management: Projected mineral development will be revisited in the plan revision. Baseline minerals information for the existing RMP area needs to be revised based on new and developing information. This planning effort will ensure that minerals management issues, opportunities, and potential impacts would be addressed at an appropriate regional scale and would include the following:

- The RFD for oil and gas requires updating to reflect recent developments and trends and should include a scenario for full field development in the Big Flat area.
- The RFD for geophysical exploration should be revisited to discuss new types of geophysical operations such as vibroseis and 3D seismic.
- An RFD is needed for locatable, salable, and other leasable minerals.
- Update mineral potential assessments throughout the planning area.
- Review mitigation and lease stipulations and ensure consistency throughout the planning area. Surface use stipulations developed for oil and gas will apply across the board to all surface disturbing activities.
- Increased demand for energy to be balanced against the need for protection of other resources.

9. Off-Highway Vehicle Use: Growth of OHV use has become a significant issue within the planning area. OHV use and management would be addressed and updated in an effort to resolve resource conflicts with natural resources and still provide for responsible recreational use of OHV's.

- Existing OHV designations should be reviewed and modified where needed to meet changing resource objectives. Designations should be coordinated with the BLM Price Field Office, the BLM Monticello Field Office, the BLM Grand Junction Field Office, and the Manti-LaSal National Forest.
- All lands will have OHV designations (open, limited, closed) and those areas designated as "limited" will have specific road and trail designations made (see Handbook 1610-1).

10. Recreation: Recreation management is of significant concern due to the presence of world-class recreational resources. This planning effort would review current and projected recreation uses to determine appropriate management. The following will be considered:

- Standards for Rangeland Health and Guidelines for Grazing Management and Guidelines for Recreation Management (IM UT 2001-090).

- Identifying additional Special Recreation Management Areas requiring enhanced or special management for recreational uses or for protection of recreational related resource values.
- Incorporating into the plan Special Recreation Permit (SRP) policies and regulations that require consistent application within the planning area and coordination with neighboring BLM offices. Establish limits of use or limits of acceptable change that will protect resource values while satisfying the public's demand for these uses.
- Assess recreation use patterns and analyze impacts on other resource values. Establish limits of use where appropriate.
- Establish criteria to provide consistent application of special and extensive recreation management areas within the planning area.
- Evaluate the management of existing recreation developments as well as the need for new facilities.
- Identifying Recreation Activity Emphasis Areas/ROS management zones.
- Establishing management objectives for Utah Scenic Byways.
- Identifying land tenure adjustments and access needed to support recreation management objectives.
- Identifying Backcountry Management Areas and establishing management objectives.
- Review management prescriptions from the old RMP and evaluate their application in the new planning effort.
- Identifying opportunities for Interpretation and Environmental Education in areas with significant resources and high visitor use.

11. Riparian Resources: The current RMP does not address current policy guidance regarding riparian management. Issues to consider in the new RMP include:

- Riparian functioning condition assessments and subsequent monitoring.
- Best management practices for riparian management and criteria for rehabilitation of at risk and non-functioning sites.
- Develop criteria for setting limits of acceptable change to functioning at risk and non-functioning riparian areas.
- Develop mitigation measures for activities resulting in disturbances to riparian areas.

12. Socio-economics: Many of the planning issues identified are likely to have major socio-economic consequences, including fire management, woodland harvest, rangeland management, minerals management, off-highway vehicle use, recreation, and special status species of plants and animals. The RMP will consider:

- Data collected on economic impacts of recreational use in the Moab area that includes the Statewide Boater Survey (1998), the Jeep Safari Survey (1996), the Mountain Bike Survey (1994), the Slickrock Bike Trail Survey (1993), and surveys on community conflict and camping sites.

- 13. Vegetation and Special Status Plants:** Management of vegetation for forage, watershed, or of special status plant species has changed in a number of ways since the completion of the Grand RMP. Issues to be considered include the following:
- In consultation with the Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS), adopt the list of special status plants for the proposed plan revision. The BLM's list of special status plants will be reviewed and included.
 - Utilize current and new science for the protection and management of special status plants. Evaluate needs for new data regarding amount, distribution, and habitat requirements for special status plant species.
 - Update the new plan regarding current recovery plans, conservation agreements, and biological opinions developed throughout the planning area. Implement actions identified in recovery plans for listed species and protection of critical habitat.
 - Management of noxious weeds and non-native invasive species is not addressed in the current RMP. The proposed plan revision would establish integrated pest management criteria in light of current policy and laws for management of these species.
 - Update plant species locations, populations, and habitats.
- 14. Visual Resources:** Visual resource management (VRM) is of significant concern given the spectacular scenery of the planning area. Changes in visitor use patterns and frequency is causing concerns in some areas and enhanced protection of visual resources may be necessary.
- The existing VRM classification system will be reviewed and amended as necessary with the intent to assess/reassess the current VRM designations, and to designate/re-designate VRM classes as necessary.
 - Establish criteria for management within VRM classes.
- 15. Watersheds and Water Quality:** The State of Utah has developed non-point source Best Management Practices (BMPs) and these are applied by stipulation on a voluntary basis. Water inventory database needs updating in areas such as springs, wells, and groundwater in order to support future planning efforts. This planning effort will address the following management needs:
- Identify water quality concerns, including ground water, related to activities on public lands, including but not limited to, the requirements mandated by the Clean Water Act, state water classifications in the 303 D and 305 report, state water inventories, as well as sources at risk for water quality due to naturally occurring formations.
 - Determine where current uses may be contributing to water quality problems and address management options to resolve the problems in the new plan.

- Identify priority watersheds within the planning area. Develop management criteria for actions allowed within priority watersheds.
- Evaluate limits of acceptable change for water quality as a result of BLM authorized activities.
- Establish BMPs for management of water quality and set criteria for restoring quality of waters not meeting State standards.
- Evaluate water rights and how they may affect recreation and other land use allocations.

16. Wilderness: Management of lands with wilderness characteristics and the use of those lands remains extremely controversial in Utah. Areas have been designated as Wilderness Study Areas (WSAs), and are being managed according to the Interim Management Policy for Lands Under Wilderness Review (IMP). Other issues to consider include the following:

- The proposed plan revision will address inconsistencies with management prescriptions resulting for OHV designations, oil and gas leasing categories, etc., and interim management of WSAs.
- Additional areas have been inventoried and found to possess wilderness character by BLM (as per the 1999 Utah Wilderness Inventory and the Moab Wilderness Inventory Area Revision Document). These areas are termed “wilderness inventory areas”. This planning effort will consider whether or not these areas with wilderness character should be managed as WSAs and subject to IMP.
- New information regarding wilderness characteristics will be considered.

17. Wild and Scenic Rivers: Wild and scenic river considerations will be made in this planning effort, including finding of river eligibility, tentative classification, and suitability. Rivers crossing multiple jurisdictions will be coordinated with partner offices and agencies to arrive at watershed level management prescriptions. Public nominations will be solicited.

18. Special Management Areas: Through this planning effort, existing designations as well as other lands within the planning area which may meet specific criteria (such as ACECs) will be reviewed. Other issues to be considered include:

- Management prescriptions for existing ACECs will be reviewed and modified if appropriate. Priorities for implementation of management plans will be set.
- Previous ACEC nominations will be revisited and new nominations will be solicited through this planning effort. Priorities for management plan development and implementation for new ACECs will be established.

19. Wildlife Habitat and Special Status Species Management: Increased use of public lands, changing laws and guidance, and new listings require that some goals and objectives pertaining to wildlife habitat and special status species in the Grand RMP be updated. Issues related to wildlife habitat and special status species include:

- This planning effort will update the wildlife and habitat inventories to assist in identifying measurable objectives for important wildlife habitats including desired future conditions, designation of priority species and habitats (special status species), and identify opportunities or restrictions needed to achieve management objectives. This should include the objectives of wildlife habitat management plans (HMP) and UDWR herd management plans.
- Forage allocations for big game species needs to be reviewed and modified to provide for objective levels of big game species and to resolve the problem with expanding wildlife populations and species into new habitats. The objectives of the Bighorn Sheep Amendment and Draft Pronghorn Amendment should be considered for incorporation into the new RMP. Review AUM allocations for livestock and big game and apply the rangeland standards and guidelines to resolve forage issues.
- Special status species locations, populations, and habitats need to be documented. Conservation and protection strategies will need to be included in the new RMP. Obtain an updated State Sensitive Species list from UDWR and determine if other species exist in the planning area which were not previously covered by planning. A new species list will be requested from FWS and a Consultation Agreement with the FWS will be developed according to the National MOU. The new plan should adopt existing recovery plans and be compatible with the objectives of the recovery plans. This would include the new plans for the spotted owl and the southwestern willow flycatcher, as well as continuing older recovery plans.

