

Environmental Assessment
Public Comment Matrix

July 2012

Comment Number	Comment Subject	Comment	Response	Section of EA Revised
Southern Utah Wilderness Alliance (SUWA)				
SUWA 1	New Wilderness Information	SUWA has submitted new information regarding the wilderness characteristics of the Upper Indian Creek wilderness character unit. BLM has not evaluated this new information, including the proposed boundaries and the presence or absence of wilderness characteristics of the Upper Indian Creek unit.	BLM reviewed the new information that was submitted following procedures in BLM WO IM-2011-154. BLM determined August 21, 2012 that this area did not contain wilderness characteristics sufficient to change its designation. Documentation is attached to the EA.	<i>No change required</i>
SUWA 2	Did not evaluate a range of reasonable alternatives.	The Indian Creek ATV trail right-of way EA fails to fully consider, analyze and evaluate a range of reasonable alternatives. The EA must fully analyze the following additional practical and feasible alternatives: The use of existing designated routes between Hamburger Rock and Route 0571 (Davis/Lavender canyon route), including the Canyonlands National Park highway and other designated dirt routes on BLM lands; Creating an “ATV only” trail beside the Canyonlands National Park highway (i.e. in the highway right-of-way corridor) between Hamburger Rock campground and Route D0571. If BLM’s primary purpose is to consider the need for an ATV-exclusive trail (in addition to the nearly 3,000 miles of dirt routes designated in Monticello Travel Plan), BLM must consider environmentally-protective routes on lands not proposed for wilderness	The operation of relatively slow moving ATVs on the highway or on its shoulder would present a serious public safety hazard. For this reason this alternative was considered by eliminated from further analysis. This route would not meet the need to provide an exclusive recreational opportunity for ATV enthusiasts by excluding use of OHVs wider than 50 inches. Travel Management, Management Action TM-6, page 141, allows for modifications to the designated routes in the Travel Plan based on the opportunity to tie into existing or planned trail networks (Appendix O, page 29).	<i>No change required</i>
SUWA 3	The EA fails to comply with NEPA’s “hard look” requirement	To comply with NEPA’s hard look requirement, BLM must gather and analyze empirical data, and perform detailed evaluations of the impacts (direct, indirect, and cumulative) to natural resources, including impacts to wilderness characteristics, scenic and visual resources, riparian resources, soils, and vegetation, cultural resources, and user conflicts from the proposed actions and reasonable alternatives.	The EA checklist addresses impacts to the resources identified. Therefore, a discussion on how these items were addressed in the EA is appropriate.	<i>No change required</i>

SUWA 4	Climbing Areas	The EA attempts to minimize the conflicts with other primary recreation groups by stating that climbing is concentrated in the Donnelly Canyon area, 8 miles south of the proposed ATV right-of way. However, this is an incorrect depiction of the world-class climbing throughout the entire Indian Creek corridor. Climbing does in fact occur much closer to the proposed ATV route.	The EA states “The Indian Creek area is a popular area for rock climbers. The nearest Wingate cliff face is approximately 1.5 miles northeast and that area is only lightly used by rock climbers.” However, the most popular and concentrated climbing areas are in the vicinity of Donnelly Canyon. The direct, indirect or cumulative effects on climbers from the proposed ROW would be negligible.	<i>No change required</i>
SUWA 5	Closing of portion of D0570	The EA fails to acknowledge that BLM has signed the designated route (D0570) north of Creek Pasture campground as “closed” and has constructed large earthen barriers to physically close the route and preclude off-road vehicles from accessing the designated route. See Attachment A. The EA must be revised to inform the public that this designated route, which acts is the middle section of the proposed right-or-way, has been physically closed by the agency. As it is currently written, the EA misrepresents the project area. The EA must take a hard look at the impacts of “reopening” this designated route.	The BLM has not closed D0570 except for a “road closed” sign placed a quarter mile from the actual end of the road. This has been rectified. The portions of the D0570 going through the Creek Pasture campground would not be utilized under the new alternative – the preferred alternative.	<i>No change required</i>
SUWA 6	The EA fails to take a Hard Look at Visual Resources	The BLM must: complete a visual resources inventory of the area that would be effected by the proposed action assess the impacts of the proposed action and reasonable alternatives on the new visual resources data disclose the potential impacts of the proposed action and alternatives in the EA to comply with NEPA’s hard look requirement and the current inventory requirement of FLPMA. Pursuant to NEPA, the BLM must take a hard look at the potential impacts of the proposed ATV route by fully analyzing the impacts of the new route to the visual resources, objectively determine if the new ATV route would “repeat the basic elements of the form, line, color and texture found in the predominant natural features” of the landscape, compare the potential impacts of other reasonable alternatives, and disclose this information in the EA.	The BLM utilized the most up to date visual resource inventory available during the preparation of the Monticello RMP to designate VRM classes. A visual resource assessment was completed for this project along the proposed route.	<i>No change required</i>

