

CHAPTER 2 ALTERNATIVES

2.1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter describes and compares five alternatives for managing the public lands and their resources within the Richfield Field Office (RFO). These alternatives are identified by the letters N, A, B, C, and D. The No Action Alternative (Alternative N) represents the continuation of current management direction. The Bureau of Land Management (BLM) developed the action alternatives (A, B, C, and D) by considering issues and concerns raised during the scoping period, planning criteria, and guidance applicable to management of resources and resource uses. The alternatives constitute a range of management actions that set forth different priorities and measures to emphasize certain uses or resource values over other uses or resource values under the multiple use sustained yield mandate so as to achieve the identified goals and objectives.

Evaluation of a reasonable range of alternatives is required by National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) regulations (40 Code of Federal Regulations [CFR] Part 1502.14), as well as by BLM planning regulations. As required in the CEQ regulations, the reasonable range must include a "no action" alternative (CEQ 1981, Question 3.A) which is the continuation of current management under the Mountain Valley MFP (1982), the Henry Mountain MFP (1982), the Parker Mountain MFP (1982), the Cedar-Beaver-Garfield-Antimony RMP (1986), the Forest MFP (1977), and the San Rafael RMP (1991), as well as subsequent plan amendments.

The BLM recognizes that social, economic, and environmental issues cross land ownership lines and that extensive cooperation is needed to actively address issues of mutual concern. To the extent possible, these alternatives were crafted utilizing input from public scoping comments and cooperating agencies.

Once developed, the BLM analyzed the alternatives to predict their impacts on the environment. Based on the impacts analysis of these alternatives, along with knowledge of specific issues raised throughout the planning process, input from cooperating agencies and BLM resource specialists, consideration of planning criteria, and potential resolution of resource conflicts, the BLM has identified Alternative B as the Preferred Alternative. Each alternative provides a different emphasis for managing public lands and resources within the planning area, and each alternative represents a complete and reasonable RMP that: 1) meets the purpose and need described in Chapter 1; 2) responds to environmental, operational, and economic concerns raised by the public, agencies, business and other special interest groups during the scoping process; and 3) addresses potential environmental issues identified during review of the proposed management actions.

2.2 ALTERNATIVE COMPONENTS

The alternatives described in this chapter represent varying approaches to addressing and resolving key planning issues (see Chapter 1) and to managing resources and resource uses in the planning area. Each alternative comprises two categories of land use planning decisions: (1) desired outcomes (goals and objectives) and (2) allowable uses and management actions that are anticipated to achieve the desired outcomes. These two categories are discussed below.

2.2.1 Desired Outcomes (Goals and Objectives)

Goals and objectives provide overarching direction for BLM actions in meeting the agency's legal, regulatory, policy, and strategic requirements. Goals are broad statements of desired outcome, but

generally are not measurable. Objectives are more specific statements of a desired outcome that may include a measurable component. Objectives generally are anticipated to achieve the stated goals.

2.2.2 Allowable Uses and Management Actions

After establishing desired outcomes, the BLM identifies allowable uses (land use allocations) and management actions for different alternatives that are anticipated to achieve the desired outcomes (goals and objectives). Alternatives were developed to address planning issues, resolve resource conflicts, improve consistency, and ensure resource-specific decisions for the following categories in the RMP revision process: 1) physical, biological, and cultural resources; 2) resource uses; and 3) special designations.

Allowable uses identify where land uses are allowed, restricted, or prohibited on all BLM-administered surface and Federal mineral estate in the planning area. Alternatives may include specific land use restrictions to meet goals and objectives and may exclude certain land uses to protect resource values. For example, alternatives considered for this DRMP close all suitable wild and scenic river segments to oil and gas leasing. Because the alternatives identify whether particular land uses are allowed, restricted, or prohibited, allowable uses often include a spatial (e.g., map) component.

Management actions are those actions anticipated to achieve desired outcomes. These actions include proactive measures (e.g., measures taken to maintain, restore, or improve land health), as well as measures or criteria that would be applied to guide day-to-day activities occurring on public land.

Although anticipated to achieve desired outcomes, the components described above may not be achieved during the planning period due to limitations in funding or staffing, changing policies or priorities, or new information. These factors could also affect the rate of RMP implementation. It is important to note that the RMP is strategic in nature, and, while it provides an overarching vision for managing resources in the planning area, it also allows management flexibility in light of changing priorities, information, and circumstances.

2.3 ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED IN DETAIL

2.3.1 Overview of the Alternatives

The BLM has developed five alternative management strategies for managing public lands and resources administered by the RFO. Alternative N is the “No Action Alternative;” that is, it represents the continuation of current management under the existing five land use plans, as amended. Alternatives A, B, C, and D (the “action alternatives”) would each effect change in management – each includes proactive responses to existing conditions and circumstances, which in some cases may have changed since the existing land use plans were written. Each alternative has a different emphasis, or theme, of management that reflects a different response to the Federal mandate to balance use and conservation of resources on public lands. All five alternatives comply with applicable laws, regulations, and policies.

This section summarizes the five alternatives. It includes a brief description of each alternative plus a comparative summary of proposed land use plan decisions by alternative (Table 2-1).

- **Alternative N (No Action Alternative)**

Alternative N represents the continuation of current management under the existing six land use plans, as amended. The existing land use plans are the Mountain Valley MFP (1982), the Henry Mountain MFP (1982), the Parker Mountain MFP (1982), the Cedar-Beaver-Garfield-Antimony

RMP (1986), the Forest MFP (1977), and the San Rafael RMP (1991). This alternative provides the baseline against which to compare the other alternatives. It includes existing Areas of Critical Environmental Concern (ACECs) (four areas totaling 14,780 acres) and eligible wild and scenic river segments (WSRs) (12 segments totaling 135 miles). None of the eligible segments would be found suitable for Congressional designation into the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System (NWSRS).

- **Alternative A**

Alternative A emphasizes commodity production, and mineral extraction – mining, oil and gas leasing, grazing, commercial recreation, and commercial woodland products harvesting – and motorized recreation. Relative to all other alternatives, Alternative A conserves the least land area for physical, biological, and cultural resources; proposes the least special designations (0 suitable WSR segments; 0 ACECs); and is the least restrictive to off-highway vehicle (OHV) use and mineral development.

- **Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)**

Alternative B has been identified by the BLM as the Preferred Alternative because it represents an attempt to balance protection/conservation of physical, biological, and cultural resources while providing for commodity production and mineral extraction. This alternative designates ACECs (2 areas totaling 2,530 acres) and recommends WSR segments (two segments totaling 59 miles).

- **Alternative C**

Alternative C emphasizes conservation of physical, biological, and cultural resources over commodity production, mineral extraction and motorized recreation access. This alternative (along with Alternative D) designates the most ACECs (16 areas totaling 886,800 acres) and recommends the most eligible WSR segments (12 segments totaling 135 miles) as suitable for Congressional designation into the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System.

- **Alternative D**

Alternative D emphasizes conservation of physical, biological, and cultural resources over commodity production, mineral extraction and motorized recreation access. Relative to all alternatives, this alternative conserves the most land area for physical, biological, and cultural resources; (along with Alternative C) designates the most ACECs (16 areas totaling 886,800 acres) and recommends the most eligible WSR segments (12 segments totaling 135 miles) as suitable for Congressional designation into the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System; and emphasizes management of non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics (682,600 acres), so as to preserve those characteristics. Except for management of lands with wilderness characteristics, decisions under this alternative are the same as under Alternative C.

2.3.2 Comparison of Alternatives Summary

Table 2-1 below compares the proposed management actions and land use allocations for each alternative.

Table 2-1. Alternative Comparison Summary

Resource/ Resource Use	Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Alternative B (Preferred)	Alternative C	Alternative D
Air Quality	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Manage all BLM and BLM-authorized actions to maintain air quality prescribed by Federal, tribal, state, and local laws and regulations. This includes meeting the National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) and ensuring that BLM authorized actions continue to keep the area in attainment, meet Prevention of Significant Deterioration (PSD) Class II standards, and protect the Class I airsheds. Mitigate potential adverse impacts of site-specific actions identified in NEPA documents prepared at the time an action is proposed, through best available control technology as part of the state permitting process and PSD review. 				
Soil Resources	Maintain or improve soil resources through implementation of Rangeland Health Standards and other appropriate protection measures.				
Water Resources	Maintain or improve water quality and quantity through implementation of Rangeland Health Standards and other appropriate protection measures.				
Vegetation	Maintain or improve soil, water, and vegetation resources through implementation of Rangeland Health Standards and other appropriate protection measures.				
Cultural Resources	Reduce imminent threats to significant cultural resources from natural and human-caused deterioration or potential conflicts with other resources.				
	Mitigate impacts from permitted activities.	Allocate and manage cultural resource sites for scientific use, public use, conservation use, traditional use, and experimental use categories.			
Paleontological Resources	No assessments or inventories required.	Require paleontological assessments in Class I areas.	Require paleontological inventories in Class I and Class II areas.	Require paleontological inventories prior to permitting all surface disturbing activities.	
Visual Resources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Class I: 0 acres Class II: 529,500 acres Class III: 569,000 acres Class IV: 1,029,500 acres 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Class I: 446,900 acres Class II: 0 acres Class III: 392,800 acres Class IV: 1,288,300 acres 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Class I: 446,900 acres Class II: 209,000 acres Class III: 410,800 acres Class IV: 1,061,300 acres 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Class I: 446,900 acres Class II: 230,600 acres Class III: 509,100 acres Class IV: 941,400 acres 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Class I: 1,129,600 acres Class II: 66,700 acres Class III: 355,100 acres Class IV: 576,600 acres
Special Status Species	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Conserve and recover all special status species and their habitats. Employ strategies to avoid or reduce fragmenting of habitat. 				
Fish and Wildlife	Maintain, restore, protect, and enhance habitats to support a diversity of fish and wildlife species.				
Wild Horses and Burros	Manage wild horses and burros at appropriate management levels (AML) to ensure a natural ecological balance between horse and burro populations and wildlife, livestock, vegetation resources, and other resource values (Map 3-8).				
	Allocate 100 animal unit months (AUMs) for wild burros in Canyonlands Herd Management Area (HMA), with no AML set.		Manage Canyonlands HMA with an AML of 60-100; allocate 600 AUMs for wild burros.	Manage Canyonlands HMA with an AML of 120-200; allocate 1,200 AUMs for wild burros.	

Table 2-1. Alternative Comparison Summary

Resource/ Resource Use	Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Alternative B (Preferred)	Alternative C	Alternative D
Fire and Fuels Management	Manage fire and fuels to protect life, firefighter safety, property, and other critical resources and, where appropriate, to restore natural systems.				
	Manage fire and fuels using a full suite of tools that allows for the graduated movement to a more ecologically sustainable condition and reduction of hazardous fuels.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Manage fire and fuels through treatments averaging 73,600 acres annually for a maximum level of 1,472,000 acres over the life of the plan. • Use the full range of treatment types, including prescribed fire; mechanical, chemical, biological, and cultural treatments; and wildland fire use. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Manage fire and fuels through treatments averaging 26,000 acres annually for a maximum level of 520,000 acres over the life of the plan. • Use prescribed fire, intensively treating areas to create properly functioning ecosystems, prioritizing treatments in areas not currently functioning properly. 	
Non-WSA Lands with Wilderness Characteristics	Provide no special management specifically for protection of non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics.				Manage all non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics (29 areas, 682,600 acres) by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • closing to oil and gas leasing • closing to off-highway vehicle use • designating VRM Class I • retaining lands in public ownership • closing to mineral material sales • managing for primitive and semi-primitive recreation opportunities • recommending for withdrawal from mineral entry • Avoiding new rights-of-way (ROWs)
Forestry and Woodland Products	Provide forest and woodland products on a sustainable basis consistent with other land management objectives.				

Table 2-1. Alternative Comparison Summary

Resource/ Resource Use	Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Alternative B (Preferred)	Alternative C	Alternative D
Livestock Grazing	<p>Continue forage allocations depicted on Map 2-7 and in Appendix 7 (Table A7-1).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Acres available for grazing: 1,989,048 Acres unavailable for grazing: 138,952 Available AUMs: 146,202 	<p>Forage allocations would be as depicted on Map 2-6 and in Appendix 7 (Table A7-2).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Acres available for grazing: 2,025,998 Acres unavailable for grazing: 102,002 Available AUMs: 147,281 	<p>Forage allocations would be as depicted on Map 2-7 and in Appendix 7 (Table A7-3).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Acres available for grazing: 1,989,048 Acres unavailable for grazing: 138,952 Available AUMs: 146,202 		
Recreation	One SRMA (120 acres)	Five SRMAs (516,400 acres)	Five SRMAs (838,700 acres)	Four SRMAs (928,550 acres)	Seven SRMAs (1,358,200 acres)
Travel Management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Open: 1,636,400 acres Limited: 277,600 acres Closed: 214,000 acres 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Open: 449,000 acres Limited: 1,679,000 acres Closed: 0 acres 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Open: 8,400 acres Limited: 1,909,200 acres Closed: 210,400 acres 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Open: 0 acres Limited: 1,445,000 acres Closed: 683,000 acres 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Open: 0 acres Limited: 972,800 acres Closed: 1,155,200 acres
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Designated routes: 4,315 miles¹ Designated routes with seasonal closures or size/width restrictions: 0 miles Closed routes: 65 miles 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Designated routes: 4,063 miles¹ Designated routes with seasonal closures or size/width restrictions: 249 miles Closed routes: 68 miles 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Designated routes: 3,693 miles¹ Designated routes with seasonal closures or size/width restrictions: 483 miles Closed routes: 204 miles 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Designated routes: 2,601 miles¹ Designated routes with seasonal closures or size/width restrictions: 591 miles Closed routes: 1,188 miles 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Designated routes: 2,493 miles¹ Designated routes with seasonal closures or size/width restrictions: 550 miles Closed routes: 1,242 miles
Lands and Realty	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Retain public lands in Federal ownership unless disposing of a particular parcel would serve the national interest. Consider land tenure adjustments (e.g., exchanges and acquisitions) that meet identified criteria. 				

¹ Route inventory and designations are implementation-level decisions, not planning level decisions and are thus subject to change with updated inventory data.

Table 2-1. Alternative Comparison Summary

Resource/ Resource Use	Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Alternative B (Preferred)	Alternative C	Alternative D
	Continue to offer for sale lands identified in the Mountain Valley MFP (280 of the 1,040 acres identified have not been sold to date).	Identify 92 parcels, totaling 13,400 acres, for sale under Section 203 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (FLPMA).		Identify no lands for sale under Section 203 of FLPMA.	
	Review existing withdrawals to determine whether they are serving the purposes for which they were withdrawn.				
	Continue existing withdrawals (154,700 acres). Recommend withdrawing the four existing ACECs (14,780 acres) from mineral entry. Total acres: 169,480	Continue existing withdrawals (154,700 acres). Recommend no new withdrawals. Total acres: 154,700	Continue existing withdrawals (154,700 acres). Recommend 21,500 acres for withdrawal from mineral entry. Total acres: 176,200	Continue existing withdrawals (154,700 acres). Recommend 176,400 acres for withdrawal from mineral entry. Total acres: 331,100	Continue existing withdrawals (154,700 acres). Recommend 749,200 acres for withdrawal from mineral entry. Total acres: 903,900
Leasable Minerals	Identify lands available for oil and gas leasing and development subject to the following lease categories: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Standard: 1,236,500 acres Controlled surface use (CSU)/Timing: 409,200 acres No surface occupancy (NSO): 22,600 acres Closed: 459,700 acres 	Identify lands available for oil and gas leasing and development subject to the following lease categories: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Standard: 860,600 acres CSU/Timing: 820,500 acres NSO: 0 acres Closed: 446,900 acres 	Identify lands available for oil and gas leasing and development subject to the following lease categories: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Standard: 545,000 acres CSU/Timing: 1,021,600 acres NSO: 110,900 acres Closed: 450,500 acres 	Identify lands available for oil and gas leasing and development subject to the following lease categories: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Standard: 491,900 acres CSU/Timing: 901,100 acres NSO: 148,800 acres Closed: 586,300 acres 	Identify lands available for oil and gas leasing and development subject to the following lease categories: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Standard: 290,200 acres CSU/Timing: 634,000 acres NSO: 43,300 acres Closed: 1,160,500 acres
Locatable Minerals	Continue existing withdrawals (154,700 acres). Recommend an additional 14,780 acres for withdrawal. Total acres: 169,480	Continue existing withdrawals (154,700 acres). Recommend no new withdrawals. Total acres: 154,700	Continue existing withdrawals (154,700 acres). Recommend 21,500 acres for withdrawal. Total acres: 176,200	Continue existing withdrawals (154,700 acres). Recommend 176,400 acres for withdrawal. Total acres: 331,100	Continue existing withdrawals (154,700 acres). Recommend 749,200 additional acres for withdrawal. Total acres: 903,900

Table 2-1. Alternative Comparison Summary

Resource/ Resource Use	Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Alternative B (Preferred)	Alternative C	Alternative D
Salable Minerals (Mineral Materials)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 459,700 acres closed to mineral material disposal 1,236,500 acres open subject to standard stipulations 431,800 acres open with restrictions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 446,900 acres closed to mineral material disposal 860,600 acres open subject to standard stipulations 820,500 acres open with restrictions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 450,500 acres closed to mineral material disposal 545,000 acres open subject to standard stipulations 1,132,500 acres open with restrictions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 586,300 acres closed to mineral material disposal 491,900 acres open subject to standard stipulations 1,049,900 acres open with restrictions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1,160,500 acres closed to mineral material disposal 290,200 acres open subject to standard stipulations 677,300 acres open with restrictions
Wilderness Study Areas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Manage 11 existing WSAs (Map 3-14) in a manner that does not impair their suitability for designation as wilderness in accordance with BLM Handbook H-8550-1, <i>Interim Management Policy for Lands Under Wilderness Review</i> (IMP). 				
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Manage as VRM Class I Designate as closed or limited to OHV use Limited: 259,900 acres Closed: 187,000 acres 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Designate as VRM Class I Designate as limited to OHV use. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Designate as closed or limited to OHV use Limited: 271,500 acres Closed: 175,400 acres 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Designate as closed to OHV use. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Designate as closed to OHV use.
Wild and Scenic Rivers	<p>All eligible river segments would continue to be managed in a protective manner on a case-by-case basis. Eligible: 12 segments, 135 miles</p>				
	<p>Manage suitable river segments in a manner that would protect their outstandingly remarkable values, tentative classification, and free flowing nature. River corridors of eligible rivers that are not determined suitable would be managed according to other resource decisions for that alternative.</p> <p>Suitable: 0 segments, 0 miles</p>	<p>Suitable: 2 segments, 59 miles</p>	<p>Suitable: 12 segments, 135 miles</p>		
Areas of Critical Environmental Concern	<p>Provide special management attention to relevant and important values, resources, natural systems and/or hazards in designated ACECs. Potential ACECs that are not designated would be managed according to other resource decisions for that alternative.</p>				
	<p>Continue designation of four (existing) ACECs totaling 14,780 acres.</p>	<p>Designate no ACECs.</p>	<p>Designate two ACECs totaling 2,530 acres.</p>	<p>Designate 16 ACECs totaling 886,810 acres.</p>	

2.4 ADAPTIVE MANAGEMENT

Adaptive management is a formal, systematic, and rigorous approach to learning from the results of management actions, accommodating change, and improving management. It involves synthesizing existing knowledge, exploring alternative actions, and making explicit forecasts about their results. Management actions and monitoring programs are carefully designed to generate reliable feedback and clarify the reasons underlying results. Actions and objectives are then adjusted based on this feedback and improved understanding to continue to try to achieve the desired outcomes. In addition, decisions, actions, and results are carefully documented and communicated to others, so that knowledge gained through experience is passed on rather than lost when individuals move or leave the organization.

Land use plan level decisions are not subject to adaptive management. These include the goals and objectives, allowable uses, management actions, and special designations. Plan amendments would be required to change these decisions. Implementation or activity level decisions could be subject to adaptive management. Future activity level plans would follow NEPA procedures and involve the public.

This Draft Resource Management Plan/Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DRMP/DEIS) recommends an adaptive management strategy. The adaptive management process is flexible and generally involves four phases: planning, implementation, monitoring, and evaluation. As the BLM obtains new information, it is able to evaluate monitoring data and other resource information to periodically refine and update desired outcomes (goals and objectives), management actions, and allowable uses. This allows for the continual refinement and improvement of management prescriptions and practices.

2.5 ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED BUT ELIMINATED FROM DETAILED ANALYSIS

This section provides a summary of two alternatives the BLM considered but eliminated from detailed analysis, as well as the reasons for not analyzing them in detail.

2.5.1 No Grazing Alternative

An alternative that proposes to make the entire RFO unavailable for grazing would not meet the purpose and need of this DRMP/DEIS. NEPA 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 which requires the complete elimination of grazing within the planning area for their resolution. Where appropriate, removal of livestock and adjustments to livestock use have been incorporated in this planning effort. Since the BLM has considerable discretion through its grazing regulations to determine and adjust stocking levels, seasons-of-use, and grazing management activities, and to allocate forage to uses of the public lands in RMPs, the analysis of an alternative to entirely eliminate grazing is not needed.