E. DATA AND GIS NEEDS

The overall data management strategy and effort expended to acquire, develop, use and share geospatial data for the MFO RMP will be integrated and coordinated with existing national Federal governmental, BLM, and Utah BLM data management initiatives (Appendix C). Much of the data gathered and used for this planning effort will become corporate data and will be used during plan implementation and by other programs to conduct their day-to-day business. In addition, the jurisdictional boundaries of this planning effort are contiguous with other Utah BLM planning starts and it is important to coordinate data development and data management for all planning efforts to insure consistent data.

Collaboration is a key component to be incorporated into the planning process and this includes the development and acquisition of data used during planning. Existing and new partnerships and cooperative agreements, as appropriate, will be extensively used to assist in the development of the planning database and to also insure the data is developed to existing corporate data standards and available to the public and concerned parties as appropriate.

An important goal of this effort will be to integrate the data collected and developed for use in this RMP into the Utah BLM corporate geospatial database to insure this data is accessible for use during RMP implementation and use by other programs in conducting their day-to-day business. This task will be one of the most intensive during the first and second years of each planning effort. The Utah BLM database will continue to be developed in a coordinated manner to accommodate future planning. The scope of work for this planning effort includes validating data converted from the Maps Overlay Statistical System (MOSS) Geographic Information System (GIS) to ARC/INFO format, horizontal and vertical integration, and preparation of metadata documentation for the database. Portions of this Information Technology Services work may be accomplished through partnerships between the BLM and the State of Utah, Division of Information Technology Services, Automated Geographic Reference Center (AGRC), and others. In addition to sharing data through BLM mechanisms, per a data sharing agreement with the State of Utah, much of the resulting data will be available to the public through the State Geographic Information Database (SGID).

Appendix D provides a table which identifies current data needs, GIS data layers, data layer condition and known data layer gaps. Availability of metadata is also specified. In many instances it has been found that existing data bases need to be updated (integrated with other data layers), compiled, and put into appropriate digital formats in order to provide a basis for impact analysis, and alternative formulation. These data layer “themes” are the building blocks necessary to quantify and portray resources, resource condition, and resource use areas and are used extensively throughout the planning process.

In many cases, existing resource information available in BLM offices or from other federal, state, or local agencies will be used during this planning effort in order to maximize planning efficiencies and reduce costs. It remains however, that workloads associated with current GIS data will be high. If these needs cannot be met timely with contractor assistance, additional support from the State Office will be required, or an additional position for support of the GIS program will be sought for the MFO.

The land use plan evaluations for the planning area included an intensive GIS evaluation which identified a significant amount of data and GIS needs that will be required to address issues, formulate alternatives and conduct impact analysis for this planning effort.

F. PARTICIPANTS IN THE PROCESS (Planning Team)

- 1. Utah Planning Management Team (PMT):** This team consists of the State Director, Field Managers, State Office Resource Planning Specialist, and a Planning Coordinator. This team is responsible for regional coordination and oversight of controversies and issues and that surround this regional planning effort and may affect other ongoing planning efforts. This team will ensure appropriate logistical support and pursue opportunities for increasing planning efficiencies through coordination of contracting, hiring, travel, training, etc. The PMT Coordinator will ensure smooth coordination of the many anticipated issues this team is likely to face.
- 2. MFO Management Team (MT):** The team consists of the Field Manager, Assistant Field Manager for Resources, Assistant Field Manager for Support Services, Branch Chief for Recreation, and the Core Team Manager. The team ensures full compliance with the planning regulations and handbooks. It is responsible for ensuring that a collaborative process is used, wherever possible, and that a high degree of meaningful public involvement is achieved. This team is responsible for selecting the appropriate issues and concerns that will be resolved in the planning effort and ensuring that a reasonable range of alternatives is developed. This team will also ensure that appropriate budgets are provided to complete the plan over the expected 3 year duration of this project.
- 3. Core Team Manager (CTM):** The CTM is responsible for the day to day management and coordination of this planning effort and keeps the PMT and MT apprized of controversies conflicts as they arise and recommends courses of actions to resolve problems. The CTM has primary responsibilities for contract oversight and directs staff involvement in contract execution and review. The CTM has overall responsibility to assure completion of the RMP, quality control, and collaborative interactions or partnerships with interested publics. The CTM also has direct supervision of the Core Team and the Interdisciplinary Team and directs their involvement throughout the planning process as required. The CTM is responsible for ensuring that appropriate project management and records management techniques are followed.
- 4. Core Team (CT):** The team consists of a Natural Resource Specialist/writer editor and GIS specialist, in addition to the CTM. Also, there is the possibility that other term activity specialists could be added to the CT if needed during the plan process. This team assists the CTM in the day to day management of the planning effort including but not limited to coordination with contractors and IDT staff, public outreach, management of documents and records management.

5. **Interdisciplinary Team (IDT):** The team is represented by staff professionals across a wide variety of resource management fields. This team is directed by the CTM and has primary responsibilities in public outreach, oversight on contracts for the collection of data or directing inventory needs, as well as working with both the secondary and primary contractors to ensure data accuracy and adequate impact analysis.
6. **State Office Wilderness Planning Team (SOWPT):** The permanent State Office Team includes wilderness planners, GIS specialists, and a field inventory specialist. Members function as support for all components of the planning process and are an integral part of all the Teams described above. The wilderness component of this RMP revision would not be part of the contract, the wilderness planners would compile the wilderness portion of the Management Situation Analysis; work in close coordination with the MFO and the contractor during alternative development; would be responsible for writing the wilderness components of the draft and final RMP revision; complete responses to wilderness comments; and work on protest resolution, as necessary.

G. FORMAT AND PROCESS FOR THE PLAN

1. Format

The format and outline for the plan will come from the NEPA and land use planning manuals. All legal and policy requirements will be met in the plan and in the process regarding public notices, required elements, distribution of the draft and final documents, and specific laws. NEPA and Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) guidelines will be met. Both the Draft and Final EIS will be published with the draft and final versions of the plan.

2. Planning Process

This planning process will be guided by the planning regulations as set forth in 43 CFR 1600 and the H-1601-1 Land Use Planning Handbook. The regulations and manual provide the procedural guidance for implementing Sections 201 and 202 of FLPMA.

The RMP which is the primary outcome of this effort will establish the basic goals and objectives for resource management activities, provide for desired future conditions, and the measures needed to achieve these goals and objectives. Planning decisions are generally made on a broad scale and guide subsequent development of implementing activities (activity level plans).

3. **EIS Process**

Completion of the DEIS/DRMP will follow basic process requirements specified by the CEQ for the preparation of EIS's. Supplementary guidance provided by the Bureau Manual 1790 Handbook will also be followed. Appendix E provides a basic outline illustrating the format and content expected in the DEIS.

The CTM will be responsible for ensuring that the primary contractor responsible for preparation of the EIS does so in a manner consistent with Bureau Manual and CEQ requirements. As data collection, compilation, and analysis is completed by contractors, the CTM will ensure that all written materials receive appropriate internal or external review and that corrections or additions to written materials made by IDT members receive appropriate consideration. All comments made by the IDT will be in standardized written format in order to facilitate contractor understanding of staff concerns and issues.

The CTM will coordinate appropriate State Office reviews in a timely manner and ensure that applicable comments are coordinated with the contractor.

Four weeks will be permitted for the internal review of the draft and final plan and EIS by the BLM and cooperating agencies, including time required to transmit comments to the core team, State Office, and Washington Office. Forms will be supplied electronically to all reviewers to facilitate receipt of comments and to facilitate the analysis of the comments and needed corrections. For the BLM, review will take place at the MFO, State Office, and Washington Office.

