

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT UTAH STATE OFFICE		Date: September 2015
LAND USE PLAN EVALUATION REPORT		
Plan Title: Monticello Field Office Approved Resource Management Plan		
Periodic Evaluation Number: I		
Dates Conducted: July 7, 2015		
Conducted By: BLM, Utah State Office		
TEAM MEMBERS		
Name	Title	
Julie Carson	Planning and Environmental Specialist Utah State Office	
Skye Sieber	Planning and Environmental Coordinator Utah State Office	
Assistance Provided by:		
Rebecca Doolittle	Planning and Environmental Coordinator Canyon Country District	
Donald Hoffheins	Field Manager Monticello Field Office	
Brian Quigley	Assistant Field Manager Monticello Field Office	
Submitted by: Monticello Field Office		Date September 30, 2015

Table of Contents

1.	Introduction	3
1.1.	Purpose	3
1.2.	Methodology.....	3
1.3.	Plan Amendments and Maintenance	4
2.	Results by Resource Topic.....	4
2.1.	Air, Water and Soil Resources.....	4
2.2.	Cultural and Paleontological Resources.....	5
2.3.	Fish, Wildlife and Special Status Species.....	5
2.4.	Fire, Forests, and Vegetation	5
2.5.	Lands and Realty	5
2.6.	Livestock Grazing	6
2.7.	Mining, Energy, and Health and Safety.....	6
2.8.	Recreation and Special Designations	7
2.9.	Travel Management.....	8
2.10.	Visual Resources	9
3.	Current Initiatives.....	9
3.1.	Renewable Energy.....	9
3.2.	Priority Corridors.....	9
3.3.	Leasing Reform.....	9
3.4.	Climate Change	9
3.5.	Sage-Grouse Habitat Conservation.....	9
3.6.	Regional Mitigation.....	10
4.	Recommendations.....	10
4.1.	Implementation-Level Planning.....	10
4.2.	Data and Effectiveness Monitoring.....	10
4.3.	Maintaining Plan Updates.....	10
4.4.	Maps.....	11
4.5.	Airstrips.....	11
4.6.	Summary of Plan Maintenance and Amendments.....	12

Appendix A: Interdisciplinary Review Team

Appendix B: Evaluation Questions and Responses

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

1. Introduction

In November 2008, the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) signed a Record of Decision (ROD) for the Monticello Field Office Approved Resource Management Plan (RMP). Prior to the 2008 plan, the Monticello Field Office (MFO) managed resources under the 1991 San Juan RMP. In 2002, the San Juan RMP was evaluated and found to require a plan revision. As the result of that revision, the 2008 RMP provides guidance for the management of over 1,800,000 acres of public land and 2,500,000 acres of Federal mineral estate administered by the BLM in San Juan and Grand Counties in southeastern Utah.

1.1. Purpose

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

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

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

1.2. Methodology

The RMP evaluation team included Julie Carson (Utah State Office) and Skye Sieber (Utah State Office), with coordination and support provided by Rebecca (Becky) Doolittle (Canyon Country District Office), Donald Hoffheins (Monticello Field Office) and Brian Quigley (Monticello Field Office). The team met at the Monticello Field Office in Monticello, Utah on July 7, 2015, to conduct interviews with field office staff. Resource specialists who helped review and evaluate the RMP are listed in Appendix A. A close-out conference call with Monticello Field Office managers was held on September 11, 2015.

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

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

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

facilitate a systematic review of each decision. Responses from this review (attached in Appendix C) informed recommendations for plan maintenance or amendments.

The evaluation questions and spreadsheet were sent to the field office manager and resource specialists prior to the evaluation team's visit in Monticello. The questionnaires and subsequent interviews address the evaluation process outlined in the BLM land use planning handbook (H-1601-1, V.B.1.).

1.3. Plan Amendments and Maintenance

Since November 2008, the Monticello RMP has been amended by the following planning efforts and environmental impact statements (EISs):

- Approved Resource Management Plan Amendments/Record of Decision (ROD) for Designation of Energy Corridors on Bureau of Land Management-Administered Lands in the 11 Western States (January 2009);¹
- Approved Resource Management Plan Amendments/Record of Decision (ROD) for Solar Energy Development in Six Southwestern States (October 2012); and
- Approved Land Use Plan Amendments/Record of Decision (ROD) for Allocation of Oil Shale and Tar Sands Resources on Lands Administered by the Bureau of Land Management in Colorado, Utah, and Wyoming and Final Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (March 2013).

Additionally, 101 maintenance actions have been completed and can be found on the Monticello Field Office webpage with the Approved RMP.²

2. Results by Resource Topic

The main findings of the evaluation are summarized by resource topics. Appendix B contains detailed responses from field office specialists to evaluation questions; Appendix C contains responses from specialists for each decision in the RMP.

2.1. Air, Water and Soil Resources

Since BLM does not have jurisdiction over air quality standards, the Monticello RMP's air quality decisions focus on maintaining compliance with standards set by the Utah Division of Air Quality. In the Monticello area, all areas are currently in attainment of air quality standards.

Under soil and water resource decisions, staff noted that Arch Canyon should be added to SOLW-9 as an impaired water body, since it has been added to the Clean Water Act's Section 303(d) list of impaired waters. However, the RMP does not currently set objectives for the restoration of these identified impaired waters, except to state that best management practices and vegetation management will be modified as appropriate to meet water quality standards. Furthermore, the RMP does not evaluate the availability of water within the planning area for fire suppression or other emergency needs, nor does it recognize source water protection areas and specify land-use restrictions to limit water quality degradation. Finally, monitoring for air quality is conducted during prescribed burns.

¹ The ROD included the note that Monticello's RMP contains statements that the ROW corridor designation decisions presented in the RMP are consistent with the PEIS Proposed Action. Since this RMP is consistent with the PEIS, further amendment of this RMP is not necessary.

² Monticello Field Office,

http://www.blm.gov/ut/st/en/fo/monticello/planning/Monticello_Resource_Management_Plan.html

2.2. Cultural and Paleontological Resources

Under the RMP's cultural resource decisions, staff noted that cultural resources have not yet been assigned to appropriate use categories, and that completion of a cultural resource management plan would improve their ability to plan for access to cultural sites, particularly with regard to special recreation permits. As a result, the RMP does not fully protect significant cultural and paleontological resources through special designations. Likewise, route and travel designations in the RMP fail to address cultural and paleontological needs and protection. Nomination of the most significant sites to the National Register of Historic Places and additional road inventories in the field office would help remedy these shortfalls. An updated Class I survey for the Monticello Field Office is in progress.

2.3. Fish, Wildlife and Special Status Species

Maps should be updated to include the most recent habitat layers from the Utah Division of Wildlife Resources (UDWR). To date, priority habitats for most special status species have been identified, but there are no management plans in place. Priority habitats for Navajo sedge have not yet been identified. The RMP does, however, contain measureable objectives for desired wildlife habitat conditions for major habitat types.

2.4. Fire, Forests, and Vegetation

Throughout the RMP, readers should note that lands within the Monticello Field Office that are managed for their wilderness characteristics, but are not designated as wilderness or wilderness study areas, are "BLM natural areas," (see Section 2.8 for further clarification). As such, decisions including FIRE-15, which specify that "light-on-the-land" techniques should be used for fire suppression, should refer to "BLM natural areas," not "non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics," which implies a larger land area.

Under the RMP's vegetation decisions, priority plant species and habitats, including special status species and populations of plants, still need to be designated. Decisions relating to Gunnison Sage-Grouse may be amended by BLM's Gunnison Sage-Grouse planning effort, which began in 2014 and has not yet been completed. To date, the sagebrush communities that have been or are being treated include Harts Draw, Alkali, Beef Basin, Shay Mesa, and Mustang.

The RMP's VEG-18 decision commits to maintaining an estimated 1,500 acres per year of existing land treatments and implementing new vegetation treatments to restore ecosystem health and functioning condition. However, staff noted that these targets are no longer achievable and the decision should be revised to note that treatments are conducted as resources and budgets allow.

2.5. Lands and Realty

As noted in Section 2.4 and 2.8, LAR-6 and LAR-14 should correctly refer to "BLM natural areas."

Lands and Realty decisions could be improved by adding language for disposal of split estate parcels where BLM has a reserved interest. For example, adding this language would allow BLM to release land with structures on it, which would be difficult for BLM to manage.

Finally, Appendix J, Tracts Identified for Disposal, is inaccurate as written and needs to be updated. In many cases, the legal description does not match the geographic area, which also does not align with the given acreage. In addition, each parcel is identified by letter as to the type(s) of disposal for which it is suitable, and under what authority. Approximately half of the table, however, is designated "P,"

meaning that it was nominated by the public subsequent to the 1991 RMP. These areas should be designated into the appropriate category for disposal type. Several identified changes to this appendix have not yet been incorporated into the current version of the RMP, even though they were submitted on maintenance forms at the same time as other maintenance actions that were incorporated. These changes include:

- Deleting line 2 (Maintenance Change #091);
- Correcting the acreage and details for Cedar Point – Sage Grouse Habitat (Maintenance Change #092);
- Correcting the acreage and legal description for Devils Canyon (Maintenance Change #093);
- Correcting a typo for East of Hatch Trading Post (Maintenance Change #094); and
- Correcting total disposal acreage (Maintenance Change #095).

2.6. Livestock Grazing

The RMP decisions pertaining to livestock grazing were found to be sufficient and no changes were suggested for improvement.

2.7. Mining, Energy, and Health and Safety

The Canyon Country District Office has initiated a planning effort to prepare the Moab Master Leasing Plan (MLP), a plan which will amend oil, gas, and potash leasing in a portion of the Monticello Field Office. The outcome of the MLP process may result in new mineral leasing stipulations and development constraints accomplished through amendments to Monticello's RMP. The Moab MLP and Draft RMP Amendments / Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) were made available in August 2015; an anticipated date for the final EIS is not yet known.³ The RMP also needs to incorporate amended language for the Oil Shale and Tar Sands Resources Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement.

Currently, the RMP suggests monitoring oil and gas drilling, production, and reclamation activities in the planning area and tracking total gross surface disturbance and net surface disturbance (Appendix H, page 3, Minerals Resources). The suggested monitoring methodology states that an accurate accounting of production will be tracked on producing leases, as specified in annual inspection strategies, and that acres of new disturbance, acres re-claimed, and production numbers from producing leases will be reported in an Annual Program Summary and Planning Update. Staff noted that the aforementioned Planning Update is not currently being prepared, but may be prepared in the future by: (1) Periodic inspections of oil and gas; (2) Oil and gas surface disturbance and production; (3) Monitoring of mining operations; and (4) Monitoring of saleable mineral materials.

Staff also suggested clarifications to the definition of surface occupancy and the associated stipulations located in Appendix B, Stipulations Applicable to Oil and Gas Leasing and Other Surface-Disturbing Activities. Namely, geophysical buggy mounted drills and truck or buggy mounted vibroseis source generating equipment are additional examples of surface occupancy that cause disturbance to soils and vegetation which may accelerate the natural erosion process. The use of heliportable drilling and recording equipment, when supported by crews on foot and involving short-term and temporary occupancy of the surface, could also occur within areas designated as No Surface Occupancy (NSO) or no surface disturbing activity (unless specified otherwise, as in REC-8), even though it is not considered casual use as defined in 43 CFR 3150(b).

³ U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management. *Master Leasing Plan*. <http://www.blm.gov/ut/st/en/fo/moab/MLP.html> Last updated August 17, 2015.

For consistency with the minerals decision section, staff recommended that terminology throughout the RMP be updated from “open” to “available” and from “closed” to “unavailable” in reference to disposal of mineral materials, oil and gas leasing, etc. These changes in wording are not changes in policy; rather, they are intended to provide consistency throughout the RMP.

2.8. Recreation and Special Designations

As noted in Sections 2.4 and 2.5, lands within the Monticello Field Office that are managed for their wilderness characteristics, but are not designated as wilderness or wilderness study areas, are “BLM natural areas.” In its current form, the RMP explains,

In future references, lands managed in the Approved RMP as non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics will be referred to as BLM natural areas. This change does not represent a new designation or a new decision. Rather, BLM wants to recognize these discretionary decisions with a better, simpler reference. Wilderness Areas and Wilderness Study Areas are formal designations that are managed in a prescribed manner. To avoid confusing these official designations with discretionary agency decisions, BLM has chosen a new reference to distinguish between formal designations (e.g., Wilderness Areas) and a discretionary management category (BLM natural areas). According to the Approved RMP, BLM natural areas will be managed to protect, preserve, and maintain values of primitive recreation, the appearance of naturalness and solitude.⁴

However, throughout the RMP, decisions still refer to “non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics,” which erroneously refers to all lands of this type, rather than the smaller subset of 88,871 acres that are actually managed for their wilderness characteristics. Where appropriate throughout the RMP, language should be updated to correctly refer to BLM natural areas.

Under decisions for Areas of Critical Environmental Concern (ACEC), some lands and their associated management are included, even though they are not ACECs. This confusion has been caused because those areas were being considered for ACEC status in the Draft EIS and Proposed Plan, but they were not designated as such in the Approved RMP and ROD. In the RMP, these include Bridger Jack Mesa, Butler Wash North, Cedar Mesa, Dark Canyon, Lockhart Basin, and the Scenic Highway Corridor. Some of these areas are entirely part of existing wilderness study areas and/or special recreation management areas. To clarify which lands are actually managed as ACECs and which lands are managed under other authorities or management decisions, staff should consider editing these decisions and moving them to more appropriate sections of the RMP. Similarly, Alkali Ridge National Historic Landmark is currently included in ACEC decisions, but it may best fit under cultural decisions.

Many recreation decisions need to be made consistent with one another and with current use. For example, decisions for where it is acceptable to collect wood for campfires are not always in line with where campfire wood is actually collected, and decisions relating to fire plan use with campfires may need to be adjusted to reflect existing management. Several decisions also reference “designated campsites,” where either there are no designated campsites, or campsites are simply assigned. Group size numbers for private and commercial groups are not consistent among some decisions.

Staff would like to clarify that no geophysical operations would be approved within existing and future

⁴ Monticello Record of Decision and Approved Resource Management Plan, p. 38.

recreation facilities. In ACEC-21, the Alkali Ridge National Historic Landmark would be subject to the clarified definition of NSO as described in Section 2.7, Mining, Energy, and Health and Safety.

Some decisions have site lists that need to be updated:

- Bridger Jack, Superbowl, Creek Pasture, Indian Creek Falls Group Site, and Newspaper Rock need to be added to the list of recreation sites that need development or improvement (REC-15); and
- Grand Gulch may best be described as an instant study area since it is no longer a primitive area (REC-91).

Some plans and agreements have not yet been completed, including a memorandum of understanding between the NPS/GCNRA and the Navajo Nation that will include details on the number of campsites and their associated permit restrictions in the San Juan River Special Recreation Management Area (SRMA). Throughout the RMP, consistency is needed with the acronym “CRMP” to define if that is a “cultural resource management plan” or a “cultural and recreation management plan.” Decisions REC-60, REC-61, and REC-62, which cover launch limits, group sizes, and private/commercial allocations, will be reevaluated in a Business Plan for the San Juan River that is currently in draft form. There are no existing management plans to identify goals and objectives for ACECs, although the RMP does identify protective management for relevant and important values. In addition, the Old Spanish National Historic Trail has been designated; the Monticello Field Office is awaiting a Comprehensive Trail Management Plan to be compiled by the Utah State Office. The RMP also commits to completing an Interagency Management Plan for the Dark Canyon SRMA with the National Park Service and the U.S. Forest Service; this plan has yet to be completed.

The RMP could benefit from a clearer definition of “isolation” with regard to management of the San Juan SRMA. In REC-22, the decision that establishes criteria for requiring a special recreation permit, stipulations also need to be developed for hot air balloons. In addition, the Southern Utah Wilderness Alliance’s Red Rock Wilderness proposal is within the planning area, but is not currently mentioned in the RMP.

Finally, the goals and objectives sections for several SRMAs state that by 2012, the SRMAs will be managed:

...To provide opportunities for visitors to realize personal development and growth, enhanced lifestyle increased local tourism revenue and maintenance of distinct recreation setting character, providing no fewer than 80% of responding visitors and impacted community residents at least a moderate realization of these benefits: (i.e., 3.0 on a probability scale where 1 = not at all, 2 = somewhat, 3 = moderate, 4 = total realization).

At this time, such studies are not relevant for the management of these SRMAs, and commitments in the RMP to them should be removed.

2.9. Travel Management

As noted in Section 2.2, Cultural and Paleontological Resources, route and travel designations in the RMP fail to address cultural and paleontological needs and protection. The RMP has also failed to analyze the impacts of numerous airstrips in the Monticello planning area on WSAs and non-WSAs with wilderness characteristics, recreationists, and natural and cultural resources (see Section 4.1.3).⁵

⁵ Monticello ROD/Approved RMP, page 21.

Other recommended changes to the RMP could be corrected by plan maintenance. Staff would like to see the language updated from “ways” to “primitive routes,” which more closely aligns with current terminology. The list of climbing trails in Indian Creek (TM-24) has also grown to include the Pistol Whipped Trail, among others.

2.10. Visual Resources

The Monticello RMP relies on a Visual Resources Inventory that was last updated in 2004. Otherwise, decisions in the current plan were found to be sufficient for resource management.

3. Current Initiatives

Since the RMP was completed in 2008, BLM has undertaken several new initiatives on public lands. The RMP’s treatment of these initiatives is summarized in this section.

3.1. Renewable Energy

Monticello’s RMP contains no specific references to renewable energy. However, the goals and objectives for lands and realty decisions state, “Make public land available for ... alternative energy sources...,” and LAR-15 states, “ROW applications for wind or solar energy development will incorporate best management practices (BMPs) and provisions contained in the Wind Energy or Solar Programmatic EIS documents. Both wind and solar energy development are authorized by ROW grants.” The field office staff has not seen great interest in renewable energy to date.

3.2. Priority Corridors

As noted in LAR-18 and depicted in Map 5, the RMP adopts the existing designated ROW corridors from the 1991 San Juan RMP, including the Western Utility Group (WUG) updates to the Western Regional Corridor Study, Section 368 Energy Policy Act of 2005, Westwide Energy Corridor PEIS. Designated transportation and utility corridors include existing groupings of ROWs for electric transmission facilities, pipelines 16 inches and larger, communication lines, federal and state highways, and major county road systems.

3.3. Leasing Reform

As noted in Section 2.7, the Canyon Country District Office has initiated a planning effort to prepare the Moab Master Leasing Plan (MLP), a plan which will amend oil, gas, and potash leasing in a portion of the Monticello Field Office.

3.4. Climate Change

The RMP does not recognize the 2009 BLM Air Quality Manual (MS 7300) or assess climate change as required by Secretarial Order 3289-1 and Departmental Management 523 DM1 (December 2012). The ROD/Approved RMP and Draft Environmental Impact Statement contain no mention of greenhouse gases, but greenhouse gases and climate change were discussed in the Final EIS. In terms of adapting to climate change, Special Status Species (SSP) and Wildlife and Fisheries (FWL) decisions that manage and promote unbroken blocks of habitat further support climate adaptation for wildlife species by keeping pathways between habitat areas open for movement.

3.5. Sage-Grouse Habitat Conservation

As noted in Section 2.4, decisions relating to Gunnison Sage-Grouse may be amended by BLM’s

Gunnison Sage-Grouse planning effort, which began in 2014 and has not yet been completed.

3.6. Regional Mitigation

The RMP states, “Measures to avoid or minimize environmental harm were built into the Approved RMP where practicable. ... Additional measures to mitigate environmental impacts may also be developed during subsequent NEPA analysis at the activity level planning and project stages.”⁶ The plan has not identified priority areas for mitigation.

4. Recommendations

Based on the findings of the evaluation, the evaluation team has summarized suggested plan maintenance and identified actions that can further implement RMP objectives and decisions.

4.1. Implementation-Level Planning

In order to ensure that goals and objectives are met, the following implementation-level plans still need to be completed:

- Interagency Management Plan with NPS and USFS for Dark Canyon SRMA (REC-123);
- Cultural CRMP for Alkali Ridge ACEC (ACEC-12);
- Cultural CRMP for Hovenweep ACEC (ACEC-37);
- Cultural Resources Management Plan for San Juan River (ACEC-54);
- Business Plans for Cedar Mesa SRMA and Field Office Campgrounds;
- Management plans for special status species; and
- Recreation/cultural management plans for Cedar Mesa SRMA, Beef Basin SRMA, and Tank Bench SRMA (REC-81, REC-140, and REC-137).

The Monticello Field Office also maintains a spreadsheet that prioritizes implementation-level actions from the RMP. However, most progress is documented as “ongoing” or “as needed.” To better ensure that the appropriate staff and budget are allocated to outstanding commitments, staff should update the spreadsheet or develop a better tool to help track RMP implementation accomplishments and outstanding commitments.

4.2. Data and Effectiveness Monitoring

Appendix H includes a monitoring section for each resource to describe how decisions will be tracked. Updates to the language within each resource’s monitoring section were suggested for only minerals and vegetation decisions. The minerals monitoring section refers to an Annual Program Summary and Planning Update that is not currently being compiled, but may be in the future. While the monitoring commitments were found to be sufficient as written in Appendix H, monitoring to determine effectiveness is not frequently conducted. MCA-5, Management Common to All Resources, states, “The BLM will conduct monitoring for all resources to determine the effectiveness of management prescriptions in achieving RMP objectives or making progress toward them.” WSAs, wild and scenic rivers, and historic trails have a formal monitoring system that is completed by field office staff. There is not a formal requirement for monitoring ACECs, but they are incidentally monitored by staff. Finally, there is no formal requirement for monitoring non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics.

4.3. Maintaining Plan Updates

⁶ Monticello Record of Decision and Approved Resource Management Plan, 43.

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

As noted in Section 2.5, some changes submitted on maintenance forms before the Plan’s Maintenance Version 1 (February 2009) were inadvertently omitted from that updated version, and other changes since that time have not yet been incorporated. These include maintenance change numbers 4, 5, 6, 8, 11, 37, 48, 52, 56, 61, 70, and 90 – 101.

4.4. Maps

The maps included with the RMP fail to clearly depict information that is essential to understanding the Monticello RMP and need to be revised. First, the background topographical layer is blurry and unreadable, even when zoomed in on a digital PDF version. Words and topo lines cannot be distinguished, and this serves only to obfuscate the relevant information on the maps. Because the Monticello Planning Area is so large, it would be beneficial to clip the map layers to only the relevant area (e.g., not depicting the Navajo Indian Reservation when not necessary), and to extend the mapped area to the full width of the legal-size paper. Many of the maps rely on colors rather than textures to differentiate between areas, which creates difficulties when two adjacent areas are depicted in similar colors and are unlabeled on the map (see Map 10). The background topo and land ownership layer colors sometimes conflict with these colors: on Map 10, Bridger Jack Mesa is depicted in a color similar to that of the Navajo Indian Reservation. Simple callouts with labels would be helpful, especially when areas are identified by color, like in Maps 8, 12, and 20.

For example, ACEC-48 describes a Visual Emphasis Zone of 880 acres that surrounds the west, south, and east sides of Hovenweep National Monument and is a right of way avoidance area. However, on Map 4, ROW Avoidance and Exclusion Areas, it is nearly impossible to locate this small parcel, not least because Hovenweep National Monument is not labeled. Again, map clarity could be improved with labels and callouts.

In addition, some information on the maps is not described anywhere on the maps or in the legends; for example, many maps contains black lines across the planning area, and although readers can infer that these lines are major roads, the maps should clearly state this fact.

4.5. Airstrips

The Record of Decision, in Section E, Notice of Modifications and Clarifications, states,

The Monticello RMP/EIS failed to analyze the impacts of remote airstrips in the Monticello planning area on WSAs and non-WSAs with wilderness characteristics, recreationists, natural and cultural resources. Because BLM did not analyze such impacts, the BLM Monticello FO is required to withdraw the decision in Appendix N of the Proposed RMP/Final EIS. In response to a protest, and in order remedy this oversight, the impacts of these numerous airstrips on the

*resources in the planning area will be considered at the earliest opportunity as part of the next planning process conducted by the field office. The BLM will delineate travel management areas for remote airstrips and determine which of these will be open or closed in compliance with the NEPA, Appendix C of the BLM Planning Handbook (H-1601-1) and Public Law 106-291, Section 345.*⁷

Analysis of the impacts of these airstrips on the resources in the planning area has not yet been completed and needs to be completed “at the earliest opportunity as part of the next planning process conducted by the field office.”⁸

4.6. Summary of Plan Maintenance and Amendments

The following table summarizes updates to the plan recommended by field office staff and the evaluation team during their review. A majority of updates are likely to be accomplished by plan maintenance as they reflect minor data changes or help to refine, document, or clarify previously approved decisions. While the appropriate method for incorporating changes must be determined from the details of each case, an initial suggestion regarding plan maintenance or amendment is provided.

Suggested Change	Affected Decision(s)	Suggested Method
Update IMP to new wilderness manuals: MS-6330, MS-6340.	MCA-1, LAR-2, REC-16, REC-80, REC-110, REC-117, REC-121, REC-127, REC-135, ACEC-22, ACEC-23, ACEC-24, ACEC-25, ACEC-29, ACEC-30, WSA-5, WSA-6, WSA-8, TM-9	Maintenance
Correct reference to IMP (not correct to cite new manual).	WSA-4	Maintenance
Consider implementing in a "cultural resource management plan" to better assist planning and SRP decisions about access to cultural sites.	CUL-8	Maintenance
Change “PA” to “Field Office.”	CUL-13, REC-3, REC-105	Maintenance
Change “wildland fire use” to “use of wildland fire.”	FIRE-1, FIRE-6, FIRE-7, FIRE-8, Fire Section Title, Fire Monitoring Section (Appendix H)	Maintenance
After “criteria” add “(not in order of preference).”	FIRE-11	Maintenance
Replace “non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics” with “BLM natural areas.”	FIRE-15, LAR-6, LAR-14	Maintenance
Update title of document to “Canyon Country Fire Zone Fire Management Plan.”	FIRE-16, ACEC-41, Fire Monitoring Section (Appendix H)	Maintenance
Update wording from “open” to “available” for	LAR-12, WC-1, REC-7, REC-	Maintenance

⁷ Monticello Record of Decision and Approved Resource Management Plan, E. Notice of Modifications and Clarifications, 21.

⁸ *Ibid.*

Suggested Change	Affected Decision(s)	Suggested Method
consistency with other sections/decisions (the meaning is the same).	136, REC-138, ACEC-57	
Update wording from “closed” to “unavailable” for consistency with other sections/decisions (the meaning is the same).	ACEC-51, ACEC-57, ACEC-58, WSR-18, REC-113	Maintenance
Delete BLM 1997 reference (redundant with Appendix F).	GRA-1, RIP-4, SOLW-2, SOLW-6	Maintenance
Add “ <i>Portions of</i> ” before Moki Canyon and “(as identified in Map 7 of Appendix A)” after Lake Canyon.	GRA-20	Maintenance
Add “(See RIP-15)” to end of sentence.	GRA-21	Maintenance
Provide clarification regarding geophysical (heliportable) in NSO and note that certain activities associated with geophysical do not meet the definition of surface occupancy. Suggested edits captured in Minerals tab of Evaluation Questions spreadsheet. Add (<i>Refer to Appendix B</i>) to end of sentence.	MIN-3	Maintenance
Drop decision – this decision is the same as MIN-16.	MIN-4	Maintenance
Need to include amended language for Oil Shale and Tar Sands Leasing Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS).	MIN-13	Maintenance
Move acreages for SRMAs to same place in each section, near the beginning.	Recreation Decisions (REC-56/48, REC-124, REC-125, REC-132, REC-136)	Maintenance
Add to end of decision: “ <i>No geophysical operations would be approved within these areas.</i> ”	REC-8	Maintenance
“General Recreation Management” heading is found in two locations.	Recreation Decisions	Maintenance
Strike “As outlined in the Recreation Corridor Plan (BLM 2005).” Add Bridger Jack, Superbowl, Creek Pasture, Indian Creek Falls Group Site, and Newspaper Rock.	REC-15	Maintenance
Modify language to reflect current policy.	REC-20	Maintenance
Some areas have designated campsites, some do not; this decision needs to be made consistent.	REC-32	Maintenance
Modify decision to read: “Commercial hiking to cultural sites is limited to areas authorized in specific special recreation permits and human waste must be packed out.”	REC-33	Maintenance
“Designated basis” needs to be clarified. Renewed on a five year term? Or prospectus for new	REC-49	Maintenance

Suggested Change	Affected Decision(s)	Suggested Method
applications every five years?		
Repeat of Forestry-7 (p. 158). Recommend dropping the decision.	REC-52	Maintenance
Make decisions about campfires with / without a fire pan consistent.	REC-54	Maintenance
Missing decisions – recommend renumbering.	REC-59, REC-95, REC-96, REC-97, REC-102, REC-126, ACEC-26, WSA-7, SSP-3	Maintenance
Change to “Per day launch limits...” Decision will be reevaluated in San Juan River Management Plan.	REC-60	Maintenance
Change to “...and are not included in the per day launch limits.” Will be reevaluated in San Juan River Management.	REC-62	Maintenance
Clarify language as follows: “Grazing in the riparian area of the San Juan River SRMA will be restricted to October 1–May 31 and must meet or exceed PFC, and incorporate rest-rotation and/or deferment systems. This will include Perkins Brothers, East League, and McCracken Wash Allotments.”	REC-72	Maintenance
Better define what is intended by “isolation.”	REC-76	Maintenance
Consistency with acronym CRMP needed to clarify joint recreation-cultural management plans or solely cultural management plans.	REC-81, REC-137, REC-140	Maintenance
“Grand Gulch Primitive area...” Consider amending "Primitive area" to "Instant Study Area" (REC-91, p.100) since Grand Gulch is no longer a primitive area.	REC-91	Maintenance
Update wording of decision to reflect the direction provided in REC-109.	REC-104	Maintenance
Change to read, “Commercial allocation is limited to no more than 30% of the Cedar Mesa permitted use.” Change to “assigned campsites” instead of “designated campsites,” in 4 th bullet. Change to “will not have assigned” instead of “will not have designated” in 5 th bullet.	REC-106	Maintenance
Decision was corrected to 12 people per day per trailhead for overnight trips per Maintenance Change #96 (2010) and needs to be reflected in the current RMP version.	REC-107	Maintenance
Clarify: in 8 th bullet, private and commercial group size limited to 12 people <i>at a time</i> (not per day).	REC-113	Maintenance

Suggested Change	Affected Decision(s)	Suggested Method
<p>This limit does not apply to State Highways, Class B roads, and developed campsites.</p> <p>In second from last bullet, change reference to designated parking areas to <i>established</i> parking areas.</p> <p>In last bullet, potentially change 8 person private group size limit in Butler Wash to 12 people (what is the justification for 8?).</p>		
<p>In bullet 7, remove word “be” from statement and change to “not.”</p>	REC-117	Maintenance
<p>In 1st bullet, change group size limit to 15 to be consistent with USFS.</p> <p>In 2nd bullet, clarify that “per week” means “per seven day period.”</p> <p>In 3rd bullet, clarify what is meant by twenty total private users per day without a permit system.</p>	REC-124	Maintenance
<p>Remove “Management prescriptions for the Indian Creek SRMA” because it is a fragment.</p>	REC-125	Maintenance
<p>Remove Creek Pasture since it is now a developed campground.</p>	REC-129	Maintenance
<p>“Cultural site visitation limited to designated trails.” There are no designated trails so unsure how this can be implemented. Consider rephrasing decision.</p>	REC-138	Maintenance
<p>Remove the paragraph that states, “By the year 2012, manage this SRMA... 4 = total realization).</p>	Goals and Objectives sections for San Juan River SRMA, Cedar Mesa SRMA, Dark Canyon SRMA, Indian Creek SRMA, White Canyon SRMA, and any other locations.	Maintenance
<p>Add “<i>and/or Non-functional</i>” to be in accord with GRA-22</p>	RIP-16	Maintenance
<p>Change “<i>Modify</i>” to “<i>Implement</i>” because BMPs are not definitive</p> <p>Note: Arch Canyon was added to the 303d list ~ 2013</p>	SOLW-9	Maintenance
<p>Ongoing process or most current policy/guidance</p>	SOLW-11	Maintenance
<p>Change 9th bullet to: Available for geophysical exploration “subject to NSO as described in Appendix B and the NSO</p>	ACEC-21	Maintenance

