

APPENDIX Q—DETAILED CHANGES FROM THE DRAFT RMP/EIS TO THE PROPOSED RMP/FINAL EIS

Preface: This was added to the beginning of Volume 1 to give a brief overview of each of the volumes and Chapters. This is similar to what was in Section 1.9 of the Draft RMP/EIS.

Executive Summary: The Executive Summary (ES) has been expanded to include a more thorough discussion of the Proposed RMP. This is not significant because it is a summary of the information found in the rest of the Proposed RMP/Final EIS.

Chapter 1: The chapter has been reorganized to improve the flow of information and to improve the readability of the chapter. Section 1.9 of the Draft RMP/EIS was moved to the Preface.

Chapter 1, Section 1.1: The Background Section has been expanded to include a summary of the public involvement process including comments on the Draft RMP/EIS and the Supplements.

Chapter 1, Section 1.6: The “Issues Addressed Through Policy or Administrative Actions” and “Issues Eliminated from Detailed Analysis because they are Beyond the Scope of the RMP” have been added. These two sections discuss why the BLM dismissed some issues raised by the public during scoping and did not consider them in the Draft RMP/EIS.

Chapter 1; Section 1.7: Added clarifying paragraphs discussing the relationship of the Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS) to support a commercial oil shale and tar sands leasing program and this land use planning effort. Also that all decisions related to land use planning decisions in the Price RMP for oil shale and tar sands will be made by the ongoing PEIS for Oil Shale and Tar Sands and are not being made as part of the land use planning process.

Chapter 1; Section 1.7: Added clarifying language discussing the relationship of the Programmatic EIS for the West-wide energy corridors and this land use planning effort. The corridors in the Proposed RMP are consistent with the Programmatic EIS and only minor adjustments were made in the corridors from the Draft RMP/EIS and these adjustments were a result of public comments to align with existing ROWs.

Chapter 1; Section 1.7: Added to Table 1-2 a section on vegetation management. This section makes reference to the Final Programmatic EIS (2007) on vegetation treatments in 17 Western States. This EIS was finalized after release of the Draft RMP/EIS and was added to clarify how vegetation treatments would be handled by the BLM.

Chapter 1; Section 1.6: RS 2477 clarifying language has been added in response to public comment and in compliance with BLM IM UT 2007-023. The language specifies that this land use planning effort is not the venue to resolve RS 2477 assertions. This expands the language that was contained in the Draft RMP/EIS.

Chapter 1; Section 1.6: The discussion of planning issues as identified through scoping and public meetings was shortened and summarized. This section now gives a general overview of the issues rather than a more detailed discussion.

Chapter 1; Section 1.4: The section has been restructured and a summary of the nine-step BLM planning process added.

Chapter 1, Section 1.8: This section has been added which summarizes the changes that have taken place between the Draft RMP/EIS and the Proposed RMP/Final EIS.

Chapter 2: The chapter was restructured to improve readability and goals and objectives were clarified and refined.

Chapter 2; Section 2.1: The Proposed RMP/Final EIS does not carry forward Alternative D (the 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, Alternative C from the supplement on ACECs that was issued for public comment on June 2006, and Alternative E from the Supplement that was issued in September 2007 on non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics.

Chapter 2; Section 2.2: The section has been expanded and restructured to include a more detailed summary of all of the Alternatives. Alternative E has been added from the non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics supplement (2007). This is a summary of the decisions contained in Section 2.3.

Chapter 2; Section 2.2.7: This new section has been added which discusses “Alternatives and Management Options Considered but Eliminated from Detailed Analysis”. This addition details why the BLM is not carrying forward for analysis specific alternatives or options that were proposed during public comment on the Draft RMP/EIS.

Chapter 2; Section 2.3: Each of the Tables in this section has been revised to clearly identify what is a goal and what is an objective, which was not clear in the Draft RMP/EIS. In some instances the Draft included only goals or objectives, in these instances the objective or goal has been added. This provides for a comprehensive understanding of the goals and objectives of this land use planning effort.

Chapter 2; Section 2.3: The “Management Guidance Common to All Alternatives in each table has been updated in the Proposed RMP/Final EIS to improve readability and understanding. Some common to all alternatives from the Draft RMP/EIS have been moved to the decisions part of the tables because they truly were not common to all actions (e.g., sage-grouse). Language added to Forest and Woodlands related to maintaining and restoring old-growth stands to a pre-fire condition.

Chapter 2; Section 2.3: The goals and objectives (Section 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, and 2.4) and common to all actions (Sections 2.7, 2.8, 2.9, and 2.10) from the Draft RMP/EIS Chapter 2 have been removed in the Proposed RMP/Final EIS. They have been removed because they are a duplication of information provided in Chapter 2, Section 2.16 Alternatives Tables. By removing these sections the reader is better able to understand what the range of alternatives is for each resource decision and it reduces redundancy.

Chapter 2, Section 2.3: Each of the resources has been separated into their own table in the Proposed RMP/Final EIS and not one big table as in the Draft RMP/EIS. This allows for the Table of Contents to have a specific reference to where each of the resource decisions can be found. Thus the reader is able to find the specific resource easier without searching the complete table.