4. **Format for Input from ID Team and Reviewers**

BLM input will be paper copies, typed, and on 3.5" floppy discs or CDs, in MICROSOFT WORD software; input will also be provided verbally, on flipcharts, via e-mail, and at group and one-on-one meetings and contacts. Submissions will be as polished as possible. The State Office will assist in obtaining timely input from reviewers.

5. **Alternative Formulation**

The MT will ensure that all alternatives are formulated in a manner which will resolve the planning issues, meet the purpose and need of the planning effort and can be realistically implemented. While it is too early in the process to identify specific alternatives, the following alternative concepts or themes are provided as food for thought, and to stimulate involvement in the alternative development process.

- **The No Action Alternative** will be represented by the existing management decisions. This alternative is required by the CEQ.

- **Conservation and Restoration Theme:** At least one alternative could be based on a Conservation and Restoration theme. This alternative would recognize community reliance on natural resource development, and would focus on enhanced reclamation and or mitigation to lessen the effects on industrial development. Thresholds could be established in some areas protecting the highest value resources from further development. This concept could be applied in a single alternative or throughout a variety of alternatives. Restoration of at risk resources or habitats would be promoted intensively.
- **Resource Zone Concepts:** This alternative could establish specific zones based on priority management areas. Each area would contain specific management prescriptions based on the sensitivity of resources located in that area and land use allocations would be made accordingly.
- **Special Designation Concepts:** This concept could be applied in a single alternative or throughout a variety of alternatives. High value resources (such as cultural, paleontological, recreational, visual, or biological) could be placed in a variety of special designations such as ACECs, HMAS, SRMAs, etc. Additional designations include byways, national landmarks, historic register sites, and recreation trails. Consideration would also be given to withdrawals for protecting resource values. Other areas would be managed according to standardized best management practices. This alternative would result in extensive subsequent activity planning.
- **Rangeland Health Theme:** This concept could result in an alternative where projected guidelines would be developed for specific categories or uses. Desired Future Conditions could be established for a variety of resources or uses.

H. PLAN PREPARATION SCHEDULE

Table 1 outlines a proposed plan preparation schedule for the Planning Process. The schedule gives estimated time frames for the completion of the required plan components including:

- All planning actions (43 CFR 1610.4) and support actions expected to be done either consecutively or concurrently,
- Target initiation and completion dates for each action,
- Time periods needed for preparation and award of contracts, and preparation costs, required for use in development of the AWP.

TABLE 1: Moab Field Office Plan Preparation Schedule

Planning Phase	Actions	Dates	Responsibility
Formally Initiate Planning Effort & Initiate Preliminary Scoping	Hire Core Team	10/1/02 - 12/30/03	CTM
	Begin Contracting Efforts (see additional items below)	10/1/02	FM
	Publish NOI in Federal Register	2/1/03	FO
	Initiate IPAs county, FWS, FS	3/1/03	FM/CTM
	Update Field Office Mailing Lists	3/1/03	FO/SO/CTM/PA
	Provide Preliminary Planning Bulletin	4/1/03	CTM/PA
	Provide Planning Orientation Open House	4/15/03	FO/PA/SOWPT
	Begin formal solicitations for issues and concerns	5/1/03	FO
	Formally address collaborative working groups	5/1/03	FO (ALL)
	Pursue MOUs or cooperating agency status for entities with jurisdiction expertise.	5/1/03	FM/CTM
	Begin Issue/Alternatives Workgroup Meetings (This time frame includes significant feedback to involve public)	5/15/03 - 12/15/03	FM/CTM/IDT/SOWPT
Finalize planning issues, concerns, and opportunities and inform the public of the final list.	12/30/03	FM/CTM/IDT	
Inventory and Data Collection	GIS database Update themes Metadata Determine data gaps	10/1/02 - 2/28/03	IDT/Contractor
	Initiate Comprehensive Plan Contract and prepare RFP and SOW.*	10/1/02 - 11/30/02	CTM/CT and IDT
	Data Collection	10/1/01 - 9/30/03	CTM/IDT/Contractor
	Collaborative data evaluation	2/1/03 - 9/30/03	FM/CTM/SO
	Initiate Mineral Technical Reports	11/1/02 – 3/1/03	CTM/IDT/SO
Compile all new data as addendum to MSA	9/30/03	IDT/CTM/SOWPT	

* A contractor representative will be involved with all significant aspects of data collection and issue identification.

TABLE 1: Moab Field Office Plan Preparation Schedule

Planning Phase	Actions	Dates	Responsibility
Initiate Consultation on T&E, Cultural		2/1/03 - 5/15/04	SO/CTM
Issue Resolution and Alternative Development	Based on information received from scoping and workgroups-formulate management alternatives with contractor focused on issue resolution. Continue public involvement through the alternative development stage. Initiate Chapters 1-3 as information becomes available.	5/15/03 - 5/15/04 5/15/03 - Ongoing	FM/CTM/IDT/SOWPT/Contractor
Write and Publish Draft EIS	Write PDEIS Review by Collaborators Revise draft EIS Allow for comprehensive distribution based on up-to-date public involvement and allow minimum 90 day review.	6/30/04 - 3/30/05	Contractor/FO/SOWPT
Analyze Public Comment and Prepare and Distribute Final EIS	Work continuously with contractor on this phase to ensure relevant comments are addressed and incorporated into FEIS.	8/15/05 - 11/15/05	Contractor/FM/CTM/IDT/SOWPT
Initiate Protest Period and Governor's Consistency Review		11/15/05 - 1/15/06	SO
Prepare and Finalize RMP/ROD		1/15/06 - 3/1/06	Contractor/FO/SOWPT
Prepare Implementation Plan		3/1/06 - 4/30/06	CTM

I. BUDGET

The Budget includes projected costs associated with development of the plan including, data collection, contracting costs, BLM staff work months, Federal Register notices, vehicle, travel and support costs. The following assumptions were used during the preparation of these budget estimates:

- A primary contractor (environmental consultant) would be used to conduct a significant portion of the planning functions including scoping, comment tracking, data collection, and impact analysis.
- GS 12 = \$7,100 per WM
- GS 11 = \$5,900 per WM
- GS 9 = \$5,000 per WM

Table 2 outlines a proposed plan budget for the Planning Process. The schedule gives preliminary estimates for the completion of the required plan actions noted in the plan schedule through year 2005 including:

- All labor costs, contracts and support requirements that are expected to facilitate completion of the plan,
- Estimated expenditure dollars for each action,
- Preparation costs required for use in development of the AWP.

It is recognized that these are only preliminary estimates and that actual cost may vary as the process moves forward. The projections do not include increased cost due to inflation or cost of living increases throughout the five year period. The dollar amounts do not provide targets for funding requests and help define the scope of expenditures relative to each of the out-years.

TABLE 2: Expected Budget Costs for the Preparation of the Moab Field Office RMP

Plan Component	FY-2003			FY-2004			FY-2005		
	Actions	Cost (\$)	Work Months (WMs)	Actions	Cost (\$)	Work Months (WMs)	Actions	Cost (\$)	Work Months (WMs)
Staffing for EIS Level Plan Revision Effort	Continue CT support	\$165,000	30 WMs	Continue CT support	\$165,000	30 WMs	CT support on FEIS IDT Support	\$165,000	30 WMs
	IDT support	\$165,000	30-35 WMs	IDT support	\$224,000	30-35 WMs		\$84,000	12 WMs
Initiate Primary & Secondary Contracts	Initiate Task Orders	TOTAL	WM s inclusive above						
Baseline air quality assessment		\$0							
Cultural Resource Overview		\$50,000							
Fire Management Assessment		\$15,000							
Woodlands Products Assessment (including Environmental Justice Considerations)		\$15,000 \$39,000	Contract IPA-6 WMs						
Mineral Technical Assessments		\$10,000	IPA-10 WMs						
OHV Overview & Data Verification		\$20,000							
Recreation Overview & Assessment		\$20,000							
Watershed Delineation & Assessment, Water Quality and Rights Assessment		\$20,000							
Wild and Scenic Rivers Assessment		\$20,000							
Special Designations		\$20,000							
Associated GIS coverage updates and integration		\$30,000							
Visual Resource Assessment		\$15,000							
Wildlife Habitat and Special Status Species Assessment		\$15,000							
Vegetation and Special Status Plants Assessment		\$15,000							
Socio-economic Assessment		\$15,000							