SUWA 7	Riparian	The area proposed for excavation is likely influenced by subsurface water, as the proposed excavation area supports riparian vegetation, and should be considered as part of the Indian Creek riparian area. The EA fails to take a hard look at the impacts to the Indian Creek riparian area, including the groundwater component of the riparian area, from the proposed action, and fails to comply with the Utah Riparian Policy to protect and restore riparian values.	One alternative was eliminated from further analysis because of the impacts to riparian resources. The proposed action and the preferred alternative do not cross riparian areas and do not include areas that support riparian vegetation. The portions of the proposed action route near Indian Creek would not be utilized under the preferred alternative.	<i>No change required</i>
SUWA 8	Need to prepare EIS	A decision to grant this proposed ATV right-of-way could establish a precedent for future actions by BLM. Pursuant to NEPA and applicable regulations, BLM must prepare an EIS for this project.	Based on the resource impacts identified in the EA, the BLM has determined that the Proposed Action would not result in any significant impacts. Therefore, an EIS is not necessary. The Finding of No Significant Impacts is included with the Decision Record.	<i>No change required</i>
SUWA 9	Noise, dust, safety	The vast majority of users of the Creek Pasture campground are non-motorized recreationalists and by supporting a major OHV trail through or near the campground, the BLM will foster the creation of unreasonable noise, dust, and safety concerns, and will violate the peaceful enjoyment of this site on public land that climbers, hikers, bicyclists, and BLM staff have worked so hard to establish. Safety is an issue with high-speed vehicles moving through. Concerned about the security compromises that may be introduced by leading large numbers of people right through the campground.	The route through the Creek Pasture campground is a designated route on the RMP travel plan. It is currently legal to travel on the road through the campground. The portion of the route through the Creek Pasture campground will not be utilized in the preferred alternative. The issue addressed by the commenter is no longer valid.	<i>No change required</i>
SUWA 10	Destruction of cultural sites	Destruction of cultural sites especially along waterway. BLM failure to comply with the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA). The EA fails to include a copy of the consultation and/or concurrence letters from SHPO or any Tribe. Pursuant to the NHPA, BLM must initiate consultation with the State Historic Preservation Officer, relevant and affected Tribes and other interested parties, and conduct a Class III cultural resource inventory of the area of potential effects of the proposed ATV right-of-way, in order to conduct meaningful consultation with affected Tribes, agencies and other interested parties, prior to issuing a	The BLM has completed consultations under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act. Cultural resource inventories were conducted. Consultation with the Utah State Historic Preservation Officer was conducted under the Utah Protocol of the BLM's nationwide programmatic agreement. The SHPO concurred with BLM's determination of No Historic Properties Effected for the project. Fifteen tribal entities were consulted on the project. No comments were received. All correspondence is included in the administrative record for the EA.	<i>No change required</i>