Chapter 2; Table 2-2: The “High Country Watershed Stipulation” has been added, this stipulation was not in the Draft RMP/EIS but it is an existing oil/gas stipulation in the Price River MFP. This stipulation was added after consultation with both Carbon and Emery Counties and structured to be in agreement with the County codes for protection of their watershed. This is not considered significant because it is an existing stipulation and both counties have similar conditions.

Chapter 2; Table 2-6: The VRM maps for each alternative (maps 2-1 through 2-5 and 2-57) have been updated because of changes in management prescriptions or boundaries of ACECs, Wild and Scenic Rivers, SRMAs, and other resource decisions. This is not significant because the changes are within the range of alternatives provided in the Draft RMP/EIS.

Chapter 2, Table 2-7: A range of alternatives for the protection of the greater sage-grouse has been added to the Special Status Species section. For all alternatives except the Proposed RMP the prescriptions are those that were contained in Appendices 8 and 16 of the Draft RMP/EIS. The specific management prescriptions for the Proposed RMP are outside the range contained in the draft. These prescriptions were added because of public comment about protecting this species. These prescriptions were developed in consultation with the USFWS and the UDWR to protect the greater sage-grouse from possible listing under the Endangered Species Act. The additional restrictions on the greater sage-grouse habitat are minor because it would only apply to four leks, two of which are partially on private land, and a minimum amount of acreage would be affected.

Chapter 2; Table 2-8: The proposed adjustments to the predator control MOU have been deleted. The USDA- APHIS/Wildlife Service correctly identified that this is a statewide MOU and thus is not a specific land use planning decision for the Price Field Office. The Proposed RMP/Final EIS will not provide a range of alternatives for predator control, but will defer to the existing national and statewide MOUs, or their revisions, for direction in carrying out this program.

Chapter 2; Table 2-8: The Proposed RMP management of the Gray Canyon Wildland Management Area has been modified to allow for grazing of the Range Creek allotment. This is within the range of alternatives considered in the Draft RMP/EIS.

Chapter 2; Table 2-8: Both the Draft RMP/EIS and the Proposed RMP/Final EIS have specific management for the Gray Canyon Wildland Management Area. However, this area was never mapped and the prescriptions were not applied to the other resources. The area is now shown on Map 3-6 and the prescriptions have been included in the other resources as appropriate. This is not significant because the management prescriptions have always been present and this was simply a mapping error.

Chapter 2; Table 2-8: “Wildlife Habitat Areas” Alternative A has been clarified that no seasonal closures would be enforced related to oil/gas leasing. Map 2-28 Alternative A oil/gas leasing in the Draft RMP/EIS accurately depicted this but the language in the table was not clear. This has been rectified in the Proposed RMP/Final EIS by specifying that no seasonal closures for wildlife would be enforced.

Chapter 2, Table 2-8 and Map 3-12a: In August of 2005, the Utah Division of Wildlife Resources (UDWR) changed its wildlife habitat classification system. Prior to 2005, the UDWR classification system distinguished between “critical” habitat (an area that provides for biological and/or behavioral requisites necessary to sustain the existence and/or perpetuation of a wildlife population) and “high value” (an area that provides for intensive use by the species). The UDWR has been criticized for using the term “critical”, as the same term refers to habitat Federally designated by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service as required by the Endangered Species Act (ESA).

In previous BLM planning efforts, mitigation decisions (usually timing stipulations) for impacts to UDWR’s “critical” habitats have been integrated into the planning process. BLM rarely incorporated management decisions in its RMPs for “high value” habitats. UDWR changed its classification system to include “critical” habitat with “high value” habitat, in part to accommodate the limitations of having classifications that were of no practical value to land managers. The new term “*crucial*” habitat is defined by UDWR as “habitat on which the local population of a wildlife species depends for survival because there are no alternative ranges or habitats available. Crucial habitat is essential to the life-history

requirements of a wildlife species. Degradation or loss of crucial habitat will lead to significant declines in the wildlife population in question.”

Crucial habitat boundaries appear larger on the wildlife maps in this Proposed RMP because they are a combination of UDWR’s old “critical” habitat and “high value” habitat, with some minor modifications. Timing stipulations for each of the species now apply to the whole crucial habitat area. It is important to note however, that the application of waivers, exceptions and modifications, as outlined in Appendix G, will be taken into consideration and used where/when applicable for all surface disturbing activities in these areas. The range of alternatives in the Draft RMP/Draft EIS considered both of UDWR’s old classifications of critical and high value habitat. Minor boundary modifications have been made by UDWR prior to incorporating them into crucial habitat boundaries. Because this information was taken into consideration and analyzed in the Draft, these minor changes are not considered significant in terms of resource uses and/or analysis in this Proposed RMP, and therefore a supplement to this EIS is not necessary for this purpose.

Crucial big game habitat acreage was increased minimally, so no adjustments to the impacts analysis is required. Additionally, waiver, modification, exception criteria may be applied to applications for surface disturbing activities.