An alternative that proposes to make the entire planning area unavailable for grazing would also be inconsistent with the intent of the Taylor Grazing Act (TGA) 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 43 USC Section 302 (43 USC 1732)(a) and Section 102 (43 USC 1701)(7)) and includes livestock grazing as a principal or major use of public lands. While multiple use does not require that all lands be used for livestock grazing, complete removal of livestock grazing in 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. The CEQ guidelines for compliance with NEPA require that agencies analyze the “No Action Alternative” in all Environmental Impact Statements (40 CFR 1502.14(d)). For the purposes of this NEPA analysis, the “no action alternative” is to continue the status quo which includes livestock grazing. For this reason and those stated above, the RFO dismissed a no grazing alternative for the entire planning area from further consideration in this DRMP/DEIS.

2.5.2 SUWA Alternative

In November 2003, the Southern Utah Wilderness Alliance (SUWA) submitted an outline and map for an RMP alternative to the BLM. It divided the lands managed by the RFO into management zones similar to those identified in the Grand Staircase—Escalante National Monument Plan and provided brief prescriptions for managing each zone. While it provided an outline for management, it fell short of a fully developed alternative because it did not address an attempt to resolve the issues raised during scoping nor the multiple laws, regulations, and policies that BLM must consider in developing an RMP. Consequently, this alternative does not meet the purpose and need for this plan revision, and it is largely inconsistent with FLPMA's multiple use sustained yield mandate. For these reasons, the RFO dismissed this alternative from further consideration in this DRMP/DEIS. However, elements of it are included in Alternatives C and D.

2.6 ALTERNATIVE DECISION TABLES

The following tables present the details of the proposed management for each resource, resource use, and special designation by alternative.

2.6.1 Natural, Biological and Cultural Resources

2.6.1.1 Air Quality

Table 2-2. Air Quality

Desired Outcomes (Goals and Objectives)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure authorizations and management activities comply with local, state, and Federal air quality regulations, requirements, and implementation plans. • Manage all BLM and BLM-authorized activities to maintain air quality within the thresholds established by the National Ambient Air Quality Standards and ensure that those activities continue to keep the area in attainment, meet PSD Class II standards, and protect the Class I airsheds. • Manage BLM and BLM-authorized activities to comply with the Utah Enhanced Smoke Management Plan, August 11, 2003 and the Utah State Law R307-204 Emission Standards: Smoke Management, August 1, 2007.
Issue: Management of Air Quality
Management Actions
Common to All Alternatives
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mitigate potential adverse impacts of site-specific actions identified in NEPA documents prepared at the time an action is proposed, through best available control technology as part of the state permitting process and PSD review. • Mitigate actions that compromise ambient air quality standards or visibility within the Class I airsheds.

2.6.1.2 Soil Resources

Table 2-3. Soil Resources

Desired Outcomes (Goals and Objectives)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maintain or improve soil quality and long-term soil productivity through implementation of Rangeland Health Standards and other soil protection measures. • Manage uses to minimize and mitigate damage to soils. • Manage soil resources to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Maintain or increase soil productivity; – Prevent or minimize accelerated soil erosion; – Prevent or minimize flood and sediment damage, as needed; – Reduce resource loss from floods and erosion; – Maintain vegetation cover at or above the level necessary to avoid accelerated soil erosion.

Table 2-3. Soil Resources

Issue: Protection of Soil Resources				
Management Actions				
Common to All Alternatives				
<p>Surface disturbance and reclamation activities would proceed consistent with current authorizations and subject to the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Utah Standards for Rangeland Health would be followed to maintain or improve soil conditions. • Activities would be the minimum necessary to accomplish the task. • Reclamation would be required for road realignments. • Measures to stabilize soils and minimize surface water runoff would be required, both during project activities and following project completion. • Reclamation of all surface disturbances would be initiated during or immediately upon completion of the authorized project. Reclamation could include recontouring the disturbed area to blend with the surrounding terrain, ripping compacted areas, replacement of topsoil, seeding, planting, and/or providing effective ground cover. 				
Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)	Alternative C	Alternative D
<p>Not specifically addressed in existing plans.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implement appropriate best management practices (BMPs) designed to protect water quality for all ground disturbing activities (Appendix 14). • All temporary roads would be closed and reclaimed immediately upon completion of the project. Reclaimed roads could be barricaded or signed until reclamation objectives are achieved. • Facilities or improvements no longer necessary would be removed and the sites would be reclaimed, provided no historic properties would be affected. 			

2.6.1.3 Water Resources

Table 2-4. Water Resources

Desired Outcomes (Goals and Objectives)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maintain and/or restore overall watershed health and reduce erosion, stream sedimentation, and salinization of water. • Work to improve water quality on listed streams and prevent listing of additional streams under the Clean Water Act, Section 303(d) (Appendix 4). • Improve quality and quantity of water in all streams, with particular emphasis on streams with populations of native species, or with non-native game fish, as well as other aquatic species. • Maintain and/or restore the chemical, physical, and biological integrity of the planning area’s waters. • Protect community watersheds and sources of culinary water. • Avoid adverse impacts to floodplains. • Restore and preserve the natural and beneficial values served by floodplains in carrying out BLM’s responsibilities for acquiring, managing, and disposing of Federal lands and facilities (Executive Order 11988, Floodplain Management). • Manage resources to reduce salinity loading where possible, and make progress towards accomplishing the goals and objectives outlined in the Colorado River Salinity Control Act.

Issue: Water Quality and Quantity				
Management Actions				
Common to All Alternatives				
Implement appropriate best management practices designed to protect water quality for all ground disturbing activities (Appendix 14).				
<p><u>Surface water:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop total maximum daily loads (TMDLs) for each Hydrologic Unit Code (HUC) listed on the Section 303d list of impaired streams in cooperation with the State of Utah. • Cooperate and contribute to the completion and implementation of the TMDL process. 				
<p><u>Recreational water standards:</u> Maintain or improve water quality and quantity for recreational uses</p>				
<p><u>Municipal watershed areas:</u> Manage culinary water sources to preserve the quality and health of water sources.</p>				
<p><u>Public water systems:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The RFO would continue to operate and maintain public drinking water systems at BLM facilities to comply with transient non-community water system requirements as defined by State of Utah Administrative Code 309 – Water Quality Monitoring Standards. The RFO would continue to gather source samples for laboratory analysis when the water system is operating (seasonal use) including coliform samples quarterly; nitrates yearly; and nitrite/sulfate every three years. • Identify public water systems with surface water or ground water sources (e.g., delineated drinking water source protection zones) that may be affected by BLM-authorized activities. Ensure that BLM-authorized activities do not pose a threat to public water systems. 				
Issue: Protection of Groundwater				
Management Actions				
Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)	Alternative C	Alternative D
Maintain a 500-foot buffer zone of no surface disturbance and/or occupancy around natural springs to protect water quality.	Maintain buffer zones of no surface disturbance and/or occupancy around natural springs unless it can be shown that (1) there are no practical alternatives, or (2) all long-term impacts can be fully mitigated, or (3) the activity will benefit and enhance the riparian area. Base the size of the buffer zone on geohydrological, riparian, and other factors necessary to protect the water quality of the springs. If these factors cannot be determined, maintain a 330-foot buffer zone from the outer edge.			Maintain buffer zones of no surface disturbance and/or occupancy around natural springs unless it can be shown that (1) there are no practical alternatives, or (2) all long-term impacts can be fully mitigated, or (3) the activity will benefit and enhance the riparian area. Base the size of the buffer zone on geohydrological, riparian, and other factors necessary to protect the water quality of the springs. If these factors cannot be determined, maintain a 660-foot buffer zone from the outer edge.

2.6.1.4 Vegetation

Table 2-5. Vegetation Decisions

Desired Outcomes (Goals and Objectives)				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Manage and mitigate activities to restore, sustain, and enhance the health of plant associations. • Manage all resources and resource uses to achieve the Standards for Rangeland Health. • Enhance and/or restore native and desirable naturalized plant species. • Manage for a mix of vegetative types, structural stages, and landscape and riparian functions, and provide for native plant, fish, and wildlife (including special status species) habitats. • Enhance biological and genetic diversity of natural ecosystems. • Maintain relict vegetation communities. • Sustain or reestablish the integrity of the sagebrush biome to provide the amount, continuity, and quality of habitat that is necessary to maintain sustainable populations of the greater sage grouse and other sagebrush-dependent wildlife species. • Manage all riparian areas to maintain, restore, or improve unique and high-value habitat characteristics, including diversified plant species composition, plant species structural diversity, and adequate native vegetative cover and density for stream bank stabilization. All riparian areas would be managed to be in properly functioning condition. • Control noxious and invasive weed species and avoid the introduction of new invasive species. 				
Issue: Overall Vegetation Management				
Management Actions				
Common to All Alternatives				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Treat areas determined to need reseeding with a variety of plant species, including native plants, if available, that are desirable for wildlife habitat, livestock, watershed management, and other resource values while maintaining vegetation species diversity. • Where appropriate, require on-site mitigation when surface disturbance cannot be avoided on a site-specific basis, and consider off-site (compensatory) mitigation where on-site mitigation is impractical. • Maintain existing vegetative treatments to provide suitable habitats for wildlife and adequate forage for livestock. 				
Issue: Vegetation Treatments				
Management Actions				
Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)	Alternative C	Alternative D
Manipulate vegetation using mechanical, wildland and/or prescribed fire, and chemical treatments on a case-by-case basis to achieve or maintain Standards for Rangeland Health and desired vegetation condition.	Maintain existing vegetation treatments and implement additional treatments (including prescribed fire and wildland fire use, mechanical, biological, manual, and chemical) to increase productivity for resource uses and achieve or maintain Standards for Rangeland	Maintain existing vegetation treatments and implement additional treatments (e.g., prescribed fire and wildland fire use, mechanical, biological, manual, and chemical) to achieve or maintain Standards for Rangeland Health and desired vegetation condition.	Allow only natural processes (e.g., prescribed fire and wildland fire use, disease, and insects) to achieve or maintain Standards for Rangeland Health and desired vegetation condition. Vegetation treatments could be conducted on up to 520,000 acres over the life of the plan. (An annual average of 26,000 acres would need to receive treatment to reach the total treatment acreage listed (see Table 2-12a). Actual annual treatment acreage would vary depending on conditions, staffing, etc. These acreage figures include all vegetation and fire fuels treatments (see also Section	

Table 2-5. Vegetation Decisions

	<p>Health and desired vegetation condition. Vegetation treatments (e.g. wildlife habitat treatments, watershed treatments, livestock grazing treatments, fuels treatments, stewardship contracts, etc.) could be conducted on up to 1,472,000 acres over the life of the plan. (An annual average of 73,600 acres would need to receive treatment to reach the total treatment acreage listed (see Table 2-12a). Actual annual treatment acreage would vary depending on conditions, staffing, etc. These acreage figures include all vegetation and fire fuel treatments (see also Section 2.6.1.11)).</p>	<p>Vegetation treatments (e.g. wildlife habitat treatments, watershed treatments, livestock grazing treatments, fuels treatments, stewardship contracts, etc.) could be conducted on up to 1,472,000 acres over the life of the plan. (An annual average of 73,600 acres would need to receive treatment to reach the total treatment acreage listed (see Table 2-12a). Actual annual treatment acreage would vary depending on conditions, staffing, etc. These acreage figures include all vegetation and fire fuels treatments (see also Section 2.6.1.11)).</p>	<p>2.6.1.11)).</p>
<p>The use and perpetuation of native species would be emphasized. However, when restoring or rehabilitating disturbed or degraded rangelands, non-intrusive, non-native plant species would be considered appropriate for use where native species (a) are not available, (b) are not economically feasible, (c) cannot achieve ecological objectives as well as nonnative species, and/or (d) cannot compete with already established non-native species.</p>	<p>The use and perpetuation of native species would be emphasized. However, when restoring or rehabilitating disturbed or degraded rangelands, non-intrusive, non-native plant species may be used where native species:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • are not available; • are not economically feasible; • cannot achieve desired future conditions (DFCs), desired plant communities (DPCs), or other ecological objectives as well as non-native species, and/or • cannot compete with already established non-native species. <p>Non-native forbs and perennial grasses could be used in preference to monocultures of non-native annuals.</p>		

Table 2-5. Vegetation Decisions

Issue: Management Activities in Riparian Areas				
Management Actions				
Common to All Alternatives				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allow uses and activities in riparian areas as consistent with Utah BLM Riparian Management Policy and in compliance with Executive Orders 11990 and 11988. • Allow no new surface disturbing activities within a specified distance of riparian areas (see specific buffer sizes below), as measured from bank-full width along all perennial streams or streams with perennial reach unless the following criteria can be met: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> –there are no practical alternatives to the surface disturbance; –all long-term impacts could be fully mitigated; or –the activity would benefit the riparian area. • Retain riparian areas in public ownership, unless exchanges result in acquisition of parcels containing superior public values. • Coordinate riparian management with interested Federal, State, Tribal and local governments and private conservation groups, etc. 				
Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)	Alternative C	Alternative D
The buffer zone would be 500 feet on each side of the stream.	The buffer zone would be 330 feet on each side of the stream.	The buffer zone would be 330 feet on each side of the stream.	The buffer zone would be 660 feet on each side of the stream.	The buffer zone would be 660 feet on each side of the stream.
Issue: Management of Noxious Weeds and Invasive Species				
Management Actions				
Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)	Alternative C	Alternative D
Apply approved weed control methods to noxious weeds in an identified integrated weed management program (including preventive management and education, as well as mechanical, biological, and chemical techniques). Do so in cooperation with state, Federal, affected counties, adjoining private land owners, and other directly affected interests.			Emphasize natural processes (e.g. wildland and/or prescribed fire, disease, and insects), preventative management and education to reduce the spread of noxious and invasive species. Other methods, including biological and hand cutting could be utilized to remove noxious weeds and non-native invasive species to restore ecological condition of a site.	
Issue: Insect Pest Management				
Management Actions				
Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)	Alternative C	Alternative D
Develop and implement strategies in cooperation with the State of Utah, adjacent states, Federal agencies, affected counties, adjoining	Treat all insect pests in coordination with the State of Utah, adjacent states, Federal agencies, affected counties, adjoining private	Treat insect pests that exceed an economic threshold on public land adjacent to other landowners or that impact high-value	Implement no control measures for insect pests.	

Table 2-5. Vegetation Decisions

private land owners, and other interests directly affected.	land owners, and other interests directly affected.	resources in coordination with the State of Utah, adjacent states, Federal agencies, affected counties, adjoining private land owners, and other directly affected interests.	
---	---	---	--

2.6.1.5 Cultural Resources

Table 2-6. Cultural Resources Decisions

Desired Outcomes (Goals and Objectives)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Preserve and protect significant cultural resources and ensure that they are available for appropriate uses by present and future generations. • Seek to reduce imminent threats from and resolve potential conflicts caused by natural or human-caused deterioration, or potential conflicts with other resource uses. • Identify priority areas for new field inventory, based on their probability for significant resources. • Coordinate with local historic and cultural preservation and interpretation efforts. • Provide opportunities for traditional (American Indian) uses of cultural resources and sites. • Ensure compliance with Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA) and National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA).
Issue: Management of Cultural Resources
Management Actions
Common to All Alternatives
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identify and manage traditional cultural properties (TCPs) in coordination with American Indian tribes. • Mitigate adverse impacts to cultural resources resulting from authorized surface disturbing activities. • Meet responsibilities under the NHPA as addressed in the State Protocol Agreement between the Utah State Director of BLM and the Utah State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) and the Programmatic Agreement among the BLM, the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, and the National Conference of SHPOs. • Authorize no surface disturbing activities in the Bull Creek Archaeological District other than archaeological research. • Complete cultural resources inventories prior to allowing permitted surface disturbing activities, excluding those areas and circumstances identified in BLM- Manual M-8110.23 <i>Identifying & Evaluating Cultural Resources</i>, and Handbook UT-BLM-H-8110, <i>Guidelines for Identifying Cultural Resources</i> Section II.C and Appendix 1. • Coordinate Old Spanish Trail management with the National Park Service (NPS) and other agencies under Public Law 107-325. • Protect eligible cultural sites and mitigate impacts when it is determined that such sites are being impacted by grazing activities.

Table 2-6. Cultural Resources Decisions

Issue: Management of Cultural Resource Sites by Allocation to Use Categories				
Management Actions				
Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)	Alternative C	Alternative D
Mitigate impacts to cultural resources from permitted activities.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Allocate and manage cultural resource sites for scientific use, public use, conservation use, traditional use, and experimental use categories described in Handbook BLM-M-8110.4, <i>Guidelines for Identifying Cultural Resources</i>, and shown in Table 2-6a. Reevaluate and revise cultural resources site allocations by site or area when circumstances change or when new data becomes available. Consult with the SHPO and American Indian Tribes as appropriate. Mitigation actions would not be necessary on cultural resource sites if both of the following conditions are met and documented— <ul style="list-style-type: none"> –BLM and the SHPO have formally agreed the site is not eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP); –The site has no value for other cultural uses (as described in BLM-M-8110.4). 			
Issue: Identification of Areas for New Field Inventories				
Management Actions				
Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)	Alternative C	Alternative D
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No priority areas for new field inventories are identified in existing land use plans. 	Inventory the following priority area— <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Horseshoe Canyon South WSA 	Inventory the following priority areas— <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Horseshoe Canyon South WSA Trough Hollow area Bull Creek Archaeological District Areas of special cultural designation that have not been fully inventoried 	Inventory the following priority areas— <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Horseshoe Canyon South WSA Trough Hollow area Bull Creek Archaeological District Areas of special cultural designation that have not been fully inventoried Resources eligible for the National Register of Historic Places that have not been fully inventoried 	
Issue: Coordination With American Indian Tribes				
Management Actions				
Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)	Alternative C	Alternative D
Continue coordinating with the Paiute Tribe to identify the types of projects on which they want to consult.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Work with American Indian Tribes to help protect their rights including their rights to practice their religions. When planning and implementing land uses, accommodate tribal access to sacred sites and traditional cultural properties and prevent or mitigate physical damage or intrusions that might impede their use. Establish agreements with all American Indian Tribes interested in the lands managed by the RFO to identify the types of projects on which they want to consult. 			

Table 2-6a. Cultural Resource Site Use Allocations

Site Type	Alternative N	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternatives C and D
Prehistoric Site Use Allocation				
Occupation Site	No allocation	Public Use/Scientific	Scientific	Conservation/Traditional
Temporary Camp	No allocation	Public Use	Scientific	Public Use/Scientific
Storage Site	No allocation	Public Use	Scientific	Conservation
Rock Alignment	No allocation	Public Use	Scientific	Public Use
Traps	No allocation	Public Use	Scientific	Conservation
Rock Art	No allocation	Traditional/Public Use	Traditional/Public Use	Conservation/Traditional
Hunting Blind	No allocation	Public Use/Scientific	Public Use/Scientific	Public Use
Tool Stone Quarry	No allocation	Public Use/Scientific	Scientific	Conservation
Mineral Sources	No allocation	Conservation/Traditional	Conservation/Traditional	Conservation/Traditional
Lithic Scatters	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
– with diagnostics	No allocation	Public Use	Scientific	Conservation
– without diagnostics	No allocation	Experimental	Discharged	Experimental
Cairns	No allocation	Public Use	Scientific	Conservation
Historic Site Use Allocations				
Early Exploration	No allocation	Public Use	Public Use	Conservation
Freight Roads	No allocation	Public Use	Scientific Use	Conservation
Telegraph/Telephone	No allocation	Public Use	Scientific Use	Conservation
Mining – Placer	No allocation	Public Use	Scientific Use	Conservation
Mining – Hardrock	No allocation	Public Use	Scientific Use	Conservation
Mining – Milling	No allocation	Public Use	Scientific Use	Conservation
Mining – Habitation	No allocation	Public Use	Public Use	Conservation
Homesteads	No allocation	Public Use	Public Use	Conservation
Ranching – Habitation	No allocation	Public Use	Public Use	Conservation
Other Ranching	No allocation	Public Use	Scientific Use	Public Use
Shepherd Camps	No allocation	Public Use	Scientific Use	Public Use

Table 2-6a. Cultural Resource Site Use Allocations

Site Type	Alternative N	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternatives C and D
Historic Inscriptions	No allocation	Public Use	Public Use	Public Use
Military – 19th Century	No allocation	Public Use	Public Use	Public Use
Military – 20th Century	No allocation	Public Use	Public Use	Public Use
Historic American Indian Habitation	No allocation	Conservation/Traditional	Conservation/Traditional	Conservation/Traditional
Battle Sites	No allocation	Conservation/Traditional	Conservation/Traditional	Conservation/Traditional
Cairns	No allocation	Public Use	Scientific	Conservation

2.6.1.6 Paleontological Resources

Table 2-7. Paleontological Resources Decisions

Desired Outcomes (Goals and Objectives)				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Protect scientifically significant paleontological resources. • Provide opportunities for scientific, educational and recreational uses of paleontological resources. • Cooperate with other Federal, state and local agencies in paleontological resources management activities. 				
Issue: Management of Paleontological Resources				
Management Actions				
Common to All Alternatives				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mitigate adverse impacts to vertebrate and significant non-vertebrate paleontological resources resulting from surface disturbing activities. • Support and provide public education and interpretive opportunities for paleontological resources, including agreements with visitor information providers, use of special designations, or interpretive sites. • Issue paleontological resource use permits for scientific study as appropriate. • Prohibit collection of invertebrate and plant fossils for commercial use. 				
Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)	Alternative C	Alternative D
No similar action in any of the existing plans.	Require paleontological assessments prior to permitting surface disturbing activities in areas where there is a high potential to impact scientifically significant paleontological resources.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Require on-the-ground paleontological inventories prior to permitting surface disturbing activities in areas where there is a high potential to impact scientifically significant paleontological resources. • Require paleontological assessments prior to permitting surface disturbing activities in areas where there is a moderate potential to impact scientifically significant paleontological resources. 	Require on-the-ground paleontological inventories prior to permitting all surfacing disturbing activities.	

