CHAPTER 2—DESCRIPTION OF ALTERNATIVES

2.1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter describes the six alternatives analyzed:

- No Action Alternative
- Alternative A
- Alternative B
- Alternative C
- Alternative E
- Proposed Resource Management Plan (RMP).

The Proposed RMP/Final Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) does not carry forward Alternative D (Preferred Alternative) from the Draft RMP/EIS. Rather, the Proposed RMP consists of a combination of all the alternatives, including Alternative D from the Draft RMP/EIS, as it and the other alternatives were modified in response to public comment, as well as information from the Area of Critical Environmental Concern (ACEC) Supplement (June 2006) and the non-Wilderness Study Area (WSA) lands with wilderness characteristics supplement (September 2007). The No Action Alternative (continuation of the existing management direction (43 CFR 1610.4-5)) includes updates within the framework of the 1983 *Price River Management Framework Plan* (MFP) and supplements and the 1991 *San Rafael RMP* and amendments, as well as new direction and policy that have been subsequently developed. The five action alternatives (Alternatives A, B, C, E, and the Proposed RMP) were developed to present a reasonable range of management options for directing resource uses and activities within the Price Field Office (PFO) (40 CFR 1502.14).

Alternatives were developed to consider a range of management options and evaluate the potential impacts on the resources in the PFO that might occur as a result of management decisions. The alternatives themselves do not constitute management decisions; rather, they represent reasonable approaches to managing land and activities consistent with law, regulation, and policy but emphasize different management scenarios from protecting resources to maximizing development to a balanced approach. The National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) requires the development and evaluation of several alternatives, including a No Action Alternative, to measure the potential impacts that a set of actions could have on the area. According to NEPA, the BLM must consider these impacts in developing the RMP for the PFO, as described in Chapter 1 (40 CFR 1502.2).

Planning decisions establish desired outcomes and actions needed to achieve them. Decisions are reached using the planning process in 43 CFR 1600. When they are presented to the public as proposed decisions, they can be protested to the BLM Director. They are not appealable to the Interior Board of Land Appeals (from *BLM Land Use Planning Handbook,* H-1601-1). Implementation decisions are decisions that take action to implement land use plan (LUP) decisions and are generally appealable to the Interior Board of Land Appeals under 43 CFR 4.410 (from *BLM Land Use Planning Handbook,* H-1601-1). Implementation-level decisions are italicized and marked with an asterisk.

This chapter presents an overview of the alternatives' development process and goals and objectives for resources, resource uses, special designations, and support. Section 2.2 summarizes the six alternatives. Section 2.3 contains the Alternatives Summary Tables including the goals, objectives, and actions common to all alternatives. Section 2.4 contains the Summary of Impacts table, allowing side-by-side comparison of the alternatives and the range of management decisions.

2.2 SUMMARY OF THE DRAFT RMP/EIS ALTERNATIVES AND THE PROPOSED RMP

The 2004 Draft RMP/EIS considered and analyzed five alternatives. Alternative C was modified to include four new ACECs through the *Supplemental Information and Analysis to the Price Field Office Draft RMP/EIS for ACECs* (June 2006). A new alternative (Alternative E) was added to the Draft RMP through the *Supplement to the Price Field Office Draft RMP/EIS for Non-WSA lands with Wilderness Characteristics* (September 2007). All these changes have resulted in the alternatives considered in this Final EIS, as displayed in Section 2.3.

The Proposed RMP does not carry forward, in whole, Alternative D (Preferred Alternative) from the Draft RMP/EIS. Rather, the Proposed RMP consists of a combination of all the alternatives, as well as information from the ACEC Supplement (June 2006) and the non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics supplement (September 2007), and Alternative D from the Draft RMP/EIS – which was used as the foundation for the Proposed RMP. The Proposed RMP was crafted in response to public comments, internal comments, and coordination with cooperating agencies. The Proposed RMP is based on examination of the following factors:

- Balance of use and protection of resources
- Extent of the environmental impacts
- Consideration of formal recommendations from the cooperating agencies
- Public comments on the Draft RMP/EIS.

The Proposed RMP was chosen because it resolves the major issues while providing for common ground among conflicting opinions and multiple uses of public lands in a sustainable fashion. It provides the best balance of resource protection and use within legal constraints.

The following sections provide a general description of the alternatives. The descriptions are organized by alternative, starting with the No Action Alternative, followed by Alternatives A, B, C, E, and the Proposed RMP.

2.2.1 No Action Alternative

The No Action Alternative represents current management as outlined in the *1983 Price River MFP* and the *1991 San Rafael RMP,* and as altered through amendment and policy since adoption of the Records of Decision for those plans (43 CFR 1610.4-5). The current levels, methods, and mix of multiple use management of public lands in the PFO would continue, and resource values would generally receive attention at present levels. Key resource objectives on public lands within the PFO include:

- Oil and gas leasing categories:
  - 949,000 acres or 38 percent of the Field Office open to oil and gas leasing subject to the standard terms and conditions of the lease form
  - 896,000 acres or 36 percent open to oil and gas leasing subject to minor constraints (timing limitations, controlled surface use [CSU], lease notices)
  - 99,000 acres or 4 percent open to oil and gas leasing subject to major constraints (no surface occupancy [NSO])
  - 535,000 acres or 22 percent unavailable to leasing.
- Vegetation treatments and manipulations would be prescribed on a case-by-case basis to achieve or maintain *Standards for Rangeland Health* (43 CFR 4180). Treatments in pinyon-juniper woodlands would focus on Wildland-Urban Interface (WUI) areas and wildlife mitigation areas.

Sagebrush communities would be managed and maintained for natural composition and age class distribution.

- There would be no changes in livestock grazing for other resource purposes, and existing allotments would continue as currently allocated.
- No rivers or river segments would be recommended as suitable for designation as a Wild and Scenic River (WSR). Suitability determinations would not be made for any of the eligible river segments; they would remain eligible and would be managed to protect their outstandingly remarkable values, free-flowing nature, and tentative classification to the degree that the BLM has authority (i.e., BLM lands within the corridor) and within the parameters of decisions made in the *San Rafael RMP* and the *Price River MFP* until such time as suitability determinations are made (43 CFR 8351.2-1 (a)). Protective management would apply to BLM lands along eligible river segments, with 271 miles tentatively classified as Wild, 268 miles as Scenic, and 111 miles as Recreational.
- The existing ACECs would continue to be maintained as prescribed, and no additional areas would be managed as ACECs.
- The existing special recreation management areas (SRMA) would be maintained and Recreation Opportunity Spectrum (ROS) objectives would continue to be used in these areas.
- Off-highway vehicle (OHV) recreation would continue to be managed according to the *2003 San Rafael Motorized Route Designation Plan* and the *1990 Price River ORV Plan*. Specifically:
  - 743,000 acres open to cross-county OHV use
  - 138,000 acres closed to OHV use
  - 1,598,000 acres limited to designated use
  - 670 miles of designated routes (routes are only designated in the area addressed by the *San Rafael RMP*).
- The existing management would continue in the four designated herd management areas (HMA): Range Creek (horses), Muddy Creek (horses), Sinbad (horses and burros), and Robbers Roost (horses).
- Visual resources would be managed to preserve the existing character of the landscape in WSAs, Desolation Canyon National Historic Landmark (NHL), and seven ACECs. VRM Classes would be as follows:
  - VRM Class I: 606,000 acres
  - VRM Class II: 379,000 acres
  - VRM Class III: 759,000 acres
  - VRM Class IV: 735,000 acres.
- No additional lands outside of WSAs would be specifically identified and managed to protect, preserve, or maintain their naturalness, solitude, and outstanding opportunities for primitive recreation.

2.2.2 Alternative A

Alternative A emphasizes active management for commodities, amenities, and services by providing maximum access and development of mineral resources, including oil, gas, coalbed natural gas, and coal, allowed by law. Mineral resource development is given priority over other uses and resource considerations to the extent possible. Key resource objectives on public lands within the PFO include:

- Oil and gas leasing categories:
  - 1,815,000 acres or 73 percent open to oil and gas leasing subject to the standard terms and conditions of the lease form
  - 17,000 acres or 1 percent open to oil and gas leasing subject to minor constraints (timing limitations, CSU, lease notices)
  - 110,000 acres or 4 percent open to oil and gas leasing subject to major constraints (NSO)

  - 537,000 acres or 22 percent unavailable to leasing.
- Existing vegetation treatments (including treatments in pinyon-juniper woodlands) would be maintained, and additional treatments would be implemented to achieve or maintain Standards for Rangeland Health. Sagebrush steppe would be managed to emphasize livestock grazing and wildlife habitat (43 CFR 4180). The BLM would encourage willing partners to participate in offsite mitigation strategies (subject to 43 CFR 1784.1-1 (b) and current policy).
- There would be no changes in current livestock grazing for other resource purposes, and existing allotments would continue as currently allocated. Future changes in available forage would be adjusted to benefit livestock and the resources (43 CFR 4100.0-2).
- No eligible rivers or river segments would be found suitable for WSR designation. Protective management for WSR eligibility or suitability would not apply to BLM lands along any river segments.
- The following seven existing ACECs would be maintained (163,560 acres), and one new area would be designated as ACECs (770 acres) (43 CFR 1610.7-2):
  - Copper Globe ACEC (existing)
  - Dry Lake Archaeological District ACEC (existing)
  - Interstate 70 ACEC (existing)
  - Muddy Creek ACEC (existing)
  - Rock Art (formerly Pictographs) ACEC (existing)
  - San Rafael Reef ACEC (existing)
  - Segers Hole ACEC (existing)
  - Potential Cleveland Lloyd Dinosaur Quarry ACEC.
- The four existing SRMAs would be maintained, with some boundary adjustments (1,018,740 acres). ROS objectives would be used in these areas to manage the recreation setting and potential experiences. Three recreation management zones (RMZ) would be designated in the San Rafael Swell SRMA and one in the Desolation Canyon SRMA. Large group camping sites would be designated as needed.
- OHV recreation would be managed according to open, closed, or limited to designated route categories as follows:
  - 0 acres open to cross-county OHV use; small open areas would be considered near local communities and managed by the BLM.
  - 370,000 acres closed to OHV use.
  - 2,109,000 acres limited to designated routes
  - 2,430 miles of designated routes (includes the 670 miles of routes carried forward from the *2003 San Rafael Motorized Route Designation Plan*).
- No HMAs would be managed for horses. The wild burro portion population of the Sinbad HMA would be adjusted to match the natural and manmade barriers that existed at the time of the passage of the Wild Free-Roaming Horse and Burro Act in 1971 (43 CFR 4700.0-2).
- Visual resources would be managed to preserve the existing character of the landscape on WSAs, Desolation Canyon NHL, and four ACECs. VRM classes would be as follows:
  - VRM Class I: 599,000 acres
  - VRM Class II: 142,000 acres
  - VRM Class III: 1,005,000 acres
  - VRM Class IV: 733,000 acres
- No additional lands outside of WSAs would be specifically identified and managed to protect, preserve, or maintain their naturalness, solitude, and outstanding opportunities for primitive recreation.

2.2.3 Alternative B

Alternative B seeks to preserve the unique values of lands within the PFO while accommodating reasonable levels of use. Alternative B would provide a moderate amount of mineral development, recreation would have a mix of motorized and primitive recreation opportunities, and approximately half the potential ACECs would be designated. Key resource objectives on public lands within the PFO include:

- Oil and gas leasing categories:
  - 0 acres open to oil and gas leasing subject to the standard terms and conditions of the lease form
  - 1,633,000 acres or 66 percent open to oil and gas leasing subject to minor constraints (timing limitations, CSU, lease notices)
  - 289,000 acres or 12 percent open to oil and gas leasing subject to major constraints (NSO)
  - 557,000 acres or 22 percent unavailable to leasing.
- Existing vegetation treatments would be maintained, and additional treatments would be implemented to achieve or maintain Standards for Rangeland Health. Treatments in pinyon-juniper woodlands would be implemented to move the woodlands toward their approximate historic range. The sagebrush steppe would be managed for all resources, encouraging actions that result in a mosaic of age and structure. The BLM would encourage willing partners to participate in offsite mitigation strategies (subject to 43 CFR 1784.1-1 (b) and current policy).
- Livestock grazing would continue as currently allocated on most of the allotments in the PFO. Future changes in available forage would be adjusted between livestock, wild horses and burros, and wildlife as determined on a case-by-case basis (43 CFR 4110.3). Livestock grazing would be closed in the Green River and Rock Creek Allotments beneath the canyon rim. The season of use would be adjusted in the Red Canyon, McKay Flat, and Hondo Allotments.
- Protective management would apply to BLM lands along suitable river segments with 78 miles tentatively classified as Wild (three river segments), 93 miles as Scenic (six river segments), and 103 miles as Recreational (five river segments). The remaining eligible segments would receive no protective management (PL 90-542 as amended sec.2 (b)).
- Nine existing ACECs would be maintained, with some ACEC boundaries being expanded (321,760 acres), and five new areas would be designated as ACECs (199,870 acres) (43 CFR 1610.7-2):
  - Copper Globe ACEC (existing)
  - Dry Lake Archaeological District ACEC (existing)
  - Interstate 70 ACEC (existing)
  - Muddy Creek ACEC (existing)
  - Rock Art ACEC (existing)
  - San Rafael Canyon ACEC (existing)
  - San Rafael Reef ACEC (existing)
  - Segers Hole ACEC (existing)
  - Sids Mountain ACEC (existing)
  - Potential Cleveland-Lloyd Dinosaur Quarry ACEC
  - Potential Lower Green River ACEC
  - Potential Beckwith Plateau ACEC
  - Potential Range Creek ACEC
  - Potential Nine Mile Canyon ACEC.
- Four existing SRMAs would be maintained, with some boundary adjustments (1,234,770 acres). The Nine Mile Canyon SRMA would be designated (31,700 acres). ROS objectives would be used in these areas to manage the recreation setting and potential experiences; Three RMZs

would be designated in the San Rafael Swell SRMA and one in the Desolation Canyon SRMA. Large group camping sites would be designated as needed.

- OHV recreation would be managed according to open, closed, or limited to designated route categories as follows:
  - 0 acres open to cross-county OHV use; small open areas would be considered on a case-by-case basis.
  - 446,000 acres closed to OHV use.
  - 2,033,000 acres limited to designated routes
  - 2,430 miles of designated routes (includes the 670 miles of routes carried forward from the *2003 San Rafael Motorized Route Designation Plan*).
- HMA boundaries on the Range Creek, Muddy Creek, and Sinbad HMAs would be adjusted to match the natural and manmade barriers that existed at the time of the passage of the Wild Free-Roaming Horse and Burro Act in 1971. The Sinbad HMA would be split: the northern portion would remain the Sinbad HMA, and the southern portion, consisting of McKay Flat and surrounding area, would be included into the Muddy Creek HMA. Wild horses would be removed from the Muddy Creek and Robbers Roost HMAs. The Sinbad and Muddy Creek HMAs would be managed for burros. The Range Creek HMA would be managed for wild horses (43 CFR 4700.0-2).
- Visual resources would be managed to preserve the existing character of the on WSAs, Desolation Canyon NHL, and six ACECs. VRM classes would be as follows:
  - VRM Class I: 632,000 acres
  - VRM Class II: 319,000 acres
  - VRM Class III: 1,229,000 acres
  - VRM Class IV: 299,000 acres
- No additional lands outside of WSAs would be specifically identified and managed to protect, preserve, or maintain their naturalness, solitude, and outstanding opportunities for primitive recreation.

2.2.4 Alternative C

Alternative C includes management strategies to preserve and protect noncommodity resources (e.g., wildlife habitat and water quality) and to deemphasize production goals for resource uses. There would be less active management of resources than under the other alternatives. Production of products from vegetation management in all habitats would be secondary to restoring vegetation and riparian areas. This alternative emphasizes dispersed and non-motorized recreation. Key resource objectives on public lands within the PFO include:

- Oil and gas leasing categories:
  - 0 acres open to oil and gas leasing subject to the standard terms and conditions of the lease form
  - 1,418,000 acres or 57 percent open to oil and gas leasing subject to minor constraints (timing limitations, CSU, lease notices)
  - 500,000 acres or 20 percent open to oil and gas leasing subject to major constraints (NSO)
  - 561,000 acres or 23 percent unavailable to leasing.
- Vegetation would be manipulated using only natural processes, such as prescriptive grazing with livestock, wildland fire, disease, and insects. Existing pinyon-juniper treatments would no longer be maintained. Natural vegetation communities, including sagebrush steppe, would be fostered. The BLM would encourage willing partners to participate in offsite mitigation strategies (subject to 43 CFR 1784.1-1 (b) and current policy).

- Livestock grazing would continue as currently allocated on most of the allotments in the PFO (43 CFR 4110.3). Future changes in available forage would be adjusted to benefit wildlife. Livestock grazing would be closed in the following areas:
  - Range Creek, Hondo, Red Canyon, and McKay Flat Allotments
  - Within the portions of the Horse Bench pasture of the Green River Allotment and Rock Creek Allotment within the Desolation Canyon SRMA
  - San Rafael River, Saucer Basin, and Horseshoe North Allotments within the Labyrinth Canyon SRMA
  - Developed Recreation Sites (if/when fenced to exclude livestock).
- Protective management would apply to BLM lands along suitable river segments with 271 miles tentatively classified as Wild (19 river segments), 268 miles as Scenic (11 river segments), and 111 miles as Recreational (8 river segments (PL 90-542 as amended sec.2 (b)).
- All areas with identified relevant and important values (existing or potential ACECs) would be managed as ACECs (883,515 acres) (43 CFR 1610.7-2):
  - Big Flat Tops ACEC (existing)
  - Bowknot Bend ACEC (existing)
  - Dry Lake Archaeological District ACEC (existing)
  - Interstate 70 ACEC (existing)
  - Muddy Creek ACEC (existing)
  - Rock Art ACEC (existing)
  - San Rafael Canyon ACEC (existing)
  - San Rafael Reef ACEC (existing)
  - Segers Hole ACEC (existing)
  - Sids Mountain ACEC (existing)
  - Potential Lower Green River ACEC
  - Potential Beckwith Plateau ACEC
  - Potential Temple-Cottonwood-Dugout ACEC
  - Potential Range Creek ACEC
  - Potential Nine Mile Canyon ACEC
  - Potential Cleveland-Lloyd Dinosaur Quarry ACEC
  - Potential Gordon Creek ACEC
  - Potential Heritage Sites ACEC
  - Potential Uranium Mining Districts ACEC
  - Potential Desolation Canyon ACEC
  - Potential White-Tailed Prairie Dog ACEC
  - Potential Mussentuchit Badlands ACEC
  - Potential Lower Muddy Creek ACEC.
- Four existing SRMAs would be maintained, with some boundary adjustments (1,354,060 acres). The Nine Mile Canyon SRMA would be designated (58,030 acres). ROS objectives would be used in these areas to manage the recreation setting and potential experiences. One RMZ would be designated in Desolation Canyon SRMA. Large group camping sites would be designated as needed.
- OHV recreation would be managed according to open, closed, or limited to designated route categories as follows:
  - 0 acres open to cross-county OHV use
  - 743,000 acres closed to OHV use
  - 1,736,000 acres limited to designated routes
  - 670 miles of designated routes carried forward from the *2003 San Rafael Motorized Route Designation Plan.*
- HMA boundaries on the Range Creek, Muddy Creek, and Sinbad HMAs would be adjusted to match the natural and manmade barriers that existed at the time of the passage of the Wild Free-

Roaming Horse and Burro Act in 1971. The Sinbad HMA would be split; the northern portion would remain the Sinbad HMA, and the southern portion, consisting of McKay Flat and surrounding area, would be included in the Muddy Creek HMA. Wild horses would be removed from the Robbers Roost HMA. The Muddy Creek and Range Creek HMAs would be managed for wild horses. The Sinbad HMA would be managed for wild burros (43 CFR 4700.0-2).

- Visual resources would be managed to preserve the existing character of the landscape on WSAs, Desolation Canyon NHL, WSR segments tentatively classified as Wild, and eight ACECs. VRM classes would be as follows:
  - VRM Class I: 659,000 acres
  - VRM Class II: 485,000 acres
  - VRM Class III: 713,000 acres
  - VRM Class IV: 622,000 acres
- No additional lands outside of WSAs would be specifically identified and managed to protect, preserve, or maintain their naturalness, solitude, and outstanding opportunities for primitive recreation.

2.2.5 Alternative E

Alternative E emphasizes protecting, preserving, and maintaining the wilderness characteristics of all non-WSA lands found to have wilderness characteristics, including closing these areas to mineral leasing and OHVs, excluding rights-of-way (ROW), and protecting undisturbed landscapes and opportunities for primitive and semi-primitive recreation opportunities. The alternative also includes designating all potential ACECs and determining that all eligible WSRs are suitable for designation. The alternative is the same as Alternative C for the remaining 40 percent of the PFO, which allows for mineral and energy development and motorized recreation use. Key resource objectives on public lands within the PFO include:

- Oil and gas leasing categories:
  - 0 acres open to oil and gas leasing subject to the standard terms and conditions of the lease form
  - 870,000 acres or 34 percent open to oil and gas leasing subject to minor constraints (timing limitations, CSU, lease notices)
  - 130,000 acres or 6 percent open to oil and gas leasing subject to major constraints (NSO)
  - 1,490,000 acres or 60 percent unavailable to leasing.
- Vegetation would be manipulated using only natural processes, such as prescriptive grazing with livestock, wildland fire, disease, and insects. Existing pinyon-juniper treatments would no longer be maintained. Natural vegetation communities, including sagebrush steppe, would be fostered. The BLM would encourage willing partners to participate in offsite mitigation strategies (subject to 43 CFR 1784.1-1 (b) and current policy).
- Livestock grazing would continue as currently allocated on most of the allotments in the PFO (43 CFR 4110.3). Future changes in available forage would be adjusted to benefit wildlife. Livestock grazing would be closed in the following areas:
  - Range Creek, Hondo, Red Canyon, and McKay Flat Allotments
  - Within the portions of the Horse Bench pasture of the Green River Allotment and Rock Creek Allotment within the Desolation Canyon SRMA
  - San Rafael River, Saucer Basin, and Horseshoe North Allotments within the Labyrinth Canyon SRMA
  - Price Canyon Recreation Site (if/when fenced to exclude livestock).
- Protective management would apply to BLM lands along suitable river segments with 271 miles tentatively classified as Wild (19 river segments), 268 miles as Scenic (11 river segments), and 111 miles as Recreational (8 river segments (PL 90-542 as amended sec.2 (b)).

- All areas with identified relevant and important values (existing or potential ACECs) would be managed as ACECs (883,515 acres) (43 CFR 1610.7-2):
  - Big Flat Tops ACEC (existing)
  - Bowknot Bend ACEC (existing)
  - Dry Lake Archaeological District ACEC (existing)
  - Interstate 70 ACEC (existing)
  - Muddy Creek ACEC (existing)
  - Rock Art ACEC (existing)
  - San Rafael Canyon ACEC (existing)
  - San Rafael Reef ACEC (existing)
  - Segers Hole ACEC (existing)
  - Sids Mountain ACEC (existing)
  - Potential Lower Green River ACEC
  - Potential Beckwith Plateau ACEC
  - Potential Temple-Cottonwood-Dugout ACEC
  - Potential Range Creek ACEC
  - Potential Nine Mile Canyon ACEC
  - Potential Cleveland-Lloyd Dinosaur Quarry ACEC
  - Potential Gordon Creek ACEC
  - Potential Heritage Sites ACEC
  - Potential Uranium Mining Districts ACEC
  - Potential Desolation Canyon ACEC
  - Potential White-Tailed Prairie Dog ACEC
  - Potential Mussentuchit Badlands ACEC
  - Potential Lower Muddy Creek ACEC.
- Four existing SRMAs would be maintained, with some boundary adjustments (1,354,060 acres). The Nine Mile Canyon SRMA would be designated (58,030 acres). ROS objectives would be used in these areas to manage the recreation setting and potential experiences. One RMZ would be designated in Desolation Canyon SRMA. Large group camping sites would be designated as needed.
- OHV recreation would be managed according to open, closed, or limited to designated route categories as follows:
  - 0 acres open to cross-county OHV use
  - 1,520,000 acres closed to OHV use
  - 970,000 acres limited to designated routes
  - 440 miles of designated routes (includes those routes from the *2003 San Rafael Motorized Route Designation Plan* that are outside the non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics).
- HMA boundaries on the Range Creek, Muddy Creek, and Sinbad HMAs would be adjusted to match the natural and manmade barriers that existed at the time of the passage of the Wild Free-Roaming Horse and Burro Act in 1971. The Sinbad HMA would be split; the northern portion would remain the Sinbad HMA, and the southern portion, consisting of McKay Flat and surrounding area, would be included into the Muddy Creek HMA. Wild horses would be removed from the Robbers Roost HMA. The Muddy Creek and Range Creek HMAs would be managed for wild horses. The Sinbad HMA would be managed for wild burros (43 CFR 4700.0-2).
- Visual resources would be managed to preserve the existing character of the landscape on WSAs, non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics, Desolation Canyon NHL, WSR segments tentatively classified as Wild, and eight ACECs. VRM classes would be as follows:
  - VRM Class I: 1,516,000 acres
  - VRM Class II: 147,000 acres
  - VRM Class III: 451,000 acres
  - VRM Class IV: 365,000 acres.

- All 27 areas of non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics (937,440 acres), identified by the BLM through inventory maintenance, would be managed to protect, preserve and maintain their wilderness characteristics.

2.2.6 The Proposed RMP

The Proposed RMP/Final EIS does not carry forward Alternative D (Preferred Alternative) from the Draft RMP/EIS. Rather, the Proposed RMP consists of a combination of all the alternatives, including Alternative D from the Draft RMP/EIS, as it and the other alternatives were modified in response to public comment, as well as information from the ACEC Supplement (June 2006) and the non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics supplement (September 2007). The Proposed RMP provides for a variety of resource needs throughout the PFO. It includes maximizing mineral development potential in areas with the greatest potential for maximum resource recovery and targeting recreation management to provide for quality recreation settings, experiences, and benefits in an environmentally appropriate manner. Key resource objectives on public lands within the PFO in the Proposed RMP include:

- Oil and gas leasing categories:
  - 1,161,000 acres or 47 percent open to oil and gas leasing subject to the standard terms and conditions of the lease form
  - 467,000 acres or 19 percent open to oil and gas leasing subject to minor constraints (timing limitations, CSU, lease notices)
  - 282,000 acres or 11 percent open to oil and gas leasing subject to major constraints (NSO)
  - 569,000 acres or 23 percent unavailable to leasing.
- Vegetation treatments and manipulations would be prescribed on a case-by-case basis to achieve or maintain *Standards for Rangeland Health* (43 CFR 4180). Treatments in pinyon-juniper woodlands would be implemented to move the woodlands toward their approximate historic range. Sagebrush communities would be managed and maintained for natural composition and age class distribution. The BLM would encourage willing partners to participate in offsite mitigation strategies.
- Livestock grazing would continue as currently allocated on most of the allotments in the PFO. Future changes in available forage would be adjusted among livestock, wild horses and burros, and wildlife as determined on a case-by-case basis (43 CFR 4100.0-2). Livestock grazing on the Range Creek Allotment would be authorized on a prescription basis, using grazing as a management tool for the benefit of resource values. Upon voluntary relinquishment of the existing permit and preference for livestock forage in the Green River and Rock Creek Allotments, the BLM would stop authorizing livestock grazing of the associated forage (which comprises Desolation and Gray Canyons below the canyon rims). The season of use would be adjusted in the Red Canyon, McKay Flat, and Hondo Allotments.
- Protective management would apply to BLM lands along suitable river segments with 62 miles tentatively classified as Wild (3 river segments combined into 1), 60 miles as Scenic (1 river segment), and 8 miles as Recreational (1 river segment) (PL 90-542 as amended sec.2 (b)).
- Thirteen ACECs would be designated (208,555 acres); however, grouping and expanding ACECs would result in maintaining eight existing ACECs. Five new areas, including the renaming of one existing area, would be designated as ACECs (43 CFR 1610.7-2):
  - Big Flat Tops ACEC (existing)
  - Bowknot Bend ACEC (existing)
  - Dry Lake Archaeological District ACEC (existing)
  - Interstate 70 ACEC (existing)
  - Muddy Creek ACEC (existing)
  - San Rafael Canyon ACEC (existing)
  - San Rafael Reef ACEC (existing)

  - Segers Hole ACEC (existing)
  - Potential Nine Mile Canyon ACEC
  - Potential Cleveland-Lloyd Dinosaur Quarry ACEC
  - Potential Heritage Sites ACEC (includes the following previous existing ACECs: Copper Globe ACEC, Swaseys Cabin ACEC, Temple Mountain ACEC)
  - Potential Uranium Mining Districts ACEC
  - Potential Rock Art ACEC (previously existing Pictographs ACEC).
- Four existing SRMAs would be maintained, with some boundary adjustments (1,116,240 acres). The Range Creek SRMA (40,700 acres) and the Nine Mile Canyon SRMA (24,300 acres) would be identified. ROS objectives would be used in these areas to manage the recreation setting and potential experiences. Three RMZs would be designated in the San Rafael Swell SRMA and one in the Desolation Canyon SRMA. Large group camping sites would be designated as needed.
- OHV recreation would be managed according to open, closed, or limited to designated route categories as follows:
  - 0 acres open to cross-county OHV use; small open areas would be considered on a case-by-case basis
  - 557,000 acres closed to OHV use
  - 1,922,000 acres limited to designated routes
  - 605 miles of designated routes
  - 670 miles of designated routes carried forward from the *2003 San Rafael Motorized Route Designation Plan*.
- HMA boundaries on the Range Creek, Muddy Creek, and Sinbad HMAs would be adjusted to match the natural and manmade barriers that existed at the time of the passage of the Wild Free-Roaming Horse and Burro Act in 1971. The Sinbad HMA would be split; the northern portion would remain the Sinbad HMA, and the southern portion, consisting of McKay Flat and surrounding area, would be included into the Muddy Creek HMA. Wild horses would be removed from the Robbers Roost HMA. The Muddy Creek and Range Creek HMAs would be managed for wild horses. The Sinbad HMA would be managed for wild burros (43 CFR 4700.0-2).
- Visual resources would be managed to preserve the existing character of the landscape on WSAs, Desolation Canyon NHL, and six ACECs. VRM classes would be as follows:
  - VRM Class I: 598,000 acres
  - VRM Class II: 342,000 acres
  - VRM Class III: 1,248,000 acres
  - VRM Class IV: 291,000 acres.
- All or portions of five areas of non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics (97,100 acres) would be managed to protect, preserve and maintain their wilderness characteristics.

2.2.7 Alternatives and Management Options Considered but Eliminated From Detailed Analysis

Several organizations and individuals provided components of alternatives and management actions as possible ways of resolving individual resource management issues and conflicts. However, none of the submittals addressed the purpose and need and multiple use requirements as identified in the Federal Lands Policy and Management Act (FLPMA). The submitted components were considered during alternative development; however, none provided the full range of decisions required.

The following alternatives and management options were considered as possible ways of resolving resource management issues and conflicts, but were eliminated from detailed analysis because they were unreasonable or not practical as a result of technical, legal, regulatory, or policy issues.

Castle Country Heritage Plan

The Castle Country Heritage Plan (CCHP) was presented by the Southern Utah Wilderness Alliance, endorsed by a number of organizations and individuals, and provided to the BLM during the public comment period on the Draft RMP/EIS. The CCHP, as presented, incorporated many timely issues and concerns that would be required of any balanced approach to managing public lands. The BLM gave careful consideration to the CCHP and, in fact, incorporated parts of the plan into the range of RMP alternatives. While the CCHP has multiple uses, it does not meet the purpose and need for the land use plan because it does not address all the resource values and uses the BLM is required to manage on public lands. The BLM has reviewed the CCHP and compared it with the range of alternatives. The range of alternatives in the EIS encompasses the CCHP; therefore, the CCHP will not be carried forward as a separate alternative. The BLM used the information presented in the CCHP in the refinement of the recreational motorized route designation plan.

Closing the PFO to Livestock Grazing

An alternative that proposes to close the entire planning area to grazing would not meet the purpose and need of this Proposed RMP/Final EIS. NEPA requires that agencies study, develop, and describe appropriate alternatives to recommended courses of action in any proposal that involves unresolved conflicts concerning alternative uses of available resources. No issues or conflicts have been identified during this land use planning effort that require the complete elimination of grazing within the planning area for their resolution. Closures and adjustments to livestock use have been incorporated into the alternatives on an allotment or area basis to address issues identified in the land use plan (LUP). Because the BLM has considerable discretion, through its grazing regulations, to determine and adjust stock levels, seasons-of-use, and grazing management activities, and to allocate forage to uses of the public lands in LUPs, the analysis of an alternative to entirely eliminate grazing is not needed.

An alternative that proposes to close the entire planning area to grazing would also be inconsistent with the intent of the Taylor Grazing Act, which directs the BLM to provide for livestock use of BLM lands, to adequately safeguard grazing privileges, to provide for the orderly use, improvement, and development of the range, and to stabilize the livestock industry dependent upon the public range.

FLPMA requires that public lands be managed on a “multiple use and sustained yield basis” (FLPMA Sec. 302(a) and Sec. 102(7)) and includes livestock grazing as a principal or major use of public lands. Although multiple use does not require that all lands be used for livestock grazing, complete removal of livestock grazing on the entire planning area would be arbitrary and would not meet the principle of multiple use and sustained yield.

Livestock grazing is and has been an important use of the public lands in the planning area for many years and is a continuing government program. Although the Council on Environmental Quality Guidelines for compliance with NEPA require that agencies analyze the “No Action Alternative” in all EISs for purposes of this NEPA analysis, the” no action alternative” is to continue the status quo, which includes livestock grazing (CEQ Forty Most Asked Questions, Question 3). For this reason and those stated above, a no grazing alternative for the entire planning area has been dismissed from further consideration in this LUP.

Livestock Grazing Adjustments Alternative

During scoping and comment on the Draft EIS, it was suggested that the BLM consider adjustments to livestock numbers, livestock management practices, and the kind of livestock grazed on allotments within the PFO to benefit wildlife and protect and promote land health including soils, hydrologic cycles, and biotic integrity.

BLM policy regarding adjustments to the levels of livestock use authorized is to monitor and inventory range conditions under existing stocking levels and make adjustments to livestock use as indicated by this data to help assure that standards for rangeland health and resource objectives are met. Regulations at 43 CFR 4130.3 require that the terms and conditions under which livestock are authorized "ensure conformance with the provisions of subpart 4180" (*Standards for Rangeland Health*) and further that "livestock grazing use shall not exceed the livestock carrying capacity of the allotment." It would be inappropriate and unfeasible to estimate and allocate the available forage, design specific management practices, and determine whether changes to the kind of livestock are necessary for each allotment in the PFO or in the area as a whole in the RMP/EIS. Such changes would not be supportable considering the type and amount of data required and the analysis necessary to make such changes.

According to BLM policy decisions regarding authorized livestock use levels and the terms and conditions under which they are managed is an implementation decision (H-1610-1, Appendix C, Page 15). The BLM assesses rangeland health, conducts monitoring and inventories, and evaluates this data on a periodic basis, normally on an allotment and/or watershed basis. After NEPA analysis, necessary changes to livestock management and implementation of *Guidelines for Rangeland Management on Public Lands in Utah* are implemented through a proposed decision in accordance with 43 CFR 4160.These decisions determine the exact levels of use by livestock in conformance with the LUP and to meet resource objectives and maintain or enhancing land health. For these reasons, this alternative has been dismissed from further consideration in this LUP revision.

Closing the PFO to Oil and Gas Leasing

During scoping and/or the comment period for the Draft RMP/EIS, it was suggested that the BLM should address a "No-Leasing Alternative" because the "No-Leasing Alternative" is the equivalent of the "No Action Alternative" that must be analyzed in all EISs.

The "No-Leasing Alternative" in an RMP revision is actually an action alternative because where lands have already been leased, the no-action for NEPA purposes continues to allow for (i.e., honor) valid existing rights. Proposing a "No-Leasing Alternative" would require revisiting existing leases and either buying them back from the lessee, or allowing them to expire on their own terms. The first option (buying back), is outside the scope of any RMP. This is a political decision that the BLM has no authority to undertake in planning. As a result, the BLM does not regularly include a "No-Leasing Alternative."

The purpose and need for the land use plan is to identify and resolve potential conflicts between competing resource uses rather than to eliminate a principle use of the public lands in the PFO. Leasing of the public lands for oil and gas exploration and production is required by the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920, as amended, and the BLM's current policy is to apply the least restrictive management constraints to the principal uses of the public lands necessary to achieve resource goals and objectives. A field office-wide "No-Leasing Alternative" would be an unnecessarily restrictive alternative for mineral exploration and production on the public lands.

The National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA Section 102 (E)) requires that agencies "study, develop, and describe appropriate alternatives to recommended courses of action in any proposal which involves unresolved conflicts concerning alternative uses of available resources." No issues or conflicts have been identified during this land use planning effort that require the complete elimination of oil and gas leasing within the planning area for their resolution. The BLM's *Land Use Planning Handbook* (BLM Manual Rel. 1-1693), Appendix C, item H, requires that LUPs identify areas as open or unavailable for leasing.

Given the potential range of decisions available in the Draft RMP/EIS, the analyzed alternatives include no leasing for certain areas; however, a field office-wide "No-Leasing Alternative" is not necessary in order to resolve issues and protect other resource values and uses.

As mentioned above, a "No-Leasing Alternative" should not be confused with the "No Action Alternative" for purposes of NEPA compliance. Leasing and No Leasing on the public lands has previously been analyzed in several NEPA documents. In 1973, the Department of the Interior published the *Final Environmental Impact Statement on the Federal Upland Oil and Gas Leasing Program* (USDI 1973).The proposed action was to lease federal lands for production of oil and natural gas resources. Alternatives included the No Action Alternative, which, at initiation of the program, was "No Leasing." To supplement that EIS, the BLM prepared a series of Environmental Assessments (then titled "Environmental Analysis Records" or "EARs"), including the Price Oil and Gas Program Environmental Analysis Record (EAR), 1976, which addressed oil and gas leasing for the public lands in the PFO. Alternatives again included the No Action or "No Leasing" alternative. The outcome was a category system for leasing that categorized all public and U.S. Forest Service (USFS) lands into four groups: 1) open to leasing with standard lease stipulations, 2) Special Stipulations to address special concerns, 3) No surface occupancy, and 4) No Leasing. Since completion of the EAR in 1976, oil and gas leasing in the PFO has been an ongoing federal program under the established categories.

The Council on Environmental Quality (Section 1502.14(d) of NEPA) requires the alternatives analysis in an EIS to "include the alternative of no action," but explains that there are two distinct interpretations of "no action" that must be considered, depending on the nature of the proposal being evaluated. "The first situation might involve an action such as updating a land management plan where ongoing programs initiated under existing legislation and regulations will continue, even as new plans are developed. In these cases 'no action' is 'no change' from current management direction or level of management intensity. To construct an alternative that is based on no management at all would be a useless academic exercise. Therefore, the 'no action' alternative may be thought of in terms of continuing with the present course of action until that action is changed." (CEQ Forty Most Asked Questions, Question 3). Therefore, for the Price Proposed RMP/Final EIS, the "No-Action Alternative" is to continue the *status quo,* which is to lease under the oil and gas stipulations (formerly categories) established in the *San Rafael RMP* and the *Price River MFP*.

Designating New Wilderness Study Areas

The 2001 Notice of Intent (NOI) announcing the preparation of a new RMP for the PFO (*Federal Register* Vol. 66, No. 216) identified the "potential establishment of Wilderness Study Areas" as a preliminary issue "that could be addressed during development of the Price Field Office RMP." Comments received throughout public scoping recommended that this issue be addressed in this effort, with positions in support of and in opposition to creating new WSAs. Comments received regarding wilderness and other types of special designations were the most frequent type of scoping comment. On April 14, 2003, a settlement agreement was reached between the Department of the Interior and the State of Utah, Utah School and Institutional Trust Lands Administration (SITLA), and Utah Association of Counties regarding the designation of WSAs through the BLM's planning process. The settlement is further explained in section 3.2.11 (Non-WSA Lands with Wilderness Characteristics) of chapter 3. In an NOI released June 4, 2003 (*Federal Register* Vol. 68, No. 107), the BLM modified its original NOI for this planning process, stating that "as a result of the settlement, the BLM will not consider the designation of new WSAs or the classification or management of BLM lands as if they are or may become new WSAs." Therefore, complete alternatives or individual management options promoting establishing additional WSAs were not considered.

San Rafael National Monument

A number of comments received throughout this planning process discussed the potential San Rafael National Monument that was considered by the State of Utah and Emery County. This RMP planning process does not include the San Rafael National Monument proposal because Monument designation is within the purviews of Congressional or Presidential decision making and is outside the scope of BLM planning.

2.3 ALTERNATIVE TABLES (SEE LIST OF TABLE 2-1 THROUGH TABLE 2-23)

This section contains goals, objectives, and management actions for all resources, resources uses, special area designations, and support in a table format. Those management actions which are common to all alternatives will be shown by having that row merged across all six columns. Other cells throughout the tables that have been merged across two or more columns depict actions that are common to those merged cells.