Chapter 2; Table 2.8: A reference to the Chapter 3 big game habitat maps has been added to the “wildlife habitat area” decisions to clarify that these maps were the ones used to develop the oil and gas restrictions. These maps were used in the Draft RMP/EIS and the Proposed RMP/EIS to develop the restriction on surface disturbing activities.

Chapter 2; Table 2-8: The range of alternatives for “reintroduction or introduction and augmentation of fish species into suitable fisheries habitat” in the Draft RMP/EIS has been combined with “reintroduction transplantation, augmentation or reestablishment of fish and wildlife species” in the Proposed RMP/Final EIS. In the Draft RMP/EIS, the language was nearly identical to that contained in the other decision. Thus the range of alternatives was deleted to eliminate potential confusion and there is no change in management prescriptions.

Chapter 2; Table 2-9: The appropriate management level (AML) for the Muddy Creek Wild Horse herd was increased from 100 to 125 horses under Alternatives C, E and Proposed RMP. This is outside the range of alternatives as presented in the Draft RMP/EIS. This change was made because in combining the Muddy Creek and Sinbad HMAs into one it was necessary to increase the AML slightly in order to maintain the genetic viability of the herd. This change in AML also resulted in a change in forage allocated to wild horses from 2,700 AUMs in the Draft RMP/EIS to 3,000 AUMs in the Proposed RMP/Final EIS. This formally allocated 300 pre-existing AUMs to the Muddy Creek HMA wild horse herd. No change to current conditions would occur, because they were already allocated. Therefore, no change was needed in the impact analysis.

Chapter 2; Table 2-10: Under the “desired wildland fire conditions” management decision, the Draft RMP/EIS used Vegetation Condition Class (CC) and the Proposed RMP/Final EIS uses Fire Regime Condition Class (FRCC). This is a name change only. The two are the same. Also in the Proposed RMP/Final EIS additional clarifying language has been added, however, the decision remains the same.

Chapter 2; Table 2-10: Six additional areas where wildland fires use would not be appropriate have been added. These areas are outside the range of alternatives in the Draft RMP/EIS. They have been added to preclude allowing fires in such sensitive areas as air quality Class I airsheds, sensitive cultural resources areas, and high value vegetative communities. This is not significant because the land use plan is formalizing a few additional areas where wildland fires would not be allowed.

Chapter 2; Table 2-11: Management of all or portions of 5 non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics and associated management prescriptions to protect, preserve and maintain their wilderness characteristics have been added to the Proposed RMP. This includes the associated Map 2-75. This is within the range of alternatives considered in the Draft RMP/EIS and Alternative E in the *Supplement to the PFO Draft RMP/EIS for Non-WSA Lands with Wilderness Characteristics*.

Chapter 2; Table 2-14: The Proposed RMP/Final EIS includes a new management option for the Range Creek grazing allotment. This was not specifically included in the Draft RMP/EIS; however, the information that has been included in the Proposed RMP/Final EIS is within the grazing management options for the Range Creek allotment that was included in the prescription for the management of the Gray Canyon Wildland Management Area.

Chapter 2; Table 2-14: The criteria for voluntary relinquishment and disposition of grazing permits or grazing preference contained in the Draft RMP/EIS have been replaced in the Proposed RMP/Final EIS with new language. The criteria gave the impression that grazing permits could be converted to other consumptive uses. This has been replaced in the Proposed RMP/Final EIS common to all section with specific language on how the BLM would approach a proposed voluntary relinquishment of a grazing permit consistent with BLM policy.

Chapter 2; Table 2-14: The grazing season of use for the Chimney Canyon/Hidden Splendor/Muddy and McKay Flat allotments was changed between the Draft RMP/EIS from Nov 1 through March 15 to Oct 16 to March 31 in the Proposed RMP/Final EIS. This season on adjustment has not reduced the AUMs nor has it changed the impact analysis.

Chapter 2; Table 2-14: The prescription for excluding grazing from the Price Canyon recreation site in the Draft RMP/EIS was expanded to include all recreation sites in the Proposed RMP/Final EIS. The range of alternatives is the same as that included in the Draft. However, the area that the management applies to was expanded because all recreation sites, not just Price Canyon, need to have grazing excluded from them.

Chapter 2; Table 2-14: The specific proposed management of the “Green River Allotment” in the Draft RMP/EIS was removed in the Proposed RMP/Final EIS because it was a duplication of the proposed management of the allotment as detailed in the “Desolation Canyon/Green River Corridor” in both the Draft RMP/EIS and the Proposed RMP/Final EIS.

Chapter 2; Table 2-15: The Desolation Canyon SRMA boundary for the Proposed RMP has been changed to match the no action alternative in the Draft RMP/EIS.

Chapter 2; Table 2-15: Specific recreation management direction for each SRMA was added to this table and Appendix K of the Proposed RMP/Final EIS. This includes direction for the following recreation management components: Market Strategy; Market Niche; Management Goals; Management Objectives; and Primary Activities, Experiences, and Benefits. This information was added because of additional BLM guidance in the revised planning handbook.

Chapter 2; Table 2-15: In the Draft RMP/EIS two SRMAs identified four high use zones. These zones have been renamed recreation management zones (RMZs) in the Proposed RMP/Final EIS. This is a name change only and the areas remain the same as does the management prescriptions.