Table 2-7. Paleontological Resources Decisions

<p>No similar action in any of the existing plans.</p>	<p>Paleontological inventories would not be required.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conduct paleontological inventories intermittently as resources allow. • Prioritize paleontological resource inventories based on the potential to impact scientifically significant resources. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conduct paleontological inventories on a limited but annual basis. • Prioritize paleontological resource inventories based on the potential to impact scientifically significant resources.
<p>Collection of common invertebrate and botanical paleontological resources would be allowed for personal use.</p>	<p>Allow surface collection (as defined in BLM Manual 8270, <i>Paleontological Resources Management</i>) of common invertebrate and botanical paleontological resources for personal (non-commercial) use without permits and if consistent with other management decisions in this RMP. Significant resources of critical scientific and educational value would be protected.</p>	<p>Allow collection of common invertebrate and botanical paleontological resources for personal (non-commercial) use without permits only in specifically designated fossil collecting areas.</p>	
<p>No similar action in any of the existing plans.</p>	<p>When appropriate, target fossil localities with significant scientific value for excavation and curation either by the BLM or by a qualified outside academic or curatorial/research facility to protect them from theft, erosion, and/or vandalism. If excavation is not carried out within one field season, periodic monitoring should be conducted to document the integrity of the locality until excavation and curation are completed.</p>		
<p>No similar action in any of the existing plans.</p>	<p>Monitor highly significant (scientific) localities with paleontological resources that are not feasible to excavate, curate or interpret. Frequency of monitoring for identified localities would be determined by the significance of the resource and the risk of damage by either natural processes or human intrusion.</p>		
<p>No similar action in any of the existing plans.</p>	<p>Develop interpretation for significant localities and sites with displays that foster a scientific knowledge of the unique nature of the resource and that create opportunities for public education and access to such resources.</p>		
<p>No similar action in any of the existing plans.</p>	<p>All permitted actions occurring in paleontologically sensitive areas would include stipulation(s) to cover unanticipated paleontological discoveries during disturbance. This stipulation would mandate work stoppage (or avoidance), notification to the authorized officer, and protection of the material and geological context if any paleontological resources are discovered during disturbance activities. Other stipulations may be appropriate on a case-by-case basis.</p>		

2.6.1.7 Visual Resources

Table 2-8. Visual Resource Management Decisions

Desired Outcomes (Goals and Objectives)				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Manage public lands for their scenic values while providing for overall multiple use and quality of life for local communities and visitors to public lands. • Manage actions to preserve those scenic vistas that are deemed most important. 				
Issue: Assign Visual Resource Management Classes to All Public Lands in the RFO				
Management Actions				
Common to All Alternatives				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Designate WSAs as VRM Class I to maintain an undeveloped landscape and preserve their natural values according to direction in Instruction Memorandum IM-2000-096, <i>Use of Visual Resource Management Class I Designation in Wilderness Study Areas</i>. • All activities authorized by the BLM must meet the management objectives for the designated VRM class in that particular area. • To the extent practicable, bring existing visual contrasts into VRM class conformance as the opportunity arises. 				
Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)	Alternative C	Alternative D
Manage the RFO according to the following VRM classes, as indicated on Map 2-1: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Class I: 0 acres • Class II: 529,500 acres • Class III: 569,000 acres • Class IV: 1,029,500 acres Per BLM policy, WSAs would continue to be managed as VRM Class I (446,900 acres).	Designate the following VRM classes, as indicated on Map 2-2: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Class I: 446,900 acres • Class II: 0 acres • Class III: 392,800 acres • Class IV: 1,288,300 acres WSAs would be designated as VRM Class I (446,900 acres).	Designate the following VRM classes, as indicated on Map 2-3: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Class I: 446,900 acres • Class II: 209,000 acres • Class III: 410,800 acres • Class IV: 1,061,300 acres WSAs would be designated as VRM Class I (446,900 acres).	Designate the following VRM classes, as indicated on Map 2-4: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Class I: 446,900 acres • Class II: 230,600 acres • Class III: 509,100 acres • Class IV: 941,400 acres WSAs would be designated as VRM Class I (446,900 acres).	Designate the following VRM classes, as indicated on Map 2-5: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Class I: 1,129,600 acres • Class II: 66,700 acres • Class III: 355,100 acres • Class IV: 576,600 acres WSAs would be designated as VRM Class I (446,900 acres).
Issue: Application of VRM Standards to Existing Rights-of-Way				
Management Actions				
Common to All Alternatives				
To avoid potential conflicts with the construction, operation, maintenance, and termination of facilities and improvements located on existing rights-of-way on public land, apply the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Where a right-of-way grant specifically identifies an area and/or width, the VRM class within the specified area/width would be VRM Class IV. • Where no width is specified, the VRM class within the interior boundaries of the area disturbed when the facility or improvement was initially constructed would be VRM Class IV. For roads, the area within the interior boundaries of the following setbacks would be designated VRM Class IV: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 30 feet on each side of centerline for low standard dirt roads • 100 feet on each side of centerline for high standard gravel roads • 300 feet on each side of centerline for high standard paved roads 				

2.6.1.8 Special Status Species

Table 2-9. Special Status Species Decisions

Desired Outcomes (Goals and Objectives)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conserve and recover all special status species (including listed species) and the ecosystems on which they depend. • Manage, minimize, and mitigate impacts to plant, fish, and animal species and habitats so that the need to list any of these species as threatened or endangered does not become necessary. • Promote recovery and conservation of special status plant, fish, and animal species, including those listed under the Endangered Species Act (ESA). • Prevent long-term habitat fragmentation through avoidance and/or site-specific reclamation to return areas to productive levels. • Continue to work with USFWS and others to ensure that plans and agreements are updated and implemented as necessary to reflect the latest scientific data. • Where possible, implement the conservation actions identified in the Utah Comprehensive Wildlife Conservation Strategy (UDWR 2005c), 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.
Issue: Overall Special Status Species Management Guidance
Management Actions
Common to All Alternatives
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For listed species that do not have designated critical habitat, cooperate with the USFWS and other agencies, such as the Utah Division of Wildlife Resources (UDWR), in managing the species and their habitat. • Allow, initiate, or participate in scientific research of listed and sensitive species and their habitats. • Collaborate with the appropriate local, state, and Federal agencies to promote public education on species at risk, their importance to the human and biological community, and reasons for protective measures that would be applied to the lands involved. • Implement species-specific conservation measures to avoid or mitigate adverse effects to known populations of BLM sensitive plant and animal species on public lands. • Prohibit actions that destroy, adversely modify, or fragment listed threatened or endangered species' habitat. • Maintain the integrity of special status species habitat to provide the quantity, continuity and quality of habitat necessary to maintain special status species populations. • Conduct habitat improvement treatments for special status species. • Retain habitat for Federally-listed and candidate species in Federal ownership. Exceptions may be considered in exchanges with the State of Utah and others after consultation with and concurrence from the USFWS. • Consider special status species habitat in all wildland fire suppression efforts. <p>Recovery Plans and Conservation Agreements</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implement the goals and objectives of recovery plans, conservation agreements and strategies, and activity level plans utilizing best available information to recover and conserve species to the point where requirements of the ESA are no longer necessary. • Work with USFWS and others to ensure that plans and agreements are updated and implemented as necessary to reflect the latest scientific data. • Implement the specific goals and objectives of recovery plans, conservation agreements and strategies, and approved activity level plans. <p>Recovery Actions for Listed Species</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do not adversely modify or destroy designated critical habitats for Federally-listed species.

Table 2-9. Special Status Species Decisions

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide habitat improvements and other management actions to promote conservation and recovery of listed species. <p>Reintroduction/Translocation of Special Status Species</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allow introduction, transplant, augmentation, and/or re-establishment of listed or non-listed special status species in cooperation and collaboration with USFWS, UDWR, and other interested parties, following NEPA requirements. 				
Issue: Habitat Mitigation				
Management Actions				
Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)	Alternative C	Alternative D
Decisions for habitat mitigation are not specifically addressed in existing plans.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use strategies to avoid or reduce habitat fragmentation when possible, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Collocating communication and other facilities – Employing directional drilling for oil and gas – Closing and reclaiming roads – Using topographic and vegetative screening to reduce the influence of intrusions • Mitigate the effects of proposed projects that have the potential of causing long-term or permanent habitat impacts or losses by enhancing, restoring, or creating other habitat within the project's region of influence. Consider protecting the habitat when the habitat type is rare and under severe development pressures. Protection should only be a portion of the mitigation and must contain elements of restoration or enhancement. • Use species-specific buffers and seasonal, temporal, and spatial restrictions to conserve habitat for special status species (see Appendix 11 and Appendix 14). 			
Issue: Protection of Raptor Habitat				
Management Actions				
Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)	Alternative C	Alternative D
Manage raptors as required in current land use plans.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Employ "Raptor Best Management Practices" (Appendix 10), utilizing seasonal and spatial buffers, as well as mitigation, to maintain and enhance raptor nesting and foraging habitat, while allowing other resource uses. • Comply with <i>Suggested Practices for Avian Protection on Power Lines: the State of the Art in 2006</i> (APLIC 2006) and Avian Protection Plan (APP) Guidelines (APLIC and USFWS 2005) for new power line construction (including upgrades and reconstruction) to prevent electrocution of raptors. 			

2.6.1.9 Fish and Wildlife

Table 2-10. Fish and Wildlife Decisions

Desired Outcomes (Goals and Objectives)				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maintain, restore, protect, and enhance habitats to support healthy populations of diverse fish and wildlife species, recognizing crucial and high-value habitats as management priorities. • Manage habitat to prevent additional listings of species under the Federal Endangered Species Act, or the State of Utah's Species of Concern List. • Manage for unfragmented blocks of habitat that provide for a variety of wildlife and fish species. • Recognize and support the role of Utah Division of Wildlife Resources (UDWR) in managing wildlife and fish populations and regulating hunting and fishing. • Recognize and support the role of USFWS in managing raptors, migratory birds, and threatened and endangered species. • Recognize and support the role of the Federal Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service (APHIS) in controlling predators. 				
Issue: Overall Fish and Wildlife Management Guidance				
Management Actions				
Common to All Alternatives				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recognize and coordinate with UDWR on their Management Plans and associated revisions, and (where appropriate) plans of other cooperating agencies. To the extent practicable, implement future plans on a case-by-case basis through applicable regulations. • Implement BLM wildlife management plans. • Implement the conservation actions identified in Executive Order 13186, <i>Federal Agency Responsibilities Under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act</i>, with particular emphasis on those migratory birds identified as Priority Species in the Utah Avian Conservation Strategy (Parrish <i>et al.</i> 2002). • Cooperate with UDWR in the management of fisheries, including habitat improvements and treatments. • Work with UDWR to establish and maintain Blue Ribbon Fisheries, as defined by the Utah Blue Ribbon Fishery Advisory Council. • Coordinate with UDWR to address population dynamics and habitat conditions for major habitat types that support a wide variety of game and non-game species. • Use strategies to avoid or reduce habitat fragmentation such as collocating facilities, employing directional drilling, reclaiming redundant roads, reclaiming roads no longer serving intended purpose, reducing road densities, and using topographic and vegetative screening to reduce influence of intrusions. • Where appropriate, require on-site mitigation when surface disturbance cannot be avoided on a site-specific basis, and consider off-site (compensatory) mitigation where on-site mitigation is impractical. • Where possible, implement the conservation actions identified in the Utah Comprehensive Wildlife Conservation Strategy (UDWR 2005c), 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. 				
Issue: Forage Management and Allocations				
Management Actions				
Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)	Alternative C	Alternative D
Manage big game winter range to maximize browse production, using class of livestock and season of use.	Use prescriptive grazing to favor forage production on crucial big game winter range.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use prescriptive grazing to favor forage production for big game high-priority and crucial winter range. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use prescriptive grazing to favor forage production for big game ranges. • On suitable allotments, as determined on a case-by-case basis, authorize livestock grazing only on a nonrenewable 	

Table 2-10. Fish and Wildlife Decisions

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On suitable allotments, as determined on a case-by-case basis, authorize livestock grazing only on a nonrenewable basis to meet wildlife habitat objectives. These actions would be limited to crucial wildlife habitat where conventional grazing management practices are not providing attainment of RMP objectives. 	<p>basis to meet wildlife habitat objectives. These actions would be limited to crucial wildlife habitat where conventional grazing management practices are not providing attainment of RMP objectives.</p>	
Accomplish habitat treatments to meet terrestrial, aquatic, and riparian habitat objectives through the use of prescribed fire, chemical, biological, and mechanical methods.	Accomplish habitat treatments to meet terrestrial, aquatic, and riparian habitat objectives through the use of prescribed and/or wildland fire, chemical, biological, and mechanical methods.		Accomplish habitat treatments to meet terrestrial, aquatic, and riparian habitat objectives through the use of prescribed and/or wildland fire and biological methods.	
Issue: Management of Henry Mountain Bison and Mule Deer				
Management Actions				
Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)	Alternative C	Alternative D
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide no special management for Henry Mountain bison or mule deer. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Develop a Habitat Management Plan (HMP) for bison, mule deer and other big game species within the Henry Mountain area in consultation with UDWR. <p>(The HMP would address management objectives with respect to size of herds (numbers of animals), desired ratio of male to female animals, and the reauthorization of voluntarily relinquished grazing</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Designate an ACEC in the Henry Mountains (288,200 acres) to recognize bison, mule deer, and scenic values. Manage bison habitat in cooperation with UDWR. Allow manipulation of habitat to benefit wildlife. Allow range improvements outside of wilderness characteristics areas (Alternative D only) that benefit wildlife (water developments, fencing riparian areas, etc.). Develop a HMP for bison and mule deer within the ACEC. Address voluntary relinquishments of grazing preference and reauthorization of AUMs as provided for in Instruction Memorandum IM-2007-67, <i>Relinquishment of Grazing Preference on BLM-Administered Lands</i>. See Section 2.6.3.3 (ACEC Decisions) for other management prescriptions. 	

Table 2-10. Fish and Wildlife Decisions

		preference and reallocation of forage on specific grazing allotments. The HMP would also address needed improvements for range conditions including proposed habitat improvement projects for both livestock and big game species to mitigate potential conflicts during seasons of use and the strategies required for herd adjustments during critical droughts.)		
Issue: Management of Desert Bighorn Sheep Habitat				
Management Actions				
Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)	Alternative C	Alternative D
Comply with the Henry Mountains Desert Bighorn HMP (1990).	Prohibit change in the kind of livestock from cattle to domestic sheep in those allotments with bighorn sheep habitat identified in the Desert Bighorn Sheep HMP.		Prohibit change in kind of livestock from cattle to domestic sheep within all identified bighorn sheep habitat.	
Implement no restrictions on surface disturbing activities in crucial bighorn sheep habitat.		Restrict surface disturbing activities in crucial bighorn sheep habitat during lambing season (April 15 through June 15). Exceptions may be granted on a case-by-case basis (see Appendix 11).	Restrict surface disturbing activities in crucial bighorn sheep habitat during lambing season (April 15 through June 15). Grant no exceptions.	
Issue: Management of OHV Use in Deer and Elk Habitats				
Management Actions				
Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)	Alternative C	Alternative D
Continue OHV management as outlined in current land use plans.	Require no specific OHV restrictions within crucial deer and elk habitat.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Limit OHV use to designated routes in deer and elk crucial winter habitat (646,000 acres), except for Glenwood, Aurora, and Mayfield Managed Open Areas. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> OHV use in 509,000 acres of deer and elk crucial winter range would be limited to designated routes. 142,000 acres of deer and 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> OHV use in 393,000 acres of deer and elk crucial winter range would be limited to designated routes. 258,000 acres of deer and

Table 2-10. Fish and Wildlife Decisions

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Close 4,000 acres of deer and elk crucial winter range to OHV use. Consider seasonal closure of designated routes on a case-by-case basis. (Maps 3-6 and 3-7)	elk crucial winter range would be closed to OHV use. (Maps 3-6 and 3-7)	elk crucial winter range would be closed to OHV use. (Maps 3-6 and 3-7)
Issue: Management of OHV Use in Crucial Bison Habitat				
Management Actions				
Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)	Alternative C	Alternative D
Close crucial bison habitat to OHV use from December 20–March 20 at Swap Mesa and Cave Flat.	Limit OHV use to designated routes in crucial bison habitat (251,000 acres).	Limit OHV use to designated routes in crucial bison habitat (251,000 acres).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> OHV use in 62,000 acres of crucial bison habitat would be limited to designated routes. 189,000 acres of crucial bison habitat would be closed to OHV use. (Map 3-5)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> OHV use in 44,000 acres of crucial bison habitat would be limited to designated routes. 207,000 acres of crucial bison habitat would be closed to OHV use. (Map 3-5)
Issue: Management of OHV Use in Sage Grouse Habitats				
Management Actions				
Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)	Alternative C	Alternative D
Continue to follow current policy for sensitive species.	Limit OHV use to designated routes in sage grouse leks and nesting habitats.	Limit OHV use to designated routes in all greater sage grouse habitats, including: breeding (leks), nesting, brood-rearing and wintering habitats.		
Issue: Management of OHV Use for Game Retrieval				
Management Actions				
Common to All Alternatives				
Manage OHV use for game retrieval consistent with OHV area and route designations.				
Issue: Seasonal Stipulation for Surface Disturbing Activities in Bison Habitats				
Management Actions				
Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)	Alternative C	Alternative D
Restrict oil and gas exploration and leasing activities in crucial bison	No special stipulation required, however, mitigation may be required for surface	Restrict surface disturbing activities in crucial bison habitats (Map 3-5) from November 1 through May 15 for protection of winter habitats and species sensitivity during calving season.		

Table 2-10. Fish and Wildlife Decisions

habitats (Map 3-5) from December 1 through April 15 for protection of winter habitats and species sensitivity during calving season.	disturbing activities in crucial bison habitats (Map 3-5) from November 1 through May 15.	See Appendix 11 for exceptions, modifications, or waivers.		
Issue: Seasonal Stipulation for Surface Disturbing Activities in Crucial and High Value Mule Deer and Elk Habitat				
Management Actions				
Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)	Alternative C	Alternative D
Restrict oil and gas exploration and development in crucial and high value mule deer and elk habitats (Maps 3-6 and 3-7) from December 15 through May 15 for protection of winter habitats and species sensitivity during fawning season.	No special stipulation required, however, mitigation may be required for surface disturbing activities in crucial and high value mule deer and elk habitats (Maps 3-6 and 3-7) from December 15 through April 15.	Restrict surface disturbing activities in crucial and high value mule deer and elk habitats) Maps 3-6 and 3-7) from December 15 through April 15 for protection of winter habitats, unless the action is carried out to enhance habitats for mule deer, elk and/or other wildlife. See Appendix 11 for exceptions, modifications, or waivers.	Restrict surface disturbing activities in crucial and high value mule deer and elk habitats (Maps 3-6 and 3-7) from December 15 through April 15 for protection of winter habitats. Grant no exceptions.	
Issue: Seasonal Stipulation for Surface Disturbing Activities in Crucial Desert Bighorn Sheep Habitat				
Management Actions				
Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)	Alternative C	Alternative D
No special stipulation required.	No special stipulation required, however, mitigation may be required for surface disturbing activities in crucial desert bighorn sheep habitat (Map 3-5) from April 15 through June 15.	Prohibit surface disturbing activities in crucial desert bighorn sheep habitat (Map 3-5) from April 15 through June 15 for protection of species sensitivity during lambing season.		