Suggested Change	Affected Decision(s)	Suggested Method
<p>definition on page 174. Specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No motorized vehicle (including but not limited to ATVs, vibroseis and drill buggies) operation would be approved. The use of heliportable drill rigs and recording equipment supported by crews on foot could be approved.” <p>Add reference to Map 20.</p> <p>Consider moving this decision to the Cultural section (if not referenced in Cultural section already).</p>		
<p>Reword decisions to clarify that some areas currently listed as “ACECs” are not managed as such. Consider moving decisions to appropriate sections (REC or a new WSA section).</p>	<p>ACEC-22, ACEC-23, ACEC-24, ACEC-25, ACEC-27, ACEC-28, ACEC-29, ACEC-30, ACEC-52, ACEC-55, ACEC-56</p>	<p>Maintenance</p>
<p>Update bullet about livestock grazing (14th bullet) to clarify meaning (for example, remove “allowed for access”).</p>	<p>ACEC-51</p>	<p>Maintenance</p>
<p>“Ways” changed to “primitive routes.”</p>	<p>WSA-8, TM-9</p>	<p>Maintenance</p>
<p>Add “described in WSA-4” to the decision to specify which lands are being referenced.</p>	<p>WSA-10</p>	<p>Maintenance</p>
<p>Note: the Utah Wildlife Action Plan is being updated. Update reference to document so that the decision references the most current version.</p>	<p>SSP-11</p>	<p>Maintenance</p>
<p>Change to refer to current travel management plan so mileage doesn’t need to be updated.</p>	<p>TM-15</p>	<p>Maintenance</p>
<p>Should be hiking “and equestrian” in parentheses.</p>	<p>TM-20</p>	<p>Maintenance</p>
<p>Some trails have been added: Pistol Whipped Trail (among others). Update list.</p>	<p>TM-24</p>	<p>Maintenance</p>
<p>Add “Subject to budgetary and resource constraints.”</p>	<p>VEG-15</p>	<p>Maintenance</p>
<p>Sec. Order 3336 and/or Gunnison Sage-grouse plan may change this priority for sage-grouse. Note: Harts, Alkali, Beef, Shay, and Mustang have been or are currently being treated.</p>	<p>VEG-16</p>	<p>Maintenance</p>
<p>These annual targets are no longer achievable. Add “Subject to budgetary and resource constraints.”</p>	<p>VEG-18</p>	<p>Maintenance</p>
<p>In the second to last bullet, “Suitable” should be removed from San Juan River Segment (not Section) 3.</p>	<p>VRM-1</p>	<p>Maintenance</p>
<p>Spelling mistake: “are” not “aree.”</p>	<p>VRM-2</p>	<p>Maintenance</p>

Suggested Change	Affected Decision(s)	Suggested Method
Update Maps to include most recent habitat layers from UDWR.	Throughout FWL section.	Maintenance
Modify last bullet under methodology to read " <i>long-term trend data</i> " (versus the current: "rangeland health assessment process.")	Monitoring, Appendix H, Vegetation section	Maintenance
Add definitions of "established," "assigned," and "designated" to glossary.	Applicable to REC decisions and elsewhere.	Maintenance
Update Appendix J: assign "P" parcels to appropriate category and ensure acreage and legal descriptions are correct.	Appendix J	Maintenance
Update Maps (see Section 4.4 of this report)	Appendix A	Maintenance
Would like to add language for disposal of split estate parcels where BLM has a reserved interest. Example language: "Reserved Federal interests in split estate lands anywhere in the planning area may be considered for conveyance out of Federal ownership." Language added from IM 2011-110 (extended).	LAR-16	Maintenance
<i>There is no requirement or commitment for the MFO to undertake changes that could only be enacted through the amendment process.</i>		
Add stipulations for hot air balloons.	REC-22	Amendment
Designate priority habitats for Navajo sedge.	Special Status Species Section	Amendment
Policies need to be revisited among decisions for campfire wood collection in various locations.	Recreation Decisions	Amendment

Appendix A: Interdisciplinary Review Team

Monticello Field Office / Canyon Country District Staff

Jed Carling	<i>Range</i>
Clifford Giffen	<i>Minerals/Air/Water</i>
Ted McDougall	<i>Minerals</i>
Paul Plemmons	<i>Fire and Fuels</i>
Chris Ransel	<i>Lands and Realty</i>
Amanda Scott	<i>Wildlife</i>
Jeff Brown	<i>Hazardous Materials</i>
Donald Hoffheins	<i>Field Manager</i>
Brian Quigley	<i>Assistant Field Manager</i>
Becky Doolittle	<i>Planning</i>
Misti Haines	<i>Recreation</i>
Nicholas Walendziak	<i>Recreation</i>
Casey Worth	<i>Recreation</i>

Appendix B: Evaluation Questions and Responses

Question	Response	Action
Are the leasing restrictions and stipulations affecting energy and renewable energy development (Oil & Gas, Geothermal, Solar, and Wind) appropriate to protect critical resources and special areas or are there additional restrictions or stipulations that are needed to protect resources? Identify the additional restrictions required.	Additional restrictions/stipulations being considered in the Moab MLP process as well as Gunnison sage-grouse planning effort.	No Change
Is there a Reasonable Foreseeable Development (RFD) scenario for implementing fluid minerals energy-related exploration and development in the planning area? If so, then:	Yes	No Change
a. Is it appropriate for the level of activity occurring now and projected in the near term (3-5 years)?	Approved 13 APDs; Seven Drilled; Six are productive/Active Injectors RFD predicted five wells per year on BLM surface. Actual wells drilled are approx. one per year. The RFD remains valid.	No Change
b. Is it appropriate for the level of activity projected in the long term (20 years)?	Yes	No Change
c. Has the RFD been exceeded or could be exceeded within the lifespan of the RMP?	No; the RFD is unlikely to be exceeded within the life of the RMP.	No Change
d. Does the RFD consider potential new discoveries from developing tight shale formations with new hydraulic fracturing and horizontal drilling technologies?	Drilling technologies such as horizontal drilling are discussed in the RFD. Hydraulic Fracturing is not discussed.	No Change
e. Was the RFD used as the basis for determining cumulative impacts in the RMP/EIS?	Yes	No Change
Does the RMP contain an appendix outlining typical BMPs that will be used for fluid mineral development?	Yes, Appendix G	No Change
Were the least restrictive constraints selected that meet the resources protection objective?	MIN-7 states that the least restrictive constraints were selected.	No Change
Does the RMP provide direction and flexibility to accommodate oil & gas and renewable energy development? Are there constraints in the RMP that would affect or delay issuing Rights-of-Way for oil & gas, geothermal, wind or solar energy development?	Yes. The RMP specifies ROW avoidance and exclusion in areas designated as NSO per LAR-12, pg. 72.	No Change
Are there restrictions that should be eliminated or modified because they no longer are needed/appropriate, or are there other protective mechanisms in place that supersede their use, or are there industry technological changes that make the restriction(s) unnecessary?	None that have come up recently.	No Change
Are there RFDs outlined in the RMP for other mineral resources, such as locatable or salable? If so, is level of activity commensurate with the RFD?	Mineral Potential Report includes RFD for "other minerals" (salable).	No Change
Does the RMP address how the RFD scenario(s) will be kept up to date?	No	No Change
Does the RMP describe criteria for the application of appropriate stipulations for fluid minerals, along with criteria for the waiver, exception, or modification of the stipulation?	Yes	No Change
Does the RMP incorporate sustainable development concepts or objectives relative to post-mining uses?	Not directly identified but reclamation plans are standard part of minerals administration.	No Change
Does the RMP ensure access to sand and gravel to support infrastructure and communities?	MIN-20, 21, and 22 help ensure access.	No Change

<p>Monitoring Appendix H (Page 3, Suggested Monitoring Methodology column): and gas drilling/production/reclamation activities in the planning area. Total gross surface disturbance and net surface disturbance from all drilling will be tracked. An accurate accounting of production will also be tracked on producing leases, as specified in annual inspection strategies. Acres of new disturbance, acres re-claimed, and production numbers from producing leases will be reported in the Annual Program Summary and Planning Update.</p>	<p>2. Monitoring of oil</p>	<p>The Annual Program Summary and Planning Update is not currently being prepared. The FO may begin preparing this report. Would prepare report by: (1) Periodic inspections of oil and gas; (2) Oil and gas surface disturbance and production; (3) Monitoring of mining operations; and (4) Monitoring of saleable mineral materials.</p>	<p>No Change</p>
---	-----------------------------	---	------------------

Appendix B. STIPULATIONS APPLICABLE TO OIL AND GAS LEASING AND OTHER SURFACE DISTURBING ACTIVITIES (p. 1, Introduction): This appendix lists the stipulations for oil and gas leasing referred to throughout this proposed RMP and EIS. These stipulations would also apply, where appropriate and practical, to other surface-disturbing activities (and occupancy) associated with land use authorizations, permits, and leases issued on BLM lands (for example, an NSO designation is not designed to prevent the construction or maintenance of a foot trail with hand tools, but could prevent the construction of a livestock trail using a dozer). The stipulations would not apply to activities and uses where they are contrary to laws, regulations, or specific program guidance. The intent is to maintain consistency to the extent possible, in applying stipulations to all surface-disturbing activities. Surface-disturbing activities are those that normally result in more than negligible disturbance to public lands and/or resources. These activities normally involve use and/or occupancy of the surface and cause disturbance to soils and vegetation which may accelerate the natural erosion process. This level of surface disturbance usually, but not always, requires reclamation and is typically caused by motorized or mechanical actions. They include, but are not limited to: the use of mechanized earth-moving equipment or truck-mounted drilling equipment; geophysical buggy mounted drills, truck or buggy mounted vibroseis source generating equipment; off-road vehicle travel in areas designated as limited or closed to Off-Road vehicle use; construction of facilities such as power lines, pipelines, oil and gas well locations, recreation sites, and improvements for livestock and wildlife; new road construction; and, use of pyrotechnics and explosives. Surface disturbance is not normally caused by casual use activities. Activities that are not considered surface disturbing include, but are not limited to: livestock grazing, cross-country hiking, minimum impact filming, and vehicular travel on designated routes. The use of heliportable drilling and recording equipment supported by crews on foot to conduct geophysical operations, while not considered casual use (as defined at 43 CFR 3150.b) and involves short-term and temporary occupancy of the surface, could also occur within areas designated as NSO or no surface disturbing activity unless specified otherwise (REC-8).

Add language that is underlined and italicized to Appendix B.

Question	Response	Action
Is the RMP's policy statement for managing hazardous materials and wastes up to date?	Yes, see Goals and Objectives on page 67 of the RMP.	No Change
Does the RMP identify an inventory of hazardous materials sites, including FUD (Formerly Used Defense) sites, and outline objectives for management and disposal of known or potential future hazardous materials sites?	Yes, see HAZ-5.	No Change
Is the RMP's policy statement for managing Abandoned Mine Lands (AML) up to date?	Yes, see HAZ-2.	No Change
Does the RMP address identification, inventory and closure actions for Abandoned Mine Lands?	Yes, see HAZ-3.	No Change
Health and Safety Monitoring	The monitoring specified in Appendix H is adequate and requires no changes.	No Change

Question	Response	Action
Do the RMP land tenure decisions provide for consolidating land ownership? If no, please explain.	Discussion of ownership consolidation is in LAR-3, bullet 4: "Such changes will promote effective management and meet essential resource objectives through land ownership consolidation."	No Change
Does the RMP include a Table or Map identifying Land and Mineral Ownership in the Planning Area, or something comparable, clearly identifying jurisdiction over various lands or interests in lands?	Map 1 shows general land status for the entire Field Office. Map-18 shows oil and gas leasing areas by stipulations ex. Standard, Closed, NSO, etc. The RMP does not indicate areas where split estates exist.	No Change
Does the RMP identify specific lands, described by legal description as potentially suitable for disposal by sale or exchange? Does the RMP identify acquisition areas such as NCAs, wilderness areas, or other high resource lands, should they become available from a willing seller? Do these areas reflect current resource priorities for landownership adjustments (i.e. sage grouse habitat, mule deer winter range, etc.)? List any new priority areas not described in the RMP.	Appendix J provides legal descriptions for lands suitable for disposal. LAR-1 (page 70) indicates that any land of potential/occupied special status species habitat is a high priority for acquisition. No legal descriptions are given on where these lands may be. LAR-4 (page 70) identifies a parcel for acquisition that contains culturally sensitive lands in the McLoyd Canyon-Moon House area. ACEC-58 bullet 7 states, "The BLM will pursue acquisition of state in-holdings in this ACEC (Valley of the Gods ACEC)." No new priority areas at this time	No Change
How are planning decisions in the RMP being applied to newly-acquired lands? Is future BLM management of the lands or interests in lands addressed in the EIS for the acquisition/exchange?	LAR-3 and 4 provide direction on land acquisitions. No newly acquired lands at this time.	No Change
Does the RMP identify right-of-way corridors, avoidance areas, and exclusion areas? For avoidance areas, does the plan outline the terms and conditions that must be met in order for a right-of-way to be granted?	LAR-18 identifies ROW corridors for transportation and utilities. It adopts ROW corridors from the 1991 San Juan RMP including the Western Utility Group updates to the Western Regional Corridor Study (Map 5), Section 368 Energy Policy Act 2005, Westwide Energy Corridor PEIS. Exclusion and avoidance areas are detailed in Map 4 (LAR-14 page 72). LAR-12 says, "NOS areas are avoidance areas for ROWs, no ROW will be granted in NSO areas unless there are no feasible alternatives."	No Change
Does the RMP address the policies and actions under Executive Order (EO) 13211 of May 18, 2001 (President's National Energy Policy) toward expediting the supply and availability of energy in your RMP area?	Yes, see Mineral Resources Goals and Objectives (p. 79).	No Change
Does the RMP identify proposed land withdrawals? Does the RMP identify both previous and new land withdrawals?	Yes, Page 74 LAR-21.	No Change
How are planning decisions being applied to lands returned to the public domain from relinquished withdrawals, where administrative jurisdiction is or will likely be returned to the BLM?	Currently no relinquished withdrawals.	No Change
Monitoring	The monitoring specified in Appendix H is adequate and requires no changes.	No Change

Question	Response	Action
Does the RMP identify air quality standards and, if appropriate, provide examples of prescriptive management practices to achieve them?	Yes, especially for fire (see AQ-2, AQ-4, pg. 57). There is also a RMP Air Quality COA (MIN-11, pg. 81).	No Change
Does the RMP recognize the State's authority to regulate air quality impacts and establish emission standards?	Yes, see pg. 24.	No Change
Does the RMP address impairment of visibility in federal and state Class I areas, including those which may be affected in adjacent states?	Yes, see AQ-5, page 81.	No Change
Does the RMP identify existing non-attainment areas, state implementation plans (SIP), tribal implementation plans (TIP) when available, and measures/actions to meet conformity with SIP/TIPs?	There are no areas of non-attainment in the planning area.	No Change
Was air quality modeling done for the RMP? If so, was the modeling qualitative or quantitative? Briefly describe the model used.	No	No Change
Based upon the information derived from modeling and/or monitoring, are air quality standards being met? If not, what management actions or mitigation measures are prescribed?	N/A	No Change
Is the plan consistent with the June 2011 Air Quality MOU for Oil and Gas projects?	AQ-6 requires working cooperatively with state, fed, tribal entities in assessment, cumulative impacts and regional air quality issues.	No Change
Monitoring (Appendix H)	Air quality monitoring is done for prescribed burns.	No Change

Question	Response	Action
Does the RMP evaluate the availability of water and/or the need to develop additional water sources needed to manage wild horses and burros, livestock, wildlife, recreation, habitat and other beneficial uses allowed under state water law?	Wildlife management actions address guzzlers.	No Change
Does the RMP evaluate the availability of water within the plan area for fire suppression or other emergency needs?	No	No Change
Does the RMP contain prescriptions for and identify methods of application(s) for emergency fire rehabilitation/restoration?	FIRE-14	No Change
Does the RMP identify Bureau water rights policy, voluntary conformance with state water law, and provisions to perfect and protect sufficient water rights to meet land management activities (BLM 7250 Manual and Utah Water Rights Policy)?	SOLW-4 states that BLM will comply with state water quality standards.	No Change
Monitoring (Appendix H)	The monitoring specified in Appendix H is adequate and requires no changes.	No Change
Monitoring - Drought and Natural Disasters (Appendix H)	The monitoring commitments under Drought and Natural Disasters are current and achievable.	No Change

Question	Response	Action
Does the RMP discuss water quality, water quantity, and current or foreseeable beneficial uses in the planning area?	RIP-2 p113, RIP-7 p114, SOLW-1 p 116, SOLW-3 p 116, SOLW-4 p 116, SOLW-5 p116, SOLW-10 p 117	No Change
Does the RMP identify State water quality standards or establish water quality objectives where State standards are nonexistent? (BLM 7240 manual).	Not specifically. SOLW-4 directs BLM to comply with state standards.	No Change
Does the RMP identify area wide use restrictions and/or Best Management Practices to meet water quality requirements?	SOLW-4: "Comply with Utah's state water quality standards."	No Change
Are there any impaired water bodies in the planning area identified on the State of Utah's list (303d)? Are any impaired water bodies linked to public land use?	Yes, Arch Canyon (added to list in 2013). Yes.	Add
Does the RMP set objectives for the restoration of identified impaired waters?	No	No Change
As appropriate, does the RMP refer to the state's Report on Water Quality (305b)?	No	No Change
In view of the Unified Federal Policy and other provisions of the Clean Water Act, are there opportunities or needs to identify priority watersheds, or watersheds in need of special protection?	SOLW-9 and have also deferred grazing in some watersheds.	No Change
Does the RMP recognize wellhead/source water protection areas and specify land-use restrictions to limit water quality degradation?	No	No Change
Are management decisions prescribed on a watershed level? Explain.	Yes, fuels reduction, forestry and sagebrush projects are done on a watershed level.	No Change
Monitoring (Appendix H)	The monitoring specified in Appendix H is adequate and requires no changes.	No Change

Question	Response	Action
Does the RMP require the use of Proper Functioning Condition surveys to assess functionality of riparian areas?	Yes (see Riparian Goals and Objectives).	No Change
Are there general goals to maintain functional riparian areas at PFC and to improve the condition of areas that are functioning-at-risk or non-functional so that such areas may achieve PFC?	Yes, and part of regulations.	No Change
Does the RMP include objectives/management actions needed to achieve goals described under #2 (actions might also be described under other management areas such as vegetation, soils, sensitive species, etc.)?	See RIP-11, 16 and 17.	No Change
Are measures required to collect quantitative monitoring data and additional PFC surveys to evaluate effectiveness of stated management actions?	Not required by the RMP.	No Change
Is the RMP subject to review under the new Riparian performance standard?	IM 2010-101 (Process for Reporting on the Performance Measure to Assess the Effectiveness of Resource Management Plans Using Riparian Condition as an Indicator) expired Sept. 30, 2011.	No Change
Monitoring (Appendix H)	The monitoring specified in Appendix H is adequate and requires no changes.	No Change

Question	Response	Action
Are soil survey data described and used to assess the suitability/capability of landscapes to achieve RMP objectives?	No, soil survey data are more specific than what would be required for an RMP level analysis. Soil survey data would be and is used during a project specific analysis.	No Change
Are soil survey data used to set priorities for restoration/rehabilitation and to guide development of site-specific prescriptions?	No, soil survey data are more specific than what would be required for an RMP level analysis. Soil survey data would be and is used during a project specific analysis.	No Change
Are soil survey data used to identify erosion hazards or erodible classes throughout the planning area?	Yes. While SSURGO data are not displayed in detail in the RMP analysis, they are used to determine factors contributing to site degradation and their inherent risks, such as those described on pg. 4-451, table 4.125 of the PRMP/FEIS.	No Change
Does the RMP utilize or address the use of Ecological Site Descriptions for determining ecological site conditions and treatment options?	No. The Ecological Site Description is the data used as a guide in setting priorities and prescriptions for restoration /rehab work. The soil survey data is usually used to determine the limitations/hazards associated with restoration /rehab work.	No Change
Monitoring (Appendix H)	The monitoring specified in Appendix H is adequate and requires no changes.	No Change

Question	Response	Action
Does the RMP provide adequate direction and flexibility for the District/Field Office to plan and implement vegetation treatment projects under programs such as the Watershed Restoration Initiative (WRI) and Healthy Landscapes?	Yes	No Change
Does the RMP identify desired future conditions of vegetation resources for land management objectives?	The goals and objectives on page 146 state, "Manage vegetation resources for desired future conditions, as determined by site-specific BLM objectives...".	No Change
Does the RMP designate priority plant species and habitats, including special status species and populations of plants? List any priority species and habitats.	There are no specific designations. Under the ESA Navajo sedge is protected.	Add
Does the RMP contain strategies to conserve threatened or endangered and special status plant species, including listed species and species proposed for listing?	Yes: in Appendix B-Stipulations Applicable to Oil and Gas Leasing and Other Surface Disturbing Activities.	No Change
Are the RMP decisions consistent with objectives and recommended actions in recovery plans, conservation agreements, and applicable biological opinions for threatened and endangered species?	Yes	No Change
Does the RMP provide management direction to address the introduction and spread of noxious and invasive species?	Yes, VEG-5.	No Change
Is there a current inventory of noxious or invasive species for the planning area?	No. There is an informal GPS database of infestation sites.	No Change
Monitoring: Appendix H (page 6)	Rangeland health assessment process is a one time snapshot. Long term trend data is the more appropriate method.	Modify last bullet under methodology to read " <i>long-term trend data</i> " (versus the current: "rangeland health assessment process.>").

Question	Response	Action
Does the RMP identify desired future conditions for health and distribution of forest resources (broken down by forest type)?	Yes, the RMP follows the guidance in the National BLM Forest Health and Forest Management Standards and Guidelines, Healthy Forest Initiative and Healthy Forest Restoration Act of 2003.	No Change
Does the RMP address old-growth features of the forest and woodland habitat types? Is management direction provided on how to maintain or contribute to the restoration of old growth forests?	RMP follows the guidance in "Recommended Old-Growth Definitions and Descriptions" USDA Forest Service Southwestern Region (Sept 1992).	No Change
Does the RMP identify characteristics of healthy forest conditions for forest/woodland types?	Yes, the RMP follows the guidance in the National BLM Forest Health and Forest Management Standards and Guidelines, Healthy Forest Initiative and Healthy Forest Restoration Act of 2003.	No Change
Does the RMP identify resources available for woodland product harvest and identify sustainable harvest levels in those areas?	Yes, areas are identified. Many areas are restricted to dead and down so there are no specific sustainable harvest levels identified.	No Change
Does the RMP identify areas where commercial and/or non-commercial harvesting is open, restricted or withdrawn from commercial activities?	Yes: FOR-9 thru FOR-26.	No Change
Does the RMP comply with the objectives outlined in the Healthy Forest Initiative and the Healthy Forests Restoration Act?	Yes	No Change
Does the RMP support utilization of biomass across broad landscapes and is it consistent with policy?	Yes	No Change
Monitoring	The monitoring specified in Appendix H is adequate and requires no changes.	No Change

Question	Response	Action
Does the plan provide adequate direction and flexibility to implement actions to maintain or restore healthy rangelands in Utah?	Yes	No Change
Does the RMP incorporate the Utah Standards and Guidelines for Rangeland Health for livestock grazing management? Does the RMP apply the standards to all programs and uses?	Yes, mentioned in various SOLW, RIP, and VEG management actions. Also discussed in MCA-6 (Management Common to All Resources) which includes surface-disturbing activities, wildlife, recreation, oil and gas Best Management Practices / Standard Operating Procedures.	No Change
Does the RMP identify lands available or not available for livestock grazing? Have the criteria for identifying lands available for grazing changed since the RMP was completed?	Yes. Criteria have not changed.	No Change
Monitoring (Appendix H)	The monitoring specified in Appendix H is adequate and requires no changes.	No Change

Question	Response	Action
How well do the Fire Planning Units (FPU) match up with FPUs of adjoining BLM districts in Utah, and adjoining states?	There are no issues.	No Change
In cases where FPUs do not match, is there sufficient rationale to validate the FPU boundaries for the planning area?	N/A	No Change
Does the RMP present any constraints or issues relative to complying with the Wildland Fire Policy? If so, please explain.	No	No Change
Does the RMP present any constraints to approving biomass utilization or stewardship projects for energy production, commercial and/or non-commercial uses (e.g., public woodcutting, commercial, co-generation energy production, etc.)?	No	No Change
Does the RMP conform to current policies on Fire Management Planning for identifying fire management units (FMU)?	Yes	No Change
Does the RMP provide objectives for appropriate use of managed fire for resource benefit?	Yes	No Change
Monitoring Appendix H		Change "MFD" to Canyon Country District; Update "wildland fire use" to "use of wildland fire"

Question	Response	Action
Does the RMP address special cultural and paleontological resource issues, including traditional cultural properties and NRHP-eligible or listed districts or sites that may affect the location, timing, or method of development or use of other resources in the planning area?	Yes	No Change
Does the RMP refer to requirements for consultation under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act and other laws and directives for with tribal governments, including general timeframes for completing consultation?	Yes	No Change
Does the RMP adequately describe or summarize the extent and type of significant archaeological resources known and assign cultural resources to the use categories specified in BLM Manuals?	No	Cultural decision number 7 and 8 need to be implemented. Nominate most significant sites to the National Register of Historic Places.
Does the RMP fully protect significant cultural and paleontological resources through special designations?	No	Need additional road inventories.
Do route and area travel designations in the RMP address cultural and paleontological resource needs and protection?	No	No Change
Does the RMP allow for the definition and management of Traditional Cultural Properties?	Yes	No Change
Does the RMP address land use applications that may affect cultural and paleontological resources, including tribal resources?	Yes	No Change
Are the decisions in the RMP based on adequate cultural and paleontological resource data as specified in BLM Planning Guidance? Is a new Class I overview needed?	Yes	A new Class I for field office is in progress.
Does the RMP include goals of identifying, preserving, and protecting significant cultural and paleo resources and ensuring that they are available for present and future use?	Yes	No Change
Does the RMP include the stated goal of reducing threats and resolving potential conflicts by ensuring compliance with NHPA Section 106 and Paleontological Resource Protection Act?	Yes	No Change
Monitoring	The Monticello Field Office is currently doubling the size of their Utah Site Stewardship Program. The monitoring specified in Appendix H is adequate and requires no changes.	No Change

Question	Response	Action
Do all special management designations have clear management objectives? If not, explain.	Yes	No Change
Does the planning area have overlapping special management designations and if so, are the management objectives conflicting with one another? This could include an ACEC or SRMA overlapping a WSA, or various OHV designations within a single management area.	Yes, there are overlapping designations; no known management conflicts.	No Change
Does the District have designated wilderness? If so, has a wilderness management plan completed?	No designated wilderness.	No Change
Are there citizen-proposed wilderness areas identified in the planning area. If so, describe.	SUWA's Red Rock Wilderness Proposal is in the planning area but is not mentioned in the RMP.	No Change
Does the RMP state clearly that Wilderness Study Areas will be managed under the "Interim Management Policy (IMP) for Lands under Wilderness Review" (H-8550-1) or BLM Manual 6330 "Management of Wilderness Study Areas"?	Yes	No Change
Has the District wilderness characteristics inventory been updated since the original inventory?	Yes (Indian Creek and Dripping Springs).	No Change
Does the RMP identify lands with wilderness characteristics and apply management constraints to some lands identified as possessing wilderness characteristics?	Yes	No Change
Are allocations appropriate for areas with wilderness characteristics that have been designated for protection of the wilderness values?	Yes	No Change
Do planning decisions identify wilderness study areas as either designated or closed to OHV use? Do planning decisions identify OHV use within Wilderness Study Areas as limited to "designated" ways or "closed to OHV use"?	Yes; yes.	No Change
Are wild and scenic river studies completed for the planning area which identify and evaluate river segments to determine eligibility, tentative classification, protection requirements, and suitability?	Yes	No Change
For public lands along streams identified as potentially suitable for inclusion in the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System, have interim management measures been established?	Yes	No Change
Does the RMP contain a separate section on managing National Historic Trails as specified by BLM Manual 6280?	Yes	No Change
Does the RMP establish National Historic Trail Management Corridors as specified by BLM Manual 6280, or address how such corridors will be established in the future?	Yes, it establishes corridors.	No Change
Are there National Historic Trails designated on the District? If so, has a comprehensive trail management plan been completed?	Yes (Old Spanish National Historic Trail); a Comprehensive Administrative Strategy has been completed.	No Change
Are there objectives and management actions identified through either the RMP or the comprehensive management plan, for high priority trail segments or segments eligible or listed on the NHRP?	Hole in the Rock trail is not a high priority or designated trail, but does have management specifications.	No Change
Is the plan consistent with updated National Conservation Lands policies?	Yes	No Change
Does the RMP address Area of Critical Environmental Concern (ACECs)?	Yes	No Change
Does the RMP outline management objectives and restrictions that would apply to the ACECs?	Yes	No Change
Have management plans been developed for designated ACECs that identify objectives and management actions? Does the plan identify protective management for relevance and importance values?	No management plans have been developed for ACECs. RMP does identify protective management for relevance and importance; no management plan exists to do this.	No Change

<p>If the RMP says that activity (implementation) plans will be developed for Special Designations such as ACECs, Wild & Scenic Rivers, Wilderness or National Scenic & Historic Trails; have these plans been completed? If the RMP say that activity plans will be developed for other designated management areas such as SRMAs, Back Country Byways, OHV use areas, etc...; have these plans been completed? If so, list the name of the plan and date it was completed.</p>	<p>RMP does not require activity plans for ACECs, Wild & Scenic Rivers, or Wilderness. Comprehensive Administrative Strategy has been completed for Old Spanish NHT. CRMPs have not yet been completed. REC-40 states that if necessary, activity plans will be written for SRMAs; none have been developed thus far. No OHV use areas.</p>	<p>No Change</p>
<p>Monitoring (Appendix H)</p>	<p>The monitoring specified in Appendix H is adequate and requires no changes.</p>	<p>No change</p>