TABLE 2: Expected Budget Costs for the Preparation of the Moab Field Office RMP

Plan Component	FY-2003			FY-2004			FY-200		
	Actions	Cost (\$)	Work Months (WMs)	Actions	Cost (\$)	Work Months (WMs)	Actions	Cost (\$)	Work Months (WMs)
Establish Office Infrastructure	Travel, Overhead, Vehicles, Support Costs, Space	\$15,000		Travel, Overhead, Vehicles, Support Costs, Space	\$15,000		Travel, Overhead, Vehicles, Support Costs, Space	\$15,000	
Initiate Public Involvement Strategies:	Publish NOI	\$0							

	Planning Bulletins (3)	\$0							

	Mailing list data bases and tracking system	\$2,500							

	Host scoping meetings/ Conduct work groups	\$5,000							

	Pursue MOUs, CAs	\$2,000	1.0 WMs						

	Develop Interactive Website	\$3,500							

	Publish Scoping Analysis	\$10,000							
Wilderness – SOWPT Component	-Prepare GIS database; assess scoping comments; complete field assessments; respond to other wilderness proposals; compile wilderness information for AMS	\$35,000	3-5 WMs	Support SOWPT	\$35,000				
Analysis of Management Situation				Document Preparation	\$5,000				

TABLE 2: Expected Budget Costs for the Preparation of the Moab Field Office RMP

Plan Component	FY-2003			FY-2004			FY-200		
	Actions	Cost (\$)	Work Months (WMs)	Actions	Cost (\$)	Work Months (WMs)	Actions	Cost (\$)	Work Months (WMs)
Primary Contractor completes DEIS				Review, finalize, and initiate public review	\$250,000 contract				
Print and distribute DEIS using a variety of methods including interactive internet capabilities				Minimum of 1000 printed documents-internet availability-disk	\$100,000				
Map Server				Provide server capability	\$15,000				
Public Involvement				Open Houses-6	\$10,000				
Partnership Support and IPA				Assistance in EIS development tasks	\$20,000				
Wilderness Inventory Assessment/Verification and comment analysis support				SOWPT – Field verification and mapping. Complete files.	\$21,000	3 WMs			

TABLE 2: Expected Budget Costs for the Preparation of the Moab Field Office RMP

Plan Component	FY-2003			FY-2004			FY-2005		
	Actions	Cost (\$)	Work Months (WMs)	Actions	Cost (\$)	Work Months (WMs)	Actions	Cost (\$)	Work Months (WMs)
Primary Contractor completes FEIS							Produce Final EIS	\$200,000 contract	
							SOWPT support	\$21,000	3 WMs
Print and Distribute FEIS using a variety of methods including interactive internet capabilities							Print and Distribute	\$150,000	
Initiate protest period and consistency review							Protest Resolution	\$10,000	
Implementation and Monitoring Plan							Develop IP and implementation tracking system	\$18,000	3 WMs
TOTALS for FY 2003 through 2005		\$718,500			\$860,000			\$409,000	

Note: The ability to execute this budget is dependent on funding availability for FY 2003. The Monticello Field Office has initiated a concurrent planning effort. It is expected that some of the projected work month costs will be made available to Moab support staff. In addition, where efficiencies can be identified in the performance of contracted plan components, monies may be shared or pooled between the two field offices. It is foreseeable that certain costs associated with scoping, technical reports and the potential of a dual EIS covering both planning efforts could be shared between offices.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A: PUBLIC PARTICIPATION SCHEDULE

PLANNING PHASE	PURPOSE	METHOD/ACTIVITY	DATES	RESPONSIBILITY
ISSUE, PLANNING CRITERIA IDENTIFIECATION	Announce upcoming scoping Meetings. Request written comments on issues/scope of Plan.	Notice of Intent <u>in Federal Register</u> . 30 day comment period.		Core Team
	Develop mailing list.	Newsletter to names on Plan mailing lists. Press release to media		Team Leader, FO Admin. Assistant Public Affairs
	Release Wilderness Inventory Revision Document	Available to Public – Print 500 copies		SOWPT
	Explain planning process to public. Solicit issues and concern. Identify scope of Plan.	Public Meetings (At least 3) in: to be determined		Core Team, FO Manager
	Explain planning process and consistency requirements to local and state government officials. Identify agency issues and concerns.	Meet with interested groups and organizations.		Core Team, FO Manager
	Review input from groups showing interest in Plan.	Forum Issue/Alt. Workgroups Public comment period.		Core & ID Team, FO Manager, SOWPT
	Respond back to the public on issues to be addressed initially. Collect additional data where needed.	News article.		Core & ID Team, FO Manager, Public Affairs, SOWPT

APPENDIX A: PUBLIC PARTICIPATION SCHEDULE

PLANNING PHASE	PURPOSE	METHOD/ACTIVITY	DATES	RESPONSIBILITY
ALTERNATIVE FORMULATION	Describe alternatives that have been developed. Make sure issues are addressed. Assure focus of plan.	Newsletter to public, Plan mailing list.		Core & ID Team, Public Affairs, SOWPT
	Request comments on alternatives.	30 day comment period.		
	Obtain comments on contents.	Written, verbal responses comment period.		
DRAFT PLAN/EIS	Request comment on draft Plan/EIS. Announce upcoming public meetings.	Draft Plan/EIS mailed. 90 day comment period.		Core Team, Printer
		Press release to local and Denver media.		Team Leader
		<u>Notice of Availability in Federal Register.</u>		
	Describe components of the Draft Plan/EIS and solicit comments on it.	Public hearings to be determined.		Core & ID Teams, FO Manager, SOWPT
	Obtain comments on Draft Plan/EIS.	Written and verbal responses. 90 day comment period.		Publics
PROPOSED PLAN/FINAL EIS	Give public the opportunity to review proposed decisions and protest decisions if adversely affected.	Publish Proposed Plan/FEIS to public and mail list.		Core Team, FO Manager
		Begin 60 day Governor consistency review. Include notice explaining protest period (30 days).		

APPENDIX A: PUBLIC PARTICIPATION SCHEDULE

PLANNING PHASE	PURPOSE	METHOD/ACTIVITY	DATES	RESPONSIBILITY
	Opportunity to comment on any significant changes made as result of a protest.	Federal Register Notice requesting comments.		Core Team
		News release		Team Leader, Public Affairs
APPROVED PLAN/ROD	Notify publics of final decisions.	News Article, Newsletter, transmittal letters.		Team Leader, Public Affairs
	Distribute Plan.	Mail approved plan		Team Leader, FO Administrative Staff Assistant
IMPLEMENTATION SCHEDULE	Document & Prioritize Plan Implementation, Modification, and Monitoring	Prepare Office Document		Team Leader, FO Manager and ID Team

APPENDIX B: CONTACT/COMMENT DOCUMENTATION

1. NAME OF COMMENTOR(S): _____

2. LOCATION OF CONTACT: _____

3. PERSON DOCUMENTING CONTACT: _____ 4. DATE: _____

5. WHAT PART OF THE PLANNING PROCESS DOES THIS CONTACT DEAL WITH?

___ A. Mailing List

___ B. Response to News Article/Letter

___ C. Response to Fed Reg Notice

___ D. Schedule

___ E. Preplan Analysis

___ F. Maps

___ G. Issues

___ H. Mgmt Obj & Goals

___ I. Mgmt Actions

___ J. Mgmt Concerns

___ K. Draft Plan: Which Chapter

___ L. Alternative(s): Which Ones

___ M. Final Plan: Which Chapter

___ N. Record of Decision: Which Section?

___ O. Other:

6. SUMMARY OF CONTACT AND INPUT (Use reverse side if necessary):

APPENDIX C GEOSPATIAL DATA DEVELOPMENT

Geospatial Database Development Assumptions:

The development of the geospatial database for this planning effort will be accomplished within the context of existing BLM data management strategies currently under development. Database development will incorporate goals, objectives, mandatory policies, and procedures identified in national Federal governmental guidance and instructions regarding the use, development, and sharing of geospatial data and its management including the following:

- Executive Order 12906 of 1994 – Coordinating Geographic Data Acquisition and Access: The National Spatial Data Infrastructure (NSDI).
- OMB Circular A-16 & the expected revision.
- OMB Information Initiative of 2000 – “Collecting Information in the Information Age”.