Table 2-10. Fish and Wildlife Decisions

Issue: Special Stipulations for Surface Disturbing Activities in Crucial Pronghorn Antelope Habitat				
Management Actions				
Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)	Alternative C	Alternative D
Prohibit oil and gas exploration and development activities in crucial pronghorn antelope habitat (Map 3-5) from December 1 through April 30 for protection of species sensitivity during fawning season.	No special stipulation required, however, mitigation may be required for surface disturbing activities in crucial pronghorn antelope habitat (Map 3-5) from May 15 through June 15.	Restrict surface disturbing activities in crucial pronghorn antelope habitat (Map 3-5) from May 15 through June 15 for protection of species sensitivity during fawning season. See Appendix 11 for exceptions, modifications, or waivers.		
Issue: Special Stipulations for Surface Disturbing Activities Near Sage Grouse Leks				
Management Actions				
Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)	Alternative C	Alternative D
Prohibit surface disturbing activities from March 1 through July 15, for protection of species sensitivity during lekking activities.	Prohibit surface disturbing activities within one-quarter mile of sage grouse leks from March 15 through June 1 for protection of species sensitivity during lekking activities. Any surface disturbing activity conducted outside this time frame would not result in an above ground structure within one-quarter mile of leks from March 15 through June 1.	Prohibit surface disturbing activities within one-half mile of sage grouse leks from March 15 through June 1 for protection of species sensitivity during lekking activities. Any surface disturbing activity conducted outside this time frame would not result in an above ground structure within one-half mile of leks from March 15 through June 1.	Prohibit surface disturbing activities within two miles of sage grouse leks from March 15 through June 1 for protection of species sensitivity during lekking activities. Any surface disturbing activity conducted outside this time frame would not result in an above ground structure within two miles of leks from March 15 through June 1.	
Issue: Special Stipulations for Surface Disturbing Activities within Sage Grouse Brooding Habitat				
Management Actions				
Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)	Alternative C	Alternative D
Prohibit surface disturbing activities within sage grouse brooding habitat from April 1 through June 15 for protection of brooding and	No special stipulation required for surface disturbing activities within sage grouse brooding habitat.	Prohibit long-term surface disturbing activities within sage grouse brooding/nesting habitat from April 1 through July 15 for	Prohibit long-term surface disturbing activities within sage grouse brooding/nesting habitat from April 1 through July 15 for protection of brooding and nesting activities.	

Table 2-10. Fish and Wildlife Decisions

nesting activities.		protection of brooding and nesting activities, unless the activity is completed to improve sage grouse brooding habitat.		
Issue: Special Stipulation for Surface Disturbing Activities in Riparian and Wetland Habitats				
Management Actions				
Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)	Alternative C	Alternative D
Prohibit surface disturbing activities within 500 feet of live water.	Prohibit surface disturbing activities within 330 feet of streams with intermittent or perennial reaches, resulting in no surface occupancy in this area, for protection of habitat for riparian-obligate species.		Prohibit surface disturbing activities within 660 feet of streams with intermittent or perennial reaches, resulting in no surface occupancy in this area, for protection of habitat for riparian-obligate species.	
Issue: Reintroduction, Transplantation, Augmentation, and Reestablishment of Wildlife and Fish Species				
Management Actions				
Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)	Alternative C	Alternative D
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cooperate with UDWR and USFWS in reintroducing wildlife species into historic ranges as determined through NEPA analysis. Consider wildlife transplants of big game species and fish. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Analyze UDWR and USFWS proposals to introduce, augment, transplant, and reestablish wildlife species through NEPA evaluation. Introduction, translocation, transplantation, augmentation, and reestablishment of both native and naturalized fish and wildlife species would be allowed in cooperation and collaboration with UDWR. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Analyze UDWR and USFWS proposals to introduce, augment, transplant, and reestablish wildlife species through NEPA evaluation. Introductions, translocation, transplantation, augmentation, and reestablishment of native species only would be allowed in cooperation and collaboration with UDWR. 	
Issue: Management of Raptor Habitat				
Management Actions				
Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)	Alternative C	Alternative D
Manage raptors as required in current land use plans.	Implement the following direction: "Raptor management will be guided by the use of "Raptor Best Management Practices" (Appendix 10), utilizing seasonal and spatial buffers, as well as mitigation, to maintain and enhance raptor nesting and foraging habitat, while allowing other resource uses."			

2.6.1.10 Wild Horses and Burros

Table 2-11. Wild Horses and Burros Decisions

Desired Outcomes (Goals and Objectives)				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Manage wild burros at appropriate levels in viable, vigorous, and stable populations to ensure a natural ecological balance among wild burro populations, wildlife, livestock, vegetation resources, and other resource values. • Manage for genetic diversity of wild burros within the Canyonlands Herd Management Area. • Maintain, enhance, and perpetuate the viable herd’s distinguishing characteristics that were typical at the time of the passage of the Wild Free-Roaming Horse and Burro Act or that are identified in population management plans. 				
Issue: Overall Wild Horses and Burros Management Guidance				
Management Actions				
Common to All Alternatives				
<p>Manage wild burro populations for appropriate age and sex ratios, genetic viability, and adoptability, as well as maintaining AML on the established HMA (Map 3-8). Allow wild burro research, as long as other wild horse and burro program goals are met. Wild burro herd research data that may be collected include, but are not limited to, data to determine population size and characteristics, assess herd health, determine herd history and genetic profile (blood and hair sampling, Instruction Memorandum IM # 2002-095 <i>Gather Policy and Selective Removal Criteria for Wild Horses Program Area: Wild Horse and Burro Program</i>), and conduct immunocontraceptive research and monitor results as appropriate. Data gathering in the Canyonlands wild burro herd has historically been limited to aerial population counts. Other data that could be useful in population management would include general characteristics such as age ratios, sex ratios, and color, as well as health characteristics such as pregnancy rates, parasite loading, and the general physical condition of the burros. Additionally, genetic sampling would determine the genetic health of the herd.</p>				
Issue: Management of the Canyonlands Herd Management Area				
Management Actions				
Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)	Alternative C	Alternative D
<p>Manage Canyonlands HMA as a wild burro HMA. No AML has been set in existing planning documents (Map 3-8).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allocate 100 AUMs for wild burros. • Maintain the AML of the Canyonlands HMA at levels to maintain genetic viability. 		<p>Manage Canyonlands HMA as a wild burro HMA with an AML of 60–100 (Map 3-8).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allocate 600 AUMs for wild burros to meet an AML upper limit of 100. • Maintain the AML of the Canyonlands HMA at levels to maintain genetic viability. • Allow introductions of wild burros from other herd areas to maintain genetic viability, given the burros being introduced have 	<p>Manage Canyonlands HMA as a wild burro HMA with an AML of 120–200 (Map 3-8).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allocate 1,200 AUMs for wild burros to meet an AML upper limit of 200. • Maintain the AML of the Canyonlands HMA at levels to maintain genetic viability. 	

Table 2-11. Wild Horses and Burros Decisions

	characteristics similar to the burros in the Canyonlands HMA.	
--	---	--

2.6.1.11 Fire and Fuels Management

Table 2-12. Fire And Fuels Management Decisions

Desired Outcomes (Goals and Objectives)				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Manage fire and fuels to protect life, firefighter safety, property, and critical resource values. • Reduce the threat of wildfire in the Wildland Urban Interface (WUI). • Manage fire and fuels, where appropriate, to restore natural systems to their desired future condition, considering the interrelated social and economic components. • Manage wildland fires to minimize cost considering firefighter and public safety, benefits, and values to be protected, consistent with resource objectives. 				
Issue: Fire Management in the Wildland Urban Interface				
Management Actions				
Common to All Alternatives				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Employ WUI Fire and Fuels Management according to national policy to meet vegetation treatment goals. • Work with partners in the WUI in wildland firefighting, hazardous fuels reduction, prevention and education, and technical assistance. 				
Issue: Appropriate Management Response, Hazardous Fuels Reduction, and Wildland Fire Use				
Management Actions				
Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)	Alternative C	Alternative D
<p>Manage fire using a full suite of tools that allows for the graduated movement to a more ecologically sustainable condition and reduction of hazardous fuels.</p>	<p>Implement appropriate management response (AMR) according to General Risk Categories (GRCs), as contained in Appendix 6. The General Risk Categories contain criteria for managing dynamic vegetation communities. Wildland fire use would not be appropriate in the following areas—</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> –Administrative sites –Developed recreation sites –Communication sites –Oil and gas facilities –Mining facilities –Above-ground utility corridors –High-use travel corridors –Crucial wildlife habitats where fire is unwanted 			

Table 2-12. Fire And Fuels Management Decisions

<p>–General Risk Category A, such as desert scrub communities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prioritize other fire management activities as directed and prioritized in the GRCs. • Specific fire suppression directions are noted in Section 2.6.3.3, ACEC Decisions, for protection of identified relevant and important values from irreparable damage. • Give specific considerations when implementing suppression activities to special status species habitats and cultural resource sites. 				
Issue: Hazardous Fuels Reduction				
Management Actions				
Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)	Alternative C	Alternative D
<p>Hazardous fuels would be reduced to restore ecosystems; protect human, natural and cultural resources; and reduce the threat of wildfire to communities.</p>	<p>Manage fire and fuels through treatments conducted on up to 1,472,000 acres over the life of the plan. Use the full range of treatment types (e.g., prescribed and wildland fire, mechanical, chemical, biological, and cultural treatments. (An annual average of 73,600 acres would need to receive treatment to reach the total treatment acreage listed (see Table 2-12a). Actual annual treatment acreage would vary depending on conditions, staffing, etc. These acreage figures include all vegetation and fire fuels treatments (See also Section 2.6.1.4)).</p>		<p>Manage fire and fuels through treatments conducted on up to 520,000 acres over the life of the plan. Use prescribed fire, intensively treating areas to create properly functioning ecosystems and desired natural communities. The type of treatment would vary depending on case-by-case environmental conditions. Human management would be applied to protect life and property and to ensure ecosystem function in areas currently at risk of losing key ecosystem components following wildland fire. (An annual average of 26,000 acres would need to receive treatment to reach the total treatment acreage listed (see Table 2-12a). Actual annual treatment acreage would vary depending on conditions, staffing, etc. These acreage figures include all vegetation and fire fuels treatment (See also Section 2.6.1.4)).</p>	
Issue: Prevention and Mitigation of Wildland Fire				
Management Actions				
Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)	Alternative C	Alternative D
<p>Prevent human-caused fires through coordination with partners and affected groups and individuals. Utilize a full range of prevention and mitigation activities.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prevent human-caused fires through coordination with partners and affected groups and individuals. Utilize a full range of prevention and mitigation activities. • Prioritization criteria are contained in the GRCs (Appendix 6). 			

Table 2-12. Fire And Fuels Management Decisions

Issue: Emergency Stabilization and Rehabilitation (ESR)				
Management Actions				
Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)	Alternative C	Alternative D
Undertake ESR efforts to protect and sustain ecosystems, public health, and safety, and to help communities protect infrastructure.		Undertake ESR efforts to protect and sustain ecosystems, public health, and safety, and to help communities protect infrastructure. Prioritize implementation of post-fire emergency stabilization and rehabilitation activities considering the following criteria—		
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Areas that could pose a threat to life and property • Areas with potential for invasive species invasion, significant ecosystem alteration (e.g., Condition Class 3 areas), and soil stabilization 		

Table 2-12a. Estimated Treatment Acreages

ESTIMATED TREATMENT ACREAGES		
20 Year Treatment Acreage – Alternatives A and B	20 Year Treatment Acreage – Alternatives C and D	Vegetation Class
0	0	Other (Non-Vegetated)
58,634	7,329	Mixed Conifer
5,786	1,927	Aspen
171,140	34,228	Ponderosa
19,629	7,852	Oak
16,378	8,189	Mountain Shrub
671,277	223,759	Pinyon-Juniper
343,781	171,891	Sagebrush Steppe
185,515	64,930	Desert Grassland
0	0	Desert Brush
1,472,140	520,105	
Estimated Average Treatment per Year		
73,607	26,005	

2.6.1.12 Non-WSA Lands with Wilderness Characteristics

Table 2-13. Wilderness Characteristics Decisions

Desired Outcomes (Goals and Objectives)				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Protect or preserve the wilderness characteristics (appearance of naturalness and outstanding opportunities for solitude or primitive and unconfined recreation or solitude) of areas with 5,000 acres or more of non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics, as appropriate. • Manage primitive and backcountry landscapes to preserve their undeveloped character and scenic quality, and to provide opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreational activities and experiences of solitude, as appropriate. 				
Issue: Management of Non-WSA Lands with Wilderness Characteristics				
Management Actions				
Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)	Alternative C	Alternative D
No special direction for managing the non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics is included in the existing land use plans.	Provide no special management direction for protecting the non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics.			Protect the 29 areas (682,600 acres) of non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics (identified in Chapter 3 and on Map 3-9) through the following land allocations and prescriptions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Designate as VRM Class I • Manage for primitive and semi-primitive non-motorized recreation • Close to motorized and mechanized use • Retain land in public ownership • Avoid new rights-of-way • Propose for withdrawal from mineral entry • Close to oil and gas leasing • Close to mineral material sales • Unavailable for further consideration for coal leasing

2.6.2 Resource Uses

2.6.2.1 Forestry and Woodland Products

Table 2-14. Forestry and Woodland Products Decisions

Desired Outcomes (Goals and Objectives)				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide forest and woodland products (including fuelwood, timber, posts, pinyon nuts, and Christmas trees) on a sustainable basis. • Reduce pinyon-juniper encroachment through woodland product use where increased density threatens other resource values. • Provide opportunities for seed and live plant collecting where and when ecologically feasible. • Emphasize forest and woodland health. 				
Issue: Overall Management of Forests and Woodlands				
Management Actions				
Common to All Alternatives				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allow use of forest and woodland species to achieve desired conditions. • Reforest sites after disturbances. • Manage forests and woodlands to meet objectives of the Healthy Forest Restoration Act of 2003, including— <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Develop a Forest and Woodlands Management Plan. – Give priority to restoration of destroyed or degraded woodland ecosystems. – Employ commercial uses to improve forest and woodland ecosystem health. – Emphasize partnerships among internal programs and outside agencies for forest and woodland management. – Increase monitoring of forest and woodland conditions. – Emphasize public education on forest and woodland health, fire danger, and resource uses. – Identify, maintain, and restore old-growth forests. 				
Issue: Areas Open to Timber Harvest				
Management Actions				
Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)	Alternative C	Alternative D
West of Capitol Reef National Park— <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Manage commercial timber harvest on a case-by-case basis East of Capitol Reef National Park— <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continue to prohibit commercial timber 	Provide for commercial and non-commercial timber harvest where feasible, sustainable, and compatible with restoring, maintaining, or improving forest health.		Allow no commercial timber harvest.	

Table 2-14. Forestry and Woodland Products Decisions

harvesting.				
Issue: Areas Open to Woodland Products Harvest: Christmas Trees, Posts, Green Wood Cutting, and Fuelwood				
Management Actions				
Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)	Alternative C	Alternative D
<p>West of Capitol Reef National Park—</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allow harvest of dead and down woodland products by permit on a case-by-case basis. • Allow green wood cutting in specified areas by permit. <p>East of Capitol Reef National Park—</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide for non-commercial use of woodland products outside WSAs by permit. 	<p>Provide for commercial and non-commercial use of forest and woodland products where sustainable and compatible with restoring, maintaining, and improving woodland health, in areas specified by permit. WSAs and suitable WSR corridors would be closed to commercial and non-commercial use of forest and woodland products. Exceptions for traditional American Indian use may be considered.</p>		<p>Provide for commercial and non-commercial use of forest and woodland products where sustainable and compatible with restoring, maintaining, and improving woodland health, in areas specified by permit. WSAs, non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics, and suitable WSR corridors would be closed to commercial and non-commercial use of forest and woodland products. Exceptions for traditional American Indian use may be considered.</p>	
Issue: Management of Seed and Live Plant Collecting				
Management Actions				
Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)	Alternative C	Alternative D
<p>Allow commercial and non-commercial live plant and seed collecting by permit.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allow commercial and non-commercial live plant and seed collecting by permit. • Consider designating specific seed collecting areas for resource benefits. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allow commercial and non-commercial live plant and seed collection by permit in areas outside WSAs and suitable Wild and Scenic River corridors. Exceptions for traditional American Indian use may be considered. • Consider designating specific seed collecting areas for resource benefits. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allow no commercial or non-commercial live plant and seed collecting within WSAs, non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics and suitable Wild and Scenic River corridors. Exceptions for traditional American Indian use may be considered. • Consider designating

Table 2-14. Forestry and Woodland Products Decisions

			specific seed collecting areas for resource benefits.
--	--	--	---

2.6.2.2 Livestock Grazing

Table 2-15. Livestock Grazing Decisions

Desired Outcomes (Goals and Objectives)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide for the orderly use, improvement, and development of the range for livestock grazing. • Provide for livestock grazing while maintaining rangelands in properly functioning condition. • Maintain healthy, sustainable rangeland ecosystems and restore degraded rangelands to meet Utah’s Standards for Rangeland Health, and to provide a wide range of public values such as wildlife habitat, livestock forage, recreation opportunities, clean water, and functional watersheds. • Livestock use and associated management practices would be integrated with other multiple use needs and objectives to maintain, protect, and improve rangeland health.
Issue: General Grazing Management
Management Actions
Common to All Alternatives
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Monitor and evaluate grazing allotments to maintain or improve rangeland productivity. • Adjust permit terms and conditions (e.g. permitted use, amount of use, season of use, and kind and class of livestock) when grazing permits are renewed, transferred, or as otherwise deemed necessary by site-specific evaluation of monitoring data and environmental analysis. • Use livestock grazing to enhance ecosystem health or mitigate resource problems (e.g., noxious/invasive weed control, hazardous fuel reduction) where supported by site-specific environmental analysis. • During periods of drought, adjust livestock numbers annually based on estimates of the available forage. • Exclude livestock grazing from small areas (such as springs) within allotments that cannot meet Rangeland Health Standards with livestock grazing. • Voluntary relinquishment of grazing permits and preference, in whole or in part, by a permittee in writing to the BLM would be handled on a case-by-case basis. BLM would not recognize as valid, relinquishments which are conditional on specific BLM actions and BLM would not be bound by them. Relinquished permits and the associated preference will remain available for application by qualified applicants after BLM considers if such action would meet Rangeland Health Standards and is compatible with achieving land use plan goals and objectives. Prior to re-issuance of the relinquished permit the terms and conditions may be modified to meet RMP goals and objectives and/or site-specific resource objectives. However, upon relinquishment, BLM may determine through a site-specific evaluation and associated environmental analysis that the public lands involved are better used for other purposes. Grazing may then be discontinued on the allotment through an amendment to the Resource Management Plan. Any decision issued concerning discontinuance of livestock grazing is not permanent and may be reconsidered and changed through future land use plan amendments and updates.

Table 2-15. Livestock Grazing Decisions

Issue: Forage Allocations				
Management Actions				
Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)	Alternative C	Alternative D
<p>Continue to permit livestock use on those allotments shown on Map 2-7 and in Appendix 7 (Table A7-1).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Acres available for grazing: 1,989,048 • Acres unavailable for grazing: 138,952 • Available AUMs: 146,202 	<p>Permit livestock use on those allotments shown on Map 2-6 and in Appendix 7 (Table A7-2). Fourteen allotments comprising 36,950 acres previously unavailable to livestock grazing would again be available to livestock grazing.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Acres available for grazing: 2,025,998 • Acres unavailable for grazing: 102,002 • Available AUMs: 147,281 	<p>Permit livestock use on those allotments shown on Map 2-7 and in Appendix 7 (Table A7-3).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Acres available for grazing: 1,989,048 • Acres unavailable for grazing: 138,952 • Available AUMs: 146,202 		
Issue: Grazing Allotment Boundaries				
Management Actions				
Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)	Alternative C	Alternative D
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continue to manage Long Hollow, Terza Flat, Deleeuw, and Loa Winter allotments as separate allotments. • Continue to manage Flat Top, King Sheep, and Bicknell Winter allotments as separate allotments. • Manage Cedar Peak, Hare Lake, Smooth Knoll, and Bicknell Spring allotments as separate allotments. • Manage Cyclone and Cyclone Co-Op allotments 	<p>Authorize allotment boundary changes, including combining and splitting allotments, on a case-by-case basis after environmental analysis. Provide for the following allotment combinations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Combine Long Hollow, Terza Flat, and Deleeuw Allotments with the Loa Winter Allotment. • Combine Flat Top and King Sheep allotments with the Bicknell Winter Allotment. • Combine Cedar Peak, Hare Lake, and Smooth Knoll Allotments with the Bicknell Spring Allotment. • Combine the Cyclone Allotment with the Cyclone Co-Op Allotment. 			