Chapter 2; Table 2-15: The Draft RMP/EIS proposed to place restrictions on the use of motorized boating on the Green River through Desolation Canyon in the preferred alternative. Numerous comments

were received from the public objecting to these restrictions. The BLM has revised the Proposed RMP/Final EIS to replace these restrictions in the Alternative A from the Draft RMP/EIS.

Chapter 2; Table 2-15: The Range Creek area has been added as a SRMA and deleted as an ACEC in the Proposed RMP. The Range Creek area was part of the Desolation Canyon SRMA under Alternative C in the Draft RMP/EIS. Therefore, the Range Creek SRMA was within the range of alternatives considered in the Draft RMP/EIS. The prescriptions are slightly adjusted from those which were included in the ACEC in the Draft RMP/EIS under the preferred alternative. The major difference is identifying what is an RMP decision as opposed to what is an activity level decision.

Chapter 2; Table 2-15: The Draft RMP/EIS identified group sizes that needed to obtain a Special Recreation Permit within the San Rafael SRMA. These requirements have been eliminated from the Proposed RMP/Final EIS. The group size was the same for all alternatives and was a repeat of the regulations. Hence, this was not a land use planning decision, so the Proposed RMP/Final EIS was clarified by removing this apparent management decision.

Chapter 2; Table 2-15: Language has been added to the “Organized Groups” management decision in the Proposed RMP/Final EIS for all alternatives clarifying who might need a SRP. This clarifying language was added to all alternative because in the Draft they were the same. This language should address the confusion raised during public comment. The basic premise that groups larger than 25 might need a SPR still remains. Also Appendix J of the Proposed RMP/Final EIS was revised to add the following section, “When is an SRP for organized groups needed in the PFO?” This also should help remove confusion related to when SRPs are required.

Chapter 2; Table 2-15: The OHV route designation maps (Maps 2-71 through 2-74) in the Proposed RMP/Final EIS have changed from the Draft RMP/EIS maps. The San Rafael route designation (2003) has been included on the maps, in the Draft they were included by reference but were not mapped. Also, some BLM system and County roads were inadvertently designated as OHV routes. These routes have been deleted in the Proposed RMP/Final EIS.

Chapter 2; Table 2-15: The OHV route designation map in for the Proposed RMP has changed from the Draft RMP/EIS. Numerous comments from the public were received requesting that specific routes either be added or deleted from the Preferred Alternative route designation map. The BLM working with our Cooperating Agencies reviewed all information submitted from the public related to routes and using the criteria specified in the San Rafael Route Designation Plan of 2003 revised Map 2-74. The BLM has added 359 miles of routes to the Proposed RMP that were identified as part of the Alternative A route designation.

Chapter 2; Table 2-15: In the Proposed RMP/Final EIS, the specific acreage for each OHV category (i.e. open, closed, or limited to designated routes) has been added and the miles of routes designated. This information for presented in the Draft RMP/EIS on maps with references in the tables. However, the acreage and miles were not specifically included in the tables

Chapter 2; Table 2-15: All of the information in the Draft RMP/EIS under recreation related to National Scenic Back Country Byways, Scenic Byways, and Scenic Backways has been moved in the Proposed RMP/Final EIS to Special Designation. There is no change in management.

Chapter 2; Table 2-16: The areas identified as withdrawn or recommended for withdrawal from mineral entry was updated between the Draft RMP/EIS and the Proposed RMP/Final EIS. Specifically the oil shale withdrawal was included which was identified in the Mineral Section of the Draft but not the Lands and Realty Section. Also the proposed Three Rivers was approved by the Secretary of the Department of

the Interior. The withdrawal information was clarified to existing withdrawals and areas recommended for withdrawal.

Chapter 2; Table 2-16: The Utility Corridor and ROW exclusion and avoidance areas related to ACECs was revised. The Draft RMP/EIS did not specify which ACECs could preclude ROWs but referenced the prescriptions in the ACEC section. The Proposed RMP/Final EIS now specifies exactly which ACECs have exclusion and avoidance prescriptions.

Chapter 2; Table 2-17: The Draft RMP/EIS made reference to the Coal Report for Carbon and Emery Counties for those areas that would be available for further consideration for coal leasing. In the Proposed RMP/Final EIS Map 2-56 has been added which identify those areas available for further consideration for coal leasing. This map is the same as Appendix 25, Map 6 with the WSAs not available for further coal leasing. It has been added to clarify what specific areas are available for further consideration.

Chapter 2; Table 2-17: Oil and gas leasing decisions (i.e., open with standard terms and conditions, minor and major constraints, and unavailable) have been revised to be consistent with other resource decisions, such as ACECs, VRM class objectives, and non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics.

Chapter 2; Table 2-17: The Draft RMP/EIS for oil and gas leasing used the term “closed to leasing”. This term has been changed to “unavailable for leasing” in the Proposed RMP/Final EIS. This is a name change only.