Table 2-1. Air Quality

No Action Alternative	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative E	PROPOSED RMP
Goals Manage BLM programs to comply with and support tribal, local, State, and federal laws, regulations, and implementation plans pertaining to air quality.					
Objectives Maintain existing air quality and air quality-related values (e.g., visibility) by ensuring that all authorized uses on public lands comply with and support federal, State, and local laws and regulations for protecting air quality.					
Management Guidance Common to All Alternatives Manage all BLM and BLM-authorized activities to maintain air quality within the thresholds established by the National and State of Utah Ambient Air Quality Standards, or to the appropriate standards set by the entity with jurisdiction. Continue to keep the area as attainment, meet prevention of significant deterioration Class II limits, and protect the Class I air quality-related values of the National Parks (i.e., Arches, Canyonlands, and Capitol Reef).					
Ensure that prescribed burns would be approved and timed to maximize smoke dispersal.					
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.					
The BLM will continue to work cooperatively with the Utah Airshed Group to manage emissions from wildland and prescribed fire activities.					
National Ambient Air Quality Standards are enforced by the Utah Department of Environmental Quality, Division of Air Quality, with EPA oversight. Special requirements to reduce potential air quality impacts will be considered on a case-by-case basis in processing land use authorizations.					
The BLM will utilize BMPs and site specific mitigation measures, when appropriate, based on site specific conditions, to reduce emissions and enhance air quality.					
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.					

Table 2-2. Soil, Water, and Riparian

No Action Alternative	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative E	PROPOSED RMP
Goals Manage uses to minimize and mitigate damage to soils, including critical soils and biological soil crusts. Prevent excessive soil erosion. Maintain or restore the chemical, physical, and biological integrity of the area's soil and waters. **Objectives** Manage resources to improve streams listed as water quality limited and prevent listing of additional streams under the Clean Water Act, Section 303(d). Manage resources to maintain or restore overall watershed health and reduce erosion, stream sedimentation, and salinization of water according to 43 CFR 4180 through watershed assessments. Manage resources to reduce salinity loading where possible in accomplishing the goals and objectives outlined in the Colorado River Basin Salinity Control Act. Maintain and enhance water-dependent natural resource values. Manage, maintain, protect, and restore riparian and wetland areas to the proper functioning condition (PFC) and achieve an advanced riparian obligate vegetation community as described in BLM TR 1737-9. Maintain and/or enhance riparian areas (Utah Riparian Management Policy 2005) through project design features and/or stipulations that protect riparian resources. Protect floodplains pursuant to Executive Order (EO) 11988 and avoiding disturbance in floodplains. Implement management actions to ensure that sufficient quantity, quality, and timing of water is present to support water-dependent resource values, including fisheries, riparian communities, wetland communities, aquatic insects, terrestrial wildlife, and migratory/nonmigratory birds. Implement management actions to ensure that sufficient quantity, quality, and timing of water is present to support human and economic uses of water on public lands, including livestock grazing, recreation, forestry, and mineral development. **Management Guidance Common to All Alternatives** In surface disturbing proposals regarding construction on slopes of 20 percent to 40 percent, include an approved erosion control strategy and topsoil segregation/restoration plan. Such construction must be properly surveyed and designed by a certified engineer and approved by the BLM prior to project implementation, construction, or maintenance. Allow no surface disturbance on slopes greater than 40 percent (except as allowed through exceptions, waivers, or modifications as described in Appendix G). Manage wetlands, and riparian areas as prescribed in Executive Order (EO) 11990. Surface disturbing activities will be timed to reduce compaction when feasible. Utilize guidance in references such as the "Hydraulic Considerations for Pipelines Crossing Stream Channels" (Fogg, 2007, ftp://ftp.blm.gov/pub/nstc/TechNotes/TechNote423.pdf) when designing pipeline crossings to minimize impacts to riparian and water resources and to minimize risks of blowouts and ruptured pipelines during high water events. Implement appropriate best management practices such as those found in the Utah Nonpoint Source Management Plan and other reference documents for protection of soil, water, and riparian resources.					

Table 2-2. Soil, Water, and Riparian

No Action Alternative	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative E	PROPOSED RMP
Groundwater					
Protection of Water Quality in Natural Springs					
A 660-foot buffer zone of no surface disturbance and/or occupancy would be maintained around natural springs to protect water quality.	No surface disturbance or occupancy would be maintained around natural springs to protect the water quality of the spring. The distance would be based on geophysical, riparian, and other factors necessary to protect the water quality of the springs. If these factors cannot be determined, a 660-foot buffer zone would be maintained.				
	The BLM would allow development of spring sources but would require protection of the spring source to maintain water quality and avoid detrimental impacts.		The BLM would discourage development of spring sources.		The BLM would allow development of spring sources but would require protection of the spring source to maintain water quality and avoid detrimental impacts. *(Same as Alternative A.)*
Maintenance of Water Table in Wetlands and Riparian Areas					
The water table in wetlands and riparian areas would be maintained or restored.	The water table in wetlands and riparian areas would be maintained or restored, when feasible. The BLM would collaborate with partners to establish minimum water requirements in wetlands and riparian areas. If additional water is required for restoration efforts, appropriate water rights will need to be obtained in accordance with Utah law.		The BLM would seek to restore water recharge areas in wetlands and riparian areas. The BLM would collaborate with partners to establish minimum water requirements and restore water recharge areas for wetlands and riparian areas. If additional water is required for restoration efforts, appropriate water rights will need to be obtained in accordance with Utah law.		The water table in wetlands and riparian areas would be maintained or restored, when feasible. The BLM would collaborate with partners to establish minimum water requirements in wetlands and riparian areas. If additional water is required for restoration efforts, appropriate water rights will need to be obtained in accordance with Utah law. *(Same as Alternative A.)*
Establishment of Buffer Zones for No Surface Disturbance Around Riparian-Wetlands Habitats					
Buffer zones of no surface disturbance or no surface occupancy (excluding fence lines) would be required in	The BLM would allow no new surface disturbing activities within 100-year floodplains, public water	New surface disturbance (excluding fence lines) would be avoided in areas equal to the 100-year	Buffer zones of no new surface disturbance (excluding fence lines) would be required in areas equal to the 100-year floodplain or 100 meters (330 feet) on either side from the		Buffer zones of no new surface disturbance (excluding fence lines) would be required in areas equal to the 100-year floodplain or 100 meters (330 feet) on either side from the

Table 2-2. Soil, Water, and Riparian

No Action Alternative	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative E	PROPOSED RMP
areas equal to the 100-year floodplain or 330 feet on either side from the centerline, whichever is greater, along all perennial streams.	reserves, or 100 meters (330 feet) of riparian areas. The BLM Authorized Officer could authorize an exception if it could be shown that the project as mitigated eliminated the need for the restriction (Appendix G).	floodplain or 100 meters (330 feet) on either side from the centerline, whichever is greater, along all perennial streams and riparian areas.	centerline, whichever is greater, along all perennial and intermittent streams, streams with perennial reaches, and riparian areas.		centerline, whichever is greater, along all perennial and intermittent streams, streams with perennial reaches, and riparian areas. The BLM Authorized Officer could authorize an exception if it could be shown that the project as mitigated eliminated the need for the restriction (Appendix G).
High Country Surface Disturbance Stipulation					
Apply the high country stipulation restricting any construction activities beginning November 1 through April 30.	To minimize watershed damage to the watersheds above 7,000 feet in elevation, any construction activities would not be allowed in these areas during the period beginning December 1 through April 15.				

Table 2-3. Vegetation

No Action Alternative	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative E	PROPOSED RMP
Goals Manage and mitigate activities to restore, sustain, and enhance the health of plant associations, enhance or restore native and naturalized plant species, and enhance biological and genetic diversity of natural ecosystems. Manage BLM projects such that the amount, type, and distribution of vegetation on public lands produce the kind, proportion, and amount of vegetation necessary to meet or exceed management objectives. Protect areas with relict vegetation. Sustain the integrity of the sagebrush habitats within the planning area to provide the quantity, continuity, and quality of habitat necessary to maintain sustainable populations of greater sage-grouse and other sagebrush obligate species. Restore, sustain, or enhance the health of ecosystems through the implementation of the *Standards for Rangeland Health* and *Guidelines for Grazing Management*.					

Table 2-3. Vegetation

No Action Alternative	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative E	PROPOSED RMP

Objectives

Implement projects that maintain or promote adequate vegetative groundcover and canopy as directed in Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) Ecological Site Descriptions.

Implement the BLM *Partners Against Weeds Action Plan,* including prevention, early detection, inventory, integrated weed management, and monitoring and evaluation of noxious weeds.

Identify the amount (and location, where possible) of sagebrush habitat that should undergo restoration and/or rehabilitation throughout the life of the plan, and initiate restoration and/or rehabilitation.

Manage the public lands to promote healthy, sustainable native plant communities, protect areas with relict vegetation, and mitigate activities to prevent introduction of noxious weeds.

Management Guidance Common to All Alternatives

Allow vegetation manipulation with restrictions to achieve the desired vegetation condition. Treat areas determined to need vegetation reestablishment using methods such as introductions, transplants, augmentation, reestablishments, and restocking with attention to diversity and habitat. These areas would be treated with a variety of plant species that are desirable for wildlife habitat, livestock, watershed management, and other resource values while maintaining vegetation species diversity.

Design sagebrush treatment projects (including fire and fuels vegetation treatments) conducted in greater sage-grouse occupied or historic habitat to meet prescriptions necessary for the seasonal use habitat requirements (i.e., winter, nesting/brood-rearing). Prescriptions would follow the Connelly guidelines (Connelly et al. 2000) or would be adjusted or modified by the BLM and Utah Division of Wildlife Resources (UDWR), with local greater sage-grouse working group and Utah Partners for Conservation and Development input, for projects occurring in occupied or historic habitat.

Use the Utah Partners for Conservation and Development, local greater sage-grouse working groups, and other interested governmental and non-governmental organizations to identify sagebrush habitat locations and amounts that should undergo restoration and/or rehabilitation. Initiate restoration and/or rehabilitation of sagebrush habitat locations by (1) maintaining large patches and reconnecting sagebrush habitats with emphasis on those patches occupied by stronghold and isolated populations of greater sage-grouse; and (2) enlarging the size of sagebrush patches with emphasis on areas occupied by greater sage-grouse and/or other sagebrush dependent species.

Promote the use of native plant species that are desirable for wildlife, livestock, watershed management, and other resource values while maintaining vegetation species diversity.

In areas where multiple resources are potentially affected by surface disturbance (e.g., crucial wildlife habitat, livestock pastures, threatened and endangered [T&E] and special status species habitat, and occupied wild horse and burro range), coordinate implementation of any offsite mitigation with other affected agencies and the overlapping resource values. This strategy will enable identification of a suitable mitigation method and location to best accomplish the objective of offsetting the impacts and to ensure that benefits of the mitigation are distributed among all users and resources affected. The BLM will approach compensatory mitigation on an “as appropriate” basis where it can be performed onsite, and on a voluntary basis where it is performed offsite, or, in accordance with current guidance.

Consider other conservation measures such as seasonal and spatial limitations.

Mitigate impacts on vegetation on the public lands from disturbance activities. Implement short- and/or long-term actions or projects to replace or enhance resources that would be impacted. Priority would be given to mitigation measures that benefit multiple resource issues within the immediate area of the impacts (within the livestock allotment, occupied wild horse and burro range or habitat for wildlife, T&E or special status species).

Table 2-3. Vegetation

No Action Alternative	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative E	PROPOSED RMP
Noxious/Invasive Weed Management Work cooperatively with local and other Federal Government agencies to develop and implement agreements and plans that promote the prevention of infestation and spread of listed noxious weeds and their eradication on public lands throughout the PFO. Continue implementation of noxious weed and invasive species control actions in accordance with national guidance and local weed management plans, in cooperation with State, federal, affected counties, adjoining private land owners, and other partners or interests directly affected. Implement Standard Operating Procedures and Mitigation Measures for herbicide use as well as prevention measures for noxious and invasive plants identified in the Record of Decision Vegetation Treatments Using Herbicides on Bureau of Land Management Lands in 17 Western States PEIS and associated documents.					
Vegetation Treatments					
Vegetation manipulations (i.e., mechanical, biological, manual, prescribed fire, or chemical) would be prescribed on a case-by-case basis to achieve/maintain *Standards for Rangeland Health*.	Existing vegetation treatments would be maintained, and additional treatments (i.e., mechanical, biological, manual, prescribed fire, or chemical) would be aggressively implemented to achieve and/or maintain *Standards for Rangeland Health*.	Existing vegetation treatments would be maintained, and limited new treatments (i.e., mechanical, biological, manual, prescribed fire, or chemical) would be implemented to achieve and/or maintain *Standards for Rangeland Health*.	Vegetation would be manipulated using only natural processes, such as wildland fire, disease, and insects.		Vegetation manipulations (i.e., mechanical, biological, manual, prescribed fire, or chemical) would be prescribed on a case-by-case basis to achieve and/or maintain *Standards for Rangeland Health*. *(Same as No Action Alternative.)*
Priority Vegetation Communities					
Existing pinyon-juniper woodland treatments would be managed and maintained for their intended purpose. Treatments would focus on WUI areas and wildlife mitigation areas.	Pinyon-juniper woodland treatments would be maintained, and new treatments would be aggressively implemented to move the woodlands toward their historic range.	Pinyon-juniper woodland treatments would be maintained, and limited amounts of new treatments would be implemented to move the woodlands toward their approximate historic range.	Existing pinyon-juniper woodland treatments would no longer be maintained. Natural succession of vegetation communities would be fostered.		Pinyon-juniper woodland treatments would be maintained, and limited amounts of new treatments would be implemented to move the woodlands toward their approximate historic range. *(Same as Alternative B.)*
Sagebrush communities would be	The sagebrush steppe would be managed to	The sagebrush steppe would be managed for	The sagebrush steppe would be managed for natural succession and		Sagebrush communities would be managed and maintained for natural

Table 2-3. Vegetation

No Action Alternative	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative E	PROPOSED RMP
managed and maintained for natural composition and age class distribution.	emphasize livestock grazing and wildlife habitat.	all resources. Actions that result in a mosaic of age and structure would be encouraged.	processes.		composition and age class distribution in a manner that accommodates key habitat condition for listed T&E or special status species or within sagebrush community areas determined on a case by case basis.
Wetland vegetation types (e.g., meadow, marsh, and riparian) would be recognized and managed as unique and limited high-value vegetation types for other resources (e.g., wildlife and livestock grazing).	Land uses within wetland vegetation types would be managed to promote restoration, expansion, and protection of this high-value vegetation type. Management would achieve diverse species composition of facultative wetland or riparian obligate species, including forbs, grasses, and grass-like species and shrubs. Where livestock grazing of these habitats occurs, use would be avoided during the spring and managed to ensure adequate herbaceous cover at the end of the grazing season.				
The BLM would recognize and manage aspen as a unique and limited high-value vegetation type for other resources (e.g., wildlife and livestock grazing).	Land uses within aspen vegetation types would be managed to promote regeneration, diverse age class distribution, and preservation or restoration of diverse understory to include forbs, grass, and shrub species.				
Collection of Vegetation Products (Seeds/Live Plants)					
Use of vegetation products (e.g., seed collection and live plant collection) would be allowed by permit.	Commercial and noncommercial collection of vegetation products (e.g., seed and live plant) would be allowed by permit. Collection would be limited to areas and species determined on a case-by-case basis and evaluated on a rangeland health basis as needed.		No commercial vegetation products collection would be allowed.		Commercial and noncommercial collection of vegetation products (e.g., seed and live plant) would be allowed by permit. Collection would be limited to areas and species determined on a case-by-case basis and evaluated on a rangeland health basis as needed. *(Same as Alternative A.)*

Table 2-3. Vegetation

No Action Alternative	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative E	PROPOSED RMP
Insect Pest Control					
Strategies would be developed and implemented to address insect control, as needed. Strategies would be developed and implemented in cooperation with the State of Utah, federal agencies, affected counties, adjoining private landowners, and other interests directly affected (e.g., *1997 Rangeland Grasshopper Cooperative Management Program*).	Insect pests would be treated in coordination with the State of Utah, federal agencies, affected counties, adjoining private landowners, and other interests directly affected. All insect pest treatments would follow regulations and guidelines.	Insect pests would be treated on public land adjacent to other landowners or where impacts on high-value resources are occurring in coordination with the State of Utah, federal agencies, affected counties, adjoining private landowners, and other interests directly affected. All insect pest treatments would follow regulations and guidelines.	The BLM would not implement any control measures for insect pest control.		Insect pests would be treated in coordination with the State of Utah, federal agencies, affected counties, adjoining private landowners, and other interests directly affected. All insect pest treatments would follow regulations and guidelines. *(Same as Alternative A.)*
Compensation for Vegetation Impacts (Offsite Mitigation)					
The BLM would require 1:1 (acre-for-acre) offsite vegetation/habitat enhancement for any action that results in surface disturbance to crucial habitats (e.g., wildlife crucial ranges, wild horse ranges, and riparian-wetland habitats).	The BLM recognizes the merits of off-site mitigation strategies for the purposes of habitat enhancement. The BLM would encourage willing partners to participate in off-site mitigation strategies.				

Table 2-4. Cultural Resources

No Action Alternative	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative E	PROPOSED RMP
Goals Preserve and protect significant cultural resources and ensure that they are available for appropriate uses by present and future generations (FLPMA Sections 103(c), 201(a), and 202(c); National Historic Preservation Act [NHPA] Section 110(a); Archaeological Resource Protection Act [ARPA] Section 14(a)). Identify priority geographic areas for new field inventory, based on a probability for unrecorded significant resources, to reduce imminent threats from natural or human-caused deterioration or potential conflict with other resource uses (ARPA Section 14(a); NHPA Sections 106 and 110). **Objectives** Cultural resources would be allocated to the following use categories identified and described in BLM-M-8110.4: • Scientific Use • Public Use • Conservation for Future Use • Traditional Use • Experimental Use • Discharged from Management Allocations to the use categories would be made during implementation and activity-level planning. Cultural resource use allocations would be re-evaluated and revised, as needed, when circumstances change or when new data become available. Areas for new field inventories would be prioritized as follows: • Areas of special cultural designation (e.g., ACECs, Research Natural Areas [RNA], NHLs, and National Register sites) that have not been fully inventoried • Resources eligible for the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) at a national level of significance that have not been fully inventoried • Cultural resources sites identified for public use • Five-mile vulnerability zones surrounding cities and towns and 400 feet from the centerline on designated OHV trails. **Management Guidance Common to All Alternatives** Complete an appropriate cultural resources inventory before approving permitted federal undertakings that could affect cultural resources or historic properties. Mitigate adverse impacts on cultural resources eligible for listing on the NRHP resulting from authorized federal undertakings (permitted activities, recreational use, OHV use, etc.) that could affect cultural resources or historic properties. Manage cultural resources according to the management objectives for the use category to which each cultural resource site is assigned.					
Cultural resource values would be managed for the following uses: • Information potential • Public values • Conservation	Cultural resources would be allocated according to the following use categories identified and described in BLM-M-8110.4: • Scientific Use • Public Use • Conservation for Future Use • Traditional Use • Experimental Use				

Table 2-4. Cultural Resources

No Action Alternative	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative E	PROPOSED RMP
The Buckhorn Cattle Guard Panel and the Buckhorn Panel would be designated public use sites.	• Discharged from Management. Allocations to the use categories would be made during implementation and activity level planning. Cultural resource use allocations would be reevaluated and revised, as needed, when circumstances change or when new data become available.				
New Field Inventories					
Implementation-level plans for Desolation Canyon NHL and Nine Mile Canyon would continue to identify a need for new field inventories.	Areas for new field inventories would be prioritized as follows: • Areas of special cultural designation (e.g., ACECs, RNAs, NHLs, and National Register sites) that have not been fully inventoried • Resources eligible for the NRHP at a national level of significance that have not been fully inventoried • Cultural resources sites identified for public use • Five-mile vulnerability zones surrounding cities and towns and 400 feet from the centerline on designated OHV trails.				
Cultural Resource Inventories for Federal Undertakings					
Cultural resources inventories, including point, area, and linear features, would be required for all federal undertakings that could affect cultural resources or historic properties in areas of direct and indirect impacts.		Cultural resources inventories would be required for areas of direct impact, plus a 100-foot area of potential effect extending beyond the impact area.	Cultural resources inventories would be required for areas of direct impact, plus a 300-foot area of potential effect extending beyond the impact area.		Cultural resources inventories, including point, area, and linear features, would be required for all federal undertakings that could affect cultural resources or historic properties in areas of direct and indirect impacts. *(Same as No Action Alternative.)*
Management of Traditional Cultural Properties					
The BLM would coordinate with tribes to identify and manage traditional cultural properties.	The BLM would coordinate with tribes or other cultural groups to identify and manage traditional cultural properties. The BLM would seek agreements with the tribes or other cultural groups to identify the types of projects or areas where they desire consultation.				
Linear Cultural Resource Management					
The following standard operating procedures (SOP) would apply for management of linear cultural resources: Record the site at the point of the project. Unless specific features are identified at that portion of the		The following SOPs would apply for management of linear cultural resources: Record the site at the	The following SOPs would apply for management of linear cultural resources: Record the site at the point of the project. Unless specific features are		The following SOPs would apply for management of linear cultural resources: Record the site at the point of the project. Unless specific features are

Table 2-4. Cultural Resources

No Action Alternative	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative E	PROPOSED RMP
resource, no mitigation is required.		point of the project. Unless specific features are identified at that portion of the resource, no mitigation is required. If a portion of a linear site were disturbed, fees would be assessed. The fees would be held in an account at the Division of State History to be used to document the resource as a whole. This process would be initiated and implemented through an agreement between the SHPO and the BLM.	identified at that portion of the resource, no mitigation is required. The first site disturbing activity would complete the cultural resource documentation for the resource as a whole.		identified at that portion of the resource, no mitigation is required. *(Same as No Action Alternative.)*

Table 2-5. Paleontology

No Action Alternative	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative E	PROPOSED RMP
Goals Facilitate suitable scientific, educational, and recreational uses of fossils. Ensure that significant fossils are not inadvertently damaged, destroyed, or removed from public ownership. Foster public awareness and appreciation of the area's paleontological heritage. **Objectives** Locate and evaluate paleontological resources and protect these resources when appropriate. Promote and facilitate scientific investigation of fossil resources. Paleontological Resource Use permits would be issued for scientific study as appropriate. Approve collection of vertebrate fossils under a permit issued to qualified individuals who agree to place all specimens and data in an approved repository.					

Table 2-5. Paleontology

No Action Alternative	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative E	PROPOSED RMP
Support and provide public education and interpretive opportunities for paleontological resources, where appropriate. Such appropriate opportunities could include agreements with visitor information providers (such as the Dinosaur Diamond Partnership), use of special designations, such as the Dinosaur Diamond National Scenic Byway and the Cleveland-Lloyd Dinosaur Quarry, or development of landscape level interpretive sites. **Management Guidance Common to All Alternatives** Mitigate adverse impacts on vertebrate and significant non-vertebrate paleontological resources resulting from authorized surface disturbing actions (e.g., permitted activities, recreational use). Allow collection of common invertebrate and plant fossils for personal, noncommercial use according to BLM policy, except on developed recreation sites and areas or where otherwise prohibited and posted. Manage the Cleveland-Lloyd Dinosaur Quarry as a significant scientific and public education resource, as guided by an activity level planning document.					
Protecting Paleontological Resources From Surface Disturbing Impacts					
An assessment of fossil resources would be required on a case-by-case basis, mitigating, as necessary, before and during surface disturbance.	Damage to significant fossils would be prevented through lease notices, stipulations, and other requirements. Adverse impacts would be mitigated in response to reports of finds.	Same as No Action Alternative. In addition: Areas with significant fossils would be identified through predictive modeling and broad-scale sampling.	Same as No Action Alternative. In addition: Assessment and mitigation in all areas where significant fossils are known or expected to occur would be required.		An assessment of fossil resources would be required on a case-by-case basis, mitigating, as necessary, before and during surface disturbance. *(Same as No Action Alternative.)*
Collection of Paleontological Resources					
	Areas for hobby collection will be identified through an activity level plan.		Same as Alternative A, except areas with rare and significant invertebrate and plant fossils would be identified and closed to hobby collection.	Same as Alternative C, except no areas would be identified for hobby collection within the non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics.	Areas for hobby collection would be identified through an activity level plan. *(Same as Alternative A.)*

Table 2-6. Visual Resources

No Action Alternative	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative E	PROPOSED RMP
Goals Identify scenic resources, integral landscapes, and vistas that contribute to the sense of place and quality of life of visitors and residents. Assign VRM classes to all landscapes. Manage scenic resources, integral vistas, and landscapes for the benefit of local residents and visitors. Identify acceptable levels of manmade contrast on area landscapes. **Objectives** Over the life of the plan management actions will be conducted in a manner that protects scenic values and landscapes through the use of the Visual Management System. Use proper design techniques and mitigation measures, future projects and use authorizations under this plan to minimize contrast with the characteristic landscape and not exceed the VRM Management Class Standards. **Management Guidance Common to All Alternatives** Manage WSAs as VRM Class I in accordance with BLM IM 2000-096 Use of Visual Resource Management Class I Designation in WSAs. Manage Wild segments of any Wild and Scenic Rivers recommended as suitable as VRM Class I. Manage Scenic segments of any Wild and Scenic Rivers recommended as suitable as VRM Class II. Manage Recreational segments of any Wild and Scenic Rivers recommended as suitable in the same VRM class as surrounding lands. Manage Desolation Canyon NHL as VRM Class I.					
VRM management include the following acreage for each management class as indicated on Map 2-1: • Class I: 606,000 acres • Class II: 379,000 acres • Class III: 759,000 acres • Class IV: 735,000 acres.	Manage the following acreages, as indicated on Map 2-2, for the objectives defined for each VRM class (Appendix 6 from the Draft RMP/EIS): • Class I: 599,000 acres • Class II: 142,000 acres • Class III: 1,005,000 acres • Class IV: 733,000 acres.	Manage the following acreages, as indicated on Map 2-3, for the objectives defined for each VRM class (Appendix 6 from the Draft RMP/EIS): • Class I: 632,000 acres • Class II: 319,000 acres • Class III: 1,229,000 acres • Class IV: 299,000 acres.	Manage the following acreages, as indicated on Map 2-4, for the objectives defined for each VRM class (Appendix 6 from the Draft RMP/EIS): • Class I: 659,000 acres • Class II: 485,000 acres • Class III: 713,000 acres • Class IV:	Manage the following acreages, as indicated on Map 2-57, for the objectives defined for each VRM class (Appendix 6 from the Draft RMP/EIS): • Class I: 1,516,000 acres • Class II: 147,000 acres • Class III: 451,000 acres	Manage the following acreages, as indicated on Map 2-5, for the objectives defined for each VRM class (Appendix 6 from the Draft RMP/EIS): • Class I: 598,000 acres • Class II: 342,000 acres • Class III: 1,248,000 acres • Class IV: 291,000 acres.

Table 2-6. Visual Resources

No Action Alternative	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative E	PROPOSED RMP
			622,000 acres.	• Class IV: 365,000 acres.	

Table 2-7. Special Status Species

No Action Alternative	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative E	PROPOSED RMP

Goals

Maintain, protect, and enhance habitats (including but not limited to designated critical habitat) and actively promote recovery, maintenance, protection, and enhancement of populations and habitats of BLM, non-listed, special status plant and animal species to ensure that actions authorized, funded, or carried out do not contribute to the need for these species to be listed as T&E under the Endangered Species Act (ESA).

Assist in managing, conserving, and recovering listed threatened and endangered plant and animal species found within the Price planning area, where appropriate.

Objectives

Recognize and support the role of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) in managing federally listed T&E plant and animal species.

In consultation with USFWS and Utah Division of Wildlife Resources (UDWR), apply species-specific protective stipulations on federal actions to avoid or minimize adverse effects on federally listed, proposed, or candidate species or suitable habitat for the same species as referenced in Appendix D, which includes conservation measures from Section 5 of the Biological Assessment.

Maintain adequate baseline information regarding the extent of special status species to make informed decisions, evaluate the effectiveness of management actions, and assess progress toward recovery. Implement species-specific conservation measures to avoid or mitigate adverse impacts on known populations and their habitats of BLM special status plant and animal species on BLM-administered lands.

Advance the conservation of greater sage-grouse and greater sage-grouse habitat in accordance with BLM's *National Sage-Grouse Habitat Conservation Strategy* to avoid contributing to the need to list the greater sage-grouse as a T&E species under the ESA.

Cooperate with the USFWS, other agencies, and universities to develop plans for federally listed T&E plant and animal species.

Work with the UDWR to identify and improve special status fish passage and habitat connectivity. Maintain or improve habitat for reintroduction of special status species fish to streams. Maintain special status species plant communities in natural patterns on a landscape scale.

Management Guidance Common to All Alternatives

As directed by *BLM Manual 6840*, manage habitat for sensitive species in a manner that will ensure that all actions authorized, funded, or carried out by the BLM do not contribute to the need for the species to become listed.

Follow guidelines and implement management recommendations presented in species recovery or conservation plans or alternative management strategies developed in consultation with USFWS.

Use emergency actions where use threatens known communities of special status plant or animal species.

Table 2-7. Special Status Species

No Action Alternative	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative E	PROPOSED RMP
Prohibit surface disturbances that may affect listed species or critical habitat of listed or candidate plants or animals without consultation or conference (ESA, Section 7) between the BLM and USFWS. Continue to work with USFWS and others to ensure that plans and agreements are updated to reflect the latest scientific data. Use the most current *UDWR Strategic Management Plan for Sage-Grouse* (UDWR 2002), the *BLM National Sage-Grouse Habitat Conservation Strategy*, and recommendations from local greater sage-grouse working groups to protect, maintain, enhance, or restore current greater sage-grouse populations and habitat. Where possible, implement the conservation actions identified in the *Utah Comprehensive Wildlife Conservation Strategy* (Gorrell et al. 2005), which identifies priority wildlife species and habitats, identifies and assesses threats to their survival, and identifies long-term conservation actions needed, including those on BLM-administered lands.					
Greater Sage-Grouse					
	Allow no surface disturbing activities (NSO) within ¼ mile of a known greater sage-grouse lek between March 15 – June 1.				Oil and gas would be open to leasing subject to major constraints (NSO) within ½ mile of a greater sage-grouse lek.
	Allow no surface disturbing activities within 2 miles of a known greater sage-grouse lek in crucial nesting/brood-rearing habitat from April 15–July 7. Development can occur until 10 percent of the habitat associated with a lek is impacted.				Allow no surface disturbing or otherwise disruptive activities within 2 miles of a known greater sage-grouse lek from March 15–July 15. Allow no surface disturbing activities in crucial winter habitat from December 1–March 14.

Table 2-8. Fish and Wildlife

No Action Alternative	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative E	PROPOSED RMP
Goals Maintain, protect, and enhance fish and wildlife habitats to support natural diversity and to provide healthy, self-sustaining populations of fish and wildlife species; in order to supply recreational, educational, and scientific benefits and opportunities to the public. Coordinate with federal, tribal, and State agencies to develop information, strategies, and plans to manage fish and wildlife habitat and facilitate the expansion and enhancement of hunting opportunities. **Objectives**					

Table 2-8. Fish and Wildlife

No Action Alternative	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative E	PROPOSED RMP
Maintain or improve the connectivity and productivity of fish and wildlife habitats to support the UDWR population objectives.					
Provide quality habitat to support the expansion in range of identified, high-priority fish and wildlife species, as appropriate, on BLM-administered lands in the planning area throughout the life of the plan.					
Avoid negative impacts on crucial fish and wildlife habitats. Minimize and/or rectify detrimental impacts on wildlife habitat and populations where management impacts are unavoidable.					
Coordinate with other agencies to manage native and nonnative predatory animals that pose a threat to the health or productivity of ecosystems.					
In concert with UDWR and other agencies, distribute wildlife, wildlife habitat, and recreational (e.g. fishing and hunting) outreach and educational material to the public on an annual basis.					
Coordinate with UDWR to establish and maintain Blue Ribbon fisheries. Current fisheries are maintained at Scofield Reservoir, Huntington Creek, Lower Fish Creek, and Upper Price River.					
Management Guidance Common to All Alternatives					
Coordinate predator control with U.S. Department of Agriculture—Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service/Wildlife Services and UDWR as described in the existing memorandum of understanding (MOU) between the BLM and the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service/Wildlife Services; predator control activities will continue to be conducted by Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service/Wildlife Services.					
Continue to recognize and implement, to the extent feasible, UDWR wildlife management plans (and associated revisions) and those of other cooperating agencies. Future plans and agreements will be considered for implementation on a case-by-case basis through applicable regulatory review.					
Adhere to and use the recommendations found in the BLM Bighorn Sheep Rangewide Management Plan, 1999, as revised; the Utah BLM Statewide Desert Bighorn Sheep Management Plan, 1986, as revised; and the Management of Domestic Sheep in Bighorn Sheep Habitats, 1992, as revised.					
To the extent feasible, and in accordance with EO 13186, incorporate conservation measures as outlined in the *Utah Partners in Flight Avian Conservation Strategy* (Parrish et al. 2002), *Utah Comprehensive Wildlife Conservation Strategy* (Gorrell et al. 2005), and other scientific information into the BLM's ongoing wildlife habitat program.					
Continue existing Habitat Management Plans (HMP). Allow or participate in research of all wildlife species and their habitats.					
The closure of the Gordon Creek Wildlife Management Area and the Desert Lake Waterfowl Management Area to leasing (including oil and gas) would continue.					
Use a full range of mitigation options (including offsite mitigation) when developing mitigation for project-level activities for fish and wildlife habitats.					
In the design of facilities associated with federal actions, incorporate concepts of habitat fragmentation and design those facilities to minimize the potential for increasing habitat fragmentation. Consider collocation of facilities, including utility corridors and oil and gas wells. Minimize the intrusion in wildlife habitats. Minimize road densities by reclaiming redundant roads when new roads access the same general area or when the intended purpose for the roads has been met and they are no longer necessary.					
Maintain, protect, and restore riparian and wetland areas to PFC state (within capability) to achieve a multilayered, diverse, riparian area dominated by either facultative wetland or obligate riparian vegetative communities to support optimum diversity and density of wildlife species.					
Emphasize the use of mechanical, chemical, and biological methods, as well as fire and livestock grazing, to achieve the desired plant community for fish and wildlife habitats.					
Maintain sustainable forage levels for livestock and wildlife.					

Table 2-8. Fish and Wildlife

No Action Alternative	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative E	PROPOSED RMP
Minor adjustments to crucial wildlife habitat boundaries periodically made by the UDWR would be accommodated through plan maintenance. Where possible, implement the conservation actions identified in the *Utah Comprehensive Wildlife Conservation Strategy* (Gorrell et al. 2005), which identifies priority wildlife species and habitats, identifies and assesses threats to their survival, and identifies long-term conservation actions needed, including those on BLM-administered lands.					
Identify Actions and Areawide Use Restrictions to Achieve Desired Fish and Wildlife Population and Habitat Conditions					
Big game winter range would be managed to maximize browse production, using kind of livestock and season of use.	Prescriptive grazing would be used, including, but not limited to, forage banking, to favor browse production on big game ranges.	Same as Alternative A. In addition, the BLM would use livestock to improve or enhance wildlife habitat, including, but not limited to, prescriptive grazing techniques such as season of use, kind of livestock, and rangeland improvements.	Same as Alternative A. In addition, temporary, non-renewable permits for livestock grazing would be used to favor browse in certain allotments for the purpose of achieving specific objectives for the allotments.		Big game winter range would be managed to maximize browse production, using kind of livestock and season of use. *(Same as No Action Alternative.)*
Pronghorn Habitat					
Current livestock grazing prescriptions would continue, and where opportunities exist, would be adjusted to enhance forb production on pronghorn ranges.	Prescriptive livestock grazing would be used to favor forb production on pronghorn ranges.	Same as Alternative A.	Spring grazing (May 15–June 15) would be eliminated in allotments within pronghorn habitat to encourage forb production.		Current livestock grazing prescriptions would continue, and where opportunities exist, would be adjusted to enhance forb production on pronghorn ranges. *(Same as No Action Alternative.)*
Bighorn Sheep Habitats					
Changes in kind of livestock from cattle to domestic sheep would be prohibited in currently identified bighorn sheep habitat.	Changes in kind of livestock from cattle to domestic sheep would be prohibited in any allotments that contain occupied bighorn sheep (Desert and Rocky Mountain) habitat.	Changes in kind of livestock from cattle to domestic sheep would be prohibited within 9 miles of currently occupied bighorn sheep (Desert and Rocky Mountain) habitat to provide an adequate buffer zone.			

Table 2-8. Fish and Wildlife

No Action Alternative	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative E	PROPOSED RMP
Gray Canyon Wildland Management Area					
The Gray Canyon Wildland Management Area would be managed for wildlife, watershed, and recreation: • OHV use would continue to be partially open and partially limited to designated routes. • Grazing would continue to be excluded.	Same as No Action Alternative with the following changes/ additions: • Oil and gas would be open to leasing subject to major constraints (NSO). • The area would be closed to OHV use except for the Range Creek Jeep Trail, which would be designated for OHV use to the present barricade (T. 17 S., R. 16 E., Section 36, SE1/4SW1/4). *(Implementation-level decision)**	Same as Alternative A with the following changes/additions: • The area would be closed to OHV use except for the Range Creek Jeep Trail, which would be designated for OHV use to the lowest drill hole (T. 17 S., R. 16 E., Section 27, SW1/4NE1/4). *(Implementation-level decision)** • The Range Creek Allotment would be added to the Gray Canyon Wildland Management Area; however, grazing would not be excluded from the Range Creek Allotment (Livestock Grazing alternatives).	Same as Alternative A with the following changes/ additions: • The area would be closed to OHV use except for the Range Creek Jeep Trail, which would be closed to motorized use at the confluence of Turtle Canyon. *(Implementation-level decision)** • The Range Creek and Price River South allotments would be added to the Gray Canyon Wildland Management Area for management for wildlife, watershed, and	The Range Creek and Price River South allotments would be added to the Gray Canyon Wildland Management Area for management for wildlife, watershed, and non-motorized recreation. • The Gray Canyon Wildland Management Area would be managed as closed to OHV use. • The Wildland Management Area would be unavailable to oil and gas leasing.	The Gray Canyon Wildland Management Area would be managed for wildlife, watershed, and recreation: • The area would be closed to OHV use except for the Range Creek Jeep Trail, which would be designated for OHV use to the present barricade (T. 17 S., R. 16 E., Section 36, SE1/4SW1/4). *(Implementation-level decision)** • The Range Creek Allotment would be added to the Gray Canyon Wildland Management Area; however, grazing would not be excluded from the Range Creek Allotment (Livestock Grazing alternatives). • Grazing would be excluded in the rest of the area.

* *This is an implementation-level decision that cannot be protested under the planning regulations. Please see the cover letter for further information.*

Table 2-8. Fish and Wildlife

No Action Alternative	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative E	PROPOSED RMP
			non-motorized recreation.		
Forage Allocation					
Forage for big game population objective numbers would be provided as currently allocated.	Same as the No Action Alternative with the following addition: Based on existing permit use, increased population objective numbers for big game would be supported if UDWR acquired additional forage or habitats and the increased population objective numbers would not interfere with livestock forage allocations.	Same as No Action Alternative with the following addition: Based on existing permit use, available forage and habitat would be used. If additional habitat or forage was acquired by UDWR, forage allocations would be adjusted to support increased population objectives for wildlife. If forage or habitat values changed, the BLM would explore opportunities to work with other stakeholders to manipulate forage to improve forage quality and habitat conditions (e.g., using methods such as prescribed burns or Dixie harrow).	Forage allocations would continue based on existing permitted use. If UDWR acquired additional habitat or forage, or if studies indicated that additional forage was available naturally, the BLM would consider providing forage to support increased population objectives for wildlife.		Increase or decrease in available forage would be adjusted on a case-by-case basis to support rangeland health objectives. If UDWR acquired additional habitat or forage, or if studies indicated that additional forage was available naturally, the BLM would consider providing forage to support increased population objectives for wildlife.
Wildlife Habitat Areas					
Seasonal closures for construction and heavy equipment operation established in the *San Rafael RMP* and the *Price River MFP* would	No seasonal closures would be enforced.	Dates of seasonal closures for surface disturbing activities within all crucial- or high-value habitats (Maps 3-9 through 3-12) would be revised and implemented to provide consistency across the entire planning area (Appendix G).			Dates of seasonal closures for surface disturbing activities within all crucial habitats (Map 3-12-a) would be revised and implemented to provide consistency across the entire planning area (Appendix G).

Table 2-8. Fish and Wildlife

No Action Alternative	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative E	PROPOSED RMP
be maintained.					
Migratory Bird Habitats					
The BLM would manage according to EO 13186, Responsibilities of Federal Agencies to Protect Migratory Birds, which would be integrated into programs for wildlife management and other resource uses including, but not limited to, the management programs for: • Riparian-wetland habitat • Standards for Rangeland Health • Raptor protection • Wildland fire • Aspen recovery • Special status species • Offsite mitigation • Habitat enhancement.	Efforts to comply with EO 13186, Responsibilities of Federal Agencies to Protect Migratory Birds, would be integrated into programs for wildlife management and other resource uses. In addition, the BLM would continue to conserve habitat for all migratory birds and emphasize management of migratory birds listed on the BLM Sensitive Species List, the USFWS current list of "Birds of Conservation Concern" (BCC) (2002, or as updated), and the Partners in Flight (PIF) priority species. As specific habitat needs and population distribution of Sensitive Species, BCC, and PIF priority species are identified, the BLM would use adaptive management strategies to further conserve and avoid impacts on these species.				
The BLM would recognize and manage priority breeding-bird habitat, such as wetlands, riparian areas, sagebrush, and aspen, as a unique and	Land uses within these priority habitats would be managed to promote regeneration, diverse age class distribution, and preservation or restoration of diverse understory to include forbs, grass, and shrub species.				