Table 2-15. Livestock Grazing Decisions

as separate allotments.				
Issue: Guidelines and Criteria for Adjusting Allotment-Specific Grazing Management Practices				
Management Actions				
Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)	Alternative C	Alternative D
Existing land use plans do not specifically address this issue.	<p>Conversion in Kind of Livestock Authorize conversion in kind of livestock on a case-by-case basis when justified through environmental analysis. Permittees may be required to provide needed range improvements to support the conversion. A conversion may be justified when it meets the following criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Monitoring studies or other acceptable data support the conversion; • Environmental conditions (e.g. vegetation types, topographic features, water availability) can accommodate the conversion; • Change in kind of livestock poses no threat to other resources; • A trial change proves acceptable. <p>Adjusting Livestock Season of Use Consider adjustments to season of use when resource conditions indicate a change is needed. Conduct appropriate environmental analysis prior to any changes. Resource conditions include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Physiological requirements (reproduction and maintenance) of desired plant species are not being met; • Range conditions are declining due to season of use; • Conflicts with other resources or uses are identified. <p>Consider the following actions if livestock grazing is contributing to declining range conditions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Shorten the grazing period; • Temporary suspension of use; • Implement or change grazing system; • Authorize non-use until conditions improve. <p>Authorize permittee requests for changes to livestock season of use when the following conditions are met:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Physiological requirements (e.g., reproduction and maintenance) of desired plants can be met; • On community allotments, all permittees in that allotment must agree to the change; • Requested changes do not conflict with other established land uses; • A trial of the change proves acceptable; • Permittees may be required to provide needed range improvements to support changing the season of use. <p>Adjusting Permitted Use Consider changes to permitted use if:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Change is supported by monitoring data, field observations, ecological site inventory, or other acceptable data; • Conflicts with other uses are identified; • There is a change in public land ownership (increase or decrease); • Protection of other resources is required; • Changes are required by 43 CFR 4180 (Rangeland Health regulations). 			

Table 2-15. Livestock Grazing Decisions

Issue: Administrative Access for Grazing Management				
Management Actions				
Common to All Alternatives				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continue to allow motorized access to range improvements for allotment management purposes. • Allow access within WSAs according to IMP. 				
Issue: Managing Domestic Sheep/Wildlife Conflicts				
Management Actions				
Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)	Alternative C	Alternative D
Permit domestic sheep grazing in bighorn sheep habitat while following the Guidelines for Domestic Sheep and Goat Management in Native Wild Sheep Habitats	Permit domestic sheep grazing in bighorn sheep habitat while following the Guidelines for Domestic Sheep and Goat Management in Native Wild Sheep Habitats	Permit no domestic sheep and goat grazing east of Capitol Reef National Park, subject to existing livestock grazing permits.	Permit no domestic sheep and goat grazing in bighorn sheep habitat throughout the lands managed by the RFO, subject to existing livestock grazing permits.	

2.6.2.3 Recreation

Table 2-16. Recreation Decisions

Desired Outcomes (Goals and Objectives)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide recreational opportunities in a variety of physical, social and administrative settings, from primitive to near-urban, that allow visitors to have desired recreational experiences and enjoy the resulting benefits. • Provide opportunities for recreational experiences unique to the lands managed by the RFO, consistent with resource capabilities and mandated resource requirements; provide for visitor education and interpretation of the recreational opportunities within the RFO. • Encourage entrepreneurial enterprises. • Work with local communities to foster recreation and tourism. • Provide for public health and safety through interpretation, facility development, and visitor management. • Maintain important recreational values and sites in Federal ownership to ensure a continued diversity of recreation settings, activities and opportunities.
Issue: Overall Recreation Guidance
Management Actions
Common to All Alternatives
Implement the Utah BLM Standards for Rangeland Health and Guidelines for Recreation Management, as follows— <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recognize that various levels of regulations and limits may be necessary, but that restrictions and limitations on public uses should be as small as possible

Table 2-16. Recreation Decisions

<p>without compromising the primary goal.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use an on-the-ground presence as a tool to protect public lands. • Where long-term damage by recreational usage is observed or anticipated, limit or control activities through special management tools such as designated campsites, permits, area closures, and limitations on numbers of users and duration of usage. • Revise recreation management plans and RMPs when they prove to be either overly restrictive or inadequate to protect public land health. • Coordinate with other Federal and state agencies, county and local governments, and tribal nations in recreation planning and managing traffic, search and rescues operations, trash control and removal, and public safety. • Consider and implement where appropriate, management methods to protect resources while maintaining the quality of the experience of various users. Limitations could include numbers, types, timing and duration of usage. • Encourage the location of public land recreational activities near population centers and highway corridors by the placement of appropriate visitor use infrastructure. Provide restrooms and other facilities adequate for anticipated uses at designated campgrounds, trailheads, and other areas where recreational users concentrate. • Allow non-commercial dispersed camping without permit, throughout the RFO administered lands, unless directed by other management prescriptions. • Allow no rock climbing within 300 feet of cultural sites or within one-quarter mile of raptor nests during nesting seasons. • Allow no camping within one-half mile of any Mexican spotted owl protected activity center (PAC). • BLM Back Country Byways may be designated in the future as deemed appropriate with site-specific environmental analysis. • National Recreation Trails may be designated in the future as deemed appropriate with site-specific environmental analysis. • Encourage “Leave No Trace” and “Tread Lightly” camping and travel techniques. 				
Issue: Management of Extensive Recreation Management Areas (ERMAs)				
Management Actions				
Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)	Alternative C	Alternative D
<p>Continue managing recreation as directed in current land use plans.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Portions of the decision area not delineated as a SRMA would be identified as an 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 land use plan decisions. • Manage the ERMAs to provide a variety of recreational opportunities including primitive, semi-primitive non-motorized, semi-primitive motorized, roaded natural, and rural. Provide outdoor settings ranging from areas with a high-to-moderate opportunity for solitude and closeness to nature, where visitors should be prepared for a high level of self reliance, challenge, and risk; to areas where visitors have the convenience of facilities and a higher interaction with other users. • Consider limiting recreational access, season of use, and numbers of users, if needed, to protect other resources. • Provide facilities, based on needs for resource protection and user demand. Consider site-specific development on a case-by-case basis, ranging from minimal, rustic facilities to larger developments that would require major site modifications. • Manage public lands in the Fiddler Butte, Labyrinth Canyon, Blue Hills, and Little Rockies areas in a primitive, naturally appearing setting for a high probability of experiencing solitude, freedom, closeness to nature, self reliance, challenge, and risk. Interaction and evidence of other users would be low. (In some alternatives, these areas are part of SRMAs.) Achieve this by— <ul style="list-style-type: none"> –Preserving resources while providing for a sustainable recreational opportunity; –Managing access and travel primarily as non-motorized, with motorized travel limited to designated routes (access for 			

Table 2-16. Recreation Decisions

	<p>people with disabilities would be difficult);</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Providing minimum improvements needed for site protection; – Providing no on-site interpretative facilities. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Manage public lands adjacent to other Federal and state lands to complement the recreational experience on the adjoining lands. • Designate sites and areas appropriate for large group events and camping, including— <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Starr Spring campground – McMillan Spring campground – Sandy Creek Overlook (except in Alternative D) – Apple Brush Flat near McMillan Spring road junction – Turkey Haven – Two sites along Sulphur Creek – Others as necessary to meet recreation demand and protect resources • Provide signs, trails, trailhead parking, and staging areas to facilitate the use and enjoyment of the ERMA and to protect visitor health, safety, and resources. • Maintain and improve the Paiute, Great Western, and other motorized trail systems. • Maintain and improve a non-motorized trail system. 			
Issue: Establishment and Management of Special Recreation Management Areas (SRMAs)				
Management Actions				
Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)	Alternative C	Alternative D
Current land use plans identify one SRMA.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establish and manage SRMAs, as identified below. • Manage recreation activities and developments in the SRMA to support SRMA goals and objectives. • Develop recreation facilities in response to resource management needs appropriate to the intent of the SRMA. 			
One SRMA, 120 acres Yuba Reservoir (defer management of Yuba SRMA to Fillmore Field Office (FO) in all alternatives)	Five SRMAs, 516,400 acres OHV: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Factory Butte • Big Rocks • Sahara Sands Dispersed Recreation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dirty Devil • Otter Creek See Map 2-8	Five SRMAs, 838,700 acres OHV: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Factory Butte • Big Rocks Dispersed Recreation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Henry Mountains • Dirty Devil • Capitol Reef Gateway See Map 2-9	Four SRMAs, 928,550 acres Dispersed Recreation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Henry Mountains • Dirty Devil • Capitol Reef Gateway • Sevier Canyon See Map 2-10	Seven SRMAs, 1,358,200 acres Primitive and semi-primitive recreation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Henry Mountains • Dirty Devil • Capitol Reef Gateway • E. Fork Sevier River • San Rafael Swell • Little Rockies • Labyrinth Canyon Dispersed recreation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Capitol Reef Gateway

Table 2-16. Recreation Decisions

				• E. Fork Sevier River See Map 2-11
Issue: Management of Recreational Opportunities in the E. Fork Sevier River (Including Otter Creek Reservoir)				
Management Actions				
Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)	Alternative C	Alternative D
Continue managing the area as a part of the ERMA in cooperation with the Utah Division of Parks and Recreation (Otter Creek State Park).	<p>Otter Creek Reservoir SRMA</p> <p>Establish the 3,200 acres of public land adjacent to Otter Creek Reservoir as an SRMA (Map 2-8).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Manage the SRMA to provide a roaded natural experience, providing users the opportunity to interact with each other in developed sites while providing some chance of privacy. • Provide a moderate level of access for people with disabilities. • Provide some facilities for user comfort. Allow site modifications if needed. • Provide simple way-side interpretive exhibits. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Manage the area as a part of the ERMA in cooperation with the Utah Division of Parks and Recreation. • If warranted by demand, enhance and expand recreation opportunities and facilities such as campgrounds, water, restrooms, and other recreation, picnic, and trailhead facilities. 	Manage the area as a part of the ERMA in cooperation with the Utah Division of Parks and Recreation.	<p>East Fork of the Sevier River SRMA</p> <p>Establish the East Fork of the Sevier River SRMA (59,500 acres)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Manage lands around Otter Creek Reservoir for dispersed recreational uses in cooperation with the Utah Division of Park and Recreation. • Manage non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics in and around Kingston Canyon for primitive recreation opportunities. • Manage remaining lands for a roaded natural experience, providing users the opportunity to interact with each other in developed sites while providing some chance of privacy. • Manage the East Fork of the Sevier River in cooperation with the UDWR to enhance the blue ribbon fishing opportunities • Enhance, expand and market recreation

Table 2-16. Recreation Decisions

				opportunities and facilities such as the Paiute ATV Trail, campgrounds, water, restrooms, and other recreation, picnic, and trailhead facilities as a regional destination location.
Continue to manage the area as open to OHV use.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Limit OHV use in the SRMA to designated routes and trails east of the reservoir. Provide an OHV open area west of the reservoir. 	Limit OHVs to designated routes, according to the area designations shown in Section 2.6.2.4, Travel Management.		Close non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics to off-highway vehicle use. Elsewhere in the SRMA, limit vehicles to designated routes. Allow permitted access, where needed, to range developments and mining claims as identified in the activity plan.
Not applicable.	Complete an SRMA activity plan within five years of RMP Record of Decision (ROD).	Not applicable.	Not applicable.	Complete an SRMA activity plan within five years of RMP Record of Decision.
Issue: Management of Recreational Opportunities in the Factory Butte Area				
Management Actions				
Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)	Alternative C	Alternative D
Continue managing the Factory Butte area as part of the ERMA.	<p>Factory Butte SRMA</p> <p>Identify 199,700 acres of public land as the Factory Butte SRMA (Map 2-8) to provide a motorized recreational experience that involves a high degree of self-reliance, challenge, and risk in a natural setting.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Allow moderate to extensive landscape modifications. Provide limited signing and interpretation. 	<p>Factory Butte SRMA</p> <p>Identify 2,600 acres of public land as the Factory Butte SRMA (Map 2-9) to provide a motorized recreational experience that involves a high degree of self-reliance, challenge, and risk in a natural setting.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Allow moderate to extensive landscape modifications. Provide limited signing and interpretation. 	<p>Manage recreation values in the Factory Butte area as part of the ERMA in concert with the Badlands ACEC designation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Develop no facilities to support recreation activities unless needed to meet ACEC objectives. 	<p>San Rafael Swell SRMA</p> <p>Identify 127,100 acres of public land in the Factory Butte area as part of the San Rafael Swell SRMA (Map 2-11) for primitive and semi-primitive recreational opportunities. Manage in coordination with the Price FO.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Preserve or retain the existing character of the landscape. Develop facilities to

Table 2-16. Recreation Decisions

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Develop facilities to provide for visitor health and safety and support the objectives of the SRMA. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Develop facilities to provide for visitor health and safety and support the objectives of the SRMA. 		<p>support motorized and non-motorized recreation in a dispersed setting and to provide for health and safety, such as restrooms, staging areas, loading facilities, and parking areas.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Manage SRMA for a medium probability of experiencing solitude, closeness to nature, self-reliance, challenge, and risk in an unmodified and natural appearing environment with low interaction or evidence of other users. Manage recreational activities to sustain natural resources while meeting social and economic needs, emphasizing the opportunity to experience solitude by recreational vehicle touring, camping, and hiking.
Continue to manage OHV use per The Notice of OHV Travel Restriction for motorized use in the Factory Butte area (See Section 2.6.2.4)	Designate SRMA as open to OHV use (Map 2-8).	Designate SRMA as open to OHV use (Map 2-9).	Close mesa tops to OHV use. Elsewhere in the ACEC, limit OHVs to designated trails to prevent irreparable damage to cultural resources, badlands topography, listed species, and scenic values (Map 2-10).	Close mesa tops and non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics to OHV use. Elsewhere in SRMA, limit vehicles to designated routes. Allow permitted access, where needed, to range developments and mining claims as identified in the activity plan. (Map 2-11).
Not applicable.	Complete an SRMA activity plan within five years of the RMP Record of Decision.	Complete an SRMA activity plan within five years of the RMP Record of Decision.	Not applicable.	Complete an SRMA activity plan within five years of the RMP Record of Decision.

Table 2-16. Recreation Decisions

Issue: Management of Recreational Opportunities in the Big Rocks Area Near Loa				
Management Actions				
Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)	Alternative C	Alternative D
Continue to manage the Big Rocks area as part of the ERMA.	<p>Big Rocks SRMA</p> <p>Identify Big Rocks SRMA (9,300 acres) and provide for motorized and dispersed recreational use, including competitive motorized recreation events (Map 2-8).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Manage recreational activities to sustain natural resources while meeting social and economic needs, emphasizing the opportunity to experience solitude. • Provide access ranging from moderate to easy through a full range of motorized vehicle types with little self-reliance and a high or moderate level of interaction between users. • Provide signing and interpretation as needed. • Develop facilities to support motorized and dispersed recreational activities, such as restrooms, staging areas, loading facilities and parking areas. 	<p>Big Rocks SRMA</p> <p>Identify Big Rocks SRMA (265 acres) to provide for motorized recreational use, including competitive motorized recreation events (Map 2-9).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Manage motorized recreational activities to sustain natural resources while meeting social and economic needs. • Provide access ranging from moderate to easy through a full range of motorized vehicle types with little self-reliance and a high or moderate level of interaction between users. • Provide signing and interpretation as needed. • Develop facilities to support motorized and dispersed recreational activities, such as restrooms, staging areas, loading facilities, and parking areas. 	Manage the Big Rocks area as part of the ERMA.	
Continue managing as an OHV open area.	Manage SRMA as an OHV open area.	Manage SRMA as an OHV open area.	Limit OHVs to designated routes according to Section 2.6.2.4, Travel Management.	

Table 2-16. Recreation Decisions

Not applicable	Complete an activity plan within five years of the RMP Record of Decision.	Complete an activity plan within five years of the RMP Record of Decision.	Not applicable	Not applicable
Issue: Management of Recreational Opportunities in the Dirty Devil/Robbers Roost Area				
Management Actions				
Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)	Alternative C	Alternative D
Continue to manage area as part of ERMA.	<p>Dirty Devil SRMA</p> <p>Identify the Dirty Devil/Robbers Roost area as an SRMA (290,000 acres, see Map 2-8) to provide for recreational experiences complementary with the remote and scenic nature and other resource values of the area. (SRMA includes the Dirty Devil WSA, Horseshoe Canyon WSA, Happy Canyon—French Springs WSA, and the Beaver Wash ACEC.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Manage SRMA consistent with prescriptions identified in the Beaver Wash ACEC and direction provided in the IMP for WSAs • Manage SRMA for a high probability of experiencing solitude, closeness to nature, self-reliance, challenge, and risk in an unmodified and natural appearing environment with very low interaction or evidence of other users. • Provide opportunities for primitive and semi-primitive, non-motorized 	<p>Dirty Devil SRMA</p> <p>Identify the Dirty Devil/Robbers Roost area as an SRMA (290,000 acres, see Map 2-9) to provide for recreational experiences complementary with the remote and scenic nature and other resource values of the area. (SRMA includes Dirty Devil WSA, Horseshoe Canyon WSA, the Happy Canyon—French Springs WSA, and the suitable Dirty Devil Wild and Scenic River segment.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Manage the portions of the WSAs within the SRMA according to the IMP. • Manage SRMA to protect the Wild and Scenic River outstandingly remarkable values • Manage SRMA for a high probability of experiencing solitude, closeness to nature, self-reliance, challenge, and risk in an unmodified and natural appearing environment with very low interaction or evidence of other users. • Provide opportunities for 	<p>Dirty Devil SRMA</p> <p>Identify the Dirty Devil/Robbers Roost area as an SRMA (375,800 acres, see Map 2-10) in concert with the Dirty Devil/North Wash ACEC to provide for recreational experiences complementary with the remote and scenic nature and other resource values of the area, notably the ACEC values. (SRMA includes the Dirty Devil WSA, Horseshoe Canyon WSA, Fiddler Butte WSA, Happy Canyon—French Springs WSA, proposed Dirty Devil/North Wash ACEC and the suitable Dirty Devil River and tributary Wild and Scenic River segments.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Manage SRMA consistent with prescriptions identified in the Dirty Devil North Wash ACEC, with direction provided in the IMP for WSAs, and with protection for Wild and Scenic River outstandingly remarkable values. • Manage SRMA for a high probability of experiencing 	<p>Dirty Devil SRMA</p> <p>Identify the Dirty Devil/Robbers Roost area as an SRMA (383,900 acres, see Map 2-11) in concert with the Dirty Devil/North Wash ACEC to provide for recreational experiences complementary with the remote and scenic nature and other resource values of the area, notably the ACEC values. (SRMA includes the Dirty Devil WSA, Horseshoe Canyon WSA, Fiddler Butte WSA, Happy Canyon—French Springs WSA, proposed Dirty Devil/North Wash ACEC and the suitable Dirty Devil River and tributary Wild and Scenic River segments.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Manage SRMA consistent with: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> –Prescriptions identified in the Dirty Devil North Wash ACEC, –Direction provided in the IMP for WSAs. –Protection of Wild and Scenic River outstandingly

Table 2-16. Recreation Decisions

	<p>recreation within the Dirty Devil River corridor, its tributaries, and the Horseshoe Canyon drainage.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide semi-primitive motorized activity on designated routes. • Provide non-motorized access by means of trails, cross-country travel, and some primitive roads (access for people with disabilities would be most difficult). • Provide no site developments or only the minimum required for site protection, considering user comfort secondarily. • Provide no on-site interpretive facilities. • Manage to allow natural processes to achieve self-sustaining systems. 	<p>primitive and semi-primitive, non-motorized recreation within the Dirty Devil River corridor, its tributaries, and the Horseshoe Canyon drainage.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide semi-primitive motorized activity on designated routes. • Provide non-motorized access by means of trails, cross-country travel, and some primitive roads (access for people with disabilities would be most difficult). • Provide no site developments or only the minimum required for site protection, considering user comfort secondarily. • Provide no on-site interpretive facilities. • Manage to allow natural processes to achieve self-sustaining systems. 	<p>solitude, closeness to nature, self-reliance, challenge, and risk in an unmodified and natural appearing environment with very low interaction or evidence of other users.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide non-motorized access on trails, cross-country and some primitive roads (access for people with disabilities would be most difficult). • Provide no site developments or only the minimum required for site protection, with user comfort secondary in consideration. • Provide no on-site interpretive facilities. • Manage to allow natural processes to achieve self-sustaining systems. 	<p>remarkable values.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Protection of non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics. • Manage SRMA for a high probability of experiencing solitude, closeness to nature, self-reliance, challenge, and risk in an unmodified and natural appearing environment with very low interaction or evidence of other users. • Provide non-motorized access on trails, cross-country and some primitive roads (access for people with disabilities would be most difficult). • Provide no site developments or only the minimum required for site protection, with user comfort considered secondarily. • Provide no on-site interpretive facilities. • Manage to allow natural processes to achieve self-sustaining systems
<p>Manage OHVs according to existing area designations (Map 2-12).</p>	<p>Limit OHVs to designated routes.</p>	<p>Close canyons and portions of WSAs to OHV use. Limit OHVs to designated routes elsewhere. See Section 2.6.2.4.</p>	<p>Close WSAs and wild and scenic river segments to OHV use except for limited designation in Poison Springs/North Hatch Canyon road corridor. Limit OHV use to designated routes in the portion of the SRMA outside the ACEC. See Section 2.6.2.4.</p>	<p>Close WSAs and non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics to vehicle use. Elsewhere in the SRMA, limit vehicles to designated roads and trails. Allow permitted access, where needed, to range developments and mining claims as identified in the activity plan. See Section 2.6.2.4.</p>