Chapter 2; Table 2-17: The Draft RMP/EIS No Action Alternative did not correctly identify how many acres were unavailable or closed to leasing. The Draft noted that the WSAs were closed to leasing but the acres in the text and Map 2-27 did not properly reflect this closure. The Proposed RMP/Final EIS corrects this error and provides the correct number of acres closed or unavailable for the No Action Alternative and properly maps the area on Map 2-30.

Chapter 2; Table 2-17: The oil/gas reasonably foreseeable development (RFD) for the Proposed RMP was changed from the RFD in the preferred alternative of the Draft RMP/EIS to be the same as Alternative A in the Draft. The change is within the range of alternatives analyzed in the Draft.

Chapter 2; Table 2-17: The Draft RMP/EIS stated that WSAs were withdrawn for mineral entry (locatables). WSAs are not withdrawn from mineral entry by Law. This has been rectified in the Proposed RMP/Final EIS. The text has been changed to remove WSAs and Maps 2- 35 to 2-39 have also been corrected to show that WSAs are not withdrawn from mineral entry.

Chapter 2; Table 2-17: The areas identified as withdrawn or recommended for withdrawal from mineral entry was updated between the Draft RMP/EIS and the Proposed RMP/Final EIS. Specifically the oil shale withdrawal was included which was identified in the Mineral Section of the Draft but not in the “Locatable Mineral” Section. Also the Three Rivers Withdrawal has been finalized. Also additional changes were made in the Proposed RMP/Final EIS to correct inconsistencies between this section and the withdrawals portion of the Lands and Realty Section including a reference. Maps 2-35 to 2-39 have been update to reflect the change in text. The maps have also been changed to show which areas are existing withdrawals and which areas are recommended for withdrawal.

Chapter 2; Table 2-18: The Preferred Alternative in the Draft RMP/EIS contained specific decisions and analysis on how WSAs would be managed if released by Congress. This direction was that each WSA would become part of an existing SRMA and would be managed in that manner. In the Proposed RMP, if released by Congress, WSAs would be managed according to the prescriptions in the RMP, unless otherwise specified by Congress in that release. Any released lands would continue to be managed

consistent with the prescriptions identified in this plan unless and until the plan is amended, therefore, no separate analysis is required to address impacts to released lands. Decisions within WSAs are outside the purview of the land use planning process, except for VRM and OHV determinations. WSAs are managed under the IMP; therefore, the impact analysis has not changed.

Chapter 2, Table 2-18: Language has been added to WSA section clarifying that two areas which the BLM administratively endorsed as WSA in 1990 are managed as if they are WSAs in this document.

Chapter 2; Table 2-18: The WSA table has been augmented with a discussion of how many acres would be closed or limited to OHV use. This information was prepared from the Draft RMP/EIS maps. This is not new information but is a numeric presentation of the data contained on the maps in the Draft.

Chapter 2; Table 2-19: A number of public comments and comments from our Cooperating Agencies suggested that a brief summary of the Relevant and Important values be added to each ACEC to assist the reader in better understanding the reasons behind each ACEC. This information was not included in the Draft RMP/EIS. Therefore, in the Proposed RMP/Final EIS rationale language for each ACEC has been added. This is a short summary of the Relevant and Important values detailed in Appendix L and is not new information.

Chapter 2; Table 2-19: The Range Creek ACEC was dropped from the Proposed RMP because it was determined that the preferred method of protecting the Range Creek area was with a SRMA. The deletion of the Range Creek ACEC and the creation of the SRMA in the Proposed RMP were within the range of alternatives discussed in the Draft RMP/EIS. The purpose of the ACEC was to manage the Range Creek area in cooperation with the UDWR's management of their Range Creek Wildlife Management Area. The major purpose of the SRMA in cooperation with the UWDR is to control recreational access, which better fits with a SRMA instead of an ACEC.

Chapter 2; Table 2-19: In the Draft RMP/EIS the existing Sids Mountain ACEC was proposed to be retained in the Preferred Alternative, however, in the Proposed RMP/Final EIS this ACEC will be eliminated in the Proposed RMP because it was determined that the ACEC provides no additional protection over what is provided by the Sids Mountain WSA. This action is within the range of alternatives in the Draft RMP/EIS because this ACEC would have been eliminated under Alternative A. Therefore, the Proposed RMP/Final EIS does not provide for the continuation of the Sids Mountain ACEC in the Proposed RMP.

Chapter 2; Table 2-19: The boundaries for the Interstate 70, Rock Art, San Rafael Canyon, Nine Mile Canyon, Uranium Mining District, and Heritage Sites ACEC have been modified in the Proposed RMP/Final EIS from the boundaries contained in the Draft RMP/EIS. All boundary changes are within the range of alternative boundaries provided for in the Draft. The areas eliminated from the ACEC were adequately protected by other resource decisions. None of the changes will result in irreparable damage to any of the R&I values that exist within the ACEC.

Chapter 2; Table 2-19: The prescription for the Nine Mile Canyon ACEC in the Draft RMP/EIS included "open to disposal of mineral materials subject to special conditions". This was changed in the Proposed RMP/Final EIS deleting "subject to special conditions". This was deleted because in the Draft even though there was a reference to special conditions, no where were they defined. And without defining the special conditions the reference was meaningless. This change has resulted in no change in the management of the Nine Mile Canyon ACEC.