Table 2-8. Fish and Wildlife

No Action Alternative	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative E	PROPOSED RMP
limited high-value vegetation type.					
Introduction, Transplantation, Augmentation, and Reestablishment of Fish and Wildlife Species					
The BLM would continue to cooperate with UDWR in reintroducing fish or wildlife species into historic or suitable ranges. Supplemental release of game birds and fishes would continue without requiring additional documentation in the RMP or additional NEPA analysis.	The BLM would continue to cooperate with and provide support to UDWR in reestablishing fish or wildlife species into historic or suitable ranges as determined appropriate through NEPA analysis.	The BLM would continue to cooperate with and provide support to UDWR in reintroducing fish or wildlife species into historic or suitable ranges as determined appropriate through NEPA analysis. Reintroductions or introductions of native and naturalized species would be considered.	Same as Alternative B with the following additions: Reintroductions or introductions of only native and naturalized species would be considered with a management priority on restoration of native populations within suitable habitat.		The BLM would continue to cooperate with and provide support to UDWR in reestablishing fish or wildlife species into historic or suitable ranges as determined appropriate through NEPA analysis. Introductions or reestablishments of native and naturalized species would be considered through additional NEPA analysis.
Raptor Habitat					
The BLM would follow seasonal closures for raptors and buffer zones of no surface disturbance around nest sites, as described in the *Price River MFP* and *San Rafael RMP*.	Raptor management would be guided by the use of BMPs for raptors and their associated habitats in Utah (Appendix F) using seasonal and spatial buffers and mitigation to maintain and enhance raptor nesting and foraging habitat while allowing other resource uses.				
White-Tailed Prairie Dog Habitat					
The BLM would recognize and manage occupied and historic white-tailed prairie dog colonies under the concept of a keystone species.	The BLM would manage land uses within occupied and historic white-tailed prairie dog colonies to preserve the habitat.				

Table 2-8. Fish and Wildlife

No Action Alternative	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative E	PROPOSED RMP
Fish Habitat					
Habitat Manipulation for Fish Population Maintenance, Recovery, and Enhancement					
The BLM would consider reintroduction of species into native ranges on a case-by-case basis. The BLM would coordinate with UDWR to reestablish habitat to support fisheries in suitable perennial historic habitats.	The BLM would provide habitat for existing populations.	The BLM would coordinate with UDWR to implement habitat improvement efforts to establish fisheries with native and non-native fish species.	The BLM would coordinate with UDWR to complete habitat improvement efforts and establish fisheries through reintroductions of native fish species.	The BLM would coordinate with UDWR to complete habitat improvement efforts and establish fisheries through reintroductions of native fish species. Projects to improve fish habitat would be allowed only when compatible with preservation of natural appearance.	The BLM would coordinate with UDWR to implement habitat improvement efforts to establish fisheries with native and non-native fish species. *(Same as Alternative B.)*

Table 2-9. Wild Horses and Burros

No Action Alternative	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative E	PROPOSED RMP
Goals Manage wild horses and burros at appropriate management levels (AML) to ensure a thriving natural ecological balance among wild horse populations, wildlife, livestock, vegetation resources, and other resource values. Manage wild horses and burros to achieve and maintain viable, vigorous, and stable populations. To the degree possible, maintain, enhance, and perpetuate respective viable herds' distinguishing characteristics (by HMA) that were typical at the time of the passage of the Wild Free-Roaming Horse and Burro Act or that are identified in a management plan. Allow introductions of wild horses and burros from other herd areas to maintain genetic viability as long as the horses being introduced have characteristics similar to the horses in the HMA to which they are being introduced.					

Table 2-9. Wild Horses and Burros

No Action Alternative	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative E	PROPOSED RMP
Objectives Prepare Herd Management Area Plans for the Muddy Creek HMA by 2015. Update Herd Management Area Plans for the Range Creek and Sinbad HMAs by 2020. Maintain the number of wild horses and burros within established HMAs at AMLs as designated in Herd Management Area Plans. **Management Guidance Common to All Alternatives** Manage populations for appropriate age and sex ratios, genetic viability, adaptability, and adoptability as well as to maintain AMLs on established HMAs. Allow wild horse and burro research as long as other wild horse and burro program goals are met.					
HMA Boundaries					
Existing management of HMA boundaries would continue for the four designated HMAs—Range Creek, Muddy Creek, Sinbad, and Robbers Roost (Map 2-6).	There would be no wild horse HMAs continued or designated. The boundaries of the wild burro portion of the Sinbad HMA would be adjusted to match the natural and manmade barriers that existed when the Wild Free-Roaming Horse and Burro Act was passed in 1971 that separate or restrict burro movement (Map 2-7).	HMA boundaries would be adjusted on the Range Creek, Muddy Creek, and Sinbad HMAs to match the natural and manmade barriers that existed when the Wild Free-Roaming Horse and Burro Act was passed in 1971 that separate or restrict wild horse and burro movement (Map 2-8).	Same as Alternative B (Map 2-9).	Same as Alternative B (Map 2-58).	HMA boundaries would be adjusted on the Range Creek, Muddy Creek, and Sinbad HMAs to match the natural and manmade barriers that existed when the Wild Free-Roaming Horse and Burro Act was passed in 1971 that separate or restrict wild horse and burro movement (Map 2-9). *(Same as Alternative C.)*
Combining/Splitting HMAs (Management of Wild Horses and Burro Herds)					
Wild horses and burros would be managed in four HMAs—Range Creek (horses), Muddy Creek (horses), Sinbad (horses and burros), and Robbers Roost (horses) (Map 2-6).	The Range Creek, Sinbad, Muddy Creek, and Robbers Roost (horses) HMAs would have an AML set at zero. They would lose their status as HMAs but would maintain herd area status for future management consideration should	Wild horses would be removed from the Muddy Creek and Sinbad HMAs before introducing wild burros in these HMAs (Map 2-8). The AML for wild horses would be reduced, and the AML	Wild horses and burros would be managed in three HMAs—Range Creek (horses), Muddy Creek (horses), and Sinbad (burros) (Map 2-9 and Map 2-58). The current portion of the Sinbad HMA that supports horses would be combined with the Muddy Creek HMA. The area of the Sinbad HMA that supports burros would remain the Sinbad HMA. The AML in the Robbers Roost HMA would be set at zero. The area would lose its status as an HMA but would maintain herd area status for future management consideration should conditions change.		

Table 2-9. Wild Horses and Burros

No Action Alternative	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative E	PROPOSED RMP
	conditions change (Map 2-7). The Sinbad (burros) HMA would remain designated and managed for wild burros only.	for wild burros would be increased. The AML in the Robbers Roost HMA would be set at zero. The area would lose its status as an HMA but would maintain herd area status for future management consideration should conditions change.			
Appropriate Management Levels *(Implementation-Level Decision)**					
AMLs would be designated within implementation documents, such as Environmental Assessments for gathers, HMA Plans, and other applicable plans but would be subject to adjustment based on monitoring data.	The AML would be periodically evaluated and subject to adjustment in HMA plans and Environmental Assessments for gathers based on monitoring data and best science methods.				
Range Creek HMA					
78,600 acres 75–125 (horses)	0 acres 0 (horses)	55,000 acres 75–125 (horses)			
Muddy Creek HMA					
190,800 acres 30–50 (horses)	0 acres 0 (horses)	164,330 acres 60–100 (burros)	283,000 acres 60-100 (horses)		283,000 acres 75–125 (horses)

* *This is an implementation-level decision that cannot be protested under the planning regulations. Please see the cover letter for further information.*

Table 2-9. Wild Horses and Burros

No Action Alternative	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative E	PROPOSED RMP
Sinbad HMA					
230,600 acres 30–50 (horses) 50–70 (burros)	99,210 acres 0 (horses) 50–70 (burros)	218,210 acres 0 (horses) 110–170 (burros)	99,210 acres 0 (horses) 50–70 (burros)		
Robbers Roost HMA					
95,700 acres 15–25 (horses)	0 acres 0 (horses)				
Forage Allocation					
No forage would be allocated for wild horses and burros. Existing AML would require 3,000 AUMs for wild horses and 420 AUMs for wild burros.	420 AUMs would be allocated for wild burros.	1,500 AUMs would be allocated for wild horses, and 1,620 AUMs would be allocated for wild burros.	2,700 AUMs would be allocated for wild horses, and 420 AUMs would be allocated for wild burros.		3,000 AUMs would be allocated for wild horses, and 420 AUMs would be allocated for wild burros.
Forage allocations have not been determined for wild horses and burros in the established HMAs. Allocations would be based on monitoring data, considering the needs of wildlife, wild horses and burros, and livestock.	When monitoring data and best science identifies an increase or decrease in available forage in HMAs, allocation of that forage would be emphasized for uses other than wild horses and burros.	When monitoring data and best science identifies an increase or decrease in available forage in HMAs, allocations would be adjusted proportionately for wild horses and burros, wildlife, and livestock.	When monitoring data and best science identifies additional available forage in HMAs, that forage would be allocated first to wild horses to achieve an AML that is genetically viable, then to other resource uses.		Increase or decrease in available forage would be adjusted on a case-by-case basis to support Standards for Rangeland Health.

Table 2-10. Fire and Fuels Management

No Action Alternative	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative E	PROPOSED RMP
Goals Manage fire and fuels to protect life, firefighter safety, property, and critical resource values. Reduce the threat of wildfire in the WUI. Manage fire and fuels, where appropriate, to restore natural systems to their desired future condition, considering the interrelated social and economic components. Suppress wildfires to minimize cost considering firefighter and public safety, benefits, and values to be protected, consistent with resource objectives. **Objectives** Using Fire Regime Condition Class (FRCC), establish landscape-level fire management initiatives that include a description of areas and the identification of acreages to illustrate where fire suppression actions are warranted; where fire may be restored to the ecosystem through wildland fire use for resource benefit; and where treatments may be used involving prescribed fire and non-fire fuel reduction, maintenance and/or rehabilitation. Identify criteria used for establishing fire management priorities. Identify resource protection measures for the implementation of fire management initiatives. **Management Guidance Common to All Alternatives** Minimize wildfire size and frequency in sagebrush communities where greater sage-grouse habitat objectives will not be met if fire occurs. To reduce risks and restore ecosystems through fuels management, allow the following fuels management tools throughout the planning area unless otherwise restricted: wildland fire use; prescribed fire; and mechanical, chemical, seeding, and biological actions. As conditions allow, employ the least intrusive fire suppression method over more intrusive methods. For example, wildland fire use is the preferred method of treatment. Where conditions are not appropriate for wildland fire use, prescribed burning would be the preferred method. Where prescribed burning is not feasible, non-fire fuel treatments would become the preferred method of treatment. **Wildland-Urban Interface Fire and Fuels Management** Work with partners in the WUI on wildland firefighting, hazardous fuels reduction, fire prevention and education, and technical assistance. **Hazardous Fuels Reduction** Use fuel management strategies (e.g., prescribed fire, mechanical, chemical, biological, hand treatments, and wildland fire) to meet desired future conditions.					
Desired Wildland Fire Conditions (DWFC)					
	The general DWFC is to have ecosystems that are at a low risk of losing key ecosystem components following wildfire and that function within their historical ecological range. In terms of FRCC, the DWFC outside the WUI would be to trend to a lower FRCC using the least intrusive method possible. When possible, wildland fire use is the preferred method of treatment to move toward FRCC 1; when conditions do not allow wildland fire use, prescribed fire and then non-fire fuel treatments would be considered. Inside the WUI, the general DWFC is to have less potential for values to be threatened by wildland fire, usually through some modification of fuels.				
Suppression					
Wildfires would be	Wildfire would be managed to protect life, firefighter safety, property, and high-risk resource values within the framework of				

Table 2-10. Fire and Fuels Management

No Action Alternative	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative E	PROPOSED RMP
suppressed where necessary to protect life, property, and high-risk resource values while ensuring safety and cost-effective fire management. Fires would be suppressed in accordance with the Fire Management Plan (FMP) prepared to implement RMP decisions. The FMP would include detailed prescriptions for or limitations on fire suppression, including areas where fires would be completely suppressed or allowed to burn, equipment and techniques allowed in specific areas, and values at risk to be protected. Full suppression would be applied to areas with high-value resources. In multiple-fire situations, fires in these areas would be suppressed as a first priority, consistent with firespread potential and threat to high property or resource values. Areas with high-value	applicable laws, regulations, and agency policies. An appropriate management response would be provided to all wildland fires, emphasizing firefighter and public safety and considering suppression costs, benefits, and values to be protected, consistent with resource objectives, standards, and guidelines. Fire Management Unit objectives, as described in the Moab Fire District FMP, would further guide the appropriate management response. In multiple fire situations, fires would be suppressed using the following prioritization criteria: • Protecting human health and safety • Protecting WUI areas • Maintaining existing healthy ecosystems • Potential to impact sensitive resources, such as: – Critical habitat (T&E) – Crucial-value wildlife habitat – Cultural resources – Sensitive riparian areas – Priority watersheds. • Potential for social impacts • Threats to other agency lands (e.g., NPS, USFS, SITLA)				

Table 2-10. Fire and Fuels Management

No Action Alternative	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative E	PROPOSED RMP
resources include: • WUI areas • Areas with high-value recreation resources (e.g., Price Canyon Recreation Site facilities, Desolation Canyon, Cleveland-Lloyd Dinosaur Quarry, and Goblin Valley State Park) • Areas with communication facilities (e.g., Bruin Point vicinity and Cedar Mountain communication facilities) • Areas with other development values (e.g., Peters Point and Jack Canyon oil and gas fields) • Areas with high forage values • Areas with high productivity potential or high erosion potential soils • High-value watersheds • Crucial wildlife habitat. Conditional/modified fire suppression would be applied to the remainder of the PFO,					

Table 2-10. Fire and Fuels Management

No Action Alternative	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative E	PROPOSED RMP
allowing naturally occurring fires to burn during periods of low, moderate, or high fire danger. Fires in these areas would be suppressed if they threaten property or have significant potential to cause resource damage.					
Wildland Fire Use Areas					
	Specific areas for wildland fire use would be identified in the Moab Fire District FMP. However, wildland fire use could be authorized for all areas except when the following resources and values may be negatively affected and there are no reasonable measures that could be employed to protect such resources and values: • WUI areas • Areas that are known to be highly susceptible to post-fire invasion by cheatgrass or noxious weeds • Important terrestrial and aquatic habitats • Non-fire adapted vegetation communities • Sensitive cultural resources • Areas with high soil erosion hazard • Air quality Class 1 areas and PM_{10} non-attainment areas • Administrative sites • Developed recreation sites • Communication sites • Oil, gas, and mining facilities • Above-ground utility corridors • High-use travel corridors such as interstates, railroads, and/or highways. The appropriate management response for areas containing these resources or values may be wildland fire use, but measures to protect these values would be necessary to avoid threats to these values. In fire situations where these resources or values would not be affected, wildland fire use might still not be employed because of other conditions, such as weather, personnel availability, or ongoing fire activity.				
General Restrictions					
The BLM would limit	Specific resource protection measures for fire management would be identified in the FMP (Moab Support Center).				

Table 2-10. Fire and Fuels Management

No Action Alternative	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative E	PROPOSED RMP
motorized suppression in areas closed to OHV use.					
Prevention and Mitigation					
Unauthorized wildland fire ignitions would be prevented through coordination with partners and affected groups and individuals. The full range of prevention and mitigation activities (e.g., personal contacts, mass media, signing, and defensible space) would be used.	Unauthorized wildland fire ignitions would be prevented through coordination with partners and affected groups and individuals. The full range of prevention and mitigation activities (e.g., personal contacts, mass media, law enforcement, signing, and defensible space) would be used. Implementation of fire prevention activities would take priority in the following areas: • WUI areas • Major travel corridors • Recreation sites • Public lands as a whole.				
Emergency Stabilization and Rehabilitation (ESR)					
ESR efforts would be undertaken to protect and sustain ecosystems and public health and safety and to help communities protect infrastructure.	ESR efforts would be undertaken to protect and sustain ecosystems, public health, and safety and to help communities protect infrastructure. Definitions of each ESR program and possible actions to guide each program are shown in Appendix 9 of the Draft RMP/EIS. Implementation of post-fire rehabilitation activities would take priority in the following areas: • Areas that without treatment could pose a threat to life and property • Areas with potential for invasive species invasion, significant ecosystem alteration (Condition Class 3 areas), and soil stabilization.				
Fuels Management Prioritization					
The BLM would use prescribed fire to implement or maintain seedings where necessary.	Implementation of fuels management action would take priority in the following areas: • WUI areas • Areas with fuel loading that could potentially result in catastrophic wildfires • Resource improvement areas.				

Table 2-11. Non-WSA Lands with Wilderness Characteristics

No Action Alternative	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative E	PROPOSED RMP
Goals Protect, preserve, and maintain wilderness character (appearance of naturalness, outstanding opportunities for solitude and primitive unconfined recreation) of non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics as determined by BLM inventory maintenance, as appropriate. **Objectives** Manage primitive backcountry landscapes for undeveloped character and provide opportunities for primitive recreational activities and experience of solitude, as appropriate. **Management Guidance Common to All Alternatives** There are no actions common to all alternatives for non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics.					
Management of Non-WSA Lands with Wilderness Characteristics					
No specific lands are identified that would be managed to protect, preserve and maintain their wilderness characteristics				All non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics areas identified by the BLM through inventory maintenance (Map 3-15 – 937,440 acres) would be managed to protect, preserve, and maintain their wilderness characteristics with the following prescriptions: • VRM Class I (Map 2-57) • Designated as closed to OHV use (Map 2-60) • Unavailable to oil and gas leasing (Map 2-63) and all activities related to geophysical operations • The lands will be eliminated from further consideration for coal leasing (Map 2-70) • Closed to disposal of mineral materials (Map 2-65) • Retain public lands in federal ownership • Exclusion area for ROWs • Excluded from private or commercial use of woodland	Manage the following 97,100 acres of non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics areas (Map 2-75) for the protection, preservation, and maintenance of their wilderness characteristics: • .Hondu Country (20,000 acres) • Mexican Mountain (4,200 acres) • Muddy Creek-Crack Canyon (52,700 acres) • San Rafael Reef (3,300 acres) • Wild Horse Mesa (16,900 acres) Protect, preserve, and maintain the wilderness characteristics in these areas through the following prescriptions: • VRM Class II • Limit OHV use and all mechanical travel to designated routes • The Hondu Country and Muddy Creek/Crack Canyon areas would be open to oil and gas leasing subject to major constraints (NSO). All other non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics managed

Table 2-11. Non-WSA Lands with Wilderness Characteristics

No Action Alternative	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative E	PROPOSED RMP
				products and seed collection (Map 2-59) • Closed to new road construction. • Permit maintenance of existing facilities and boundary and cherrystem roads.	in this alternative would be unavailable to oil and gas leasing. • Closed to activities related to geophysical operations • Closed to disposal of mineral materials • Retain public lands in federal ownership • Avoidance area for ROWs • Excluded from private or commercial use of woodland products and seed collection. • Permit maintenance and use of existing facilities, boundary and cherrystem roads. • Available for range improvements, vegetative and fire treatments and Healthy Lands Initiatives where it meets the goals and objectives for managing these lands.

Table 2-12. Fire, Drought, Natural Disasters

No Action Alternative	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative E	PROPOSED RMP
Coordinate appropriate management responses with affected parties when natural resources may be affected by fire, drought, insects and diseases, or natural disasters. A variety of emergency or interim actions may be necessary to minimize land health degradations, such as reduced forage allocations; reductions in the number of livestock, wild horses, and/or wildlife; increased mitigation measures to ensure reclamation; and limitations on energy field activities and recreational uses. Incorporate current Utah BLM *Standards for Rangeland Health*, as appropriate, across all resource programs as a minimum. Management prescriptions in the form of constraints to use, terms and conditions, and stipulations may be needed to sustain rangeland health and viability. Management prescriptions will consider the following: • Surface disturbing activities—These will be closely monitored to ensure compliance with conditions of approval or terms and conditions of authorizations and permits. Action minimizing new surface disturbance, allowed by regulations, and actions ensuring successful reclamation, will be of paramount concern.					

Table 2-12. Fire, Drought, Natural Disasters

No Action Alternative	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative E	PROPOSED RMP
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 irrigators, and fencing to exclude ungulate grazing/browsing. • Livestock grazing—Use will be allowed in both quantity and timing that will not result in a downward shift in rangeland health and/or production. The BLM will work cooperatively to effect a grazing strategy specific to a grazing permittee's individual grazing allotment(s) and make changes to the grazing authorizations, as appropriate, within the limits of the existing permit and in accordance with the grazing regulations. In the case of drought, the last recourse for the BLM will be to temporarily close the range, or portions of it, to livestock grazing. • Wild horse management—Use will be allowed within allocations made in the LUP, and overall herd numbers will be confined to management limits established at an appropriate management level. Should conditions be such that the principle of a thriving ecological balance could not be maintained because of climatic conditions, "excess" wild horses will be removed from the range. • Wildlife management—During periods of prolonged dryness or drought to the extent that wildlife ungulate populations cannot be sustained because of competition for water and available forage, and overall animal health is compromised, the BLM will enter into discussions with the UDWR regarding herd numbers and overall management options to combat the effects of drought. • Recreation—During periods of prolonged dryness or drought, the BLM, in cooperation with local and State fire management agencies, will limit campfires to established fire rings or fully contained fires. The last resort will be to close the public lands to campfires of any kind. • OHVs—Off-highway/road vehicle use during periods of prolonged dryness could be further restricted; or, if site-specific conditions warrant, closure to OHVs could be implemented to minimize vehicle-induced injury or damage to rangeland and/or woodland resources and to minimize the potential of spark-caused fires.					

Table 2-13. Forestry and Woodlands

No Action Alternative	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative E	PROPOSED RMP
Goals Restore and manage forest and woodland ecosystems. Provide forest and woodland products (e.g., fuel-wood, timber, posts, pinyon nuts, and Christmas trees) on a sustainable basis. Manage the public lands to promote healthy, sustainable forest and woodland ecosystems. Provide forest and woodland products for public and commercial uses in areas that are ecologically suitable and in consideration with other resource values. This would be accomplished through permit sales for firewood, timber, Christmas trees, seed and plant collecting, and pine nut gathering, etc. **Objectives** Provide opportunities for seed gathering where and when ecologically feasible. Permit commercial uses to improve forest and woodland ecosystem health. Develop partnerships among internal programs and outside agencies for forest and woodland management.					

Table 2-13. Forestry and Woodlands

No Action Alternative	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative E	PROPOSED RMP
Emphasize public education on forest and woodland health, fire danger, and resource uses. Develop a Forest and Woodlands Management Plan (FWMP) for the forest and woodlands in the PFO. **Management Guidance Common to All Alternatives** The BLM will write and adopt a FWMP, an activity level plan. Until the plan is adopted, permit commercial harvest of forest and woodland products will be considered on a case-by-case basis. Manage the forest and woodlands in accordance with the stated objectives and land use designations. This management would include silvicultural practices, including site preparation, regeneration, stand protection, stand maintenance, pre-commercial thinning (density management) and release, commercial thinning (density management), fertilization, pruning, forest and woodland condition restoration treatments, and salvage. Apply BMPs during all ground and vegetation disturbing activities and harvest systems to avoid or minimize adverse impacts on soils. Control harvest of forest and woodland products through permitting. Permits would specify area, timing, and type of product according to the prescriptions of the FWMP. The FWMP would include treatments necessary for plan implementation, which would be detailed to the extent possible in the plan. Project- and site-specific treatments would be covered in the environmental assessments for each project. Identify, maintain, and restore forest and woodland old-growth stands to a pre-fire suppression condition. For this identification, the PFO will adopt the USFS old-growth definitions and identification standards in accordance with the USFS document *Characteristics of Old-Growth Forests in the Intermountain Region (April 1993)*. In instances where the area of application in the previous document does not apply to specific species (for example, *Pinus edulis*), use the document *Recommended Old-Growth Definitions and Descriptions, USDA Forest Service Southwestern Region (Sept. 1992)*.					
Forests and Woodlands					
Forest condition would be managed through the use of ongoing forest condition monitoring; fire management; harvest for domestic use; and mechanical, chemical, or biological means as well as cooperative agreements with other forest resource management agencies (Map 2-10).	A PFO FWMP would be developed and updated as inventory and stand data are collected. The FWMP will provide direction to manage forest and woodland ecosystems to restore, maintain, and improve forest and woodland health, diversity, and resilience to insects and disease. Forests and woodlands would be managed for the long term, including maintenance of healthy habitat for plant and animal species. Forest and woodland management would provide for the harvest of forest and woodland products (including timber) where feasible and compatible with restoring, maintaining, or improving ecosystem health as directed by the Price RMP. As appropriate, the FWMP would include specific management of noncommercial and commercial woodlands products, as well as of the commercial harvest of timber products. The FWMP would include management of forests and woodlands under drought or other temporal or seasonal conditions. The FWMP would include silvicultural practices, including site preparation, regeneration, stand protection, stand maintenance, pre-commercial thinning (density management) and release, commercial thinning (density management), fertilization, pruning, forest and woodland condition restoration treatments, and salvage.				
Commercial Harvest of Woodland and Timber Products					
Limited commercial	Commercial harvest of timber and woodland products would be			Same as	Commercial harvest of timber and

Table 2-13. Forestry and Woodlands

No Action Alternative	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative E	PROPOSED RMP
harvest of forest and woodland resources would continue to be permitted on a case-by-case basis. Commercial harvest of timber products would continue to not be allowed (Map 2-10).	managed as outlined in the FWMP while maintaining forest and woodland health (Map 2-11 through Map 2-13).			Alternative A, except WSAs, non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics, and ACECs, where identified in the prescription, would be closed to harvest (Map 2-59).	woodland products would be managed as outlined in the FWMP while maintaining forest and woodland health, except where otherwise closed to commercial harvest in management prescriptions specific to WSAs, non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics, and ACECs (Map 2-14).

Table 2-14. Livestock Grazing

No Action Alternative	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative E	PROPOSED RMP
Goals Manage the public lands to promote healthy sustainable rangeland ecosystems that provide livestock forage production and allow the development of necessary livestock management facilities for the orderly use of the livestock industry. **Objectives** Maintain, restore, and improve public rangelands to meet the *Standards for Rangeland Health*. **Management Guidance Common to All Alternatives** Manage grazing and rangeland health according to the *Standards for Rangeland Health* and *Guidelines for Grazing Management for BLM Lands in Utah*, and in 43 CFR 4100 et seq. based on historical use and dependent on the availability of forage and water. Based on Taylor Grazing Act guidance that directs that public “land and its resources must be preserved from destruction or unnecessary injury,” temporarily adjust forage allocations as needed during periods of forage depletion caused by severe drought or other natural causes such as fire. Additional guidance is found in the *Standards for Rangeland Health* and *Guidelines for Grazing Management for BLM Lands in Utah*. During times when extreme climatic conditions exist, the BLM would manage and adjust grazing practices to maintain and work toward meeting Standards for Rangeland Health for Public Lands in the PFO, see Appendix 10 of the Draft RMP/EIS. Base changes in levels of use or continuance of permitted use on current laws, policy, and monitoring data, and analysis in accordance with NEPA. The analysis process will consider LUP program decision objectives and priorities in relation to livestock grazing and achievement of *Standards for Rangeland Health* on a case-by-case basis. Provide for the development and maintenance of range improvement projects and livestock facilities on a case-by-case basis. Construct range improvement				

Table 2-14. Livestock Grazing

No Action Alternative	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative E	PROPOSED RMP
projects to BLM specifications. Document access routes for the range improvements in the individual project files. Handle voluntary relinquishments of grazing preference, in whole or in part, by a permittee in writing to the BLM, on a case-by-case basis. The BLM will not recognize as valid, relinquishments that are conditional on specific BLM actions, and the BLM will not be bound by them. Relinquished permits and the associated preference will remain available for application by qualified applicants after the BLM considers whether such actions would meet rangeland health standards and is compatible with achieving land use 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. Upon relinquishment, determine, through a site-specific evaluation and associated NEPA analysis, whether 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. Any decision issued concerning discontinuance of livestock grazing is not permanent and may be reconsidered and changed through future LUP amendments and updates.					
Forage Allocations					
Continue livestock forage allocations as noted in Appendix O, with 99,520 active AUMs allocated for livestock grazing and 39,701 suspended AUMs.		Same as the No Action Alternative, except for the closure of the Rock Creek Allotment (reduction in 110 horse active AUMs and 600 cattle active AUMs).	Same as the No Action Alternative, except for the closure of the following allotments: • Hondo – 224 active AUMs • Red Canyon – 2,249 active AUMs • McKay Flay – 1,274 active AUMs • Range Creek – 286 active AUMs • Horse Bench Pasture of Green River Allotment – 1,156 active AUMs • Rock Creek – 710 active AUMs • TOTAL reduction of 5,899 active AUMs Additionally, the portions of the San Rafael River, Saucer Basin, and Horseshoe Canyon North Allotments within the Labyrinth Canyon SRMA would be closed, reducing a portion of the 4,801 active AUMs in these allotments. The exact reduction would depend on where the allotment would be closed and/or fenced).		Same as the No Action Alternative, except, if permits on the Green River and Rock Creek Allotments in the Desolation Canyon/Green River Corridor were relinquished, there could be a reduction of up to 710 active AUMs.

Table 2-14. Livestock Grazing

No Action Alternative	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative E	PROPOSED RMP
Areas Where Grazing Use Could Be Changed for Other Resource Purposes					
Range Creek Allotment					
The State of Utah has acquired private lands (Wilcox Ranch) that served as base for the BLM Range Creek Allotment grazing permit. Pending completion of this planning effort and under current regulations the grazing permit would be issued based on applications accepted from public notification. The permit would be offered as historically issued.	Grazing would continue in this area as historically allocated for livestock and wildlife.	Same as Alternative A.	Livestock grazing would be closed in this area. Combine Range Creek into the Gray Canyon Wildland Management Area. Plant cover would be for watershed, riparian, and stream enhancement. (Refer to wildlife section concerning combining the Range Creek Allotment with the Gray Canyon Wildland Management Area.)		Authorize livestock (cattle and/or horses) grazing within this area on a prescription basis. Grazing would be used as a management tool for the benefit of resource values—watershed, riparian, fisheries, and wildlife. Grazing would also be used to reduce the potential risk of wildland fires because of accumulation of vegetation fine fuel loads.
Desolation Canyon/Green River Corridor (Sand Wash to Swaseys Rapid)					
Livestock grazing (cattle and horses) would continue in this area as currently allocated.	Same as No Action Alternative.	Livestock grazing (cattle, sheep, and horses) would be closed in the Green River Allotment (no change, grazing not currently allowed beneath canyon rim), and the Rock Creek Allotment (20 horses from November 1–April 15 for 110 AUMs and 110 cattle for same time period for 600 AUMs). Grazing would be removed for the	Livestock grazing (cattle, sheep, and horses) would be closed in the Horse Bench Pasture of the Green River Allotment (1,156 AUMs), and Rock Creek Allotment (710 AUMs) within the Desolation Canyon SRMA. Grazing would be removed for the following reasons: • Vegetation maintenance • Soil stabilization and erosion reduction • Additional wildlife habitat protection and reduced competition for available food, space, cover, and water • Maintenance or enhancement of		Upon voluntary relinquishment of the existing permit and preference for livestock forage allocations in the Green River, and Rock Creek Allotments, the BLM would stop authorizing livestock grazing of the associated forage in these allotments (which comprise Desolation and Gray Canyons below the canyon rim). The forage that had been allocated to livestock would serve the following purposes: • Vegetation maintenance • Soil stabilization and erosion reduction • Additional wildlife habitat protection

Table 2-14. Livestock Grazing

No Action Alternative	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative E	PROPOSED RMP
		following reasons: • Vegetation maintenance • Soil stabilization and erosion reduction • Additional wildlife habitat protection and reduced competition for available food, space, cover, and water • Maintenance or enhancement of high-value recreational lands and existing recreational opportunities	high-value recreational lands and existing recreational opportunities		and reduced competition for available food, space, cover, and water • Maintenance or enhancement of high-value recreational lands and existing settings and experiences • Enhancement of values and conditions in the Desolation Canyon NHL.
Labyrinth Canyon/Green River Corridor (Confluence of San Rafael River to Mineral Bottom)					
Grazing would continue in this area as currently allocated, including coordination with Glen Canyon National Recreation Area along the Labyrinth Canyon corridor (beyond Mineral Bottom).	Same as No Action Alternative.	Same as No Action Alternative.	Livestock grazing would be closed in the San Rafael River, Saucer Basin, and Horseshoe North Allotments within the Labyrinth Canyon SRMA for the following reasons: • Vegetation enhancement • Soil stabilization and erosion reduction • Additional wildlife habitat protection and reduced competition for available food, space, cover, and water • Maintenance or enhancement of high-value recreational lands and existing recreational opportunities • If a willing permittee relinquishes AUMs in this allotment, forage use would be reallocated to other		Grazing would continue in this area as currently allocated, including coordination with Glen Canyon National Recreation Area along the Labyrinth Canyon corridor (beyond Mineral Bottom). (Same as *No Action Alternative.)*

Table 2-14. Livestock Grazing

No Action Alternative	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative E	PROPOSED RMP
			resource uses.		
Chimney Canyon/Hidden Splendor/Muddy (Hondo, Red Canyon, and McKay Flat Allotments)					
Grazing would continue in this area as currently allocated. *(Implementation-Level Decision)** Red Canyon Allotment October 16–March 15 McKay Flat Allotment November 1–March 15 Hondo Allotment November 1–May 31		Set grazing season of use *(Implementation-Level Decision)** from October 16 to March 31 in the Red Canyon, McKay Flat, and Hondo Allotments with no change in AUMs (cattle numbers would be adjusted to reflect no change in AUMs) for the following reasons: • Orderly administration of the range • Vegetation enhancement • Soil stabilization and erosion reduction • Additional wildlife habitat protection and reduced competition for available food, space, cover, and water • Maintenance or enhancement of high-value recreational lands and existing recreational opportunities • Critical riparian area protection.	Livestock grazing would be closed in Hondo, Red Canyon, and McKay Flat Allotments for the following reasons: • Vegetation enhancement • Soil stabilization and erosion reduction • Additional wildlife habitat protection and reduced competition for available food, space, cover, and water • Maintenance or enhancement of high-value recreational lands and existing recreational opportunities • Critical riparian area protection.		Set grazing season of use *(Implementation-Level Decision)** from October 16 to March 31 in the Red Canyon, McKay Flat, and Hondo Allotments with no change in AUMs (cattle numbers would be adjusted to reflect no change in AUMs) for the following reasons: • Orderly administration of the range • Vegetation enhancement • Soil stabilization and erosion reduction • Additional wildlife habitat protection and reduced competition for available food, space, cover, and water • Maintenance or enhancement of high-value recreational lands and existing setting and experiences • Critical riparian area protection. (Same as Alternative B.)

* *This is an implementation-level decision that cannot be protested under the planning regulations. Please see the cover letter for further information.*

Table 2-14. Livestock Grazing

No Action Alternative	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative E	PROPOSED RMP
Recreation Sites					
Grazing would continue in this area as currently allocated.			Grazing would be closed in developed recreation sites to eliminate recreation-livestock conflicts. Fencing of the recreation area would be required to keep livestock out. Construction and maintenance of fencing to exclude livestock from these sites would be the BLM's responsibility.	Livestock grazing would be closed in the Price Canyon Recreation Site (a portion of the Price Canyon West allotment) for the following reasons: • Recreation • Fencing of the recreation area would be required to keep livestock out.	Grazing would be closed in developed recreation sites to eliminate recreation-livestock conflicts. Fencing of the recreation area would be required to keep livestock out. Construction and maintenance of fencing to exclude livestock from these sites would be the BLM's responsibility. *(Same as Alternative C.)*
Reallocate AUMs Between Wildlife, Wild Horses and Burros, and Livestock					
Adjustments would be made to livestock to maintain rangeland health, range conditions, wildlife habitat needs, and other management objectives.	Increases or decreases in available forage would be adjusted to benefit livestock.	Increases or decreases in available forage would be adjusted among livestock, wild horses and burros, and wildlife as determined on a case-by-case basis.	Increases or decreases in available forage would be adjusted to benefit wildlife.		Increases or decreases in available forage would be adjusted among livestock, wild horses and burros, and wildlife as determined on a case-by-case basis. *(Same as Alternative B.)*
Forage Allocation Within Lands Acquired After Adoption of the Price RMP					
Lands acquired since the *San Rafael RMP* (1991) and *Price River MFP* (1983) and any	Lands acquired after adoption of this plan would be managed consistent with the purposes for which it was acquired or historic use.				

Table 2-14. Livestock Grazing

No Action Alternative	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative E	PROPOSED RMP
future acquisitions would not be allotted for livestock grazing until a plan amendment is completed.					
Administrative Access—Maintaining Motorized Vehicle Access for Range Improvement Construction and Maintenance					
Access for existing and future range projects would continue to be allowed on an allotment basis.	Required motorized access for existing and future range projects would be limited to specified routes as identified in the range improvement permitting process. Identification of administrative access routes, including historic and existing routes, to range improvements would be documented in each specific range improvement file as existing range projects are maintained or as new projects are implemented.				

Table 2-15. Recreation and Off Highway Vehicles

No Action Alternative	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative E	PROPOSED RMP
Goals Establish management that provides necessary public services, authentic recreation experience, and opportunity within allowable use levels; minimizes user conflicts; and maintains the healthy ecosystems and settings that provide the basis for recreation opportunity and experience. Provide an environment for and encourage entrepreneurial activities that are supportive of the recreation program goals and objectives. **Objectives** Manage all SRMAs to provide the benefits, experiences, and opportunities identified for each. Use the ROS classification system in SRMAs as a guide to decisionmaking on projects with the potential to alter the physical, managerial, or social settings that create the opportunities and experiences. Develop a Recreation Area Management Plan (RAMP) for all designated SRMAs. Review and update the Cleveland Lloyd Dinosaur Quarry RAMP. Review and update the Desolation and Gray Canyons of the Green River, River Management Plan. Use recreation permitting to direct and manage recreation use. **Management Guidance Common to All Alternatives** Manage recreation generally guided by the *Standards for Rangeland Health* and *Guidelines for Recreation Management for BLM Lands in Utah*. The guidelines describe, in a broad sense, the procedures that should be applied to achieve standards for rangeland health within the recreation program.					

Table 2-15. Recreation and Off Highway Vehicles

No Action Alternative	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative E	PROPOSED RMP
Portions of the PFO not identified as a SRMA would be identified as an Extensive Recreation Management (ERMA). ERMAs would receive only custodial management (which addresses only activity opportunities) of visitor health and safety, user conflict, and resource protection issues with no activity-level planning. Therefore, actions within ERMAs would generally be implemented directly from LUP decisions, such as Special Recreation Permits (SRP) or OHV management decisions. See Appendix K for additional specific recreation management objectives for the PFO ERMA. **Recreation Activity Prescriptions and Guidance** Allow dispersed camping throughout the PFO without permit, unless otherwise designated by the BLM. Determine and designate areas for dispersed camping and associated access routes with the cooperation of the counties. Prohibit rock climbing above or within 300 feet horizontally of cultural sites. Rock climbing activities will be authorized only in areas where there are no conflicts with cliff-nesting raptors. Manage developed recreation sites as recommended for withdrawal from mineral entry or as open to oil and gas leasing subject to major constraints (NSO). Close developed recreational sites to grazing and include fencing the site in the development plan when appropriate. Address non-motorized and motorized recreational trails in activity level plans (e.g., designation and/or development of routes/trail systems, maintenance, how the trails relate to the ERMA, SRMA, and specific RMZs, etc.). Allow mountain biking on all routes designated for OHV use and on June's Bottom and Black Canyon Dragon routes and other routes or areas designated for mountain bike use. Designation of additional mountain bike areas or routes would occur through activity plans. *(Route designations are an implementation-level decision)* *					
Developed Recreation Sites Continue to manage and maintain developed recreation sites. Sites administered by the PFO are Daddy Canyon Recreation Site (RS), Price Canyon RS, Cleveland-Lloyd Dinosaur Quarry, Cedar Mountain RS, Buckhorn Pictograph Panel, San Rafael Bridge RS, Swaseys Cabin RS, Little Wild Horse Canyon RS, Wedge Overlook RS, and Temple Mountain RS. Sites located in other field office areas and maintained by the PFO are Lower Gray Canyon RS, Mineral Bottom RS, and Sand Wash RS. Develop new sites in response to user demand, amenity value, and critical resource protection needs.					
Recreation Opportunity Spectrum (ROS)					
The *San Rafael RMP* established prescriptive ROS management classes. An ROS inventory exists for the Price River area; however, the *Price River MFP* did not establish ROS	Within SRMAs, manage for recreation opportunity settings, as identified in the ROS inventory (Map 3-17) (see Appendix K for description of ROS settings). Recreation facilities would be developed only in response to resource management needs and would be appropriate for the managerial setting identified for each ROS class.			Same as Alternative A, except in non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics, emphasize managing for Primitive and	Within SRMAs, manage for recreation opportunity settings, as identified in the ROS inventory (Map 3-17) (see Appendix K for description of ROS settings). Recreation facilities would be developed only in response to resource management needs and would be appropriate to the managerial setting identified for each

* *This is an implementation-level decision that cannot be protested under the planning regulations. Please see the cover letter for further information.*

Table 2-15. Recreation and Off Highway Vehicles

No Action Alternative	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative E	PROPOSED RMP
management classes.				Semi-Primitive Non-Motorized (SPNM) recreational objectives. Other resource uses would be subject to limitations based on the ROS class designations and associated opportunity types.	ROS class. *(Same as Alternative A.)*
Special Recreation Management Areas					
Adjust RMZs identified in this RMP through their respective SRMA activity plan, as necessary. Designate all SRMAs as special areas (Federal Lands Recreation Enhancement Act [2004]), and if needed, require permits and payment of fees for recreational use (Map 2-20 through Map 2-24). Activity plans will be created or updated for all SRMAs. Conduct all recreation management activities and developments in the SRMA in support of the individual SRMA goals and objectives.					
Desolation Canyon SRMA					
The purpose of the Desolation Canyon SRMA is to maintain the natural character of the canyon environment in Desolation and Gray Canyons, provide a continuing opportunity for a quality wilderness experience between Sand Wash and Nefertiti Rapid, provide an opportunity for day-use recreation below Nefertiti Rapid, and protect the scientific value of the cultural resources while allowing for visitor enjoyment. Permits would be issued for guided tours and shuttle and livery services and special area SRPs for noncommercial groups. Continue to use the existing 1979 *Desolation and Gray Canyons of the Green River River Management Plan* (as amended) as the activity plan for the Desolation Canyon SRMA. Prescriptions that will continue according to this plan will include, but are not limited to, management decisions for: • Passenger day limitations • River travel limitations and procedures • Daily launch limits • Party size limits • Waste disposal procedures.					
	Specific recreation management direction for the Desolation Canyon SRMA is contained in Appendix K. This includes direction for the following recreation management components: Market Strategy; Market; Niche; Management Goals; Management Objectives; Primary Activities; Experiences; and Benefits.				