Question	Response	Action
Does the RMP identify the allowable kinds and levels of recreational use to protect or conserve other resource values in the planning area? List any limitations or restrictions on recreational activities to protect or conserve other resource values.	Yes. Limits on visitor numbers in Cedar Mesa and Dark Canyon protect cultural resources in that area. Certain activities (Commercial SRPS) have further restrictions.	No Change
Does the RMP identify allowable kinds and level of land uses to sustain recreational values? List any limitations or restrictions on land uses to sustain recreational values.	Yes. Group size limitations, use type limitations.	No Change
Have the Recreation Management issues changed since the RMP was completed? If yes, how are those issues being handled?	No.	No Change
Are all public lands clearly designated as SRMAs, ERMA, or public lands not designated as recreation management areas?	Yes.	No Change
Does the RMP identify recreation setting characteristics? Are recreation management zones identified for SRMAs (wherever necessary)?	Appendix K.2.1 had prescriptions. RMZs are identified.	No Change
Does the RMP include management objectives for the specific recreation opportunities to be produced in both SRMAS and ERMA?	Yes. Objectives and goals are set for each SRMA and the ERMA.	No Change
Are there significant cave resources present? If yes, are specific management goals outlined for the preservation or protection of significant cave resources?	No.	No Change
Recreation	The monitoring specified in Appendix H is adequate and requires no changes.	No Change

Question	Response	Action
Does the RMP identify all public lands as; open, limited, or closed to OHV use?	Yes	No Change
Are the OHV designations still meeting resource objectives?	Yes	No Change
Does the RMP outline travel prescriptions under each designation?	Yes	No Change
Have implementation level travel plans been completed? If not, does the RMP provide a mechanism to complete an implementation plan? Explain.	Yes	No Change
Is the plan consistent with updated TTM policy/manual?	Yes	No Change
Monitoring	The monitoring specified in Appendix H is adequate and requires no changes.	No Change

Question	Response	Action
Does the RMP identify visual resource management classes?	Yes	No Change
Do the VRM management classes consider the relationships between the visual resource inventory values and resource allocations?	Yes	No Change
Are the constraints imposed by the VRM classes appropriate for protecting sensitive resources and managing development?	Yes	No Change
Does the RMP include visual resource inventory classes and visual resource management classes?	Monticello does not have an updated Visual Resource Inventory (~est. 2004); does include VRM classes.	Consider incorporating new VRI information.
Monitoring	The monitoring specified in Appendix H is adequate and requires no changes.	No Change

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

Question	Response	Action
Does the RMP identify priority wildlife species and habitats?	Yes	No Change
Are there management plans or prescriptions in place for priority habitats?	Areas have been identified as well as habitat types-there are no specific management plans.	No Change
Does the RMP contain measurable objectives for desired wildlife habitat conditions for major habitat types?	Yes	No Change
Are the Western Association of the Fish and Wildlife Agency (WAFWA) guidelines for wildlife (sage grouse, mule deer, bighorn sheep, etc.) incorporated into the RMP?	N/A - these guidelines relate to Greater Sage-Grouse.	No Change
Does the RMP provide adequate direction to protect migratory birds and their associated habitat?	Yes	No Change
Does the RMP provide adequate direction to protect raptors and their associated habitat?	Yes	No Change
Has the RMP undergone Section 7 consultation for all listed species within the planning area?	Yes	No Change
Are RMP decisions consistent with the supporting Biological Assessments, Biological Opinions, and Recovery Plans? If not, explain.	Yes	No Change
Does the RMP contain strategies to conserve threatened or endangered and special status species, including listed species, species proposed for listing, and BLM sensitive species?	Yes	No Change
Does the RMP provide direction to manage priority wildlife, fish, T&E, rare plants, including transplant, augmentations, seasonal restrictions, guidelines, etc.?	Yes	No Change
Does the RMP provide objectives and actions for containing the potential spread of wildlife diseases, such as adequate separation between domestic and wild species; or white nose syndrome?	Yes	No Change
Does the RMP contain effective strategies for no net loss threatened or endangered, special status or sensitive species?	Yes	No Change
Does the RMP include use of the State Wildlife Action Plan? Does the RMP include consideration of climate adaptation for T&E, and BLM sensitive species (i.e. keeping pathways open for movement to refugia, etc.)?	Yes	No Change
Monitoring	The monitoring specified in Appendix H is adequate and requires no changes.	No Change

Question	Response	Action
Does the RMP incorporate BLM's Wind Energy Development Policy? If not, how is wind energy being addressed?	Yes: lands and realty goals and objectives and LAR-15.	No Change
Does the RMP incorporate the allocations and stipulations developed through the National Wind, Solar, and Geothermal PEISs? If not explain:	No specific stipulations. LAR-15 requires incorporating BMPs and provisions contained in the PEIS.	No Change
Does the RMP reference the DOE/BLM publication of February 2003 on Assessing the Potential for Renewable Energy on public land? If not, how is renewable energy being addressed?	Not specifically. Goals and objectives generally support "alternative energy sources."	No Change
Does the RMP incorporate the Solar Energy Development Policy (<i>IM 2007-097 updated to IM 2011-003 and extended to 9/30/15</i>)? If not, how is solar energy addressed?	Not specifically. LAR-15 and goals/objectives provide limited direction. The RMP makes clear we will follow guidelines, policy, and law in dealing with these species. This office has not seen interest in renewable energy at this time.	No Change
Does the RMP address or incorporate the Fish and Wildlife Service Bald and Golden Eagle Guidelines with respect to renewable energy development? If not, how are these guidelines being addressed?	Not specifically. LAR-15 and goals/objectives provide limited direction.	No Change
Does the RMP reference the 2008 BLM/DOD Wind Energy Protocol? If not, explain:	No issues identified. Corridors are identified in LAR-18 and Map 5.	No Change
Does the RMP address transmission issues and identify transmission corridors? If corridors are identified, do they adequately match corridors established on the other side of the boundaries (i.e. does the corridor extend beyond the boundary of the RMP into the jurisdiction of the next RMP, and are they consistent across boundaries with respect to corridor widths, requirements, etc.)?	No issues identified. Corridors are identified in LAR-18 and Map 5.	No Change

Question	Response	Action
Does the RMP provide for orderly corridor planning to meet current National needs and technological trends?	LAR-18	No Change
Does the RMP adequately consider ROW corridors, ROW use areas, and other ROW issues as outlined in IM 2002-196 Right of Way Management – Land Use Planning (6/26/02)?	LAR-12 thru LAR-18	No Change
Does the scope of designated corridors within the planning area accommodate existing, compatible, proposed and/or new uses?	LAR-18	No Change
Do designated corridors have appropriate width given potential and existing uses or energy demand?	The RMP is silent on specific widths.	No Change
Are there resource management objectives for TES for designated corridors?	SSP-24 provides limited direction specific to Gunnison sage-grouse.	No Change
Are there vegetation management objectives identified specifically within designated corridors that provide for sustainability of habitat while accommodating long-term maintenance of rights of way within the corridor?	No specific vegetation management objectives for designated corridors.	No Change

Question	Response	Action
Does the RMP address the intent of WO-IM-2012-117 leasing reform? I.E: a) Standardized Stipulations; b) Master Leasing Plans; c) Lease sale parcel review process?	No. We follow the leasing reform policy of conducting EAs for oil and gas lease sales and follow the lease sale parcel review process. Moab MLP is being prepared which includes part of Monticello FO.	No Change

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

Question	Response	Action
Does the RMP recognize the 2009 BLM Air Quality Manual (MS 7300) and assess climate change as required by Secretarial Order 3289-1 and Departmental Manual 523 DMI (dated 12/20/2012)?	Current policies pre-date the 2008 RMP so not specifically mentioned.	No Change
Does the RMP analysis address greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions for affected resource programs such as fluid mineral production or other activities with GHG generating potential?	Found in the Final EIS.	No Change
Does the RMP analysis address climate change effects and adaptation measures on natural resources? Explain:	Climate change is addressed qualitatively.	No Change
Has the planning area been inventoried for terrestrial or subsurface carbon sequestration potential?	No	No Change
Are there areas of terrestrial or subsurface carbon sequestration potential in the planning area as evidenced by applications to explore or develop?	No	No Change

Question	Response	Action
Does the RMP provide adequate policy to preserve or enhance sage-grouse habitat and implement sage-grouse conservation planning? [Note: Greater-sage grouse in Richfield, Kanab, Vernal, and Price planning areas; Gunnison sage-grouse in Moab and Monticello planning areas.]	Yes - RMP follows the guidance set in the Statewide Conservation Plan for Gunnison Sage-grouse.	No Change

Question	Response	Action
Is the RMP geospatial data in digital format? If not, is it in hardcopy and do you know where the spatial data is located?	Yes	No Change
Does the geospatial data meet BLM National data standards where they exist?	Yes	No Change
Is the geospatial planning data managed and archived according to WO IM 2003-238?	Yes	No Change
Is the RMP selected alternative geospatial data incorporated into the corporate data for the State and District?	Yes	No Change
Does the geospatial data for the RMP have metadata? If so, is this metadata up to date and maintained? If there is no metadata, explain:	Yes and yes, to the best of our ability.	No Change

Question	Response	Action
Are management actions outlined in the plan in the plan being implemented?	Yes. Some management plans have not yet been completed; these are outlined in Section 4.1, Implementation-Level Planning, of the final Evaluation Report.	No Change
Does the RMP have an implementation schedule and is it current?	Yes, the RMP has an implementation schedule, but many items are simply listed as "ongoing" or "on demand."	No Change
Is the rate and degree to which plan implementation is being completed meeting the goals and objectives of the RMP?	Goals and objectives of the RMP are being met, but budget and staffing needs, if addressed, could help accelerate action on items that have not yet been completed.	No Change
Are management actions (decisions implemented) effective in achieving management goals and objectives?	Yes	No Change

Question	Response	Action
Are there major changes in the related plans of other agencies (including tribal, state and county) since the RMP was approved which are resulting in RMP direction to be inconsistent with the direction contained in those plans?	No	No Change

Question	Response	Action
Are there new data or analyses that significantly affect the planning decisions or validity of the NEPA analysis?	No	No Change
Are there unmet needs or new opportunities that can best be met through a plan amendment or revision, or will current management be sufficient?	Stipulations for hot air balloons, potential changes to decisions for campfire wood collection, and changes to group size limits would also require amendments.	No Change
Are new inventories warranted pursuant to the BLM's duty to maintain inventories on a continuous basis (FLPMA Section 201)?	An updated Class I survey for the Monticello Field Office is in progress. A new Visual Resources Inventory is in progress from the BLM Utah State Office. Inventories to lands with wilderness characteristics are ongoing based on citizen participation.	No Change
Based on this evaluation, is there sufficient cause to warrant amendment or revision of the RMP to accommodate implementation of National and State priorities and initiatives? If so, identify the program area(s) which warrant plan modification and the initiative/priorities affected.	National and State priorities and initiatives are being implemented in such a way that plan amendment or revision is not necessary. As noted above, there are some changes to decisions that would require amendments, but they are unrelated to National and State priorities and initiatives.	No Change
Based on new information or circumstances, is there sufficient cause to warrant completing supplemental NEPA analyses or RFDs to keep the RMP current? If so, identify the specific program areas which require focused supplemental analysis or RFDs.	No	No Change

Recommended Change	Location
<p>Add two paragraphs to the definition of No Surface Occupancy (NSO): NSO may also be applied where appropriate and practical, to other surface-disturbing activities (and occupancy) associated with land use authorizations, permits, and leases issued on BLM lands (for example: a NSO designation is not designed to prevent the construction or maintenance of a foot trail with hand tools, but could prevent the construction of a livestock trail using a dozer).</p> <p>The use of heliportable drilling and recording equipment supported by crews on foot to conduct geophysical operations, while not considered casual use and involves short term and temporary occupancy of the surface, could also occur within areas designated as NSO or no surface disturbing activity unless specified otherwise (REC-8).</p>	Record of Decision, Approved RMP, page 174
<p>Improve definition of non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics to specify that there are five areas carried forward for management of their wilderness characteristics, which are referred to as "BLM Natural Areas."</p>	Record of Decision, Approved RMP, page 172
<p>Add a definition for "BLM Natural Area" and specify the five areas identified as such.</p>	Record of Decision, Approved RMP, page 164
<p>When the RMP references the five areas identified as non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics that are managed for their wilderness characteristics, correctly refer to these areas as "BLM natural areas," not "non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics."</p>	Throughout RMP
<p>When two areas share the same name but different management prescriptions, refer to the full area name. For example, there is a Mancos Mesa Wilderness Study Area as well as a Mancos Mesa BLM Natural Area, and the two areas do not overlap. The RMP could improve clarity by referring to the areas as the "Mancos Mesa WSA" or "Mancos Mesa BLM Natural Area."</p>	Throughout RMP
<p>Recommend recategorizing "P" tracts as A, B, C, D, E, or F, since the "P" category has been carried over since 1991. Many legal descriptions and acreages are incorrect; ensure that all are accurate.</p>	Appendix J

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
<i>Special Designations</i>						
MCA-1	Wilderness Study Areas will be managed according to the Interim Management Policy and Guidelines for Lands under Wilderness Review (IMP).		X			Update IMP to new wilderness manuals: MS-6330, MS-6340.
MCA-2	All Areas of Critical Environmental Concern (ACECs) will be retained in public ownership, will be subject to appropriate fire management response, and will have travel limited to designated routes unless otherwise noted.	X				
<i>Education and Interpretation</i>						
MCA-3	The BLM will work with its partners, including local school districts and universities, to develop a variety of opportunities to promote education, research, and interpretation on public lands.	X				
<i>Fire, Drought, and Natural Disasters</i>						
MCA-4	The BLM will coordinate actions with affected parties where natural resources may be impacted by fire, drought, insects and diseases, or natural disasters.	X				
<i>Monitoring</i>						
MCA-5	The BLM will conduct monitoring for all resources to determine the	X				No monitoring yet for ACEC, WSA, WC, WSR,

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	effectiveness of management prescriptions in achieving RMP objectives or making progress toward them.					HT.
<i>Utah Standards for Rangeland Health</i>						
MCA-6	<p>BLM lands will be managed and uses will be authorized in a manner consistent with meeting or moving toward meeting Utah's Standards for Rangeland Health (BLM 1997). The current Utah Standards for Rangeland Health (as revised), augmented with ecological condition and trend objectives, will be incorporated across all resource programs as a minimum management objective. Management prescriptions in the form of constraints to use, terms and conditions, and stipulations may be needed to meet resource objectives and/or to comply with current regulations. Management prescriptions may consider, but will not be limited to, the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Surface-disturbing activities: These will be closely monitored to ensure compliance with authorizations/permits, 	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<p>conditions of approval, or terms and conditions. Actions minimizing new surface disturbance, as well as actions insuring successful reclamation, will be of paramount concern. During periods of drought, the BLM could require additional actions such as changes to standard seed mix compositions, amounts of seed, and method of application. Methods to ensure successful revegetation following disturbance could include hydromulching, installation of drip irrigation, and/or temporary fencing to exclude ungulate grazing/browsing.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Livestock Grazing: Active livestock use will be authorized in animal unit months (AUMs), season, and duration to meet static (no apparent trend) to upward trends towards achieving site-specific resource objectives. In the case of fire, drought, 					

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<p>insects and diseases, or other natural disasters, the BLM will work cooperatively to implement a grazing strategy on an individual grazing allotment basis and make changes to the annual grazing authorizations as appropriate within the limits of the existing permit and in accordance with the grazing regulations. The BLM may temporarily close allotments or portions of allotments to grazing where it is determined that other, less drastic measures will not avoid degradation of vegetative resources. Temporary changes to active permitted use or grazing practices, or nonuse may also be implemented voluntarily by the permittee with BLM consent.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wildlife Management: During periods of prolonged dryness or drought or other natural disaster, to the extent that wildlife grazing ungulate populations may not be sustainable and/or impacts to the 					

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<p>resource habitats may occur due to competition for water and/or available forage and/or overall animal health is compromised, the BLM may enter into discussions with the Utah Division of Wildlife Resources (UDWR) regarding temporary adjustments in herd numbers and overall management options to address the effects of drought.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recreation: During periods of prolonged dryness or drought, the BLM, in cooperation with local and state fire management agencies, may limit campfires to established fire rings or fully contained fires. The last resort will be to close the public lands to campfires of any kind. • OHV Use: OHV use during periods of prolonged dryness could be further restricted to designated routes. If site-specific conditions warrant, closure to OHVs could be implemented to minimize vehicle-induced injury 					

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<p>or damage to rangeland and/or woodland resources, and to minimize the potential of spark caused fires.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs): These will be implemented as described in Appendix G. 					
AQ-1	The best available control technology, recommended by the Utah Division of Air Quality (UDAQ), will be applied as needed to meet air quality standards.	X				This is actually a state responsibility and is determined by state permitting process.
AQ-2	Prescribed burns will be consistent with the State of Utah Division of Environmental Quality (UDEQ) permitting process and timed in conjunction with meteorological conditions so as to minimize smoke impacts.	X				The BLM complies in accordance with smoke management MOA.
AQ-3	The BLM will comply with Utah Air Conservation (UAC) Regulation R307-205, which prohibits the use, maintenance, or construction of roadways without taking appropriate dust abatement measures.	X				This is a state regulation that any holder of a BLM authorization must comply with.
AQ-4	The BLM will comply with the current Smoke Management Memorandum of	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	Agreement (MOA) between the BLM, the U.S. Forest Service (USFS), and UDAQ. The MOA, in accordance with UAC regulation R301-204, requires reporting size, date of burn, fuel type, and estimated air emissions from each prescribed burn.					
AQ-5	The BLM will manage emissions to prevent deterioration to air quality in Class I Airsheds.	X				This is actually a state responsibility and is determined by state permitting process.
AQ-6	The BLM will continue to work cooperatively with state, federal, and tribal entities in developing air quality assessment protocols to address cumulative impacts and regional air quality issues.	X				The fuels program is involved with the Utah Airshed Group.
AQ-7	The BLM will continue to work cooperatively with the Utah Airshed Group to manage emissions from wildland and prescribed fire activities.	X				
AQ-8	National Ambient Air Quality Standards are enforced by the Utah Department of Environmental Quality, Division of Air Quality (UDEQ-DAQ), with EPA oversight. Special requirements to reduce potential air quality impacts	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	will be considered on a case-by-case basis in processing land-use authorizations.					
AQ-9	The BLM will utilize best management practices (BMPs) and site-specific mitigation measures, when appropriate, based on site-specific conditions, to reduce emissions and enhance air quality. Examples of these types of measures can be found in the Four Corners Air Quality Task Force Report of Mitigation Options, November 1, 2007.	X				BMPs and COAs for oil and gas help address this
AQ-10	Project specific analyses will consider use of quantitative air quality analysis methods (i.e., modeling), when appropriate as determined by the BLM, in consultation with state, federal, and tribal entities.	X				
CUL-1	The BLM will nominate appropriate cultural resource objects, sites, districts, and multiple listings to the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP).	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
CUL-2	Priority geographic areas for new field inventory pursuant to Section 110 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) and Section 14 of the Archaeological Resources Protection Act (ARPA) will be identified based upon a probability for unrecorded important resources. These inventories will be conducted as funding is available and as opportunities arise.	X				
CUL-3	The BLM will ensure that all authorizations for land and resource use will comply with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA), consistent with and subject to the objectives established in the RMP for the proactive use of cultural properties in the public interest.	X				
CUL-4	Impacts to any NRHP-listed or eligible cultural resource sites, objects, or districts will be mitigated in accordance with 36 CFR 800, generally through avoidance of cultural sites. Should it be determined that cultural resources	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	eligible or listed on the NRHP cannot be avoided, consultation with the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) will be initiated and the procedures identified in the National Programmatic Agreement and the Utah State BLM Protocol for meeting the BLM's responsibilities under the NHPA will be followed.					
CUL-5	The BLM will consult with Native American tribes to identify, protect, and maintain access for areas of traditional and religious use that includes but is not limited to burials, rock art, traditional use areas, religiously active areas, and sacred sites.	X				
CUL-6	Burial sites, associated burial goods, and sacred items will be protected in accordance with the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA) and the Archaeological Resources Protection Act.	X				
CUL-7	Cultural resources will be evaluated according to National Register criteria (36 CFR Part 60.4) and assigned to appropriate use categories as the basis for management decisions.	X				Have not yet been assigned to appropriate use categories.

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
CUL-8	Cultural sites, including ethnographic properties, will continue to be allocated to one of six management use categories: experimental, discharged from management, public, scientific, traditional, and conservation.	X				Consider implementing in a "cultural resource management plan" to better assist planning and SRP decisions about access to cultural sites.
CUL-9	The BLM will conduct a consultation process to identify both the resource management concerns and the strategies for addressing them through an interactive dialogue with appropriate Native American communities.	X				
CUL-10	The BLM will work with tribes and other communities with traditional linkage to public lands to identify places of traditional cultural and religious importance. To the extent allowed by statute, regulation, and policy, such locations will be managed to minimize impacts to important values and to allow continued access for traditional purposes.	X				
CUL-11	When new sites are discovered, interim protection may be applied until Section 106 consultation and NAGPRA (CFR 10) processes are completed, if warranted.	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
CUL-12	The BLM will provide for legitimate field research by qualified scientists and institutions.	X				
CUL-13	The BLM will work with local communities and other groups to foster heritage tourism throughout the Monticello PA.		X			Change PA to “Field Office.”
CUL-14	Protective measures will be established and implemented for sites, structures, objects, and traditional use areas that are important to tribes with historical and cultural connections to the land, in order to maintain the view shed and intrinsic values, as well as the auditory, visual, and esthetic settings of the resources. Protection measures for undisturbed cultural resources and their natural settings will be developed in compliance with regulatory mandates and Native American consultation.	X				
CUL-15	Cultural resource management plans (CRMPs) will be developed for culturally sensitive areas unless included in other integrated activity plans. The CRMP would not require an amendment to the Monticello RMP if it is consistent with the goals and	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<p>objectives of this RMP. Such plans will include protective measures such as restrictions and limitations on recreation around cultural at-risk areas and sites, Native American consultation, and regulatory compliance. These plans will also include but not be limited to developing cultural monitoring systems; identifying sites and areas in need of stabilization and protective measures (e.g., fences, surveillance equipment); developing research designs for selected sites/areas; designating sites/areas for interpretive and educational development; identifying areas for cultural inventory where federal undertakings are expected to occur; and developing specific mitigation measures. The plan will designate sites, districts, landmarks, and landscapes that will be nominated for inclusion on the NRHP.</p>					
CUL-16	<p>The BLM will proactively reduce hazardous fuels or mitigate the potential hazard around archaeological and cultural sites that are susceptible to destruction by fire from prescribed or</p>	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	wildland fire. Management response to fire will follow the guidelines in the Moab District Fire Management Plan.					
CUL-17	The BLM will promote collaborative partnerships to assist in meeting management goals and objectives for cultural resources.	X				
CUL-18	Domestic pets and pack animals will not be allowed in cultural sites or on archaeological resources as defined in ARPA.	X				
CUL-19	Ropes and other climbing aids will not be allowed for access to cultural sites or archaeological resources as defined in ARPA, except for emergencies or administrative needs.	X				
CUL-20	Camping will not be allowed within cultural sites or archaeological resources as defined in ARPA.	X				
CUL-21	Cultural sites may be closed to visitation when they are determined to be at risk or pose visitor safety hazards.	X				
FIRE-1	Fire management will adopt the comprehensive Utah Land Use Plan Amendment for Fire and Fuels Management, September 2005 (LUP		X			Change “wildland fire use” to “use of wildland fire”

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<p>Amendment; BLM 2005c). This document may be found at www.ut.blm.gov/fireplanning/index/htm. Direction and guidance approved by the LUP Amendment is incorporated by reference into this RMP. Specific decisions for other resources that could impact fire management are found throughout the Approved RMP. However, the content and purpose of the LUP Amendment is adopted and is summarized as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establishes landscape-level fire management goals and objectives. • Describes Desired Wildland Fire Conditions (DWFC) and the management strategies and actions to meet DWFC goals. • Describes areas where fire may be restored to the ecosystem through wildland fire use for resource benefit and areas where wildland fire use is not appropriate. • Identifies Resource Protection Measures (RPMs) for fire management practices to protect 					

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	natural and cultural resource values. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identifies criteria used to establish fire management priorities. 					
FIRE-2	Wildland fire will be utilized to protect, maintain and enhance resources and, when possible, will be allowed to function in its natural ecological role.	X				
FIRE-3	Hazardous fuels reduction treatments will be used to restore ecosystems; protect human, natural and cultural resources; and reduce the threat of wildfire to communities.	X				
FIRE-4	The BLM will work together with Native Americans to provide for their use of woodland products as associated with fire, fuels, and emergency stabilization and rehabilitation (ES&R) actions.	X				
<i>Criteria for Establishing Fire Management Priorities</i>						
FIRE-5	Protection of human life is the primary fire management priority. Establishing a priority among protecting human communities and community infrastructure, other property and improvements, and natural and cultural	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<p>resources is based on human health and safety, the values to be protected, and the costs of protection. When firefighters and other personnel have been committed to an incident, these human resources become the highest values to be protected. Priorities for all aspects of fire management decisions and actions are based on the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Protection of the Wildland-Urban Interface (WUI) (including At-Risk Communities and At-Risk Watersheds) • Maintaining existing healthy ecosystems • High priority subbasins or watersheds • Threatened, endangered, or special status species • Cultural resources and/or cultural landscapes 					
<i>Suppression</i>						
FIRE-6	An Appropriate Management Response (AMR) procedure is required for every wildland fire that is not a prescribed fire. In all fire management decisions,		X			Change “wildland fire use” to “use of wildland fire”

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<p>strategies, and actions, firefighter and public safety are the highest priority followed by consideration of benefits and values to be protected as well as suppression costs. The AMR can range from full suppression to managing fire for resource benefit (wildland fire use). Resource goals and objectives outlined in the RMP guide the development and implementation of AMR fire management activities in regard to the accomplishment of those objectives. The FMP establishes fire suppression objectives with minimum and maximum suppression targets for each Fire Management Unit (FMU) within the PA. While firefighter and public safety are the first priority, considerations for suppression activities also include fire intensity, acreage, and spread potential; threats to life and property; potential to impact high-value resources such as critical habitat for threatened, endangered, and sensitive species; crucial wildlife habitat; cultural resources and/or riparian areas; historic fire regimes; and other special</p>					

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	considerations such as wilderness and/or adjacent agency lands.					
Section Title	<i>Wildland Fire Use for Resource Benefit</i>		X			Change “wildland fire use” to “use of wildland fire”
FIRE-7	Wildland fire is authorized as a tool, when appropriate, to allow naturally ignited wildland fire to accomplish specific resource management objectives. Due to existing resource conditions and proximity to values at risk, fire cannot be allowed to resume its natural role on all BLM lands in the FO. Consideration of ongoing management decisions and other natural changes will direct periodical reassessment of DWFC and determination of potential areas for wildland fire use. Operational management of wildland fire use is described in the Wildland Fire Implementation Plan (WFIP). The FMP identifies FMUs that may have the potential for wildland fire use. Wildland fire use may be authorized for all areas, except when the following resources and values may be negatively impacted and there are no reasonable Resource Protection Measures to protect such		X			Change “wildland fire use” to “use of wildland fire”

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	resources and values: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WUI areas • Areas known to be highly susceptible to post-fire cheatgrass or invasive weed invasion • Important terrestrial and aquatic habitats • Non-fire-adapted vegetation communities • Sensitive cultural resources • Areas of soil with high or very high erosion hazard • Class I areas and PM10 nonattainment areas • Administrative sites • Developed recreation sites • Communication sites • Oil, gas, and mining facilities • Aboveground utility corridors • High-use travel corridors, such as interstates, railroads, and/or highways 					
<i>Fuels Treatment</i>						
FIRE-8	Fuels management activities outlined in the FMP will be consistent with the resource goals and objectives contained in the RMP. To reduce hazards and to restore ecosystems, authorized fuels		X			Change “wildland fire use” to “use of wildland fire”

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<p>management decisions include wildland fire use, prescribed fire, and mechanical, manual, chemical, biological, and seeding treatments. The FMP describes fuels management goals and objectives, and the full range of fuels management strategies and actions authorized for fuels reduction. Fuels treatments are focused on the DWFC of restoring historic fire regimes to ecosystems when feasible, so that future wildland fire use actions can be more easily implemented.</p>					
FIRE-9	<p>Fuels management decisions may include but are not limited to the following activities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mechanical treatments such as mowing, chopping, or chipping/grinding (brush cutter), chaining, tilling, or cutting • Manual treatments such as handcutting (chainsaw or handsaw) and handpiling • Prescribed fire, including broadcast, underburn, and handpile burning 	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chemical spraying or biological treatments such as insects or goats/sheep • Seeding including aerial or ground application (manual or mechanical) 					
FIRE-10	Targeted areas may be treated in phases over a period of several years and may involve multiple and varied treatments. Estimated fuels reduction treatments of 5,000 to 10,000 acres/year are targeted dependent on budgetary and time constraints.	X				
FIRE-11	Implementation of fuels management decisions will be prioritized using the following criteria: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WUI areas • Areas with fuel loading that could potentially result in the loss of ecosystem components following wildland fire • Resource management goals and objectives 		X			After “criteria” add “(not in order of preference)” This list of criteria may be amended by the upcoming Gunnison sage-grouse planning effort.
<i>Prevention and Mitigation</i>						
FIRE-12	Prevention and mitigation goals target a reduction in unauthorized wildland fire ignitions. Goals include coordination	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	with partners and affected groups and individuals, and a wide range of prevention and mitigation activities such as personal contacts, mass media, signing, and defensible space education.					
FIRE-13	<p>Implementation of fire prevention activities will be prioritized using the following criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WUI areas • Major travel corridors • Recreation sites • Public lands as a whole 	X				
<i>Emergency Stabilization and Rehabilitation (ES&R)</i>						
FIRE-14	A Normal Year Fire Stabilization and Rehabilitation Plan (NFRP) is in place to meet ES&R needs and to comply with up-to-date ES&R policy and guidance. The NFRP is a programmatic implementation plan authorizing treatment options specific to vegetative communities and dependent upon post-wildland fire conditions and other site-specific considerations. Treatment actions that are designed according to the type and severity of wildfire impacts and priorities include but are	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<p>not limited to areas where the following criteria apply:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is necessary to protect human life and safety as well as property. • Unique or critical cultural and/or historical resources are at risk. • It is determined soils are highly susceptible to accelerated erosion. • Perennial grasses and forbs (fire-tolerant plants) are not expected to provide soil and watershed protection within two years. • There is a need to establish a vegetative fuel break of less flammable species (greenstrips). • Unacceptable vegetation, such as noxious weeds, may readily invade and become established. • Shrubs and forbs are a crucial habitat component for wintering mule deer, antelope, sage- grouse, or other special status species. • Stabilization and rehabilitation are necessary to meet RMP resource objectives, including rangeland 					

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	seedings. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is necessary to protect water quality. It is necessary to quickly restore threatened, endangered, or special status species habitat populations to prevent negative impacts. 					
FIRE-15	Fire suppression on non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics will be through “light-on-the-land” techniques.		X			Replace “non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics” with “BLM natural areas.”
FIRE-16	The Moab Fire District Fire Management Plan (FMP) will be updated and amended to meet the direction and objectives of the RMP.		X			Update title of document to “Canyon Country Fire Zone Fire Management Plan” Note: Use of FMP acronym is still correct.
<i>Human Health and Safety</i>						
HAZ-1	The BLM will strive to ensure that human health and safety concerns on the public lands it manages are appropriately mitigated if determined hazardous.	X				
<i>Abandoned Mine Lands</i>						
HAZ-2	In conformance with the BLM's long-term strategies and National Policies regarding Abandoned Mine Lands	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<p>(AMLs), this RMP recognizes the need to work with our partners toward identifying and addressing physical safety and environmental hazards at all AML sites on public lands. In order to achieve this goal, a state strategy has been written. National program criteria for determining site priorities were used to develop the work plan. This state strategy is entitled "Utah Abandoned Mine Land Multi -Year Work Plan." The following criteria will be established to assist in determining priorities for site and area mitigation and reclamation.</p>					
HAZ-3	<p>AML physical safety program priorities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Highest priority will be cleaning up AML sites where (a) a death or injury has occurred, (b) the site is situated on or in immediate proximity to developed recreation sites and areas with high visitor use, or (c) upon formal risk assessment, a high or extremely high risk level is indicated; • AML will be factored into future recreation management 	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<p>area designations, land-use planning assessments, and all applicable use authorizations;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site is presently listed or is eligible for listing in the Abandoned Mines and Site Cleanup Module; • AML hazards should be, to the extent practicable, mitigated or remediated on the ground during site development. • AML water-quality program priorities are ones where the state has identified the watershed as a priority based on 1) one or more water laws or regulations; 2) threat to public health or safety; 3) threat to the environment; 4) the project reflects a collaborative effort with other land managing agencies; 5) the site is presently listed or is eligible for listing in the Abandoned Mines and Site Cleanup Module; and 6) the project will be funded by contributions from collaborating agencies. 					