Chapter 2; Table 2-20: Public comment pointed out that the Draft RMP/EIS had no alternative which considered no river segments suitable under the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act. Also that this was contrary

to the BLM's policy. The Proposed RMP/Final EIS's Alternative A has been revised to consider no river segment suitable. This is outside the range of alternatives considered in the Draft but was included in order to comply with BLM policy and is therefore not considered significant. The three river segments in the Draft RMP/EIS Alternative A, along the Green River, are also carried forward and recommended as suitable in Alternatives B, C, E, and the Proposed RMP with more restrictive management prescriptions. Therefore, no management options for suitable river segments have been precluded.

Chapter 2; Table 2-20: The Proposed RMP/EIS includes a description of the special management that would apply to each of the segments. This special management section was not in the Draft RMP/EIS. However, the management identified in the section is drawn from other resources in the Draft. For example "wild" segments being managed as VRM Class I was identified in the Draft RMP/EISs VRM section. This special management has been presented here to assist the reader in understanding how the different river segments would be managed and there is no change in the management as identified in the Draft.

Chapter 2; Table 20: The river segments being proposed as suitable under the Proposed RMP has changed from what was presented in the preferred alternative in the Draft RMP/EIS. Two segments of the Green River through Desolation Canyon are being proposed with a tentative classification of "wild" instead of "scenic". These two segments were considered "wild" in Alternative C of the Draft and this change is within the range of alternatives presented in the Draft. The "recreational" segment of the Green River near the Town of Green River is being dropped from the Proposed RMP because a large percentage of the river is not BLM administered land but private land. Also the "scenic" segment of the San Rafael River is being dropped from the Proposed RMP. Both of these changes are within the range of alternatives in the Draft RMP/EIS.

Chapter 2; Table 2-21: The special management for the Old Spanish Trail was moved from the Recreation and Cultural Sections of the Draft RMP/EIS to this new section of National Historic Trails. The management identified is the same as that included in the Draft RMP/EIS for all alternatives but the Proposed RMP. In the Proposed RMP specific special management has been included for different segments of the Old Spanish Trail. This management was not included in the Draft RMP/EIS. This management was included as a result of public comment from a Cooperating Agency requesting specific goals/ objectives and management of the Old Spanish Trail. The management makes few changes but does consolidate the description into one location. This is not significant because it is a minor adjustment to the management identified in the Draft RMP/EIS.

Chapter 2; Section 2.4: The Summary of Impacts section was omitted from the Draft RMP/EIS. Several commentors pointed out that NEPA requires this section. Therefore, the BLM has added this section to the Proposed RMP/Final EIS in compliance with Section 1502.14 of NEPA. This new section is not a significant addition because it is a summary of the impacts in Chapter 4 and it not adding any new analysis to the Proposed RMP/Final EIS.

Chapter 3; Section 3.2.1: The Air Quality Section of the Draft RMP/EIS was expanded in the Proposed RMP/Final EIS. The Draft relied heavily on the *Air Quality Baseline and Analysis Report (BAH 2003)* and included just a very brief summary. The 2003 report was revised based on public comment and included air quality emission calculations for all alternatives (*Air Quality Baseline and Analysis Report (BAH 2008)*). To assist the reader better understand the air quality affected environment more information was presented in the Proposed RMP/Final EIS. The major additions are 1) National and Utah Ambient Air Quality Standards, 2) existing air quality data, and a discussion of Prevention of Significant Deterioration and Visibility.

Chapter 3; Section 3.2.1: In response to a Department of the Interior Secretarial Order the BLM has add to the Air Quality Section's affected environment in Chapter 3 a discussion of "Global Climate Change".

Chapter 3; Section 3.2.4: A more complete discussion of the cultural periods and current condition has been added to the Proposed RMP/EIS. This expanded discussion allows for a better discussion of the impacts that the various decisions will have on the cultural resources present in the PFO. This discussion also helps to put into proper perspective the cultural values of the PFO.

Chapter 3; Section 3.2.7: The discussion of Special Status Species in Chapter 3 of the Proposed RMP/Final EIS has been revised from the Draft RMP/EIS to clearly identify what species are federally listed as threatened, endangered, proposed, or candidate as opposed to those species that are BLM and/or State of Utah sensitive species. Also the information in the Draft RMP/EIS has been augmented with a short paragraph about each species. This provides a better base for understanding the impacts and assisted in the preparation of the Biological Assessment provided to the USFWS. Because of the petition and interest in greater sage-grouse for listing as a T&E species additional information of the occurrence of this species in the PFO has been included. Also the Bald Eagle has been delisted as a T&E species and is now only a sensitive species.

Chapter 3; Section 3.2.8: In order to fully comply with Executive Order 13186 related to migratory birds, the Proposed RMP/Final EIS has been augmented with information about migratory and non-migratory bird species that could occur in the PFO.

Chapter 3; Section 3.3.5: The description of the leasable minerals (coal and oil/gas) contained in the affected environment section of the Proposed RMP/Final EIS has been augmented with addition details that were in either the *Mineral Potential Report (2002)* or the *Coal Report* (Appendix 25 of the Draft RMP/EIS). This information was added to present a clear understanding of the coal and oil/gas resources present in the PFO.