		decision, and must seek ways to avoid and protect any and all cultural resources that it discovers.		
SUWA 11	Impacts will exceed direct impacts examined	For this project, it is probable that the scope and magnitude of indirect impacts not examined in the EA greatly exceed those of the direct impacts that were examined by BLM. We ask that these indirect impacts be fully analyzed and considered in BLMs final decision. BLM must catalogue the “past, present, and reasonably foreseeable” future uses and management actions in the area that might impact the environment.	Indirect impacts are adequately analyzed in the EA in Section 4.2.	<i>No change required</i>
Great Old Broads for Wilderness (GOB)				
GOB 1	Fence Crossings	What will prevent full size vehicles from accessing the trail at its junction with D0570?	The fence crossings are ATV cattleguards – like stiles. They are too narrow for any other vehicles to use. Access onto the trail would be through San Juan County’s standard entrances which limit the size of vehicles that can enter the trail. This is just wide enough for 50 inch vehicles to pass through. This point was clarified in the EA in response to this and other like comments.	<i>Changed in Proposed and Preferred Alternative</i>
GOB 2	Multiple revisions	You state that multiple revisions were made to the ROW application on multiple dates that revise, clarify and finalize specifics of the proposal. The public was never notified of any of these revisions, nor has the final proposal been made easily available to the public.	Revisions are part of process in reaching a final draft. The draft final proposal was open for public review. A preferred alternative was developed by BLM to address issues identified in public comments received.	<i>No change required</i>
GOB 3	Consequences of ROW violations	There is no clear discussion of what will happen should the applicant violate the terms of the ROW and no clear proposed terms for the ROW.	The ROW grant would contain standard stipulations of the consequences of violations of terms of the right-of-way. “Failure of the holder to comply with applicable law or any provision of this right-of-way grant or permit shall constitute grounds for suspension or termination thereof.”	<i>No change required</i>
GOB 4	Invasive Species	The statements regarding Invasive Species/Noxious Weeds are inconsistent with known impacts of motorized use in areas where such use has not previously occurred. Weed seeds and other invasive species are known to be transported into areas via motorized use. Keeping such use out of an area is the best way to prevent infestations.	The ROW grant would contain a stipulation that the proponent is responsible for control of invasive species within their right-of-way. San Juan County has an active weed control program.	<i>No change required</i>

GOB 5	Original ENBB posting date	Summary of Public Participation – the information here is inconsistent with the date created for this proposed action on the ENBB which show 04/05/2006 as the posting date. The disregard for facts and accuracy extends to all aspects of this proposal.	The EA states the correct date of the ENBB posting as November 3, 2005.	<i>No change required</i>
GOB 6	Use of Paved Highway	Would the paved highway being a County Road affect the ability to use the ROW for an ATV trail?	See comment response at SUWA 5	<i>No change required</i>
GOB 7	More alternatives needed	We feel the BLM erred by not adequately considering a full range of reasonable alternatives that meet the reasonable NEED of the proposed action.	See comment response at SUWA 3	<i>No change required</i>
GOB 8	Design elements and signs	No design elements are addressed at all in this section.	A clarifying statement was added to the EA. This is also included in the stipulations of the ROW.	<i>Change made in the Proposed and Preferred Alternatives</i>
GOB 9	User conflicts	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Staging areas for motorized use should be separate from those of non-motorized users. They should be designed in a way to minimize riding in the campgrounds. 2. Consider the impact of other users when you decide on the trail's location. There is a lot of open land around those parts. 3. Please consider not having the ATV trail go directly through or even right next to a quiet, peaceful campground area. 4. Nor is it mentioned that the ATV use/abuse has displaced many other recreational users from this area, especially in the spring months. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The proposal is for a connector trail between the two roads. Staging is not anticipated at Creek Pasture. The route does not go through Creek Pasture. This is the middle of a connecting route, not a beginning. 2. Impacts to other users was analyzed in the EA. The preferred alternative utilizes an area not used very often by other recreationist. 3. This was the main purpose for developing the preferred alternative. 4. No evidence to substantiate this claim. 	<i>No change required</i>
GOB 10	Monitoring	BLM lacks the resources to enforce regulations relating to use of designated trails	BLM has outdoor recreation planners, recreation technicians, other resource specialists, law enforcement personnel, and partnerships to manage and monitor increased visitor use. The BLM has been and continues to monitor OHV routes for resource damage.	<i>No change required</i>
GOB 11	Riparian	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The proposed ATV trail includes segments that travel near a riparian area. Such green areas are rare in the Utah dry landscape. The EA fails to assess the impacts to the Indian Creek riparian 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. See response at SUWA 7 2. The preferred alternative will not drive up any dry washes. It does cross two 	<i>No change required</i>