Table 2-15. Recreation and Off Highway Vehicles

No Action Alternative	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative E	PROPOSED RMP
The SRMA boundary would be as shown on Map 2-20. (72,800 acres)	The SRMA boundary would be as shown on Map 2-21. (72,500 acres)	The SRMA boundary would incorporate the existing SRMA plus the Desolation Canyon WSA as shown on Map 2-22. (224,530 acres)	The SRMA boundary would incorporate the existing SRMA plus the Desolation Canyon WSA. (271,830 acres)	The SRMA boundary would incorporate the existing SRMA, Desolation Canyon WSA, and contiguous non-WSA lands with wilderness character. This SRMA would be managed with emphasis on Primitive and SPNM recreation objectives as shown in Map 2-61. (300,000 acres)	The SRMA boundary would be as shown on Map 2-24. (72,700 acres)
	Visitor facilities would be provided for visitor health and safety and resource protection in the Sand Wash Recreation Site and the Lower Gray Canyon RMZ.				
Motorized boating would continue to be restricted to downstream travel only at a slow, wakeless speed.	Motorized boating would be restricted to downstream travel only at a wakeless speed. Additional restrictions on motor use in the SRMA would be prescribed in activity plans, with the coordination of interested parties.			No motorized boating use would be permitted.	Motorized boating would be restricted to downstream travel only at a wakeless speed. Additional restrictions on motor use in the SRMA would be prescribed in activity plans, with the coordination of interested parties. *(Same as Alternative A.)*
	Primitive and SPNM ROS class areas of the SRMA would be closed to OHV use and limited to designated routes in Semi-Primitive	The SRMA would be closed to recreational OHV use except for the Sand Wash and the Lower Gray Canyon RMZ. The Range Creek	The primitive and SPNM ROS class areas in the SRMA would be closed to OHV use and limited to designated BLM and county system roads in SPM areas. The Range Creek Jeep Trail would be closed to motorized		The SRMA would be closed to recreational OHV use except for Sand Wash and Lower Gray Canyon RMZ. The Range Creek Jeep Trail would be designated for OHV use to the present barricade (T. 17 S., R. 16

Table 2-15. Recreation and Off Highway Vehicles

No Action Alternative	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative E	PROPOSED RMP
	Motorized (SPM) areas. The Range Creek Jeep Trail would be designated for OHV use to the present barricade (T. 17 S., R. 16 E., Section 36, SE1/4SW1/4). *(Implementation-level decision)**	Jeep Trail would be designated for OHV use to the lowest drill hole (T. 17 S., R. 16 E., Section 27, SW1/4NE1/4). *(Implementation-level decision)** Any additional routes constructed on existing leases for oil and gas would be gated and open for administrative use only unless it was determined they would enhance the SRMA objectives.	use at the confluence of Turtle Canyon. *(Implementation-level decision)** Any additional routes constructed on existing leases for oil and gas would be gated and closed to recreational use.		E., Section 36, SE1/4SW1/4). *(Implementation-level decision)** Any additional routes constructed on existing leases for oil and gas would be gated and open for administrative use only unless determined to enhance the SRMA objectives.
Desolation Canyon SRMA Lower Gray Canyon RMZ					
	Concessionaire leases and the use of outfitters would be relied on to provide maximum development of recreation opportunities (Map 2-25). (1,200 acres) The BLM would retain overall management. Concessionaires would charge fees for entry, camping, and other uses (e.g., boat ramp and hiking) and services in the area.	Emphasize facilities development, limiting use to developed sites and reliance on special recreation permittees to provide certain goods and services (Map 2-26). (1,300 acres)	Recreation management would be limited to existing development, an established carrying capacity, limited designation of dispersed campsites, and a fee-based reservation system for any use of the zone during peak use periods (e.g., summer, high-flow weekends, and holidays) (Map 2-27). (1,700 acres)		Emphasize facilities development, limiting use to developed sites and reliance on special recreation permittees to provide certain goods and services (Map 2-28). (1,300 acres) *(Same as Alternative B)*

* *This is an implementation-level decision that cannot be protested under the planning regulations. Please see the cover letter for further information.*

Table 2-15. Recreation and Off Highway Vehicles

No Action Alternative	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative E	PROPOSED RMP
	Fees would be commensurate with lease value, comparable market recreation fees, and cost of services provided. Concessionaires would also be permitted to vend items in support of resource protection (such as firewood) and to sell interpretive materials.				
Range Creek SRMA					
No SRMA would be created for Range Creek.			The Desolation Canyon SRMA includes the Range Creek area (Map 2-23).	Same as No Action Alternative.	Specific recreation management direction for the Range Creek SRMA is contained in Appendix K. This includes direction for the following recreation management components: Market Strategy; Market; Niche; Management Goals; Management Objectives; Primary Activities; Experiences; and Benefits. The Range Creek SRMA (Map 2-24) (40,700 acres) would be created out of portions of the Desolation Canyon SRMA, as in Alternative C. To effectively manage the State and federal lands for protection of cultural values in this area, a cooperative management plan is necessary. The BLM will work with the State of Utah to develop common management prescriptions for protection. The activity plan for the Range Creek SRMA will be developed in

Table 2-15. Recreation and Off Highway Vehicles

No Action Alternative	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative E	PROPOSED RMP
					coordination with the State of Utah to ensure consistent management, which may include additional restrictions for the protection of natural resources including cultural. The SRMA would include the following management, as well as prescriptions identified in the activity level plan: • Oil and gas would be open to leasing subject to major constraints (NSO) outside the WSAs • Excluded for ROW grants • Closed to OHV use • Closed to disposal of mineral materials Until the activity level plan was finalized, the BLM would implement the State of Utah's interim management where it was more restrictive than management on public lands, which is as follows *(Implementation-level decision)**: • Closed to mechanical use • Camping and campfires would not be allowed • Public access limited to hiking and horseback riding.
Cleveland-Lloyd Dinosaur Quarry SRMA					
The purpose of this SRMA is to provide for public education and interpretation of paleontological resources and associated geology and other natural features. Within the SRMA boundary is the 80-acre Cleveland-Lloyd Dinosaur Quarry National Natural Landmark (NNL). Close the Cleveland-Lloyd Dinosaur Quarry SRMA to collection of natural products, including paleontological resources, except by permit.					

* *This is an implementation-level decision that cannot be protested under the planning regulations. Please see the cover letter for further information.*

Table 2-15. Recreation and Off Highway Vehicles

No Action Alternative	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative E	PROPOSED RMP
Develop recreation facilities for visitor safety, convenience, and comfort, and to enhance viewing of paleontological resources and understanding of the scientific processes. Permit fires only in BLM-provided fire pits. Allow day use of Cleveland-Lloyd Dinosaur Quarry SRMA only and prohibit dispersed camping. Prohibit disposal of mineral materials (salable) in Cleveland-Lloyd Dinosaur Quarry SRMA. Limit OHV use to designated routes in the Cleveland-Lloyd Dinosaur Quarry SRMA except for permitted scientific or research purposes.					
	Specific recreation management direction for the Cleveland-Lloyd Dinosaur Quarry SRMA is contained in Appendix K. This includes direction for the following recreation management components: Market Strategy; Market; Niche; Management Goals; Management Objectives; Primary Activities; Experiences; and Benefits.				
The *Price River MFP* provides for the management of the Cleveland-Lloyd Dinosaur Quarry. Cleveland-Lloyd Dinosaur Quarry is an 80-acre NNL and an SRMA (Map 2-20).	The SRMA boundary would be aligned with the boundaries of the ACEC (770 acres), as shown on Map 2-21.	The SRMA boundary would be expanded to include approximately 2,800 acres (770-acre ACEC is entirely contained within this area) adjoining private land to the east, as shown on Map 2-22.	The SRMA boundary would be expanded to include approximately 2,800 acres (770-acre ACEC is entirely contained within this area) adjoining private land to the east, as shown on Map 2-23.	The SRMA boundary would be expanded to include approximately 2,800 acres (770-acre ACEC is entirely contained within this area) adjoining private land to the east, as shown on Map 2-61.	The SRMA boundary would be expanded to include approximately 2,800 acres (770-acre ACEC is wholly contained within this area) adjoining private land to the east, as shown on Map 2-24.
Labyrinth Canyon SRMA					
The purpose of the Labyrinth Canyon SRMA is to jointly manage recreation on a popular section of the Green River with the Utah State Division of Forestry, Fire, and State Lands, and the Moab Field Office for floating access that provides for the use and enjoyment of the area. Emphasize opportunities for flat water and novice river corridor recreation in a semi-primitive recreation setting. Through an MOU, jointly manage use below the high water line of the Green River with the Utah State Division of Forestry, Fire, and State Lands. The BLM serves as the official public contact point for information and permits. Permits are required to float the river and are issued as discussed in the SRP section and Appendix J: Evaluation Criteria.					
	Specific recreation management direction for the Labyrinth Canyon SRMA is contained in Appendix K. This includes direction for the following recreation management components: Market Strategy; Market; Niche; Management Goals; Management Objectives; Primary Activities; Experiences; and Benefits.				
The SRMA boundary would be as shown on	The SRMA boundary would extend from	The SRMA boundary would be as shown on	The SRMA boundary would	The SRMA boundary would	The SRMA boundary would be as shown on Map 2-24. (34,240 acres)

Table 2-15. Recreation and Off Highway Vehicles

No Action Alternative	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative E	PROPOSED RMP
Map 2-20. (39,900 acres)	Green River State Park to the Emery County line and would be one-quarter mile wide on either side of the centerline of the Green River, as shown on Map 2-21. (6,970 acres)	Map 2-22. (37,240 acres)	extend from the river centerline to the Antelope Valley Road as shown on Map 2-23. (82,900 acres)	extend from the river centerline to the Antelope Valley Road as shown on Map 2-61. (82,900 acres)	*(Same as Alternative B)*
	An activity plan for the Labyrinth SRMA would be developed to address prescriptions for: • SRPs • Camping regulations • Travel planning, including road and trail designations for all uses (e.g., OHV [San Rafael Motorized Route Designation Plan], foot, horse, and mountain bike). • Carrying capacity.			Same as Alternative A, except non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics would be closed to OHVs.	An activity plan for the Labyrinth SRMA would be developed to address prescriptions for: • SRPs • Camping regulations • Travel planning including road and trail designations for all uses (e.g., OHV [San Rafael Motorized Route Designation Plan], foot, horse, and mountain bike). • Carrying capacity. (Same as Alternative A.)
	SRPs would be required for all recreational users within the SRMA. SRPs would be available for commercial tours, shuttle and livery services, organized groups including the Friendship Cruise, and competitive events.				
	No facilities would be constructed in ROS Primitive class areas; minimal facilities would be used in SPNM and SPM class areas and would be used only to protect critical resources.				
	Management facilities and presence would be maintained at the Mineral Bottom takeout.				
San Rafael Swell SRMA					
The purpose of the San Rafael Swell SRMA is to provide for a wide spectrum of recreational opportunities that emphasize expansive landscapes of unique scenic geology, as well as enjoyment of cultural and paleontological resources. Use management methods that allow responsible recreational use in appropriate settings. Consider additional camping and recreational facilities in support of objectives. The San Rafael SRMA activity plan will consider campfires, fuel wood gathering, pack stock, dispersed camping and associated access routes, vehicle camping, travel planning, and other relevant issues.					
	Specific recreation management direction for the San Rafael Swell SRMA is contained in Appendix K. This includes direction for the following recreation management components: Market Strategy; Market; Niche; Management Goals; Management Objectives;				

Table 2-15. Recreation and Off Highway Vehicles

No Action Alternative	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative E	PROPOSED RMP
	Primary Activities; Experiences; and Benefits.				
The SRMA boundary would be as shown on Map 2-20. (843,600 acres)	The boundaries of the San Rafael SRMA would be realigned to include Mexican Mountain WSA, the Cedar Mountain area, and the area surrounding the cutoff road, as indicated on Map 2-21. (938,500 acres)	The SRMA boundaries would be the same as indicated in Alternative A, Map 2-22. (938,500 acres)	The SRMA boundaries would be the same as indicated in Alternative A, Map 2-23. (938,500 acres)	The SRMA boundaries would be the same as indicated in Alternative A, Map 2-61. (938,500 acres) Motorized use would be consistent with the San Rafael Motorized Route Designation Plan, except non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics would be closed to OHVs. SPM areas would be managed as SPNM in non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics.	The San Rafael SRMA would expand to the Cedar Mountain area, including all of Mexican Mountain WSA, as indicated on Map 2-24. (938,500 acres)
	Large group areas would be designated in the San Rafael Swell, developed, and made available through concessionaire-issued recreation use permit. Large group areas (Map 2-29) would	Large group areas would be designated in the San Rafael Swell, developed, and made available through reservation. Large groups could apply for a reservation through a recreation permit	Large group areas would be designated in the San Rafael Swell, developed, and made available through reservation. Large groups could apply for a reservation through a recreation permit process. Large group areas (Map 2-29) would include:		Large group areas would be designated in the San Rafael Swell, developed, and made available through reservation. Large groups could apply for a reservation through a recreation permit process. Large group areas (Map 2-29) would include:

Table 2-15. Recreation and Off Highway Vehicles

No Action Alternative	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative E	PROPOSED RMP
	include: • Temple Mountain • Hidden Splendor • Buckmaster Draw (near I-70/SR-24) • South Salt Wash (I-70 Exit 108) • Juniper (near Exit 131) • Staker Spring area • Others as necessary to meet recreation demand.	process. Large group areas (Map 2-29) would include: • Temple Mountain • Hidden Splendor • Buckmaster Draw (near I-70/SR-24) • South Salt Wash (I-70 Exit 108) • Juniper (near Exit 131) • Staker Spring area • Others as necessary to meet recreation demand and protect resources.	• Temple Mountain • Hidden Splendor • Buckmaster Draw (near I-70/SR-24) • South Salt Wash (I-70 Exit 108) • Juniper (near Exit 131) • Staker Spring area • Others as necessary to protect resources.		• Temple Mountain • Hidden Splendor • Buckmaster Draw (near I-70/SR-24) • South Salt Wash (I-70 Exit 108) • Juniper (near Exit 131) • Staker Spring area • Others as necessary to meet recreation demand and protect resources. (Same as Alternative B.)
RMZs in the San Rafael Swell SRMA					
	At sites accessed by motor vehicles, visitors would be required to provide their own fuel-wood. Gathering wood from standing trees, live or dead, would be prohibited. At sites accessed by motor vehicles, campers without a BLM-provided fire grill would be required to use a fire pan to contain the fires, ash, and charcoal. Portable toilets would be required at designated campsites that do not have toilet facilities.			There would be no RMZs for recreation management in the San Rafael Swell SRMA.	At sites accessed by motor vehicles, visitors would be required to provide their own fuel-wood. Gathering wood from standing trees, live or dead, would be prohibited. At sites accessed by motor vehicles, campers without a BLM-provided fire grill would be required to use a fire pan to contain the fires, ash, and charcoal. Vehicle camping would be allowed only in developed and designated sites. Portable toilets would be required at designated campsites that do not have toilet facilities.

Table 2-15. Recreation and Off Highway Vehicles

No Action Alternative	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative E	PROPOSED RMP
	Recreation management would focus on the provision of recreation amenities. RMZs (Map 2-25) would be established to facilitate the provision of recreation amenities. The RMZs would include: • Temple Mountain, Little Wild Horse, Behind the Reef • Buckhorn, The Wedge, Mexican Mountain • Head of Sinbad, Swaseys Cabin, Sids Mountain, and the trail system.	Recreation management would focus on sustaining natural resources while meeting social and economic needs. RMZs (Map 2-26) would be established to facilitate the provision of recreation amenities. The following areas would be BLM-operated and -maintained RMZs: • Temple Mountain, Little Wild Horse, Behind the Reef • Buckhorn, The Wedge, Mexican Mountain • Head of Sinbad, Swaseys Cabin, Sids Mountain, and the trail system.	Recreation management would focus on emphasizing natural processes to achieve self-sustaining systems. All recreation use and recreation access would be managed through a permit/ reservation system.		Recreation management would focus on sustaining natural resources while meeting social and economic needs. RMZs (Map2-28) would be established to facilitate the provision of recreation amenities. The following areas would be BLM-operated and -maintained RMZs: • Temple Mountain, Little Wild Horse, Behind the Reef • Buckhorn, The Wedge, Mexican Mountain • Head of Sinbad, Swaseys Cabin, Sids Mountain, and the trail system.
	Direction for managing the RMZs would: • Rely on concessionaire leases and the use of outfitters to provide maximum development of recreation opportunities • Allow the BLM to retain overall management • Allow concessionaires	The BLM would retain overall management of RMZs to provide maximum development of recreation opportunities with minimal commercial concessionaire involvement.			The BLM would retain overall management of RMZs to provide maximum development of recreation opportunities with minimal commercial concessionaire involvement. *(Same as Alternative B.)*

Table 2-15. Recreation and Off Highway Vehicles

No Action Alternative	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative E	PROPOSED RMP
	to charge fees for use, camping, and other uses (e.g., hiking) and services in the area. Fees would be commensurate with lease value, comparable-market recreation fees, and cost of services provided on the OHV trail system • Permit concessionaires to vend items in support of resource protection (e.g., firewood) and to sell interpretive materials • Allow the BLM to manage recreation and issue rules to support successful concessionaire leases of the RMZs (e.g., areas outside the RMZs could be closed to car camping except in the concessionaire-run facilities) • Concessions would be operated only in response to the following needs: – Management of camping use and				

Table 2-15. Recreation and Off Highway Vehicles

No Action Alternative	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative E	PROPOSED RMP
	impacts – Management of solid waste disposal from recreation use.				
Nine Mile Canyon SRMA					
		Specific recreation management direction for the Nine Mile Canyon SRMA is contained in Appendix K. This includes direction for the following recreation management components: Market Strategy; Market; Niche; Management Goals; Management Objectives; Primary Activities; Experiences; and Benefits.			
		The Nine Mile Canyon SRMA would be managed in coordination with the Vernal Field Office according to the *1995 Recreation and Cultural Area Management Plan* except as modified by the management alternatives listed below. Such changes include VRM objectives.			
Management of the Nine Mile Canyon area would coincide with the Vernal Field Office SRMA management and would continue to be managed according to the existing *1995 Nine Mile Canyon Cultural Resource Management Plan* as updated and amended (Map 2-20).	No SRMA would be created for the Nine Mile Canyon area. Nine Mile Canyon would continue to be part of the Price ERMA (Map 2-21).	The Nine Mile Canyon SRMA would be created as indicated on Map 2-22. (31,700 acres) The purpose of the Nine Mile Canyon SRMA would be to protect, preserve, and enhance the prehistoric and historic cultural resources, natural character, inspirational value, and scenic quality of the area while optimizing recreation and interpretive opportunities.	The Nine Mile Canyon SRMA would be created as indicated on Map 2-23. (58,030 acres) The purpose would be the same as Alternative B.	The Nine Mile Canyon SRMA would be created as indicated on Map 2-61. (58,030 acres) The purpose would be the same as Alternative B.	The Nine Mile Canyon SRMA would be created as indicated on Map 2-24 (24,300 acres). The purpose of the Nine Mile Canyon SRMA would be to manage recreation and interpretive activities related to the cultural and historic resources and landscapes in the area.
		Oil and gas would be open to leasing subject to minor constraints (timing limitations, CSU, and lease notices) in the SRMA (Map 2-32).	Oil and gas would be open to leasing subject to major constraints (NSO) in the SRMA (Map 2-	Same as Alternative C, except in non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics,	Oil and gas would be open to leasing subject to standard terms and conditions and with minor constraints, as well as with major constraints (NSO) in the SRMA. The NSO stipulation is only applied where the

Table 2-15. Recreation and Off Highway Vehicles

No Action Alternative	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative E	PROPOSED RMP
			33).	which would be unavailable to leasing (Map 2-63)	Nine Mile Canyon ACEC overlaps the SRMA.
		Development would be required to meet VRM II and III objectives (Map 2-3).	Development would be required to meet VRM II and III objectives (Map 2-4).	Development would be required to meet VRM restrictions. (Map 2-57)	Development would be required to meet VRM II and III objectives (Map 2-5).
		ROS class SPNM areas would be closed to OHV use. No facilities would be located in these areas. The remainder of the area would be limited to designated routes, including all BLM and county system roads. ROS Roaded Natural (RN) class areas would contain visitor facilities, directional signage, interpretive materials, and infrastructure to support visitor health and safety, visitor appreciation of cultural resources, and resource protection. Private enterprise on private lands in support of public visitation within RN class areas would be encouraged by the BLM. The Nine Mile Canyon area would be closed to camping on public lands except for designated areas.		Same as Alternative B, except non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics areas would be closed to OHVs (Map 2-60).	ROS class SPNM areas would be closed to OHV use. No facilities would be located in these areas. The remainder of the area would be limited to designated routes, including all BLM and county system roads. ROS RN class areas would contain visitor facilities, directional signage, interpretive materials, and infrastructure to support visitor health and safety, visitor appreciation of cultural resources, and resource protection. Private enterprise on private lands in support of public visitation within RN class areas would be encouraged by the BLM. The Nine Mile Canyon area would be closed to camping on public lands except for designated areas.
Extensive Recreation Management Area (ERMA)					
	Portions of the PFO not identified as a SRMA would be identified as an Extensive Recreation Management (ERMA). ERMAs would receive only custodial management (which addresses only activity opportunities) of visitor health and safety, user conflict, and resource protection issues with no activity-level planning. Therefore, actions within ERMAs would generally be implemented directly				

Table 2-15. Recreation and Off Highway Vehicles

No Action Alternative	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative E	PROPOSED RMP
	from LUP decisions, such as Special Recreation Permits (SRP) or OHV management decisions. See Appendix K for additional specific recreation management objectives for the PFO ERMA.				
The Price Field Office ERMA (1,522,620 acres) would be managed custodially with limited specific management.	The Price Field Office ERMA (1,460,260 acres) would be managed as identified below and as further described in Appendix K.	The Price Field Office ERMA (1,244,230 acres) would be managed as identified below and as further described in Appendix K.	The Price Field Office ERMA (1,124,940 acres) would be managed as identified below and as further described in Appendix K.	The Price Field Office ERMA (1,096,770 acres) would be managed as identified below and as further described in Appendix K.	The Price Field Office ERMA (1,362,760 acres) would be managed as identified below and as further described in Appendix K.
	Signs, trails, and facilities would be used to facilitate use and enjoyment of the ERMA.	The use of signs, trails, and facilities would be limited and used if resource damage occurred.	Signs, trails, and facilities would be used sparingly and only to prevent resource damage.		Signs, trails, and facilities would be used to facilitate use and enjoyment of the ERMA. *(Same as Alternative A.)*
	Summerville/Chimney Rock Trail System Trails system management would include: • Concessionaire-operated and -maintained site • Limited entry off Highway 6 and the Castle Dale to Woodside Road • One staging area off Highway 6 and one near the Rock House/Humbug Road • Fees charged for facility access and use	Summerville/Chimney Rock Trail System/ Arapeen Trails System management would include: • BLM-operated and -maintained site • Limited entry off Highway 6 and the Castle Dale to Woodside Road • One staging area off Highway 6 and one near the Rock House/Humbug Road • When facilities (e.g., restrooms, enhanced parking areas, and loading ramps) are developed, fees	Summerville/Chimney Rock Trail System: Not designated.		Summerville/Chimney Rock Trail System/Arapeen Trails System management would include: • BLM-operated and -maintained site • Limited entry off Highway 6 and the Castle Dale to Woodside Road • One staging area off Highway 6 and one near the Rock House/Humbug Road • When facilities (e.g., restrooms, enhanced parking areas, and loading ramps) are developed, fees would be charged for facility access and use. (Same as Alternative B.)

Table 2-15. Recreation and Off Highway Vehicles

No Action Alternative	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative E	PROPOSED RMP
	• Management prescriptions for the Nine Mile Canyon Area would pertain to the 1995 Special Recreation and Cultural Resources Management Plan boundary.	would be charged for facility access and use.			
	Sites appropriate for large group events and camping would be designated. Large group areas (Map 2-29) would include: • Mounds Bridge • Price Recreation Area • Consumers • Saleratus • Hornsilver Gulch Road near Crown Point • Others as necessary to meet recreation demand.	Sites appropriate for large group events and camping would be designated. Large group areas (Map 2-29) would include: • Mounds Bridge • Price Recreation Area • Consumers • Saleratus • Hornsilver Gulch Road near Crown Point • Others as necessary to meet recreation demand and protect resources.	Sites appropriate for large group events and camping would be designated. Large group areas (Map 2-29) would include: • Mounds Bridge • Price Recreation Area • Consumers • Saleratus • Hornsilver Gulch Road near Crown Point • Others as necessary to protect resources.		Sites appropriate for large group events and camping would be designated. Large group areas (Map 2-29) would include: • Mounds Bridge • Price Recreation Area • Consumers • Saleratus • Hornsilver Gulch Road near Crown Point • Others as necessary to meet recreation demand and protect resources. (Same as Alternative B.)
Special Recreation Permitting					
The BLM will issue SRP as a discretionary action subject to NEPA analysis (Appendix J). Additionally, commercial SRPs would also be issued to provide a fair return for the commercial use of public lands.					
Manage active SRPs through compliance and evaluation.	SRPs would be issued according to established evaluation factors described in Appendix J. The factors identified would primarily examine the sensitivity of the proposed site and the nature of the proposed use. Competitive events would not be permitted in WSAs.			Same as Alternative A, except competitive events would not	SRPs would be issued according to established evaluation factors described in Appendix J. The factors identified would primarily examine the sensitivity of the proposed site and

Table 2-15. Recreation and Off Highway Vehicles

No Action Alternative	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative E	PROPOSED RMP
	The BLM could require permits and/or charge fees in all special areas. Vending could be authorized in conjunction with organized events or when the vending is necessary to support resource protection or appropriate recreation use. Vending permits could also be authorized to enhance recreational experience.			be permitted on public lands in Desolation Canyon, Nine Mile Canyon, or Cleveland-Lloyd Dinosaur Quarry, SRMAs, WSAs, or non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics.	the nature of the proposed use. Competitive events would not be permitted in WSAs. The BLM could require permits and/or charge fees in all special areas. Vending could be authorized in conjunction with organized events or when the vending is necessary to support resource protection or appropriate recreation use. Vending permits could also be authorized to enhance recreational experience. *(Same as Alternative A.)*
	Organized Groups All organized groups of more than 14 people within a WSA and more than 24 people throughout the remainder of the PFO would be required to contact the BLM; however, it is anticipated that most family gatherings could be accommodated without needing to obtain an SRP. Contact by an organized group and the BLM's determination that a permit is not required would be documented in a Letter of Agreement. See Appendix J for criteria the BLM would use to determine whether such groups need an SRP.				
	Competitive Events Refer to Appendix J for competitive event SRP criteria.			Motorized competitive events would be permitted only in the Price ERMA.	Competitive Events Refer to Appendix J for competitive event SRP criteria. *(Same as Alternative A.)*
Off-Highway Vehicle Recreation					
In preparing RMP designations and implementation-level travel management plans, the BLM will follow policy and regulation authority found at: 43 C.F.R. Part 8340; 43 C.F.R. Subpart 8364; and 43 C.F.R. Subpart 9268. Where the authorized officer determines that OHVs are causing or would cause considerable adverse impacts, the authorized officer shall close or restrict such areas. The public would be notified. BLM could 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. OHV use for game retrieval will follow all area and routes designations for OHV use.					
OHV recreation would be managed according	OHV recreation would be managed according	OHV recreation would be managed according	OHV recreation would be	OHV recreation would be	OHV recreation would be managed according to the following open,

Table 2-15. Recreation and Off Highway Vehicles

No Action Alternative	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative E	PROPOSED RMP
to the *1991 San Rafael RMP* and the *1990 Price River ORV Plan* as follows: • 743,000 acres open • 138,000 acres closed • 1,598,000 acres limited to designated routes (Map 2-15)	to the following open, closed, and limited to designated route categories: • 0 acres open • 370,000 acres closed • 2,109,000 acres limited to designated routes (Map 2-16)	to the following open, closed, and limited to designated route categories: • 0 acres open • 446,000 acres closed • 2,033,000 acres limited to designated routes (Map 2-17)	managed according to the following open, closed, and limited to designated route categories: • 0 acres open • 743,000 acres closed • 1,736,000 acres limited to designated routes (Map 2-18)	managed according to the following open, closed, and limited to designated route categories: • 0 acres open • 1,520,000 acres closed • 970,000 acres limited to designated routes (Map 2-60)	closed, and limited to designated route categories: • 0 acres open • 557,000 acres closed • 1,922,000 acres limited to designated routes (Map 2-19)
In the areas where OHV use is limited to designated routes, designate 670 miles of designated routes carried forward from the *2003 San Rafael Motorized Route Designation Plan.* (Map 2-71) *(Route designations are an implementation-level decision)**	In the areas where OHV use is limited to designated routes, designate 2,430 miles of routes (Includes the 670 miles of routes carried forward from the *2003 San Rafael Motorized Route Designation Plan).* (Map 2-72) *(Route designations are an implementation-level decision)**	In the areas where OHV use is limited to designated routes, designate 2,430 miles of routes (Includes the 670 miles of routes carried forward from the *2003 San Rafael Motorized Route Designation Plan.)* (Map 2-72) *(Route designations are an implementation-level decision)**	In the areas where OHV use is limited to designated routes, designate the 670 miles of routes carried forward from the *2003 San Rafael Motorized Route Designation Plan.* (Map 2-73) *(Route designations are an implementation-level decision)**	In the areas where OHV use is limited to designated routes, designate 513 miles of routes (Includes those routes from the *2003 San Rafael Motorized Route Designation Plan* that are outside the non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics). (Map 2-69) The San Rafael	In the areas where OHV use is limited to designated routes, designate routes as follows: • 606 miles of proposed designated routes (shown in blue on Map 2-74) • 670 miles of designated routes carried forward from the *2003 San Rafael Motorized Route Designation Plan* (shown in green on Map 2-74). Areas that were open to cross country OHV use in the San Rafael RMP (1991) have been changed to limited to designated routes. However, due to planning oversight, routes in these areas were not displayed on the route maps in the Draft RMP/EIS and therefore the public was unable to comment on

* *This is an implementation-level decision that cannot be protested under the planning regulations. Please see the cover letter for further information.*

Table 2-15. Recreation and Off Highway Vehicles

No Action Alternative	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative E	PROPOSED RMP
				Route Designation Plan, approved in 2003, would be modified to close the non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics to OHV use. Non-motorized mechanical transportation methods (e.g., mountain bikes) would be restricted to OHV designated routes. *(Route designations are an implementation-level decision)**	these potential decisions. For this reason, the Proposed RMP does not designate any routes in these areas. Future activity-level planning will consider route designations. *(Route designations are an implementation-level decision)**
	Small open areas for OHV use would be considered near local communities and managed by the BLM.	Small open areas for OHV use would be considered. Requests would require review under NEPA and would be considered on a case-by-case basis.	No open areas for OHV use would be available on public lands in the PFO.		Small open areas for OHV use would be considered. Requests would require review under NEPA and would be considered on a case-by-case basis through a land use plan amendment.
	Additional recreational motorized trail systems will be considered on a case-by-case basis.				Route designations in the limited to designated category would be periodically reviewed and changes made based on resource conditions, changes in use, and other needs.

Table 2-16. Lands and Realty

No Action Alternative	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative E	PROPOSED RMP
Goals Designate those parcels that are eligible for disposal or preferred for acquisition. Consider land tenure adjustments when in the public interest and to accomplish resource management goals or to meet community, State, county, or ecological needs. Make public lands available through ROWs or leases for such purposes as transportation routes, utilities, transmission lines, and communication sites, in coordination with other resource goals. Designate utility corridors and appropriate uses within those corridors. Allow for development of alternative energy sources while meeting other resource objectives. Consider lands for the development of wind and solar energy resources. **Objectives** Develop and maintain a land-ownership pattern that will provide better access for managing and protecting public lands. Maximize appropriate disposal actions to help solve problems related to intermixed land-ownership patterns. Maintain availability of public lands to meet the habitation, cultivation, trade, mineral development, recreation, and manufacturing needs of external customers and the general public. Identify lands for withdrawal to meet federal land-use needs. Identify lands for acquisition to meet federal land-use needs. Make public lands available to meet the needs for smaller ROWs (e.g., roads or pipelines for oil fields). Maintain and acquire public access to meet resource management needs. Make public lands available to meet the needs of major ROW customers within designated corridors (e.g., an intrastate pipeline). **Management Guidance Common to All Alternatives** Transfer only lands out of federal ownership and/or acquire non-federal lands where needed to accomplish important resource management goals or to meet essential community, State, or county needs. Dispose of lands as specifically identified for lease or disposal under various authorities (FLPMA 203, 206, R&PP). Prioritize acquisition of lands within special designations, including WSAs and ACECs. Use access or conservation easements to better manage public lands. Permit commercial filming on a case-by-case basis subject to a NEPA process. Manage R&PP lease areas as open to oil and gas leasing subject to major constraints (NSO). Do not classify, open, or make available any BLM-administered public lands within the planning area for agricultural leasing or agricultural entry under either Desert Land Entry or Indian Allotment for one or more of the following reasons: rugged topography, presence of sensitive resources, lack of water or access, small parcel size, and/or unsuitable soils. Review any other major land leases on a case-by-case basis subject to a NEPA process.					