Chapter 3; Section 3.3.5: The affected environment section has been augmented with a brief discussion of oil shale and tar sands that exist in the PFO. This information was extracted from the *Minerals Potential Report (2002)*.

Chapter 3; Section 3.4.2: The ACEC section of the Proposed RMP/Final EIS has been completely revised from what was presented in the Draft RMP/EIS. Information has been added about each of the potential ACECs explaining what relevant and important values are present in that ACEC. This is a summary of the information contained in Appendix L and is not new information. It has been included here to improve the readability of the chapter and to understand the importance of each potential ACEC.

Chapter 3; Section 3.6: Numerous public comments were received identifying that the Draft RMP/EIS did not contain any information related to the "social environment" of the PFO. The Proposed RMP/Final EIS has been modified to include a discussion of the four major social groups that could be affected by the Proposed RMP as required by the BLM Land Use Planning Handbook.

Chapter 4: Numerous public comments were received of the difficulty in reviewing the impacts as presented in the Draft RMP/EIS in a matrix format. The Proposed RMP/Final EIS has been revised to present the impact in narrative format and eliminate the matrix that was used in the Draft. The Draft RMP/EIS was written as the impacts of a specific resource on the other resources; where as the Proposed RMP/Final EIS is written from the perspective of the impacts of all decisions on a specific resource. This has not changed any of the analysis contained in the Draft but is simply a change in the organization of the chapter. The impacts section also presents for the first time analysis of the Proposed RMP.

Chapter 4: The analysis was updated to reflect changes that were made to the potential management decisions delineated in Chapter 2.

Chapter 4; Section 4.2.1: Public comments wanted a more detailed analysis than what was contained in the Draft RMP/EIS. The air quality section was upgraded by estimating the total air pollutant emissions for each alternative.

Chapter 4; Section 4.2.1: In response to a Department of the Interior Secretarial Order the BLM has add to the Air Quality Section a discussion of “Global Climate Change” impacts.

Chapter 4; Section 4.3.5: During the public comment period industry and the cooperator’s pointed out that the Draft RMP/EIS did not fully comply with the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (EPCA). Specifically the Draft did not discuss the impacts of limitations (resource stipulations) had on recovery of oil and gas resources. The Proposed RMP/Final EIS has been updated to include EPCA maps for each alternative. These maps display the potential drilling window after all limitations are taken into account including areas unavailable for leasing. Projections of the amount of oil and gas reserves and undiscovered technically recoverable oil and gas resources underlying areas unavailable and with no surface occupancy (NSO) beyond a ½ directional drilling limit have been added to the Proposed RMP/Final EIS.

Chapter 4; Section 4.4.2: Commentors identified a difficulty in determining the impacts to each specific ACEC in the Draft RMP/EIS. The Proposed RMP/Final EIS has been restructured and more specific detail included discussing the impacts to each specific ACEC.

Chapter 4; Section 4.6: Numerous public comments were received identifying the lack of information in the Draft RMP/EIS related to the “social environment” of the PFO. The Proposed RMP/Final EIS has been modified to include a discussion of impacts to the four major social groups that could be affected by the Proposed RMP as required by the BLM Land Use Planning Handbook.

Chapter 4; Section 4.6: A number of public comments requested that the economic impacts of the alternatives be enhanced. Therefore, the economic impacts of all alternatives was improved in the Proposed RMP/Final EIS by using the IMPLAN model to estimate the economic impacts from coal, oil/gas, and grazing actions.

Chapter 5; Sections 5.2, 5.3, and 5.4: Since the Draft RMP/EIS was published there has been continuing consultation with Native American Tribes and Cooperating Agencies. These sections of the Proposed RMP/Final EIS have been updated with a summary of the additional consultation and coordination. Also a table has been added to the Proposed RMP/Final EIS detailing the consistency of the Proposed RMP with the State of Utah Code and the County consistency tables has been updated

Chapter 5; Section 5.5: The public participation section in the Proposed RMP/Final EIS has been updated to include summary information about each of the four opportunities that the public has had to comment of the Draft RMP/EIS and the Supplements.

Chapter 5; Section 5.6: This new section has been added to the Proposed RMP/Final EIS which describes the public comment response process, lists commentors, and summarizes the public comments and the BLM’s response to these comments. The comments and responses are addressed by each of the four different public comment periods. Each set of comments is divided into a summary of major comments, comments from Cooperating Agencies, and comments that changed the Proposed RMP. This section has been added to comply with NEPA discussing the public comment process and the results of the public input.

Appendices: In the Draft RMP/EIS all of the appendices were numbered. To reduce confusion in the Proposed RMP/Final EIS the appendices have been given an alphabetic letter.

Appendices: Also a number of the appendices are no longer relevant and have been deleted from the Proposed RMP/Final EIS.