		<p>area, even though the EA reveals that the applicant proposes to excavate a drainage ditch, The EA fails to make clear whether this proposed excavation, 100 feet, is included in the proposed right-of-way. The EA should be revised to accurately and clearly reflect the proposal.</p> <p>2. A section of the proposed ATV trail drives along a dry wash. Dry washes are often wet areas after heavy rains. The local wildlife depend on such wet areas. ATV use speeds the evaporation and disappearance of water. ATV trails should be kept out of dry washes. When the wash is muddy some ATV users will by-pass the muddy section, leading to widening and braiding. A better routing is needed.</p> <p>3. At a minimum an Army Corps of Engineers 404 permit is required to ensure that no degradation occurs to this body of water and the associated riparian system of Indian Creek into which the water and associated sediment are to be directed.</p>	<p>drainages.</p> <p>3. An Army Corps of Engineers 404 permit is not required for this mitigating measure. This is not a permanent body of water. It only contains water when there is moisture significant enough to flow off the slickrock adjacent on the south. The preferred alternative does not go through this area.</p>	
<p>GOB 12</p>	<p>Piecemealing</p>	<p>Without this “big picture” plan as a basis for looking at the potential for cumulative impacts the BLM is using a “piecemeal” approach to travel planning as regards ATV trails on the Field Office.</p>	<p>Travel Management, Management Action TM-6, page 141, allows for modifications to the designated routes in the Travel Plan based on the opportunity to tie into existing or planned trail networks (Appendix O, page 29). The MFO RMP states at LAR-13: 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.</p>	<p><i>No change required</i></p>

GOB 13	Need for ATV trails in RMP	Nowhere was the need for ATV specific trails identified in this plan.	See comment response at GOB 12	<i>No change required</i>
GOB 14	Noise, dust, safety	Opening this area to ATV use via the Proposed Action WILL create safety issues, noise issues, dust issues, riparian issues, conflict issues, off-route use/unauthorized use issues, increase crowding at this heavily used campground.	See comment response at SUWA 9	<i>No change required</i>
GOB 15	Safety at paved highway	There is no reference whatsoever to the danger to ATV operators and highway vehicle drivers of funneling ATVs onto a paved highway traveled by full size vehicles at speeds over 50 miles per hour (and often at much greater speeds).	See: 2.4 Alternatives Considered but Eliminated from Further Analysis 2.4.1 Alternative Access Routes The preferred alternative has modifications designed to enhance safety when crossing the paved highway.	<i>No change required</i>
GOB 16	User conflicts lead to impacts elsewhere with uncontrolled camping	What will happen if A TV are driving through the campground, is all the hordes of climbers that stay there, will seek peace and quiet somewhere else, and go camp out in primitive sites with no toilets or fire rings. Imagine all of those people pooping in the sand, tearing at the junipers for firewood, and leaving all their tiny bits of trash and T.P. flowers for the next weekend warriors, who will do the same. We need to keep these folks wanting to stay in the campgrounds, and Creek Pasture provides many a climber a toilet and an established fire ring.	Speculative. Beyond the scope of this analysis	<i>No change required</i>
GOB 17	Change in proposed action needed new scoping	When were the public, or any of the original commenters notified of a change in the purpose of this proposed action? Given the long time from proposal to EA, the fact that use in the proposal area has increased and changed significantly since the proposal was first made, and significant use changes have occurred since the Indian Creek Special Management Recreation Area Plan finalized and since the Monticello Field Office Resource Management Plan and Travel Management Plan were finalized, at a minimum there should have been some renewed scoping comments solicited and public notice of the proposed and changed action.	BLM followed the letter of the law by posting the draft EA to their public Environmental Notification Bulletin Board (ENBB). A 30 day comment period was initiated. BLM reviewed comments which they received and changes were made to the EA. The new draft EA with the modified preferred alternative will be posted to the ENBB with an additional comment period.	<i>No change required</i>