Database development will incorporate goals, objectives, mandatory policies, and procedures identified in national BLM guidance and instructions regarding the use, development and sharing of geospatial data and its management which include the following:

- Incorporate goals, objectives, mandatory policies, and procedures identified in Washington Office BLM planning guidance and other instructions regarding data management.
- BLM H-1601-1 Land Use Planning Handbook.
- BLM IM No. 20001-038 (11/30/2000) – Development/Approval of Preparation Plans for New Planning Starts.
- BLM IM No. 2001-029 (11/13/2000) – Interim Data Management Guidance

Database development will incorporate goals, objectives, mandatory policies, and procedures identified in Utah BLM planning guidance, cooperative agreements, MOUs, and other instructions regarding data management which include the following:

- Utah BLM IM No. UT 2001-021 (12/12/2000) – Utah BLM GIS Implementation Plan.
- “A Workforce Strategy for Meeting Utah BLM’s Land Use Planning Challenge” – Final Recommendations to the Utah Leadership Team of 11/23/2000.
- Utah Implementation Team (I-Team) Plan – Utah Framework Implementation Plan”.

- Use lessons learned and the GIS data development model for Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument RMP.

GIS hardware/software resources assembled to support these planning efforts will be integrated and coordinated with:

- Bureau Architecture Design and Implementation, a national BLM initiative to define Information Technology processes, hardware, and software and implement the results as an enterprise system.
- BLM GIS Transition Strategy, a national BLM initiative understand the existing situation and identify a strategy to transition the bureau to the enterprise GIS.

The Utah BLM is currently implementing its “GIS Implementation Plan” which documents GIS hardware/software installations, geospatial data management processes and policies for Utah BLM. This plan serves as the guiding document to manage and maintain an interim corporate GIS for Utah BLM. The document may be downloaded at:

http://www.utso.ut.blm.gov/GeoSciences/utah_blm_gis.htm

This plan identifies a GIS hardware/software implementation strategy, outlines corporate data management processes, and calls out GIS Specialist/DealMaker roles and responsibilities, including performance standards. A standard directory structure and naming conventions for the data layers have been identified and implemented, preliminary geospatial datasets have been documented with FGDC compliant metadata, loaded on the master GIS server in the USO and are currently being replicated to the MFO. The next phases of this implementation effort will be the finalization and implementation of the GIS data standards/data stewardship process, the development of interim data standards, the integration of the multiple MFO datasets into seamless statewide corporate data layers and serving the resultant data to the field. The implementation of this plan sets the stage for a future transition to the bureau enterprise GIS that is being defined by the Bureau Architecture project. It is within this context that data for the MFO RMP will be developed.

Geospatial Database Development Guidelines:

The following guidelines will be adhered to as data is developed for this planning effort:

1. Existing data will be used where possible and new data will be collected only where absolutely necessary. All new data will be collected to established data standards. Existing data will be converted to accepted and established data standards.
2. The development of redundant data will be avoided by extensive coordination with our data partners. Data from existing sources will be used when possible.
3. Data for this planning effort will be integrated into seamless corporate datasets.

4. The data standards strategy used will be the following:
 - a. Established national data standards will be used when available.
 - b. Data standards from other agencies will be adopted when appropriated.
 - c. Data standards will be jointly developed and documented with our statewide data partners as appropriate. Data category standards teams, which include state data stewards, resource specialists, and GIS specialists from BLM and other agencies, will be used as necessary. The national BLM data stewards will be included in the review process as appropriate.
5. All geospatial data used in this planning effort will be documented with Federal Geographic Data Committee (FGDC) compliant metadata.
6. Data sharing with the public will be accomplished through the use of BLM GIS data servers and interactive GIS Map Servers connected through the Internet. The national BLM website design guidelines and deployment strategy will be followed.

Data will also be available to the public through links to the Utah State Geographic Information Database (SGID) as appropriate and as existing laws and regulations allow.

7. Existing GIS-related agreements/partnerships will be used to supplement BLM resources for the data development and data integration efforts. Partners that are familiar with these datasets and that have a proven track record will be used.
8. Existing Utah BLM GIS Implementation Plan process/procedures will be followed to achieve a consistent corporate geospatial database in Utah BLM.

GIS Data Management Tasks

A brief overview of the specific data management tasks and processes is presented below.

1. Internal Coordination

A Utah BLM GIS Data Development coordination team will be formed to coordinate the development of a GIS database to support the planning efforts. This team will be composed of GIS Specialists/Dealmakers from the USO, from each FO with a planning start, and the GIS Specialist from the respective support center and will communicate on a weekly basis via conference call. This task will be coordinated and lead by the USO.

2. External Coordination

USO GIS/Geospatial Data personnel will continue to coordinate with our data partners through participation in Utah GISAC meetings and activities and coordinate with Utah BLM. Coordination with other entities will continue to be accomplished as required. This task will be coordinated and lead by the USO.

3. Data Inventory

This task includes cataloging available data sets, producing maps and screen displays of data for evaluation by the resource specialists. A preliminary information needs assessment has been conducted to identify data requirements for this planning effort. See the Data Matrix in Appendix B for more information. This will be coordinated by the USO and conducted by the MFO.

4. Data Acquisition

This task includes contacting data providers to request data and metadata. This data will then be added to the BLM corporate GIS database. Metadata will be prepared or modified as necessary. This task will be lead and coordinated by the USO. The MFO staff will assist as necessary.

5. Data Development Process

Core Data Standards Development
Utah BLM Data Stewards/Program Leads
Data Category Standards Teams
Data Integration
Includes data editing/updating
Horizontal Data Integration
 USO GIS staff
 Use of partnerships/contracts
 Contract Management (USO GIS staff/FO GIS staff)
Vertical Data Integration
 USO GIS staff
 Use of partnerships/contracts
 Contract Management (USO GIS staff/FO GIS staff)
Attribute Integration/Updates
 USO GIS staff
 Use of partnerships/contracts
 Contract Management (USO GIS staff/FO GIS staff)
Data Validation/Verification
Includes verification map production and staff review of datasets.

Spatial Data

- FO GIS staff
- FO Resource Specialists
- USO GIS staff

Attribute Data

- FO GIS staff
- FO Resource Specialists
- USO GIS staff

Metadata Documentation

- FO GIS staff
- FO Resource Specialists
- USO GIS staff

Combine Planning Data Into Utah BLM Corporate GIS Database

- Arc/Info Librarian
- Data Maintenance/Update Process
- USO GIS staff

SDE/Informix Transition

- Pilot Project beginning FY 2001
 - USO GIS staff
 - USO IRM staff
- Data Maintenance/Update Process
 - USO GIS staff