- Listed, Sensitive and Other Native Species
- Objectives for Cultural Resource Management Categories
- Visual resource Management
- Emergency Stabilization and Rehabilitation Program Definitions
- Standards for Rangeland Health and Guidelines for Grazing Management for BLM Lands in Utah
- Areas Recommended for Withdrawal
- Standard Lease Form for Oil and Gas
- Hydraulic Considerations for Pipeline Crossings of Stream Channels
- Hydrologic Modification Standards for Roads
- Basis and Rationale for Modification of Surface Water, Ground Water, and Floodplain Protection Buffer Zone
- Energy Policy and Conservation Act Planning Considerations
- Multiple Use Requires Multiple Management
- Coal Report for the Price RMP

Appendix C: Appendix 3 from the Draft RMP/EIS was augmented in its discussion of suitability of each potential river segment. These additions were added in response to public comments on needing a more detailed discussion of the suitability of each segment.

Appendix D: This appendix has been added to the Proposed RMP/Final EIS and contains correspondence with the US Fish and Wildlife Service on Section 7 consultation under the Threatened and Endangered Species Act. The appendix also contains the conservation measures as contained in the biological assessment.

Appendix E: This appendix has been added to the Proposed RMP/Final EIS and contains correspondence with the State Historic Preservation Office on Section 106 consultation under the National Historic Preservation Act.

Appendix F: The Best Management Practices (BMPs) for Raptors and Associated Habitats (September 2003) contained in the Draft RMP/EIS has been replaced in the Proposed RMP/Final EIS with the updated BMPS for Raptors and Associated Habitats for Utah (August 2006).

Appendix G: The Draft RMP/EIS contained two appendices concerning spatial and seasonal timing stipulations and surface disturbing activities (Appendices 8 and 16). Public comment identified numerous discrepancies between these two appendices. The discrepancies were resolved in the Proposed RMP/Final EIS by combining these two appendices into one appendix.

Appendix K: Appendix 15 of the Draft RMP/EIS has been revised in the Proposed RMP/Final EIS. Appendix K now includes information for each Special Recreation Management Areas (SRMA) on Market strategy, Market, Niche, Management goals, and Management Objectives.

Appendix L: Table L-1 was added to the Proposed RMP/Final EIS ACEC appendix identifying threats to each of the existing and potential ACECs. This was in response to comments received from the State of Utah to help understand the special management and the need for each ACEC.

Appendix M: The RFD was changed from wells in the Draft RMP/EIS to well pads in the Proposed RMP/Final EIS. This allows for multiple wells per location. This is not a significant change because the acres disturbed per well in Draft and the acres per well location in the Proposed are the same. Therefore, there is no change in the total short-term and long-term acre disturbance between the Draft and the Final. Because of increased interest in oil/gas leasing in the PFO the RFD for the Proposed RMP was changed in the Proposed RMP/Final EIS to be the same as the RFD for Alternative A in the Draft RMP/EIS. This change is within the range of alternatives.

Appendix O: This new appendix addresses livestock grazing allotments and associated forage preference allocation.

Appendix P: This is a new appendix that has been added to the Proposed RMP/Final EIS and was submitted by the State of Utah as part of their public comments on the non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics Supplement. The appendix is a social survey conducted by Utah State University in 2007 for Carbon and Emery Counties.

Appendix Q: This new appendix is a detailed discussion of the changes between the Draft RMP/EIS and the Proposed RMP/Final EIS.

Appendix R: This new appendix addresses BMPs for oil/gas development.

Appendix S: This new appendix is a letter from the State of Utah addressing air quality mitigation strategies for the BLM's ongoing land use planning efforts.

Maps: A number of changes have been made to the maps in the Draft RMP/EIS for inclusion in the Proposed RMP/Final EIS. These changes reflect minor corrections, presentation, and consistency between maps. This is not significant because in general the maps present the same information that was contained in the Draft RMP/EIS in addition to small mapping and GIS corrections and does not affect either the decisions or the impact analysis.

Maps 2-35 to 2-39: The areas identified as withdrawn or recommended for withdrawal from mineral entry was updated between the Draft RMP/EIS and the Proposed RMP/Final EIS. Specifically the oil shale withdrawal was included which was identified in the Mineral Section of the Draft but not in the "Locatable Mineral" Section. Also the Three Rivers Withdrawal was finalized since the Draft RMP/EIS was released. Also additional changes were made in the Proposed RMP/Final EIS to correct inconsistencies between this section and the withdrawals in the Lands and Realty Section including a reference. The maps in the Draft RMP/EIS stated that WSAs were withdrawn for mineral entry (locatables). WSAs are not withdrawn from mineral entry by Law. This has been rectified in the Proposed RMP/Final EIS. These maps also have been updated to show the occurrence potential for gypsum and uranium/vanadium. This information was available in the *Minerals Potential Report* but has been added here to improve the impact analysis for Chapter 4.

Maps 2-40 thru 2-44: These maps also have been updated to show the occurrence potential for clay, stone, sand and gravel. This information was available in the *Minerals Potential Report* but has been added here to improve the impact analysis for Chapter 4.

Maps 2-53 to 2-55: The utility corridors were revised to map the existing rights-of-way for major transmission lines based on information provided during the public comment period. The maps now reflect current conditions.

This page intentionally left blank.