Table 2-16. Recreation Decisions

Continue dealing with recreation use conflicts on a case-by-case basis.	Consider limiting recreational activities if they conflict with other resources or users, if necessary. (Limitations could include numbers of people, season of use, or area of use.)			
Not applicable	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop an activity plan for the SRMA within five years to address developed facilities, special recreation permits (SRPs), and special rules for protecting resources such as regulating fire use, camping, sanitation, backcountry permits, group size, spatial and seasonal restrictions. • Consider developing facilities to support the objectives of the SRMA, to provide for visitor health and safety, and for resource protection. • Locate facilities such as trailheads, instructional signs, group sites, and parking areas on the bench lands near existing access roads. • Address changes to OHV route designations, if needed. • Continue to issue current SRPs according to site-specific analysis already completed and according to existing permit stipulations. (SRPs are currently in place for commercial uses such as canyoneering, rock climbing, backpacking, hiking, guided hunting, and vehicle tours.) • Prior to completing the activity plan, issue additional similar SRPs, subject to the following stipulations— <ul style="list-style-type: none"> –Within one-half mile of canyon rims and below the rim, limit group size to 12 or fewer. Allow no commercial or organized group larger than 12 to operate in this area. –Allow only one commercial group to occupy the same side canyon at any one time. –Review itineraries prior to each operating season. –Allow no camping within one-half mile of Mexican spotted owl protected activity centers. Require all activities be consistent with the guidelines in the Mexican spotted owl recovery plan. –Allow no camping within 330 feet of any spring or within one-quarter mile of water sources in desert bighorn sheep use areas during the lambing season (April 15-June 15). –Stipulate additional requirements, if needed, to protect sensitive species and their critical habitats. • Conduct environmental analysis on SRP proposals that do not meet the criteria above or that are different than existing SRPs. 			
Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)	Alternative C	Alternative D
Continue managing oil and gas leasing according to existing land use plans and applicable law (Map 2-34).	Manage oil and gas leasing in SRMA (outside WSA) as follows— <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lease remaining areas subject to controlled surface use and/or timing limitations. (Map 2-35)	Manage oil and gas leasing in SRMA (outside WSAs and Wild and Scenic River corridors) as follows— <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lease VRM Class II areas and canyon rims within the viewshed of all canyons (approximately one-quarter mile), with major constraints (no surface occupancy). 	Manage oil and gas leasing in SRMA (outside WSAs, Wild and Scenic River corridors, and VRM Class II areas within Poison Springs Canyon and Happy Canyon) as follows— <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lease the remaining VRM Class II areas and canyon rims within the viewshed of all canyons 	Manage oil and gas leasing in SRMA (outside WSAs, Wild and Scenic River corridors and non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics) as follows— <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lease the remainder of the SRMA as no surface occupancy or subject to controlled surface use and/or timing limitations.

Table 2-16. Recreation Decisions

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lease the remainder of the SRMA subject to controlled surface use and/or timing limitations. (Map 2-36) 	<p>(approximately one-quarter mile) with major constraints (NSO).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lease the remainder of the SRMA subject to controlled surface use and/or timing limitations. (Map 2-37) 	(Map 2-38).
Issue: Management of Recreational Opportunities on Lands Adjacent to Capitol Reef National Park				
Management Actions				
Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)	Alternative C	Alternative D
<p>Continue managing the Capitol Reef Gateway area as part of the ERMA. In addition—</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Manage the Fremont Gorge WSA under the IMP. Manage the eligible Fremont Gorge wild river segment to protect its outstandingly remarkable values. 	<p>Manage the Capitol Reef Gateway area as part of the ERMA. In addition—</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Manage the Fremont Gorge WSA under the IMP. 	<p>Capitol Reef Gateway SRMA</p> <p>Identify the Capitol Reef Gateway as an SRMA (12,800 acres, see Map 2-9) to manage recreation opportunities associated with Capitol Reef National Park. SRMA boundary includes the Fremont Gorge WSA and the suitable Fremont Gorge wild river segment.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Manage the Fremont Gorge WSA under the IMP. Manage the Fremont Gorge suitable wild river segment to protect its outstandingly remarkable values. Manage the Capitol Reef Gateway SRMA for a moderate probability of experiencing solitude, closeness to nature and tranquility, high degree of self-reliance, challenge, 	<p>Capitol Reef Gateway SRMA</p> <p>Identify the Capitol Reef Gateway as an SRMA (12,800 acres, see Map 2-10) to manage recreation opportunities associated with Capitol Reef National Park. SRMA boundary includes Fremont Gorge WSA, the suitable wild river segment of the Fremont River, and the Fremont Gorge Cockscomb potential ACEC.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Manage appropriate portions of the SRMA in concert with the Fremont Gorge/Cockscomb ACEC. Manage the Fremont Gorge WSA under the IMP. Manage the Fremont Gorge eligible wild river segment to protect its outstandingly remarkable values. Manage the Capitol Reef 	<p>Capitol Reef Gateway SRMA</p> <p>Identify the Capitol Reef Gateway as an SRMA (168,800 acres, see Map 2-11) to manage recreation opportunities associated with Capitol Reef National Park. SRMA boundary includes Fremont Gorge WSA, the suitable wild river segment of the Fremont River, portions of the Fremont Gorge Cockscomb potential ACEC and non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics adjacent to the east boundary of the park.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Manage appropriate portions of the SRMA in concert with the Fremont Gorge/Cockscomb ACEC. Manage the Fremont Gorge WSA under the IMP. Manage the Fremont Gorge eligible wild river

Table 2-16. Recreation Decisions

		<p>and risk in a predominately natural-appearing environment with low interaction but often evidence of other users.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide access into the area through motorized and non-motorized routes (access for people with disabilities would be difficult). • Allow facilities to reduce resource impacts, including campgrounds, picnic areas, restrooms, parking and staging areas, and interpretive facilities. • Explore concession opportunities for management and development of additional facilities. 	<p>Gateway SRMA for a moderate probability of experiencing solitude, closeness to nature and tranquility, high degree of self-reliance, challenge, and risk in a predominately natural-appearing environment with low interaction but often evidence of other users.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Access into the area and staging would involve a higher level of interaction with visitors, while travel through the interior would be through non-motorized means on trails or cross-country (access for people with disabilities would be difficult). • Provide no interior site developments and only the minimum required for site protection. • Provide no on-site interpretation facilities. 	<p>segment to protect its outstandingly remarkable values.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Protect non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics. • Manage the Capitol Reef Gateway SRMA for a moderate probability of experiencing solitude, closeness to nature and tranquility, high degree of self-reliance, challenge, and risk in a predominately natural-appearing environment with low interaction but often evidence of other users. • Access into the area and staging would involve a higher level of interaction with visitors, while travel through the interior would be through non-motorized means on trails or cross-country (access for people with disabilities would be difficult). • Provide no interior site developments and only the minimum required for site protection. • Provide no on-site interpretation facilities.
<p>Continue managing OHV use according to current land use plans.</p>	<p>Manage OHV use according to designations in Section 2.6.2.4, Travel Management.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Close the Fremont Gorge WSA and Fremont Gorge wild river corridor to OHV use. • Limit OHVs to designated routes elsewhere. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Close the Fremont Gorge WSA, Fremont Gorge wild river corridor, and VRM Class II areas to OHV use. • Limit OHVs to designated routes elsewhere. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Close the Fremont Gorge WSA, Fremont Gorge wild river corridor, and non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics to OHV use.

Table 2-16. Recreation Decisions

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Elsewhere, limit OHVs to designated routes. Allow permitted access, where needed, to range developments and mining claims as identified in the activity plan.
Not applicable.		Complete a SRMA activity plan within five years of RMP Record of Decision.		
Issue: Management of Recreational Opportunities in the Sahara Sands Area				
Management Actions				
Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)	Alternative C	Alternative D
Continue managing Sahara Sands as part of the ERMA.	<p>Sahara Sands SRMA</p> <p>Identify Sahara Sands SRMA (12,300 acres) as indicated on Map 2-8.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Manage for a roaded natural recreational opportunity providing users the opportunity to interact with others in developed sites, with some chance of privacy. Provide a managed OHV recreation experience, including cross-country all terrain travel. Develop facilities for user comfort and convenience (as opposed to site protection) to promote and enhance recreation experience as a managed open area. This could include development of parking and staging areas, restrooms, and instructional signing, and could involve moderate or 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Manage Sahara Sands as part of the ERMA. 		

Table 2-16. Recreation Decisions

	<p>even heavy site modifications.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Explore concession opportunities for management and operation of recreation activity in the area. 			
Continue managing as open to OHV use.	Designate as an OHV open area.	Manage OHV use according to area designations in Section 2.6.2.4, Travel Management.		
Not applicable.	Complete an SRMA activity plan within five years of RMP Record of Decision.	Not applicable.		
Issue: Management of Recreational Opportunities in the Henry Mountains				
Management Actions				
Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)	Alternative C	Alternative D
<p>Continue to manage the Henry Mountains as part of the ERMA.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Manage WSAs according to the IMP. • Manage Bull Creek Archaeological District to protect cultural resource values. 	<p>Manage the Henry Mountains as part of the ERMA.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Manage WSAs according to the IMP. • Manage Bull Creek Archaeological District to protect cultural resource values. 	<p>Henry Mountains SRMA</p> <p>Identify a Henry Mountains SRMA (533,900 acres—see Map 2-9). Area includes the Mount Ellen–Blue Hills WSA, Bull Mountain WSA, Mount Pennell WSA, Mount Hillers WSA, and Bull Creek Archaeological District.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Manage WSAs according to the IMP. • Manage Bull Creek Archaeological District to protect cultural resource values. • Emphasize opportunities for a combination of semi-primitive non-motorized 	<p>Henry Mountains SRMA</p> <p>Identify a Henry Mountains SRMA (533,900 acres—see Map 2-10). Area includes the Mount Ellen–Blue Hills WSA, Bull Mountain WSA, Mount Pennell WSA, Mount Hillers WSA, and Bull Creek Archaeological District.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Manage WSAs according to the IMP. • Manage Bull Creek Archaeological District to protect cultural resource values. • Manage the SRMA in concert with the Henry Mountains ACEC. 	<p>Henry Mountains SRMA</p> <p>Identify a Henry Mountains SRMA (479,500 acres—see Map 2-11). Area includes the Mount Ellen–Blue Hills WSA, Bull Mountain WSA, Mount Pennell WSA, Mount Hillers WSA, and Bull Creek Archaeological District.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Manage WSAs according to the IMP. • Manage Bull Creek Archaeological District to protect cultural resource values. • Protect non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics.

Table 2-16. Recreation Decisions

		<p>and motorized recreational experiences in a natural or predominately natural setting with a high or very high probability of experiencing solitude, closeness to nature, self-reliance, challenge, and risk (interactions between users would be low with minimal evidence of other users).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide facilities needed to protect resources and provide for visitor safety. • Provide signs, trails, trailhead parking, and staging areas to facilitate the use and enjoyment of the SRMA and protection of resources. • Maintain and improve non-motorized trails, including— <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Panorama Knoll – Mount Ellen – Burro Wash – Cottonwood Wash – Sheets Gulch – Five Mile Wash • Designate areas for large group events and camping, including— <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Starr Springs Campground – McMillan Spring Overlook – Sandy Creek Overlook – Apple Brush Flat – Turkey Haven 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Emphasize opportunities for a combination of semi-primitive non-motorized and motorized recreational experiences in a natural or predominately natural setting with a high or very high probability of experiencing solitude, closeness to nature, self-reliance, challenge, and risk (interactions between users would be low with minimal evidence of other users). • Provide facilities needed to protect resources and provide for visitor safety. • Provide signs, trails, trailhead parking, and staging areas to facilitate the use and enjoyment of the SRMA and protection of resources. • Maintain and improve non-motorized trails, including— <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Panorama Knoll – Mount Ellen – Burro Wash – Cottonwood Wash – Sheets Gulch – Five Mile Wash • Designate areas for large group events and camping, including— <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Starr Springs Campground – McMillan Spring Overlook 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Manage the SRMA in concert with the Henry Mountains ACEC. • Emphasize opportunities for a combination of semi-primitive non-motorized and motorized recreational experiences in a natural or predominately natural setting with a high or very high probability of experiencing solitude, closeness to nature, self-reliance, challenge, and risk (interactions between users would be low with minimal evidence of other users). • Provide facilities needed to protect resources and provide for visitor safety. • Provide signs, trails, trailhead parking, and staging areas to facilitate the use and enjoyment of the SRMA and protection of resources. • Maintain and improve non-motorized trails, including— <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Panorama Knoll – Mount Ellen – Burro Wash – Cottonwood Wash – Sheets Gulch – Five Mile Wash • Designate areas for large group events and camping, including— <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Starr Springs
--	--	--	--	--

Table 2-16. Recreation Decisions

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Sandy Creek Overlook – Apple Brush Flat – Turkey Haven 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Campground – McMillan Spring Overlook – Sandy Creek Overlook – Apple Brush Flat – Turkey Haven
Continue OHV area designations from current land use plans.	Manage according to area designations in Travel Management Section 2.6.2.4.	Manage according to area designations in Travel Management Section 2.6.2.4.	Manage according to area designations in Travel Management Section 2.6.2.4.	Close WSAs and non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics to motorized vehicle use. Elsewhere, limit vehicles to designated routes. Allow permitted access, where needed, to range developments and mining claims as identified in the activity plan.
Not applicable.		Complete an SRMA activity plan within five years of the RMP Record of Decision.		
Issue: Management of Recreational Opportunities in the Sevier Canyon Area				
Management Actions				
Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)	Alternative C	Alternative D
Continue to manage Sevier Canyon as part of the ERMA.			<p>Sevier Canyon SRMA</p> <p>Identify a Sevier Canyon SRMA (7,500 acres. See Map 2-10.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Manage the SRMA to protect the scenic values in and around Sevier Canyon. • Manage the SRMA in concert with the Sevier Canyon ACEC. • Provide opportunities for semi-primitive motorized and non-motorized recreation. 	Continue to manage Sevier Canyon as part of the ERMA.

Table 2-16. Recreation Decisions

Continue OHV area designations from current land use plans.	Manage OHV use according to area designations in Section 2.6.2.4, Travel Management.	Limit OHV use to designated routes.		
Not applicable		Complete an SRMA activity plan within five years of the RMP Record of Decision.	Not applicable.	
Issue: Management of Recreational Opportunities in Horseshoe Canyon				
Management Actions				
Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)	Alternative C	Alternative D
Continue to manage as part of the ERMA.	Dirty Devil SRMA Manage as part of the Dirty Devil SRMA (see above)			Labyrinth Canyon SRMA <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Manage 75,300 acres in the Horseshoe Canyon area as part of the Labyrinth Canyon SRMA in cooperation with the Price FO (Map 2-11) for primitive and semi-primitive recreational opportunities. • Access into the area and staging would involve a higher level of interaction with visitors, while travel through the interior would be through non-motorized means on trails or cross-country. • Provide no interior site developments and only the minimum required for site protection elsewhere. • Manage SRMA for a high probability of experiencing solitude, closeness to nature, self-reliance, challenge, and risk in an unmodified and natural appearing environment

Table 2-16. Recreation Decisions

					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> with very low interaction or evidence of other users. • Provide non-motorized access on trails, cross-country and some primitive roads. • Provide no on-site interpretation facilities.
Manage OHVs per direction in existing land use plan.	Manage OHVs per management direction in the Dirty Devil SRMA (above) and Section 2.6.2.4.				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Close WSAs and non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics to OHVs. Elsewhere, limit vehicles to designated routes (see Section 2.6.2.4). • Allow permitted access, where needed, to range developments and mining claims as identified in the activity plan.
Not applicable	Complete an SRMA activity plan within five years of the RMP Record of Decision.				
Issue: Management of Recreational Opportunities in the Little Rockies					
Management Actions					
Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)	Alternative C	Alternative D	
Continue to manage as part of the ERMA.				<p>Little Rockies SRMA</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Manage the 64,000 acres of the Little Rockies SRMA for primitive and semi-primitive recreational opportunities (Map 2-11). • Access into the area and staging would involve a higher level of interaction with visitors, while travel through the interior would be through non-motorized means on trails or cross- 	

Table 2-16. Recreation Decisions

		<p>country (access for people with disabilities would be difficult)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide no interior site developments and only the minimum required for site protection and public safety elsewhere. • Manage the SRMA in coordination with National Natural Landmark values. • Preserve or retain the existing character of the landscape. • Manage SRMA for a high probability of experiencing solitude, closeness to nature, self-reliance, challenge, and risk in an unmodified and natural appearing environment with very low interaction or evidence of other users.
<p>Manage OHVs per direction in existing land use plan.</p>	<p>Manage OHVs per management direction in Section 2.6.2.4, Travel Management.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Close WSAs and non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics to OHVs. • Allow permitted access, where needed, to range developments and mining claims as identified in the activity plan.
<p>Not applicable.</p>		<p>Complete an SRMA activity plan within five years of the RMP Record of Decision.</p>

Table 2-16. Recreation Decisions

Issue: Management of Recreational Opportunities Around Yuba Reservoir				
Management Actions				
Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)	Alternative C	Alternative D
Continue implementing the current Yuba Reservoir Management Plan.	Implement the Yuba Reservoir Management Plan, as revised by the Fillmore FO.			
Issue: Overall Special Recreation Permit (SRP) Guidance				
Management Actions				
Common to All Alternatives				
Permit no competitive events in WSAs.				
Issue: Criteria for Commercial Special Recreation Permits				
Management Actions				
Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)	Alternative C	Alternative D
Current plans provide no guidance on SRPs. Issue SRPs on a case-by-case basis.	Authorize commercial use permits that provide recreational opportunities, enhance recreational experiences, and protect resources on a case-by-case basis, subject to environmental analysis.			
Issue: Criteria for Competitive Special Recreation Permits				
Management Actions				
Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)	Alternative C	Alternative D
Current plans provide no guidance on competitive events.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Authorize motorized and non-motorized competitive events consistent with OHV area and route designations on a case-by-case basis, subject to environmental analysis. • Permit no competitive events in the Dirty Devil/Robbers Roost SRMA. 			
Issue: Criteria for Organized Group Special Recreation Permits				
Management Actions				
Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)	Alternative C	Alternative D
Current plans provide no guidance on regulating organized groups.	Require SRPs for organized groups outside designated large group areas meeting any <i>one</i> of the following criteria– <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Group occupation of an area lasts more than two hours; • Group includes fifty or more participants; • Group uses 10 or more vehicles 			

Table 2-16. Recreation Decisions

Issue: Criteria for Vending Management Actions				
Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)	Alternative C	Alternative D
Current plans provide no guidance on vending.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Authorize vending on a case-by-case basis subject to environmental analysis in conjunction with organized events or when the vending is necessary to support protection of resources or recreational use. • Authorize vending permits for uses that enhance recreational experiences. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Authorize vending on a case-by-case basis subject to environmental analysis in conjunction with organized events or when the vending is necessary to support protection of resources or recreational use. • Authorize vending permits for uses that enhance recreational experiences. • Do not authorize vending along scenic byways and backways. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allow no vending in conjunction with organized events. • Authorize no vending along scenic byways and backways. 	

2.6.2.4 Travel Management

Table 2-17. Travel Management Decisions

Desired Outcomes (Goals and Objectives)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Existing access would be maintained, where needed, to meet public and administrative needs including acquiring or maintaining necessary access across non-Federal land. • Compatible traditional, current, and future use of the land would be sustained by establishing a route system that contributes to protection of sensitive resources, accommodates a variety of uses, and minimizes user conflicts. • Public access, resource management, and regulatory needs would be considered through transportation planning. • Coordinate OHV management with other agencies where possible (U.S. Forest Service, National Park Service, State of Utah, counties and communities). • Provide opportunities for off-highway vehicle use on public lands.