APPENDIX D: Pre-Plan Data Status

1 Planning Questions	2 Needed Data Set (s)	3 Is Needed Data Set Available? <i>Yes/No/Partially</i>	4 Work Needed to Obtain New Data or Prepare Existing Data?	5 Est. Cost \$\$	6 *Are FGDC Metadata Available? <i>Yes/No</i>	7 Name/Source of Data Standard?	8 Does Available Data Meet a National or Regional Standard?	9 Name/Source of Potential National or Regional Data Standard?
1. Air Quality	Air Quality Data Precipitation	Yes	Obtain from EPA? Obtain from Utah State University	\$1000	Unknown Yes	Unknown Utah State University	Unknown Unknown	Unknown Unknown
2. Cultural, Paleontology, and Natural History	Cultural Sites and Surveys Archaeology Sensitivity Areas Paleontology Potential (Fossil Yield Potential Classification) Paleontology Sites	Partially No No No	Coordinate with and obtain from SHPO (1995). Manuscript and digitize data from 1995 to present. Digitize data Use geology data-attribute potential of the various formations Digitize data	3 wms ½ wm ½ wm ½ wm	Unknown No No No	Utah SHPO Cultural Data Standard Utah BLM to develop Review BLM GSENM data standard Utah BLM/Wyoming BLM	Regional Regional Regional Regional	NA Utah BLM USFS/University of Wyoming-Utah BLM Paleontologist Utah BLM/Wyoming BLM
3. Fire Management	Fire Management Zones Fire Suppression Areas Wildfire History	Yes Yes Yes	Data is available-review and validate Data is available-review and validate (Data complete A,B,C,D polygons completed with the 2000 updated FMP) Data is currently available on CDS in dispatch	¼ wm ½ wm Yes	Yes Yes Yes	Utah BLM Utah BLM DOI 1202 - BLM	Regional Regional National	Utah BLM Utah BLM DOI 1202 - BLM
4. Woodland Harvest and Management	Woodland Collection Areas	Yes	Review/update existing FO data Review/use USFS statewide woodland inventory data	½ wm	Partially	Review BLM GSENM data standard	Regional	Review/adapt BLM GSENM data standard
5. Hazardous Material and Wastes	Abandoned Mine Land Inventory Mining Districts	Partially Yes	Inventory for the Yellow Cat Mining area is available. Use MILS and CRIB data for other areas. Review data. May require vertical integration with PLSS.		No No	BLM AML & State Abandoned Mine Reclamation Program Forms.	National/regional Regional	BLM AML & State Abandoned Mine Reclamation Program Forms Utah BLM

APPENDIX D: Pre-Plan Data Status

1 Planning Questions	2 Needed Data Set (s)	3 Is Needed Data Set Available? <i>Yes/No/Partially</i>	4 Work Needed to Obtain New Data or Prepare Existing Data?	5 Est. Cost \$\$	6 *Are FGDC Metadata Available? <i>Yes/No</i>	7 Name/Source of Data Standard?	8 Does Available Data Meet a National or Regional Standard?	9 Name/Source of Potential National or Regional Data Standard?
6. Lands and Realty	Easements	No	Review case records and digitize for MFO.	¼ wm	No	Utah BLM to develop/adopt	Regional	Utah BLM
	Rights-of-Way (point, line, polygon)	Partially	Review/update Grand RMP data. Scan MTPs.	2 wms	No	Utah BLM to develop/adopt	Regional	Utah BLM/State of Utah SITLA
	Rights-of-Way Corridors (pipelines, etc.)	Partially	Review/update Grand RMP data. Acquire or digitize pipeline data for Questar or MAPCO.	½ wm	No	Utah BLM to develop/adopt	Regional	Utah BLM/State of Utah SITLA
	Land Tenure Adjustments – Disposal/Acquisition	Partially	Review/update Grand RMP data. Vertically integrate with land status dataset.	1 wm	No	Utah BLM to develop adopt	Regional	Utah BLM/State of Utah SITLA
	Public Water Reserves	Partially	Review/update Grand RMP data. Vertically integrate with land status dataset.	½ wm	No	Utah BLM/State of Utah SITLA	Regional	Utah BLM/State of Utah SITLA
	Withdrawals	Partially	Review/update Grand RMP data. Vertically integrate with land status dataset.	½ wm	No	Utah BLM to develop/adopt	Regional	Utah BLM/State of Utah SITLA
	Land Status	Partially	Review/update Grand RMP data. Vertically integrate with GCDB based PLSS dataset.	2 wms	No	Utah BLM/State of Utah SITLA	Regional	Utah BLM/State of Utah SITLA
	Transportation (For details see #19.	Partially	Photo revise USFS fringe quads. Integrate county GPS data.	NA				
	RS 2477 Assertions	No	Acquire from Counties.	¼ wm	Yes	State of Utah AGRC/Utah BLM	Regional	Utah Canyon Country Partnership Transportation Share Codes
	Municipal Watersheds	Partially	Manuscript and digitize for FO	½ wm	No	Utah BLM to develop/adopt	Regional	Utah BLM
	Municipal Boundaries	Partially	Revise and update based on County records.	1 wm	No	State of Utah AGRC/Utah BLM	Regional	State of Utah AGRC/Utah BLM

APPENDIX D: Pre-Plan Data Status

1 Planning Questions	2 Needed Data Set (s)	3 Is Needed Data Set Available? <i>Yes/No/Partially</i>	4 Work Needed to Obtain New Data or Prepare Existing Data?	5 Est. Cost \$\$	6 *Are FGDC Metadata Available? <i>Yes/No</i>	7 Name/Source of Data Standard?	8 Does Available Data Meet a National or Regional Standard?	9 Name/Source of Potential National or Regional Data Standard?
7. Rangeland Management	Grazing Allotments Range Improvements (point, line, polygon) Vegetation (see # 12 for detail)	Partially Partially	Revise and update existing data, revise to meet BLM Utah data standard. Review/update Grand RMP data. Vertically integrate with base datasets-plss, transportation, etc.	2 wms	Partially No	BLM Rangeland Accounting System & RIPS BLM Rangeland Information System & RIPS	National Core Standard & BLM Utah Regional Standard National Core Standard & BLM Utah Regional Standard	BLM Rangeland Information System data Standard BLM Rangeland Information System Data Standard
8. Minerals Management	Subsurface Mineral Reservations/Status Locatable Mineral Occurrence Potential Mining Claim Density CRIB Data MILS Data Mineral Material Occurrence Potential Mineral Material Sites (Community pits, Free Use Permits, Sales) Oil and Gas Potential Oil and Gas Leases Oil and Gas Categories Potash Potential Potash Leases, Permits, and Known Potash Leasing Areas	No Partially Yes Yes Partially Partially Partially Partially Partially	Review MTPs/digitize and attribute data. Review/update the Grand RMP data. Generate using Premier software. Data is available. Data is available. Review/update Grand RMP data. Review/update Grand RMP data. Review/update Grand RMP data. Regenerate using Premier data. Review/update Grand RMP data. Review/update Grand RMP data. Develop new data available.	4 wms ½ wm ¼ wm ½ wm ½ wm ½ wm ¼ wm ¼ wm 1 wm ½ wm	No No Partially Partially No No No No No	Utah BLM/State of Utah SITLA Utah BLM to develop/adopt Utah BLM to develop/adopt Utah BLM/UDOGM Utah BLM/UDOGM Utah BLM to develop/adopt Utah BLM to develop/adopt Utah BLM to develop/adopt Utah BLM Utah BLM Utah BLM Utah BLM to develop/adopt	Regional Regional Regional Regional Regional Regional Regional Regional Regional Regional	Utah BLM/State of Utah SITLA Utah BLM Utah BLM Utah BLM/UDOGM Utah BLM/UDOGM Utah BLM Review/adapt BLM GSENM data standard Review/adapt BLM GSENM data standard Utah BLM Utah BLM Utah BLM Utah BLM