GOB 18	Not in conformance with RMP	The Proposed Action clearly does not conform to the Federal Register Notice for the 2008 RMP, Subpart 8342 – Designation of Areas and Trails Designation Criteria that all designations SHALL be based on the protection of the resources of the public lands, the promotion of the safety of all users of the public lands, and the minimization of conflicts among various uses of the public lands...No map of SJC “Loop” provided. The “plan” must be vetted publicly.	The Monticello Field Office RMP Travel Management Plan at Management Action TM-6, page 141, allows for modifications to the designated routes in the Travel Plan based on the opportunity to tie into existing or planned trail networks (Appendix O, page 29).	<i>No change required</i>
GOB 19	Clean Water Act	The pool (at the west end of the campground) constitutes a “lake” under the definitions of a wetland as a water of the United States under the Clean Water Act. The BLM should be nurturing all such ephemeral pools of water, especially those directly a result of and in such close proximity to a relatively rare desert feature, perennial Indian Creek. Has the BLM done any survey to determine if this pool is used by any amphibians, insects, or other creatures that estivate/lay eggs in such areas?	A review of the Clean Water Act does not reveal that this temporary pool of water could be deemed a “lake”. At 40 CFR Ch. I § 230.3 Definitions. (t) it states: The term <i>wetlands</i> means those areas that are inundated or saturated by surface or ground water at a frequency and duration sufficient to support, and that under normal circumstances do support, a prevalence of vegetation typically adapted for life in saturated soil conditions. Wetlands generally include swamps, marshes, bogs and similar areas. Under the preferred alternative, this area would not be part of the trail and this would not be an issue.	<i>No change required</i>
GOB 20	Developed vs. undeveloped	The Creek Pasture Campground is described as a dispersed camping area providing an undeveloped camping area yet BLM funds were used in 2011 to “develop” this campground providing designated sites, fire rings, parking areas, campsite markers, permanent vault toilets and designated group sites? How is this an “undeveloped camping area?”	This point was clarified in the EA in response to this comment.	<i>Change made at 3.3.1 to semi-developed campground</i>
GOB 21	Rock climbing area campground	Understated description of the world class rock climbing opportunities in the area that places concentrated climbing use 8 miles from the Creek Pasture campground and neglects to say there are really no other campgrounds any closer than 8 miles from those climbing area.	The proposed and preferred alternatives are for an ATV trail. They should have little effect on use of the campgrounds.	<i>No change required</i>
GOB 22	Impacts to Superbowl	There is no mention of how bringing ATV use proximate to the heavily used Superbowl dispersed use campsite WILL impact that area.	The proposal is a route between two designated roads where it is legal to ride. The proposed route does not connect to Superbowl. Discussions regarding Superbowl is beyond the scope of this EA and is speculative.	<i>No change required</i>

GOB 23	Benefit to recreating public	<p>What are the advantages and disadvantages of removing this recreational use/trail from the BLM's immediate control and management and bringing in an outside entity via a ROW? There was no mention of this being a desired or needed action in the Resource Management Plan. How is issuing a ROW to the applicant a benefit to the resource or the recreating public?</p> <p>Most FLPMA ROWs are for short duration for specific uses that are anticipated to cease at some future point in time or that serve a particular private or commercial interest.</p>	<p>The costs and responsibility of maintaining the route goes to San Juan County not BLM. This is how rights-of-way are designed, BLM does not retain control for the costs or maintenance etc. The trail will be concentrating use discouraging spider webs. Travel Management, Management Action TM-6, page 141, allows for modifications to the designated routes in the Travel Plan based on the opportunity to tie into existing or planned trail networks (Appendix O, page 29). Control of the ROW and public lands within the ROW would remain under the management of the BLM.</p> <p>FLPMA ROWs are issued for 30 year terms with right of renewal. They can be terminated sooner if the need for them no longer exists. They can be terminated for failure to comply with the stipulations in the grant.</p>	<i>No change required</i>
GOB 24	Purpose & Need not clearly stated	Need for the Proposed Action – The BLM completely fails to clearly state what the purpose and need of new segments of ATV trails that provide exclusive recreational opportunities for ATV enthusiasts is. Is there really a need for exclusive ATV trails in this area?	<p>The Utah NEPA Handbook states for Purpose and Need: List the BLM objectives or reasons for considering a non-bureau proposal.</p> <p>The EA now includes a broadened definition of “exclusive”</p>	<i>Change made to 1.4 Need for the Proposed Action</i>
GOB 25	Routes not pre-existing	ATV use was at that time restricted by the 2005 Indian Creek Corridor Plan to “Existing Roads and Trails.” It was clear from the new tracks on the ground in 2006 that there was no pre-existing use or existing trail in this area at all.	<p>The purpose of this analysis is to designate a trail through a right-of-way.</p> <p>See comment response at SUWA 12</p>	<i>No change required</i>
GOB 26	Impacts not adequately examined	This EA falls very short in the realistic analysis of potential impacts that could result with the implementation .	See discussion under SUWA 3	<i>No change required</i>
GOB 27	Impacts to Davis and Lavendar Canyons	We also recommend that BLM analyze indirect impacts to natural soundscapes due the potential for greater ATV use in Davis and Lavender Canyons including areas directly adjacent to Canyonlands.	At this time the impacts are unknown. However, the situation would be monitored and different land management practices in the area taken into consideration. If impacts become extensive, further actions may be taken the future.	<i>No change required</i>