Table 2-17. Travel Management Decisions

Issue: OHV Area Designations				
Management Actions				
Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)	Alternative C	Alternative D
<p>Continue existing OHV area designations as follows (Map 2-12)—</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Open: 1,636,400 acres • Limited: 277,600 acres <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Existing routes: 271,000 acres – Designated routes: 4,900 acres – Maintained routes: 1,700 acres • Closed: 214,000 acres <p>Continue to manage OHV use per The Notice of OHV Travel Restriction for motorized use in the Factory Butte Area, published September 20, 2006 (2,602 acres open to OHV use, 142,023 acres limited to designated routes, and 3,843 acres of North Caineville Mesa closed to OHV use). This restriction will remain in effect until the RFO DRMP becomes final.</p>	<p>Provide motorized access to the public lands with the minimum restrictions needed to protect other resources. Designate areas as follows (Map 2-13)—</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Open: 449,000 acres • Limited: 1,679,000 acres • Closed: 0 acres 	<p>Balance motorized access to public lands with other resource and resource use needs. Designate areas as follows (Map 2-14)—</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Open: 8,400 acres • Limited: 1,909,200 acres • Closed: 210,400 acres 	<p>Restrict motorized access to public lands to protect other resources and resource uses. Designate areas as follows (Map 2-15)—</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Open: 0 acres • Limited: 1,445,000 acres • Closed: 683,000 acres 	<p>Restrict motorized access to public lands to protect other resources and resource uses. Designate areas as follows (Map 2-16)—</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Open: 0 acres • Limited: 972,800 acres • Closed: 1,155,200 acres
Management Actions				
Common to All Alternatives				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Designate WSAs as closed or limited to OHV use (see Section 2.6.3.1, WSA decisions for details). • If OHV use in areas designated as open or limited causes threats or adverse impacts to resources, the BLM would take appropriate steps, including but not limited to use restrictions or closures, installation of additional signs and barricades, restoration of affected areas, etc. 				

Table 2-17. Travel Management Decisions

Issue: Designation of Managed Open Areas				
Management Actions				
Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)	Alternative C	Alternative D
<p>Continue to manage existing open areas.</p>	<p>Designate the following managed open areas—</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ticaboo Play Area (19,000 acres. Cane Spring Desert east of Ticaboo)—Designate and manage as an OHV open area to accommodate existing use and growth, provide alternative modes of recreation adjacent to Glen Canyon National Recreation Area (NRA), and provide opportunities for economic development. • Sahara Sands Play Area (12,000 acres. Northeast of Hwy 95/276 junction)—Designate and manage as an OHV open area to provide a sand dune riding opportunity, accommodate existing use and growth, provide alternative modes of recreation adjacent to Glen Canyon NRA, and provide opportunities for economic development. • Roost Play Area (19,000 acres. Northwest of Antelope Valley)—Designate and manage as an OHV open area to provide a sand dune riding opportunity and to accommodate existing use 	<p>Designate the following managed open areas—</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Factory Butte Play Area (2,600 acres.—Designate and manage as an OHV open area to provide a unique OHV riding experience on Mancos shale badlands to accommodate existing use and future growth. • Big Rocks Trials Area (270 acres.)—Designate and manage as an OHV open area to provide trials motorcycle/rock crawling OHV recreational opportunity. • Glenwood Play Area (3,300 acres.)—Designate as an OHV open area and manage as a community OHV area. • Aurora Play Area (310 acres.)—Designate as an OHV open area and manage as a community OHV area. • Mayfield Open Area (1,900 acres.)—Designate as an OHV open area and manage as a community OHV play area. 	<p>Designate no OHV open areas.</p>	

Table 2-17. Travel Management Decisions

	<p>and future growth.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Factory Butte Play Area (200,000 acres. Near Caineville and Notom)—Designate and manage as an OHV open area to provide a Mancos shale riding opportunity and to accommodate existing use and future growth. • Miners Mountain (9,500 acres. Southeast of Torrey)—Designate and manage as an OHV open area to accommodate dispersed camping, prospecting, firewood cutting, game retrieval, and other traditional uses of the land. • Beas Lewis Flat (4,500 acres. East of Torrey)—Designate and manage as an OHV open area to accommodate dispersed camping, prospecting, firewood cutting, game retrieval, and other traditional uses of the land. • Big Rocks Dispersed Recreation Area (9,000 acres. South of Loa)—Designate and manage as an OHV open area to accommodate trials motorcycle/rock crawling use and dispersed camping. • Dry Wash (6,500 acres. East of Antimony)—Designate and manage as 		
--	---	--	--

Table 2-17. Travel Management Decisions

	<p>an OHV open area to accommodate dispersed camping, prospecting, firewood cutting, game retrieval and other traditional uses of the land.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hunter Spring (4,500 acres. West of Antimony.)—Designate and manage as an OHV open area to accommodate dispersed camping, prospecting, firewood cutting, game retrieval, and other traditional uses of the land. • Otter Creek Reservoir (1,000 acres. Public land around the reservoir.)—Designate and manage as an OHV open area west of the reservoir to accommodate dispersed camping and access to Otter Creek Reservoir and nearby OHV trails. • Antelope Range/Kingston Canyon (102,000 acres. Southern Sevier County and western Piute County.)—Designate and manage as an OHV open area to accommodate prospecting, firewood cutting, game retrieval, dispersed camping, and other traditional uses of the land. • Glenwood Play Area 		
--	---	--	--

Table 2-17. Travel Management Decisions

	<p>(3,500 acres. East of Glenwood.)—Designate as an OHV open area and manage as a community OHV area.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Richfield to Aurora Play Area (7,000 acres. West of I-70.)—Designate as an OHV open area and manage as a community OHV area. • Rocky Ford Play Area (12,500 acres. East of Rocky Ford Reservoir.)—Designate as an OHV open area and manage as a community OHV area. • White Hills Play Area (16,500 acres. North of Aurora.)—Designate as an OHV open area and manage as a community OHV area. • Fayette Play Area—(4,500 acres. West of Fayette.)—Designate as an OHV open area and manage as a community OHV area. • Salina to Mayfield (12,500 acres. North and east of Salina and west of Mayfield.)—Designate as an OHV open area and manage as a community OHV area. • Gunnison Reservoir (5,500 acres. West of Gunnison reservoir.)—Designate and manage as an OHV open area to provide access to the west 		
--	--	--	--

Table 2-17. Travel Management Decisions

	side of the reservoir and an associated open OHV area.			
Issue: Management of OHV Play Areas Adjacent to Communities				
Management Actions				
Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)	Alternative C	Alternative D
Consider and promote leasing OHV open areas near communities such as Caineville, Glenwood, Aurora and Mayfield under Recreation and Public Purposes Act (R&PP) authorities to encourage local management of OHV play areas. Generally these would include areas with existing surface disturbance. Requests would be considered on a case-by-case basis, subject to an environmental analysis.			Consider no requests for R&PP leases for OHV open play areas.	
Issue: Designate Areas as Closed to All Motorized and Mechanized Vehicular Traffic				
Management Actions				
Common to All				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All motorized or mechanized travel would be prohibited in closed areas, with the following exceptions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – For emergency and other purposes as authorized under 43 CFR 8340.0-5(a)(2),(3),(4) and (5); – Minimum use necessary to exercise a valid existing right or authorized use. 				
Management Actions				
Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)	Alternative C	Alternative D
Continue existing closed areas. (Map 2-12) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Wilderness Study Areas: to prevent impairment of the areas' suitability for preservation as wilderness. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Little Rockies WSA – Portions of the Dirty Devil, Fiddler Butte, Mount Ellen/Blue Hills and Mount Hillers WSAs ACECs: All of the existing ACECs as specified by management prescriptions to protect relevant and 	Close no areas to motorized or mechanized use. (Map 2-13)	Close the following areas to motorized or mechanized use. (Map 2-14) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Wilderness Study Areas: to prevent impairment of the areas' suitability for preservation as wilderness. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Little Rockies WSA – Portions of the Dirty Devil, Fiddler Butte, Fremont Gorge, French Spring/Happy Canyon, Horseshoe Canyon North, Horseshoe Canyon South and Mount Ellen/Blue Hills 	Close the following areas to motorized or mechanized use. (Map 2-15) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Wilderness Study Areas: All WSAs, to prevent impairment of the areas' suitability for preservation as wilderness. Wild and Scenic Rivers: All segments proposed to protect outstandingly remarkable river-related values. (Refer to Section 2.6.3.2, Wild and Scenic River Decisions) ACECs: As specified by management prescriptions 	Close the following areas to motorized or mechanized use. (Map 2-16) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Wilderness Study Areas: All WSAs, to prevent impairment of the areas' suitability for preservation as wilderness. Non-WSA Lands with Wilderness Characteristics: All non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics, to protect their naturalness and opportunities for solitude and primitive recreation.

Table 2-17. Travel Management Decisions

<p>important values.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – North Caineville Mesa ACEC – South Caineville Mesa ACEC (overlaps a portion of Mt. Ellen/Blue Hills WSA) – Beaver Wash Canyon ACEC (overlaps a portion of Dirty Devil WSA) – Gilbert Badlands ACEC (overlaps a portion of Mt. Ellen/Blue Hills WSA) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Trough Hollow: to protect cultural resources in this area. 		<p>WSAs</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wild and Scenic Rivers: to protect outstandingly remarkable river-related values. (Refer to Section 2.6.3.2, Wild and Scenic River Decisions) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Fremont Gorge Suitable Wild River – Dirty Devil Suitable Wild River • ACECs: All potential ACECs as specified by management prescriptions to protect relevant and important values. (Refer to Section 2.6.3.3, ACEC Decisions) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – North Caineville Mesa ACEC – Old Woman Front ACEC • Special Recreation Management Areas: Portions of the proposed SRMAs to retain the desired recreation setting and for consistency with other management decisions. (Refer to Section 2.6.2.3, Recreation Decisions) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Dirty Devil SRMA – Fremont Gorge SRMA 	<p>to protect relevant and important values. (Refer to Section 2.6.3.3, ACEC Decisions)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Old Woman Front ACEC – Rainbow Hills ACEC – A portion of the Badlands ACEC (mesa tops) – A portion of the Henry Mountains ACEC (No Man’s Mesa) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Special Recreation Management Areas: Portions of the proposed SRMAs to retain the desired recreation setting, scenic values and for consistency with other management decisions. In areas where the proposed SRMAs overlap WSAs and/or Wild and Scenic Rivers, the decisions in those sections would apply to the SRMA. (Refer to Section 2.6.2.3, Recreation Decisions) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Dirty Devil SRMA – Henry Mountains SRMA – Capitol Reef Gateway SRMA 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wild and Scenic Rivers: All segments proposed to protect outstandingly remarkable river-related values. (Refer to Section 2.6.3.2, Wild and Scenic River Decisions) • ACECs: As specified by management prescriptions to protect relevant and important values and for consistency with other management decisions. In areas where the potential ACECs overlap WSAs, non-WSA lands and/or Wild and Scenic Rivers, the decisions in those sections would apply to the ACEC. (Refer to Section 2.6.3.3, ACEC Decisions) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – All of the Old Woman Front, Rainbow Hills, Dirty Devil, Horseshoe Canyon and Lower Muddy Creek ACECs – Portions of the Badlands, Bull Creek, Fremont Gorge/ Cockscomb, Henry Mountains, Kingston Canyon, Little Rockies, Quitcupah and Thousand Lakes Bench ACECs • Special Recreation Management Areas: As identified by management actions to retain the desired recreation
---	--	--	--	--

Table 2-17. Travel Management Decisions

				settings, scenic values and for consistency with other management decisions. In areas where the proposed SRMAs overlap WSAs, non-WSA lands and/or Wild and Scenic Rivers, the decisions in those sections would apply to the SRMA. (Refer to Section 2.6.2.3, Recreation Decisions) – Little Rockies SRMA – Portions of the E. Fork Sevier, San Rafael Swell, Dirty Devil, Capitol Reef Gateway, Henry Mountains and Labyrinth Canyon SRMAs
Issue: Designate Limited Areas				
Management Actions				
Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)	Alternative C	Alternative D
Continue managing 277,600 acres identified on Map 2-12 as limited to OHV use as identified in current land use plans.	Manage 1,679,000 acres identified on Map 2-13 as limited to designated routes or designated routes with seasonal closures or size/width restrictions.	Manage 1,909,200 acres identified on Map 2-14 as limited to designated routes or designated routes with seasonal closures or size/width restrictions.	Manage 1,445,000 acres identified on Map 2-15 as limited to designated routes or designated routes with seasonal closures or size/width restrictions.	Manage 972,800 acres identified on Map 2-16 as limited to designated routes or designated routes with seasonal closures or size/width restrictions.
Issue: Route Designation and Vehicle Use within Limited Areas				
Management Actions				
Common to All				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All cross-country (off-transportation system) motorized or mechanized travel would be prohibited in limited areas, with the following exceptions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Minimum necessary to administer of the area; – For emergency and other purposes as authorized under 43 CFR 8340.0-5(a)(2),(3),(4) and (5). – Minimum use necessary to exercise a valid existing right or authorized use. • Coordinate OHV route designations with U.S. Forest Service, National Park Service, State of Utah, counties and communities, where possible. 				

Table 2-17. Travel Management Decisions

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rehabilitation of closed OHV routes would occur on a case-by-case basis as required to mitigate impacts to resources. Closed or non-designated routes would be allowed to rehabilitate naturally unless a specific resource impact was occurring that warranted expedited rehabilitation of the route (e.g., soil erosion, water quality concerns, and/or continued illegal use). • Route designations are implementation decisions that are subject to change based upon future site-specific environmental analysis. 				
Management Actions				
Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)	Alternative C	Alternative D
<p>Where routes are designated for motorized use within WSAs, such use would be subject to the condition that it not impair the area's wilderness suitability (as that concept is described in the IMP). The continued use of these routes is conditioned on non-impairment of wilderness suitability. If such use were to impair wilderness suitability, BLM would take appropriate steps, including but not limited to use restrictions or closures, installation of additional signs and barricades, restoration of affected areas, etc. Further, in the event Congress were to designate a WSA as wilderness, unless Congress specified that specific route(s) were to remain open to motorized use, all routes in the wilderness area would be closed to such use.</p>			<p>Not applicable (all WSAs are closed to motorized travel).</p>	
<p>Designate existing, inventoried routes for motorized use per existing land use plan direction.</p>	<p>Designate routes for motorized use unless a clear threat to soil, watershed, wildlife (including special status species), vegetation, air, or other public land resources or uses is identified or to prevent impairment of an area's suitability for wilderness (within WSAs).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Designate routes to minimize damage to soil, watershed, vegetation, air, or other public land resources. • Designate routes to minimize harassment of wildlife or significant disruption of wildlife habitats. Give special attention to protecting special status species and their habitats. • Designate routes to minimize conflicts between off-road vehicle use and other existing or proposed recreational uses of the same or neighboring public lands, and to ensure the compatibility of such uses with existing conditions in populated 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Designate routes to prevent damage to soil, watershed, vegetation, air, or other resources of the public lands. • Designate routes to prevent harassment of wildlife or significant disruption of wildlife habitats. Give special attention to protecting special status species and their habitats. • Designate routes to prevent conflicts between off-road vehicle use and other existing or proposed recreational uses of the same or neighboring public lands, and to ensure the compatibility of such uses with existing conditions in populated 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Designate routes to prevent damage to soil, watershed, vegetation, air, or other resources of the public lands, and to prevent impairment of wilderness characteristics • Designate routes to prevent harassment of wildlife or significant disruption of wildlife habitats. Give special attention to protecting special status species and their habitats. • Designate routes to prevent conflicts between off-road vehicle use and other existing or proposed recreational uses of the same or neighboring public lands, and to ensure the compatibility of

Table 2-17. Travel Management Decisions

		<p>areas, taking into account noise and other factors.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Designate motorized routes in WSAs only if vehicle use in such locations would not result in impairment of an area's suitability for wilderness. 	<p>areas, taking into account noise and other factors.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Designate no routes within WSAs. 	<p>such uses with existing conditions in populated areas, taking into account noise and other factors.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Designate no routes within WSAs. Designate no routes in non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics.
Issue: Identify Routes Where Seasonal Closures Are Needed to Protect Deer and Elk				
Management Actions				
Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)	Alternative C	Alternative D
Not specifically addressed in existing plans.	No specific restrictions within crucial habitat.	Limit OHV use to designated routes in deer and elk crucial winter range, except for Glenwood, Aurora, and Mayfield Managed Open Areas. Consider seasonal closure of designated routes on a case-by-case basis, subject to environmental analysis.	Close identified routes in deer and elk crucial winter range seasonally (December 1–April 15) to protect wildlife values.	
Issue: Identify Routes Where Seasonal Closures Are Needed to Protect Bison in the Henry Mountains.				
Management Actions				
Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)	Alternative C	Alternative D
Continue seasonal (December 20–March 20) closures in bison crucial habitat at Swap Mesa and Cave Flat.	Limit OHV use to designated routes in bison crucial habitat.		Manage OHV use in bison habitat as closed or limited to designated routes, according to the prescriptions outlined in the Henry Mountains ACEC (Section 2.6.3.3).	
Summary of Route Designations, by Alternative				
Management Actions				
Common to All Alternatives				
Route designations are implementation decisions that are subject to change in the future based on site-specific environmental analyses.				

Table 2-17. Travel Management Decisions

Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)	Alternative C	Alternative D
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Designated routes: 4,315 miles Designated routes with seasonal closures or size/width restriction: 0 miles Closed routes: 65 miles 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Designated routes: 4,063 miles Designated routes with seasonal closures or size/width restriction: 249 miles Closed routes: 68 miles See Map 2-17.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Designated routes: 3,693 miles Designated routes with seasonal closures or size/width restriction: 483 miles Closed routes: 204 miles See Map 2-18.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Designated routes: 2,601 miles Designated routes with seasonal closures or size/width restriction: 591 miles Closed routes: 1,188 miles See Map 2-19.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Designated routes: 2,493 miles Designated routes with seasonal closures or size/width restriction: 550 miles Closed routes: 1,242 miles See Map 2-20.
Issue: Motor Vehicle Access for Parking/Staging in OHV Limited Areas Outside WSAs				
Management Actions				
Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)	Alternative C	Alternative D
Place no restrictions on motorized use off of a designated route for the purposes of parking/staging.	Allow motor vehicles to pull off of a designated route up to 100 feet of either side of the centerline for the purposes of parking/staging.	Allow motor vehicles to pull off of a designated route up to 50 feet of either side of the centerline for the purposes of parking/staging.	Allow motor vehicles to pull off of a designated route up to 25 feet of either side of the centerline for the purposes of parking/staging.	
Issue: Motor Vehicle Access to Campsites in OHV Limited Areas Outside WSAs				
Management Actions				
Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)	Alternative C	Alternative D
Place no restrictions on motorized access to campsites, per current land use plans.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Allow motor vehicles to use existing spur routes for ingress and egress to established campsites within 300 feet of the centerline of designated routes. (Previous campsites can be distinguished by evidence of rock fire rings, old tent sites, and tracks from earlier vehicle access.) This does not authorize creation of new campsites or travel ways. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Allow motor vehicles to use existing spur routes for ingress and egress to established campsites within 150 feet of designated routes. (Previous campsites can be distinguished by evidence of rock fire rings, old tent sites, and tracks from earlier vehicle access.) This does not authorize creation of new campsites or travel ways. Prohibit motorized travel 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Designate campsites for motor vehicle use where compatible with other resources and resource uses. Prohibit motorized travel ways between multiple campsites, establishment of motorized play areas, race tracks, or travel across wet meadows or riparian areas. Prohibit motorized access to camping areas where conflicts with other resources are identified. 	

Table 2-17. Travel Management Decisions

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Prohibit motorized travel ways between multiple campsites, establishment of motorized play areas, race tracks, or travel across wet meadows or riparian areas. Prohibit motorized access to camping areas where conflicts with other resources are identified. 	<p>ways between multiple campsites, establishment of motorized play areas, race tracks, or travel across wet meadows or riparian areas.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Prohibit motorized access to camping areas where conflicts with other resources are identified. 		
Issue: Motor Vehicle Access to Campsites and for Parking/Staging in OHV Limited Areas Within WSAs.				
Management Action				
Common to All Alternatives				
Require vehicles to stay on designated routes within wilderness study areas, per IMP direction.		Not applicable (All WSAs are closed to motorized travel.)		
Issue: Game Retrieval				
Management Action				
Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)	Alternative C	Alternative D
Not specifically addressed in existing plans.	Allow use of non-motorized wheel carriers to retrieve game kills outside of WSAs.		Preclude the use of game carriers off of designated routes.	
Issue: Management of Paiute ATV Trail and Great Western Trail				
Management Action				
Common to All Alternatives				
Cooperatively manage with the U.S. Forest Service, State of Utah, and local governments the portions of the Paiute ATV Trail and Great Western Trail systems which lie on public lands managed by the RFO.				