APPENDIX D: Pre-Plan Data Status

1 Planning Questions	2 Needed Data Set (s)	3 Is Needed Data Set Available? <i>Yes/No/Partially</i>	4 Work Needed to Obtain New Data or Prepare Existing Data?	5 Est. Cost \$\$	6 *Are FGDC Metadata Available? <i>Yes/No</i>	7 Name/Source of Data Standard?	8 Does Available Data Meet a National or Regional Standard?	9 Name/Source of Potential National or Regional Data Standard?
8. Minerals Management	Special Tar Sand Areas SITLA Leases Geology Data	No Yes Partially	Manuscript and digitize, verify Acquire from SITLA and integrate into planning database. Acquire from UGS. Develop 100K data if available otherwise use 500 K data.	¼ wm ½ wm	No No No	Utah BLM to develop/adopt Utah BLM/State of Utah SITLA Utah Geologic Survey	Regional Regional Regional	Utah BLM State of Utah SITLA Utah Geologic Survey
9. Off-Highway Vehicle Use	OHV Designations Transportation (see # 19 for details) OHV Inventory-impact areas	Partially No	Review/update Grand RMP data. Manuscript, digitize, and verify.	½ wm 3 wms	No No	Utah BLM Utah BLM	Regional 	Utah BLM Review/adopt BLM GSENM data standard.
10. Recreation	Recreation Sites – Developed Recreation Trails National Historic/Scenic Trails ROS Classes SRMA/ERMA Recreation Use Pattern Areas	Partially Partially Partially Partially Yes No	Review update Grand RMP data. Manuscript, digitize, and verify. Integrate into transportation dataset. Manuscript, digitize, and verify. Integrate into transportation dataset. Manuscript, digitize, and verify. Manuscript, digitize, and verify. Field inventory with GPS? Manuscript, digitize, and verify.	½ wm 1 wm ¼ wm 1 wm 1 wm 1 year	No No No No No No	Utah BLM Utah BLM Utah BLM Utah BLM Utah BLM Utah BLM	Regional Regional Regional Regional Regional Regional	Utah BLM Utah BLM Utah BLM Utah BLM Utah BLM Utah BLM
11. Riparian Resources	Riparian Areas (point, line, polygon)	Partially	Review/update Grand RMP data. Integrate proper functioning condition attributes.	4 wms	No	Utah BLM/USFS	Regional	Utah BLM/USFS
12. Vegetation and Special Status Plants	Vegetation Intensive/Noxious Plant Inventory Data	No Yes	Complete EIS (SWA) inventory. Append and integrate into statewide dataset. Convert to national data standard (when adopted).	2 yrs? 1 wm	No No	NAWMA Data Standard	National	NAWMA Data Standard

APPENDIX D: Pre-Plan Data Status

1 Planning Questions	2 Needed Data Set (s)	3 Is Needed Data Set Available? <i>Yes/No/Partially</i>	4 Work Needed to Obtain New Data or Prepare Existing Data?	5 Est. Cost \$\$	6 *Are FGDC Metadata Available? <i>Yes/No</i>	7 Name/Source of Data Standard?	8 Does Available Data Meet a National or Regional Standard?	9 Name/Source of Potential National or Regional Data Standard?
12. Vegetation and Special Status Plants	Special Status Species (T&E Habitat)	Yes	Use GAP Model	4 wms	No	USFWS	Regional	USFWS
	State Special Status Species List	Yes	Acquire from State of Utah DNR.		Unknown	Utah BLM	Regional	Utah BLM
13. Visual Resources	Scenic Quality Inventory	No	Manuscript, digitize, and verify.	4 wms	No	Utah BLM	Regional	Utah BLM
	Visual Sensitivity Inventory	Partially	Manuscript, digitize, and verify.	1 wm	No	Utah BLM	Regional	Utah BLM
	Distance Zone Inventory	Partially	Manuscript, digitize, and verify.	1 wm	No	Utah BLM	Regional	Utah BLM
	VRM Inventory Classes	Partially	Generate in GIS using above datasets.	¼ wm	No	Utah BLM	Regional	Utah BLM
14. Watersheds and Water Quality	Ground Water Aquifer Data	Partially	Generate/model from geology dataset or obtain from State Water Resources.	½ wm	No	Utah BLM/State of Utah Water Resources	Regional	Utah BLM
	Watershed Boundary (Level 6)	Partially	Develop dataset using contract with USGS.	1500		FGDC/USGS/NRCS (Federal Standards for Delineation of Hydrologic Unit Boundaries)	National	NA
	Threatened Water Sources (303 waters)	Yes	Obtain from State of Utah Division of Water Resources or EPA website.	¼ wm	Yes	EPA data standard	National	NA
	Drinking Water Sources	Yes	Obtain from State of Utah Division of Water Resource.	¼ wm	Unknown	State of Utah Division of Water Resources	Regional	State of Utah Division of Water Resources
	Water Quality Data	Partially	Obtain from State of Utah Division of Water Resources.	¼ wm	Unknown	State of Utah	Regional	State of Utah Division of Water Resources
15. Wilderness	WSA Boundaries	Yes	Review and update as required for FO.	1 wm	Yes	BLM-Wilderness and Wilderness Study Area GIS Boundary Mapping Standards	National BLM	NA

APPENDIX D: Pre-Plan Data Status

1 Planning Questions	2 Needed Data Set (s)	3 Is Needed Data Set Available? <i>Yes/No/Partially</i>	4 Work Needed to Obtain New Data or Prepare Existing Data?	5 Est. Cost \$\$	6 *Are FGDC Metadata Available? <i>Yes/No</i>	7 Name/Source of Data Standard?	8 Does Available Data Meet a National or Regional Standard?	9 Name/Source of Potential National or Regional Data Standard?
15. Wilderness	Wilderness Inventory (202) Boundaries and Independent Wilderness proposals.	Yes	Review and update as required for FO.	1 wm	Yes	BLM-Wilderness and Wilderness Study Area GIS Boundary Mapping Standards	National BLM	NA
16. Wild and Scenic River	Wild and Scenic River Inventory Data	No	Manuscript, digitize, verify for FO. Integrate with hydrology (water courses) dataset. I	2 wms	No	Under development	Regional	Review/adapt BLM GSENM data standard.
17. Special Management Areas	ACECs (includes Outstanding Natural Areas, Research Natural Areas	Partially	Review/update Grand RMP data and data submitted by The Nature Conservancy.	½ wm	No	Utah BLM	Under development	Review/adapt BLM GSENM data standard
18. Wildlife Habitat and Special Status Species Management	Antelope Habitat	Partially	Obtain from State of Utah DWR, review and update as required for FO.	½ wm	Unknown	State of Utah DWR	Regional (Utah)	Will adapt/use State of Utah DWR.
	Elk Habitat	Partially	Coordinate with State of Utah DWR, review and update as required for FO.	½ wm	No	State of Utah DWR	Regional (Utah)	Will adapt/use State of Utah DWR.
	Desert Bighorn Sheep Habitat	Partially	Coordinate with State of Utah DWR, review and update as required for FO.	½ wm	No	State of Utah DWR	Regional (Utah)	Will adapt/use State of Utah DWR.
	Mule Deer Habitat	Partially	Coordinate with State of Utah DWR, review and update as required for FO.	½ wm	No	State of Utah DWR	Regional (Utah)	Will adapt/use State of Utah DWR.
	Sage Grouse Habitat	Partially	Coordinate with State of Utah DWR, review and update as required for FO.	½ wm	No	State of Utah DWR	Regional (Utah)	Will adapt/use State of Utah DWR.
	Sage Grouse Leks	Partially	Coordinate with State of Utah DWR, review and update as required for FO.	¼ wm	No	State of Utah DWR	Regional (Utah)	Will adapt/use State of Utah DWR.
	Raptor Nests	Partially	Coordinate with State of Utah DWR, review and update as required for FO. Field Inventory??	1 year?	No	State of Utah DWR	Regional (Utah)	Will adapt/use State of Utah DWR.