Table 2-16. Lands and Realty

No Action Alternative	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative E	PROPOSED RMP
Give land exchanges with the State of Utah priority consideration to resolve inholdings issues for the following reasons: • A significant number of State land sections administered by SITLA are scattered throughout the PFO. Many of these State lands are inholdings located within designated resource management areas identified in this RMP. SITLA has indicated its desire to exchange SITLA lands within these BLM management areas for BLM-administered lands elsewhere. • The BLM recognizes the opportunity for mutually beneficial land tenure adjustments and will apply the RMP land tenure adjustment criteria. • For legislative land tenure adjustments, all appropriate procedures will be followed consistent with the authorizing legislation. In accordance with the State of Utah v. Andrus, Oct. 1, 1979 (Cotter Decision), the BLM would grant the State of Utah reasonable access to State lands for economic purposes, on a case-by-case basis. **Land Tenure Adjustments** Consider land ownership changes on lands not specifically identified in the RMP for disposal or acquisition if the changes are in accordance with resource management objectives and other RMP decisions, determined to be in the public interest, and will accomplish one or more of the following criteria: • The changes are determined to be in the public interest. The public benefits from land resources coming into public ownership, while accommodating the needs of local and State governments, including the needs for public purposes, community growth, and the economy. • The changes result in a gain of important manageable resources on public lands such as crucial wildlife habitat, significant cultural sites, mineral resources, water sources, listed species by habitat, and areas key to productive ecosystems. • The changes ensure public access to lands in areas where access is needed and cannot otherwise be obtained. • The changes promote more effective management and meet essential resource objectives through land ownership consolidation. • The changes result in acquisition of lands that serve regional or national priorities identified in applicable policy directives or legislation. • The changes in federal ownership result in “no net loss” of wetlands and/or riparian areas. If none of the above criteria are met, proposed land ownership changes will not be approved or will require a plan amendment. Acquire non-federal lands located within sensitive areas through donation, purchase, or land exchange. Land acquisitions will be negotiated from willing landowners. Acquire fee title or interest in non-federal lands (e.g., water rights, scenic easements, and greater sage-grouse leks) with priority placed on lands with critical resource values. **Disposal of Lands Through Sale** Lands identified for potential disposal through sale are identified and listed in Appendix H. All potential disposals through sale must meet the goals and objectives of other resource programs. Prohibit disposal of lands by sale unless they are identified for disposal in the RMP or after a plan amendment is completed including those lands as disposal parcels. All sales will be completed through a competitive or modified competitive bid process. Under very rare circumstances, parcels will be sold in a direct sale.				
Management of Acquired Lands				
Manage all lands acquired for the	Manage all lands acquired for the purpose for which they were acquired.	If specific management	Same as Alternative C,	Manage all lands acquired for the purpose for which they were

Table 2-16. Lands and Realty

No Action Alternative	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative E	PROPOSED RMP
purpose for which the acquisition was completed.	If specific management prescriptions were not outlined in the acquisition, manage acquisitions in a manner similar to the least restrictively managed adjacent parcel.		prescriptions were not outlined in the acquisition, manage acquisitions in a manner similar to the most restrictively managed adjacent parcel.	except acquired parcels within WSAs and non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics would be managed to maintain naturalness and opportunities for solitude and primitive and unconfined recreation.	acquired. If specific management prescriptions were not outlined in the acquisition, manage acquisitions in a manner similar to the least restrictively managed adjacent parcel. *(Same as Alternative A.)*
Withdrawal Areas					
No additional lands would be recommended by the BLM for withdrawal.	Review and propose revocation of inappropriate or unnecessary withdrawals previously identified.		Additional areas recommended for withdrawal from mineral entry, include the following: • Suitable Wild and Scenic River segments tentatively classified as Wild. • ACECs where needed to protect relevant and important values.		Review and propose revocation of inappropriate or unnecessary withdrawals previously identified. *(Same as Alternative A.)*
The existing 328,600 acres withdrawn from locatable mineral entry or the 98,500 acres recommended for withdrawal from locatable mineral entry (Map 2-35) would continue. See the Lands and Realty (Table 2-16) Withdrawal Areas. Areas currently	The following areas (328,600 acres) are currently withdrawn from mineral entry (Maps 2-36 through 2-39 and 2-64): • Oil Shale Withdrawal • Desert Lake Waterfowl Management Area (BLM mineral estate) • Sunnyside Watershed Withdrawal • Water Withdrawals • Three Rivers Withdrawal The following areas would be recommended for withdrawal from locatable mineral entry (these areas can not be managed as though they were withdrawn until such time as the withdrawal was completed through Secretarial or Congressional action). • CLDQ NNL • ACECs, where recommended in ACEC prescriptions • Developed recreation sites				

Table 2-16. Lands and Realty

No Action Alternative	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative E	PROPOSED RMP
withdrawn: • Oil Shale Withdrawal • Desert Lake Waterfowl Management Area (BLM mineral estate) • Sunnyside Watershed Withdrawal • Three Rivers Withdrawal The following areas are recommended for withdrawal in the San Rafael RMP (1991): • CLDQ NNL • Big Flat Tops ACEC • Bowknot Bend ACEC • Copper Globe ACEC • Pictographs ACEC • San Rafael Canyon ACEC (upper and lower portion) • San Rafael Reef ACEC (north portion) • Swaseys Cabin ACEC • Developed recreation sites.	• Incorporated municipalities • Cemeteries • Carbon County Airport • Carbon County Recreation Complex • Carbon County Sanitary Landfill/Transfer Station • East Carbon sewage lagoons • Emery County School Complex • Green River Airport • Scofield Reservoir • Olsen Reservoir • Millsite Reservoir • Gordon Creek Wildlife Management Area (BLM mineral estate)				
Utility Corridors					
WSAs are utility corridor exclusion areas.					
Areas to be avoided for utility corridors would include: • Dry Lake	This RMP would recognize existing utility corridors, including the Western Utility Group	This RMP would recognize existing utility corridors, including the WUG updates to the	This RMP would maintain the existing designated utility	This RMP would maintain the existing designated utility	The Proposed RMP would recognize existing utility corridors, including the WUG updates to the Western Regional Corridor Study and west-

Table 2-16. Lands and Realty

No Action Alternative	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative E	PROPOSED RMP
Archaeological District ACEC • Interstate 70 ACEC • Muddy Creek ACEC • Segers Hole ACEC • Sids Mountain ACEC • Temple Mountain ACEC Areas to be excluded from utility corridors would include: • Big Flat Tops ACEC • Bowknot Bend ACEC • Copper Globe ACEC • Pictographs ACEC • San Rafael Reef ACEC • Swaseys Cabin ACEC • San Rafael Canyon ACEC	(WUG) updates to the Western Regional Corridor Study and west-wide energy corridors designated pursuant to the Energy Policy Act of 2005 and studied in an interagency Programmatic EIS, and would designate additional corridors subject to physical barriers and sensitive resource values. All utility corridors within the PFO are designated for any size utility and transportation uses needed. The corridors are 1 mile in width crossing any BLM-administered public lands. These approved corridors would be the preferred location for future major linear ROWs that meet the following criteria: • Pipelines with a diameter greater than 16 inches • Transmission (not distribution) lines with a voltage capacity of 69 kV or greater • Significant conduits requiring a permanent	Western Regional Corridor Study and west-wide energy corridors designated pursuant to the Energy Policy Act of 2005 and studied in an interagency Programmatic EIS, and would designate additional corridors subject to physical barriers and sensitive resource values. All utility corridors within the PFO are designated for any size utility and transportation uses needed. The corridors are 1 mile in width crossing any BLM-administered public lands. These approved corridors would be the preferred location for future major linear ROWs that meet the following criteria: • Pipelines with a diameter greater than 16 inches • Transmission (not distribution) lines with a voltage capacity of 69 kV or greater • Significant conduits requiring a permanent width greater than 50	corridors. In consideration of existing utility corridors, avoidance areas would include: • Dry Lake Archaeological District ACEC • Interstate 70 ACEC • Muddy Creek ACEC • Segers Hole ACEC • Sids Mountain ACEC • Areas unavailable to oil and gas leasing • Areas classified as VRM Class I In consideration of existing utility corridors, exclusion areas would include: • Big Flat Tops ACEC • Bowknot Bend ACEC • Pictographs ACEC • San Rafael	corridors. Consider ROWs within existing corridors. (Map 2-68).	wide energy corridors designated pursuant to the Energy Policy Act of 2005 and studied in an interagency Programmatic EIS, and would designate additional corridors subject to physical barriers and sensitive resource values. All utility corridors within the PFO are designated for any size utility and transportation uses needed. The corridors are 1 mile in width crossing any BLM-administered public lands. These approved corridors would be the preferred location for future major linear ROWs that meet the following criteria: • Pipelines with a diameter greater than 16 inches • Transmission (not distribution) lines with a voltage capacity of 69 kV or greater • Significant conduits requiring a permanent width greater than 50 feet Any new utility corridors would require a plan amendment. In development of new utility corridors, avoidance areas would include: • Dry Lake Archaeological District ACEC • Interstate 70 ACEC • Muddy Creek ACEC • San Rafael Canyon ACEC • Segers Hole ACEC • The five non-WSA lands with

Table 2-16. Lands and Realty

No Action Alternative	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative E	PROPOSED RMP
	width greater than 50 feet Any new utility corridors would require a plan amendment. In development of new utility corridors, avoidance areas would include: • Dry Lake Archaeological District ACEC • Interstate 70 ACEC • Muddy Creek ACEC • Segers Hole ACEC • On or within one mile of greater sage-grouse leks In development of new utility corridors, exclusion areas would include: • Copper Globe ACEC • Rock Art ACEC • San Rafael Reef ACEC (Map 2-53).	feet Any new utility corridors would require a plan amendment. In development of new utility corridors, avoidance areas would include: • Dry Lake Archaeological District ACEC • Interstate 70 ACEC • Muddy Creek ACEC • Segers Hole ACEC • Sids Mountain ACEC • Beckwith Plateau ACEC In development of new utility corridors, exclusion areas would include: • Copper Globe ACEC • Pictographs ACEC • San Rafael Reef ACEC • San Rafael Canyon ACEC • On or within one mile of greater sage-grouse leks (Map 2-54).	Reef ACEC • Beckwith Plateau ACEC • Heritage Sites ACEC • Desolation Canyon ACEC (Map 2-55).		wilderness characteristics managed to protect, preserve, and maintain their wilderness characteristics. In development of new utility corridors, exclusion areas would include: • Range Creek SRMA • Big Flat Tops ACEC • Bowknot Bend ACEC • Pictographs ACEC • San Rafael Reef ACEC • Heritage Sites ACEC (Map 2-54).
Issuance of ROWs					
WSAs are ROW exclusion areas.					
	Additional ROWs could	In development of	Same as	Same as	Additional ROWs could be granted

Table 2-16. Lands and Realty

No Action Alternative	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative E	PROPOSED RMP
In development of discretionary ROWs, avoidance areas would include: • Dry Lake Archaeological District ACEC • Interstate 70 ACEC • Muddy Creek ACEC • Segers Hole ACEC • Sids Mountain ACEC • Temple Mountain ACEC In development of discretionary ROWs, exclusion areas would include: • Big Flat Tops ACEC • Bowknot Bend ACEC • Copper Globe ACEC • Pictographs ACEC • San Rafael Reef ACEC • Swaseys Cabin ACEC • San Rafael Canyon ACEC	be granted consistent with goals and objectives of the RMP. New ROWs for aboveground structures would not be permitted on or within one mile of greater sage-grouse leks. Preference for communication ROWs would be given to applications using existing designated communication sites (e.g., Cedar Mountain and Bruin Point). In development of discretionary ROWs, avoidance areas would include: • Dry Lake Archaeological District ACEC • Interstate 70 ACEC • Muddy Creek ACEC • Segers Hole ACEC In development of discretionary ROWs, exclusion areas would include: • Copper Globe ACEC • Rock Art ACEC • San Rafael Reef ACEC	discretionary ROWs, avoidance areas would include: • Dry Lake Archaeological District ACEC • Interstate 70 ACEC • Muddy Creek ACEC • Segers Hole ACEC • Sids Mountain ACEC • Beckwith Plateau ACEC In development of new discretionary ROWs, exclusion areas would include: • On or within one mile of a greater sage-grouse lek. • Copper Globe ACEC • Rock Art ACEC • San Rafael Reef ACEC • San Rafael Canyon ACEC The BLM would consider issuance of additional ROWs for communication sites only when existing communication site ROWs (e.g., Cedar Mountain and Bruin Point) were built.	Alternative B except use of existing designated communication sites (e.g., Cedar Mountain and Bruin Point) would be required for all new communication ROWs. Additional exclusion areas would be: • Big Flat Tops ACEC • Bowknot Bend ACEC • Beckwith Plateau ACEC • Heritage Sites ACEC • Desolation Canyon ACEC	Alternative C, except development of discretionary ROWs, additional exclusion areas would include: • Non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics. • Sids Mountain ACEC	consistent with RMP goals and objectives. Preference for communication ROWs would be given to applications using existing designated communication sites (e.g., Cedar Mountain and Bruin Point). Existing communication management plans prescriptions would be adhered to. In development of new discretionary ROWs, avoidance areas would include: • Dry Lake Archaeological District ACEC • Interstate 70 ACEC • Muddy Creek ACEC • San Rafael Canyon ACEC • Segers Hole ACEC • The five non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics managed to protect, preserve, and maintain their wilderness characteristics. In development of new discretionary ROWs, exclusion areas would include: • Range Creek SRMA • Big Flat Tops ACEC • Bowknot Bend ACEC • Pictographs ACEC • San Rafael Reef ACEC • Heritage Sites ACEC

Table 2-16. Lands and Realty

No Action Alternative	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative E	PROPOSED RMP
Wind Energy Development					
Any wind energy exploration and development would be subject to a site-specific NEPA analysis. Wind energy development is granted under an ROW.	Any wind energy exploration and development would be subject to a site-specific NEPA analysis. Wind energy development is granted under an ROW. The BLM would consider proposals for ROWs for wind energy exploration and development on a case-by-case basis. The BLM would encourage wind energy development in areas where impacts on vegetation coverage and other resources would be minimized. The BLM would not permit wind energy development in NSO areas or areas unavailable to leasing for oil and gas, VRM Class I and II areas, and migratory bird breeding habitat and raptor nesting complexes.			Same as Alternative A, except the BLM would not permit wind energy development in areas of non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics.	Any wind energy exploration and development would be subject to a site-specific NEPA analysis. Wind energy development is granted under an ROW. The BLM would consider proposals for ROWs for wind energy exploration and development on a case-by-case basis. The BLM would encourage wind energy development in areas where impacts on vegetation coverage and other resources would be minimized. The BLM would not permit wind energy development in NSO areas or areas unavailable to leasing for oil and gas, VRM Class I and II areas, and migratory bird breeding habitat and raptor nesting complexes. The BLM would not permit wind energy development in the five non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics managed to protect, preserve, and maintain their wilderness characteristics.
Solar Energy Development					
Any solar energy exploration and development would be subject to a site-specific NEPA analysis. Solar energy development would be granted under an ROW.	Any solar energy exploration and development would be subject to a site-specific NEPA analysis. Solar energy development would be granted under an ROW. The BLM would consider proposals for ROWs for solar energy exploration and development on a case-by-case basis. The BLM would encourage solar energy development in areas where impacts on vegetation and other resources would be minimized through appropriate mitigation measures because of inherent properties of the site. The BLM would not permit solar energy development in NSO areas, areas unavailable to oil and gas leasing, and VRM Class I and II areas.			Same as Alternative A, except the BLM would not permit solar energy development in areas of non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics.	Any solar energy exploration and development would be subject to a site-specific NEPA analysis. Solar energy development would be granted under an ROW. The BLM would consider proposals for ROWs for solar energy exploration and development on a case-by-case basis. The BLM would encourage solar

Table 2-16. Lands and Realty

No Action Alternative	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative E	PROPOSED RMP
					energy development in areas where impacts on vegetation and other resources would be minimized through appropriate mitigation measures because of inherent properties of the site. The BLM would not permit solar energy development in the five non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics managed to protect, preserve, and maintain their wilderness characteristics.
Areas for Special Consideration					
The Woodside Cemetery would remain closed to any additional burials in accordance with BLM policy for burial on public lands.	The Woodside Cemetery would remain closed to any additional burials in accordance with BLM policy for burial on public lands. The BLM would seek transfer of the Woodside Cemetery through sale, exchange, or R&PP to a qualified entity that would then manage and maintain the cemetery.				

Table 2-17. Minerals and Energy Resources

No Action Alternative	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative E	PROPOSED RMP
Goals					
Provide opportunities for mineral exploration and development under the mining and mineral leasing laws subject to legal requirements to protect other resource values.					
Provide mineral materials needed for community and economic purposes.					
Identify areas that would require special mineral management to manage salable mineral permitting and development, mining claim location, prospecting and mining operations on BLM-administered lands within the planning area in a manner that will not cause undue and unnecessary degradation and will minimize impacts on other resources.					
Support the need for domestic energy resources by managing and conserving the mineral resources without compromising the long-term health and diversity of public lands.					

Table 2-17. Minerals and Energy Resources

No Action Alternative	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative E	PROPOSED RMP

Objectives

Maintain coal leasing, exploration, and development within the planning area while minimizing impacts to other resource values.

Maintain opportunities for the collection of subsurface geological (geophysical) data to aid in the exploration of oil and gas resources.

Maintain opportunities to lease other solid leasable minerals while minimizing impacts to other resource values.

Manage oil and gas leasing, exploration and development while minimizing impacts to other resource values.

Management Guidance Common to All Alternatives

The Federal Onshore Oil and Gas Leasing Reform Act of 1987 closed lands within BLM WSAs to oil, gas, or geothermal leasing (30 USC 226-3(a)2).

Incorporated municipalities are not available for Federal mineral leasing as established in 43 CFR 3100-3(a)(2)(iii) and 3100-3(b)(2)(ii)

Locatable minerals would be managed according to the 43 CFR 3809 Surface Management regulations and the 43 CFR 3715 Use and Occupancy regulations.

Acknowledge future development potential for coal resources in areas where coalbed natural gas development is taking place.

Review the withdrawal created under EO 5327, April 15, 1930, and Public Land Order 4522, September 13, 1968, in Utah, Wyoming, and Colorado. The oil shale lands were originally withdrawn from all disposition (including oil shale leasing) pending evaluation and classification. Later, orders allowed leasing for oil and gas and sodium. Before any oil shale can be leased, the withdrawal must be lifted. The BLM will review this withdrawal and recommend modification, retention, and revocation of the oil shale withdrawal. In the meantime, the withdrawal will continue and the area will remain available for leasing in accordance with the RMP. About 171,000 acres of low potential and moderate oil shale potential areas (Map 3-22) in the northeast corner of the PFO would remain within an oil shale withdrawal.

In accordance with an UDEQ-DAQ letter dated June 6, 2008, (see Appendix R) requesting implementation of interim nitrogen oxide control measures for compressor engines; BLM will require the following as a Lease Stipulation and a Condition of Approval for Applications for Permit to Drill:

- All new and replacement internal combustion gas field engines of less than or equal to 300 design-rated horsepower must not emit more than 2 gms of NOx per horsepower-hour. This requirement does not apply to gas field engines of less than or equal to 40 design-rated horsepower.
- All new and replacement internal combustion gas field engines of greater than 300 design rated horsepower must not emit more than 1.0 gms of NOx per horsepower-hour.

Abandoned Mine Lands

Use the following criteria to establish physical safety hazard program priorities:

- Abandoned Mine Lands physical safety program's highest priority will be cleaning up those Abandoned Mine Lands 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, and (c) upon formal risk assessment, a high or extremely high risk level is indicated.
- Abandoned Mine Lands would be factored into future recreation management area designations, land use planning assessments, and all applicable use authorizations.
- The site is currently listed or is eligible for listing in the Abandoned Mines Module of the Protection and Response Information System.
- Abandoned Mine Lands hazards should be, to the extent practicable, mitigated, or remediated on the ground during site development.

Use the following criteria to establish water-quality-based Abandoned Mine Lands program priorities:

- The State has identified the watershed as a priority based on (a) one or more water laws or regulations, (b) threat to public health or safety, and (c) threat to the environment.

Table 2-17. Minerals and Energy Resources

No Action Alternative	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative E	PROPOSED RMP
• The project reflects a collaborative effort with other land-managing agencies. • The project would be funded by contributions from collaborating agencies. These priorities would be maintained and updated as needed in the State abandoned mine lands strategy.					
Leasable Minerals					
Consider any geothermal leasing, plan of operations for exploration, or application for development on a case-by-case basis.					
Coal					
Lands acceptable for further consideration for coal leasing and development would be areas identified in the *San Rafael RMP* as suitable for leasing in the Wasatch and Emery Known Recoverable Coal Resource Areas. The BLM would consider leasing those coal lands within the PFO that have been found acceptable for further consideration for leasing through previous planning amendments. Lands were identified in the following amendments: • Wattis Underground Mining, 1979 • Price River/Range Creek Coal Area, 1981 • Wattis Surface Mining, 1983.	Map 2-56 shows areas that would be available for further coal leasing considerations.			Non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics would be eliminated from consideration for coal leasing (Map 2-70).	Map 2-56 shows areas that would be available for further coal leasing considerations. *(Same as Alternative A.)*
Identify Areas Unsuitable for Surface Mining of Coal (43 CFR 1610.7-1) Under the Criteria Set Forth in 43 CFR 3461.5					
Continue to use the coal	Use the coal unsuitability determinations as identified in Appendix N. WSAs would be unsuitable for future consideration for coal				

Table 2-17. Minerals and Energy Resources

No Action Alternative	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative E	PROPOSED RMP
unsuitability determinations for the San Rafael planning unit as found in the *San Rafael RMP*. Determine coal unsuitability for the Price planning unit on a case-by-case basis.	leasing, but other areas would be suitable for leasing, with other restrictions (Appendix N).				
Conflicts in Areas with Oil, Gas, or Coalbed Natural Gas as well as Coal Resource Potential					
The BLM would examine potential conflicts with oil and gas and coal leasing in areas where natural gas could occur to promote safe and efficient extraction of energy resources.	The BLM would require dual resource leasing and development in the same areas.	The BLM would identify the priority energy resource in conflict areas to promote safe and efficient extraction of energy resources.	The BLM would permit single resource leasing and development in a given area.		The BLM would identify the priority energy resource in conflict areas to promote safe and efficient extraction of energy resources. *(Same as Alternative B.)*
Oil, Gas, and Coalbed Natural Gas					
The BLM has identified LUP leasing allocations for all lands within the PFO. In addition, the Proposed RMP describes specific lease stipulations (Appendix G) that apply to a variety of different resources including raptors, greater sage-grouse, and big game habitat, as well as program-related Best Management Practices (Appendix S) that may be applied on a case-by-case, site-specific basis to prevent, minimize, or mitigate resource impacts. Review all lease parcels prior to lease sale. If the PFO determines that new resource data information or circumstances relevant to the decision is available at the time of the lease review that warrants changing a leasing allocation or specific lease stipulation, the PFO will make appropriate changes through the plan maintenance or amendment process. PFO may also apply appropriate conditions of approval at the permitting stage to ensure conformance with the LUP and all applicable law, regulation, and policy. Allow leasing of oil and gas on lands within the PFO with oil shale/tar sands potential only for conventional oil and gas and coalbed natural gas. Oil shale/tar sands would be specifically excluded from the lease. This RMP will be amended upon completion of the Programmatic EIS for oil shale and tar sands resources leasing on lands administered by the BLM in Utah, Colorado, and Wyoming (Chapter 1, Section 1.7).					
Oil and gas leasing management would be conducted as shown on Map 2-30. • Areas open to leasing subject to the standard terms and	Oil and gas leasing management would be conducted as shown on Map 2-31. • Areas open to leasing subject to the standard terms and	Oil and gas-leasing management would be conducted as shown on Map 2-32. • Areas open to leasing subject to the standard terms and	Oil and gas leasing management would be conducted as shown on Map 2-33.	Oil and gas leasing management would be conducted as shown on Map 2-63:	Oil and gas leasing management would be conducted shown on Map 2-34. • Areas open to leasing subject to the standard terms and conditions of the lease form (1,161,000 acres). • Areas open to leasing subject to

Table 2-17. Minerals and Energy Resources

No Action Alternative	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative E	PROPOSED RMP
conditions of the lease form (964,000 acres). • Areas open to leasing subject to minor constraints (timing limitations, CSU, and lease notices) (896,000 acres). • Areas open to leasing subject to major constraints (NSO) (99,000 acres). • Areas unavailable to leasing (535,000 acres).	conditions of the lease form (1,815,000 acres). • Areas open to leasing subject to minor constraints (timing limitations, CSU, and lease notices) (17,000 acres). • Areas open to leasing subject to major constraints (NSO) (110,000 acres). • Areas unavailable to leasing (537,000 acres).	conditions of the lease form (0 acres). • Areas open to leasing subject to minor constraints (timing limitations, CSU, and lease notices) (1,633,000 acres). • Areas open to leasing subject to major constraints (NSO) (289,000 acres). • Areas unavailable to leasing (557,000 acres).	• Areas open to leasing subject to the standard terms and conditions of the lease form (0 acres). • Areas open to leasing subject to minor constraints (timing limitations, CSU, and lease notices) (1,418,000 acres). • Areas open to leasing subject to major constraints (NSO) (500,000 acres). • Areas unavailable to leasing (561,000 acres).	• Areas open to leasing, subject to the standard terms and conditions of the lease form (0 acres) • Areas open to leasing, subject to minor constraints (timing limitations; controlled surface use, and lease notices) (870,000 acres) • Areas open to leasing, subject to major constraints (NSO) (130,000 acres) • Areas unavailable to leasing (1,490,000 acres).	minor constraints (timing limitations; CSU, and lease notices) (467,000 acres). • Areas open to leasing subject to major constraints (NSO) (282,000 acres). • Areas unavailable to leasing (569,000 acres).
Geophysical Operations Under 43 CFR 3150					
Areas in the San Rafael resource area open to leasing would continue to be also open to geophysical exploration. Geophysical exploration	Geophysical operations would be allowed consistent with existing regulations for geophysical exploration.			Same as Alternative A, except geophysical operations would not be allowed in WSAs and non-	Geophysical operations would be allowed consistent with existing regulations for geophysical exploration, except in the five non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics managed in this alternative, which would be closed to

Table 2-17. Minerals and Energy Resources

No Action Alternative	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative E	PROPOSED RMP
in the Price River resource area would continue to be authorized on a case-by-case basis.				WSAs lands with wilderness characteristics.	activities related to geophysical operations.
Locatable Minerals					
Locatable minerals are those minerals that can be obtained by locating and perfecting mining claims under the General Mining Law of 1872.					
The current 328,600 acres currently withdrawn or the 98,500 acres recommended for withdrawal from locatable mineral entry (Map 2-35) would continue. See the Lands and Realty (Table 2-16) Withdrawal Areas. Areas currently withdrawn: • Oil Shale Withdrawal • Desert Lake Waterfowl Management Area (BLM mineral estate) • Sunnyside Watershed Withdrawal • Water withdrawals • Three Rivers Withdrawal The following areas are recommended for withdrawal in the San Rafael RMP (1991): • CLDQ NNL • Big Flat Tops ACEC • Bowknot Bend ACEC	In addition to the 328,600 acres currently withdrawn, 87,800 acres would be recommended for withdrawal from locatable mineral entry (Map 2-36). See the Lands and Realty (Table 2-16) Withdrawal Areas.	In addition to the 328,600 acres currently withdrawn, 87,800 acres would be recommended for withdrawal from locatable mineral entry (Map 2-37). See the Lands and Realty (Table 2-16) Withdrawal Areas.	In addition to the 328,600 acres currently withdrawn, 167,200 acres would be recommended for withdrawal from locatable mineral entry (Map 2-38). See the Lands and Realty (Table 2-16) Withdrawal Areas.	In addition to the 328,600 acres currently withdrawn, 204,300 acres would be recommended for withdrawal from locatable mineral entry (Map 2-64).	In addition to the 328,600 acres currently withdrawn, 92,700 acres would be recommended for withdrawal from locatable mineral entry (Map 2-39). See the Lands and Realty (Table 2-16) Withdrawal Areas.

Table 2-17. Minerals and Energy Resources

No Action Alternative	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative E	PROPOSED RMP
• Copper Globe ACEC • Pictographs ACEC • San Rafael Canyon ACEC (upper and lower portion) • San Rafael Reef ACEC (north portion) • Swaseys Cabin ACEC • Developed recreation sites.					
Mineral Materials (Sand and Gravel, Stone, Riprap, Clay, Humates, Common Variety Building Stone)					
Areas closed to mineral materials (salable) development are shown on Map 2-40 (653,000 acres) Closed areas include: • All WSAs • ACECs recommended in this alternative where determined necessary to protect the noted value • Developed recreation sites • Riparian and aquatic habitat areas.	Areas that would be closed for mineral materials disposal are indicated on Map 2-41. (611,000 acres)	Areas that would be closed for mineral materials disposal are indicated on Map 2-42. (773,000 acres)	Areas that would be closed for mineral materials disposal are indicated on Map 2-43. (863,000 acres)	Areas that would be closed for mineral materials disposal are indicated on Map 2-65. (1,540,000 acres)	Areas that would be closed for mineral materials disposal are indicated on Map 2-44. (820,000 acres)

Table 2-18. Wilderness Study Areas

No Action Alternative	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative E	PROPOSED RMP
Goals					

Table 2-18. Wilderness Study Areas

No Action Alternative	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative E	PROPOSED RMP
Manage WSAs in accordance with the BLM's *Interim Management Policy for Lands Under Wilderness* review (H-8550-1). **Objectives** Manage WSAs in a manner that does not to impair the suitability of such areas for preservation as wilderness. Grazing, mining, and mineral lease uses that existed before or on October 21, 1976, may continue in the same manner and degree, subject to IMP. Recognize valid existing rights. These uses will be regulated to ensure they will not cause unnecessary or undue degradation of WSA lands as required by section 302(b) of FLPMA. **Management Guidance Common to All Alternatives** Continue to manage all WSAs (Map 3-28) according to the *Interim Management Policy for Lands Under Wilderness Review* (BLM Handbook H-8550-1) until legislation is enacted to either designate the areas as wilderness or release them for uses other than wilderness. The only decisions related to WSA management made in this plan are VRM and OHV designations. Within the area managed by the PFO there are two areas, one about 5,370 acres contiguous to the San Rafael Reef WSA and an area totaling 315 acres contiguous to Crack Canyon WSA, that were studied as boundary variations during the wilderness review mandated by the Congress in FLPMA Sections 603(a) 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), and were therefore BLM Administratively Endorsed as WSAs. This recommendation was forwarded by the President of the United States to the Congress in 1993. Continue to manage the lands in a manner that does not impair their suitability for congressional designation in accordance with FLPMA Section 603(c). Subject to valid existing rights, only consider case-by-case actions where it is determined that wilderness suitability will not be adversely affected. Where routes would remain available for motorized use within WSAs, continue such use on a conditional basis. Use of the existing authorized routes in the WSA ("ways" when located within WSAs) could continue as long as the use of these routes does not impair wilderness suitability, as provided by the Interim Management Policy (IMP) (BLM 1995). If the Congress designates the area as wilderness, the routes may be closed, unless otherwise specified by Congress. In the interim, if use and/or non-compliance are found through monitoring efforts to impair the area's suitability for wilderness designation, the BLM would take further action to limit use of the routes or close them. The continued use of these routes, therefore, is based on user compliance and non-impairment of wilderness values.					
OHV Use in WSAs					
OHV area designations in WSA would be as follows (Map 2-15): • 0 acres open • 120,400 acres closed • 406,560 acres limited to designated routes. In the areas where	OHV area designations in WSA would be as follows (Map 2-16): • 0 acres open • 323,100 acres closed • 203,860 acres limited to designated routes. In the areas where	OHV area designations in WSA would be as follows (Map 2-17): • 0 acres open • 388,900 acres closed • 138,060 acres limited to designated routes. In the areas where	OHV area designations in WSA would be as follows (Map 2-18): • 0 acres open • 526,680 acres closed	All WSAs would be closed to OHV use (Map 2-60).	OHV area designations in WSA would be as follows (Map 2-19): • 0 acres open • 512,960 acres closed • 14,000 acres limited to designated routes. In the areas where OHV use is limited to designated routes,

* *This is an implementation-level decision that cannot be protested under the planning regulations. Please see the cover letter for further information.*

Table 2-18. Wilderness Study Areas

No Action Alternative	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative E	PROPOSED RMP
OHV use is limited to designated routes, designate four routes (46 miles of routes) within the Sids Mountain WSA (Map 2-71). *(Implementation-level decision)**	OHV use is limited to designated routes, designate four routes (46 miles of routes) within the Sids Mountain WSA (Map 2-72). *(Implementation-level decision)**	OHV use is limited to designated routes, designate four routes (46 miles of routes) within the Sids Mountain WSA (Map 2-72). *(Implementation-level decision)**	• 280 acres limited to designated routes. In the areas where OHV use is limited to designated routes, designate four routes (46 miles of routes) within the Sids Mountain WSA (Map 2-73). *(Implementation-level decision)**		designate four routes (46 miles of routes) within the Sids Mountain WSA (Map 2-74). *(Implementation-level decision)**
VRM in WSAs					
Manage WSAs to a VRM Class I objective.	Designate all WSAs as VRM Class I.				
If Congress Releases WSAs from Wilderness Consideration					
	Should Congress release the following WSAs from management under the IMP, they would be managed as part of the San Rafael SRMA as described in the alternatives that follow: Crack Canyon, Devil's Canyon, Link's Flat ISA, Mexican Mountain, Muddy Creek, San Rafael River, and Sid's Mountain.			If released by the Congress, these lands would be managed as non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics.	Should any WSA, in whole or in part, be released from wilderness consideration, such released lands would be managed in accordance with the goals, objectives, and management prescriptions established in this RMP, unless otherwise specified by Congress in its releasing legislation. The BLM would examine proposals in the released areas on a case-by-case basis but would defer all actions that are inconsistent with RMP goals, objectives, and prescriptions until it completes a land use plan amendment. [Because any released

Table 2-18. Wilderness Study Areas

No Action Alternative	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative E	PROPOSED RMP
					lands would continue to be managed consistent with the prescriptions identified in this plan unless and until the plan is amended, no separate analysis is required to address impacts to released lands.]
1991 San Rafael RMP identified managed as ACEC for WSAs if released from wilderness study by Congress.	Managed as part of San Rafael Swell SRMA with management decisions as outlined, with the following exceptions: • Open to oil and gas leasing with controlled surface use stipulations and open to locatable and mineral materials • VRM Class II • OHV use limited to designated trails.	Managed as part of San Rafael Swell SRMA with management decisions as outlined, with the following exceptions: • ROS primitive and semiprimitive nonmotorized areas will be no surface occupancy for oil and gas leasing and closed to locatable and mineral materials • VRM Class II • OHV use limited to designated trails.	Managed as part of San Rafael Swell SRMA with management decisions as outlined, with the following exceptions: • Closed to oil and gas leasing and closed to locatable and mineral materials • VRM Class I • Closed to OHV use.		
	Should Congress release the following WSAs from management under the IMP, they would be managed as part of the Desolation Canyon SRMA as described in the alternatives below: Desolation Canyon, Jack Canyon, and Turtle Canyon.			If released by the Congress, these lands would be managed as non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics.	Should any WSA, in whole or in part, be released from wilderness consideration, such released lands would be managed in accordance with the goals, objectives, and management prescriptions established in this RMP, unless otherwise specified by Congress in its releasing legislation. The BLM would examine proposals in the released areas on a case-by-case basis but would defer all actions that are inconsistent with RMP goals,

Table 2-18. Wilderness Study Areas

No Action Alternative	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative E	PROPOSED RMP
					objectives, and prescriptions until it completes a land use plan amendment. [Because any released lands would continue to be managed consistent with the prescriptions identified in this plan unless and until the plan is amended, no separate analysis is required to address impacts to released lands.]
The 1983 Price River MFP did not address management of the WSAs if released from wilderness study by Congress.	Managed as part of Desolation Canyon SRMA with management decisions as outlined, with the following exceptions: • Areas open to leasing, subject to minor constraints (timing limitations, controlled surface use, lease notices), and open to locatable and mineral materials. • VRM Class II except in Desolation Canyon NHL, where VRM will be managed as VRM Class I. • OHV use limited to designated trails unless otherwise noted in SRMA direction.	Managed as part of Desolation Canyon SRMA with management decisions as outlined, with the following exceptions: • ROS primitive and semiprimitive nonmotorized areas will be areas open to leasing, subject to minor constraints (timing limitations, controlled surface use, lease notices), and open to locatable and mineral materials. • VRM Class II except in Desolation Canyon NHL, where VRM will be managed as VRM Class I. • OHV use limited to designated trails unless otherwise noted in SRMA direction.	Managed as part of Desolation Canyon SRMA with management decisions as outlined, with the following exceptions: • Will be managed as areas closed to leasing and closed to locatable and mineral materials • VRM Class I • OHV use limited to designated trails unless otherwise noted in SRMA direction.		
	Should Congress release the following WSAs from management under			If released by the	Should any WSA, in whole or in part,

Table 2-18. Wilderness Study Areas

No Action Alternative	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative E	PROPOSED RMP
	the IMP, they will be managed as part of the Labyrinth Canyon Special Recreation Management Area as described in the alternatives as follows: Horseshoe Canyon (North).			Congress, these lands would be managed as non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics.	be released from wilderness consideration, such released lands would be managed in accordance with the goals, objectives, and management prescriptions established in this RMP, unless otherwise specified by Congress in its releasing legislation. The BLM would examine proposals in the released areas on a case-by-case basis but would defer all actions that are inconsistent with RMP goals, objectives, and prescriptions until it completes a land use plan amendment. [Because any released lands would continue to be managed consistent with the prescriptions identified in this plan unless and until the plan is amended, no separate analysis is required to address impacts to released lands.]
1991 San Rafael RMP identified managed as ACEC for WSAs if released from wilderness study by Congress. Specific prescriptions are identified in 4,332 of the FEIS. Those not covered would be managed according to other resource decisions.	Managed as part of Labyrinth Canyon SRMA (expanding the SRMA boundary) with management decisions as outlined, with the following exceptions: • Areas open to leasing, subject to minor constraints (timing limitations; controlled surface use, lease notices), and open to locatable and mineral materials • VRM Class II • OHV use limited to	Managed as part of Labyrinth Canyon SRMA (expanding the SRMA boundary) with management decisions as outlined, with the following exceptions: • ROS primitive and semiprimitive nonmotorized areas will be areas open to leasing, subject to minor constraints (timing limitations, controlled surface use, lease notices), and closed to	Managed as part of Labyrinth Canyon SRMA (expanding the SRMA boundary) with management decisions as outlined, with the following exceptions: • Areas closed to leasing and closed to locatable and mineral materials		

Table 2-18. Wilderness Study Areas

No Action Alternative	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative E	PROPOSED RMP
	designated trails.	locatable and mineral materials • VRM Class II • OHV use limited to designated trails.	• VRM Class I • Closed to OHV use.		

Table 2-19. Areas of Critical Environmental Concern

No Action Alternative	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative E	PROPOSED RMP
Goals Identify and manage areas as ACECs where special management attention is required to protect and prevent irreparable damage to important historic, cultural, or scenic values; and fish and wildlife and botanical resources (Appendix L). **Objectives** Manage ACECs to protect the relevant and important values for which each area was established.					
There would be 13 ACECs designated comprising 266,660 acres.	There would be 8 ACECs designated comprising 164,330 acres.	There would be 14 ACECs designated comprising 521,630 acres.	There would be 23 ACECs designated comprising 883,515 acres.		There would be 13 ACECs designated comprising 208,555 acres.
Existing ACECs					
Big Flat Tops ACEC—Relevant and Important Values: Relict Vegetation					
Rationale: Contains an isolated relict plant community that remains unaltered by human intervention or domestic livestock grazing.					
The area would be maintained as an ACEC (Map 2-45) (190 acres) according to the special management prescriptions in the *San Rafael RMP* including: • Unavailable to oil and gas leasing	The area would not be managed as an ACEC.		The area would be maintained as an ACEC (Maps 2-48 and 2-66) (190 acres) and would continue to be managed with the following special management prescriptions: • Unavailable to oil and gas leasing • Closed to the disposal of mineral materials • Recommended for withdrawal from		The area would be maintained as an ACEC (Map 2-49) (190 acres) according to the special management prescriptions in the *San Rafael RMP* including: • Unavailable to oil and gas leasing • Closed to the disposal of mineral materials • Recommended for withdrawal from

Table 2-19. Areas of Critical Environmental Concern

No Action Alternative	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative E	PROPOSED RMP
• Closed to the disposal of mineral materials • Recommended for withdrawal from locatable mineral entry • Excluded from ROW grants • Excluded from private or commercial use of woodland products except for limited onsite collection of downed dead wood for campfires • Closed to livestock use • Excluded from land treatment and range improvements except for test plots and facilities necessary for study of relict and near-relict plant communities • VRM Class I • Closed to OHV use • Subject to fire suppression activities with special conditions.			locatable mineral entry • Excluded from ROW grants • Excluded from private or commercial use of woodland products except for limited onsite collection of downed dead wood for campfires • Closed to livestock use • Excluded from land treatment and range improvements except for test plots and facilities necessary for study of relict and near-relict plant communities • Closed to OHV use • Subject to fire suppression activities as identified in the FMP.		locatable mineral entry • Excluded from ROW grants • Excluded from private or commercial use of woodland products except for limited onsite collection of downed dead wood for campfires • Closed to livestock use • Excluded from land treatment and range improvements except for test plots and facilities necessary for study of relict and near-relict plant communities • VRM Class I • Closed to OHV use • Subject to fire suppression activities with special conditions. (Same as No Action Alternative.)
Bowknot Bend—Relevant and Important Values: Relict Vegetation					
Rationale: Contains an isolated relict plant community that remains unaltered by human intervention (e.g., domestic livestock grazing).					
The area would be managed as an ACEC (Map 2-45) (1,100	The area would not be managed as an ACEC.		Same management as the No Action	Same management as the No Action	The area would be managed as an ACEC (Map 2-49) (1,100 acres) with the following special management

Table 2-19. Areas of Critical Environmental Concern

No Action Alternative	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative E	PROPOSED RMP
acres) with the following special management prescriptions: • Unavailable oil and gas leasing • Closed to the disposal of mineral materials • Recommended for withdrawal from locatable mineral entry • Excluded from ROW grants • Excluded from private or commercial use of woodland products except for limited onsite collection of downed dead wood for campfires • Closed to livestock use • Excluded from land treatment and range improvements except for test plots and facilities necessary for study of relict and near-relict plant communities • Closed to OHV use • VRM Class I • Subject to fire suppression activities with special conditions.			Alternative (Map 2-48) (1,100 acres).	Alternative (Map 2-66) (1,100 acres).	prescriptions (The portion of the Bowknot Bend ACEC that is overlain by the Horseshoe Canyon (North) WSA would be managed in accordance with the IMP, where the IMP is more restrictive than the prescriptions below.): • Unavailable oil and gas leasing • Closed to the disposal of mineral materials • Recommended for withdrawal from locatable mineral entry • Excluded from ROW grants • Excluded from private or commercial use of woodland products except for limited onsite collection of downed dead wood for campfires • Closed to livestock use • Excluded from land treatment and range improvements except for test plots and facilities necessary for study of relict and near-relict plant communities • Closed to OHV use • VRM Class I • Subject to fire suppression activities with special conditions. (Same as No Action Alternative.)

Table 2-19. Areas of Critical Environmental Concern

No Action Alternative	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative E	PROPOSED RMP
Copper Globe ACEC—Relevant and Important Values: Historic and Cultural					
Rationale: To protect a historic copper base metal mine.					
The area would be managed as an ACEC (Map 2-45) (220 acres) and maintained with the following special management prescriptions: • Unavailable to oil and gas leasing • Closed to the disposal of mineral materials • Recommended for withdrawal from locatable mineral entry • Excluded from ROW grants • Excluded from private or commercial use of woodland products except for limited onsite collection of downed dead wood for campfires • Excluded from land treatment and range improvements except for watershed control structures where these would protect historic values • Limit OHV use to designated routes • VRM Class II	The area would be managed as an ACEC (Maps 2-46 and 2-47) (130 acres) and maintained with the following special management prescriptions: • Oil and gas would be open to leasing subject to major constraints (NSO) • Closed to the disposal of mineral materials • Recommended for withdrawal from locatable mineral entry • Excluded from ROW grants • Excluded from private or commercial use of woodland products except for limited onsite collection of downed dead wood for campfires • Closed to livestock use • Excluded from land treatment and range improvements except for watershed control structures where these would protect historic values • Limit OHV use to designated routes • VRM Class II • Subject to fire suppression activities as identified in the FMP.		Copper Globe would be included as part of the Heritage Site ACEC (Map 2-48) and managed according to the prescriptions listed for that ACEC.	Copper Globe would be included as part of the Heritage Site ACEC (Map 2-66) and managed according to the prescriptions listed for that ACEC.	Copper Globe would be included as part of the Heritage Site ACEC (Map 2-49) and managed according to the prescriptions listed for that ACEC.

Table 2-19. Areas of Critical Environmental Concern

No Action Alternative	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative E	PROPOSED RMP
• Subject to fire suppression activities with special conditions.					
Dry Lake Archaeological District ACEC—Relevant and Important Values: Cultural					
Rationale: Dry Lake Archaeological District has a multitude of apparently undisturbed single-episode lithic scatters, as well as other site types such as lithic procurement, shelters, and campsites. It is one of the most likely locations for finding Paleo-Indian sites, the rarest site type in Utah.					
The area would be managed as an ACEC (Map 2-45) (16,990 acres) with the following special management prescriptions: • Oil and gas would be open to leasing subject to minor constraints (timing limitations, CSU, and lease notices) • Open to disposal of mineral materials • Open to mineral entry with notice or plan of operations • Avoided for ROW grants • Open to land treatments and range improvements subject to special conditions • Limit OHV use to designated routes • Subject to fire suppression with special conditions	The area would be managed as an ACEC (Maps 2-46, 2-47, 2-48, 2-66, and 2-49) (18,000 acres) with the following special management prescriptions: • Block cultural surveys will be required • Oil and gas would be open to leasing subject to major constraints (NSO) • Open to mineral entry with notice or plan of operations • Avoided for ROW grants In addition, the following general management prescriptions would include: • Open to disposal of mineral materials • Open to land treatments and range improvements • Limit OHV use to designated routes • Subject to fire suppression as identified in the FMP.				