GOB 28	Impacts to air quality, soils, wildlife and invasive species	[W]e recommend that BLM identify air quality, soils, wildlife, and invasive species as issues to be carried forward for detailed analysis in a revision to the EA.	These resources were considered and write-ups by resource specialists are included in the ID Team checklist – Appendix B.	<i>No change required</i>
Friends of Indian Creek (FOIC)				
FOIC 1	Faint trails mentioned in the EA do not exist	Proposed Action says "This segment would be about 1.4 miles long and consists of a faint trail established through ATV use which crosses relatively flat terrain". I have walked this terrain and can find no evidence that an ATV route exists except at its western edge where there are myriad "faint trails". There are some faint game trails in this segment, but nothing that would accommodate an ATV from Hamburger Rock to the point where Segment 3 begins.	The trail would be flagged and/or signed on the ground using where possible faint trails already existing. The trail will be established through repeated use by ATVs.	<i>No change required</i>
FOIC 2	D0570 Does not exist past campground	Segment 3 talks of utilizing a road (D0570)that is "is up to 12 feet wide and could accommodate full sized vehicles." This road does not exist. The road that fits that description is the campground, but it ends in the campground.	D0570 extends past the campground for approximately half a mile. It is depicted this way on the BLM travel plan maps.	<i>No change required</i>
FOIC 3	Drainage ditch	Segment 3 also talks of deepening a drainage ditch in the Indian Creek bed so as to mitigate concerns future AHV enthusiasts might have riding through water. As anyone who works in the desert can attest, a flash flood fills-in and creates ditches at nature's will. Without an enormous amount of excavation in a pristine riparian zone, you cannot expect to make a water free road for OHV use.	See comment response at GOB 11. The preferred alternative route is no longer in this area.	<i>No change required</i>
FOIC 4	Noise, dust, safety	The noise will ruin the camping experience for all visitors. ATV's will increase the dust all campers have to deal with. This also lessens the quality of the campsite.	The preferred alternative will not route the trail through the Creek Pasture campground. This would no longer be an issue in the campground.	<i>No change required</i>
FOIC 5	Highway Alternative	On page 7 the EA mentions an alternative that "would involve ATVs traveling alongside the highway within the highway right of way." This alternative makes sense.	See comment response at SUWA 2	<i>No change required</i>
Rocky Mountain Field Institute (RMFI)				
RMFI 1	Noise and dust	Negatively impact the present camping experience by increasing vehicular noise and dust levels.	See comment response at SUWA 9 The preferred alternative routes the trail away from the Creek Pasture campground.	<i>No change required</i>
RMFI 2	User conflicts	Create significant conflicts between motorized and non-motorized (climbers) recreationists.	See response at SUWA 3	<i>No change required</i>