APPENDIX D: Pre-Plan Data Status

1 Planning Questions	2 Needed Data Set (s)	3 Is Needed Data Set Available? <i>Yes/No/Partially</i>	4 Work Needed to Obtain New Data or Prepare Existing Data?	5 Est. Cost \$\$	6 *Are FGDC Metadata Available? <i>Yes/No</i>	7 Name/Source of Data Standard?	8 Does Available Data Meet a National or Regional Standard?	9 Name/Source of Potential National or Regional Data Standard?
18. Wildlife Habitat and Special Status Species Management	Turkey Habitat	Partially	Coordinate with State of Utah DWR, review and update as required for FO.	½ wm	No	State of Utah DWR	Regional (Utah)	Will adapt/use State of Utah DWR.
	Upland Game Bird Habitat	Partially	Coordinate with State of Utah DWR, review and update as required for FO.	½ wm	No	State of Utah DWR	Regional (Utah)	Will adapt/use State of Utah DWR.
	Mexican Spotted Owl	Yes	Coordinate with State of Utah DWR, review and update as required for FO.	¼ wm	No	State of Utah DWR	Regional (Utah)	Will adapt/use State of Utah DWR.
	UDWR Management Units	Yes	Coordinate with State of Utah DWR, review and update as required for FO.	¼ wm	Unknown	State of Utah DWR	Regional (Utah)	Will adapt/use State of Utah DWR
	Wildlife Habitat Management Plans	Partially	Coordinate with State of Utah DWR, review and update as required for FO.	¼ wm	Unknown	State of Utah DWR	Regional (Utah)	Will adapt/use State of Utah DWR
	Fish Habitat	Partially	Coordinate with State of Utah DWR, review and update as required for FO.	½ wm	Unknown	State of Utah DWR	Regional (Utah)	Will adapt/use State of Utah DWR
	Special Status Species (T&E) Mammals-Utah Prairie Dog, etc.) Habitat	Partially	Coordinate with State of Utah DWR, review and update as required for FO.	½ wm	Unknown	Utah BLM/State of Utah DWR	Regional standard will be developed	Utah BLM 1994 Content Standard
	Special Status Species (T&E Birds) Habitat	Partially	Coordinate with State of Utah DWR, review and update as required for FO.	½ wm	Unknown	Utah BLM/State of Utah DWR	Regional standard will be developed	Utah BLM 1994 Content Standard
	Special Status Species (T&E Fish) Habitat	Partially	Coordinate with State of Utah DWR, review and update as required for FO.	½ wm	Unknown	Utah BLM/State of Utah DWR	Regional standard will be developed	Utah BLM 1994 Content Standard
Special Status Species (T&E Invertebrate Habitat)	Partially	Coordinate with State of Utah DWR, review and update as required for FO.	¼ wm	Unknown	Utah BLM/State of Utah DWR	Regional standard will be developed	Utah BLM 1994 Content Standard	

APPENDIX D: Pre-Plan Data Status

1 Planning Questions	2 Needed Data Set (s)	3 Is Needed Data Set Available? <i>Yes/No/Partially</i>	4 Work Needed to Obtain New Data or Prepare Existing Data?	5 Est. Cost \$\$	6 *Are FGDC Metadata Available? <i>Yes/No</i>	7 Name/Source of Data Standard?	8 Does Available Data Meet a National or Regional Standard?	9 Name/Source of Potential National or Regional Data Standard?
18. Wildlife Habitat and Special Status Species Management	Special Status Species Habitat Management Plans	Partially	Coordinate with State of Utah DWR, review and update as required for FO.	¼ wm	Unknown	Utah BLM/State of Utah DWR	Regional standard will be developed	Utah BLM 1994 Content Standard
	State Sensitive Wildlife Species Data	Yes	Obtain from State of Utah DWR	¼ wm	Unknown	State of Utah DWR	Regional (Utah)	State of Utah DWR
	Animal Damage Control Data	Partially	Integrate and attribute grazing allotment data	¼ wm	No	Utah BLM/State of Utah	Regional standard will be developed	Utah BLM
	Watchable Wildlife Viewing Sites	No	Develop during planning process	¼ wm	No	Utah BLM	Regional standard will be developed	Utah BLM
19. All Planning Questions/Issues	Cadastral (GCDB)	Partially	Complete GCDB collection, integrate various sources (AGRC cadastral data, Utah BLM wilderness team GCDB and FO data) into a single seamless “cadastral” coverage.	9 wms	Partially	Cadastral Data Standard	National FGDC Standard	NA
	PLSS	Partially	Integrate various data sources with GCDB	2 wms	Partially	State of Utah AGRC/Utah BLM	Regional	State of Utah AGRC/Utah
	Land Status	Partially	Review/update Grand RMP data. Vertically integrate with GCDB based PLSS dataset. Coordinate with SITLA.	4 wms	Yes	State of Utah SITLA/AGRC/Utah BLM	Regional standard will be developed	State of Utah SITLA
	Boundaries (Jurisdictional-state, county, federal agency)	Partially	Review/update Grand RMP data. Vertically integrate with GCDB based PLSS dataset. Coordinate with SITLA.	1 wm	Partially	State of Utah SITLA/AGRC/Utah BLM	Regional standard will be developed	State of Utah SITLA

APPENDIX D: Pre-Plan Data Status

1 Planning Questions	2 Needed Data Set (s)	3 Is Needed Data Set Available? <i>Yes/No/Partially</i>	4 Work Needed to Obtain New Data or Prepare Existing Data?	5 Est. Cost \$\$	6 *Are FGDC Metadata Available? <i>Yes/No</i>	7 Name/Source of Data Standard?	8 Does Available Data Meet a National or Regional Standard?	9 Name/Source of Potential National or Regional Data Standard?
19. All Planning Questions/Issues	Municipal Boundaries Transportation Hydrology Geographic Place Names	Partially Partially Partially Yes	Review with counties and update as required. Photo revise USFS fringe quads. Integrate county GPS data. Photo revise USFS fringe quads. Obtain from USGS and/or State of Utah AGRC	1 wm 48000 10000 NA	No Partially Partially Yes	State of Utah AGRC/Utah BLM State of Utah AGRC/Utah BLM State of Utah AGRC/Utah BLM/USGS USGS	Regional standard will be developed Will meet regional standard Will meet regional standard Yes	State of Utah AGRC Canyon Country Partnership Transportation Share Codes State of Utah AGRC/Utah BLM/USGS NA

* Executive Order #12906 requires FGDC-compliant metadata for geospatial data used by Federal agencies.

Notes

1. **PLANNING QUESTION** – The question, or issue with a data requirement (Pre-Plan Question/Issue from I.M. 2001-038).
2. **NEEDED DATA SETS** - The specific data needed to address the PLANNING QUESTION.
3. **AVAILABILITY OF DATA SETS** – Is there existing data or new data yet to be collected or acquired?
4. **WORK TO OBTAIN/PREPARE DATA** – If new data, describe how the data will be obtained. If existing data will be converted to GIS or some other format, describe processing.
5. **ESTIMATED COSTS** – Summary of costs associated with collecting or converting required data.
6. **AVAILABILITY OF FGDC METADATA** – Does metadata exist that is in compliance with the FGDC Geo-Spatial Metadata Content Standard?
7. **NAME/SOURCE OF DATA STANDARD** – What is or will be the name/source of the data standard? What kind of data is it: has it been designated by BLM at the National, State, Regional, Local level? If the data does not meet a national standard, be sure to document the standard being used, If the data does not meet that standard, indicate that.
8. **DATA MEETS NATIONAL OR REGIONAL STANDARD** – If there is a national or regional standard, does/will the data meet that standard? (Verify with Data Steward)
9. **NAME/SOURCES OF POTENTIAL DATA NATIONAL OR REGIONAL STANDARD** – If there is a national or regional data standard in general use, but is not being used in your plan, and you believe it would be an appropriate standard to work toward, list it.

Entries for data sets that apply to more than one question should be cut and pasted to complete the entry for each line so that each action type/question is self-contained. This will enable us to more readily transfer information to a database.

APPENDIX E
PRELIMINARY DEIS FORMAT AND CONTENT OUTLINE

Cover Sheet: Title, Type, Lead Agencies and Cooperators, Project Lead/public contact person for comments, Abstract, EIS review and consultation requirements, date of issuance, date comments due, Name, Title of responsible official.

Dear Reader Letter

Executive Summary

Table of Contents

Chapter 1: Introduction
Historical Background
Purpose and Need
Public Scoping/Planning Issue Identification
Issues and Alternatives Considered for Detailed Analysis
Issues and Alternatives Rejected for Detailed Analysis
Planning Criteria
Conformance with Land Use Plans
Relationship to Ongoing Programs, Plans, and Policies

Chapter II: Alternatives Considered for Detailed Analysis
Management Common to the Action Alternatives
No Action Alternative – 1
Alternative – 2
Alternative – 3
Alternative – 4

Chapter III: Affected Environment

This section will show baseline, condition or trends that may be affected by the various alternatives, relative importance of the affected resources and relationships to the region, highlights those values that do not fit traditional resources categories, and incorporate by reference suitable affected environment material from the existing land use planning base.

Chapter IV: Environmental Consequences
Analysis Assumptions
Reasonable Foreseeable Development Scenarios
Impact Analysis by Alternatives
Summary Table of Impacts

Chapter V: Coordination and Consultation
Describe scoping process and efforts
Summarize comments received
Identify Agencies, Organizations Participating in Process
List of Preparers

Glossary
Index
Appendices