Table 2-19. Areas of Critical Environmental Concern

No Action Alternative	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative E	PROPOSED RMP
Interstate 70 ACEC—Relevant and Important Values: Scenic					
Rationale: Scenic quality "A" in the BLM's VRM inventory system passing through the San Rafael Swell and bounded on the east by the San Rafael Reef.					
Highway I-70 Scenic Corridor ACEC would be maintained (Map 2-45) (50,650 acres) with the following special management prescriptions: • Oil and gas would be open to leasing subject to major constraints (NSO) • Closed to the disposal of mineral materials • Open to mineral entry with notice or plan of operations • Avoided for ROW grants • Excluded from land treatment • Open to range improvements with special conditions • Excluded from private and commercial use of woodland products except for limited onsite collection of downed dead wood for campfires • Limit OHV use to designated routes • VRM Class I • Subject to fire	Maintain ACEC management; however, the boundaries would be adjusted to extend from Moore Road on the west to Highway 24 on the east, as indicated on Map 2-46. (25,300 acres) The ACEC would be managed with the following special management prescriptions: • Oil and gas would be open to leasing subject to major constraints (NSO) • Closed to the disposal of mineral materials • Open to mineral entry with notice or plan of operations • Avoided for ROW grants • Excluded from land treatment • Open to range improvements • Excluded from private and commercial use of woodland products except for limited onsite collection of	Maintain ACEC management; however, the boundaries would be adjusted to extend to Highway 24 on the east, as indicated on Map 2-47. (40,800 acres) The ACEC would be managed with the following special management prescriptions: • Oil and gas would be open to leasing subject to major constraints (NSO) • Closed to the disposal of mineral materials • Open to mineral entry with notice or plan of operations • Avoided for ROW grants • Excluded from land treatment • Open to range improvements • Excluded from private and commercial use of woodland products except for limited onsite collection of downed dead wood	Maintain ACEC management; however, the boundaries would be expanded to extend to State Highway 6, as presented on Map 2-48 and Map 2-66. (45,300 acres) The ACEC would be managed with the following special management prescriptions: • Oil and gas would be open to leasing subject to major constraints (NSO) • Closed to the disposal of mineral materials • Open to mineral entry with notice or plan of operations • Avoided for ROW grants • Excluded from land treatment • Open to range improvements • Excluded from private and commercial use of woodland products except for limited onsite collection of downed dead wood for campfires • Limit OHV use to designated routes • VRM Class I • Subject to fire suppression activities as identified in the FMP.	Maintain ACEC management; however, the boundaries would be adjusted as indicated on Map 2-49. (33,100 acres) The ACEC would be managed with the following special management prescriptions (The portion of the Interstate 70 ACEC that is overlain by the San Rafael Reef, Devils Canyon, and Sids Mountain WSAs would be managed in accordance with the IMP, where the IMP is more restrictive than the prescriptions below.): • Oil and gas would be open to leasing subject to major constraints (NSO) • Closed to the disposal of mineral materials • Open to mineral entry with notice or plan of operations • Avoided for ROW grants • Excluded from land treatment • Excluded from private and commercial use of woodland products except for limited onsite collection of downed dead wood for campfires • VRM Class I In addition, the following general management prescriptions would include: • Open to range improvements

Table 2-19. Areas of Critical Environmental Concern

No Action Alternative	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative E	PROPOSED RMP
suppression activities with special conditions.	downed dead wood for campfires • Limit OHV use to designated routes • VRM Class I • Subject to fire suppression activities as identified in the FMP.	for campfires • Limit OHV use to designated routes • VRM Class I • Subject to fire suppression activities as identified in the FMP.			• Limit OHV use to designated routes • Subject to fire suppression activities as identified in the FMP.
Muddy Creek ACEC—Relevant and Important Values: Cultural, Historic, and Scenic					
Rationale: Landscape is panoramic with few visual boundaries, such as Hondu Arch and Tomsich Butte.					
The area would be managed as an ACEC (Map 2-45) (22,540 acres) with current boundaries and the following special management prescriptions: • Oil and gas would be open to leasing subject to major constraints (NSO) except where the ACEC is in a WSA, where it would be unavailable to leasing • Closed to disposal of mineral materials • Open to mineral entry with notice or plan of operations • Avoided for ROW grants • Open to range improvements with	Manage the area as an ACEC (Maps 2-46, 2-47, 2-48, 2-66, and 2-49) (25,000 acres) with the following special management prescriptions (The portion of the Muddy Creek ACEC that is overlain by the Muddy Creek WSA would be managed in accordance with the IMP, where the IMP is more restrictive than the prescriptions below.): • Oil and gas would be open to leasing subject to major constraints (NSO) • Closed to disposal of mineral materials • Open to mineral entry with notice or plan of operations • Avoided for ROW grants • Excluded from land treatments • Excluded from private and commercial use of woodland products • VRM Class I • Firewood collection not allowed in the ACEC. In addition, the following general management prescriptions would include: • Open to range improvements • Limit OHV use to designated routes • Subject to fire suppression as identified in the FMP.				

Table 2-19. Areas of Critical Environmental Concern

No Action Alternative	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative E	PROPOSED RMP
special conditions • Excluded from land treatments • Excluded from private and commercial use of woodland products except for limited onsite collection of downed dead wood for campfires • Limit OHV use to designated routes • VRM Class I • Subject to fire suppression with special conditions.					
Pictographs ACEC/Rock Art ACEC—Relevant and Important Values: Cultural					
Rationale: These sites are some of the best examples of prehistoric rock art in the Colorado Plateau.					
The area would be managed as an ACEC (Map 2-45) (40 acres) with the following special management prescriptions: • Unavailable to oil and gas leasing • Closed to disposal of mineral materials • Recommended for withdrawal from locatable mineral entry • Excluded for ROW grants • Excluded from range	Change the name to “Rock Art ACEC.” The existing ACEC would be maintained; however, the following sites would be managed as part of the Rock Art ACEC (Maps 2-46, 2-47, 2-48, and 2-66) (16,010 acres): Sand Cove Spring, King’s Crown, Short Creek, Dry Wash, North Salt Wash, Molen Seep, Big Hole, Cottonwood Canyon, Wild Horse Canyon, and Grassy Trail. Archaeological inventories and test excavations would be required before site improvements or a designated route decision. Manage with the following special management prescriptions: • Oil and gas would be open to leasing subject to major constraints (NSO) • Closed to disposal of mineral materials • Recommended for withdrawal from locatable mineral entry • Excluded for ROW grants • Excluded from range improvements and land treatments except for watershed control structures where these would protect cultural resource values • Immediate areas around panels closed to livestock use • Excluded from private and commercial use of woodland products except for limited onsite				Change the name to “Rock Art ACEC.” The existing ACEC would be maintained; however, the following sites would be managed as part of the Rock Art ACEC (Map 2-49) (5,300 acres): Sand Cove Spring, King’s Crown, Short Creek, Dry Wash, North Salt Wash, Molen Seep, Big Hole, Cottonwood Canyon, Wild Horse Canyon, and Grassy Trail. (The portion of the Rock Art ACEC that is overlain by the Mexican Mountain and San Rafael Reef WSAs would be managed in accordance with the IMP, where the IMP is more restrictive than the prescriptions below.)

Table 2-19. Areas of Critical Environmental Concern

No Action Alternative	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative E	PROPOSED RMP
improvements and land treatments except for watershed control structures where these would protect cultural resource values • Immediate areas around panels closed to livestock use • Excluded from private and commercial use of woodland products except for limited onsite collection of downed dead wood for campfires • Limit OHV use to designated routes • Subject to fire suppression activities with special conditions	collection of downed dead wood for campfires In addition, the following general management prescriptions would include: • Limit OHV use to designated routes • Subject to fire suppression activities as identified in the FMP				Archaeological inventories and test excavations would be required before site improvements or a designated route decision. Manage with the following special management prescriptions: • Oil and gas would be open to leasing subject to major constraints (NSO) • Closed to disposal of mineral materials • Recommended for withdrawal from locatable mineral entry • Excluded for ROW grants • Excluded from range improvements and land treatments except for watershed control structures where these would protect cultural resource values • Immediate areas around panels closed to livestock use • Excluded from private and commercial use of woodland products except for limited onsite collection of downed dead wood for campfires In addition, the following general management prescriptions would include: • Limit OHV use to designated routes • Subject to fire suppression activities as identified in the FMP
San Rafael Canyon ACEC—Relevant and Important Values: Scenic					
Rationale: The San Rafael River has cut a channel creating what is known as the “Little Grand Canyon” as viewed from the Wedge. The Black Boxes are world renowned.					

Table 2-19. Areas of Critical Environmental Concern

No Action Alternative	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative E	PROPOSED RMP
Manage the area as an ACEC (Map 2-45). (34,420 acres) Manage the upper and lower portions of the canyon with the following special management prescriptions: • Unavailable to oil and gas leasing • Closed to disposal of mineral materials • Recommended for withdrawal from locatable mineral entry • Excluded from ROW grants (except the Mexican Mountain road) • Excluded from private and commercial use of woodland products except for limited onsite collection of downed dead wood for campfires • Excluded from land treatments and range improvements except for watershed control structures where these would protect recreation or riparian values • Closed to OHV use • VRM Class I	The area would not be managed as an ACEC.	Maintain the area managed as an ACEC and expand it to include Buckhorn Draw, Spring Canyon, Nate Canyon, and Cottonwood Canyon and associated contiguous ROS-P and Class A scenery (Map 2-47). (87,500 acres) Manage the upper and lower portions of the canyon with the following special management prescriptions: • Unavailable to oil and gas leasing • Closed to disposal of mineral materials • Open to mineral entry with notice or plan of operations • Excluded from ROW grants (except the Mexican Mountain road) • Excluded from private and commercial use of woodland products except for limited onsite collection of downed dead wood for campfires • Excluded from land treatments and range improvements except for watershed control	Same as Alternative B (Map 2-48).	San Rafael Canyon ACEC (lower, middle, upper portions) would be maintained and expanded (Map 2-66) (87,500 acres) to include the Buckhorn Draw, Spring Canyon, Nate Canyon, and Cottonwood Canyon and associated contiguous Primitive and Class A scenery. It would be managed with the following management prescriptions, for the protection of recreation, scenic, and cultural resources in the area: • Lower—unavailable to oil and gas leasing • Middle—areas open to leasing, subject to	Manage the area as an ACEC (Map 2-49) (15,200 acres), combining the upper, middle and lower portions of the existing ACEC, then excluding those portions within the WSAs (which would eliminate most of the upper and lower portions). Manage with the following special management prescriptions: • Oil and gas would be open to leasing subject to major constraints (NSO) • Closed to disposal of mineral materials • Open to mineral entry with notice or plan of operations • Avoided for ROW grants • Excluded from private and commercial use of woodland products except for limited onsite collection of downed dead wood for campfires • Closed to livestock grazing within Buckhorn Draw • Excluded from land treatments and range improvements unless used to protect or improve riparian values • VRM Class II. In addition, the following general management prescriptions would include: • Limit OHV use to designated routes • Subject to fire suppression activities as identified in the FMP.

Table 2-19. Areas of Critical Environmental Concern

No Action Alternative	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative E	PROPOSED RMP
• Subject to fire suppression activities with special conditions. Manage the middle portion of the canyon with the following special management prescriptions: • Oil and gas would be open to leasing subject to minor constraints (timing limitations, CSU, lease notices) • Open to disposal of mineral materials with special conditions • Open to mineral entry with notice or plan of operations • Avoided for ROW grants • Excluded from private and commercial use of woodland products except for limited onsite collection of downed dead wood for campfires • Closed to livestock grazing within Buckhorn Draw • Excluded from land treatments and range improvements unless used to protect or		structures where these would protect recreation or riparian values • Closed to OHV use • VRM Class I • Subject to fire suppression activities as identified in the FMP. Manage the middle portion of the canyon with the following special management prescriptions: • Oil and gas would be open to leasing subject to minor constraints (timing limitations, CSU, lease notices) • Open to disposal of mineral materials • Open to mineral entry with notice or plan of operations • Avoided for ROW grants • Excluded from private and commercial use of woodland products except for limited onsite collection of downed dead wood for campfires • Closed to livestock grazing within		minor constraints (timing limitations, controlled surface use, and lease notices), for oil and gas leasing • Upper—unavailable to oil and gas leasing. • Archaeological inventories and site avoidance would be required before designated route and recreation site decisions.	

Table 2-19. Areas of Critical Environmental Concern

No Action Alternative	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative E	PROPOSED RMP
improve riparian values • Limit OHV use to designated routes • VRM Class II • Subject to fire suppression activities with special conditions.		Buckhorn Draw • Excluded from land treatments and range improvements unless used to protect or improve riparian values • Limit OHV use to designated routes • VRM Class II • Subject to fire suppression activities as identified in the FMP • Requirement for archaeological inventories and site avoidance before designated route and recreation site decisions.			
San Rafael Reef ACEC—Relevant and Important Values: Scenic and Vegetation					
Rationale: Unique for its vegetation and scenic values. Relict vegetation communities are found throughout the steeply dipping cuestas on the back side of the reef. There are few views within the reef that do not involve a panoramic scene into a deeply cut canyon or an enclosed view dominated by a vertical red sandstone wall or tremendous fin.					
Manage the area as an ACEC (Map 2-45) (68,720 acres) with the following special management prescriptions: North Portion (between Temple Mountain and I-70): • Unavailable to oil and gas leasing	Manage the area as an ACEC, combining the North and South portions of the existing ACEC (Maps 2-46, 2-47, 2-48, 2-66, and 2-49) (72,000 acres), with the following special management prescriptions (The portion of the San Rafael Reef ACEC that is overlain by the San Rafael Reef WSA would be managed in accordance with the IMP, where the IMP is more restrictive than the prescriptions below.): • Unavailable to leasing for oil and gas • Closed to disposal of mineral materials • Recommended for withdrawal from locatable mineral entry • Excluded from ROW grants • Excluded from private or commercial use of woodland products except for limited onsite collection of downed dead wood for campfires				

Table 2-19. Areas of Critical Environmental Concern

No Action Alternative	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative E	PROPOSED RMP
• Closed to disposal of mineral materials • Recommended for withdrawal from locatable mineral entry • Excluded from ROW grants • Excluded from private or commercial use of woodland products except for limited onsite collection of downed dead wood for campfires • Excluded from land treatments and range improvements except for water control structures where these would protect scenic values • Limit OHV use to designated routes • VRM Class I • Subject to fire suppression with special conditions South Portion (San Rafael Reef South of Temple Mountain) has same the management prescriptions as North Portion except for the follows changes: • Open to mineral entry with notice or plan of	• Excluded from land treatments and range improvements except for water control structures where these would protect scenic values • VRM Class I. In addition, the following general management prescriptions would include: • Limit OHV use to designated routes • Subject to fire suppression as identified in the FMP.				

Table 2-19. Areas of Critical Environmental Concern

No Action Alternative	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative E	PROPOSED RMP
operations • Oil and gas would be open to leasing, subject to major constraints (NSO).					
Segers Hole ACEC—Relevant and Important Values: Scenic					
Rationale: Scenic quality "A" in the BLM's VRM inventory and bordered by the Chimney on the north and east and by the Moroni Slopes on the south and west.					
Manage the area as an ACEC (Maps 2-45, 2-46, 2-47, 2-48, 2-66, and 2-49) (7,120 acres) with the following special management prescriptions (The portion of the Segers Hole ACEC that is overlain by the Muddy Creek WSA would be managed in accordance with the IMP, where the IMP is more restrictive than the prescriptions below.): • Oil and gas would be open to leasing subject to major constraints (NSO) • Closed to disposal of mineral materials • Open to mineral entry with notice or plan of operations • Avoided for ROW grants • Open to range improvements with special conditions • Excluded from land treatments • Excluded from private and commercial use of woodland products except for limited onsite collection of downed dead wood for campfires • VRM Class I • Subject to fire suppression activities with special conditions. In addition, the following general management prescriptions would include: • Limit OHV use to designated routes.					
Sids Mountain ACEC—Relevant and Important Values: Scenic					
Rationale: The scenic quality is outstanding in terms of diverse color and landform.					
Manage the area as an ACEC (Map 2-45) (61,870 acres) with the following special management prescriptions: • Oil and gas would be open to leasing subject to major	The area would not be managed as an ACEC.	Same management as the No Action Alternative (Map 2-47). (55,200 acres)	The existing ACEC boundary would be expanded (Map 2-48) (78,700 acres) and managed with the following special management	The existing Sid's Mountain ACEC boundary would be expanded (Map 2-66) (78,700 acres) to include the potential Sid's Mountain expanded ACEC	The area would not be managed as an ACEC. *(Same as Alternative A.)*

Table 2-19. Areas of Critical Environmental Concern

No Action Alternative	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative E	PROPOSED RMP
constraints (NSO) • Closed to disposal of mineral materials • Open to mineral entry with notice or plan of operations • Avoided for ROW grants • Open to range improvements with special conditions • Excluded from land treatments • Excluded from private and commercial use of woodland products except for limited onsite collection of downed dead wood for campfires • Limit OHV use to designated routes • VRM Class I • Subject to fire suppression activities with special conditions.			prescriptions: • Oil and gas would be mostly unavailable to leasing, with areas outside the WSA open to leasing subject to minor constraints (timing limitations, CSU, and lease notices) • Closed to disposal of mineral materials • Open to mineral entry with notice or plan of operations • Avoided for ROW grants • Open to range improvements • Excluded from land treatments • Excluded from private and commercial use of woodland products	and managed with the following prescriptions: • Unavailable to oil and gas leasing • Closed to disposal of mineral materials • Open to mineral entry with plan of operations • Excluded from ROW grants • Open to range improvements with special conditions • Excluded from land treatments • Excluded from private and commercial use of woodland products, except for limited onsite collection of downed dead wood for campfires • OHV use limited to designated	

Table 2-19. Areas of Critical Environmental Concern

No Action Alternative	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative E	PROPOSED RMP
			except for limited onsite collection of downed dead wood for campfires • Limit OHV use to designated routes • VRM Class I • Subject to fire suppression activities as identified in the FMP.	routes • VRM Class I • Subject to fire suppression activities with special conditions.	
Swaseys Cabin ACEC—Relevant and Important Values: Historic					
Rationale: The Swasey family, famous in the San Rafael folklore, used the cabin area as the central part of their livestock operations in the early 1900s.					
Manage the area as an ACEC (Map 2-45) (220 acres) with the following special management prescriptions: • Unavailable to oil and gas leasing • Closed to disposal of mineral materials • Recommended for withdrawal from locatable mineral entry • Excluded from ROW grants • Excluded from private or commercial use of woodland products except for limited	The area would not be managed as an ACEC. The area would be managed as a recreation site.		Swaseys Cabin would be included as a part of the Potential Heritage Sites ACEC (Map 2-48, 2-66, and 2-49) and would be managed according to the prescriptions for that ACEC.		

Table 2-19. Areas of Critical Environmental Concern

No Action Alternative	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative E	PROPOSED RMP
onsite collection of downed dead wood for campfires • Closed to grazing use except livestock trailing under an approved permit • Excluded from land treatments and range improvements except for watershed control structures where these would protect historic values • Limit OHV use to designated routes • VRM Class II • Subject to full fire suppression.					
Temple Mountain ACEC—Relevant and Important Values: Historic					
Rationale: Temple Mountain is one of the best examples of uranium mining activities in the area. Especially in the 1950s, this activity was nationally significant, and these old uranium workings offer important evidence of the technology of that time.					
Manage the area as an ACEC (Map 2-45) (2,580 acres) with the following special management prescriptions: • Oil and gas would be open to leasing subject to minor constraints (timing limitations, CSU, lease notices) • Open to disposal of mineral materials	The area would not be managed as an ACEC. The area would be managed as a recreation site.		Temple Mountain would be included as part of the Heritage Sites ACEC (Map 2-48, 2-66, and 2-49) and would be managed according to the prescriptions for that ACEC.		

Table 2-19. Areas of Critical Environmental Concern

No Action Alternative	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative E	PROPOSED RMP
subject to special conditions • Open to mineral entry with notice or plan of operations • Avoided for ROW grants • Excluded from private or commercial use of woodland products, including wood from historic structures except for limited onsite collection of downed dead wood for campfires • Open to land treatments and range and wildlife habitat improvements subject to special conditions • Limit OHV use to designated routes • Subject to full fire suppression.					
Potential Areas of Critical Environmental Concern					
Lower Green River—Relevant and Important Values: Ecology, Scenic, Vegetation, and Cultural					
Rationale: Includes Paleo-Indian, Archaic, and Fremont sites. The riparian areas and wetlands provide an oasis of rare and lush vegetation in an otherwise arid environment. The Lower Green River and its canyons have outstanding scenic values.					
The area would not be managed as an ACEC.		Manage the area as an ACEC (Map 2-47) (34,000 acres) with the following special management prescriptions:	Manage the area as an ACEC (Map 2-48, 2-66) (34,000 acres) with the following special management prescriptions: • Closed to livestock grazing • Prohibit expanded distribution of		The area would not be managed as an ACEC. *(Same as the No Action Alternative.)*

Table 2-19. Areas of Critical Environmental Concern

No Action Alternative	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative E	PROPOSED RMP
		• Maintain current level of livestock grazing • Prohibit expanded distribution of livestock into riparian areas • Exclude riparian habitats from mechanical land treatments except for the purpose of restoring native habitat • Oil and gas would be open to leasing subject to major constraints (NSO) • Open to disposal of mineral materials • Open to mineral entry with notice or plan of operations • Limit OHV use to designated routes outside the WSA • VRM Class I. Note: The potential area overlaps existing Bowknot Bend and Dry Lake Archaeological District ACECs.	livestock into riparian areas • Exclude riparian habitats from mechanical land treatments except for the purpose of restoring native habitat • Oil and gas would be open to leasing subject to major constraints (NSO) • Closed to disposal of mineral materials • Recommended for withdrawal from mineral entry • Closed to OHV use • VRM Class I. Note: The potential area overlaps existing Bowknot Bend and Dry Lake Archaeological District ACECs.		
Beckwith Plateau—Relevant and Important Values: Geologic and Natural Processes					
Rationale: Characterized as a primitive outdoor classroom that displays the processes of coal formation in a classic regressive coastal sequence.					
The area would not be managed as an ACEC.		Manage the area as an ACEC (Map 2-47) (50,6000 acres) with	Manage the area as an ACEC (Map 2-48, 2-66) (50,600 acres) with the following special management		The area would not be managed as an ACEC.

Table 2-19. Areas of Critical Environmental Concern

No Action Alternative	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative E	PROPOSED RMP
		the following special management prescriptions: • Limit OHV use to designated routes outside the WSA • Apply current management prescriptions for the Gray Canyon Wildland Management Area to the entire potential area • Avoid for ROW • Unavailable to oil and gas leasing • Open to disposal of mineral materials • Open to mineral entry with notice or plan of operations.	prescriptions: • Closed to OHV use • Apply current management prescriptions for the Gray Canyon wildland area to the entire potential area • Area would be an exclusion for ROWs • Unavailable to oil and gas leasing • Closed to disposal of mineral materials • Recommended for withdrawal from mineral entry.		*(Same as the No Action Alternative.)*
Temple-Cottonwood Dugout Wash—Relevant and Important Values: Cultural					
Rationale: Highly significant for its large assemblage of undisturbed archaic sites.					
The area would not be managed as an ACEC.			Manage the area as an ACEC (Map 2-48 and Map 2-66) (72,600 acres) with the following special management prescriptions: • Oil and gas would be open to leasing subject to major constraints (NSO) • No additional routes beyond those designated in the *San Rafael Motorized Route Designation Plan* (2003)		The area would not be managed as an ACEC. *(Same as the No Action Alternative.)*

Table 2-19. Areas of Critical Environmental Concern

No Action Alternative	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative E	PROPOSED RMP
			• Open to disposal of mineral materials • Open to mineral entry with notice or plan of operations.		
Range Creek—Relevant and Important Values: Cultural					
Rationale: Range Creek has nationally significant, outstanding cultural resources. It holds hundreds, if not thousands, of Fremont archaeological sites. This is the most complete collection of existing, pristine Fremont sites.					
The area would not be managed as an ACEC.		Manage the area as an ACEC (Maps 2-47 and 2-48). (65,500 acres) Work with the State of Utah to develop common management prescriptions for protection of these values, which could include: • ACEC will have limited public access • Closed to OHV use • Public access limited to hiking and horseback riding • Unavailable to oil and gas leasing • Closed to disposal of mineral materials.		Manage the area as an ACEC (Map 2-66) (65,500 acres) with the same management as Alternative B, except the area would be recommended for withdrawal from mineral entry	The area would not be managed as an ACEC. *(Same as the No Action Alternative.)*
Nine Mile Canyon—Relevant and Important Values: Cultural					
Rationale: This area holds significant prehistoric archaeological resources. Nine Mile Canyon is known to contain the country's highest concentration of rock art panels, remnants of the prehistoric Archaic, Fremont, and Ute cultures. About 80 percent of the known sites are rock art. This ACEC is within the BLM Vernal and Price Field Offices.					
The area would not be managed as an ACEC.		Manage the area as an ACEC (Map 2-47). (49,000 acres) Special management prescriptions would include: • Oil and gas would be open to leasing subject to minor constraints (timing limitations, CSU, and	Manage the area as an ACEC (Map 2-48, 2-66). (49,000 acres) Special management prescriptions would include: • Oil and gas would be open to leasing subject to major constraints (NSO) • Manage cultural sites in the ACEC for conservation use • Limit OHV use to designated routes		Manage the area as an ACEC (Map 2-49). (26,200 acres) Special management prescriptions would include: • Oil and gas would be open to leasing subject to major constraints (NSO) • Split estate would be open to oil and gas leasing subject to minor constraints (CSU)

Table 2-19. Areas of Critical Environmental Concern

No Action Alternative	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative E	PROPOSED RMP
		lease notices) • Limit OHV use to designated routes • VRM Class II and III in selected areas as indicated on Map 2-3 • Open to disposal of mineral materials • Utility corridor will be allowed as shown on Map 2-54.	• VRM Class II • Open to disposal of mineral materials • Utility corridor will be allowed as shown on Map 2-55 and 2-68.		• VRM Class II and III in selected areas as indicated on Map 2-5 • Utility corridor will be allowed as shown on Map 2-54. In addition, the following general management prescriptions would include: • Limit OHV use to designated routes • Open to disposal of mineral materials.
	Oil and gas development in the Nine Mile Canyon ACEC would be permitted after compliance with the NHPA.	Oil and gas development in the Nine Mile Canyon ACEC would not be permitted within 100 feet of inventoried cultural resources after compliance with the NHPA.			Oil and gas development in the Nine Mile Canyon ACEC would be permitted after compliance with the NHPA.
Cleveland-Lloyd Dinosaur Quarry—Relevant and Important Values: Paleontologic					
Rationale: The Cleveland-Lloyd deposit is unique in itself. The Cleveland-Lloyd bone deposit is the densest concentration of Jurassic dinosaur bones in the world. This area also contains the world's largest collection of fossils of a large meat-eating dinosaur (*Allosaurus fragilis*) yet found.					
The area would not be managed as an ACEC. The existing 80-acre NNL would remain in alignment; paleontological values would be managed under existing management prescriptions.	The area would be managed for protection of the paleontologic resources as indicated on Map 2-46 (770 acres). The ACEC would be managed with the following special management prescriptions: • Collection of fossils would be allowed to those with a valid	Manage the area as an ACEC (Maps 2-47 and 2-48) (770 acres). The ACEC would be managed with the following special management prescriptions: • Would be managed for protection and scientific use and public interpretation and education of the paleontologic resources • Collection of fossils would be allowed to those with a valid BLM-issued paleontological use permit • Closed to all public access without authorization. Note: Paid use fee would be considered authorization • Mountain bikes and OHV use to be	Same as Alternative C, except for the following (Map 2-66) (770 acres): • Closed to recreational OHV use. • Recreation facilities would be developed for visitor safety, convenience,	Manage the area as an ACEC (Map 2-49) (770 acres). The ACEC would be managed with the following special management prescriptions: • Would be managed for protection and scientific use and public interpretation and education of the paleontologic resources • Collection of fossils would be allowed to those with a valid BLM-issued paleontological use permit • Closed to all public access without authorization. Note: Paid use fee

Table 2-19. Areas of Critical Environmental Concern

No Action Alternative	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative E	PROPOSED RMP
	BLM issued paleontological use permit • Closed to all public access without authorization (Note: paid use fee would be considered authorization) • Mountain bikes and OHV use would be allowed on designated routes • Camping would not be allowed • The construction of facilities would be allowed for research, visitor safety, convenience, resource interpretation, and comfort • Unavailable to oil and gas leasing within the NNL boundary. Oil and gas would be open to leasing subject to minor constraints (timing limitations, CSU, lease notices) outside the NNL boundary to the ACEC boundary • Closed to disposal of mineral materials • The 770-acre ACEC would be	allowed on designated routes • Camping would not be allowed • The construction of facilities to be allowed for research, visitor safety, convenience, resource interpretation, and comfort • Closed to disposal of mineral materials • The 770-acre ACEC would be recommended for withdrawal from mineral entry • Collection of non-renewable resources such as fossils, rocks, mineral specimens, common invertebrate fossils, semiprecious gemstones, petrified wood, and mineral materials would not be allowed, per 43 CFR 8365.1-5.b.2-4 • Hiking to be allowed only on developed interpretive trails; hiking off trails to be allowed for guided tours offered by BLM staff • Unavailable to oil and gas leasing within the NNL boundary. Oil and gas would be open to leasing subject to major constraints (NSO) outside the NNL boundary and within the ACEC.		and comfort and to enhance the enjoyment of paleontological resources and understanding of the scientific processes.	would be considered authorization • Mountain bikes and OHV use to be allowed on designated routes • Camping would not be allowed • The construction of facilities to be allowed for research, visitor safety, convenience, resource interpretation, and comfort • Closed to disposal of mineral materials • The 770-acre ACEC would be recommended for withdrawal from mineral entry • Collection of non-renewable resources such as fossils, rocks, mineral specimens, common invertebrate fossils, semiprecious gemstones, petrified wood, and mineral materials would not be allowed, per applicable law, policy, and regulation. • Hiking to be allowed only on developed interpretive trails; hiking off trails to be allowed for guided tours offered by BLM staff • Unavailable to oil and gas leasing within the NNL boundary. Oil and gas would be open to leasing subject to major constraints (NSO) outside the NNL boundary and within the ACEC. (Same as Alternative B.)

Table 2-19. Areas of Critical Environmental Concern

No Action Alternative	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative E	PROPOSED RMP
	recommended for withdrawal from mineral entry • Collection of non-renewable resources such as fossils, rocks, mineral specimens, common invertebrate fossils, semiprecious gemstones, petrified wood, and mineral materials would not be allowed, per 43 CFR 8365.1-5.b.2-4.				
Gordon Creek—Relevant and Important Values: Cultural					
Rationale: While there are many places where the Fremont and historic peoples farmed the same area, Gordon Creek is unique. In most places the historic activities turned into modern activities that have damaged or destroyed the Fremont and historic sites. It now is the only known area where such study can take place.					
The area would not be managed as an ACEC.			Manage the area as an ACEC (Maps 2-48 and 2-66) (3,300 acres) with the following special management prescriptions: • Closed to OHV use • Unavailable to oil and gas leasing • Closed to disposal of mineral materials • Recommended for withdrawal from mineral entry • Closed to livestock grazing • Excavation and data recovery of the entire potential area would be required before any surface disturbing activities could occur (e.g., site-by-site excavation and data recovery would not be allowed)		The area would not be managed as an ACEC. *(Same as the No Action Alternative.)*

Table 2-19. Areas of Critical Environmental Concern

No Action Alternative	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative E	PROPOSED RMP
Heritage Sites—Relevant and Important Values: Historic					
Rationale: Includes several sites associated with the early historic uses on the public lands in Emery County including Wilsonville, Shepherds End, Smith Cabin, Hunt Cabin, Copper Globe, Temple Mountain, and Swaseys Cabin.					
The area would not be managed as an ACEC.			Manage these areas as an ACEC (Map 2-48) (2,745 acres) with the following special management prescriptions: • Firewood collection not allowed in the ACEC • Oil and gas would be open to leasing subject to major constraints (NSO) • Recommended for withdrawal from locatable mineral entry except Temple Mountain will be open to mineral entry with notice or plan of operation • Closed to disposal of mineral materials	Same as Alternative C, except the entire potential ACEC (Map 2-66) (2,745 acres) would be recommended for withdrawal from mineral entry.	Manage these areas as an ACEC (Map 2-49) (1,485 acres) with the following special management prescriptions: • Firewood collection not allowed in the ACEC • Oil and gas would be open to leasing subject to major constraints (NSO) • Recommended for withdrawal from locatable mineral entry except Temple Mountain will be open to mineral entry with notice or plan of operation • Closed to disposal of mineral materials • Excluded from ROW grants • Excluded from land treatments and range improvements except for watershed control structures where these would protect historic values • VRM Class II. (Same as Alternative C.)

Table 2-19. Areas of Critical Environmental Concern

No Action Alternative	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative E	PROPOSED RMP
			• Excluded from ROW grants • Excluded from land treatments and range improvements except for watershed control structures where these would protect historic values • VRM Class II.		
Uranium Mining Districts—Relevant and Important Values: Historic					
Rationale: These sites include Tidwell Draw, Hidden Splendor, Little Susan, and Lucky Strike Mining Districts. The potential ACEC includes several significant mining sites associated with the development of uranium as part of U.S. efforts during the escalation of the cold war during the 1950s.					
The area would not be managed as an ACEC.			Manage these areas as an ACEC (Map 2-48, 2-66) (4,170 acres) with the following special management prescriptions: • Closed to firewood collection in the ACEC • Closed to livestock use • Oil and gas would be open to leasing subject to major constraints (NSO) • Open to disposal of mineral materials • Open to mineral entry with notice or plan of operations • No disturbance of historic structures until the historic features have been recorded and oral		Manage these areas as an ACEC (Map 2-49) (3,470 acres) with the following special management prescriptions (The portion of the Uranium Mining Districts ACEC that is overlain by the Crack Canyon WSA would be managed in accordance with the IMP, where the IMP is more restrictive than the prescriptions below.): • Closed to firewood collection in the ACEC • Closed to livestock use • Oil and gas would be open to leasing subject to major constraints (NSO) • Open to mineral entry with notice or plan of operations

Table 2-19. Areas of Critical Environmental Concern

No Action Alternative	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative E	PROPOSED RMP
			history has been conducted.		• No disturbance of historic structures until the historic features have been recorded and oral history has been conducted. In addition, the following general management prescriptions would include: • Open to disposal of mineral materials.
Desolation Canyon—Relevant and Important Values: Scenic, Cultural, and Ecological					
Rationale: Desolation Canyon is Utah's deepest canyon. It is nationally and internationally known and significant for its diverse values. The resources of Desolation Canyon are fragile and vulnerable to change. While Fremont sites are the most prolific, Archaic through Ute sites are found. The landscape of the canyon itself is a historic feature. It is the least changed landscape of all the Green and Colorado River segments explored by John Wesley Powell in 1869.					
The area would not be managed as an ACEC.			Manage the area as an ACEC (Maps 2-48 and 2-66) (156,200 acres) with the following special management prescriptions: • Closed to OHV use • Excluded for ROWs • Unavailable to oil and gas leasing within the WSAs; the remainder would be open to leasing, subject to major constraints (NSO) • The area within the WSAs would be closed to disposal of mineral materials.		The area would not be managed as an ACEC. *(Same as the No Action Alternative.)*
White-Tailed Prairie Dog—Relevant and Important Values: Wildlife					
Rationale: The Castle Valley Complex provides habitat for the white-tailed prairie dog, a Utah BLM Sensitive Species. The dog towns create a habitat feature for other sensitive species such as the burrowing owl, long-billed curlew, and the black-footed ferret.					
The area would not be managed as an ACEC.			Manage the area as an ACEC (Maps 2-48 and 2-66) (5,400 acres) with the following special management prescriptions:		The area would not be managed as an ACEC. *(Same as the No Action Alternative.)*

Table 2-19. Areas of Critical Environmental Concern

No Action Alternative	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative E	PROPOSED RMP
			• Limit OHV use to designated routes • Oil and gas leasing would be open to leasing subject to major constraints (NSO) • Open to disposal of mineral materials • Open to mineral entry with notice or plan of operations.		
Mussentuchit—Relevant and Important Values: Cultural					
Rationale: The prehistoric quarrying areas are important for the study of local prehistoric economies and the stone material is distinctive enough to be studied as part of regional trading systems.					
The area would not be managed as an ACEC.			Manage the area as an ACEC (Maps 2-48 and 2-66) (58,400 acres) with the following special management prescriptions: • Manage as areas open to leasing subject to minor constraints (timing limitations, CSU, lease notices) for oil and gas leasing • Limit OHV use to designated routes • Open to disposal of mineral materials • Open to mineral entry with notice or plan of operations.		The area would not be managed as an ACEC. *(Same as the No Action Alternative.)*
Lower Muddy Creek—Relevant and Important Values: Scenic and Vegetation					
Rationale: The scenery attracts people from outside the area and is therefore more than locally significant. There are documented occurrences of three threatened, endangered, or sensitive plants with at least one endemic to Emery County.					
The area would not be managed as an ACEC.			Manage the area as an ACEC (Map 2-48) (29,900 acres) with the following special management	Manage the area as an ACEC (Map 2-66) (29,900 acres) with the following special management	The area would not be managed as an ACEC. *(Same as the No Action Alternative.)*

Table 2-19. Areas of Critical Environmental Concern

No Action Alternative	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative E	PROPOSED RMP
			prescriptions: • Open to oil and gas leasing, subject to major constraints (NSO) • Limit OHV use to designated routes • Open to disposal of mineral materials subject to special conditions • Recommend the primitive ROS area for withdrawal from mineral entry • Manage as VRM Class II	prescriptions: • Unavailable to oil and gas leasing • Closed to OHV use • Closed to disposal of mineral materials • Recommend the primitive ROS area for withdrawal from mineral entry • VRM Class I	

Table 2-20. Wild and Scenic Rivers

No Action Alternative	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative E	PROPOSED RMP
Goals					
To the extent of the BLM's authority (limited to BLM lands within the corridor), maintain the free-flowing character, preserve or enhance the outstandingly remarkable values, and allow no activities within the river corridor that will alter the tentative classification of those segments determined suitable for congressional designation for inclusion in the National Wild and Scenic River System.					

Table 2-20. Wild and Scenic Rivers

No Action Alternative	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative E	PROPOSED RMP
Objectives Review all eligible rivers to determine suitability for Congressional designation into the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System. Apply appropriate management decisions that will protect the tentative classifications of wild, scenic, or recreational suitable river segments.					
Determinations of Potential Wild and Scenic Rivers					
Previous planning efforts in the PFO have not included analysis and recommendations for suitability. As a result, to date no rivers or river segments have been determined suitable for designation. In the No Action Alternative, no rivers or river segments are recommended as suitable for designation as a WSR. In keeping with BLM Manual 8351, .32C and .33C, suitability determinations would not be made for any of the eligible river segments. They would remain eligible and would be managed to protect their outstandingly remarkable values, free-flowing nature, and tentative classification to the degree that the BLM has authority (BLM lands within the corridor) and within the	Under one or more of the action alternatives that follow, each eligible river segment would be determined suitable for congressional designation to the National Wild and Scenic River System and managed to protect its outstandingly remarkable values, tentative classification (Wild, Scenic, or Recreational), and free-flowing nature. Any eligible segment not determined to be suitable under an alternative would receive no special protection specifically for its free-flowing values, outstandingly remarkable values, and tentative classifications.				