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
<i>Acquisitions/Exchanges</i>						
HAZ-4	These priorities will be maintained and updated as needed in the state AML strategy.	X				
HAZ-5	The BLM will identify and clean up unauthorized dumping and shooting areas in the PA as required to comply with applicable state, local, and federal regulations. These will include areas such as the unauthorized shooting range west of Blanding, dumps near Hovenweep, the Monticello Airport, and Paiute Knoll.	X				
<i>Hazardous Materials</i>						
HAZ-6	Use, transportation, storage and disposal of hazardous materials shall comply with the applicable Federal and State laws. Use of pesticides and herbicides shall be used only in accordance with their registered uses and within limitations imposed by the Secretary of the Interior.	X				
<i>Hazardous Waste</i>						
HAZ-7	The BLM will respond to releases as appropriate.	X				
LAR-1	The BLM will not transfer out of	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	federal ownership any habitat for listed threatened or endangered species or any habitat for non-listed special status species if it could be determined that such an action will lead to the need to list any species as threatened or endangered. Acquisition of potential/occupied special status species habitat will be high priority. These acquired/exchanged lands will be managed according to BLM land management prescriptions for special status species.					
LAR-2	Under IMP and Congressional action, WSAs and Wilderness Areas will be exclusion areas for any ROWs (Section 501[a] FLPMA).		X			Update IMP to new wilderness manuals: MS-6330, MS-6340.
<i>Land Tenure Adjustments</i>						
LAR-3	Lands will be considered for disposal or acquisition if the changes are in accordance with resource management objectives and other RMP decisions, and will meet one or more of the following criteria as outlined by BLM Land Tenure Adjustment criteria: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Such changes are determined to be 	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<p>in the public interest and will accommodate the needs of local and state governments, including needs for the economy, public purposes, and community growth.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Such changes will result in a net gain of important and manageable resources on public lands such as crucial wildlife habitat, important cultural sites, quality riparian areas, live water, listed species habitat, or areas key to productive ecosystems. • Such changes will ensure public access to lands in areas where access is needed and cannot otherwise be obtained. • Such changes will promote effective management and meet essential resource objectives through land ownership consolidation. • Such changes will result in acquisition of lands that serve regional or national priorities identified in applicable policy directives. 					

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Such changes have been identified in existing activity plans (i.e., habitat management plans, etc.). 					
LAR-4	<p>Acquisitions will be managed in the same manner as adjoining lands unless they are acquired for a specific purpose (i.e., wildlife habitat, buffer zones near other federal lands, etc.).</p> <p>A priority section for acquisition will be Utah State Section 2, Township 39S Range 19E to acquire culturally sensitive lands in the McLoyd Canyon–Moon House area.</p>	X				
LAR-5	<p>Give land exchanges with the State of Utah priority consideration to resolve in-holdings issues. The BLM will recognize the mission, goals, and objectives of the State of Utah as they relate to the values and resources of state-owned lands. The Monticello FO will work cooperatively with the State of Utah in identifying opportunities for Land Tenure Agreements (LTAs) that may assist the state in furthering its mission. These agreements must comply with applicable law and policy;</p>	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	consider fair market values; consider LTA criteria; and comply with goals and objectives for resource management prescribed in the RMP. They will be processed on a case-by-case basis, with consideration given to the goals, objectives, and decisions of this RMP.					
Filming Permits						
LAR-6	Filming permit authorizations are subject to Public Law 106-206. Applications for filming permits in the Monticello PA will be limited to existing highways, roads, and pullouts and previously disturbed or cleared areas throughout the Field Office (including Valley of the Gods, Moki Dugway, Highway 211, Newspaper Rock, and Highway 95) and will have to meet the following criteria of minimal impact to be approved without any NEPA analysis. Filming projects that do not meet these criteria will be subject to site-specific NEPA analysis prior to permit approval or use of programmatic NEPA documents including EAs, on BLM-managed lands in Utah within WSAs (EA USO-		X			In 6 th bullet, replace “non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics” with “BLM natural areas.”

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<p>06-004), or other programmatic NEPA documents that may be developed on a local, state or bureau basis.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project will not impact sensitive habitat or species. • Project will not impact cultural resources or Native American sacred sites. • Project will not involve use of pyrotechnics or explosives. • Project will not involve more than minimum impacts to land, air, or water. (Minimum is defined as temporary impact only; no permanent impacts; no surface disturbance allowed that can't be raked out or rehabbed so that there is no sign of activity at the end of the filming). • Project will not involve use of exotic plant or animal species that could cause danger of introduction into the area. • Project will not involve WSAs, non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics, WSR corridors, 					

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<p>National Register Eligible Sites, and Native American Sacred Sites.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project will not involve adverse impacts to sensitive surface resource values including: historic, cultural or paleontological sites; sensitive soils; relict environments; wetlands or riparian areas; ACECs. • Project does not involve substantial restriction of public access. • Project does not involve substantial use of domestic livestock. • Project does not involve 15 or more production vehicles within sensitive area. • Project does not involve 75 or more people within sensitive area. • The activity within the sensitive area will not continue in excess of 10 days. • No refueling allowed within sensitive areas. • Aircraft use in area with wildlife concerns is not proposed during crucial wildlife period for more 					

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<p>than 1 day and does not exceed frequency of 2 projects per 30-day period.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Aircraft use in area with no wildlife concerns is proposed for no more than 2 days and does not exceed frequency of 3 projects per 30-day period. • Use of aircraft is not proposed within 0.5 mile of a designated campground located within a sensitive area and the number of low-elevation passes will not exceed 4 passes per day. 					
<i>Recreation and Public Purpose Act (R&PP) and Other Authorizations for Disposal</i>						
LAR-7	Lands conveyed to state or local governments or non-profit organizations under the R&PP Act may include those identified in LTAs. In addition, requests for lands other than those identified could be considered for disposal provided the proposed use will provide a greater public benefit than that which the current management provides, and that the action is otherwise consistent with this RMP. Examples may include but are not limited to local	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	government or non-profit recreational and public purposes facilities such as public shooting ranges, landfills, motocross tracks, racetracks, etc. Other authorizations for disposal include the Airport and Airway Improvement Act, state selections under the Enabling Act, and other authorities.					
<i>Trespass Resolution</i>						
LAR-8	Resolution of intentional trespass will be limited to removal and/or restoration as appropriate. Resolution of unintentional trespass may include authorization under ROW grant, commercial/agricultural lease, or permit; disposal of the impacted land through sale or exchange; or removal, depending on the nature of the trespass. In all such trespass cases, administrative costs incurred by the BLM for investigating and resolving trespasses will be collected. All trespass incidents resolved by issuance of ROW grants, leases, or permits will be subject to payment by the holder/lessee/permittee of rent based on market value. Trespass cases resolved	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	by land sales will be based on fair market value, and land exchanges will be completed on an equal value basis.					
Access						
LAR-9	ROWS for state and private in-holdings, in-field oil and gas leases, and pipelines for producing oil and gas wells will be approved subject to a determination of "reasonable" access for the "intended purpose" and they are processed and issued upon application.	X				
LAR-10	As per the State of Utah v. Andrus, October 1, 1979 (Cotter Decision), the BLM will grant the State of Utah reasonable access to state lands for economic purposes, on a case by case basis.	X				
Easements						
LAR-11	Easements will be acquired from willing landowners and the State of Utah to gain access to public lands or placement of facilities on non-public lands, and acquire easements to accomplish resource objectives.	X				
Rights-of-Way (ROW)						
LAR-12	Rights-of-Way (ROW) avoidance and		X			Update wording for oil and

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<p>exclusion areas will generally be consistent with the stipulations identified in Appendix B for oil and gas leasing and other surface-disturbing activities. These stipulations have been developed to protect important resource values. Areas identified as NSO are open to oil and gas leasing but surface-disturbing activities cannot be conducted on the surface of the land. Access to oil and gas deposits will require directional drilling from outside the boundaries of the NSO areas. NSO areas are avoidance areas for ROWs; no ROW will be granted in NSO areas unless there are no feasible alternatives.</p>					<p>gas leasing from “open” to “available” for consistency with other sections/decisions (the meaning is the same).</p>
LAR-13	<p>Applications for new ROW on public lands will be considered and analyzed on a case-by-case basis, taking into consideration areas identified for avoidance and exclusion. Proposals will be reviewed for consistency with planning decisions and evaluated under requirements of applicable laws for resource protection.</p>	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
LAR-14	<p>Consider lands available for ROWs except for exclusion and avoidance areas (Map 4):</p> <p><u>Exclusion Areas: 416,115 acres</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WSAs 389,444 acres (Mancos Mesa, Grand Gulch ISA Complex, Road Canyon, Fish Creek Canyon, Mule Canyon, Cheesebox Canyon, Dark Canyon ISA Complex, Butler Wash, Bridger Jack Mesa, Indian Creek, South Needles, Squaw and Papoose Canyons, and Cross Canyon • Lands administratively endorsed for wilderness by Butler Wash North WSA • Valley of the Gods ACEC (22,863 acres) • San Juan River Segment 5 • Colorado River Segment 3 <p><u>Avoidance Areas: 133,293 acres</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Indian Creek ACEC (3,908 acres) • Shay Canyon ACEC (119 acres) • Lavender Mesa ACEC (649 acres) • Hovenweep ACEC (880-acre) 		X			<p>Replace “non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics” with “BLM natural areas.”</p>

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<p>Visual Emphasis Zone)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Alkali Ridge National Historic Landmark (2,146) • non-WSA with wilderness characteristics 88, 871 acres: (Dark Canyon, Nokai Dome East, Nokai Dome West, Grand Gulch, and Mancos Mesa) • Comb Ridge Recreation Management Zone of Cedar Mesa SRMA (30,752 acres) • San Juan River SRMA (except for Wild & Scenic River Segment 5 which is an exclusion area) • Colorado River Segment 2 • developed recreation sites • floodplains • riparian areas and springs • public water reserves. 					
<i>Wind and Solar Development</i>						
LAR-15	ROW applications for wind or solar energy development will incorporate best management practices (BMPs) and provisions contained in the Wind Energy or Solar Programmatic EIS	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	documents. Both wind and solar energy development are authorized by ROW grants.					
<i>Sale Disposal Criteria</i>						
LAR-16	As described under Sections 203 (a) of FLPMA (43 United States Code [U.S.C.] 1713; 1716), public lands have potential for disposal by sale when they are isolated and/or difficult to manage.				X	<p>Would like to add language for disposal of split estate parcels where BLM has a reserved interest. Example language: “Reserved Federal interests in split estate lands anywhere in the planning area may be considered for conveyance out of Federal ownership.”</p> <p>A current example of this is an R&PP to the LDS Church. They are no longer operating the church want to purchase the reversionary interest. The parcel is not specifically identified for disposal in our 2008 RMP. These parcels often have structures on them and would be difficult for BLM to manage the interest</p>

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
						reverted back to the BLM.
LAR-17	Dispose of approximately 6,760 acres of lands identified in Appendix J. These lands need to be screened on a case-by-case basis to assure that they meet FLPMA disposal criteria.	X				
<i>Transportation and Utility Corridors</i>						
LAR-18	This RMP will adopt the existing designated ROW corridors from the 1991 San Juan RMP including the Western Utility Group (WUG) updates to the Western Regional Corridor Study (Map 5), Section 368 Energy Policy Act of 2005, Westwide Energy Corridor PEIS. Designate additional corridors as needed subject to physical barriers and sensitive resource values. Designated transportation and utility corridors include existing groupings of ROWs for electric transmission facilities, pipelines 16 inches and larger, communication lines, federal and state highways, and major county road systems.	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
<i>Withdrawal Processing and Review</i>						
LAR-19	Review agency withdrawals and prior Classification and Multiple Use Act (C&MU) classifications according to schedules prepared by USO or upon special BLM or agency request. Review other-agency withdrawals (24,140 acres) and withdrawals found to be obsolete can be removed. New withdrawal applications are processed upon request from the BLM or other federal agencies but withdrawals can be made only by the Secretary or Congress.	X				
LAR-20	Support from Utah State Office and Washington Office will be needed for requests for withdrawal. Interdisciplinary staff support will be needed for coordination and development of site-specific mitigation. Coordination with surface owners, surface-administering agencies, or the State of Utah may also be required. Coordination with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service will be required where threatened or endangered species are involved.	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
LAR-21	Initiate withdrawal processing on areas recommended for withdrawal from mineral entry (50,665 acres) (Map 6): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Grand Gulch National Historic District (37,388 acres) • All developed recreation sites (232 acres) • San Juan River SRMA (9,859 acres) • Alkali Ridge National Historic Landmark (2,146 acres) • Colorado River Segment 3 (1,040 acres) 	X				Cross references REC-6.
GRA-1	Manage grazing according to Standards for Rangeland Health and Guidelines for Grazing Management (BLM 1997) (Appendix F).		X			Delete BLM 1997 reference (redundant with Appendix F).
GRA-2	Maintain lands currently unavailable (128,098 acres) for livestock grazing (due to vegetation, recreation, wildlife, or other concerns). These areas are included in GRA-17.	X				
GRA-3	Maintain existing land treatments, to meet RMP objectives and Standards for Rangeland Health (BLM 1997). Any	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	new land treatments developed in addition to those listed will also be maintained as necessary to meet RMP objectives and Standards for Rangeland Health.					
GRA-4	Modify and implement existing (Tank Draw and East Canyon) and new Allotment Management Plans (AMPs) as necessary to meet RMP objectives and Standards for Rangeland Health (BLM 1997). Develop and implement 29 new AMPs and others identified on a site-specific basis, for which resource concerns develop that require such action.	X				
GRA-5	Continue to authorize current active permitted grazing use unless monitoring data or other factors indicate a need for change (e.g., change in federal land ownership, etc.).	X				
GRA-6	Continue to categorize allotments in accordance with BLM policy.	X				
GRA-7	Manage allotments towards mid- to late-seral ecological condition that meet other goals and objectives of this RMP until replaced by a more specific	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	allotment objective classification such as Desired Future Condition (DFC).					
<i>Forage, Livestock/Wildlife</i>						
GRA-8	Coordinate with UDWR and grazing permittees to manage for long-term forage and habitat and/or ecological condition requirements or needs for livestock and wildlife, consistent with grazing allotment and herd management unit objectives.	X				
<i>Seasons of Use</i>						
GRA-9	Changes in livestock season of use will be made by the FO on an allotment-specific basis to meet RMP objectives or Standards for Rangeland Health (BLM 1997), as shown by monitoring data, and to provide flexibility in management of livestock grazing.	X				
GRA-10	Allotment seasons of use, subject to the statement above, will be as identified in Appendix F (Utah Standards and Guidelines for Rangeland Health).	X				
GRA-11	Season of Use Changes (modified to match grazing permits as currently authorized, yet altered from the 1991	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<p>San Juan RMP):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Church Rock season of use is December 1 - May 31. • Indian Rock season of use is November 15 - April 15. • Owens Dugout season of use is February 1 - April 30. • Laws season of use will be April 16–November 15. • Bear Trap Season of use will be September 1–December 12. • Monument Canyon season of use will be December 1–May 31. 					
GRA-12	<p>New Allotments—Established Since 1991 San Juan RMP (grazing permits as currently authorized):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • South Vega season of use will be January 6–February 28. • Upper Mail Station season of use will be November 14–February 28. • Big Westwater season of use will be April 1–May 31 or October 15–December 15. 	X				
<i>Glen Canyon NRA</i>						
GRA-13	Specific management direction for	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	livestock grazing is provided for under the Glen Canyon NRA 1999 Grazing Management Plan.					
Utilization						
GRA-14	Desired utilization levels as management guidelines for key forage species will be identified as needed to monitor use levels on an allotment specific basis to achieve Desired Future Condition (DFC). Where utilization levels have not been established, a use level of 50% will be the management guideline. Utilization is the proportion or degree of current year's forage production that is consumed or removed by animals (including insects). Utilization data should be analyzed in conjunction with climate, actual grazing use, current or historic impacts (wildfire, livestock, wildlife, insects, etc.), and long-term trend data to help evaluate existing and design future management to meet LUP objectives.	X				
Relinquishment of Preference						
GRA-15	Voluntary relinquishments of grazing	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<p>permits and preference, in whole or in part, by a permittee in writing to the BLM will be handled on a case by case basis. The BLM will not recognize relinquishments that are conditional on specific BLM actions as valid, and the BLM will not be bound by them. Relinquished permits and the associated preference will remain available for application by qualified applicants after BLM considers if such action will meet rangeland health standards and is compatible with achieving LUP goals and objectives. Prior to re-issuance of the relinquished permit the terms and conditions may be modified to meet LUP goals and objectives and/or site-specific resource objectives.</p>					
GRA-16	<p>However, upon relinquishment, BLM may determine through a site-specific evaluation and associated NEPA analysis that the public lands involved are better used for other purposes. Grazing may then be discontinued on the allotment through an amendment to the existing LUP or a new LUP effort.</p>	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	Any decision issued concerning discontinuance of livestock grazing is not permanent and may be reconsidered and changed through future LUP amendments and updates.					
<i>Areas Unavailable for Grazing</i>						
GRA-17	<p>Make 133,318 acres unavailable for grazing as follows (Map 7):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comb Wash side canyons (Mule Canyon south of U-95, Arch, Fish, Owl, and Road). These areas were made unavailable to grazing by court decision and are also made unavailable to grazing in this RMP. • Bridger Jack Mesa (near relict vegetation) • Grand Gulch area (within the canyon) of Cedar Mesa • Lavender Mesa (relict vegetation) • Five identified mesa tops (White Canyon area) • Pearson Canyon (hiking area boundary) • Developed recreation sites (currently developed and 	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<p>proposed and listed in the recreation section. Any sites additional to those listed may be unavailable for grazing without a plan amendment and will be analyzed with site-specific NEPA).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Parts of the slopes of Peter's Canyon and East Canyon (15,720 acres of wildlife habitat) • Slickhorn Canyon (within Perkins Brother's Allotment). • Rone Bailey Mesa (within Upper Mail Station Allotment) • Dodge Canyon Allotment • Rogers Allotment • Portions of West Butler Wash Canyons • Horsehead Canyon (within Montezuma Canyon allotment) • Dark Canyon Area with the exception of 962 acres in Fable Valley that is limited to trailing on an annual basis and grazing use under emergency conditions. 					
GRA-18	Areas made unavailable for grazing or	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	restricted to trailing only may be reconsidered as available for grazing during subsequent revision or amendment of the RMP.					
<i>Other Grazing Management</i>						
GRA-19	Restrict 6,518 acres to livestock trailing only, no grazing in the following areas (may only include a portion of the area): Dark Canyon area (Fable Valley), Harts Canyon, Shay Canyon ACEC, and Indian Creek from Kelly Ranch vicinity to USFS boundary.	X				
GRA-20	Moki Canyon and Lake Canyon will be restricted to trailing only except in the spring and fall for up to 1 to 2 weeks for gathering livestock prior to moving to and from these areas.		X			Add “Portions of” before Moki Canyon and “(as identified in Map 7 of Appendix A)” after Lake Canyon.
GRA-21	Moki Canyon is open to grazing above the fence northeast of Harrison Spring and below the fence downstream from the sand slide road access to Moki Canyon.		X			Add “(See RIP-15)” to end of sentence.
GRA-22	The BLM will develop seasonal restrictions, closures, and/or forage utilization limits on grazing in riparian areas deemed Functioning at Risk and/or	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	Non-functional.					
GRA-23	Grazing in the riparian area of the San Juan River SRMA will be restricted to October 1–May 31 and must meet or exceed PFC, and incorporate rest-rotation and/or deferment systems. This will include Perkins Brothers, East League, and McCracken Wash Allotments.	X				Perkins Brothers allotment has been split into two allotments since the RMP.
GRA-24	Sage Flat, Upper East Canyon, Sage-grouse and Dry Farm allotments will not be grazed from March 20 to May 15 (Gunnison Sage-grouse nesting season).	X				Upper East Canyon grazing permit renewal EA has implemented this seasonal restriction.
MIN-1	The plan will provide for a variety of mineral exploration and development activities. These activities will be allowed in the PA unless precluded by other program prescriptions. The stipulations identified in Appendix B will apply to these activities where they are applicable. Seasonal wildlife conditions will not apply to maintenance and operation activities for mineral production (see also Wildlife).	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
MIN-2	WSAs and designated Wilderness will remain closed, by law, to mineral leasing and development.	X				
MIN-3	The MFO is available for geophysical work unless stated otherwise.		X			Add “(Refer to Appendix B)” to end of sentence. Provide clarification regarding geophysical (heliportable) in NSO and note that certain activities associated with geophysical do not meet the definition of surface occupancy. Suggested edits captured in Minerals tab of Evaluation Questions spreadsheet
MIN-4	The MFO will be open for mineral entry unless specifically withdrawn by Secretarial Order, public law or segregated from mineral entry under specific reservations, such as an R&PP lease.			X		Drop decision – this decision is the same as MIN-16.
MIN-5	In areas where the No Surface Occupancy (NSO) stipulation for oil and gas leasing is applied, the same restriction will also, where appropriate	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	and practical, apply to other surface-disturbing activities (and occupancy) associated with land-use authorizations, permits, and leases issued on BLM lands. The restrictions will not apply to activities and uses where they are contrary to laws, regulations or specific program guidance. The intent is to maintain consistency to the extent possible in applying stipulations/restrictions to all surface-disturbing activities.					
<i>Leasable Minerals</i> <i>Oil and Gas</i>						
MIN-6	The plan will recognize and be consistent with the National Energy Policy Act and related BLM policy by adopting the following objectives: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • recognizing the need for diversity in obtaining energy supplies; • encouraging conservation of sensitive resource values; and • improving energy distribution opportunities. 	X				
MIN-7	All lands are available for leasing subject to standard lease terms, unless	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<p>otherwise specified in the plan. Lease stipulations have been developed, where necessary, to mitigate the impacts of oil and gas activity (Appendix B). These stipulations adhere to the Uniform Format prepared by the Rocky Mountain Regional Coordinating Committee in March 1989. Stipulations reflect the minimum requirements necessary to accomplish the desired resource protection and contain provisions and criteria to allow for exception, waiver, and modification if warranted. Stipulations from Section 6 of the Standard Lease Terms are incorporated for all leases. Best Management Practices (BMP) will be applied on individual Applications for Permit to Drill (APD) and associated ROWs. These procedures are based on WO IM 2007-021 and the <i>Surface Operating Standards and Guidelines for Oil and Gas Development (Gold Book)</i>, 2006.</p>					
MIN-8	<p>Oil and gas leases issued prior to the plan will continue to be managed under the stipulations in effect when issued.</p>	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	Those issued subsequent to this plan will be subject to the stipulations developed in this plan.					
MIN-9	<p>Certain federal oil and gas resources within the Monticello PA underlie lands not administered by the BLM. The BLM administers the federal leases on these lands. These lands include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 101,720 acres within the Glen Canyon National Recreation Area (NRA) (see Glen Canyon NRA Minerals Management Plan) • 366,850 acres within the Manti-La Sal National Forest (NF), Monticello Ranger District • 51,610 acres within the Navajo Indian Reservation • 1,080 acres within Indian Trust lands • 55,390 acres on split-estate lands 	X				
MIN-10	Split-estate lands (private surface/federal minerals) and lands administered by other federal agencies are not managed by the BLM. The surface owner or surface management agency (SMA) manages the surface.	X				Note: The Gunnison sage-grouse planning effort may amend this decision in future.

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<p>The BLM administers the operational aspects of oil and gas leases. On lands administered by other federal agencies, lease stipulations will include those required by the SMA. On split-estate lands, lease stipulations will consist of those necessary to comply with non-discretionary federal laws, such as the Endangered Species Act. The one exception to this will be the stipulations developed for Gunnison Sage-grouse as identified in Appendix B. Mitigation measures will also be applied to protect other resource values such as VRM class, recreation, and non-federally protected fish and wildlife species consistent with Section 6 of the standard lease terms. These mitigation measures will be developed during site-specific environmental analysis and will be attached as conditions of approval (COA) in consultation with the surface owner or SMA.</p>					
MIN-11	<p>In accordance with an UDEQ-DAQ letter dated June 6, 2008, (Appendix C) requesting implementation of interim nitrogen oxide control</p>	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<p>measures for compressor engines; the BLM will require the following as a Lease Stipulation and a Condition of Approval for Applications for Permit to Drill:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All new and replacement internal combustion oil and gas field engines of less than or equal to 300 design-rated horsepower must not emit more than 2 gms of NO_x per horsepower-hour. This requirement does not apply to oil and gas field engines of less than or equal to 40 design-rated horsepower. • All new and replacement internal combustion oil and gas field engines of greater than 300 design rated horsepower must not emit more than 1.0 gms of NO_x per horsepower-hour. 					
<i>Coal</i>						
MIN-12	The coal resources within the Monticello PA are limited to the San Juan Coal Field, totaling about 530,000 acres. Approximately 60% of this field is under private ownership (both	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<p>surface and mineral estate), and about 212,000 acres of federal surface and federal minerals in the coal field are administered by the Monticello FO. The potential for development of coal resources is low (see Mineral Potential Report and RFD [BLM 2005]). The public has expressed no interest in coal leasing. The RMP does not establish conditions for coal leasing or exploration requirements. This will be done through a plan amendment, should sufficient interest warrant. At such time as interest is expressed in coal leasing, the RMP will be amended and mining unsuitability criteria (43 CFR 3461) will be applied by the Monticello FO before any coal leases are issued. If coal leases are issued, they will be subject to special conditions developed in the RMP amendment and the unsuitability assessment. This may restrict all or certain types of mining techniques. Before any coal could be removed, Monticello FO will have to approve the mining permit application package, incorporating stipulations developed in</p>					

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	the RMP					
<i>Tar Sands</i>						
MIN-13	An Oil Shale and Tar Sands Leasing Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS) is being prepared for oil shale and tar sands resources leasing on lands administered by the U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management (BLM) in Colorado, Utah, and Wyoming. Based upon the information and analyses developed in this PEIS, the BLM will amend LUPs for these areas.		X			We need to include amended language in updated/annotated plan.
<i>Potash (Non-energy Leasable)</i>						
MIN-14	Within the Monticello PA, two areas fall within Known Potash Leasing Areas (KPLAs). KPLA designations, based on known geologic data, will remain in place until potash resources are depleted. In KPLAs, potash leases are acquired through competitive bidding. In areas where potash values are not known, the Monticello PA could issue prospecting permits, which could lead to issuance of a preference right lease. The RMP establishes	X				MLP will modify this. RFD for potash has been drafted.

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<p>stipulations that will apply to prospecting permits and leases. The KPLAs are available for leasing subject to the same lease stipulations developed in the RMP for oil and gas. Additional KPLAs could be designated, based on geologic data, if interest warranted. This will be an administrative action. Exploration and mining operations for potash are conducted in accordance with the regulations at 43 CFR 3590.</p>					
<i>Leasable Minerals: Geothermal</i>						
MIN-15	<p>A portion of the Warm Springs Canyon geothermal area (approximately 16,320 acres) extends into the Monticello PA. Low temperature geothermal waters have been recorded from springs. Because the Monticello PA is situated within the Colorado Plateau geologic province, where heat flow through the earth's crust is generally low, no high-temperature geothermal resources are expected at reasonable drilling depths. Therefore, development potential is low (see Mineral Potential Report and</p>	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	RFD [BLM 2005]). The public has expressed no interest in geothermal leasing. The RMP does not establish conditions for geothermal leasing or exploration requirements. This will be done through a plan amendment should sufficient interest warrant.					
<i>Locatable Minerals</i>						
MIN-16	All public domain lands overlying federal minerals are available for mining claim location unless specifically withdrawn from mineral entry by Secretarial Order or public law or segregated from mineral entry under specific reservations, such as an R&PP lease.	X				
MIN-17	The RMP recommends certain lands to be withdrawn from mineral entry. Claims located on these areas prior to withdrawal will not be impacted. Operations on BLM-administered lands available for mineral entry must be conducted in compliance with the BLM's surface management regulations (43 CFR Subparts 3802, 3809, 3715 and 3814). BLM surface management	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	regulations do not apply to operations on other federal lands but do apply to all operations authorized by the mining laws on public lands where the mineral interest is reserved to the United States, including Stock Raising Homestead lands.					
MIN-18	The BLM will evaluate all operations authorized by the mining laws in the context of its requirement to prevent unnecessary and undue degradation of Federal lands and resources. Consistent with the rights afforded claimants under the mining laws, operations will conform to the management prescriptions in the plan.	X				
MIN-19	Federally owned locatable minerals underlying federal lands administered by the NPS are not generally available for mineral entry. However, locatable minerals under Glen Canyon NRA may be leased under Title 43 of the Code of Federal Regulations, part 3500 (43 CFR 3500) in accordance with the Mineral Management Plan for the NRA.	X				
<i>Salable Minerals</i>						

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
MIN-20	All BLM-administered lands in the MFO are placed in one of the following three categories: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Available for disposal of mineral material subject to standard conditions. • Available for disposal of mineral material subject to special conditions. • Unavailable for disposal of mineral material. 	X				
MIN-21	Management conditions for disposal of mineral materials under each category correspond respectively to the oil and gas leasing stipulations developed in the RMP, as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Standard lease terms • TL and CSU • NSO and closed 	X				
MIN-22	There are 16 community pits, totaling about 5,505 acres.	X				
<i>Lands Available for Oil and Gas Leasing (Map 18)</i>						
MIN-23	Approximately 484,217 acres are administratively available for oil and gas leasing, subject to standard lease terms.	X				MLP will likely change acreages.

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
MIN-24	Timing Limitations: Approximately 594,469 acres are administratively available for oil and gas leasing subject to timing limitations.	X				MLP will likely change acreages.
MIN-25	Controlled Surface Use: Approximately 60,741 acres are administratively available for oil and gas leasing subject to controlled surface use.	X				MLP will likely change acreages.
MIN-26	Controlled Surface Use and Timing Limitations: Approximately 85,384 acres are administratively available for oil and gas leasing subject to timing limitations and controlled surface use.	X				MLP will likely change acreages.
MIN-27	No Surface Occupancy: Approximately 66,108 acres are administratively available for oil and gas leasing subject to no surface occupancy.	X				MLP will likely change acreages.
MIN-28	Dark Canyon (11,619 acres) non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics are available for oil and gas leasing subject to no surface occupancy.	X				This area is not included in the MLP. Add “(BLM natural area)” after “non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics” (as per ROD).
MIN-29	Approximately 493,400 acres are unavailable for leasing.	X				Acreage could change if MLP closes more areas.