RMFI 3	Impacts to dispersed camping	Further complicate efforts to address the impacts of dispersed camping in the area, and place additional pressure on other designated camping areas.	The proposal is for an ATV trail and should not affect camping as it does not go through any known camping areas. The preferred alternative is away from the Creek Pasture campground and not have impacts on campers there.	<i>No change required</i>
RMFI 4	BLM relationship w/ climbers	Undermine the positive working relationship that the Monticello Field Office has successfully established with the climbing community.	As the preferred alternative would not go through the Creek Pasture campground, this concern should be alleviated.	<i>No change required</i>
National Park Service (NPS)				
NPS 1	Impacts will exceed direct impacts examined	For this project, it is probable that the scope and magnitude of indirect impacts not examined in the EA greatly exceed those of the direct impacts that were examined by BLM. We ask that these indirect impacts be fully analyzed and considered in BLMs final decision regarding the applicant's ROW proposal.	See comment response at SUWA 3	<i>No change required</i>
NPS 2	Impacts to air quality, soils, wildlife and other resources	BLM did not analyze potential impacts to air quality, soils, wildlife, and other resources resulting from greater route connectivity and greater ATV / recreational use of areas directly adjacent to Canyonlands National Park.	These resources were considered and write-ups by resource specialists are included in the ID Team checklist – Appendix B.	<i>No change required</i>
NPS 3	Monitoring	As indicated in Appendix 0 to the Monticello Field Office Resource Management Plan, regulations at 43 CFR 8342.2 require BLM to monitor effects of OHV use.	See comment response at GOB 10	<i>No change required</i>
NPS 4	Noise impacts	We also recommend that BLM analyze indirect impacts to natural soundscapes due the potential for greater ATV use in Davis and Lavender Canyons	ATV use in Davis and Lavendar Canyons would be on routes designated in the Monticello BLM Resource Management Plan that are located on lands administered by the BLM. Use on these routes could increase but to what degree is speculative. Noise could increase in the areas of the NPS unit adjacent to the routes but would be of short duration and minimal.	<i>No change required</i>
Summary of Comments from Individuals (comments not captured above)				
IND 1	More alternatives needed	BLM's environmental review failed to assess reasonable alternatives.	See comment response at SUWA 2	<i>No change required</i>
IND 2	Economic impacts	The economic impacts of bringing in the off-road culture, are off-set by those of us who will not camp within a campsite that has OHV usage.	Speculative, no empirical evidence to support this argument.	<i>No change required</i>
IND 3	Character of campground	An OHV trail would have a large negative affect on the character of this Campground.	This would not be an impact under the preferred alternative.	<i>No change required</i>
IND 4	Right of way width	The Proposed Action is for a 10 foot ROW width. This	The 10 foot ROW width would allow for passing or	<i>Changes made in EA</i>

		width is sufficient for passage of full size vehicles and is not necessary for the Proposed Action. No vehicles wider than 50” should ever be needed or used in the ROW if approved.	meeting of vehicles and would also allow for maintenance work and placement of signs and barriers within the ROW. Access onto the trail would be through San Juan County’s standard entrances which limit the size of vehicles that can enter the trail. This is just wide enough for 50 inch vehicles to pass through.	<i>at 2.2 and 2.3</i>
IND 5	Wilderness Character	Would irreparably impact a large portion of lands that have wilderness characteristics, and that are included in America's Red Rock Wilderness Act. The EA does not discuss the impact of this project on wilderness character. Even if BLM believes this particular area lacks wilderness characteristics as defined in BLM policy guidance, the EA should be responsive to concerns expressed by the public. The fact that this route is being proposed for protection by lawmakers in the United States Congress should tell BLM that some form of protective management is in order, even if it might not be wilderness.	The BLM inventoried and evaluated lands for wilderness characteristics as part of the RMP process, dated August 2008. The proposal is not within any of the lands found by BLM to have wilderness characteristics. The proposed project is within the part of the Red Rock Plateau inventory area which was found to lack wilderness characteristics. The area was also re-evaluated after a submission of new information from the Southern Utah Wilderness Alliance. See comment response at SUWA 1.	<i>No change required</i>
IND 6	Impair creek	Could adversely affect this stretch of Indian Creek – a desert stream that supports a variety of wildlife species including desert bighorn sheep, mule deer, and golden eagles as it meanders through the redrock and high desert grasslands on its way to the Colorado River.	See comment response at SUWA 7 – riparian Wildlife surveys have been conducted for the area. The narratives relating to wildlife are documented in the ID Team Checklist attached to the EA	<i>No change required</i>
IND 7	Affect wildlife	Noise and dust from ATV usage will impact wildlife seeking out these areas.	See comment response at GOB 28	<i>No change required</i>
IND 8	Segment 3 not on TM	The 0.9 miles of existing but not designated route was NOT DESIGNATED for OHV use for some reason(s). What were those reasons?	One of many existing user created tracks. Now there is a request to authorize an ATV trail which will traverse areas not designated in travel plan.	<i>No change required</i>
IND 9	Keep full sized vehicles off trail	How does the BLM propose to keep full-size vehicles from using this segment given the wide nature of the existing route?	See comment response at GOB 1	<i>No change required</i>
IND 10	Crypto	The inevitable destruction of cryptobiotic soil that would come with increased OHV use are too much for this fragile land.	The analyses of the impacts to soils is found in the checklist. The proposed action will not impact the overall soil function and productivity to the degree	<i>No change required</i>