Table 2-20. Wild and Scenic Rivers

No Action Alternative	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative E	PROPOSED RMP
parameters of decisions made in the *San Rafael RMP* and the *Price River MFP* until such time as suitability determinations were made.					
Protective Management of Rivers Suitable for the National Wild and Scenic River System					
		The BLM would not seek additional water rights for management of the Green River as a wild and scenic river. Therefore, recommendation of river segments as suitable would not affect adjudicated water rights for any of the identified segments. Management for the noted river segment corridors would not assert a federal reserved water right.			
		BLM would work with the State of Utah, local and tribal governments, and other federal agencies, in a state-wide study, to reach consensus regarding recommendations to Congress for the inclusion of rivers in the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System. Besides applying consistent criteria across agency jurisdictions, the joint study would avoid piece-mealing of river segments in logical watershed units in the state. The study would evaluate, in detail, the possible benefits and effects of designation on the local and state economies, agricultural and industrial operations and interests, outdoor recreation, natural resources (including the outstandingly remarkable values for which the river was deemed suitable), water rights, water quality, water resource planning, and access to and across river corridors within, and upstream and downstream from the proposed segments(s). Actual designation of river segments would only occur through congressional action or as a result of Secretarial decision at the request of the Governor in accordance with provisions of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (the Act). BLM will work with the State, local and tribal governments, and the agencies involved to coordinate its decision making on wild and scenic river issues and to achieve consistency wherever possible. 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 Proposed RMP are recommended to Congress for designation, BLM will continue to work with affected local, state, federal, and tribal partners to identify in-stream flows necessary to meet critical resource needs, including values related to the subject segments(s). Such quantifications would be included in any recommendation for designation. BLM would then seek to jointly promote innovative strategies, community-based planning, and voluntary agreements with water users, under State law, to address those needs. Should designations occur on any river segment as a result of Secretarial or congressional action, existing rights, privileges, and contracts would be protected. Under Section 12 of the Act, termination of such rights, privileges, and contracts may happen only with the consent of the affected non-federal party. A determination by the BLM of eligibility and suitability for the inclusion of rivers on public lands to the				

Table 2-20. Wild and Scenic Rivers

No Action Alternative	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative E	PROPOSED RMP
		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 component is added to the Wild and Scenic Rivers System, it would come from water that is not appropriated at the time of designation, in the amount necessary to protect features which led to the river's inclusion into the system. BLM's intent would be to leave existing water rights undisturbed and to recognize the lawful rights of private, municipal, and state entities to manage water resources under state law to meet the needs of the community. Federal law, including Section 13 of the Act and the McCarren Amendment (43 USC 666), recognizes state jurisdiction over water allocation in designated streams. Thus, it is BLM's position that existing water rights, including flows apportioned to the State of Utah interstate agreements and compacts, including the Upper Colorado River Compact, and developments of such rights would not be affected by designation or the creation of the possible federal reserved water right. BLM would seek to work with upstream and downstream water users and applicable agencies to ensure that water flows are maintained at a level sufficient to sustain the values for which affected river segments were designated.			
No suitability determination would be made. Protective management would apply to BLM lands along eligible river segments with 271 miles tentatively classified as Wild, 268 miles as Scenic, and 111 miles as Recreational.	No river segments found suitable.	Protective management would apply to BLM lands along suitable river segments with 78 miles tentatively classified as Wild, 93 miles as Scenic, and 103 miles as Recreational (Map 2-50).	Protective management would apply to BLM lands along suitable river segments with 271 miles tentatively classified as Wild, 268 miles as Scenic, and 111 miles as Recreational (Maps 2-51 and 2-67).		Protective management would apply to BLM lands along suitable river segments with 62 miles tentatively classified as Wild, 60 miles as Scenic, and 8 miles as Recreational (Map 2-52).
		Specific management prescriptions for each suitable segment are identified below. Any portion of a suitable segment (Wild, Scenic, or Recreational) that is overlain by the a WSA would be managed in accordance with the IMP, where the IMP is more restrictive than the prescriptions below. The prescriptions below reflect the least restrictive level of management that is applied to the entire segment, although more restrictive management may apply to portions of the segment due to overlap from other management prescriptions.			
Barrier Creek					
Canyonlands National Park boundary to mouth at Green River					
	Not suitable	Not suitable	Suitable—Wild	Suitable—Wild	Not suitable

Table 2-20. Wild and Scenic Rivers

No Action Alternative	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative E	PROPOSED RMP
			• Oil and gas leasing: NSO • OHV category: Closed • VRM designation: Class I	• Oil and gas leasing: Unavailable • OHV category: Closed • VRM designation: Class I	
Bear Canyon					
Headwaters to mouth at Rock Creek					
	Not suitable	Not suitable	Suitable—Wild • Oil and gas leasing: NSO • OHV category: Closed • VRM designation: Class I	Suitable—Wild • Oil and gas leasing: Unavailable • OHV category: Closed • VRM designation: Class I	Not suitable
Buckskin Canyon Creek					
Headwaters to mouth at Rock Creek					
	Not suitable	Not suitable	Suitable—Wild • Oil and gas leasing: Unavailable • OHV category: Closed • VRM designation: Class I	Suitable—Wild • Oil and gas leasing: Unavailable • OHV category: Closed • VRM designation: Class I	Not suitable
Cane Wash					
Head of wash to mouth at San Rafael River					

Table 2-20. Wild and Scenic Rivers

No Action Alternative	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative E	PROPOSED RMP
	Not suitable	Not suitable	Suitable—Scenic • Oil and gas leasing: NSO • OHV category: Limited to designated routes • VRM designation: Class II	Suitable—Scenic • Oil and gas leasing: Unavailable • OHV category: Limited to designated routes • VRM designation: Class II	Not suitable
Coal Wash					
Confluence of North and South Forks of Coal Wash to mouth at North Salt Wash					
	Not suitable	Not suitable	Suitable—Recreational • Oil and gas leasing: Minor constraints (CSU) • OHV category: Limited to designated routes • VRM designation: Class II	Suitable—Recreational • Oil and gas leasing: Unavailable • OHV category: Closed • VRM designation: Class I	Not suitable
Cottonwood Wash					
Head of wash to county road at T. 20 S., R. 13 E., Sec. 14					
	Not suitable	Not suitable	Suitable—Wild • Oil and gas leasing: NSO • OHV category: Closed	Suitable—Wild • Oil and gas leasing: Unavailable • OHV category:	Not suitable

Table 2-20. Wild and Scenic Rivers

No Action Alternative	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative E	PROPOSED RMP
			• VRM designation: Class I	Closed • VRM designation: Class I	
Fish Creek					
Scofield Reservoir to confluence with White River					
	Not suitable	Not suitable	Suitable—Scenic • Oil and gas leasing: NSO • OHV category: Limited to designated routes • VRM designation: Class II	Suitable—Scenic • Oil and gas leasing: NSO • OHV category: Limited to designated routes • VRM designation: Class II	Not suitable
Gordon Creek					
Confluence of Bob Wright and Mud Water Canyons to mouth at Price River					
	Not suitable	Not suitable	Suitable—Scenic • Oil and gas leasing: NSO • OHV category: Limited to designated routes • VRM designation: VRM Class II	Suitable—Scenic • Oil and gas leasing: NSO • OHV category: Limited to designated routes • VRM designation: VRM Class II	Not suitable
Green River					
County line near Nine Mile Creek to Chandler Canyon (Desolation Canyon)					
	Not suitable	Suitable—Wild	Suitable—Wild	Suitable—Wild	Suitable—Wild

Table 2-20. Wild and Scenic Rivers

No Action Alternative	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative E	PROPOSED RMP
		• Oil and gas leasing: NSO • OHV category: Closed • VRM designation: Class I	• Oil and gas leasing: NSO • OHV category: Closed • VRM designation: Class I	• Oil and gas leasing: Unavailable • OHV category: Closed • VRM designation: Class I	• Oil and gas leasing: NSO • OHV category: Closed • VRM designation: Class I
Chandler Creek to Florence Creek (Desolation Canyon)					
	Not suitable	Suitable—Scenic • Oil and gas leasing: Unavailable • OHV category: Closed • VRM designation: Class I	Suitable—Scenic • Oil and gas leasing: Unavailable • OHV category: Closed • VRM designation: Class I	Suitable—Scenic • Oil and gas leasing: Unavailable • OHV category: Closed • VRM designation: Class I	Suitable—Scenic • Oil and gas leasing: Unavailable • OHV category: Closed • VRM designation: Class I
Florence Creek to Nefertiti boat ramp (Desolation and Gray Canyons)					
	Not suitable	Suitable—Wild • Oil and gas leasing: Unavailable • OHV category: Closed • VRM designation: Class I	Suitable—Wild • Oil and gas leasing: Unavailable • OHV category: Closed • VRM designation: Class I	Suitable—Wild • Oil and gas leasing: Unavailable • OHV category: Closed • VRM designation: Class I	Suitable—Wild • Oil and gas leasing: Unavailable • OHV category: Closed • VRM designation: Class I
Nefertiti boat ramp to Swaseys boat ramp					
	Not suitable	Suitable—Recreational • Oil and gas leasing: Unavailable • OHV category:	Suitable—Recreational • Oil and gas leasing:	Suitable—Recreational • Oil and gas leasing:	Suitable—Recreational • Oil and gas leasing: Unavailable • OHV category: Closed

Table 2-20. Wild and Scenic Rivers

No Action Alternative	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative E	PROPOSED RMP
		Closed • VRM designation: Class I	Unavailable • OHV category: Closed • VRM designation: Class I	Unavailable • OHV category: Closed • VRM designation: Class I	• VRM designation: Class I
Swaseys boat ramp to I-70 bridge					
	Not suitable	Not suitable	Suitable—Recreational • Oil and gas leasing: Minor constraints (CSU) • OHV category: Limited to designated routes • VRM designation: Class III	Suitable—Recreational • Oil and gas leasing: NSO • OHV category: Limited to designated routes • VRM designation: Class III	Not suitable
I-70 to mile 91 below Ruby Ranch (to Confluence with San Rafael River in Proposed RMP)					
	Not suitable	Suitable—Recreational • Oil and gas leasing: NSO • OHV category: Limited to designated routes • VRM designation: VRM Class I	Suitable—Scenic • Oil and gas leasing: NSO • OHV category: Closed • VRM designation: Class I	Suitable—Scenic • Oil and gas leasing: NSO • OHV category: Closed • VRM designation: Class I	Not suitable
Confluence with San Rafael River to Canyonlands National Park (Proposed RMP only)					
This segment includes all or portions of the following two segments (Mile 91 and Hey Joe segments).					Suitable—Scenic • Oil and gas leasing: NSO • OHV category: Limited to

Table 2-20. Wild and Scenic Rivers

No Action Alternative	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative E	PROPOSED RMP
					designated routes • VRM designation: Class II
Mile 91 below Ruby Ranch to Hey Joe Canyon (Labyrinth Canyon)					
	Not suitable	Suitable—Scenic • Oil and gas leasing: NSO • OHV category: limited to designated routes • VRM designation: Class I	Suitable—Wild • Oil and gas leasing: NSO • OHV category: Closed • VRM designation: Class I	Suitable—Wild • Oil and gas leasing: Unavailable • OHV category: Closed • VRM designation: Class I	*See Confluence with San Rafael River to Canyonlands National Park segment above.*
Hey Joe Canyon to Canyonlands National Park boundary (Labyrinth Canyon)					
	Not suitable	Suitable—Recreational • Oil and gas leasing: NSO • OHV category: limited to designated routes • VRM designation: Class I	Suitable—Scenic • Oil and gas leasing: NSO • OHV category: Closed • VRM designation: Class I	Suitable—Scenic • Oil and gas leasing: Unavailable • OHV category: Closed • VRM designation: Class I	*See Confluence with San Rafael River to Canyonlands National Park segment above.*
Keg Spring Canyon					
Head of Canyon to mouth at Green River					
	Not suitable	Not suitable	Suitable—Wild • Oil and gas leasing: NSO • OHV category: Limited to designated routes • VRM	Suitable—Wild • Oil and gas leasing: Unavailable • OHV category: Limited to designated routes	Not suitable

Table 2-20. Wild and Scenic Rivers

No Action Alternative	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative E	PROPOSED RMP
			designation: Class I	• VRM designation: Class I	
Muddy Creek					
I-70 to Lone Tree Crossing					
	Not suitable	Not suitable	Suitable—Wild • Oil and gas leasing: NSO • OHV category: Limited to designated routes • VRM designation: Class I	Suitable—Wild • Oil and gas leasing: Unavailable • OHV category: Closed • VRM designation: Class I	Not suitable
Lone Tree Crossing to South Salt Wash					
	Not suitable	Not suitable	Suitable—Scenic • Oil and gas leasing: NSO • OHV category: Limited to designated routes • VRM designation: Class II	Suitable—Scenic • Oil and gas leasing: Unavailable • OHV category: Closed • VRM designation: Class I	Not suitable
South Salt Wash to County Road below San Rafael and North Caineville Reefs					
	Not suitable	Not suitable	Suitable—Wild • Oil and gas leasing: NSO • OHV category:	Suitable—Wild • Oil and gas leasing: Unavailable	Not suitable

Table 2-20. Wild and Scenic Rivers

No Action Alternative	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative E	PROPOSED RMP
			Limited to designated routes • VRM designation: Class I	• OHV category: Closed • VRM designation: Class I	
Nine Mile Creek					
Minnie Maude Creek to Bulls Canyon					
	Not suitable	Not suitable	Suitable—Recreational • Oil and gas leasing: NSO • OHV category: Closed • VRM designation: Class II	Suitable—Recreational • Oil and gas leasing: NSO • OHV category: Closed • VRM designation: Class II	Not suitable
North Fork Coal Wash					
Head of Wash to Fix It Pass route					
	Not suitable	Not suitable	Suitable—Wild • Oil and gas leasing: Unavailable • OHV category: Closed • VRM designation: Class I	Suitable—Wild • Oil and gas leasing: Unavailable • OHV category: Closed • VRM designation: Class I	Not suitable
Fix It Pass route to confluence with South Fork Coal Wash					
	Not suitable	Not suitable	Suitable—Recreational • Oil and gas	Suitable—Recreational • Oil and gas	Not suitable

Table 2-20. Wild and Scenic Rivers

No Action Alternative	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative E	PROPOSED RMP
			leasing: Unavailable • OHV category: Closed • VRM designation: Class I	leasing: Unavailable • OHV category: Closed • VRM designation: Class I	
North Salt Wash					
Confluence with Hornsilver Gulch to mouth at San Rafael River					
	Not suitable	Not suitable	Suitable—Wild • Oil and gas leasing: NSO • OHV category: Closed • VRM designation: Class I	Suitable—Wild • Oil and gas leasing: Unavailable • OHV category: Closed • VRM designation: Class I	Not suitable
Price River					
Confluence of Fish Creek and White River to Poplar Street Bridge in Helper					
	Not suitable	Not suitable	Suitable—Recreational • Oil and gas leasing: Minor constraints (CSU) • OHV category: Limited to designated routes • VRM designation: Class III	Suitable—Recreational • Oil and gas leasing: NSO • OHV category: Limited to designated routes • VRM designation: Class III	Not suitable

Table 2-20. Wild and Scenic Rivers

No Action Alternative	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative E	PROPOSED RMP
Mounds Bridge to Book Cliffs Escarpment					
	Not suitable	Not suitable	Suitable—Scenic • Oil and gas leasing: NSO • OHV category: Limited to designated routes • VRM designation: Class II	Suitable—Scenic • Oil and gas leasing: NSO • OHV category: Limited to designated routes • VRM designation: Class II	Not suitable
Book Cliffs Escarpment to mouth at Green River					
	Not suitable	Suitable—Scenic • Oil and gas leasing: Unavailable • OHV category: Closed • VRM designation: Class I	Suitable—Wild • Oil and gas leasing: Unavailable • OHV category: Closed • VRM designation: Class I	Suitable—Wild • Oil and gas leasing: Unavailable • OHV category: Closed • VRM designation: Class I	Not suitable
Range Creek					
Headwaters to Trail Canyon					
	Not suitable	Not suitable	Suitable—Wild • Oil and gas leasing: Unavailable • OHV category: Limited to designated routes • VRM designation:	Suitable—Wild • Oil and gas leasing: Unavailable • OHV category: Limited to designated routes • VRM designation:	Not suitable

Table 2-20. Wild and Scenic Rivers

No Action Alternative	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative E	PROPOSED RMP
			Class I	Class I	
Trail Canyon to drill holes at T. 17 S., R. 16 E., Sec. 27					
	Not suitable	Suitable—Recreational • Oil and gas leasing: Unavailable • OHV category: Closed • VRM designation: Class III	Suitable—Recreational • Oil and gas leasing: Unavailable • OHV category: Closed • VRM designation: Class II	Suitable—Recreational • Oil and gas leasing: Unavailable • OHV category: Closed • VRM designation: Class II	Not suitable
Drill holes at T. 17 S., R. 16 E., Sec. 27 to mouth at Green River					
	Not suitable	Suitable—Scenic • Oil and gas leasing: Unavailable • OHV category: Closed • VRM designation: Class II	Suitable—Wild • Oil and gas leasing: Unavailable • OHV category: Closed • VRM designation: Class I	Suitable—Wild • Oil and gas leasing: Unavailable • OHV category: Closed • VRM designation: Class I	Not suitable
Rock Creek					
North Fork headwaters to mouth at Green River					
	Not suitable	Suitable—Wild • Oil and gas leasing: Unavailable • OHV category: Closed • VRM designation: Class I	Suitable—Wild • Oil and gas leasing: Unavailable • OHV category: Closed • VRM designation:	Suitable—Wild • Oil and gas leasing: Unavailable • OHV category: Closed • VRM designation:	Not suitable

Table 2-20. Wild and Scenic Rivers

No Action Alternative	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative E	PROPOSED RMP
			Class I	Class I	
San Rafael River					
Confluence of Ferron and Cottonwood Creeks to Fuller Bottom					
	Not suitable	Not suitable	Suitable—Scenic • Oil and gas leasing: NSO • OHV category: Limited to designated routes • VRM designation: Class II	Suitable—Scenic • Oil and gas leasing: NSO • OHV category: Limited to designated routes • VRM designation: Class II	Not suitable
Fuller Bottom to Johansen Corral					
	Not suitable	Suitable—Scenic • Oil and gas leasing: Unavailable • OHV category: Closed • VRM designation: Class I	Suitable—Wild • Oil and gas leasing: Unavailable • OHV category: Closed • VRM designation: Class I	Suitable—Wild • Oil and gas leasing: Unavailable • OHV category: Closed • VRM designation: Class I	Not suitable
Johansen Corral to Lockhart Wash					
	Not suitable	Suitable—Recreational • Oil and gas leasing: Minor constraints (CSU) • OHV category: Limited to designated routes • VRM designation:	Suitable—Scenic • Oil and gas leasing: NSO • OHV category: Limited to designated routes • VRM	Suitable—Scenic • Oil and gas leasing: Unavailable • OHV category: Limited to designated routes	Not suitable

Table 2-20. Wild and Scenic Rivers

No Action Alternative	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative E	PROPOSED RMP
		Class II	designation: Class II	• VRM designation: Class II	
Lockhart Wash to Tidwell Bottom					
	Not suitable	Suitable—Scenic • Oil and gas leasing: NSO • OHV category: Closed • VRM designation: Class I	Suitable—Wild • Oil and gas leasing: Unavailable • OHV category: Closed • VRM designation: Class I	Suitable—Wild • Oil and gas leasing: Unavailable • OHV category: Closed • VRM designation: Class I	Not suitable
Tidwell Bottom to confluence with Green River					
	Not suitable	Not suitable	Suitable—Scenic • Oil and gas leasing: NSO • OHV category: Limited to designated routes • VRM designation: Class II	Suitable—Scenic • Oil and gas leasing: NSO • OHV category: Limited to designated routes • VRM designation: Class II	Not suitable
South Fork Coal Wash					
Head of wash to Eva Conover route					
	Not suitable	Not suitable	Suitable—Wild • Oil and gas leasing: Unavailable • OHV category: Closed	Suitable—Wild • Oil and gas leasing: Unavailable • OHV category: Closed	Not suitable

Table 2-20. Wild and Scenic Rivers

No Action Alternative	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative E	PROPOSED RMP
			• VRM designation: Class I	• VRM designation: Class I	
Eva Conover route to confluence with North Fork Coal Wash					
	Not suitable	Not suitable	Suitable—Recreational • Oil and gas leasing: Unavailable • OHV category: Closed • VRM designation: Class I	Suitable—Recreational • Oil and gas leasing: Unavailable • OHV category: Closed • VRM designation: Class I	Not suitable

Table 2-21. Other Special Designations

No Action Alternative	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative E	PROPOSED RMP
Goals Manage the Old Spanish Trail National Historic Trail (OST) for long-term heritage, recreational, and educational values. Manage National Landmarks to maintain or enhance the values for which they were designated. **Objectives** Develop and maintain an OST Plan within five years from signature of the ROD. Manage public lands to maintain or enhance the recreational opportunities associated with byways and backways for the purposes for which they were designated.					
National Historic Trails					
Old Spanish Trail (Public Law 107-325)					
The newly designated Old Spanish National	Work with the NPS planning team in the development of a comprehensive management plan for the National Historic Trail (Map 3-29).				

Table 2-21. Other Special Designations

No Action Alternative	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative E	PROPOSED RMP
Historic Trail (OST) would be managed to protect the resource values for which it was designated (Public Law 107-325). In accordance with the *1990 Price River ORV Plan,* 800 acres of the OST would be closed to OHV use.	The BLM will co-administer the OST in partnership with the National Park Service. Prepare an Activity (Trail) Plan for the OST to identify specific on-the-ground actions that will be taken to implement the goal and objectives of the Trail plan. Evaluate the OST for inclusion on the National Register of Historic Places. Nominate Trail sites and segments for inclusion in the Register where appropriate. Segments of the OST would be identified and classified for historic integrity and condition. These segments would then be designated for appropriate types of travel. SRPs on the OST would be authorized only for heritage tours and reenactments.				
Old Spanish Trail: Lost Springs Wash/Trail Springs Wash Segment (13 miles total, 11 miles on BLM)					
	Segments of the OST would be identified and classified for historic integrity and condition. These segments would then be designated for appropriate types of travel and other resource uses.				Preserve the historic character of the landscape much as it existed at the time the trail was in use (1829–1848) while providing for recreation opportunities and other resources values. Manage this segment as follows: • Work with Utah State Parks and Recreation, Green River City, Emery County, Native American Tribes, and other interested parties to provide interpretive, educational, and recreation opportunities for this segment • Retain public lands; acquire State inholdings • Manage primarily for non-motorized recreation uses • Limit OHV use to designated routes • VRM Class III (existing) • Oil and gas would be open to leasing subject to major constraints (NSO) • Closed to mineral materials (sand

Table 2-21. Other Special Designations

No Action Alternative	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative E	PROPOSED RMP
					and gravel) sales • Avoid ROWs except where the designated corridor crosses the trail • Authorize SRPs only for heritage tours and reenactments in this segment • Consider ROS inventory in preparing the activity plan for this segment.
Old Spanish Trail: Green River Crossing (via Cottonwood Wash) to Big Flat Segment (43 miles total, 31 miles on BLM)					
	Segments of the OST would be identified and classified for historic integrity and condition. These segments would then be designated for appropriate types of travel and other resource uses.				Preserve the historic character of the landscape much as it existed at the time the trail was in use (1829–1848) while providing for recreation opportunities and other resources values. Manage this segment as follows: • Work with Utah State Parks and Recreation, Green River City, Emery County, Native American Tribes, and other interested parties on providing interpretive, educational, and recreation opportunities for this segment • Retain public lands; acquire State inholdings • Limit OHV use to designated routes • Manage for motorized recreation uses • Manage for VRM objectives (overlaps VRM Classes I, II, and III) • Oil and gas would be open to leasing subject to minor constraints (timing limitations, CSU, lease notices) (Map 2-34) • ROWs allowed within the

Table 2-21. Other Special Designations

No Action Alternative	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative E	PROPOSED RMP
					designated corridor • Consider ROS inventory in preparing the activity plan for this segment.
Old Spanish Trail: Big Flat to Walker Flat (Emery/Sevier County Line) Segment (67 miles total, 26 miles on BLM)					
	OST segments would be identified and classified for historic integrity and condition. These segments would then be designated for appropriate types of travel and other resource uses.				Manage this segment as follows: • Work with Utah State Parks and Recreation, Green River City, Emery County, Native American Tribes, and other interested parties on providing interpretive, educational, and recreation opportunities for this segment • Limit OHV use to designated routes • Manage for motorized recreation uses • ROWs allowed within the designated corridor. • Manage for VRM objectives in areas open to oil and gas leasing subject to minor constraints (Map 2-34) (these areas of overlap are VRM Class III).
Backways and Byways					
National Scenic Byways and National Scenic Backways Issue no SRPs for vending on scenic byways and backways. Commercial activities will be directed to communities along the routes. Work with local communities and other groups to foster heritage tourism throughout the PFO. **Nine Mile Canyon State Scenic Backway/BLM Backcountry Byway** Manage the Nine Mile Canyon State Scenic Backway/BLM Backcountry Byway to protect and preserve the prehistoric and historic values that contribute to the landscape for which the byway was established. **Dinosaur Diamond National Scenic Byway (Including Previous Designations of Dinosaur Diamond Prehistoric Highway and Indian Canyon)** The Dinosaur Diamond National Scenic Byway was established for its intrinsic natural values. Promote public appreciation of and education on the paleontological resources found along the Dinosaur Diamond Byway.					

Table 2-21. Other Special Designations

No Action Alternative	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative E	PROPOSED RMP
Use the byway to provide a variety of heritage recreational opportunities related to paleontological, cultural, and historic values at sites along the byway including: • Cleveland-Lloyd Dinosaur Quarry • Nine Mile Canyon • Buckhorn Panel. Cooperate with the interpretive plan as completed by the Dinosaur Diamond Cooperative Partnership. Install additional directional signage for visitor convenience and safety. **Huntington/Eccles Canyons Energy Loop National Scenic Byway** Manage the small portion of this byway in the PFO in accordance with the USFS Byway Management Plan. **Wedge Overlook/Buckhorn Draw State Scenic Backway** Protect natural values and scenery in the corridor. **Dinosaur Quarry/Cedar Overlook State Scenic Backway** Adhere to appropriate recreation management implemented by the Scenic Byway Committee to the extent possible according to the goals and objectives outlined in the Proposed RMP. **Temple Mountain/Goblin Valley Road State Scenic Backway** Adhere to appropriate recreation management implemented by the Scenic Byway Committee to the extent possible according to the goals and objectives outlined in the Proposed RMP.					
National Landmarks					
Manage the Desolation Canyon NHL for heritage tourism under the prescriptions of the Desolation and Gray Canyons of the Green River River Management Plan, SRMA, WSA, and suitable WSR segment. Manage the Cleveland-Lloyd Dinosaur Quarry NHL under the prescriptions of the SRMA and ACEC.					

Table 2-22. Transportation

No Action Alternative	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative E	PROPOSED RMP
Goals Upgrade and construct roads to provide essential access for resource management purposes. Continue to support Carbon and Emery counties and the State of Utah in providing a network of roads across public lands. **Objectives** Develop and maintain a Transportation Plan within 5 years of the approval of the RMP. **Management Guidance Common to All Alternatives** Manage the transportation system in accordance with maintenance agreements with Carbon and Emery counties. Periodically review and update maintenance agreements with Carbon and Emery counties. Allow for reasonable access to non-BLM-managed lands within the PFO. To reduce road density, maintain connectivity, and reduce habitat fragmentation, continue to require reclamation of redundant road systems or roads that no longer serve their intended purpose. In cooperation with the State of Utah and counties, install direction, informational, regulatory, and interpretive signs at appropriate locations throughout the area in conformance with recreation, visual, engineering, and safety objectives. Continue to use the following existing and currently used backcountry airstrips for noncommercial and limited commercial use. Extended commercial use would require an ROW authorization. Any closure of an existing airstrip would be accomplished through consultation with the Federal Aviation Administration, the Utah Division of Aeronautics, and affected user groups and authorization holders on a case-by-case basis: • Peter's Point • Mexican Mountain • Cedar Mountain • Hidden Splendor • Tavaputs Ranch. Allow aircraft to use existing backcountry airstrips and allow minimal maintenance of the airstrips to ensure pilot and passenger safety.					

Table 2-23. Hazardous Materials and Waste

No Action Alternative	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative E	PROPOSED RMP
Goals Keep public lands free from unauthorized hazardous material (HazMat) generation or storage. **Objectives** Educate the public in HazMat release prevention. Prohibit HazMat production and storage on BLM-administered lands. Work with other agencies in rapid response to HazMat releases. **Management Guidance Common to All Alternatives** Conduct management of hazardous materials, substances, and waste (including storage, transportation, and spills) in compliance with applicable federal, state, and local law, regulation, and policy, including but not limited to 29 CFR 1910, 49 CFR 100-185, 40 CFR 100-400, Comprehensive Environmental Response Compensation and Liability Act (CERCLA), Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA), Superfund Amendment Reauthorization Act (SARA), Toxic Substances Control Act (TSCA), and the Clean Water Act (CWA). Implement hazardous materials management through the PFO, State BLM, and national contingency plans. For BLM-authorized activities that involve presence or use of hazardous materials, apply precautionary measures to guard against releases or spills into the environment. Prohibit hazardous materials disposal sites within the planning area. Two Formerly Used Defense Sites (FUDS) have been identified on public lands within the PFO. No Unexploded Ordinance (UXO) sites have been identified. One of the FUDS was never used (Haddon Flat); the other was used and has been inspected and cleared of munitions (Buckhorn Wash). The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers is responsible for inspection, clearance, and sealing of these sites.					

2.4 IMPACTS SUMMARY

Table 2-24 presents a comparison summary of impacts from management actions proposed in the six management alternatives. This summary presents impacts on the various resources, uses, and designations of each alternative and is structured in the same resource, use, and designation order as Chapters 2, 3, and 4. Please see Chapter 4 for a more detailed impact analysis.

Table 2-24. Impacts Summary Table

Summarized Impacts on:	No Action Alternative	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative E	PROPOSED RMP
RESOURCES						
Air Quality	Emissions of pollutants would increase over the baseline but not to the extent that ambient air quality standards would be exceeded.	The highest amount of emissions would be expected. However, the emission increase would not cause ambient air quality standards to be exceeded.	The third-smallest amount of emissions would be expected. However, the emission increase would not cause ambient air quality standards to be exceeded.	The second lowest amount of emissions would be expected. However, the emission increase would not cause ambient air quality standards to be exceeded.	The lowest amount of emissions would be expected. However, the emission increase would not cause ambient air quality standards to be exceeded.	The highest amount of emissions would be expected. However, the emission increase would not cause ambient air quality standards to be exceeded. (Same as Alternative A.)
Soil, Water, and Riparian	Activities such as mineral development leasing, livestock grazing, cross-country OHV use, wildfires, and timber harvest would cause soil damage and erosion, which could lead to diminished water quality and siltation in riparian-wetland habitats. Areas of no new surface disturbing activities surrounding riparian-wetland habitats would protect these areas from direct damage from disturbances.				The greatest amount of acreage would be off limits to surface disturbing activities that would cause soil damage and erosion. This alternative would provide the greatest protection to water quality and riparian areas. Areas of no new surface disturbing activities surrounding riparian-wetland habitats would protect these areas from direct damage from disturbances.	Activities such as mineral development leasing, livestock grazing, cross-country OHV use, wildfires, and timber harvest would cause soil damage and erosion, which could lead to diminished water quality and siltation in riparian-wetland habitats. Areas of no new surface disturbing activities surrounding riparian-wetland habitats would protect these areas from direct damage from disturbances.
	Allowing cross-	Eliminating cross-	Eliminating cross-	Eliminating cross-	Eliminating OHV use	Eliminating cross-

Table 2-24. Impacts Summary Table

Summarized Impacts on:	No Action Alternative	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative E	PROPOSED RMP
	country OHV use on 30 percent of the PFO would damage soils, increase erosion, and diminish water quality. Closing areas to activities such as oil and gas extraction and OHV use would reduce risk of soil damage and erosion, which would reduce the potential impacts to water quality and decrease siltation in riparian-wetland habitats.	country OHV use would reduce the risk of increased soil damage and erosion. Compared with the No Action Alternative, Alternative A would close more areas to activities such as oil and gas extraction and OHV use. This would reduce the risk of soil damage and erosion, which would reduce the potential impacts to water quality and decrease siltation in riparian-wetland habitats to a greater degree than the No Action Alternative.	country OHV use would reduce the risk of increased soil damage and erosion. Closing areas to activities such as oil and gas extraction and OHV use would reduce the risk of soil damage and erosion, which would reduce the potential impacts to water quality and decrease siltation in riparian-wetland habitats to a greater degree than the No Action Alternative and Alternative A.	country OHV use would reduce the risk of increased soil damage and erosion. Closing areas to activities such as oil and gas extraction and OHV use would reduce the risk of soil damage and erosion, which would reduce the potential impacts to water quality and decrease siltation in riparian-wetland habitats to a greater degree than any other alternative.	on 60 percent of the PFO would reduce the risk of increased soil damage and erosion. Closing 60 percent of the PFO to activities such as oil and gas extraction and OHV use would reduce the risk of soil damage and erosion, which would reduce the potential impacts to water quality and decrease siltation in riparian-wetland habitats to a greater degree than any other alternative.	country OHV use would reduce the risk of increased soil damage and erosion. Closing areas to activities such as oil and gas extraction and OHV use would reduce the risk of soil damage and minimize erosion, which would reduce the potential impacts to water quality and decrease siltation in riparian-wetland habitats. The Proposed RMP would close a similar number of acres as Alternative B, which would reduce surface disturbing activities
Vegetation	Impacts on vegetation resources would occur from activities that disturb and remove vegetation, such as mineral development activities, livestock grazing, dispersed recreation, and cross-country OHV use. These activities would alter the composition and structure of	Impacts would be the same as those identified for the No Action Alternative except increased mineral development and dispersed recreation use would increase the degree of impact on vegetation resources. However, aggressive implementation of	Impacts would be the same as those identified for the No Action Alternative except decreased mineral development would decrease the degree of impact on vegetation resources. Increases in dispersed recreation could increase the impacts on vegetation	Impacts would be the same as those identified for the No Action Alternative except decreased mineral development would decrease the degree of impact on vegetation resources. Increases in dispersed recreation could increase the impacts on vegetation	Impacts would be the same as those identified for Alternative C except decreased mineral development would decrease the degree of impact on vegetation resources. Decreases in dispersed recreation could decrease the impacts on vegetation resources noted in	Impacts would be the same as those identified for the No Action Alternative except increased mineral development and dispersed recreation use would be anticipated to increase the degree of impact on vegetation resources. Implementation of additional vegetation treatments and

Table 2-24. Impacts Summary Table

Summarized Impacts on:	No Action Alternative	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative E	PROPOSED RMP
	vegetation communities; increase the potential for the introduction and establishment of noxious weeds; and reduce vegetation cover, species diversity, primary production, and the recruitment of new plants.	vegetation treatments would provide for more intensive reclamation of vegetation communities. Prohibiting cross-country OHV use throughout the PFO would reduce the degree of disturbance to vegetation resources and reduce related changes to the composition and structure of vegetation communities.	resources noted in the No Action Alternative. Implementation of additional vegetation treatments and increased land use restrictions related to the management of wildlife and ACECs would help to further mitigate effects. Prohibiting cross-country OHV use throughout the PFO would reduce the degree of disturbance to vegetation resources and reduce related changes to the composition and structure of vegetation communities.	resources noted in the No Action Alternative. Increased land use restrictions related to the management of wildlife and ACECs would help to further mitigate effects. However, limiting vegetation treatments to natural processes would result in less intensive reclamation of vegetation communities. Prohibiting cross-country OHV use throughout the PFO would reduce the degree of disturbance to vegetation resources and reduce related changes to the composition and structure of vegetation communities.	Alternative C. Increased land use restrictions related to the management of wildlife, ACECs, and Non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics would help to further mitigate effects. However, limiting vegetation treatments to natural processes would result in less intensive reclamation of vegetation communities. Prohibiting OHV use on 60 percent of the PFO would reduce the degree of disturbance to vegetation resources and reduce related changes to the composition and structure of vegetation communities.	increased land use restrictions related to the management of wildlife and ACECs would help to further mitigate effects. Prohibiting cross-country OHV use throughout the PFO would reduce the degree of disturbance to vegetation resources and reduce related changes to the composition and structure of vegetation communities.
	The implementation of mitigation guidelines, BMPs, mitigations and stipulations on surface use, and vegetation treatments would help to mitigate these effects by protecting and treating vegetation communities.					
Cultural Resources	The BLM would continue to mitigate impacts on cultural resources from authorized uses through project abandonment, redesign, and, if necessary, data recovery investigations. However, cultural resources would continue to deteriorate through natural agents and inadvertent damage.					

Table 2-24. Impacts Summary Table

Summarized Impacts on:	No Action Alternative	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative E	PROPOSED RMP
	Disturbance associated with development would result in the identification and recording of cultural resource sites and the potential for inadvertent damage to sites.	Impacts would be the same as the No Action Alternative except the number of sites anticipated to be identified would increase because of an increase in surface disturbance.	Impacts would be the same as the No Action Alternative except the number of sites anticipated to be identified would decrease because of a decrease in surface disturbance.	Impacts would be the same as the No Action Alternative except the number of sites anticipated to be identified would decrease below the No Action Alternative and Alternative B because of a decrease in surface disturbance.	Impacts would be the same as the No Action Alternative except the number of sites anticipated to be identified would be the lowest of all alternatives because of a decrease in surface disturbance.	Impacts would be the same as the No Action Alternative except the number of sites anticipated to be identified would increase because of an increase in surface disturbance.
	Cross-country OHV use would generally break, spread, and otherwise disturb cultural resources at the surface and increase the potential for inadvertent damage. OHV use on identified routes would result in minimal impacts on cultural resources because of existing use on these routes. Because the designated routes currently exist, the damage adjacent to them would also be minimal.	Not managing any areas as open to cross-country OHV use would preclude disturbance of sites and any associated inadvertent damage. OHV use on 2,430 miles of designated routes would result in minimal impacts on cultural resources because of existing use on these routes. Because the designated routes currently exist, the damage adjacent to them would also be minimal.		Not managing any areas as open to cross-country OHV use would preclude disturbance of sites and any associated inadvertent damage. OHV use on 670 miles of designated routes would result in minimal impacts on cultural resources because of existing use on these routes. Because the designated routes currently exist, the damage adjacent to them would also be minimal.	OHV use on identified routes would result in minimal impacts on cultural resources because of the elimination of OHV use on 60 percent of the PFO. Because the identified routes currently exist, the damage adjacent to them would also be minimal.	OHV use on identified routes would result in minimal impacts on cultural resources because of existing use on these routes. Because the identified routes currently exist, the damage adjacent to them would also be minimal.
Paleontology	Surface disturbing actions could result in the identification of paleontological	Surface disturbing actions could result in the identification of paleontological	Surface disturbing actions could result in the identification of paleontological	Surface disturbing actions could result in the identification of paleontological	Surface disturbing actions could result in the identification of paleontological	Surface disturbing actions could result in the identification of paleontological

Table 2-24. Impacts Summary Table

Summarized Impacts on:	No Action Alternative	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative E	PROPOSED RMP
	resources. The significance of this impact would depend on the scientific significance of the fossil. Unmitigated impacts from cross-country OHV use could occur on 30 percent of the PFO. Disturbance associated with development would result in the identification of paleontological resources.	resources. The significance of this impact would depend on the significance of the fossil. Not managing any areas as open to cross-country OHV use would reduce inadvertent damage of paleontological resources. Impacts from oil and gas development would be the same as the No Action Alternative except the resources anticipated to be identified during oil and gas development would increase because of an increase in surface disturbance.	resources. The significance of this impact would depend on the significance of the fossil. Not managing any areas as open to cross-country OHV use would reduce inadvertent damage of paleontological resources. Impacts from oil and gas development would be the same as the No Action Alternative except the resources anticipated to be identified during oil and gas development would decrease because of a decrease in surface disturbance.	resources. The significance of this impact would depend upon the significance of the fossil. Not managing any areas as open to cross-country OHV use would reduce inadvertent damage of paleontological resources. Impacts from oil and gas development would be the same as the No Action Alternative except the resources anticipated to be identified during oil and gas development would decrease below the levels in the No Action Alternative and Alternative B because of a decrease in surface disturbance.	resources. The significance of this impact would depend upon the significance of the fossil. However, this Alternative E allows of the least amount of disturbance. Closing OHV use on 60 percent of the PFO would reduce inadvertent damage of paleontological resources. Impacts from oil and gas development would be the same as the No Action Alternative except the resources anticipated to be identified during oil and gas development would be the lowest of all alternatives because of a decrease in surface disturbance.	resources. The significance of this impact would depend upon the significance of the fossil. Not managing any areas as open to cross-country OHV use would reduce inadvertent damage of paleontological resources. Impacts from oil and gas development would be the same as the No Action Alternative except the resources anticipated to be identified during oil and gas development would increase because of an increase in surface disturbance.
Visual Resources	Development affecting scenic quality would be designed to conform to an area's VRM Class objective. Acres managed as Class I would increase by 110	Development affecting scenic quality would be designed to conform to an area's VRM Class objective. Acres managed as Class I would increase 108	Development affecting scenic quality would be designed to conform to an area's VRM Class objective. Acres managed as Class I would increase 119	Development affecting scenic quality would be designed to conform to an area's VRM Class objective. Acres managed as Class I would increase by 129	Development affecting scenic quality would be designed to conform to an area's VRM Class objective. Acres managed as Class I would increase by 426	Development affecting scenic quality would be designed to conform to an area's VRM Class objective. Acres managed as Class I would increase by 108 percent compared with

Table 2-24. Impacts Summary Table

Summarized Impacts on:	No Action Alternative	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative E	PROPOSED RMP
	percent compared with inventoried acres. Vegetation management actions could alter vegetation composition, which could improve visual variety by introducing a mosaic of vegetation patterns in the landscape. Maintenance of existing pinyon-juniper treatments would retain the existing vegetative character of the landscape. Developments would alter the landform, remove vegetation, and introduce human-made structures to the landscape. The size of the facilities and associated developments would dictate the degree of visual impact.	percent compared with inventoried acres. Aggressively moving pinyon-juniper woodlands to their historic range would create openings in large expanses of pinyon and juniper woodlands. The treatments create variety and interest in an otherwise monotonous landscape, enhancing the scenic quality. Impacts from development would be the same as the No Action Alternative except more visual intrusions would occur because of an increase in surface disturbance and development.	percent compared with inventoried acres. Management of priority vegetation communities would have the same effect on landscapes and visual resources as described under the No Action Alternative except fewer new areas would be treated. Impacts from development would be the same as the No Action Alternative except fewer visual intrusions would occur because of a decrease in surface disturbance and development.	percent compared with inventoried acres. Management of vegetation treatments would have the same effect on landscapes and visual resources as described under the No Action Alternative except that limiting treatment methods to natural processes (fire) would result in fewer new areas treated. Impacts from development would be the same as the No Action Alternative except fewer visual intrusions would occur because of a decrease in disturbance and development below of the levels in the No Action Alternative and Alternative B.	percent compared with inventoried acres. Management of vegetation treatments would have the same effect on landscapes and visual resources as described under the No Action Alternative except that limiting treatment methods to natural processes (fire) would result in fewer new areas treated. Impacts from development would be the same as the No Action Alternative except fewer visual intrusions would occur because of the limitations on surface disturbing activities	inventoried acres. Treatment of priority vegetation communities (pinyon-juniper woodland, wetlands vegetation types, and aspen stands) under this alternative would have the same effects on landscapes as described in the No Action Alternative. Impacts from development would be the same as the No Action Alternative except more visual intrusions would occur because of an increase in surface disturbance and development.
Special Status Species	Continued management of permitted activity and recreation uses could lead to long-term habitat	More restrictions on OHV and recreation use, including not allowing cross-country OHV use, would minimize	More restrictions on OHV and recreation use, including not allowing cross-country OHV use, and decreasing	More restrictions on OHV and recreation use, including not allowing cross-country OHV use, and decreasing	Closing OHV use on 60 percent of the PFO would reduce effects on special status species. More area protections	More restrictions on OHV and recreation use would minimize effects on special status species, but development could

Table 2-24. Impacts Summary Table

Summarized Impacts on:	No Action Alternative	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative E	PROPOSED RMP
	deterioration that could cause population function to decline over time, which could become significant as development and recreation uses increased. Existing area protections would continue to indirectly maintain or improve special status species habitat by placing restrictions on surface disturbance.	effects on special status species, but allowing for more development could lead to long-term habitat deterioration, which could become significant as development increased. Decreasing area protections associated with oil and gas leasing and development would reduce areas that restrict surface disturbance.	surface disturbance would minimize effects on special status species. More area protections associated with oil and gas leasing and development could indirectly maintain or improve special status species habitat by placing restrictions on surface disturbance.	surface disturbance would minimize effects on special status species. More area protections associated with oil and gas leasing and development could indirectly maintain or improve special status species habitat by placing restrictions on surface disturbance.	associated with oil and gas leasing and development could indirectly maintain or improve special status species habitat by placing restrictions on surface disturbance.	lead to long-term habitat deterioration, which could become significant as development increased. More area protections could indirectly maintain or improve special status species habitat by placing restrictions on surface disturbance.
	Habitat management actions would not yield as many benefits to special status species as might be necessary to offset the effects of increasing recreation and permitted activity, and could result in deteriorated ecological health and condition of necessary habitat components for special status species.	Habitat management actions would be more aggressive, which would expedite improved ecological health and rangeland condition for special status species; however, they would also create more habitat disturbances within a short time frame which could remove some habitat components preferred by some species.	Habitat management actions would be limited to existing treatments and additional treatments as needed, which would move vegetation communities toward improved ecological health and rangeland condition and limit habitat disturbances from treatments.	Habitat management actions would be limited to natural processes, which would allow vegetation communities that were influenced by human activities to become unhealthy as invasive species and overgrowth dominated the landscape. This would remove vital habitat components necessary for special status species and thereby significantly affect their survivability.		Habitat management actions would be limited to existing treatments and additional treatments as needed, which would move vegetation communities toward improved ecological health and rangeland condition and limit habitat disturbances from treatments.
	Implementing BMPs and conservation measures developed through consultation to specific projects would minimize potential adverse impacts to listed or non-listed special status plant and animal species and their habitats. Conducting surveys, inventories, and monitoring					

Table 2-24. Impacts Summary Table

Summarized Impacts on:	No Action Alternative	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative E	PROPOSED RMP
	studies prior to authorizing a given action would assist in identifying areas to be avoided or managed.					
Fish and Wildlife	Impacts on fish and wildlife would occur as a result of activities that increase human presence in crucial- or high-value habitats such as dispersed recreation, mineral development, and OHV use. These activities would mostly lead to short-term displacement of animals; however, depending on the timing and location of activities, long-term displacement could occur.	Impacts would be the same as those identified for the No Action Alternative except more restrictions on OHV and recreation use, including not allowing cross-country OHV use, would minimize effects on fish and wildlife. Allowing for the most development with only standard terms and conditions on leases would lead to increased human presence and animal displacement.	Impacts would be the same as those identified for the No Action Alternative except more restrictions on OHV and recreation use and a decrease surface disturbance would minimize effects on fish and wildlife.	Impacts would be the same as those identified for the No Action Alternative except more restrictions on OHV and recreation use and surface disturbance would minimize effects on fish and wildlife.	Impacts would be the same as those identified for the No Action Alternative except more restrictions on OHV and recreation use and the least surface disturbance would minimize effects on fish and wildlife.	Impacts would be the same as those identified for the No Action Alternative except more restrictions on OHV and recreation use would minimize effects on fish and wildlife. Allowing for more development with only standard terms and conditions on leases would lead to increased human presence and animal displacement.