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
MIN-30	Mancos Mesa, Nokai Dome West, Nokai Dome East and Grand Gulch non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics are unavailable for oil and gas leasing.	X				Add “(BLM natural areas)” after “non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics” (as per ROD).
<i>Lands Available for Mineral Entry</i>						
MIN-31	Approximately 1,734,458 acres are available for mineral entry.	X				
MIN-32	Approximately 50,665 acres are recommended for withdrawal from locatable mineral entry (Map 6).	X				Correlates with LAR-21
<i>Lands Available for Mineral Material Disposal (Map 19)</i>						
MIN-33	Approximately 624,734 acres are available for disposal of mineral materials subject to standard terms and conditions.	X				If oil and gas categories change in the MLP, acreages are likely to change.
MIN-34	Approximately 724,234 acres are available for disposal of mineral materials subject to special conditions.	X				If oil and gas categories change in the MLP, acreages are likely to change.
MIN-35	Approximately 435,338 acres are unavailable for disposal of mineral materials.	X			X	If oil and gas categories change in the MLP, acreages are likely to change.
WC-1	Manage 88,871 acres of non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics		X			Update wording for disposal of mineral

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<p>for their wilderness characteristics (Map 8) in 5 individual areas: Dark Canyon (11,540 acres), Mancos Mesa (30,068 acres), Nokai Dome West (14,988 acres), Nokai Dome East (18,618 acres) and Grand Gulch (13,657 acres). The following management will apply:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unavailable for mineral leasing in Mancos Mesa, Nokai Dome West, Nokai Dome East and Grand Gulch; no surface occupancy for mineral leasing (NSO) in Dark Canyon • OHV travel limited to designated roads and trails. There are no routes designated within the 88,871 acres protected for their wilderness characteristics. • ROW avoidance areas • Closed to disposal of mineral materials • Unavailable for private and commercial woodland harvest except for on-site collection of dead wood for campfires 					<p>materials from “closed” to “unavailable” for consistency with other sections/decisions (the meaning is the same).</p>

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Available for range, watershed or habitat improvements and vegetation treatments if beneficial or non-impairing to wilderness characteristics and will meet VRM Class II objectives • VRM Class II for surface-disturbing activities • All existing improvements could be maintained at their current level • Unavailable for coal leasing • Unavailable for geothermal leasing • Fire suppression will be through light on the land techniques 					
PAL-1	Recreational collectors may collect and retain reasonable amounts of common invertebrate and plant fossils for personal, noncommercial use. Surface disturbance must be negligible, and mechanized tools may not be used.	X				
PAL-2	Petrified wood collection will be limited to amounts mandated in BLM regulations.	X				
PAL-3	Collection of scientifically noteworthy and/or uncommon invertebrate and	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	plant fossils may require a permit.					
PAL-4	Vertebrate fossils may be collected only under a permit issued by the authorized officer to qualified individuals. Vertebrate fossils include bones, teeth, eggs, and other body parts of animals with backbones such as dinosaurs, fish, turtles, and mammals. Vertebrate fossils also include trace fossils such as footprints, burrows, and dung.	X				
PAL-5	Casting of vertebrate fossils, including dinosaur tracks, will be prohibited unless allowed under a scientific/research permit issued by the Utah State BLM Office.	X				
PAL-6	Fossils collected under a permit remain the property of the federal government and must be placed in a suitable repository (such as a museum or university) identified at the time of permit issuance.	X				
PAL-7	Lands identified for disposal or exchange will be evaluated to determine whether such actions will remove important fossils from federal	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	ownership.					
PAL-8	In areas where surface disturbance, either initiated by the BLM or by other land users, may threaten substantial or noteworthy fossils, the BLM will follow its policy per Paleontology Resources Management Manual and Handbook 8370-1 (BLM 1998a) to assess any threat and mitigate damage.	X				
PAL-9	Where scientifically noteworthy fossils are threatened by natural hazards or unauthorized collection, the BLM will work with permittees and other partners to salvage specimens and reduce future threats to resources at risk.	X				
PAL-10	Conduct on-site evaluation of surface-disturbing activities for all Class 5 areas and minimize impacts to paleontological resources to the degree practicable. Evaluation will consider the type of surface disturbance proposed and mitigation will be developed based on site-specific information.	X				
REC General	Collection of wood for campfires.		X			Policies need to be synchronized among

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
						decisions for campfire wood collection in various locations.
REC General	Placement of acreages in descriptions.		X			Move acreages for SRMAs to same place in each section, near the beginning.
REC General	Acronym clarification.		X			Change “PA” to “Field Office” so that the acronym isn’t confused with Programmatic Agreement.
REC-1	Continue existing reservations issued to the BLM for all existing developed recreation sites and facilities. Issue similar protective reservations for all new recreation facilities.	X				
REC-2	Manage recreation to meet Utah's Rangeland Health Standards guided by the Standards for Public Land Health and Guidelines for Recreation Management (Appendix K). The guidelines describe the procedures that should be applied to achieve standards for rangeland health within the recreation program. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recognize that various levels of regulations and limits are 	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<p>necessary. Restrictions and limitations on public uses should be as minimal as possible without compromising the primary goal.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use on-the-ground presence (BLM, site stewards, volunteers) as a tool to protect public lands. • Limit or control activities where long-term damage by recreational uses is observed or anticipated through specialized management tools such as designated campsites, permits, area closures, and limitations on number of users and duration of use. Revise recreation area management plans (RAMP) as necessary to maintain public land health. • Coordinate with federal and state agencies, county and local governments, and tribal nations in recreation planning and managing traffic, search and rescue operations, trash control and removal, and public safety. • Consider and, where appropriate, implement management methods 					

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<p>to protect the resource, as well as maintain the quality of experience of the various user groups. These methods could include limitation of numbers, types, timing, and duration of use.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Encourage the location of public land recreational activities near population centers and highway corridors by placement of appropriate visitor-use infrastructure. Provide restrooms and other facilities that will be adequate for anticipated uses at designated campgrounds, trailheads, and other areas where there is a concentration of recreational users. • Emphasize "Leave No Trace" camping and travel techniques throughout the Monticello PA. • Consider and, where appropriate, implement management methods to protect natural and cultural resources and while giving consideration to community and economic impacts, implement 					

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<p>management methods to maintain or enhance recreation opportunities. Management methods may include limitation of visitor numbers, camping and travel controls, implementation of fees, alteration of when use takes place, and other similar actions as they are approved through normal BLM procedures.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Coordinate management of recreation use with other agencies, state and local government, and tribal units to provide public benefits, help assure public safety, and make effective use of staff and budget resources. • Recreational OHV and mechanized travel will be consistent with route and area designations described in the travel management decisions. The BLM will work with agency and government officials and permit holders to develop procedures, protocols, permits or 					

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<p>other types of authorization, as appropriate, to provide reasonable access for non-recreational use of OHVs for military, search and rescue, emergency, administrative, and permitted uses.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • OHV access for game retrieval will follow all area and route designations. (There will be no off-road retrieval.) • Dispersed camping, where allowed when not specifically restricted, may be closed seasonally or as impacts or environmental conditions warrant. 					
General Recreation Management						
REC-3	Allow development of hiking paths and trails within the PA subject to site-specific NEPA.		X			Change PA to Planning Area.
REC-4	<p>The following actions require a signed agreement with the specified agency:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Manage the BLM portion of the Colorado River in coordination with Canyonlands National Park and the Moab BLM FO. • Manage the BLM portion of the 	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<p>San Juan River in coordination with Glen Canyon National Recreation Area and the Navajo Nation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Manage the BLM portion of Dark Canyon Complex in coordination with Manti-La Sal National Forest and Glen Canyon National Recreation Area. • Manage the BLM portion of the Keeley Trail in coordination with Hovenweep National Monument. 					
<i>Management of Existing and Development of Future Recreation Facilities</i>						
REC-5	Existing developed recreation sites will be maintained. New sites/facilities/trails will be developed in response to user demand, amenity value, and critical resource protection needs.	X				
REC-6	All developed recreation sites are recommended for withdrawal from locatable mineral entry.	X				
REC-7	Recreation facilities will be closed to disposal of mineral materials.		X			Update wording for disposal of mineral materials from “closed” to “unavailable” for consistency with other

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
						sections/decisions (the meaning is the same).
REC-8	Developed recreation sites are available for oil and gas leasing subject to NSO. NSO boundaries around developed recreation sites are defined as one quarter mile from the perimeter of campgrounds and 200 meters from the perimeter of other developed recreation sites.		X			Add to end of decision: "No geophysical operations would be approved within these areas."
REC-9	These sites are also available for oil and gas leasing subject to NSO and unavailable for disposal of mineral materials.	X				
REC-10	Grazing is excluded from developed recreation sites.	X				
REC-11	Developed recreation facilities are unavailable for private and/or commercial use of woodland products including on-site collection of dead wood for campfires.	X				
<i>General Recreation Management</i>						
General	"General Recreation Management" heading is repeated here and over REC-3 and REC-4.		X			The location of this heading should correspond to the appropriate decisions.
REC-12	Benefits Based Management Goals and	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	Objectives (BBMs) have been written for most SRMAs. (Appendix K)					
REC-13	No camping within 200 feet of isolated springs to allow space for wildlife to access water.	X				
REC-14	No camping is allowed within cultural sites or archaeological resources as defined in ARPA.	X				
<i>Management of Existing and Development of Future Recreation Facilities</i>						
REC-15	Develop or improve development of recreation sites as prioritized below: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Kane Gulch Ranger Station (40 acres) • Sand Island Campground (21 acres) • Mexican Hat Launch site (20 acres) • Hamburger Rock Campground (20 acres) • Comb Wash Campground (10 acres) • Butler Wash Ruin (60 acres) • Mule Canyon Ruin (10 acres) • Three Kiva Pueblo (10 acres) • Shay Mountain Vista Campground (20 acres) 		X			Strike “As outlined in the Recreation Corridor Plan (BLM 2005).” Add Bridger Jack, Superbowl, Creek Pasture, Indian Creek Falls Group Site, and Newspaper Rock.

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Indian Creek Recreational and Camping Facilities as outlined in the Indian Creek Recreation Corridor Plan (BLM 2005). The BLM will work with Natural Bridges National Monument to develop an overflow camping area. No campfires will be allowed in these overflow camping areas. The BLM will work with Canyonlands National Park Needles District to develop an overflow camping area. 					
<i>Special Recreation Permits (SRPs)</i>						
REC-16	There will be no competitive mechanized or motorized events in WSAs in accordance with IMP.		X			Update IMP to new wilderness manuals: MS-6330, MS-6340.
REC-17	SRPs will be issued as a discretionary action as a means to help meet management objectives, control visitor use, protect recreational and natural resources, and provide for the health and safety of visitors.	X				
REC-18	All SRPs will contain standard stipulations appropriate for the type of activity and may include additional	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	stipulations (Appendix K) necessary to protect lands or resources, reduce user conflicts, or minimize health and safety concerns.					
REC-19	SRPs will be used to manage different types of recreation associated with commercial uses, competitive events, organized groups, vending, and special areas. These recreation uses can include, for example, large group events, river guide services, and commercial recreation activities.	X				
REC-20	The BLM will follow the 43 CFR 2930, October 1, 2004, the National Guidelines on Cost Recovery (Federal Register, Volume 67, October 1, 2002), and the Utah Special Recreation Permit Cost Recovery Policy (Utah IM 2004-036).		X			Modify language to reflect current policy.
REC-21	In accordance with the BLM's Priorities for Recreation and Visitor Services Work Plan (May 2003, as amended), commercial SRPs will also be issued as a mechanism to provide a fair return for the commercial use of public lands.	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
------------	----------	------------------	-----------------	---------------	---------------------	---------

<i>Criteria for Requiring an SRP</i>						
REC-22	<p>The criteria for requiring an SRP include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Any commercial use. • Non-mechanized/non-stock day use organized group or event of more than 50 people in ERMA. • Non-mechanized/non-stock overnight with group or event of more than 25 people in ERMA. • More than 25 motorized vehicles/OHVs on designated routes (does not include County B Roads or state and federal highways). • More than 25 nonmotorized mechanized vehicles on designated routes (does not include County B Roads or state and federal highways). • A group size of more than 15 riding and/or pack animals. • Car camping with more than 15 vehicles or more than 50 people. • Activities or events with the potential to conflict with existing 		X			Add stipulations for hot air balloons.

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	resource management guidelines/prescriptions. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Events with the potential for user conflict. • Events that could impact public health and safety. 					
Commercial						
REC-23	Commercial motorized/mechanized events/tours are allowed on designated routes, except in WSAs.	X				
REC-24	Commercial use permits are authorized in conjunction with organized events or when the use supports resource protection and management.	X				
REC-25	In Arch Canyon, OHV use is limited to the designated route up to the National Forest boundary, a total of 8 miles one way. Organized and commercial groups will be required to obtain a Special Recreation Use Permit. This permit will allow access on the designated route up to the National Forest boundary, except from March 1 through August 31. During this period, access will be limited to 7.5 miles of the designated route. Therefore, during this period	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	motorized access will not be allowed within .5 miles of the National Forest boundary.					
REC-26	Commercial motorized or mechanized events or tours in crucial bighorn sheep lambing and rutting areas may be limited in number of participants and duration (depending on the event) from April 1 to June 15 (lambing) and from October 15–December 15 (rutting), unless it can be shown that the animals are not present in a specific project location or the activity can be conducted so the animals are not adversely impacted.	X				
REC-27	Commercial motorized or mechanized events or tours in crucial antelope habitat may be limited in number of participants and duration (depending on the event) from May 1–June 15.	X				
REC-28	Commercial motorized or mechanized events or tours in crucial deer and elk winter range may be limited in number of participants and duration (depending on the event) from November 15– April 15.	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
REC-29	Group sizes for commercial motorized events/tours are limited to 2 groups of 12 vehicles per route per day.	X				
REC-30	Balloon festivals are limited to 35 balloons with their associated support vehicles.	X				
REC-31	Commercial hiking tours in Comb Wash and Butler Wash are limited to 12 individuals. A permit system will be established for commercial day and overnight use.	X				
REC-32	Commercial camping is limited to designated areas.		X			Some areas have designated campsites, some do not; this decision needs to be made consistent.
REC-33	Commercial hiking to cultural sites is limited to designated trails and human waste must be packed out.		X			Modify decision to read: "Commercial hiking to cultural sites is limited to areas authorized in specific special recreation permits and human waste must be packed out."
REC-34	Ropes and other climbing aides are not allowed to access cultural sites.	X				
REC-35	Commercial guides using dogs to	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	hunt/pursue mountain lion and black bear will not operate in areas where dogs are prohibited.					
REC-36	Commercial motorized or mechanized cross country use is not allowed in the Cedar Mesa SRMA.	X				
<i>Competitive Events</i>						
REC-37	Motorized/mechanized competitive events will be authorized consistent with OHV designations.	X				
REC-38	Motorized and mechanized competitive events are not permitted in WSAs.	X				
<i>Special Recreation Management Areas (SRMA- seven areas, 562,824 acres)</i>						
REC-39	Provide general recreation management guidance and subsequent implementation of management decisions for activity plan-level actions for SRMAs through continuation of approved Recreation Area Management Plans (RAMPs) and development of new RAMPs for all SRMAs.	X				
REC-40	If necessary, activity plans will be written for SRMAs.	X				
REC-41	Review and update RAMPS as necessary to make adjustments for changing conditions and opportunities.	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
REC-42	Domestic pets and pack animals are not allowed in cultural sites or on archaeological resources as defined in ARPA.	X				
REC-43	Ropes and other climbing aids are not allowed for access to cultural sites or archaeological resources as defined in ARPA, except for emergencies or administrative needs.	X				
REC-44	Camping is not allowed within cultural sites or archaeological resources as defined in ARPA.	X				
REC-45	Cultural sites may be closed to visitation when they are determined to be at risk or pose visitor safety hazards.	X				
General SRMA Guidelines						
REC-46	Identify additional SRMAs or add areas to SRMAs as necessary to respond to changing management circumstances. Establishment of post-RMP SRMAs or revision of SRMA boundaries will require a plan amendment. The criteria for establishment of post-RMP SRMAs or revising SRMA boundaries include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recreation use requires intensive management to provide recreation 	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<p>opportunities or maintain resource values.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A recreation area management plan or interdisciplinary plan with intensive recreation management decisions is approved. • The BLM announces designation and plan approval through media. 					
REC-47	All recreation management activities and developments in the SRMA will be in support of the individual SRMA goals and objectives.	X				
REC-48	All SRMAs will be designated as special areas under the Land and Water Conservation Fund (LWCF) definition. As per the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act and the Federal Lands Recreation Enhancement Act, this could require permits and payment of fees for recreation use.		X			Move acreage from REC-56 to REC-48.
<i>San Juan River SRMA</i>						
REC-49	Permits will be issued to commercial companies on a five-year designated basis. They will also be issued to private users through an annual lottery system.		X			“Designated basis” needs to be clarified. Renewed on a five year term? Or prospectus for new applications every five

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
						years?
REC-50	River trips on the San Juan River require a special use permit.	X				
REC-51	Unavailable for woodland product use, except for limited on-site collection of dead wood for campfires. Woodland use within the floodplain is limited to collection of driftwood for campfires.		X			Revisit wood collection policies in REC section.
REC-52	Cottonwood and willow harvest is allowed for Native American ceremonial uses only by permit. Restrictions on this permitted harvest will be implemented as necessary to achieve or maintain Proper Functioning Condition (PFC), and to maintain or improve threatened and endangered species/special status species (TES/SSS) habitat.			X		Repeat of Forestry-7 (p. 158).
REC-53	Backpackers in Slickhorn Canyon and Grand Gulch are not allowed to camp within 1 mile of the river.	X				
REC-54	Campfires allowed only with a fire pan.		X			Modify for consistency with other decisions.
REC-55	The bench above Sand Island Campground (256 acres) is closed to camping.	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
REC-56	The San Juan River is managed as an SRMA (9,859 acres) (Map 9). The boundary remains as in the previous RMP with the exception of State Section 16 or the Holliday Pit Quarry on Lime Ridge.	X				
REC-57	The SRMA boundary east of existing oil and gas leasing category NSO is below the bench, thereby allowing access to high-quality gravel.	X				
<i>Motorized Boating</i>						
REC-58	Downstream travel is allowed at low, wakeless speed. Upstream travel is prohibited, except for emergency purposes (SPM).	X				
REC-59	<i>Note: there is no REC-59 listed in the Final Plan.</i>					Recommend renumbering.
<i>Launch Limits</i>						
REC-60	Launch limits allow approximately 40,000 user/days per year.		X			Change to “Per day launch limits...” Decision will be reevaluated in San Juan River Management Plan.
REC-61	Trip size is limited to 25 people total (including crew) for private trips. Commercial group size limits on the San Juan River will remain at 33 people	X				Will be reevaluated in San Juan River Management.

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	(25 passengers plus 8 guides) per trip.					
<i>Commercial/Private Allocations</i>						
REC-62	Commercial use is allowed up to 40% of total use. Two commercial day trips per day (one launch of 25 passengers and one launch of ten passengers) are allowed and are not included in the launch limits.		X			Change to "...and are not included in the per day launch limits." Will be reevaluated in San Juan River Management.
<i>Administrative/Research Use</i>						
REC-63	Administrative and research use will be authorized on a case-by-case review and determination.	X				
<i>Visitor Services</i>						
REC-64	Minimal visitor services at Sand Island and Mexican Hat ramp areas will be provided for visitor health and safety and resource protection.	X				
<i>Designated Campsites</i>						
REC-65	An MOU will be signed between the NPS/GCNRA and the Navajo Nation. This memorandum will include details on numbers of campsites and their associated permit restrictions.	X				No MOU has yet been signed with the Navajo Nation.
<i>Non-Boating Use</i>						
REC-66	With the exceptions of along Lime Creek Road, the Mexican Hat Rock	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	area and Mexican Hat Boat Ramp, vehicle camping is allowed within the San Juan SRMA only upstream of Comb Wash. In this area, dispersed vehicle camping is allowed in previously disturbed areas within 150 feet of designated routes.					
REC-67	Lime Creek campsite is reserved for river runners only.	X				
REC-68	All campers (including backpackers) must have carry-out toilets.	X				
REC-69	The bench above Sand Island Recreation Area is closed to camping, including 122 acres outside of the SRMA which fall within the Extensive Recreation Management Area (ERMA). The closure area boundary is described as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. US Highway 191 on the north b. The edge of the bench to the south c. The private land on the west d. The edge of the bench on the east 	X				
REC-70	Area wide, camping will be closed within 0.5 mile of designated campsites.	X				
Minerals						
REC-71	Available for oil and gas leasing	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	subject to NSO and recommended for withdrawal from locatable mineral entry and unavailable for disposal of mineral materials.					
<i>Grazing</i>						
REC-72	Grazing in the riparian area is restricted to October 1–May 31 and must meet or exceed PFC, and incorporate rest-rotation and/or deferment systems. This includes Perkins Brothers (outside Slickhorn Canyon), East League, and McCracken Wash Allotments.		X			Clarify language as follows: “Grazing in the riparian area of the San Juan River SRMA will be restricted to October 1–May 31 and must meet or exceed PFC, and incorporate rest-rotation and/or deferment systems. This will include Perkins Brothers, East League, and McCracken Wash Allotments.”
<i>Watershed</i>						
REC-73	Watershed control structures are subject to surface restrictions and seasonal restrictions to protect bighorn sheep lambing and rutting areas.	X				
REC-74	Vehicle access in other areas within the SRMA is limited to designated routes.	X				
REC-75	Area is subject to fire suppression to protect riparian habitat.	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
<i>Other</i>						
REC-76	Manage San Juan SRMA to maintain an environment of isolation insofar as allowed by river permit and patrol system.		X			Better define what is intended by "isolation."
REC-77	Surface disturbance from mining activities on existing claims will be limited to the extent possible without unnecessary impact to valid existing rights.	X				
REC-78	No vehicle access or mechanized travel is allowed from Comb Wash downstream to Lime Creek and below Mexican Hat Bridge (except for motorized boat use on the river).	X				There is an existing vehicle trespass at the Mexican Hat Bridge.
REC-79	Mechanized/motorized travel is limited to designated routes.	X				
<i>Cedar Mesa SRMA</i>						
REC-80	Portions of the Cedar Mesa SRMA overlay four existing WSAs (Grand Gulch ISA Complex, Fish Creek Canyon, Mule Canyon and Road Canyon, Map 10) and the Valley of the Gods ACEC (Map 11). WSAs will be managed according to the IMP and Valley of the Gods ACEC will be		X			Update IMP to new wilderness manuals: MS-6330, MS-6340.

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	managed as VRM Class I, unavailable for private and commercial use of woodland products, campfires are not allowed, among other restrictions (see the Valley of the Gods ACEC section in this Chapter under Special Designations).					
REC-81	A joint recreation/cultural resources management plan (CRMP) will be written for this area based on the RMP.		X			Consistency with acronym CRMP needed to clarify joint recreation-cultural management plans or solely cultural management plans.
REC-82	The Cedar Mesa SRMA (407,098 acres) (Map 9), formerly the Grand Gulch Plateau SRMA, includes three Recreation Management Zones (RMZs) focused on more intense recreational use; Grand Gulch National Historic District Recreation Management Zone (37,388), Comb Ridge Recreation Management Zone (38,012 acres) and the McLoyd-Moon House Recreation Management Zone (1,607 acres). More specific or restrictive management is outlined under these three management zones and presented below. Generally, this SRMA is managed according to	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<p>the following prescriptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Where livestock grazing is permitted mitigation activities may be implemented if cultural resources are determined to be at risk. • Available for watershed, range, and wildlife improvements and vegetation treatments. • Campfires allowed on mesa tops only; fire pan required. • Available for private and/or commercial use of woodland products including on-site collection of dead wood for campfires. Access to available areas will be limited to designated roads and trails, dependent on cultural Class III surveys and occur outside WSAs and canyon bottoms. Traditional cultural use by Native Americans of woodland products is allowed as long as other resource values are not adversely affected. • Open to dispersed camping except 					

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<p>in areas where cultural resources are at risk.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Managed as VRM Class II, III and IV outside of WSAs and Valley of the Gods ACEC, which are managed as VRM Class I. 					
<i>Pets and Stock</i>						
REC-83	If resources or the visitors' experiences are adversely impacted, pets and or stock animals may be limited or prohibited in canyons requiring permits.	X				
REC-84	No unauthorized use of existing corrals.	X				
<i>Areas for Day Stock Use Only</i>						
REC-85	Bullet Canyon from Grand Gulch to Jailhouse Ruin. Two miles upstream Fish Canyon from the confluence with Owl Canyon, McLoyd Canyon to impassable pour-off, and Owl Canyon to Nevill's Arch.	X				
<i>Pets</i>						
REC-86	No limit or fees for pets. All pets must be collared, leashed, and under human control at all times. No pets are allowed in Slickhorn Canyon or below Collins Canyon in Grand Gulch. Pets are not allowed in or at any alcoves, rock art	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	sites, or ruins. Pets must not harass or harm wildlife. Pets must not harass visitors and other visitors' pets. Pets are not allowed to swim in springs, pot holes, or other natural water sources. Pet waste must be buried in a shallow hole away from trails, campsites, cultural sites, and natural water sources.					
<i>Stock (horses, llamas, goats, etc.)</i>						
REC-87	All commercial and private stock use requires a permit. Within the Grand Gulch NHD 1 stock trip at any one time will be allowed in the area, including day use. Other Cedar Mesa canyons allow 1 overnight stock trip at any one time, and unlimited day use.	X				
<i>Overnight Stock Use Areas</i>						
REC-88	Kane Gulch, Collins Canyon, Government Trail, Grand Gulch from Kane Gulch to Collins Canyon, Fish Creek Canyon from Comb Wash to confluence with Owl Canyon, Mule Canyon South of U-95, Road Canyon, Lime Creek Canyon, Johns Canyon, and Arch Canyon.	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
<i>Areas Closed to Stock Use</i>						
REC-89	Grand Gulch below Collins Canyon, all the Slickhorn Canyons, Mule Canyons north of U-95, Bullet Canyon above Jailhouse Ruin, Fish Creek Canyon from 2 miles upstream from Fish Creek and Owl Creek confluence, and Owl Canyon above Nevill's Arch.	X				
<i>Use Limitations</i>						
REC-90	Stock use, both day and overnight, is subject to the provisions of the Grand Gulch Plateau Cultural and Recreation Management Plan, which allows for no more than 1 overnight stock party at a time in any canyon on Cedar Mesa. However, Grand Gulch is limited to only one stock trip at any time, day or overnight. Stock day use will be limited to 1 party per day per trailhead in all canyons requiring permits (except Grand Gulch and McLoyd). The BLM will monitor day use, and reserves the right to implement a day-use allocation and reservation system at a future date, if the impacts of day-use visitation warrant.	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
Group Size						
REC-91	Overnight and day use in the Grand Gulch Primitive area and other Cedar Mesa Canyons is restricted to 12 individuals and 8 animals (pack and/or saddle).		X			"Grand Gulch Primitive area..." Consider amending "Primitive area" to "Instant Study Area" since Grand Gulch is no longer a primitive area.
Feed						
REC-92	Stock users are required to take all feed (non-germinating, certified weed free) necessary to sustain their animals while on the trip.	X				
Loose Herding						
REC-93	Loose herding of pack and saddle stock is prohibited. All stock must be under physical control. When tethered, all stock must be at least 200 feet away from any water source and archaeological sites and their surrounding benches.	X				
No New Trails						
REC-94	In permitted canyons, no new trails will be established for stock use. Use is restricted to existing trails and routes in areas open to recreational stock use.	X				
REC-95, -	<i>Note: There are no REC-95, REC-96, or</i>					Recommend renumbering.

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
96, -97	<i>REC-97 decisions in the Final Plan.</i>					
<i>Mesa Top Camping</i>						
REC-98	Vehicle camping is limited along designated routes to designated primitive vehicle campsites.	X				
REC-99	Designated campsites for large groups (20 to 24 people).	X				
REC-100	Group size is limited to 24 people for both private and commercial use.	X				
REC-101	Closure of campsites impacting cultural sites.	X				
REC-102	<i>Note: There is no REC-102 decision in the Final Plan.</i>					Deleted by plan maintenance 4/4/2009. Recommend renumbering.
REC-103	14-day camping limit within any 28 consecutive days, with the options of reducing the number of days or closing campsites if impacts occur.	X				
<i>In Canyon Private/Commercial Day Use</i>						
REC-104	<i>Private</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limit of 12 people per day per trailhead. • Group size limited to 12. • A limited day use permit system will be implemented as necessary to protect cultural and other 		X			Update wording of decision to reflect the direction provided in REC-109.

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	resources.					
REC-105	<p><u>Commercial</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Group size limited to 12. • One commercial group per day per trailhead. • Implement additional restrictions on group size and visitor frequency (based on monitoring of impact) as necessary to protect cultural or other resources. • Advanced permit required through Monticello PA. 		X			Change PA to “Field Office.”
REC-106	<p><u><i>In Canyon Overnight Camping</i></u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pack it in, pack it out. All cans, trash, organic garbage, and burnable refuse including toilet paper must be carried out. Liquid garbage may be discarded 200 feet away from water sources. Dish water must be strained and discarded 200 feet from camps, trails, and water sources. • No swimming or bathing is allowed in the pools. • Commercial allocation is 30% of 		X			<p>Change to read, “Commercial allocation is limited to no more than 30% of the Cedar Mesa permitted use.”</p> <p>Change to “assigned campsites” instead of “designated campsites,” in 4th bullet. Change to “will not have assigned” instead of “will not have designated” in 5th bullet.</p>

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<p>the Cedar Mesa permitted use.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Designated campsites for large groups of 8–12 people, and for groups with stock animals. • Groups of 1–7 people will not have designated campsites and will camp in dispersed campsites. • In canyon camping could be limited to certain designated areas if resource or cultural damage occurs. • If human waste becomes a problem, a requirement to carry out waste may be implemented. • Total caps on visitor numbers for each trailhead are shown below. Caps on visitor numbers or group size may be modified as necessary to protect resources. 					
REC-107	<p><u>Private</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Private group size limited to 8 people per day per trailhead for overnight trips. 		X			Decision was corrected to 12 people per day per trailhead for overnight trips per Maintenance Change #96 (2010) and needs to be reflected in the current

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
						RMP version.
REC-108	<p><u>Commercial</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Commercial group size limited to 12 people per day per trailhead. • One commercial group per trailhead per day. • Commercial guides are required to meet all pertinent state guidelines. 	X				
REC-109	<p><u>Trailhead Allocations</u></p> <p>Total overnight visitors per day:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Kane 20 • Bullet 20 • Government 20 • Collins 20 • Fish/Owl 20 • Road Canyon 20 • Lime Creek 20 • Mule Canyons 20 • Slickhorn Canyons 20 <p>If commercial cap limits are not met on a given day, additional private visitors will be allowed provided the overall cap of 20 people per trailhead is not exceeded.</p>	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
------------	----------	------------------	-----------------	---------------	---------------------	---------

<i>Cedar Mesa SRMA Grand Gulch NHD Recreation Management Zone (RMZ)</i>						
REC-110	<p>This area is a RMZ within the SRMA due to its high level of backcountry use and the potential to impact the high density world renowned cultural resources in this area. Restrictions and management prescriptions are intended to minimize conflict between this use and cultural resources. The following management prescriptions apply in this RMZ:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Grand Gulch National Historic District is within a WSA and is managed under the IMP. • In addition to the management prescriptions described above for the Cedar Mesa SRMA, Grand Gulch National Historic District (37,388 acres) is managed with the following prescriptions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Unavailable for geophysical activities. - Recommended for withdrawal from locatable mineral entry. - Unavailable for private 		X			Update IMP to new wilderness manuals: MS-6330, MS-6340.