			that would require detailed analysis in the EA.	
IND 11	User conflicts and naturalness	BLM has an obligation to minimize impacts of ORV routes against natural and cultural resources and wilderness values and to minimize conflicts with other public uses. The Indian Creek A TV route clashes with that obligation.	The proposed/preferred action and potential impacts to resources was analyzed in the EA Section 4.0. Mitigation measures area also found in this section.	
IND 12	Impacts to livestock	The negative ramifications of this proposed right of way are many, a few of the impacts will be on livestock	The proposed ATV trail would not impact existing livestock operations. The area is currently utilized by motorized recreationists. Total surface disturbance would be approximately 6.3 acres. The applicant proposes to install an ATV cattle guard in the highway fence to prevent cattle passage. The action would not appreciably increase motorized recreation use levels to a level that would impact livestock grazing.	<i>No change required</i>
IND 13	Effects on private landowners	Effects on private land owners should be taken into consideration.	See comment response at IND 12. No private property is in the immediate area of the proposal.	<i>No change required</i>
IND 14	Designated campground	Segment 3 of the proposed route would funnel all this new ATV use directly through a recently designated group campsite area in the Creek Pasture area. How can this be “minimizing impacts to other recreational users,” especially since the Creek Pasture camping areas are currently used almost exclusively by non-ATV recreationists and by those wishing the most remote, quiet, non-motorized setting possible.	Creek Pasture is not an exclusive use campground. BLM has not designated a group campsite – design of the campground is not complete. This is a motorized access campground This would not be an issue under the preferred alternative, as the campground is avoided.	<i>No change required</i>
IND 15	Transportation	The Federal Land Management and Policy Act (FLMPA) and the implementing regulations limit a BLM-granted right-of-way under Title V to those necessary for transportation.	At FLPMA it states at: Sec. 501. [43 U.S.C. 1761] The Secretary, with respect to the public [is]authorized to grant, issue, or renew rights-or-way over, upon, under, or through such lands for– (a) (6) roads, <u>trails</u> , highways, railroads, canals, tunnels, tramways, airways, livestock driveways, or other means of transportation except where such facilities are constructed and maintained in connection with commercial recreation facilities on lands in the National Forest System; Authorization of this right of way is in conformance with Title V of FLPMA.	<i>Clarified in EA at 1.6</i>
IND 16	The Proposed ATV Route is Not in the Public Interest	BLM affirmatively states the purpose of the ATV right-of-way is to provide an “exclusive” use for ATV riders. Exclusive use, such as that proposed in the EA, contradicts	FLPMA mandates “multiple use”. This does not equate to all uses on all lands. There are many “exclusive use” areas on BLM administered lands.	<i>No change required</i>

		the clear purpose of Title V right-of-way authority under FLPMA. Therefore, as is clear in this instance, BLM lacks Title V authority to take publicly-owned land and hold it aside for exclusive use.	See comment response at IND 15	
--	--	--	--------------------------------	--