Table 2-24. Impacts Summary Table

Summarized Impacts on:	No Action Alternative	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative E	PROPOSED RMP
	Changes in fish and wildlife habitat condition would occur as a result of activities that disturb and remove vegetation. These activities would alter the composition and structure of vegetation communities, increase the potential for the introduction and establishment of noxious weeds, and reduce vegetation cover and species diversity.	Decreasing protection of areas would reduce areas that restrict surface disturbance, leading to degradation of habitat conditions and habitat loss. Aggressive implementation of vegetation treatments would provide for more intensive reclamation of vegetation communities and therefore wildlife habitat; however, more short-term loss of habitat would be experienced. Adjusting forage for livestock grazing could result in decreased forage available for wildlife.	More area protections could indirectly maintain or improve fish and wildlife habitat by placing restrictions on surface disturbance. Implementation of additional vegetation treatments and increased land use restrictions related to the management of wildlife and ACECs would help to further mitigate effects. Adjusting forage among livestock, wild horses and burros, and wildlife could affect available forage for wildlife.	More area protections could indirectly maintain or improve fish and wildlife habitat by placing restrictions on surface disturbance. Increased land use restrictions related to the management of wildlife and ACECs would help to further mitigate effects. However, limiting vegetation treatments to natural processes would result in less intensive reclamation of vegetation communities.	Alternative E has the most protections that could indirectly maintain or improve fish and wildlife habitat by placing restrictions on surface disturbance. Increased land use restrictions related to the management of wildlife, ACECs, and Non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics would help to further mitigate effects. However, limiting vegetation treatments to natural processes would result in less intensive reclamation of vegetation communities.	More area protections could indirectly maintain or improve fish and wildlife habitat by placing restrictions on surface disturbance. Implementation of additional vegetation treatments and increased land use restrictions related to the management of wildlife and ACECs would help to further mitigate effects.
Wild Horses and Burros	Wild horses in the Robbers Roost HMA would require frequent introductions of wild horses from other HMAs to ensure genetic viability. The small population numbers combined with the need to introduce horses	As a result of the removal of wild horses from the HMAs, only the wild burro herd in 99,210 acres within the Sinbad HMA would be affected by development or human impacts noted under the No Action Alternative.	The wild horse and burro populations would be managed within the designated HMAs to support genetically viable populations. Mineral development and other human intrusions would be the same as noted	The wild horse and burro populations would be managed within the designated HMAs to support genetically viable populations. Mineral development and other human intrusions would be the same as noted for the No Action Alternative except there would be a decrease in disturbances from development compared with the other alternatives. However, there could be an increase in disturbances associated with dispersed recreation. Beyond the areas of high recreation use, the free-roaming nature		The wild horse and burro populations would be managed within the designated HMAs to support genetically viable populations. Mineral development and other human intrusions would be the same as noted for the No Action

Table 2-24. Impacts Summary Table

Summarized Impacts on:	No Action Alternative	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative E	PROPOSED RMP
	regularly would increase the gather cycle for the Robbers Roost HMA. The wild horse AMLs and herd interactions in the other HMAs would provide for genetically viable populations. Mineral development and other human intrusions would increase the short-term displacement of wild horses from preferred foraging areas; increase the loss of wild, free-roaming nature; and potentially increase the stress resulting from vehicular traffic, noise, and human presence.		for the No Action Alternative except there would be a decrease in disturbances from development and an increase in disturbances associated with dispersed recreation.	of the wild horses and burros would continue.		Alternative except there could be an increase in disturbances from development and continued increases in dispersed recreation. Operational and maintenance activities at the development sites would increase the frequency of short-term displacement if these activities occurred within areas used by wild horses and burros.
Fire and Fuels	Recreational activities, development of mineral resources, general use of the PFO, and other land management practices would introduce additional ignition sources into the PFO and alter the composition and structure of	Impacts would be the same as those identified for the No Action Alternative except aggressively implementing vegetation treatments would further decrease fuel loading and promote healthy vegetation communities that would generally fuel	Impacts would be the same as those identified for the No Action Alternative except implementing additional vegetation treatments would further decrease fuel loading and promote healthy vegetation communities that would generally fuel low-intensity fires.	Impacts would be the same as those identified for Alternative B except vegetation treatments would be limited to natural processes, which would reduce the degree of effect caused by vegetation treatments.		Impacts would be the same as those identified for Alternative B except reduced land use restrictions within ACECs would reduce the extent of fire suppression restrictions and increase the extent to which vegetation treatments could be

Table 2-24. Impacts Summary Table

Summarized Impacts on:	No Action Alternative	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative E	PROPOSED RMP
	vegetation communities in some areas. This would increase the probability of wildland fire occurrence and increase the potential for high-intensity wildland fires to occur. Efforts to enhance vegetation cover and wildlife habitat via vegetation treatments and surface disturbance restrictions would help to mitigate these effects.	low-intensity fires. Prohibiting cross-country OHV use would reduce the distribution of potential ignition sources and the level of vegetation removal and damage caused by OHV use. Anticipated increases in mineral development and recreation activities activity would introduce additional ignition sources into the PFO and thereby increase wildland fire frequency.	Prohibiting cross-country OHV use and decreasing the level of mineral development would also promote healthy vegetation communities and reduce the distribution of ignition sources.			used to reduce fuel loads and wildland fire intensity.
Non-WSA Lands With Wilderness Characteristics	Impacts would occur on the wilderness characteristics in areas where development activities, surface disturbance, and cross-country and limited OHV use would be allowed.	Increased surface disturbance and development activities would increase impacts on the wilderness characteristics of these areas compared with the No Action Alternative. Limiting all OHV use to designated routes would minimize impacts of this use; however, a large percentage of the non-WSA lands	Impacts would be reduced compared with the No Action Alternative and Alternative A because of restrictions on surface disturbance, development activities, and OHV use. However, impacts would still occur in areas where these activities occurred.	Impacts would be greatly reduced compared with the No Action Alternative and Alternative A because of increased restrictions on surface disturbance, development activities, and OHV use. However, minimal impacts would still occur in areas where these activities occurred.	This alternative provides protection to 937,440 acres of Non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics, which would protect, preserve, and maintain the naturalness and opportunities for solitude on 60 percent of the PFO.	Impacts would be reduced compared with the No Action Alternative and Alternative A because of restrictions on surface disturbance, development activities, and OHV use. However, impacts would still occur in areas where these activities occurred. This alternative would directly protect, preserve, and maintain wilderness characteristics on

Table 2-24. Impacts Summary Table

Summarized Impacts on:	No Action Alternative	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative E	PROPOSED RMP
		would have designated routes within them, resulting in long-term impacts.				97,100 acres.
RESOURCE USES						
Forest and Woodlands	Impacts on forest and woodland resources would occur as a result of activities that disturb and remove vegetation. These activities would alter the composition and structure of forest and woodland communities; increase the potential for the introduction and establishment of noxious weeds; and reduce vegetation cover, species diversity, primary production, and the recruitment of new understory plants. These effects would indirectly reduce opportunities for product harvest by reducing the productivity of these vegetation communities. The implementation of the BLM's	Impacts would be the same as those identified for the No Action Alternative except increased mineral development would increase the degree of impact on forest and woodland resources.	Impacts would be the same as those identified for the No Action Alternative except decreased mineral development would decrease the degree of impact on forest and woodland resources. Increased land use restrictions related to the management of wildlife and ACECs would help to further mitigate effects but could also limit forest and woodland product harvest in some areas.	Impacts would be the same as those identified for the No Action Alternative except decreased mineral development would decrease the degree of impact on forest and woodland resources. Increased land use restrictions related to the management of wildlife and ACECs would help to further mitigate effects but could also limit forest and woodland product harvest in some areas.	Impacts would be the same as those identified for the No Action Alternative except decreased mineral development would decrease the degree of impact on forest and woodland resources. Increased land use restrictions related to the management of wildlife, ACECs, and Non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics would help to further mitigate effects but could also limit forest and woodland product harvest.	Impacts would be the same as those identified for the No Action Alternative except increased mineral development would increase the degree of impact on forest and woodland resources. Increased land use restrictions related to the management of wildlife and ACECs, and non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics would help to further mitigate effects but could also limit forest and woodland product harvest in some areas.

Table 2-24. Impacts Summary Table

Summarized Impacts on:	No Action Alternative	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative E	PROPOSED RMP
	mitigation guidelines, BMPs, and restrictions on surface use would help to mitigate these effects by reducing impacts on forests and woodlands.					
Livestock Grazing	Development activities (Appendix M), other surface disturbing activities, recreational activities, and general human disturbance within the PFO would result in forage loss and degradation, noxious weed proliferation, and livestock displacement and injury. Vegetation treatments would generally help to offset forage losses by increasing forage production in treatment areas.	Impacts would be the same as those identified for the No Action Alternative except recreation use and mineral development (Appendix M) would be anticipated to increase, which would increase the degree of forage removal and disturbance to livestock. However, limiting all OHV use to designated routes would decrease these impacts. Additional vegetation treatments would be aggressively implemented, which would also help to offset these impacts.	Impacts would be the same as those identified for the No Action Alternative except mineral development would be anticipated to decrease (Appendix M), which would decrease the degree of forage removal and disturbance to livestock, as would limiting all OHV use to designated routes. Furthermore, additional vegetation treatments would be implemented, which could help to increase forage production in treatment areas. Continued increases in recreational activities could increase the impacts noted in the No Action Alternative.	Impacts would be the same as those identified for the No Action Alternative except mineral development would be anticipated to decrease (Appendix M), which would decrease the degree of forage removal and disturbance to livestock, as would limiting all OHV use to designated routes. Vegetation treatments would be limited to natural processes, which would result in a lower degree of increased forage production compared with the other alternatives. Continued increases in recreational activities could increase the impacts noted in the No Action Alternative.		Impacts would be the same as those identified for the No Action Alternative except recreation use and mineral development (Appendix M) would be anticipated to increase, which would increase the degree of forage removal and disturbance to livestock. However, limiting all OHV use to designated routes would decrease these impacts. Furthermore, additional vegetation treatments would be implemented, which could help to increase forage production in treatment areas.

Table 2-24. Impacts Summary Table

Summarized Impacts on:	No Action Alternative	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative E	PROPOSED RMP
Recreation	Activities that disturb the surface, alter vegetation composition, or allow for development of manmade structures on the landscape could reduce the quality of recreational experiences; displace recreation users to other, less developed areas; or eliminate some recreation opportunities. Increasing demands for motorized and non-motorized recreation, in conjunction with the reasonably foreseeable development (RFD) of mineral and energy, would result in impacts on social settings and managerial facilities in relation to recreation.	Impacts would be similar to the No Action Alternative except increases in mineral and energy development and vegetation treatments would result in increased impacts on recreational experiences.	Impacts would be similar to the No Action Alternative except stipulations from other resources would decrease the acres disturbed by development.	Impacts would be similar to Alternative B except more stipulations from other resources would further decrease the acres disturbed by development. In addition, fewer areas would be disturbed by vegetation treatments, resulting in less displacement of recreation users and maintenance of the existing recreation opportunities. This alternative would provide opportunities for primitive types of recreation but would not meet levels of demand that are in excess of capacity, which could lead to resource impacts and increased conflict between recreation users.	Impacts would be similar to Alternative B except more restrictions from Non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics would further decrease the acres disturbed by development. In addition, there would be fewer areas disturbed by vegetation treatments, resulting in less displacement of recreation users and maintenance of the existing recreation opportunities. Alternative E would provide the greatest opportunities for primitive types of recreation, but would not meet levels of demand that are in excess of capacity, which could lead to resource impacts and increased conflict between recreation users.	Impacts would be similar to the No Action Alternative except increases in development would result in increased impacts on recreational experiences. Restrictions on surface disturbing activities would reduce impacts on recreation and provide opportunities for motorized, developed, and primitive/ unconfined recreation opportunities.
	Managing recreation in four SRMAs would provide for focused recreation	Impacts would be the same as the No Action Alternative except more acres	Impacts would be the same as Alternative A except five areas would be	Impacts would be the same as Alternative B except five areas would be managed as SRMAs and more acres would receive		Managing recreation in six SRMAs would provide for focused recreation

Table 2-24. Impacts Summary Table

Summarized Impacts on:	No Action Alternative	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative E	PROPOSED RMP
	management, protect recreation opportunities and experiences, and connect similar geographic and recreational resources for the purposes of user, resource, and activity management and provision of visitor facilities.	would be managed as SRMAs. In addition, management of recreation activities using the ROS as a management tool within SRMAs would maintain and enhance recreation opportunities and experiences within the SRMAs.	managed as SRMAs and more acres would receive focused recreation management.	focused recreation management.		management, protect recreation opportunities and experiences, and connect similar geographic and recreational resources for the purposes of user, resource, and activity management and provision of visitor facilities. Management of recreation activities using the ROS as a management tool within SRMAs would maintain and enhance recreation opportunities and experiences within the SRMAs.
	Allowing cross-country OHV travel would provide opportunities for unrestricted cross-country OHV travel in approximately 30 percent of the open portion of the PFO. However, such use would also result in conflicts between motorized and non-motorized recreation users as well as between some motorized users. The recreation	Not designating an area as open to cross-country OHV use would preserve and enhance natural resources important to other forms of recreation, but it would also result in a loss of open OHV opportunities. Allowing small open OHV areas could accommodate local demand for confined OHV recreation. Allowing OHV use	Impacts would be the same as Alternative A except consideration of small open OHV areas could accommodate local demand for confined OHV recreation.	Impacts would be the same as Alternative A except not allowing the designation of any small areas open to cross-country OHV use would be unlikely to meet the demand for this recreational opportunity. In addition, reducing the miles of designated routes would reduce the opportunities for	Impacts would be the same as Alternative A except not allowing the designation of any small areas open to cross-country OHV and closing 60 percent of the PFO to OHV use would be unlikely to meet the demand for this recreational opportunity. In addition, reducing the miles of designated routes	Not designating an area as open to cross-country OHV use would preserve and enhance natural resources important to other forms of recreation, but it would also result in a loss of open OHV opportunities. Consideration of small open OHV areas could accommodate local demand for confined OHV recreation. Allowing OHV use on

Table 2-24. Impacts Summary Table

Summarized Impacts on:	No Action Alternative	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative E	PROPOSED RMP
	experiences for both user groups would be degraded.	on designated routes throughout most of the PFO would accommodate demand for the trail, based on the type of OHV recreation most suitable for the PFO terrain. Natural resources important to OHV recreation would be protected, and eliminating open OHV use would reduce resource damage and conflicts with other land uses.		trail-based type of OHV recreation.	would reduce the opportunities for trail-based type of OHV recreation	designated routes throughout most of the PFO would accommodate demand for the trail, based on the type of OHV recreation most suitable for the PFO terrain. Natural resources important to OHV recreation would be protected, and eliminating open OHV use would reduce resource damage and conflicts with other land uses.
Lands and Realty	Restrictions on surface disturbing activities for wildlife, VRM Class I and II, minerals and energy, ACECs, and eligible WSR segments could alter the areas where land tenure adjustments (LTA) occurred. Restrictions on surface disturbing activities could also reduce the areas where lands and realty actions would be considered.	Restrictions on surface disturbing activities for wildlife, VRM Class I and II, minerals and energy, and ACECs could alter the areas where LTAs occurred. Restrictions on surface disturbing activities could also reduce the areas where lands and realty actions would be considered.	Restrictions on surface disturbing activities for wildlife, cultural resources, VRM Class I and II, minerals and energy, ACECs, and suitable WSR segments could alter the areas where LTAs occurred. Restrictions on surface disturbing activities could also reduce the areas where lands and realty actions would be considered.	Restrictions on surface disturbing activities for wildlife, cultural resources, VRM Class I and II, minerals and energy, ACEC and WSR segments could alter the areas where LTAs occurred. In addition, Restrictions on surface disturbing activities could also reduce the areas where lands and realty actions would be considered.	Restrictions on surface disturbing activities because of non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics would alter the areas where LTAs occurred. These restrictions would also alter where ROWs could be approved thus limiting access.	Restrictions on surface disturbing activities for wildlife, cultural resources, non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics, VRM Class I and II, minerals and energy, and ACECs could alter the areas where LTAs occurred. Restrictions on surface disturbing activities could also reduce the areas where lands and realty actions would be considered.
Oil and Gas Resources	While 38 percent of the PFO would be open to oil and gas	While 73 percent of the PFO would be open to oil and gas	No areas with a high occurrence of oil and gas resources	No areas with a high occurrence of oil and gas resources	No areas with a high occurrence of oil and gas resources	While 47 percent of the PFO would be open to oil and gas

Table 2-24. Impacts Summary Table

Summarized Impacts on:	No Action Alternative	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative E	PROPOSED RMP
	leasing subject to the standard terms and conditions, approximately 64 percent of these acres have a high occurrence of oil and gas resources. Restrictions from other resources and uses would result in 36 percent of the PFO being open to leasing subject to minor constraints, 4 percent open to leasing subject to major constraints (NSO), and 22 percent unavailable to leasing. These restrictions and stipulations on oil and gas leasing would result in approximately 14 thousand barrels of oil and 710 million cubic feet of gas being in non-recoverable areas open to leasing subject to major constraints (NSO). In addition, approximately 3,275 thousand barrels of oil and 251,191 million cubic feet of gas would be in	leasing subject to the standard terms and conditions, approximately 73 percent of these acres have a high occurrence of oil and gas resources. Restrictions from other resources and uses would result in 1 percent of the PFO being open to leasing subject to minor constraints, 4 percent open to leasing subject to major constraints (NSO), and 22 percent unavailable to leasing. These restrictions and stipulations on oil and gas leasing would result in approximately 105 thousand barrels of oil and up to 1,043 million cubic feet of gas being in non-recoverable areas open to leasing subject to major constraints (NSO). In addition, approximately 3,274 thousand barrels of oil and 251,190 million cubic feet of gas would be in	would be open to leasing subject to the standard terms and conditions on the lease form. Restrictions from other resources and uses would result in 66 percent of the PFO being open to leasing subject to minor constraints, 12 percent open to leasing subject to major constraints (NSO), and 22 percent unavailable to leasing. These restrictions and stipulations on oil and gas leasing would result in approximately 291 thousand barrels of oil and 9,793 million cubic feet of gas being in non-recoverable areas open to leasing subject to major constraints (NSO). In addition, approximately 3,464 thousand barrels of oil and 260,093 million cubic feet of gas would be in areas unavailable to oil and gas leasing and not available for	would be open to leasing subject to the standard terms and conditions on the lease form. Restrictions from other resources and uses would result in 57 percent of the PFO being open to leasing subject to minor constraints, 20 percent open to leasing subject to major constraints (NSO), and 23 percent unavailable to leasing. These restrictions and stipulations on oil and gas leasing would result in approximately 1,012 thousand barrels of oil and 25,014 million cubic feet of gas being in non-recoverable areas open to leasing subject to major constraints (NSO). In addition, approximately 3,466 thousand barrels of oil and 272,497 million cubic feet of gas would be in areas unavailable to oil and gas leasing and not available for	would be open to leasing subject to the standard terms and conditions on the lease form. Restrictions from other resources and uses would result in 34 percent of the PFO being open to leasing subject to minor constraints, 6 percent open to leasing subject to major constraints (NSO), and 60 percent unavailable to leasing. These restrictions and stipulations on oil and gas leasing would result in approximately 247 thousand barrels of oil and 18,291 million cubic feet of gas being in non-recoverable areas open to leasing subject to major constraints (NSO). In addition, approximately 10,331 thousands of barrels of oil and 439,057 million cubic feet of gas would be in areas unavailable to oil and gas leasing and	leasing subject to the standard terms and conditions, approximately 73 percent of areas with a high occurrence of oil and gas resources would be open to leasing subject to the standard terms and conditions on the lease form. Restrictions from other resources and uses would result in 19 percent of the PFO being open to leasing subject to minor constraints, 11 percent open to leasing subject to major constraints (NSO), and 23 percent unavailable to leasing. These restrictions and stipulations on oil and gas leasing would result in approximately 218 thousand barrels of oil and 10,867 million cubic feet of gas being in non-recoverable areas open to leasing subject to major constraints (NSO). In addition, approximately 3,275 thousand barrels of oil and 250,369 million

Table 2-24. Impacts Summary Table

Summarized Impacts on:	No Action Alternative	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative E	PROPOSED RMP
	areas unavailable to oil and gas leasing and not available for development within the PFO.	areas unavailable to oil and gas leasing and not available for development within the PFO.	development within the PFO.	development within the PFO.	not available for development within the PFO.	cubic feet of gas would be in areas unavailable to oil and gas leasing and not available for development within the PFO.
Locatable Minerals	Approximately 427,100 acres would be withdrawn or recommended for withdrawal from locatable mineral entry, which could preclude locatable mineral development in these areas. However, the majority of the areas with high potential for locatable mineral development would be open for entry of locatable minerals.	Areas withdrawn or recommended for withdrawal would decrease by 10,700 acres compared with the No Action Alternative. However, the majority of the areas with high potential for locatable mineral development would be open for entry of locatable minerals.	Areas withdrawn or recommended for withdrawal would decrease by 10,700 acres compared with the No Action Alternative. However, the majority of the areas with high potential for locatable mineral development would be open for entry of locatable minerals.	Areas withdrawn or recommended for withdrawal would increase by 68,700 acres compared with the No Action Alternative, which would further preclude locatable mineral development in these areas. However, the majority of the areas with high potential for locatable mineral development would be open for entry of locatable minerals.	Areas withdrawn or recommended for withdrawal would increase by 105,800 acres compared with the No Action Alternative, which would further preclude locatable mineral development in these areas. However, the majority of the areas with high potential for locatable mineral development would be open for entry of locatable minerals.	Areas withdrawn or recommended for withdrawal would decrease by 5,800 acres compared with the No Action Alternative. However, the majority of the areas with high potential for locatable mineral development would be open for entry of locatable minerals.
Mineral Materials	Approximately 653,000 acres would be closed to mineral materials disposal, which would limit the areas available for mineral materials disposal. However, the majority of the areas with high potential for mineral material development would be open for	Disposal of mineral materials would not be allowed on 42,000 acres fewer than under the No Action Alternative. The majority of the areas with high potential for mineral material development would be open for development of	Disposal of mineral materials would not be allowed on 120,000 acres more than under the No Action Alternative. However, the majority of the areas with high potential for mineral material development would be open for development of	Disposal of mineral materials would not be allowed on 210,000 acres more than under the No Action Alternative. However, the majority of the areas with high potential for mineral material development would be open for development of	Disposal of mineral materials would not be allowed on 1,487,400 acres of the PFO. This could limit the availability of sand, gravel, rock, and clay.	Disposal of mineral materials would not be allowed on 167,000 acres more than under the No Action Alternative. However, the majority of the areas with high potential for mineral material development would be open for development of mineral materials.

Table 2-24. Impacts Summary Table

Summarized Impacts on:	No Action Alternative	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative E	PROPOSED RMP
	development of mineral materials.	mineral materials.	mineral materials.	mineral materials.		
SPECIAL DESIGNATIONS						
Wilderness Study Areas	Short-term impacts on wilderness characteristics within WSAs could occur as a result of OHV use along the four designated routes in the southern portion of the Sids Mountain WSA. In the long term, adaptive management and mitigative action would ensure there would be no impact on wilderness characteristics in this area because the routes are open on the condition that they meet the non-impairment standard.					
	Managing WSAs as VRM I would provide additional protections for maintaining the wilderness characteristics of the areas by reducing opportunities for impacts on the areas' natural character and increasing opportunities for solitude and primitive recreation.					
Areas of Critical Environmental Concern	Management associated with seven of the existing ACECs would protect the associated relevant and important values. Management in the remaining six existing ACECs is insufficient in some manner to fully protect the relevant and important values. Relevant and important values in four of the potential ACECs would be protected because of management associated with other resource decisions in this alternative, including the presence of a WSA and its associated management. Relevant and	Management associated with six potential ACECs would protect the associated relevant and important values. Relevant and important values in two of the potential ACECs would be protected because of management resulting from other resource decisions in this alternative. Relevant and important values in the remaining 18 potential ACECs could be irreparably damaged because of the lack of protective management.	Management associated with 12 potential ACECs would protect the associated relevant and important values. Relevant and important values in three of the potential ACECs would be protected because of management resulting from other resource decisions in this alternative, including the presence of a WSA and its associated management. Relevant and important values in the remaining 11 potential ACECs could be irreparably damaged because of the lack of protective management.	All relevant and important values would be protected through special management associated with designated ACECs.	All relevant and important values would be protected through special management associated with designated ACECs. In addition, non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics would provide for greater restrictions than ACECs thus providing for even less surface disturbance and greater protection.	Management associated with 13 designated ACECs (including 3 existing ACECs which would be combined into the Heritage Sites ACEC) would protect the associated relevant and important values. Relevant and important values in 10 of the potential ACECs would be protected because of management associated with other resource decisions in this alternative, including the presence of a WSA and its associated management.

Table 2-24. Impacts Summary Table

Summarized Impacts on:	No Action Alternative	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative E	PROPOSED RMP
	important values in the remaining nine potential ACECs could be irreparably damaged.					
Wild and Scenic Rivers	All eligible river segments identified under this alternative would be affected by actions associated with WSR management policy, resulting in the protection of their outstandingly remarkable values, free-flowing nature, and tentative classification. There could be impacts on tentative classifications and outstandingly remarkable values on 53 miles of rivers open to cross-country OHV use. Indirect protection of eligible rivers and their outstandingly remarkable values would be provided because of management associated with other resources and designations such as ACECs, WSAs, and SRMAs.	Because no rivers would be identified as suitable, the BLM would not provide direct protections to the river segments' outstandingly remarkable values or tentative classification. Protections afforded these values would occur indirectly from management actions associated with other resources. Examples of such indirect protections could include management associated with ACECs, WSAs, or various forms of restrictions placed on surface disturbance activities associated with resource management. Because no direct protections would be afforded to eligible river segments, there is a potential	Indirect protection of suitable river segments and their outstandingly remarkable values would be provided because of management associated with other resources and designations such as ACECs, WSAs, and SRMAs. There would be more protection provided in this alternative because of increased acres of ACECs and SRMAs. In addition, management of suitable wild segments as VRM Class I and suitable scenic segments as VRM Class II would restrict visually obtrusive activities or provide mitigation for such activities that could affect the segments' classifications or outstandingly remarkable values.	Same as Alternative B except there would be more indirect protections provided to suitable river segments because of increased acres of ACECs and SRMAs and management associated with other resources, reducing the acres that would be disturbed from mineral development.	Same as Alternative B except there would be more indirect protections provided to suitable river segments because non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics restrictions would, reduce the acres disturbed from surface activities.	The majority of suitable rivers would be located within WSAs and SRMAs. Applying ROS Class management prescriptions in SRMAs would provide indirect protection to suitable segments in SRMAs with a large percentage of Primitive and Semi-Primitive Non-Motorized areas. In addition, management of suitable wild segments as VRM Class I and suitable scenic segments as VRM Class II would restrict visually obtrusive activities or provide mitigation for surface disturbing activities that could affect the segments' classifications or outstandingly remarkable values. Applying non-WSA management prescriptions would

Table 2-24. Impacts Summary Table

Summarized Impacts on:	No Action Alternative	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative E	PROPOSED RMP
		that impacts could occur on the outstandingly remarkable values (impacts on each value are presented under their respective resources) and tentative classification that could be severe enough to preclude them from any future opportunities for WSR consideration.	Applying ROS Class management prescriptions in SRMAs would further protect suitable segments in SRMAs with a large percentage of Primitive and Semi-Primitive Non-Motorized areas. No suitable rivers would be located in OHV open areas.			indirectly protect suitable segments by reducing the acres disturbed from surface activities. No suitable rivers would be located in OHV open areas.
SUPPORT						
Transportation	Buffer zones to protect water quality and managing 271 miles of river segments as eligible for Wild designation could restrict new locations or maintenance of transportation systems. Managing 40 percent of the PFO to meet VRM Class I and II objectives could restrict the location of new transportation systems. Roads associated with the 1,540 well pads could increase	Buffer zones to protect water quality could restrict new locations or maintenance of transportation systems. Managing 30 percent of the PFO to meet VRM Class I and II objectives and 17 percent as Primitive or Semi-Primitive Non-Motorized ROS classes could restrict the location of new transportation systems. Roads associated with the 1,900 well	Buffer zones to protect water quality could restrict new locations or maintenance of transportation systems. Managing 38 percent of the PFO to meet VRM Class I and II objectives and 23 percent as Primitive or Semi-Primitive Non-Motorized ROS classes could restrict the location of new transportation systems. Roads associated with the 1,400 well	Buffer zones to protect water quality along all perennial streams and intermittent streams could restrict new locations or maintenance of transportation systems. Managing 47 percent of the PFO to meet VRM Class I and II objectives and 26 percent as Primitive or Semi-Primitive Non-Motorized ROS classes could restrict the location of new transportation systems.	Buffer zones to protect water quality along all perennial streams and intermittent streams could restrict new locations or maintenance of transportation systems. Managing 67 percent of the PFO to meet VRM Class I and II objectives to protection wilderness characteristics could restrict the location of new transportation systems. Roads associated	Buffer zones to protect water quality, flood plains, and public water reserves could restrict new locations or maintenance of transportation systems. Managing 38 percent of the PFO to meet VRM Class I and II objectives and 20 percent as Primitive or Semi-Primitive Non-Motorized ROS classes could restrict the location of new transportation systems. Roads associated with the 1,900 well pads could increase the transportation system

Table 2-24. Impacts Summary Table

Summarized Impacts on:	No Action Alternative	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative E	PROPOSED RMP
	the transportation system network and maintenance.	pads could increase the transportation system network and maintenance.	pads could increase the transportation system network and maintenance.	Roads associated with the 1,100 well pads could increase the transportation system network and maintenance.	with the 950 well pads could increase the transportation system network and maintenance.	network and maintenance.
Hazardous Material and Waste	No impacts on hazardous material and waste as a result of management of other resources, resource uses, or support programs would occur under any alternative because of strict federal regulation of management of hazardous materials, substances, and waste; PFO and national contingency plans; BLM policy on hazardous waste disposal; and continued coordination with federal and State partners regarding hazardous materials and waste issues.					
Impacts on Social and Economic Conditions	The total economic impacts from coal mining, oil and gas drilling and production, and livestock grazing from activities directly attributable to decision area lands were estimated using IMPLAN, available data, and assumptions based on professional judgment. Employment and income generated by activities associated with the BLM lands in this Proposed RMP/Final EIS are a small percentage of total employment and personal income in the two-county socioeconomic study area. For coal mining, the economic impacts would be common to all alternatives. Coal mining would provide an average of 984 direct jobs and 906 indirect jobs, and $102,716,986 in direct and $27,577,664 indirect income per year. Continued development of coal is expected to provide significant tax revenues to the State of Utah and local government entities. For oil and gas drilling and oil and gas production, the economic impacts vary by alternative based on number of wells drilled, drilling and completion expenses, and operating expenses per year. For oil and gas drilling and production, quantitative comparison of economic impacts is provided in chapter 4 by alternative. Variations in tax revenue receipts are discussed qualitatively, as are potential impacts on population. In the case of livestock grazing, the alternatives include differences in the number of AUMs allocated to livestock. However, the resulting differences in the value of production, when run through the IMPLAN model, produced differences for employment of five jobs and differences in labor income of only $12,000 dollars for both current active AUMs and total permitted AUMs—in both cases within the margin of error of any economic model and within the rounding margin for reporting of results. Livestock production from the decision area for total permitted AUMs would provide 46 and 56 direct and indirect jobs, respectively, and $25,700 and $220,700 in direct and indirect income. For some resources, quantification of economic impacts was not possible. The lack of quantifiable differences in economic impacts does not mean that differences would not occur. Some differences are simply not quantifiable given the available data. The following sectors are likely to have economic impacts, but quantification of the impacts was *not* possible: locatable minerals (specifically gypsum); other minerals (specifically, humate and CO2); lands and realty (e.g., ROWs, disposals); recreation; transportation (OHV use), vegetation, and forestry and woodlands products. In particular, recreational activities (including OHV-based recreation) generate substantial employment and income. For these sectors, qualitative description of economic impacts is provided in chapter 4 if there are any economically discernable differences in the alternatives.					
	The No Action Alternative would continue current management practices. The No Action Alternative	Alternative A gives priority to energy development over other uses and resource considerations. Oil	Alternative B seeks to provide a balanced approach to resource management. Oil and gas drilling	Alternative C would allow for resource uses for economic benefits while increasing protection of natural values. Oil	Alternative E would allow for resource uses for economic benefits while maximizing protection of natural	The Proposed RMP would maximize resource uses for economic benefits in areas with the greatest potential for energy

Table 2-24. Impacts Summary Table

Summarized Impacts on:	No Action Alternative	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative E	PROPOSED RMP
	would allow oil and gas development to occur as expected under the RFD. Oil and gas drilling would generate 426 direct jobs and 684 indirect/ induced jobs, and $40,658,000 in direct and $24,630,000 indirect/induced income per year. Oil and gas production would generate 37 total jobs and $2,261,000 in total revenue per year. Continued development of natural gas is expected to provide significant tax revenues to the State of Utah and local government entities. Oil and gas development could result in increased population and increased demands on community services. However, local communities appear to have excess infrastructure capacity available to absorb this demand. The No Action	and gas drilling would generate 510 direct jobs and 819 indirect/ induced jobs, and $48,671,000 in direct and $29,483,000 indirect/induced income per year. Oil and gas production would generate 46 total jobs and $2,771,000 in total revenue per year. Additionally, development of natural gas is expected to provide slightly increased tax revenues to the State of Utah and local government entities, compared to the No Action Alternative. Population increases could be slightly higher. Existing conflicts between conservation-minded individuals and groups and the pro-development community are expected to rise with the increases expected in gas development. In	would generate 320 direct jobs and 513 indirect/ induced jobs, and $30,510,000 in direct and $18,482,000 indirect/induced income per year. Oil and gas production would generate 33 total jobs and $2,005,000 in total revenue per year. Additionally, development of natural gas is expected to provide slightly decreased tax revenues to the State of Utah and local government entities, compared to the No Action Alternative. Existing conditions and social trends would generally remain the same. Conflicts between conservation-minded individuals and groups and the pro-development community are expected to decline with decreases in gas development. In addition, conflicts between certain	and gas drilling would generate 222 direct jobs and 356 indirect/ induced jobs, and $21,178,000 in direct and $12,829,000 indirect/induced income per year. Oil and gas production would generate 26 total jobs and $1,557,000 in total revenue per year. Additionally, development of natural gas is expected to provide decreased tax revenues to the State of Utah and local government entities, compared to the No Action Alternative. Alternative C could have some adverse impacts on individuals and groups who favor resource development over preservation. Alternative C would somewhat favor persons and groups interested in non-motorized recreation and preservation of	values, with 60% of the study area unavailable for oil and gas leasing and 937,440 acres of non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics. Oil and gas drilling would generate 157 direct jobs and 251 indirect/ induced jobs, and $14,941,000 in direct and $9,051,000 indirect/induced income per year. Oil and gas production would generate 22 total jobs and $1,328,000 in total revenue per year. Additionally, Alternative E would result in the greatest decrease in tax revenues from gas development to the State of Utah and local government entities, compared to the No Action Alternative. Alternative E would have more pronounced adverse social impacts on individuals and groups who favor	development while targeting recreation management providing some protection of natural values including 97,100 acres of non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics. Oil and gas drilling and production and associated tax revenues and population increases from these activities would be the same as Alternative A. The Proposed RMP would have some adverse impacts on individuals and groups who favor preservation over resource development. The Proposed RMP would be preferred by individuals and groups interested in natural resource development and motorized recreation and less favored by those with preferences for less development and use of public lands, although it would still provide important protections for the local environment and

Table 2-24. Impacts Summary Table

Summarized Impacts on:	No Action Alternative	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative E	PROPOSED RMP
	Alternative continues most current land management policies and practices, which would be welcomed by some users in and beyond the socioeconomic study area but found less desirable by many others, who see a variety of adverse impacts and foregone opportunities under current management. Specifically, the cross-country OHV use throughout 743,000 acres would continue to provide opportunities for motorized recreation while resulting in increased user conflicts between those interested in motorized recreation and those interested in preservation and non-motorized recreation. It is likely that given current trends, conflicts between these and other resource users would increase.	addition, conflicts between certain types of recreationists (motorized and non-motorized) and livestock grazing are expected to continue. Alternative A's closure of almost all land to cross-country OHV use would produce some impacts on local custom and culture such as some motorized recreation users of BLM lands could be restricted. At the same time, managing 3,210 miles of designated OHV routes and provision of increased facilities and other improvements would improve the recreational experience for many motorized recreation users and would reduce some conflicts with non-motorized users.	types of recreationists (motorized and non-motorized) and livestock grazing are expected to decline in some areas. Alternative B would include land treatments to increase livestock forage availability, which would be welcomed by livestock grazing interests.	habitat, ecosystem, visual, and similar values of natural landscapes. However, opportunities for oil and gas development, motorized recreation, and other more traditional uses of BLM lands would still exist.	resource development over preservation. Alternative E would most favor persons and groups interested in non-motorized recreation and preservation of habitat, ecosystem, visual, and similar values of natural landscapes. However, opportunities for oil and gas development, motorized recreation, and other more traditional uses of BLM lands would still exist.	opportunities for non-motorized recreation.

This page intentionally left blank.