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<p>and/or commercial use of woodland products, except for limited on-site collection of dead wood for campfires.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Campfires limited to mesa tops only (no campfires in the canyon). - Available for livestock grazing, except Grand Gulch Canyon and associated tributaries, below Kane Gulch fence to the confluence with the San Juan River (approximately 16,316 acres). - Closed to OHV use. - Designate trails and camping areas as necessary to protect cultural resources. - If cultural or natural resources or the visitors' experiences are impacted, pets and or stock animals 					

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<p>may be limited or prohibited in canyons requiring permits.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Non-motorized habitat improvements, watershed improvements, vegetation treatments, including aerial seeding, hand reseeding, planting seedlings, and control of invasive non-native species are allowed as long as they will not impact cultural resources based on a site-specific analysis, and are consistent with the IMP. - Limitations on numbers of trips may be implemented if cultural resources are impacted. 					
<i>Cedar Mesa SRMA Comb Ridge Recreation Management Zone</i>						
REC-111	This area is a RMZ within the SRMA due to easy vehicular accessibility, high level of visitation and popularity, and density of significant cultural ruins and rock art. Specific management is needed to resolve conflicts between	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	recreation use and protection of cultural resources. The objective is to manage for heritage tourism and traditional cultural values in a regulated manner.					
REC-112	The Cedar Mesa SRMA limitations described above for Mesa Top Day Use, Mesa Top Camping, In Canyon Private/Commercial Day Use, and In Canyon Permitted Overnight Camping do not apply to the Comb Ridge RMZ.	X				
REC-113	<p>The following management prescriptions apply in this RMZ:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Manage as VRM Class II • Unavailable for geophysical exploration • Oil and gas leasing subject to NSO • Closed to disposal of mineral materials • ROW avoidance area • OHVs limited to designated routes • Campfires allowed at designated sites only • Private and commercial group size limited to 12 people • Comb Wash campground will be 		X			<p>Clarify: in 8th bullet, private and commercial group size limited to 12 people <i>at a time</i> (not per day). This limit does not apply to State Highways, Class B roads, and developed campsites.</p> <p>In second from last bullet, change reference to designated parking areas to <i>established</i> parking areas.</p> <p>In last bullet, potentially change 8 person private group size limit in Butler</p>

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<p>developed</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In camp areas without toilets, human waste must be packed out • Closed to dispersed camping • Camping limited to designated camp areas and campgrounds, with designated access routes and parking • A permit system will be established for day and overnight use if necessary to protect cultural resources • Trails from parking areas to cultural sites will be designated and signed • Parking for day use is limited to designated areas • In the Butler Wash area, overnight private group size is limited to 8 people and primitive camp sites will be designated 					<p>Wash to 12 people (what is the justification for 8?).</p> <p>Update wording for disposal of mineral materials from “closed” to “unavailable” for consistency with other sections/decisions (the meaning is the same).</p>
REC-114	<p>Butler Wash, if necessary, will be managed as part of the existing Cedar Mesa permits and regulation system, including regulations and permit fees. Groups will view a low impact video at Kane Gulch or Sand Island Ranger</p>	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	Stations when obtaining a permit.					
<i>Cedar Mesa SRMA McLoyd Canyon–Moon House Recreation Management Zone</i>						
REC-115	McLoyd Canyon–Moon House (1,607 acres) is a RMZ within the SRMA due to its accessibility and the unique architecture of the Moon House ruin. From a scientific perspective, Moon House ruin is world renowned, unique to the region, and is a significant cultural treasure. Restrictions and management prescriptions are intended to minimize conflict between recreational use and cultural resources.	X				
REC-116	The Cedar Mesa SRMA limitations described above for Mesa Top Day Use, Mesa Top Camping, In Canyon Private/Commercial Day Use, and In Canyon Permitted Overnight Camping will not be applied to the McLoyd Canyon–Moon House RMZ.	X				
REC-117	This RMZ occurs within the Fish Creek Canyon WSA and is managed under the IMP. In addition to this management, the following prescriptions will apply: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Closed to OHV use. 		X			Update IMP to new wilderness manuals: MS-6330, MS-6340. In bullet 7, remove word “be” from statement and

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop a cultural resource management plan (CRMP) for McLoyd Canyon–Moon House. • Public access limited via a permit system for day visits. • No more than 36 people allowed to visit Moon House per day. Limitations on visitation may change based on site monitoring of impacts of visitation. • One commercial group per day. The number of people is included in the day use number of 36. • Access to the interior corridor of Moon House ruin is limited to 4 people at any one time. • Visitors are be allowed to enter the Moon Room and adjoining rooms within Moon House ruin. • Human waste must be packed out. • Camping limited only to the designated primitive camp and park area south of the Snow Flat Road. Camping prohibited outside of this primitive camp area. • Hiking to Moon House site is 					change to “not.”

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<p>limited to the designated trail. Hiking to other sites in the RMZ may also be limited to designated trails if determined necessary.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RMZ is closed to pack animals and pets. • Campfires are not allowed. • Unavailable for private and/or commercial use of woodland products, including on-site collection of dead wood for campfires. • McLoyd Canyon is closed to overnight use from the head of the canyon to UTM: 607100E, 4143495N. • Acquire Utah State Section Township 39S Range 19E, Section 2. • Develop a site stewardship program to monitor site and possibly develop guided tours. 					
<i>Dark Canyon SRMA</i>						
REC-118	Create and allocate an interagency permit and fee system for these canyons as necessary to preserve	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	resources and the visitor experience.					
REC-119	The 1991 Canyon Basins SRMA is dissolved and three new SRMAs are created: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dark Canyon SRMA • Indian Creek SRMA • Beef Basin SRMA. 	X				
REC-120	The Dark Canyon SRMA (Map 9) includes canyon rims and bottoms for Dark Canyon, Gypsum Canyon, Bowdie Canyon, Lean To Canyon, Palmer Canyon, Lost Canyon, Black Steer Canyon, Young's Canyon, and Fable Valley Canyon. Trailheads and associated parking/camping areas are included within the SRMA boundaries where the canyons are specified as the SRMA.	X				
REC-121	The Dark Canyon WSA overlays the SRMA and will be managed according to the IMP.		X			Update IMP to new wilderness manuals: MS-6330, MS-6340.
REC-122	The SRMA is unavailable for livestock grazing in the canyons and available to livestock grazing on mesa tops.	X				
REC-123	An Interagency Management Plan will be written in coordination with the	X				Interagency Management Plan has not yet been

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	contiguous NPS and USFS agencies.					written.
REC-124	<p>Dark Canyon SRMA (30,820 acres) (Map 9) is managed with the following prescriptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Group size is limited to 18 people for private and commercial. • Three commercial trips are allowed per week. • Up to twenty total private users allowed per day. This number may be altered depending upon future visitor impacts. • If and where necessary, camping will be restricted to designated sites only. • Campfires are allowed on mesa tops. Cook stoves only in canyons. • Unavailable for private and/or commercial collection of woodland product use, except for the on-site collection of dead wood for campfires on mesa tops. • If human waste becomes a problem, carrying out waste may be implemented in canyon. • Pets are allowed on leash and 		X			<p>Move acreage to top of Dark Canyon section.</p> <p>In 1st bullet, change group size limit to 15 to be consistent with USFS. This change should have been 15 from the start so this change still falls under plan maintenance.</p> <p>In 2nd bullet, clarify that “per week” means “per seven day period.”</p> <p>In 3rd bullet, clarify what is meant by twenty total private users per day without a permit system.</p>

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<p>under physical control.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Closed to OHV use. 					
Indian Creek SRMA						
REC-125	The 1991 Canyon Basins SRMA is dissolved and three new SRMAs are created: the Indian Creek SRMA, the Dark Canyon SRMA, and the Beef Basin SRMA. Management prescriptions for the Indian Creek SRMA.		X			<p>Add Indian Creek SRMA acreage before REC-125.</p> <p>Remove “Management prescriptions for the Indian Creek SRMA” because it is a fragment.</p>
REC-126	<i>Note: there is no REC-126 decision in the Final Plan.</i>					Deleted by plan maintenance 1/26/2009. Recommend renumbering.
REC-127	Indian Creek SRMA (Map 9) matches the boundary of the Indian Creek Corridor Plan (EA UT – 090-00-47, 2005) and includes all of the Indian Creek and Bridger Jack Mesa WSAs and Shay Canyon, Lavender Mesa and Indian Creek ACECs. WSAs are managed under the IMP and ACECs and remaining areas will be managed in accordance with management prescriptions outlined below.		X			Update IMP to new wilderness manuals: MS-6330, MS-6340.
REC-128	Indian Creek SRMA boundary matches the boundary for the Indian Creek	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<p>Corridor Plan (EA UT-090-00-47, BLM 2005). Management of the Indian Creek Corridor will be in conformance with the decisions outlined in the Indian Creek Corridor Plan, which includes the following guidelines:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Camping is prohibited in the Indian Creek riparian corridor from Newspaper Rock to approximately 1 mile downstream of the Dugout Ranch. • Camp sites will be removed from the Newspaper Rock area and rehabilitated. • A picnic area will be constructed adjacent to the Newspaper Rock parking area. • Camping along the Bridger Jack Mesa Bench is limited to designated sites. • A new campground called Shay Mountain Vista Campground will be constructed. • The area is unavailable for private and/or commercial use of woodland products, including on- 					

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<p>site collection of dead wood for campfires. Campers must bring in their own wood for campfires.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Campfires are restricted to fire rings where fire rings are available. In dispersed camping areas, where fire rings are not available, campfires are subject to "Leave No Trace" standards. No campfires are allowed in the Lavender Mesa ACEC. • Rock-climbing routes in conflict with cultural sites will be closed. • Camping fees will be charged if deemed necessary to provide needed facilities and services. • Parking areas will be developed. • Additional camping stipulations and regulations could be implemented if monitoring data shows this is necessary. • If new climbing routes are established, the BLM may designate a footpath to access the base of the climb to protect wildlife/raptors. 					

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
REC-129	Dispersed camping is allowed in the Indian Creek Corridor, except within the established designated camping zones: Bridger Jack Mesa, Indian Creek Falls, and Creek Pasture. Camping within these zones is limited to designated sites.		X			Remove Creek Pasture since it is now a developed campground.
REC-130	Where dispersed vehicle camping is allowed, it is restricted to previously disturbed areas within 150 feet of designated routes.	X				
REC-131	Within the Shay Canyon ACEC portion of the SRMA, the ACEC prescriptions require that hiking be limited to designated trails, except within the side canyons, and camping and campfires are not allowed.	X				
White Canyon SRMA						
REC-132	White Canyon SRMA (2,828 acres) (Map 9) is managed with the following management prescriptions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A backcountry allocated permit system will be established as necessary to protect resources. • If human waste becomes a problem, carrying out waste may be implemented in the canyon. 		X			Move acreage from REC-132 to beginning of section.

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Campfires are not allowed in the canyons. Cook stoves only in canyons. • Managed as VRM Class I and II. • OHV use closed and limited to designated routes • Unavailable and CSU (site-specific) for oil and gas leasing. 					
REC-133	Trailheads and associated parking/camping areas are included within the SRMA boundary where the canyons are specified as the SRMA. The White Canyon SRMA is defined as from rim to rim.	X				
REC-134	Canyons are excluded from woodland product use including on-site collection of dead wood for campfires.	X				
REC-135	The Cheesebox Canyon WSA overlays a portion of the White Canyon SRMA; this area is managed in accordance with the IMP.		X			Update IMP to new wilderness manuals: MS-6330, MS-6340.
<i>Tank Bench SRMA</i>						
REC-136	Tank Bench SRMA (2,646 acres) (Map 9) is managed with the following prescriptions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dispersed hiking allowed; not 		X			Move acreage to beginning of section. Update wording for

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<p>limited to designated trails.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Area will remain open to domestic pets and pack animals but use may be limited if damage is occurring to cultural resources. • Commercial group size limited to 12 people. • Closed to OHV use. • Livestock use will continue but it may be limited if cultural resources are impacted. • Available for range, wildlife habitat, watershed improvements, vegetation treatments, and other surface-disturbing land treatments if consistent with management plan objectives. • Campfires allowed. • Closed to private and/or commercial use of woodland products (including on-site collection of dead wood for campfires) with the exception of traditional Native American cultural uses, as long as they do not adversely impact other resource 					<p>disposal of mineral materials from “open” to “available” for consistency with other sections/decisions (the meaning is the same).</p>

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<p>values.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Open to disposal of mineral materials and geophysical work. • Available for oil and gas leasing, subject to standard lease terms. • Manage as VRM Class III and IV. 					
REC-137	The BLM will complete a joint recreation/cultural resources management plan (CRMP) for this area based on the RMP.		X			Consistency with acronym CRMP needed to clarify joint recreation-cultural management plans or solely cultural management plans.
<i>Beef Basin SRMA</i>						
REC-138	<p>Beef Basin SRMA (20,302 acres) (Map 9) is managed with the following prescriptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Available for private and/or commercial use of woodland products (including on-site collection of dead wood for campfires). • Open to disposal of mineral materials under special conditions. • Available for oil and gas leasing subject to timing limitations. • Livestock use will continue but may be limited if cultural resources 		X			<p>“Cultural site visitation limited to designated trails.” There are no designated trails so unsure how this can be implemented.</p> <p>Update wording for disposal of mineral materials from “open” to “available” for consistency with other sections/decisions (the meaning is the same).</p>

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<p>are impacted.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Available for range, wildlife habitat, watershed improvements, vegetation treatments and other surface-disturbing land treatments if consistent with management plan objectives. • OHV use limited to designated routes. • A car campground will be developed in Ruin Park for primitive camping. • Primitive car camping areas will be designated in Middle Park, House Park, and along Beef Basin Loop Road, as well as other areas as necessary to control impacts to cultural resources. • Until primitive camping areas are designated in this area, dispersed vehicle camping will be allowed in previously disturbed areas within 150 feet of designated routes. • Campfires are allowed and are restricted to fire rings where fire rings are available. In dispersed 					

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<p>camping areas, where fire rings are not available, campfires are subject to "Leave No Trace" standards.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dispersed campsites that impact archaeological sites will be closed. • Cultural site visitation limited to designated trails. • Groups larger than 20 people total are required to camp in designated areas. Human waste must be packed out. • Manage as VRM Class III. 					
REC-139	The BLM will work with the USFS and NPS to develop interagency recreation commercial permits.	X				
REC-140	The BLM will complete a joint recreation/cultural resources management plan (CRMP) for the area based on the RMP.		X			Consistency with acronym CRMP needed to clarify joint recreation-cultural management plans or solely cultural management plans.
<i>Extensive Recreation Management Areas (ERMA)</i>						
REC-141	ERMA lands are managed to provide an undeveloped setting where visitors can disperse and recreate in a generally unregulated manner, as long as the use	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	is consistent with other resource values.					
REC-142	Manage all lands within the PA, not within an SRMA (either initially or through subsequent action as described above) as the Monticello Extensive Recreation Management Area	X				
REC-143	Any portions of an ERMA subject to other management prescriptions (i.e., ACEC, WSA, etc.) will be managed according to those prescriptions.	X				
REC-144	Monitor the ERMA to determine if more intensive recreational management is required to protect resource values and preserve the recreational experience.	X				
REC-145	Encourage "Leave No Trace" and "Tread Lightly" principles throughout the ERMA.	X				
REC-146	ERMA lands may be designated as SRMAs in the future based on intensity of use and will be analyzed through the plan amendment process.	X				
REC-147	Minimal facilities may be constructed in the ERMA as needed to insure visitor health and safety, reduce user conflict, and protect resources.	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
REC-148	<p>Mesa Top Camping (other than Cedar Mesa):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limit the Bears Ears Road to designated camping only from the intersection of Highway 275 to the USFS boundary. • Limit the Deer Flat Road to designated camping only for the first 4 miles from Highway 275. • Coordinate with Glen Canyon National Recreation Area on building a campground at Muley Point or pursue a land exchange for Muley Point in order to develop a campground. 	X				
REC-149	<p>Within the ERMA, dispersed vehicle camping is allowed only in previously disturbed areas within 150 feet of designated routes (on each side of a centerline). If use is such that undue environmental impacts are taking place, BLM will close and rehabilitate damaged areas. This use will not include areas within WSAs (389,444 acres) or non-WSA areas with wilderness characteristics (88,871</p>	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	acres), WSR corridors, ACECs, or T&E/special status species habitats. Where monitoring identifies resource impacts, future implementation level plans could consider designation of specific camp sites.					
RIP-1	Public lands are managed in accordance with laws, executive orders, and regulations on floodplain and wetland areas to reduce resource loss from floods and erosion.	X				
RIP-2	The BLM will take appropriate actions to maintain water quality in streams within Monticello PA to meet state and federal water quality standards, including designated beneficial uses and anti-degradation requirements.	X				
RIP-3	Oil and gas leasing is NSO in riparian areas. Although oil and gas activity must also meet this standard, an NSO lease stipulation is not necessary since this can be accomplished under the terms of the standard lease form because of the 200 meter/60-day rule. (The 200 meter/60-day rule is the BLM regulation at 43 CFR 3101.1-2 that allows, at a minimum, for the	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	relocation of proposed oil and gas leasing operations up to 200 meters and/or timing limitations up to 60 days to provide additional protection to ensure that proposed operations minimize adverse impacts to resources, uses, and users.)					
RIP-4	The BLM will follow Utah's Standards for Rangeland Health and Guidelines for Grazing and Recreation Management (BLM 1997) to achieve riparian PFC.		X			Change BLM 1997 to Appendix F.
RIP-5	No new surface-disturbing activities are allowed within active floodplains or within 100 meters of riparian areas unless it can be shown that: a) there are no practical alternatives or, b) all long-term impacts can be fully mitigated or, c) the activity will benefit and enhance the riparian area.	X				
RIP-6	BLM guidelines will be followed as appropriate for managing riparian areas (See Technical Reference 1737-6: Riparian Area Management as amended) and Utah Riparian Management Policy.	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
RIP-7	All floodplains and riparian/aquatic areas are managed in accordance with Executive Orders 11988 and 11990, Sections 303 and 404 of the Clean Water Act, the Endangered Species Act, the BLM Riparian Area Management Policy, and the Utah guidelines for implementing BLM riparian area management policy.	X				
RIP-8	<p>Floodplains and riparian/aquatic areas are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Subject to fire suppression to protect riparian habitat. • Excluded from private and/or commercial use of woodland products, except for Native American traditional purposes as determined on a site-specific basis; limited on-site collection of dead wood for campfires is allowed as per Woodlands section. • Available for habitat, range, and watershed improvements and vegetation treatments described in 2007 Vegetation EIS. • Excluded from surface disturbance 	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	by mechanized or motorized equipment (except as allowed above) and from structural development (unless there is no practical alternative or the development will enhance riparian/aquatic values).					
RIP-9	Unnecessary multiple social foot trails in riparian/floodplain areas will be minimized. Social foot trails in Road Canyon, Fish Creek, and Mule Canyon will be closed to protect riparian resources.	X				
RIP-10	The BLM will follow/implement the Southwest Willow Flycatcher Recovery Plan as appropriate.	X				
RIP-11	Monitoring and management strategies and restrictions will be developed as necessary to meet or maintain PFC.	X				
RIP-12	Cottonwood and willow harvest are allowed for Native American ceremonial uses only, through a permit system. Restrictions on this harvest will be implemented as necessary to achieve or maintain PFC.	X				
RIP-13	No camping is allowed within 200 feet	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	of isolated springs or water sources.					
RIP-14	Close Harts Canyon from private land (Seeps) to Yancy's Fence (T30S, R22E, Section 8) to OHV and mechanized use. Close routes in other selected riparian areas considered Functioning at Risk if site-specific analysis determines that OHV use is contributing to riparian degradation.	X				Closed. Not part of travel plan.
RIP-15	Restrict Harts Canyon, Shay Canyon ACEC and Indian Creek from Kelly Ranch vicinity to Forest Service to livestock trailing only, no grazing. Moki Canyon and Lake Canyon are restricted to trailing only, except in the spring and fall for up to 1 to 2 weeks to gather livestock prior to moving to and from these areas.	X				Ties in with similar GRA management actions.
RIP-16	Develop seasonal restrictions, closures, and/or forage utilization limits on grazing in riparian areas considered Functioning at Risk.		X			Add "and/or Non-functional" to be in accord with GRA-22.
RIP-17	Temporarily close riparian areas considered Functioning at Risk to dispersed motorized camping until PFC is restored.	X				Have not yet needed to implement.

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
<i>Pipeline Crossings</i>						
RIP-18	Pipeline crossings of perennial, intermittent, and ephemeral stream channels should be constructed to withstand 100-year floods to prevent breakage and subsequent accidental contamination of runoff during high-flow events. Surface crossings must be constructed high enough to remain above stream flows at each crossing, and subsurface crossings must be buried deep enough to remain undisturbed by scour throughout passage of the peak flow. Hydraulic analysis will be completed in the design phase by the project proponent to eliminate potential environmental degradation associated with pipeline breaks at stream crossings to avoid repeated maintenance of such crossings. Specific recommendations regarding surface and subsurface crossings are found in guidance for pipeline crossings (Appendix L).	X				
SOLW-1	Manage all floodplains and riparian/wetlands in accordance with Executive Orders 11988 and 11990,	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	Sections 303 and 404 of the Clean Water Act, and the Endangered Species Act.					
SOLW-2	Maintain satisfactory watershed conditions as indicated by maintenance of riparian PFC and Utah Standards and Guidelines for Rangeland Health (BLM 1991) (Appendix F) and Guidelines for Recreation Management for BLM Lands in Utah (Appendix K).		X			Drop outdated BLM 1991 reference and cite Appendix F only.
SOLW-3	Manage public lands consistent with the Colorado River Salinity Control Act.	X				
SOLW-4	Comply with Utah's state water quality standards.	X				
SOLW-5	Collaborate with San Juan County, the State of Utah, tribal governments, and local municipalities on management of municipal watersheds to meet local needs.	X				
SOLW-6	Maintain or improve soil quality and long-term soil productivity through the implementation of Standards for Rangeland Health and Guidelines for Grazing Management (BLM 1997) and other soil protection measures.		X			Change BLM 1997 to Appendix F.
SOLW-7	Manage uses to minimize and mitigate	X				BMPs and COAs in an

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	damage to soils.					APD would address this action.
SOLW-8	Maintain and/or restore overall watershed health and reduce erosion, stream sedimentation, and salinization of water.	X				BMPs and COAs in an APD would address this action.
<i>Watershed Health</i>						
SOLW-9	Modify the BMPs and vegetation management as appropriate to meet water quality standards and maintain watershed function (Montezuma Creek, Indian Creek [the USFS boundary to Newspaper Rock], Johnson Creek [and tributaries from confluence with Recapture Creek to headwaters], and Recapture Reservoir).		X			Change “ <i>Modify</i> ” to “ <i>Implement</i> ” because BMPs are not definitive. Note: Arch Canyon was added to the 303d list ~ 2013.
SOLW-10	Assess watershed function using Utah's Standards for Rangeland Health, riparian PFC, and state water quality standards.	X				Ongoing process.
SOLW-11	Where Utah's Standards for Rangeland Health are not met due to the impairment of biological soil crusts, apply guidelines from Biological Soil Crusts: Ecology and Management (BLM 2001b, as revised), if consistent with the		X			Ongoing process or most current policy/guidance.

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	management decisions of this plan.					
SOLW-12	Reduce tamarisk where appropriate using allowable vegetation treatments (refer to vegetation section for treatment acreages).	X				Included in comprehensive FO Weed Management Plan.
<i>Sensitive Soils</i>						
SOLW-13	Any proposed activities that will be located in sensitive soils (e.g., hydric, saline, gypsiferous, or highly erodible soils), will incorporate BMPs and other mitigation measures to minimize soil erosion and maintain soil stability. Site-specific mitigation measures and other additional mitigation measures required to protect soil resources and maintain soil productivity, will be determined in site-specific NEPA analysis.	X				BMPs and COAs in an APD address this action.
<i>Steep Slopes</i>						
SOLW-14	If surface-disturbing activities cannot be avoided on slopes between 21% and 40%, an erosion control plan will be required. The plan must be approved by the BLM prior to construction and maintenance and include the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> An erosion control strategy 	X				Currently have an Oil and Gas Lease CSU Stipulation to address this.

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The BLM accepted and/or approved survey and design 					
SOLW-15	For slopes greater than 40%, no surface disturbance is allowed unless it is determined that it will cause undue or unnecessary degradation to pursue other placement alternatives. An erosion control plan is required.	X				Currently have an Oil and Gas Lease CSU Stipulation to address this.
<i>ALKALI RIDGE ACEC—Relevant and Important Value: Cultural Resources</i>						
ACEC-1	Alkali Ridge is designated as an ACEC (39,196 acres) (Map 11).	X				
ACEC-2	Where the BLM authorized officer determines that avoidance of direct and indirect impacts to historic properties is not feasible (e.g., avoidance may cause unacceptable damage to other public land resources or affect valid existing rights) and adverse effects may occur, the BLM will resolve those effects through development of appropriate mitigation measures and consultation under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act as outlined in the regulations at 36 CFR 800. Regardless of the situation, BLM will comply with laws, rules and regulations	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	related to the management of cultural resources.					
ACEC-3	<p>Additional measures such as fencing, camouflaging, sound muffling, etc. may be necessary to further avoid indirect and direct impacts caused by surface-disturbing activities.</p> <p>Management will emphasize maintaining the relevant and important cultural and historic values within the ACEC. When siting facilities, the primary objective will be avoidance of direct and indirect impacts to resources on, or eligible for listing on, the NRHP (historic properties). Avoidance may require that a facility be moved farther than allowed under standard lease terms and conditions. Siting may require coordination among the BLM, State Historic Preservation Officer, and Utah Division of Oil Gas and Mining to ensure consistency with all applicable well spacing requirements.</p>	X				
ACEC-4	All cultural properties eligible for the	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	NRHP will be surrounded by an avoidance area sufficient to allow permanent protection.					
ACEC-5	In any given situation, mitigation will be designed to fit the specific circumstances and reviewed by the SHPO and if necessary, the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation.	X				
ACEC-6	The area is available for geophysical exploration.	X				
ACEC-7	The area is available for the disposal of mineral materials.	X				
ACEC-8	The area is available for locatable mineral entry with an approved plan of operations.	X				
ACEC-9	The area will be retained in public ownership and not classified, segregated, or withdrawn from entry.	X				
ACEC-10	Campfires are allowed.	X				
ACEC-11	The area is available for wildlife habitat improvements.	X				
ACEC-12	A Cultural CRMP consistent with the goals and objectives of this RMP will be written for Alkali Ridge ACEC and will not require a plan amendment to the	X				Has not yet been completed.

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	RMP.					
ACEC-13	The area is available for watershed improvements.	X				
ACEC-14	The area is available for private and/or commercial use of woodland products, of which access will be limited only to designated routes. If woodland product use is impacting cultural resources, woodland product use may be confined to specific areas within Alkali Ridge.	X				
ACEC-15	Livestock may be restricted if cultural resources are being impacted.	X				
ACEC-16	The area is managed as VRM Class III.	X				
ACEC-17	The area is available for mineral leasing under controlled surface use.	X				
ACEC-18	The area is available for vegetation treatments. Access routes used for vegetation treatments will be reclaimed to prevent future use. Non-surface-disturbing treatments will be preferred.	X				
ACEC-19	The appropriate management response for wildland fire will be in accordance with the Moab District Fire Plan.	X				
ACEC-20	OHV use is limited to designated roads and trails.	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
<i>Alkali Ridge National Historic Landmark</i>						
ACEC-21	<p>Alkali Ridge National Historic Landmark (contained within the Alkali Ridge ACEC) (2,146 acres), is managed according to the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Available for oil and gas leasing subject to NSO. • All mechanized/motorized traffic limited to designated routes. • Campfires not allowed. • Unavailable for private and/or commercial use of woodland products including on-site collection of dead wood for campfires. • Available for watershed improvements. • Appropriate Management Response to fire in accordance with the Moab District Fire Plan. • Open to livestock use with restrictions if cultural resources become impacted. • No surface-disturbing vegetation treatments are allowed. Any 		X			<p>Change 9th bullet to: Available for geophysical exploration “subject to NSO as described in Appendix B and the NSO definition on page 174. Specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No motorized vehicle (including but not limited to ATVs, vibroseis and drill buggies) operation would be approved. • The use of heliportable drill rigs and recording equipment supported by crews on foot could be approved.” <p>Add reference to Map 20.</p> <p>Consider moving this decision to the Cultural</p>

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<p>treatment must avoid cultural sites by sufficient margin as to have no adverse impact.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Available for geophysical exploration that meets the definition of "casual use" as defined 43 CFR 3150.b) <i>Casual use</i> means activities that involve practices which do not ordinarily lead to any appreciable disturbance or damage to lands, resources and improvements. For example, activities which do not involve use of heavy equipment or explosives and which do not involve vehicular movement, except over established roads and trails are casual use. • Unavailable for disposal of mineral materials. • Recommended for withdrawal from locatable mineral entry. • Surface disturbance allowed for emergency fire suppression. • Recreation use limited if cultural resources become impacted. 					<p>section (if not referenced in Cultural section already).</p>

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Climbing aids such as ropes are not allowed for access into cultural sites/ruins. • ROW avoidance area. • Managed as VRM Class III. 					
<i>BRIDGER JACK MESA (Mesa Top Only) ACEC – Relevant and Important Value: Near Relict Vegetation</i>						
ACEC-22	Bridger Jack Mesa ACEC lies entirely within a WSA and is managed under the IMP, unless more restrictive management is prescribed. Management under the IMP will provide for the protection for near-relict vegetation.		X			<p>Update IMP to new wilderness manuals: MS-6330, MS-6340.</p> <p>Clarify that Bridger Jack Mesa, which is comprised only of the top of the mesa, is a WSA, not an ACEC. Consider moving decision to a new WSA section.</p>
ACEC-23	<p>Bridger Jack Mesa is not designated as an ACEC. Bridger Jack Mesa WSA is managed according to the IMP, except for the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unavailable for livestock grazing, including grazing by saddle stock and pack animals allowed for access. 		X			<p>Update IMP to new wilderness manuals: MS-6330, MS-6340.</p> <p>Clarify that Bridger Jack Mesa, which is comprised only of the top of the mesa, is a WSA, not an ACEC.</p>

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unavailable for private and/or commercial use of woodland products, including on-site collection of dead wood for campfires. • Campfires are restricted to fire rings, where available. If not available, subject to “Leave No Trace” principles. • Bridger Jack Mesa area is managed as part of the Indian Creek Special Recreation Management Area (SRMA) described in the Recreation section of this Chapter. 					Consider moving decision to a new WSA section.
<i>BUTLER WASH NORTH ACEC – Relevant and Important Value: Scenic</i>						
ACEC-24	Butler Wash North ACEC lies within the Butler Wash WSA and is managed under the IMP, unless more restrictive management is prescribed. Management under the IMP will provide for the protection of scenic values.		X			Update IMP to new wilderness manuals: MS-6330, MS-6340. Clarify that Butler Wash North is a WSA, not an ACEC. Consider moving decision to a new WSA section.
ACEC-25	Butler Wash North area is not		X			Update IMP to new wilderness manuals: MS-

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	designated as an ACEC but is managed under the IMP. Management prescriptions include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Retained in public ownership. • Unavailable for private and/or commercial use of woodland products, with the exception of limited on-site collection of dead wood for campfires. • Available for livestock use but may be limited if cultural resources are impacted. • Closed to OHV use. • Managed as VRM Class I. 					6330, MS-6340. Clarify that Butler Wash North is a WSA, not an ACEC. Consider moving decision to a new WSA section.
ACEC-26	<i>Note: There is no ACEC-26 decision in the Final Plan.</i>					Deleted by plan maintenance 1/26/2009. Recommend renumbering.
<i>CEDAR MESA ACEC – Relevant and Import Values: Fish and Wildlife, Cultural and Scenic</i>						
ACEC-27	Cedar Mesa area will not be designated as an ACEC.		X			Cedar Mesa decisions should not be listed under ACEC if not an ACEC (see p. 31-34). Recommend move to REC section since it will be managed as a SRMA.

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
ACEC-28	The area will be managed as a Special Recreation Management Area (SRMA) (407,098 acres) (Map 9) described in the Recreation section of this Chapter. It will include three Recreation Management Zones (RMZs) (Grand Gulch NHD, McLoyd Canyon- Moon House and Comb Ridge) that emphasize management of recreation users for the protection of cultural resources.		X			See REC-82. Recommend move to REC section since it will be managed as a SRMA.
<i>DARK CANYON ACEC – Relevant and Important Values: Scenic and Fish and Wildlife</i>						
ACEC-29	Dark Canyon ACEC lies entirely within the Dark Canyon WSA (Map 10) and partially within the Dark Canyon SRMA (Map 9). WSAs are managed under the IMP, unless more restrictive management is prescribed.		X			Update IMP to new wilderness manuals: MS-6330, MS-6340. Decisions should not be under ACEC section if not an ACEC.
ACEC-30	Dark Canyon is not managed as an ACEC. The ACEC lies entirely within the Dark Canyon WSA (Map 10) and is managed according to the IMP and the Dark Canyon SRMA management prescriptions outlined in the Recreation section of this chapter. The WSA and SRMA are closed to OHV use.		X			Update IMP to new wilderness manuals: MS-6330, MS-6340. Decisions should not be under ACEC section if not an ACEC.

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
<i>HOVENWEEP ACEC – Relevant and Important Values: Scenic, Habitat, and Cultural</i>						
ACEC-31	Hovenweep is designated as an ACEC (2,439 acres) (Map 11) with two special emphasis zones (Visual and Cajon Pond). This includes the 641 acres east of Hovenweep National Monument.	X				
<i>General Area Exclusive of Special Emphasis Zones</i>						
ACEC-32	Management will emphasize maintaining the relevant and important cultural and historic values. When siting facilities, the primary objective will be avoidance of direct and indirect impacts to resources on or eligible for listing on the NRHP (historic properties). Avoidance may require that a facility be moved farther than allowed under standard lease terms and conditions. Siting may require coordination among BLM, State Historic Preservation Officer, and Utah Division of Oil Gas and Mining to ensure consistency with all applicable well spacing requirements.	X				
ACEC-33	Where the BLM authorized officer determines that avoidance of direct and indirect impacts to historic properties is	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	not feasible (e.g., avoidance may cause unacceptable damage to other public land resources or affect valid existing rights) and adverse effects may occur, the BLM will resolve those effects through development of appropriate mitigation measures and consultation under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act as outlined in the regulations at 36 CFR 800.					
ACEC-34	Additional measures such as fencing, camouflaging, sound muffling, etc. may be necessary to further avoid indirect and direct impacts caused by surface-disturbing activities.	X				
ACEC-35	Cultural properties eligible for the NRHP will be surrounded by an avoidance area sufficient to allow permanent protection.	X				
ACEC-36	In any given case, mitigation will be designed to fit the specific circumstances and reviewed by the SHPO, and if necessary, the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation. A Hovenweep National Monument Cooperative Management Strategy	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	(1987) helps to guide site protection, data recovery, and all other necessary cultural management activities.					
ACEC-37	A Cultural CRMP consistent with the goals and objectives of this RMP will be written for Hovenweep ACEC, if necessary, and will not require a plan amendment to the RMP.	X				Has not yet been completed.
ACEC-38	The area is available for mineral leasing subject to moderate constraints (CSU).	X				
ACEC-39	The area is available for geophysical exploration.	X				
ACEC-40	The area is unavailable for disposal of mineral materials.	X				
ACEC-41	The appropriate management response for wildland fire will be in accordance with the Moab District Fire Plan.		X			Update “Moab District Fire Plan” to current title.
ACEC-42	The area is available for mineral entry with an approved plan of operation.	X				
ACEC-43	OHV use is limited to designated roads/trails.	X				
ACEC-44	The area is excluded from private or commercial use of woodland products, except for limited on-site collection of dead wood for campfires.	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
ACEC-45	Improvements for habitat, watershed and vegetation treatments could be considered.	X				
ACEC-46	Livestock use may be restricted if cultural resources are impacted.	X				
ACEC-47	The area is managed as VRM Class III.	X				
<i>Visual Emphasis Zone (880 acres)</i>						
ACEC-48	The Visual Emphasis Zone which surrounds the west, south, and east sides of Hovenweep National Monument, is managed in accordance with the general prescriptions and with the following special prescriptions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NSO for mineral leasing. • Excluded from watershed and vegetative treatments. • ROW avoidance area. • Managed as VRM Class II. • Livestock use may be restricted if cultural resources are impacted. 	X				
<i>Cajon Pond Emphasis Zone (Habitat)</i>						
ACEC-49	The Cajon Pond Emphasis Zone is approximately 1 acre within a fenced exclusion area in the northern part of the ACEC. It is managed in accordance	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<p>with the general prescriptions and with the following special prescriptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mineral leasing will also be in accordance with a controlled timing stipulation during the shorebird and waterfowl courtship and nesting season of March 1– June 30. • Excluded from livestock use. 					
ACEC-50	<p>Indian Creek (3,908 acres) (Map 11) is designated as an ACEC and is managed with the following prescriptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Managed as VRM Class I. • Available for mineral leasing subject to No Surface Occupancy (NSO). • Unavailable for disposal of mineral materials. • Available for geophysical work if VRM Class I can be met. • Unavailable for private and/or commercial use of woodland products, except for limited on-site collection of dead wood for campfires. 	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Available for livestock use. • Closed to OHV use. • All revegetation must be with native species naturally occurring in the vicinity. • Managed to limit recreation use if scenic values are being damaged. • Retained in public ownership. • ROW avoidance area. 					
LAVENDER MESA (Mesa Top Only) ACEC – Relevant and Important Value: Relict Vegetation						
ACEC-51	<p>Lavender Mesa (649 acres) (Map 11) will continue to be designated as an ACEC and will be managed with the following management prescriptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Managed to provide a baseline for rangeland studies through research and experiments. • Excluded from land treatments or other improvements, except for test plots and facilities necessary for study of the plant communities, and restoration/reclamation activities. • Managed as NSO for oil and gas leasing. 		X			<p>Update 14th bullet to clarify meaning (for example, remove “allowed for access”).</p> <p>Update wording for disposal of mineral materials from “closed” to “unavailable” for consistency with other sections/decisions (the meaning is the same).</p>

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Closed to disposal of mineral materials • Available for locatable mineral entry with an approved plan of operations, subject to stipulations protecting vegetation on the mesa top. • No campfires allowed. • Managed to limit recreation use if vegetation communities are being adversely impacted. • Geophysical exploration allowed if it does not adversely impact vegetation communities. • Managed as VRM Class II. • Helicopter access allowed for scientific study and heliportable equipment. • ROW avoidance area. • Retained in public ownership. • Excluded from private or commercial use of woodland products, including limited on-site collection of dead wood for campfires. • Unavailable for livestock 					

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<p>grazing, including grazing by saddle stock and pack animals allowed for access.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Excluded from wildlife habitat improvements. • Excluded from watershed control structures. • Appropriate management response to wildland fire in accordance with the Moab District Fire Plan. • Closed to OHV use. • Managed to limit recreation use if cultural resources or scenic values are being damaged. 					
ACEC-52	<p>Lockhart Basin is not designated as an ACEC. It is managed with the following prescriptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Available for mineral leasing subject to timing limitations and controlled surface use in Bighorn Sheep area, and Standard lease terms in remaining area. • Retained in public ownership. • Available for livestock use. • Managed as VRM Class I and II. • OHV use limited to designated 		X			<p>Lockhart Basin decisions should not be under ACEC section since it is not an ACEC. Potentially move to REC section.</p>

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<p>roads and trails</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Open for campfires. • Unavailable for woodland product use except for limited on-site collection of dead wood for campfires. • Where the ACEC intersects with the Colorado River Segment 2, it will be managed as VRM Class II, NSO for mineral leasing. • Where the ACEC intersects Colorado River Segment 3, it will be managed as VRM II, unavailable for mineral leasing, closed to OHV use, and recommended for withdrawal from locatable mineral entry. 					
<i>SAN JUAN RIVER ACEC – Relevant and Important Values: Scenic, Cultural, Fish and Wildlife, Natural Systems and Processes, and Geologic Features</i>						
ACEC-53	The San Juan River (4,321 acres) (Map 11) is designated as an ACEC. The acreage has been reduced to exclude San Juan River Segment 5 area, which was determined suitable for inclusion into the Wild and Scenic River system (see Wild and Scenic River section of this Chapter for	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<p>management prescriptions.) The ACEC will be managed with the following prescriptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Vehicle access, including OHVs/mechanized, limited to designated routes. • Unavailable for private and/or commercial use of woodland products except for limited on-site collection of dead wood for campfires; woodland use within the floodplain will be limited to collection of driftwood for campfires. • Available for livestock use October 1–May 31. Grazing must incorporate rest-rotation and/or deferred management systems. Riparian areas must meet or exceed PFC to the extent affected by grazing. • Available for watershed, range, wildlife habitat improvements and vegetation treatments. • West Montezuma Creek to Private land managed as VRM Class II. 					

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • West of accreted land at Town of Bluff to River mile 9 managed as VRM Class III. • River mile 9 to river mile 23 (above Mexican Hat formation) managed as VRM Class I. • River mile 23.8 to river mile 28 managed as VRM Class III. • Available for oil and gas leasing subject to NSO. • Unavailable for mineral material disposal. • Recommended for withdrawal from locatable mineral entry. • Managed to limit recreation use if wildlife values are being adversely impacted. • Camping closed in areas as necessary to protect cultural, wildlife, and natural processes. • Designated access trails to cultural sites as necessary to protect cultural resources. • No camping in cultural sites. • Ropes and other climbing aids not allowed for access to ruins, 					

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<p>cultural sites, and nesting raptors.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> All areas intersected by the San Juan River SRMA are ROW avoidance areas. Recreation management prescriptions identified under the San Juan River SRMA in the Recreation Section of this Chapter will also be followed and is consistent with the management outlined above. 					
ACEC-54	A Cultural Resources Management Plan will be written for the San Juan River.	X				Has not yet been completed.
<i>SCENIC HIGHWAY CORRIDOR ACEC – Relevant and Important Value: Scenic</i>						
ACEC-55	The Scenic Highway Corridor is not designated as an ACEC.		X			If not designated, decisions do not need to be in ACEC section.
ACEC-56	The scenic values will be protected throughout this linear feature through management prescriptions for the overlying SRMAs, WSAs, and ACECs among others.		X			If not designated, decisions do not need to be in ACEC section.
<i>SHAY CANYON ACEC – Relevant and Important Value: Cultural</i>						
ACEC-57	Shay Canyon (119 acres) (Map 11) is designated as an ACEC and is managed with the following prescriptions:		X			Update wording for disposal of mineral materials from “closed” to

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • OHV and mechanized travel limited to designated routes. • No surface disturbance for vegetation, watershed, or wildlife treatments/improvements. • NSO for oil and gas. • Open to geophysical exploration as long as it is consistent with the objectives of the ACEC. • Grazing restricted to trailing only. • With the exception of side canyons, hiking limited to designated trails. • Open to mineral entry with an approved plan of operations to avoid impacts to cultural and paleontological resources. • Closed to disposal of mineral materials. • Campfires not allowed. • Unavailable for private or commercial use of woodland products including on-site collection of dead wood for campfires. • Recreation use may be limited if 					<p>“unavailable” for consistency with other sections/decisions (the meaning is the same).</p> <p>Update wording for geophysical exploration from “open” to “available” for consistency with other sections/decisions (the meaning is the same).</p> <p>Update wording for mineral entry from “open” to “available” for consistency with other sections/decisions (the meaning is the same).</p>

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<p>cultural and paleontological resources are impacted.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Managed as VRM Class II. • Closed to camping. • ROW avoidance area. • A Cultural CRMP consistent with the goals and objectives of this RMP will be written for Shay Canyon ACEC and will not require a plan amendment to the RMP. 					
<i>VALLEY OF THE GODS ACEC – Relevant and Important Value: Scenic</i>						
ACEC-58	<p>Valley of the Gods (22,863 acres) (Map 11) is designated as an ACEC and is managed with the following prescriptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Managed as VRM Class I. • Unavailable for mineral leasing. • Closed to the disposal of mineral materials. • Available for mineral entry with an approved plan of operations. • Available for vegetation treatments when consistent with VRM Class 1. • Unavailable for private and/or commercial use of woodland 		X			Update wording for disposal of mineral materials from “closed” to “unavailable” for consistency with other sections/decisions (the meaning is the same).

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<p>products.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The BLM will pursue acquisition of state in-holdings in this ACEC. • OHV use limited to designated roads and trails • ROW exclusion area. • No campfires allowed. 					
WSR-1	<p>The BLM will work with state, local, and tribal governments, and other federal agencies, in a state-wide study, to reach consensus regarding recommendations to Congress for the inclusion of rivers in the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System. Besides applying consistent criteria across agency jurisdictions, the joint study will avoid piecemealing of river segments in logical watershed units in the state. The study will evaluate, in detail, the possible benefits and effects of designation on the local and state economies, agricultural and industrial operations and interests, outdoor recreation, natural resources (including the outstandingly remarkable values for which the river was deemed suitable),</p>	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<p>water rights, water quality, water resource planning, and access to and across river corridors within, and upstream and downstream from the proposed segment(s). Actual designation of river segments will only occur through congressional action or as a result of Secretarial decision at the request of the governor in accordance with provisions of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (the Act). The BLM will work with the state, local, and tribal governments, and the agencies involved to coordinate its decision making on WSR issues and to achieve consistency wherever possible.</p>					
WSR-2	<p>The BLM recognizes that water resources on most river and stream segments within the State of Utah are already fully allocated. Before stream segments that have been recommended as suitable under this approved RMP are recommended to Congress for designation, the BLM will continue to work with affected local, state, federal, and tribal partners to identify in-stream flows necessary to meet critical</p>	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<p>resource needs, including values related to the subject segment(s). Such quantifications will be included in any recommendation for designation. The BLM will then seek to jointly promote innovative strategies, community-based planning, and voluntary agreements with water users, under State law, to address those needs.</p>					
WSR-3	<p>Should designations occur on any river segment as a result of Secretarial or congressional action, existing rights, privileges, and contracts will be protected. Under Section 12 of the Act, termination of such rights, privileges, and contracts may happen only with the consent of the affected non-federal party. A determination by the BLM of eligibility and suitability for the inclusion of rivers on public lands to the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System does not create new water rights for the BLM. Federal reserved water rights for new components of the Wild and Scenic Rivers System are established at the discretion of Congress. If water is reserved by Congress when a river</p>	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<p>component is added to the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System, it will come from water that is not appropriated at the time of designation, in the amount necessary to protect features, which led to the river's inclusion into the system. The BLM's intent will be to leave existing water rights undisturbed and to recognize the lawful rights of private, municipal, and state entities to manage water resources under state law to meet the needs of the community. Federal law, including Section 13 of the Act and the McCarren Amendment (43 United States Code [U.S.C.] 666), recognizes state jurisdiction over water allocation in designated streams.</p> <p>Thus, it is the BLM's position that existing water rights, including flows apportioned to the State of Utah interstate agreements and compacts, including the Upper Colorado River Compact, and developments of such rights will not be affected by designation or the creation of the</p>					

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	possible federal reserved water right. The BLM will seek to work with upstream and downstream water users and applicable agencies to ensure that water flows are maintained at a level sufficient to sustain the values for which affected river segments were designated.					
<i>Colorado River Segment 1</i>						
WSR-4	The Colorado River Segment 1 is not identified as suitable for designation into the National Wild and Scenic River System.	X				
<i>Colorado River Segment 2 (Map 12)</i>						
WSR-5	The Colorado River Segment 2 is identified as suitable for designation into the National Wild and Scenic River System. The Segment specifics include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Recommendation</u>: Suitable—Scenic • <u>Size</u>: 880 acres • <u>Location</u>: State lands near river mile 44 to approximately river mile 38.5 (5.5 miles). • <u>Total river miles</u>: 6.8 • <u>BLM river miles</u>: 6.8 	X				
WSR-6	This segment is managed with the	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	following prescriptions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • VRM Class II. • Available for oil and gas leasing subject to NSO. • Motorized boat use allowed on the river. • ROW avoidance area. 					
<i>Colorado River Segment 3 (Map 12)</i>						
WSR-7	The Colorado River Segment 3 is identified as suitable for designation into the National Wild and Scenic River System. The Segment specifics include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Recommendation</u>: Suitable—Scenic • <u>Size</u>: 1,040 acres • <u>Location</u>: From approximately river mile 37.5 at state land to boundary of Canyonlands National Park near river mile 31 (6.5 miles). • <u>Total river miles</u>: 6.5 • <u>BLM river miles</u>: 6.5 	X				
WSR-8	This segment is managed with the following prescriptions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • VRM Class I • Unavailable for oil and gas leasing. 	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Closed to OHV use. • Recommended for withdrawal from locatable mineral entry. • Motorized boat use allowed on the river • ROW exclusion area. 					
<i>Indian Creek</i>						
WSR-9	The Indian Creek Segment is not identified as suitable for designation into the National Wild and Scenic River System.	X				
<i>Fable Valley</i>						
WSR-10	The Fable Valley Segment is not identified as suitable for designation into the National Wild and Scenic River System.	X				
<i>Dark Canyon (Map 12)</i>						
WSR-11	<p>The Dark Canyon Segment is identified as suitable for designation into the National Wild and Scenic River System. The Segment specifics include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Recommendation</u>: Suitable—Wild. • <u>Size</u>: 2,048 acres • <u>Location</u>: Forest boundary to Glen 	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<p>Canyon NRA below Young's Canyon.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Total river miles</u>: 13.6 • <u>BLM river miles</u>: 6.4 					
WSR-12	<p>This segment is managed with the following prescriptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • VRM Class I. • Unavailable for oil and gas leasing. • Closed to OHV use. • Recommended for withdrawal from locatable mineral entry. 	X				
<i>San Juan River Segment 1</i>						
WSR-13	<p>The San Juan River Segment 1 is not identified as suitable for designation into the National Wild and Scenic River System</p>	X				
<i>San Juan River Segment 2</i>						
WSR-14	<p>The San Juan River Segment 2 is not identified as suitable for designation into the National Wild and Scenic River System.</p>	X				
<i>San Juan River Segment 3</i>						
WSR-15	<p>The San Juan River Segment 3 is not identified as suitable for designation into the National Wild and Scenic River</p>	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	System.					
<i>San Juan River Segment 4</i>						
WSR-16	The San Juan River Segment 4 is not identified as suitable for designation into the National Wild and Scenic River System.	X				
<i>San Juan River Segment 5 (Map 12)</i>						
WSR-17	The San Juan River Segment 5 is identified as suitable for designation into the National Wild and Scenic River System. The Segment specifics include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Recommendation</u>: Suitable—Wild. • <u>Size</u>: 2,768 acres • <u>Location</u>: River mile 28 to Glen Canyon NRA at river mile 45. • <u>Total river miles</u>: 17.3 • <u>BLM river miles</u>: 17.3 	X				
WSR-18	This segment is managed with the following prescriptions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • VRM Class I. • Closed to oil and gas leasing • Closed to OHV use. • Recommended for withdrawal from locatable mineral entry. • ROW exclusion area. 		X			Update wording for disposal of mineral materials from “closed” to “unavailable” for consistency with other sections/decisions (the meaning is the same).
<i>Arch Canyon</i>						

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
WSR-19	The Arch Canyon Segment is not identified as suitable for designation into the National Wild and Scenic River System.	X				
WSA-1	WSAs will continue to be managed in a manner that does not impair their suitability for congressional designation in accordance with FLPMA Section 603(c), subject to valid existing rights. Actions may be allowed on a case-by-case basis only where the BLM determines that such action will not impair the lands' wilderness suitability.	X				
WSA-2	The Monticello FO manages 13 WSAs (Map 10) [389,444 acres as identified in the Statewide Report to Congress and (386,027 GIS acres)]: Mancos Mesa (51,440 acres), Grand Gulch ISA Complex (105,520), Road Canyon (52,420), Fish Creek Canyon (46,440), Mule Canyon (5,990), Cheesebox Canyon (15,410), Dark Canyon ISA Complex (68,030), Butler Wash (24,190), Bridger Jack Mesa (5,290), Indian Creek (6,870), South Needles (160), Squaw and Papoose Canyons	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	(6,676), and Cross Canyon (1,008).					
WSA-3	Only Congress can release a WSA from wilderness consideration. Should any WSA, in part or in whole, be released from wilderness consideration, examine proposals in the released area on a case-by-case basis for consistency with the goals and objectives of the RMP decisions. Actions inconsistent with RMP goals and objectives will be deferred until completion of requisite plan amendments. Because the management direction of the released land will continue in accordance with the goals and objectives established in the RMP, no separate analysis is required in this LUP to address resource impacts if any WSAs are released by Congress.	X				
WSA-4	Within the area managed by the Monticello FO, there is an area totaling 2,155 acres contiguous to the Butler Wash WSA that was studied as a boundary variation during the wilderness review mandated by Congress in FLPMA Sections 603(a)		X			Correct reference to IMP (not correct to cite new manual).

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<p>and (b). These lands were addressed in the Utah BLM Statewide Wilderness Final EIS (November, 1990) and were recommended for congressional wilderness designation in the Utah Statewide Wilderness Study Reports (October, 1991). This recommendation was forwarded by the President of the United States to Congress in 1993. The lands will continue to be managed in a manner that does not impair their suitability for congressional designation in accordance with FLPMA Section 603(c). Subject to valid existing rights, the only case-by-case actions that will be considered will be those where it is determined that wilderness suitability will not be adversely impacted. Lands within this administratively endorsed area are not under IMP management. RMP decisions protect those lands until Congress acts.</p>					
WSA-5	<p>WSAs are managed in a manner consistent with the Interim Management Policy for Lands Under Wilderness Review (IMP) (BLM 1995). The only decisions related to WSA management</p>		X			<p>Update IMP to new wilderness manuals: MS-6330, MS-6340.</p>

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	that will be made in this plan are VRM, OHV designations, and conditional use of specific ways. Any ways established for use through this planning effort must have been previously identified during the initial wilderness inventory.					
WSA-6	WSA management prescriptions, as stipulated in the IMP, will take precedence over other management prescriptions throughout this RMP, unless the other management prescriptions are more restrictive.		X			Update IMP to new wilderness manuals: MS-6330, MS-6340.
WSA-7	<i>Note: There is no WSA-7 Decision in the final plan.</i>					Deleted by plan maintenance 1/26/2009. Recommend renumbering.
WSA-8	Where vehicle ways will remain available for motorized use within WSAs, such use could continue on a conditional basis. Use of the existing routes in the WSAs ("ways" when located within WSAs—see Glossary) could continue as long as the use of these ways does not impair wilderness suitability, as provided by the IMP. If Congress designates the area as		X			Update IMP to new wilderness manuals: MS-6330, MS-6340. “Ways” changed to “primitive routes.”

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	wilderness, the routes will be closed. In the interim, if use and/or noncompliance are found through monitoring efforts to impair the area's suitability for wilderness designation, the BLM will take further action to limit use of the ways or close them. The continued use of these ways, therefore, is based on user compliance and non-impairment of wilderness values. This applies to the 0.08 miles open to motorized recreation use to the Moon House ruin. This can also be applied to administrative access.					
WSA-9	WSAs are managed as VRM Class I.	X				
WSA-10	WSAs including the Butler Wash administratively endorsed lands are closed to OHV use.		X			Add “described in WSA-4” to the decision to specify which lands are being referenced.
WSA-11	One way in Fish Creek WSA totaling 0.08 miles will remain conditionally open to motorized recreation use in order to access the Moon House ruin. In addition, four ways will remain available for administrative access only and are not available for motorized	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	recreation use: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Two ways in Grand Gulch ISA-Pine Canyon and Slickhorn units: totaling 3.1 miles and located east of Pine Canyon and Point Lookout areas. • One way in Fish Creek WSA-Lower Baullies Mesa; totaling 4.93 miles. • One way in Road Canyon WSA-Perkins Point; totaling 2.67 miles. 					
HT-1	The designated Old Spanish National Historic Trail is managed to protect the resource values for which it was designated (Public Law 107-325).	X				
HT-2	Hole in the Rock Trail is managed for Heritage Tourism in consultation with Utah State Historic Preservation Office and Native American tribes, as well as interested stakeholder groups.	X				
HT-3	The BLM will coordinate with the NPS and other managing agencies in management of the Old Spanish National Historic Trail.	X				
HT-4	All interpretation projects will be done in consultation with Native	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	Americans and other interested parties including the Old Spanish Trail Association and NPS.					
HT-5	Segments (linear) of the Old Spanish National Historic Trail (Map 11) will be identified and classified for historic integrity and condition. These segments will then be designated for appropriate types of travel.	X				
HT-6	Special Recreation Permits (SRPs) on the Old Spanish National Historic Trail will be authorized only for heritage tours and reenactments.	X				
HT-7	Landmarks (structures) along the Old Spanish National Historic Trail will be identified for historic integrity and interpreted only if the action will not impact the values at the site.	X				
HT-8	Segments of the Hole in the Rock Trail will be identified and evaluated for historic integrity and appropriate use (Map 11).	X				
HT-9	Landmark (structures, features) will be interpreted only if the action will not impact the values of the site/landmark.	X				
SSP-1	Threatened and Endangered species	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<p>conservation measures and lease notices will be used for all surface-disturbing activities to comply with the Endangered Species Act, and the BLM Manual 6840, Special Status Species Management (Appendix B, E, I, and M). These species include: California condor, Mexican spotted owl, Southwestern willow flycatcher, Yellow-billed cuckoo, Bonytail, Colorado pikeminnow, Humpback chub, Razorback sucker, and Navajo sedge. Appendix B includes stipulations applicable to Oil and Gas leasing and other surface- disturbing activities regarding the 10 listed and candidate species. Appendix E includes USFWS correspondence. Appendix I provides wildland fire protection/management measures for special status species.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Appendix M provides the finalized conservation measures and BMPs for T&E species resulting from programmatic Section 7 Consultation with USFWS (2007). 					
SSP-2	Oil and gas and mineral development BMPs will be used, including	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	minimizing roadbed width and footprint size, co-location of facilities, etc., to minimize habitat fragmentation.					
SSP-3	<i>Note: there is no SSP-3 decision in the final plan.</i>					Recommend renumbering.
SSP-4	Inventories and monitoring studies will be conducted in order to determine special status plant and animal species locations, potential habitat, population dynamics, and existing and potential threats.	X				
SSP-5	The protection of species and potential and/or occupied habitat for special status species will be considered and implemented prior to any authorization or action by the BLM that could alter or disturb such habitat.	X				
SSP-6	No management action will be permitted on BLM lands that will jeopardize the continued existence of species that are listed, proposed for listing, or candidates for listing under the Endangered Species Act.	X				
SSP-7	The BLM will follow and implement the guidelines and management recommendations presented in species	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	recovery or conservation plans (as updated), or alternative management strategies developed in consultation with USFWS.					
SSP-8	The BLM will support and implement where possible current and future sensitive species Conservation Agreements, including the Colorado River Cutthroat Trout Conservation Agreement and Strategy and Conservation Agreement for the roundtail chub, bluehead sucker, and flannelmouth sucker.	X				
SSP-9	The BLM will continue to work with USFWS and others to ensure that plans and agreements are updated to reflect the latest scientific data.	X				
SSP-10	The BLM will work cooperatively with USFWS and UDWR to obtain and/or maintain maps of current occupied and potential habitats for special status species.	X				
SSP-11	The BLM will work with the UDWR to implement the Utah Wildlife Action Plan (UDWR 2005) to coordinate management decisions that will		X			Note: the Utah Wildlife Action Plan is being updated. Update reference to document so that the

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	conserve native species and prevent the need for additional listings.					decision references the most current version.
SSP-12	Translocations of population augmentation of special status species will be allowed to aid in conservation and recovery efforts. Necessary habitat manipulations and monitoring will be implemented to ensure successful translocation efforts.	X				
SSP-13	The BLM will implement and follow the guidelines in the Colorado River Fishes Recovery and Implementation Program (as updated).	X				
SSP-14	Implement the BLM's Guidance for the Management of Sagebrush Plant Communities for Sage- grouse Conservation and the BLM's National Sage-grouse Habitat Conservation Strategy.	X				
SSP-15	Consistent with RMP goals and objectives, the following plans or best available scientific information will be utilized and applied, as needed, as part of implementing the BLM's National Sage-grouse Habitat Conservation Strategy: Strategic Management Plan	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	for Sage-grouse (BLM 2004d), WAFWA Conservation Assessment of Greater Sage-grouse and Sagebrush Habitats (Connelly et al. 2004), and the Gunnison Sage-grouse Rangewide Conservation Plan (2005, as revised).					
SSP-16	The Gunnison Sage-grouse Conservation Easement (320 acres) will be managed as outlined in the easement to protect and enhance habitat for sage-grouse. The easement is in perpetuity, even as ownership changes.	X				
SSP-17	Retain potential/occupied special status species habitat in federal ownership. Acquisition of potential/occupied special status species habitat will be high priority. These acquired/exchanged lands will be managed according to BLM land management prescriptions for special status species.	X				
SSP-18	Any nonessential routes developed for a project located in special status species habitat will be closed and rehabilitated when the project is complete.	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
SSP-19	Raptor management will be guided by the use of Best Management Practices for Raptors and Their Associated Habitats in Utah (Appendix N), utilizing seasonal and spatial buffers, as well as mitigation, to maintain and enhance raptor nesting and foraging habitat, while allowing other resource uses.	X				
SSP-20	The BLM will implement and follow the Finalized Conservation Measures and Best Management Practices for Bald Eagle and Threatened and Endangered Species of Utah from the Land Use Plan Programmatic BAs and Section 7 Consultation (2007, as revised) (Appendix M).	X				
<i>Gunnison Prairie Dogs</i>						
SSP-21	Site-specific analysis will be conducted to determine presence or absence of prairie-dog colonies within potential/occupied habitat (Map 14). Colonies will be protected from surface-disturbing activities with the use of Best Management Practices, standard oil and gas lease terms (60 days/200 meters rule), Conditions of	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	Approval, and Standard Operating Procedures. Site-specific analysis will mitigate impacts from other BLM-authorized activities.					
<i>Gunnison Sage-Grouse</i>						
SSP-22	The following prescriptions apply to crucial Gunnison Sage-grouse habitat (145,583 acres of which 4,884 acres are on BLM lands) on BLM lands and/or BLM-permitted activities associated with the administration of federal minerals on split-estate lands. See Appendix B, Stipulations Applicable to Oil and Gas Leasing and Other Surface Disturbing Activities, for exceptions, modifications and waivers that can be applied by the Authorized Officer, on a case-by-case basis for reasons outlined in the appendix.	X				
SSP-23	<u>Lek habitat</u> (within 0.6 miles of active strutting ground): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Prohibit year-round construction of fences. Retrofit visual devices on existing fences to prevent collisions. Where opportunity exists, remove existing fences. 	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prohibit construction of power lines or permanent aboveground structures year-round. • NSO for oil and gas leasing activities. • Unavailable for non-ground-disturbing geophysical work from March 20 to May 15. • Prohibit construction of roads year-round. • Prohibit construction of wind power turbines year-round. • Avoid all permitted activities from March 20 to May 15. If impractical to avoid all permitted activities, then no activity from sunset the evening before to 2 hours after sunrise the next morning. 					
SSP-24	<p><u>Year-round habitat</u> (within 4 miles of active strutting ground):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sagebrush treatments must have recovery objectives that meet the habitat objectives listed in the Gunnison Sage-grouse Rangewide Conservation Plan (2005, as 	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<p>amended). Any variance from these recovery objectives will be subject to site-specific NEPA, including collaboration with stakeholder groups.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Avoid construction of new fences. If impracticable, increase the visibility of the fences (flagging, white-tipped T-posts, etc.) and monitor effectiveness of visual devices and modify or remove fences if necessary to minimize sage-grouse mortality. • Leasing will be available with standard stipulations for oil and gas development. Follow Suggested Management Practices, where applicable, for oil and gas development listed in the Gunnison Sage-grouse Rangewide Conservation Plan (2005, as amended). • Avoid the construction of power lines, wind power turbines, or other aboveground structures. If impractical, bury power lines or retrofit them to prevent perching 					

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<p>by raptors. Follow Suggested Management Practices for wind power turbines or other aboveground structures as listed in the Gunnison Sage-grouse Rangewide Conservation Plan (2005, as amended).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limit grazing use levels as necessary to maintain and/or improve sage-grouse habitat. 					
SSP-25	<p>The following grazing allotments will not be grazed from March 20 to May 15:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sage Flat • Upper East Canyon • Sage-grouse • Dry Farm. 	X				
<i>Habitat for Mexican Spotted Owl and Flannelmouth Sucker (Arch Canyon)</i>						
SSP-26	<p>In Arch Canyon, OHV use is limited to the designated route up to the national forest boundary, a total of 8 miles one way. Organized and commercial groups will be required to obtain a Special Recreation Use Permit. This permit will allow access on the designated route up to the National Forest boundary except from March 1 through August 31.</p>	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	During this period, access will be limited to 7.5 miles of the designated route. Therefore, during this period motorized access will not be allowed within 0.5 miles of the National Forest boundary.					
TM-1	OHV vehicle use is managed in accordance with the BLM's National OHV strategy.	X				
TM-2	Through future implementation level planning, designated routes will be categorized as mechanized only (bicycles), single-track motorized (dirt bikes), or two-track motorized (four-wheelers, jeeps), or available to all vehicles, or any combination of these categories. Adjustments of these categories will be made based on recreational demand and potential conflict. All non- motorized travel is allowed on designated routes unless otherwise prohibited.	X				
TM-3	Mechanized travel (bicycles) is limited to designated roads and trails.	X				
TM-4	There are no exceptions that allow for cross-country travel for game retrieval	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	or antler gathering in areas designated as limited or closed. OHV use for game retrieval will adhere to all OHV classifications.					
TM-5	BLM Back Country Byways and National Recreation Trails may be designated in the future, as deemed appropriate, with site-specific environmental analysis.	X				
TM-6	Appendix O outlines the processes and procedures for making modifications to the travel plan designated route network.	X				
TM-7	The BLM, in preparing its RMP designations and its implementation-level travel management plans, is following policy and regulation authority found at: 43 CFR Part 8340; 43 CFR Subpart 8364; and 43 CFR Subpart 9268.	X				
TM-8	Where the authorized officer determines that OHVs are causing or will cause considerable adverse impacts, the authorized officer shall close or restrict such areas. The public will be notified. The BLM could	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	impose limitations on types of vehicles allowed on specific designated routes if monitoring indicates that a particular type of vehicle is causing disturbance to the soil, wildlife habitat, cultural or vegetative resources, especially by off-road travel in an area that is limited to designated routes.					
TM-9	Where routes remain available for motorized use within WSAs, such use could continue on a conditional basis. Use of the existing routes in the WSAs ("ways" when located within WSAs – see Glossary) could continue as long as the use of these routes does not impair wilderness suitability, as provided by the IMP (BLM 1995). If Congress designates the area as wilderness, the routes will be closed. In the interim, if use and/or noncompliance are found through monitoring efforts to impair the area's suitability for wilderness designation, the BLM will take further action to limit use of the routes, or close them. The continued use of these routes, therefore, is based on user compliance		X			Update IMP to new wilderness manuals: MS-6330, MS-6340. Same as in WSAs. "Ways" should refer to "primitive routes."

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	and non-impairment of wilderness values. This applies to the 0.08 miles open to motorized recreation use to the Moon House ruin. This can also be applied to administrative access.					
<i>OHV Area Designations (Map 13)</i>						
TM-10	Open to OHV use: 0 acres	X				
TM-11	Limited to designated routes: 1,388,191 acres	X				
TM-12	Mountain bike use is limited to the same designated routes as OHV travel.	X				
TM-13	<p>Closed to OHV Use: 393,895 acres To protect the following vegetation study areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bridger Jack Mesa WSA • Lavender Mesa ACEC <p>To protect the following scenic values:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Indian Creek ACEC <p>To protect the following cultural, scenic, and recreational values:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A portion of the San Juan River SRMA <p>To protect the following cultural values:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tank Bench SRMA, Outlaw Canyon • Tank Bench SRMA, South 	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<p>Cottonwood Wash To protect the wilderness character of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cross Canyon WSA • Squaw and Papoose WSA • Mule Canyon WSA • Fish Creek WSA • Grand Gulch WSA ISA Complex • Road Canyon WSA • Dark Canyon WSA • Indian Creek WSA • Bridger Jack Mesa WSA • Butler Wash WSA • Mancos Mesa WSA • Cheesebox Canyon WSA • South Needles WSA and the Administratively Endorsed Lands that are contiguous to Butler Wash WSA. 					
TM-14	<p>One way in Fish Creek WSA totaling 0.08 miles remains conditionally open to motorized recreation use in order to access the Moon House ruin. In addition, four ways remain available for administrative access only and are not</p>	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	available for motorized recreation use: a. Two ways in Grand Gulch ISA-Pine Canyon and Slickhorn units: totaling 3.1 miles and located east of Pine Canyon and Point Lookout areas. b. One way in Fish Creek WSA-Lower Baullies Mesa; totaling 4.93 miles. c. One way in Road Canyon WSA-Perkins Point; totaling 2.67 miles.					
<i>Miles of Designated and Non-Designated Routes on Public Lands within the Monticello PA</i>						
TM-15	Open 2,820 miles Closed 316 miles		X			Change to refer to current travel management plan so mileage doesn't need to be updated.
<i>Special Stipulation Areas within the Limited to Designated Routes Category</i>						
<i>Arch Canyon (to protect wildlife)</i>						
TM-16	OHV use is limited to the designated route up to the USFS boundary year-round, a total of 8 miles one way.	X				
TM-17	Organized and commercial groups are required to obtain a Special Recreation Use Permit. This permit will allow access on the designated route up to the National Forest boundary except March 1–August 31. During this period, access	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	will be 7.5 miles of the designated route. Motorized access will not be allowed within 0.5 miles of the national forest boundary.					
<i>McLoyd Canyon–Moon House (for Cultural Protection)</i>						
TM-18	No motorized travel is allowed on the northern section of road (approximately 500 feet) D4798, which crosses onto BLM land (and lies within Fish Creek WSA) at the northern State Section boundary.	X				
<i>Non-mechanized (e.g., Hiking, Equestrian, and Backpacking)</i>						
TM-19	Nonmechanized travel is not restricted on public lands except where limited or prohibited to protect specific resource values, provide for public safety, or maintain an identified opportunity.	X				
TM-20	Provide opportunities for non-mechanized travel (hiking) on all routes open to mechanized use. Manage routes to exclude motorized and mechanized use and provide opportunities for non-mechanized travel independent of motorized and mechanized routes.		X			Should be hiking “and equestrian” in parentheses.
TM-21	Limit non-mechanized travel on	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	specific lands to designated routes for resource protection purposes.					
TM-22	Manage the following trails for non-mechanized use: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Open to Foot Travel</u>: Kane Gulch, Todie Canyon, Bullet Canyon, Shieks Canyon, Government Trail, Collins Canyon, Slickhorn Canyon, Point Lookout Canyon, Grand Gulch (from junction to San Juan River), Fish Canyon, Owl Canyon, Road Canyon, McLoyd Canyon, Lime Creek Canyon, North Mule Canyon, South Mule Canyon, Lower Mule Canyon from Comb Wash, Mule Canyon or Cave Canyon Towers, Arch Canyon, Johns Canyon, Honaker Trail, Keeley Trail, Dark Canyon (Sundance Trail), Fable Valley Trail, Salt Creek Mesa Trail, Butler Ruin Interpretative Trail, Sand Island Petroglyph Trail, Shay Canyon Petroglyph Trail, Newspaper Rock Trail, Salvation Knoll Trail, Monarch Cave Trail, 	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<p>Fish Mouth Trail, Cold Springs Trail, Procession Panel Trail, Wolf Man Panel Trail, Moon House Trail, Ball Room Cave Trail.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Open for Stock Overnight Use:</u> Kane Gulch, Government Trail, Collins Canyon, Grand Gulch (from Kane Gulch to the junction of Collins Canyon; no stock below Collins Canyon), Fish Canyon (from Comb Wash to confluence with Owl Canyon), Road Canyon, Lime Creek Canyon, Lower Mule Canyon from Comb Wash, Arch Canyon, Johns Canyon, Salt Creek Mesa Trail. • <u>Open for Stock Day Use:</u> Bullet Canyon (from Grand Gulch to Jailhouse Ruin), Fish Canyon (2 miles above the confluence with Owl Canyon), Owl Canyon (to Neville's Arch), Road Canyon, McLoyd Canyon (to the impassible pour-off), Lime Creek Canyon, Salt Creek Mesa Trail, Monarch Cave Trail, Fish Mouth Trail, Cold 					

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	Springs Trail, and Procession Panel Trail.					
TM-23	Non-mechanized routes may be added through subsequent planning at the activity plan level on a case by case basis.	X				
TM-24	Indian Creek Climbing Trails include the following: Bridger Jack Mesa, Super Crack Buttress, Cat Wall, Broken Tooth Wall, Scarface, and Battle of the Bulge.		X			Some trails have been added: Pistol Whipped Trail (among others).
VEG-1	Areas that meet Utah's Rangeland Health Standards are open to seed gathering and plant collection, including commercial seed gathering. The entire field office or certain localities may be closed to seed gathering dependent upon annual seed production of native plants in relation to sustainable landscapes.	X				
VEG-2	Seed gathering is managed according to Utah BLM guidance for Seed Collection Policy and Pricing (as amended).	X				
VEG-3	Implement Guidance for Addressing Sagebrush Habitat Conservation (November, 2004) as described in the BLM's National Sage-grouse Habitat	X				There is no greater sage-grouse habitat in Monticello PA. Gunnison Sage-grouse plan will likely amend

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	Conservation Strategy (WO-IM-2005-024).					Monticello RMP.
VEG-4	Necessary vegetation information will be gathered and monitoring continued to assess if planning objectives are being met.	X				
VEG-5	Invasive and non-native weed species (as identified in Table 3.59 of the PRMP, Invasive and Noxious Weeds of San Juan County) will be controlled, and the infestation and spread of new invasive species prevented through cooperative agreements and implementation of the principles in BLM weed management policies and action plans.	X				Integrated Pest Management EA has been completed for the Monticello planning area.
VEG-6	Poisonous plant species will be controlled as necessary based on site-specific needs.	X				
VEG-7	Cooperating agreements with other federal, state, local, and private organizations will be developed to control invasive non-native species, control insect pest species, and implement fuels vegetation treatments and WUI risk assessments and	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	management.					
VEG-8	Prevention measures (SOPs and mitigation measures) from the 2007 ROD Vegetation Treatments Using Herbicides on Bureau of Land Management Lands in 17 Western States PEIS (and associated document] are incorporated. Those BMPs are located in Appendix B and mitigation measures in Table 2 of that ROD.	X				2015 Integrated Pest Management EA has been completed for the Monticello planning area and tiers to PEIS.
VEG-9	Upland areas are managed to achieve DFC.	X				
VEG-10	Unnecessary social footpath trails will be minimized throughout the PA.	X				
VEG-11	Pack stock and riding stock users on BLM-administered land are required to use certified weed- free feed.	X				
VEG-12	Restoration/rehabilitation activities are required to use certified weed-free seed mixes, mulch, fill, etc.	X				
VEG-13	The power washing of equipment used for permitted uses may be required to help control noxious weeds.	X				
VEG-14	Continue implementation of noxious weed and invasive species control	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	actions as per affected counties, adjoining private land owners and other partners or interests directly affected.					
VEG-15	Implement 30,000 to 50,000 acres of vegetation treatments in Fire Regime Condition Class III areas over a 15-year period.		X			Add “Subject to budgetary and resource constraints.”
VEG-16	The following sagebrush communities are prioritized for treatment: Harts Draw, Beef Basin, Black Mesa, Alkali, Mustang, Cedar Point, Shay Mesa, and all areas with Gunnison Sage-grouse habitat.		X			Sec. Order 3336 and/or Gunnison Sage-grouse plan may change this priority for sage-grouse. Note: Harts, Alkali, Beef, Shay, and Mustang have been or are currently being treated.
VEG-17	Treat greasewood in Comb Wash, Butler Wash, Montezuma, East Canyon, Indian Creek, South and North Cottonwood Wash, and Cross Canyon to improve ground cover, biodiversity, and water quality.	X				Have not yet focused on treatments.
VEG-18	Maintain an estimated 1,500 acres/year of existing land treatments and implement new vegetation treatments to restore ecosystem health, functioning condition, etc. in the		X			These annual targets are no longer achievable. Add “ <i>Subject to budgetary and resource constraints.</i> ”

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	following vegetation cover types (Map 15): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • sagebrush 1,500 acres/year • weed treatments 3,000 acres/year • pinyon-juniper 3,000 acres/year • riparian 100 acres/year • greasewood 200 acres/year 					
VRM-1	422,989 acres are managed as VRM Class I (Map 16). These areas include: <u>WSAs:</u> 13 WSAs (389,440 acres): Mancos Mesa (51,440 acres), Grand Gulch ISA Complex (37,810), Road Canyon (52,420), Fish Creek Canyon (46,440), Mule Canyon (5,990), Cheesebox Canyon (15,410), Dark Canyon ISA Complex (62,040), Butler Wash (22,030), Bridger Jack Mesa (5,290), Indian Creek (6,870), South Needles (160), Squaw and Papoose Canyons (6,560), Cross Canyon (1,008), and the Butler Wash lands administratively endorsed for wilderness. <u>ACECs:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Valley of the Gods 		X			In the second to last bullet, “Suitable” should be removed from San Juan River Segment (not Section) 3.

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Indian Creek <p><u>WSRs:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dark Canyon Suitable River Segment • Colorado River Suitable Segment 3 • San Juan River Suitable Section 3 • San Juan River Suitable Segment 5 					
VRM-2	<p>262,256 acres are managed as VRM Class II including but not limited to the following (Map 16):</p> <p><u>ACECs:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lavender Mesa • Shay Canyon • San Juan River (portions) • Hovenweep Visual Emphasis Zone <p><u>WSRs:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Colorado River Suitable Segment 2 <p><u>Other Areas:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mesa tops for Tables of the Sun • Comb Ridge Management Zone of 		X			Spelling mistake: “are” not “aree.”

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<p>Cedar Mesa SRMA</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Indian Creek SRMA from Indian Creek ACEC south to USFS boundary and Davis and Lavender Canyons • Harmony Flat • White Canyon area • Dripping Canyon/Chicken Corners area • Non-WSA areas with wilderness characteristics (Dark Canyon, Mancos Mesa, Grand Gulch, Nokai Dome East and Nokai Dome West) • Lockhart Basin 					
VRM-3	<p>473,368 acres are managed as VRM Class III including but not limited to the following (Map 16):</p> <p><u>ACECs:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hovenweep (outside of Visual Emphasis Zone) • Alkali Ridge • San Juan River Sections 2 and 4 <p><u>Other Areas:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cedar Mesa SRMA (portions) 	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Moqui Canyon • North Cottonwood area • North of Highway 95 in the South Cottonwood area • Grand Flat area • Upper Montezuma Creek Watershed • Dry Valley – Upper Hart Draw • Beef Basin (portions) • Gravel, Long and Short Canyon areas • Cal Black Airport east area • Other areas illustrated on Map 16 					
VRM-4	623,002 acres will be managed as VRM Class IV, as illustrated on Map 16.	X				
<i>Migratory Birds</i>						
FWL Global Change	Maps		X			Update Maps to include most recent habitat layers from UDWR.
FWL-1	Comply with the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) and implement Executive Order 13186 ("Responsibilities of Federal Agencies to Protect Migratory Birds") during all activities to protect habitat for migratory birds. Management will	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	emphasize birds listed on the current USFWS "Birds of Conservation Concern" (BCC) (2002 or as updated), and Partners-in-Flight priority species (as updated). As specific habitat needs and population distribution to Birds of Conservation Concern and Partners-in-Flight priority species the Partners-In-Flight Avian Conservation Strategy (UDWR, 2000, as updated) priority species are identified, the BLM will use adaptive management strategies to further conserve habitat and avoid impacts to these species.					
FWL-2	During nesting season for migratory birds (May 1–July 30), avoid or minimize surface- disturbing activities and vegetative-altering projects and broad-scale use of pesticides in identified occupied priority migratory bird habitat.	X				
FWL-3	Prioritize the maintenance and/or improvement of lowland riparian, wetlands, and low and high desert shrub communities, which are the four most important and used habitat types by	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	migratory birds in the Monticello PA.					
FWL-4	Prevent the spread of invasive and non-native plants, especially cheatgrass, salt cedar, and Russian olive. Strive for a dense understory of native species with a reduction in salt cedar and improvement of cottonwood and willow regeneration.	X				
FWL-5	As a supplement to comply with Executive Order 13186, the Bird Habitat Conservation Areas identified in the Coordinated Implementation Plan for Bird Conservation in Utah (2005, or as updated), will receive priority for conducting bird habitat conservation projects through cooperative funding initiatives such as the Intermountain West Joint Venture.	X				
FWL-6	Land-use decisions that contain migratory birds and their habitats will consider the goals and objectives established in respective bird conservation strategies: bird conservation plans and Utah wildlife action plan.	X				
FWL-7	Management of habitat for species	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	conservation will incorporate statewide conservation strategies.					
<i>Raptors</i>						
FWL-8	Raptor management will be guided by the use of Best Management Practices for Raptors and Their Associated Habitats in Utah (Utah BLM 2006, Appendix N), utilizing seasonal and spatial buffers, as well as mitigation, to maintain and enhance raptor nesting and foraging habitat, while allowing other resource uses.	X				
FWL-9	Cooperate with utility companies, UDWR, and USFWS to prevent electrocution of raptors.	X				
FWL-10	Temporarily close areas (amount of time depends on species) near raptor nests to rock climbers or other activities if activity may result in nest abandonment.	X				
<i>Bighorn Sheep</i>						
FWL-11	Five mesa tops (56,740 acres) within the crucial bighorn sheep habitat have been identified as areas of potential conflict between bighorn and activities that cause surface disturbance resulting	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	in permanent loss of bighorn sheep habitat. Bighorn sheep habitat improvement projects will be prioritized in these areas.					
FWL-12	Livestock grazing and associated range improvement projects are not allowed on the five mesa tops.	X				
FWL-13	Any future proposal for a change in kind of livestock from cattle to sheep in crucial desert bighorn sheep habitat will be denied in order to prevent competition for forage and the transmission of disease from domestic to wild sheep.	X				
FWL-14	Adhere to the recommendations in the BLM Bighorn Sheep Rangeland Management Plan (BLM 1993c, as revised); and the Utah BLM Statewide Desert Bighorn Sheep Management Plan, 1996 (as revised), where practicable.	X				
<i>Introduction, Transplantation, Augmentation, and Reestablishment</i>						
FWL-15	The BLM will continue to cooperate with and provide support to UDWR in reintroducing native fish and wildlife species into historic or suitable ranges,	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	as determined appropriate through case-by-case NEPA analysis.					
FWL-16	Introduction, transplantation, augmentation, and re-establishment of both native and naturalized species will be considered and will include but may not be limited to pronghorn, desert bighorn sheep, wild turkey, beaver, chukar, Colorado River cutthroat trout, and Endangered Colorado River fish species.	X				
<i>Animal Damage Control</i>						
FWL-17	Predator management will continue to be coordinated with APHIS and UDWR, and will be conducted utilizing the guidance provided by the existing MOU with APHIS.	X				
<i>Habitat Improvements and Protection</i>						
FWL-18	In areas lacking proper water distribution or natural water sources, allow for installation of precipitation catchments (guzzlers) or the development of springs on rangelands.	X				
FWL-19	Adhere to BLM fence standards to allow wildlife movement when fences are being developed or maintained.	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
FWL-20	Wildlife habitat objectives will be considered in all reclamation activity. Priority will be given to meeting Standards for Rangeland Health and Guidelines for Grazing Management (BLM 1997).	X				
FWL-21	Adhere to the recommendations in the BLM Habitat Management Guides for the American Pronghorn Antelope (1980 as revised), wherever practicable.	X				
FWL-22	Ground-disturbing and permitted activities carried out in all seasonal wildlife protection areas will be subject to special conditions regulating use during certain seasons. These seasonal conditions will not impact maintenance and operation activities for mineral production or hunting during a recognized hunting season established by the UDWR.	X				
FWL-23	Recognize 17,300 acres as allotted to wildlife (parts of the slopes of Peter's Canyon and East Canyon).	X				
FWL-24	Ground-disturbing actions in crucial habitats will be avoided where practical. Where unavoidable disturbances are	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	required, the BLM will follow BLM Washington Office Guidance (IM 2005-069) on application of compensatory measures.					
<i>Off-site Mitigation</i>						
FWL-27 <i>Note: out of order</i>	The BLM will approach compensatory mitigation on an "as appropriate" basis where it can be performed on site, and on a voluntary basis where it is performed off-site, or, in accordance with current guidance.	X				
<i>Habitat Boundaries</i>						
FWL-28 <i>Note: out of order</i>	Minor adjustments to crucial wildlife habitat boundaries periodically made by the UDWR will be accommodated through plan maintenance.	X				
<i>Seasonal Wildlife Protection Areas</i>						
FWL-25	In addition to any other special conditions that may be in effect, crucial big game habitats are subject to special conditions regulating use during certain seasons. These seasonal conditions will not impact maintenance and operation activities for mineral production or hunting during a recognized hunting season established	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	by the UDWR.					
FWL-26	See Appendix B, Stipulations Applicable to Oil and Gas Leasing and Other Surface Disturbing Activities, for exceptions, modifications and waivers that can be applied by the Authorized Officer, on a case-by-case basis for a myriad of reasons outlined in the appendix.	X				
FWL-29	Special conditions for the seasonal wildlife protection areas include the following for all land-use authorizations, with the exception of private woodland harvest: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No use of low-flying aircraft. • Closed to the following uses, among others, (refer to Appendix B) during the established season: • No oil and gas exploration, drilling and production activities or geophysical work. • Permitted or commercial OHV use may be limited in number of participants and duration depending on the event. • No use of pyrotechnics, shooting, 	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	etc. during permitted filming because of noise impacts.					
<i>Bighorn Sheep Lambing and Rutting Areas</i>						
FWL-30	Adhere to special conditions (FWL-29 and Appendix B) on 453,388 acres (Map 14) from April 1 to June 15 for lambing, and from October 15 to December 15 for rutting.	X				
<i>Pronghorn Fawning Area</i>						
FWL-31	Adhere to special conditions (FWL-29 and Appendix B) on 29,365 acres (Map 14) from May 1 to June 15.	X				
<i>Grazing Management in Pronghorn Ranges</i>						
FWL-32	Current livestock-grazing prescriptions will continue and, where opportunities exist, will be adjusted to enhance for production on pronghorn ranges. This will include the following grazing allotments: Mail Station, Upper Mail Station, Dry Valley/Deer Neck, Lone Cedar, Tank Draw, and Hart Draw.	X				
<i>Deer Winter Range</i>						
FWL-33	Adhere to special conditions (FWL-29 and Appendix B) on 383,098 acres (Map 14) from November 15 to April 15.	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
<i>Elk Winter Range</i>						
FWL-34	Adhere to special conditions (FWL-29 and Appendix B) on 97,471 acres (Map 14) from November 15 to April 15.	X				
FOR-1	Implement the Healthy Forest Initiative and the Healthy Forest Restoration Act of 2003.	X				
FOR-2	Follow National BLM Forest Health and Forest Management Standards and Guidelines to assess conditions and guide management decisions for woodland resources.	X				
FOR-3	Prioritize treatment in high-value/high-risk areas (WUI, developed recreation facilities including campgrounds, FRCC III).	X				
FOR-4	Allow live woodland harvest in areas with pinyon pine and juniper encroachment with focus on the restoration of the sagebrush steppe community.	X				
FOR-5	Fuel treatment projects will allow for harvest of woodland products.	X				
FOR-6	Permits for private and/or commercial use of woodland products will continue	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	to be issued to the public, consistent with the availability of woodland products and the protection of other resource values.					
FOR-7	Cottonwood and willow harvest will be allowed for Native American ceremonial uses only by permit. Restrictions on this permitted harvest will be implemented as necessary to achieve or maintain Proper Functioning Condition (PFC), and to maintain or improve threatened and endangered species/special status species (TES/SSS) habitat.	X				
FOR-8	Harvesting of woodland products is subject to the following exceptions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Exclude from woodland product use except for limited on-site collection of dead wood for campfires in all WSAs, Arch Canyon, Alkali Ridge NHL, Grand Gulch NHD (mesa top), Beef Basin, Fable Valley, Comb Ridge SRMA (south of Highway 95), San Juan River SRMA and the 5 non-WSA areas with 	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<p>wilderness characteristics (Map 8) (Dark Canyon, Mancos Mesa, Nokai Dome West, Nokai Dome East and Grand Gulch).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Exclude from all woodland product use, including on-site collection of dead wood for campfires, all developed recreation sites, livestock/wildlife exclosures, cultural sites, Indian Creek SRMA, McLoyd Canyon–Moon House Ruin, Cedar Mesa SRMA (in-canyon), and Grand Gulch NHD (in canyon). • Exclude floodplains, riparian/aquatic areas from woodland product use except for limited on- site collection of driftwood for campfires, and uses for Native American ceremonial purposes as determined on a site-specific basis. • Limitations on off-road travel for wood gathering will be modified as necessary to maintain long-term sustainability or facilitate wood gathering where resource impacts 					

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	are not a concern.					
FOR-9	Permits will be limited and/or areas closed, as necessary, to maintain sustainability and protect resources.	X				
FOR-10	Zones in the Field Office considered for private and/or commercial use of woodland products: East Canyon; Harts Draw; Salt Creek Mesa; Dark Canyon Plateau; White Canyon; Cedar Mesa; North Comb Ridge; South Cottonwood; and Montezuma Watershed (Map 17).	X				
FOR-11	Areas not identified in zones below, or not restricted as defined in this plan, will be available for private use of woodland products limited to designated routes and available to pinyon pine nut gathering.	X				
FOR-12	<u>East Canyon (64,559 acres)</u> (Including Peter's Point Big Indian, East Canyon, Peters Canyon, NE of Monticello, and South Canyon) Available to private and/or commercial use of woodland products with permitted off-road travel within 150 feet of designated routes to collect wood.	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
FOR-13	<p><u>NE of Monticello, South Canyon</u> (Part of East Canyon Zone)</p> <p>Available to private and/or commercial use of woodland products with permitted off-road travel within 150 feet of designated routes to collect wood.</p>	X				
FOR-14	<p>Harts Point, Harts Draw, Shay Mesa, Photograph Gap/Lone Cedar (64,671 acres)</p> <p>Available to private and/or commercial use of woodland products with permitted off-road travel within 150 feet of designated routes to collect wood.</p>	X				
FOR-15	<p>Salt Creek Mesa (5,271 acres)</p> <p>Available to private and/or commercial use of woodland products with permitted off-road travel in chained areas to collect wood.</p>	X				
FOR-16	<p>Dark Canyon Plateau (23,288 acres)</p> <p>Available to private and/or commercial use of woodland products with permitted off-road travel within 150 feet</p>	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	of designated routes and permitted off-road travel in chained areas to collect wood.					
FOR-17	<p>White Canyon (255,267 acres) Wooden Shoe, Deer Flat, Horse Flat (extending out toward Jacob’s Chair, Pinyon Point)</p> <p>Available to private and/or commercial use of woodland products with permitted off-road travel within 150 feet of designated routes and permitted off-road travel in chained areas to collect wood.</p>	X				
FOR-18	<p>Moss Back and Grand Flats (Part of the White Canyon Zone)</p> <p>Available to private and/or commercial use of woodland products with permitted off-road travel within 150 feet of designated routes to collect wood.</p>	X				
FOR-19	<p>Cedar Mesa (outside of WSAs) (65,807 acres)</p> <p>Available to private and/or commercial use of woodland products, however, vehicles must remain on designated</p>	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	routes (no cross county travel).					
FOR-20	Additional routes may be identified for wood harvest dependent on cultural Class III surveys. In the interim of designating woodland harvest areas and completing associated cultural surveys, woodland harvest is allowed and travel is limited to designated routes.	X				
FOR-21	North Comb Ridge (North of Highway 95) (5,833 acres) Available to private and/or commercial use of woodland products, however, vehicles must remain on designated routes (no cross county travel).	X				
FOR-22	Additional routes may be identified for wood harvest dependent on cultural Class III surveys. In the interim of designating woodland harvest areas and completing associated cultural surveys, woodland harvest is allowed and travel is limited to designated routes.	X				
FOR-23	South Cottonwood (117,399 acres) <i>Texas Flat</i> Available to private and/or commercial	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	use of woodland products with permitted off-road travel within 150 feet of designated routes and permitted off-road travel in chained areas to collect wood.					
FOR-24	<p>South Cottonwood (117,399 acres) <i>Brushy Basin, Black Mesa, Little Baullies, Upper South Cottonwood</i></p> <p>Available to private and/or commercial use of woodland products with permitted off-road travel within 150 feet of designated routes and permitted off-road travel in chained areas to collect wood.</p>	X				
FOR-25	<p>Montezuma Watershed (239,841 acres)</p> <p>Available to private and/or commercial use of woodland products, however, vehicles must remain on designated routes (no cross county travel).</p>	X				
FOR-26	Additional routes may be identified for wood harvest dependent on cultural Class III surveys. In the interim of designating woodland harvest areas and completing associated cultural surveys,	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<p>woodland harvest is allowed and travel is limited to designated/existing routes.</p> <p>As appropriate, maps depicting the management decisions are provided in Appendix A.</p>					