2.6.2.5 Lands and Realty

Table 2-18. Lands and Realty Decisions

Desired Outcomes (Goals and Objectives)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Retain public lands in Federal ownership, unless it is determined that disposal of a particular parcel will serve the public interest. Emphasize a balanced program of disposals, acquisitions, and land exchanges in conducting land tenure adjustments. Consider land tenure adjustments to improve land ownership patterns, accomplish resource management goals, and accommodate community expansion

Table 2-18. Lands and Realty Decisions

<p>and economic development needs.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support alternative energy development purposes, such as wind and solar energy resources, and coordinate with other resource objectives. • Use right-of-way corridors and collocate new proposals within existing sites or right-of-way areas, to the extent practical, in order to minimize adverse environmental impacts and the proliferation of separate rights-of-way. • Public lands that enhance multiple-use management, allow access to public lands, or contain sensitive or rare resources, would be retained in Federal ownership. • Lands or interests in lands would be acquired to complement existing resource values and uses. • Lands or interests in lands that are difficult and/or expensive to manage, or are no longer needed for Federal purposes would be considered for disposal.
<p>Issue: Land Tenure Adjustments General Direction</p>
<p>Management Actions</p>
<p>Common to All Alternatives</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Any form of land tenure adjustment (including but not limited to exchanges, <i>in lieu</i> selections, state grants, desert land entries, R&PP patents, easement acquisitions, etc.), except for FLPMA Section 203 sales, must meet one or more of the following criteria: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> –Be in the public interest and accommodate the needs of state, local or private entities, including needs for the economy, community growth and expansion, and be in accordance with other land use goals, objectives and planning decisions; –Result in a net gain of important and manageable resource values on public lands such as crucial wildlife habitat, significant cultural sites, high value recreation areas, high quality riparian areas, live water, special status species habitat, or areas key to maintenance of productive ecosystems; –Ensures the accessibility of public lands in areas where access is needed and cannot otherwise be obtained; –Be essential to allow effective management of public lands in areas where consolidation of ownership is necessary to meet resource management objectives; –Result in the acquisition of lands which serve a national priority as identified in national policy directives. • In addition to the above criteria, all future land disposal actions would require a site-specific environmental analysis in accordance with NEPA. This subsequent analysis may reveal resource conditions that could not be mitigated to the satisfaction of the authorized officer and may, therefore preclude disposal. • All land tenure adjustments must be in conformance with other decisions (goals, objectives, management actions) within this RMP. • Habitat for listed and candidate T&E species would be retained in Federal ownership. Exceptions may be considered in exchanges with the State of Utah and others with consultation and concurrence with the USFWS. • Surface lands identified for disposal with unpatented mining claims could be conveyed if the purchaser is the mining claimant, or the mining claims are relinquished if the purchaser is other than the mining claimant. • Issue patents for existing shooting ranges (see Appendix 5, Table A5-11)). No portions of these R&PP patented lands, under any circumstances, would revert to the United States if any such portion was used for solid waste disposal or for any other purpose that may result in the disposal, placement, or release of any hazardous substance. • Where consistent with the goals and objectives of the RMP, classify as suitable for lease and/or disposal under Section 7 of the Taylor Grazing Act of 1934, as amended, lands disposed of or leased under the R&PP Act, Desert Land Entry (DLE) Act, Color of Title, Carey Act, and state grants. • The preferred method of managing OHV Open Play Areas located near communities is to issue a lease or patent under the R&PP Act, and have the areas managed by the relevant state, county, or local community. • Pursue land acquisitions from willing sellers when lands— <ul style="list-style-type: none"> –Are within or adjacent to WSAs, ACECs, Wild and Scenic Rivers, or other special designations; –Are associated with key fisheries or wildlife habitats and riparian zones;

Table 2-18. Lands and Realty Decisions

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Provide linkage or public access to other public lands; – Have significant paleontological or cultural resources; – Provide high recreation or other significant resource or public values; – Are needed to improve manageability of public lands; • Give exchanges with the State of Utah priority consideration. 				
Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)	Alternative C	Alternative D
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All eligible wild and scenic river segments (12 segments – 135 miles) would be retained in Federal ownership unless such action would benefit outstandingly remarkable values and improve wild and scenic rivers management potential. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not applicable. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All suitable wild and scenic river segments (2 segments – 59 miles) would be retained in Federal ownership unless such action would benefit outstandingly remarkable values and improve wild and scenic rivers management potential. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All suitable wild and scenic river segments (12 segments – 135 miles) would be retained in Federal ownership unless such action would benefit outstandingly remarkable values and improve wild and scenic rivers management potential. 	
Issue: FLPMA Section 203 Sales				
Management Actions				
Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)	Alternative C	Alternative D
Continue to offer for sale lands identified in the Mountain Valley MFP (280 of the acres identified are still available).	Approximately 13,400 acres of public land would be available for FLPMA Section 203 sales (as listed in Appendix 5 and shown on Maps 2-21 through 2-25) subject to NEPA compliance and consistent with other decisions in this RMP.		Consider no lands for FLPMA Section 203 sales.	
Issue: Withdrawals, Classifications, and Segregations				
Management Actions				
Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)	Alternative C	Alternative D
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review existing withdrawals to determine whether they are serving the purposes for which they were withdrawn (existing withdrawals are listed in Table A5-7 in Appendix 5). • Any lands becoming unencumbered by withdrawals would be managed in a manner consistent with adjacent or comparable public land within the RFO. • Review existing classifications and segregations on a case-by-case basis to determine whether the classification or segregation is appropriate and should be continued, modified or terminated. 				
Continue existing withdrawals (154,700 acres).	Continue existing withdrawals (154,700 acres).	Continue existing withdrawals (154,700 acres).	Continue existing withdrawals (154,700 acres).	Continue existing withdrawals (154,700 acres).

Table 2-18. Lands and Realty Decisions

<p>Recommend withdrawing the following developed recreation sites from mineral entry—</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lonesome Beaver Campground • McMillan Spring Campground • Starr Springs Campground • Dandelion Flat Picnic Area • Hog Springs Picnic Area <p>Recommend withdrawing the four existing ACECs (14,780 acres) from mineral entry. Total acres: 169,480</p>		<p>Recommend withdrawing the following areas from mineral entry (Map 2-26)—</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • North Caineville Mesa ACEC • Old Woman Front ACEC • Dirty Devil and Fremont (Fremont Gorge) suitable wild rivers within one-quarter mile of each side of the river • Developed recreation sites including Lonesome Beaver Campground, McMillan Spring Campground, Starr Springs Campground, Dandelion Flat Picnic Area, Hog Springs Picnic Area, Otter Creek Reservoir Recreation Sites, Kingston Canyon Recreation Site and Koosharem Picnic Area <p>New recommended acres: 21,500 Total acres: 176,200</p>	<p>Recommend withdrawing the following areas from mineral entry (Map 2-27)—</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rainbow Hills ACEC • Old Woman Front ACEC • All suitable Wild and Scenic Rivers within one-quarter mile each side of river • Developed Recreation Sites including Lonesome Beaver Campground, McMillan Spring Campground, Starr Springs Campground, Dandelion Flat Picnic Area, Hog Springs Picnic Area, Otter Creek Reservoir Recreation Sites, Kingston Canyon Recreation Site and Koosharem Picnic Area <p>Recommend withdrawing the VRM Class II portions of the following ACECs from mineral entry (see ACEC prescriptions for details)—</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dirty Devil/North Wash ACEC • Fremont Gorge/Cockscomb ACEC • Badlands ACEC • Henry Mountains ACEC • Horseshoe Canyon ACEC • Little Rockies ACEC <p>New recommended acres: 176,400 Total acres: 331,100</p>	<p>Recommend withdrawing the following areas from mineral entry (Map 2-28)—</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rainbow Hills ACEC • Old Woman Front ACEC • All suitable Wild and Scenic Rivers within one-quarter mile each side of river • All areas identified as non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics. • Developed recreation sites including Lonesome Beaver Campground, McMillan Spring Campground, Starr Springs Campground, Dandelion Flat Picnic Area, Hog Springs Picnic Area, Otter Creek Reservoir Recreation Sites, Kingston Canyon Recreation Site and Koosharem Picnic Area <p>Recommend withdrawing the VRM Class II portions of the following ACECs from mineral entry (see ACEC prescriptions for details)—</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dirty Devil/North Wash ACEC • Fremont Gorge/Cockscomb ACEC • Badlands ACEC • Henry Mountains ACEC • Horseshoe Canyon ACEC • Little Rockies ACEC <p>New recommended acres: 749,200 Total acres: 903,900</p>
--	--	---	--	--

Table 2-18. Lands and Realty Decisions

Issue: Managing Rights-of-Way				
Management Actions				
Common to All Alternatives				
<p>In existing rights-of-way, authorize culinary water source developments (Culinary Water Sources Table A5-12 in Appendix 5) subject to valid existing rights and future land use authorizations to ensure that they do not lead to degradation, pollution, or contamination of water supply. When compatible, require multiple communication site users to share the same sites and buildings, and use the same facilities. See Existing Communication Sites Table A5-10 in Appendix 5.</p> <p>Consider obtaining easements across non-Federal land to—</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide public access; • Enhance resource management in key fishery and wildlife habitats and riparian zones; • Cooperate with other Federal, state, and local governing agencies, organizations, tribes, and private individuals in obtaining right-of-way easements; • Enhance resource management. 				
Issue: Right-of-Way Avoidance and Exclusion Areas				
Management Actions				
Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)	Alternative C	Alternative D
<p>Spatial and temporal restrictions outlined in Section 2.6.1.9, Fish and Wildlife Decisions, would apply to right-of-way construction and maintenance activities, by alternative. These restrictions do not apply to emergency maintenance.</p>				
<p>Manage the following as right-of-way avoidance areas (see Map 2-29):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WSAs • ACECs • Eligible wild and scenic river corridors • Areas closed to oil and gas leasing • Areas open to oil and gas leasing with no surface occupancy stipulations 	<p>Manage the following as right-of-way avoidance or exclusion areas (see Map 2-30):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WSAs • Areas closed to oil and gas leasing 	<p>Manage the following as right-of-way avoidance or exclusion areas (see Map 2-31):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WSAs • ACECs • Suitable wild and scenic river corridors • Areas closed to oil and gas leasing • Areas open to oil and gas leasing with no surface occupancy stipulations 	<p>Manage the following as right-of-way avoidance or exclusion areas (see Map 2-32):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WSAs • ACECs • Suitable wild and scenic river corridors • Areas closed to oil and gas leasing • Areas open to oil and gas leasing with no surface occupancy stipulations 	<p>Manage the following as right-of-way avoidance or exclusion areas (see Map 2-33):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WSAs • ACECs • Suitable wild and scenic river corridors • Non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics • Areas closed to oil and gas leasing • Areas open to oil and gas leasing with no surface occupancy stipulations
<p>Consider exceptions on a case-by-case basis if the proposed right-of-way would:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not create substantial surface disturbances or cause only temporary impacts; • Be compatible with the resource values being protected by the restrictions; • Be consistent with IMP objectives (WSAs only); • Be consistent with management prescriptions for ACECs and wild and scenic rivers (Alternatives N, B, C and D); • Pose no irreversible or irretrievable impacts to ACEC relevant and important values or wild and scenic river outstandingly remarkable values (Alternatives N, 				

Table 2-18. Lands and Realty Decisions

B, C and D); • Not impact the wilderness characteristics of the identified non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics (Alternative D only).				
Issue: Managing Wind and Solar Energy Development				
Management Actions				
Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)	Alternative C	Alternative D
Not specifically addressed in existing plans.	Authorization of any right-of-way for wind or solar energy development would incorporate best management practices and provisions contained in the Wind Energy Development Program Record of Decision (see Appendix 15 of this DRMP/DEIS and BLM 2005d) and BLM's Solar Energy Policy.			
Consider wind and solar energy exploration and development on a case-by-case basis.	Consider proposals for wind and solar energy exploration and development throughout the RFO with the following exceptions— <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WSAs (right-of-way exclusion areas as per IMP) 	Consider proposals for wind and solar energy development throughout the RFO except within the following areas- <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WSAs (right-of-way exclusion areas as per IMP) • Dirty Devil and Fremont (Fremont Gorge) suitable wild river corridors • ACECs • Areas open to oil and gas leasing with no surface occupancy and areas closed to leasing. • VRM Class I and II areas • Migratory bird habitats and raptor nesting complexes • Threatened & Endangered Species habitats Consider proposals for wind and solar energy exploration throughout the RFO managed lands. Except for WSAs, exploration may be allowed within special management areas if the proposal would not adversely affect the resources of concern.	Consider proposals for wind and solar energy development throughout the lands administered by the RFO except within the following areas— <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WSAs (right-of-way exclusion areas as per IMP) • Suitable Wild and Scenic River corridors • ACECs • Areas open to oil and gas leasing with no surface occupancy and areas closed to leasing • VRM Class I and II areas • Migratory bird habitats and raptor nesting complexes • Special status species habitats • Consider proposals for wind and solar energy exploration throughout the RFO managed lands. Except for WSAs, exploration may be allowed within special management areas if the proposal would not	Consider proposals for wind and solar energy development throughout the lands administered by the RFO except within the following areas— <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WSAs (right-of-way exclusion areas as per IMP) • Non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics • Suitable Wild and Scenic River corridors • ACECs • Areas open to oil and gas leasing with no surface occupancy and areas closed to leasing. • VRM Class I and II areas • Migratory bird habitats and raptor nesting complexes • Special status species habitats Consider proposals for wind and solar energy exploration throughout the RFO managed lands. Except for WSAs, exploration may be allowed within special management areas if the proposal would not adversely

Table 2-18. Lands and Realty Decisions

			adversely affect the resources of concern.	affect the resources of concern.
Issue: Transportation and Utility Corridors				
Management Actions				
Common to All Alternatives				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To minimize adverse environmental impacts and the proliferation of separate rights-of-way, use common rights-of-way whenever possible, including collocation of new utility transmission lines and other facilities within existing utility and highway corridors. Decisions on designation of energy corridors contained within the “West-wide Energy Corridor Programmatic EIS” currently being developed separately from this RMP analysis that affect public lands in the RFO will be carried forward into the Richfield RMP, or will amend the Richfield RMP. 				
Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)	Alternative C	Alternative D
Designate no transportation and utility corridors.	Designate those transportation and utility corridors listed in Appendix 5, Table A5-8.			
Issue: Leases (Including R&PP Leases), Permits, and Easements				
Management Actions				
Common to All Alternatives				
Consider authorizing leases, permits, and easements that are compatible with other decisions throughout this RMP.				

2.6.2.6 Minerals and Energy

Table 2-19. Minerals and Energy Decisions

Desired Outcomes (Goals and Objectives)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Manage conservation of leasable mineral resources utilizing appropriate best management practices, and without compromising the long-term health and diversity of public lands. Manage mining claim location, prospecting, and mining operations in a manner that would not cause unnecessary or undue degradation of public lands and resources. Provide salable minerals needed for community and economic purposes while minimizing impacts to other resource values. Encourage and facilitate the development by private industry of public land mineral resources in a manner that satisfies national and local needs and provides for economical and environmentally sound exploration, extraction, and reclamation practices utilizing appropriate best management practices. Support the domestic need for energy resources.

Table 2-19. Minerals and Energy Decisions

Issue: Management of Fluid Mineral Leasing (Oil and Gas, Coal Bed Natural Gas)				
Management Actions				
Common to All Alternatives				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Issue oil and gas leases and allow for oil and gas exploration and development. • WSAs are closed to leasing, pursuant to the Federal onshore Oil and Gas Leasing Reform Act of 1987. • To the extent allowed by a site-specific environmental analysis that justifies a constraint, consistent with 43 CFR 3101.1-2, and consistent with the terms of an existing lease, the constraints and requirements for leasing implemented in this RMP would be applied to leases that were authorized prior to the signing of the Record of Decision and the approval of the RMP. • Manage the following sites as closed to leasing: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Incorporated municipalities • Manage the following additional sites as open to leasing with no surface occupancy, except as otherwise provided in other management decisions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – All cemeteries – Culinary water sources – Landfills – existing and closed – Lands managed under a Recreation and Public Purpose Act lease – Sites listed on the National Register of Historic Places – Developed recreation sites – BLM Administrative sites • Lease split-estate lands according to BLM Resource Management Plan stipulations for adjacent or nearby public lands or plans of other surface management agencies as consistent with Federal laws, 43 CFR 3101, and the surface owner's rights. 				
Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)	Alternative C	Alternative D
Area closed to leasing: 459,700 acres	Area closed to leasing: 446,900 acres	Area closed to leasing: 450,500 acres	Area closed to leasing: 586,300 acres	Area closed to leasing: 1,160,500 acres
Manage fluid mineral leases as shown on Map 2-34— <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Areas open to leasing with standard lease terms: 1,236,500 acres • Areas open to leasing subject to controlled surface use and/or timing limitations: 409,200 acres • Areas open to leasing subject to no surface occupancy: 22,600 acres 	Manage fluid mineral leases as shown on Map 2-35— <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Areas open to leasing with standard lease terms: 860,600 acres • Areas open to leasing subject to controlled surface use and/or timing limitations: 820,500 acres • Areas open to leasing subject to no surface occupancy: 0 acres 	Manage fluid mineral leases as shown on Map 2-36— <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Areas open to leasing with standard lease terms: 545,000 acres • Areas open to leasing subject to controlled surface use and/or timing limitations: 1,021,600 acres • Areas open to leasing subject to no surface occupancy: 110,900 acres 	Manage fluid mineral leases as shown on Map 2-37— <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Areas open to leasing with standard lease terms: 491,900 acres • Areas open to leasing subject to controlled surface use and/or timing limitations: 901,100 acres • Areas open to leasing subject to no surface occupancy: 148,800 acres 	Manage fluid mineral leases as shown on Map 2-38— <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Areas open to leasing with standard lease terms: 290,200 acres • Areas open to leasing subject to controlled surface use and/or timing limitations: 634,000 acres • Areas open to leasing subject to no surface occupancy: 43,300 acres

Table 2-19. Minerals and Energy Decisions

Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)	Alternative C	Alternative D
Geophysical operations are subject to the oil and gas leasing categories.	Geophysical operations under 43 CFR 3150 are subject to the oil and gas leasing restrictions with the following exception: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Geophysical operations proposed for lands that are designated as NSO or closed to leasing may be considered for approval when (1) the circumstances or relative resource values in the area have changed, (2) less restrictive requirements could be developed to protect the resource of concern, or (3) operations could be conducted without causing unacceptable impacts to the resource of concern. 			
Issue: Management of Geothermal Resources				
Management Actions				
Common to All Alternatives				
Lease split-estate lands according to BLM Resource Management Plan stipulations for adjacent or nearby public lands or plans of other surface management agencies as consistent with Federal laws, 43 CFR 3101, and the surface owner's rights.				
Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)	Alternative C	Alternative D
Continue to allow geothermal leasing on a case-by-case basis. Use the oil and gas leasing designations as a guide for geothermal resources.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Leasing of geothermal resources would be in conformance with the oil and gas leasing restrictions (open, open with minor constraints, open with major constraints, and closed) for oil and gas leasing, consistent with the authorities granted at 43 CFR 3200, including 3201 and 3250. • Note: exploration operations under 43 CFR 3250 proposed for lands that are designated as NSO or closed to leasing may be considered for approval when (1) the circumstances or relative resource values in the area have changed, (2) less restrictive requirements could be developed to protect the resource of concern or (3) operations could be conducted without causing unacceptable impacts to the resource or concern. 			
Issue: Management of Tar Sands Areas				
Management Actions				
Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)	Alternative C	Alternative D
Decisions for leasing tar sands will be determined in the Record of Decision and associated <i>Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement on Oil Shale and Tar Sands Leasing</i> , being conducted by the BLM separately from this analysis. Leasing for tar sands would be subject to the oil and gas leasing restrictions.				
Issue: Surface Mining of Coal				
Management Actions				
Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)	Alternative C	Alternative D
Consider leasing coal resources on the following lands identified in the existing land use plans as acceptable— <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 25,446 acres of Federal 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consider applications for exploration licenses for lands that are subject to leasing as defined at 43 CFR 3400.2. Licenses would be subject to the surface disturbing restrictions and the provisions for exceptions, modifications, and waivers, similar to the oil and gas restrictions as consistent with the regulations at 43 CFR 3400. • Consider proposals for coal leasing on public lands determined to be acceptable for further consideration for leasing in the coal unsuitability analysis (Appendix 8), if and when there is interest. Prior to leasing, complete a multiple use analysis (43 			

Table 2-19. Minerals and Energy Decisions

<p>mineral estate in the Henry Mountains are identified as acceptable for consideration of coal leasing by surface mining methods.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 30,052 acres of Federal mineral estate in the Wasatch Plateau and Emery coal fields are identified as acceptable for consideration of coal leasing by surface mining methods. 	<p>CFR 3420.1 (3)), consult with other surface owners (43 CFR 3420.1-5 (4) (i)), and address other applicable requirements of 43 CFR 3400 Coal Management.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – In the Henry Mountains coal field, 36,028 acres are acceptable for consideration for leasing by surface mining methods. – In the Emery coal field, 0 acres are acceptable for consideration by surface mining methods. 			
<p>Consider no coal leasing proposals in VRM Class I areas. VRM Classes II, III and IV areas would be subject to coal exploration and development mitigation requirements, with VRM Class II being most restrictive and VRM Class IV least restrictive.</p>		<p>Consider no coal leasing proposals in VRM Class I or II areas.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consider no coal leasing proposals in VRM Class I or II areas. • Consider no coal leasing proposals in non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics. 	
<p>Issue: Subsurface Mining of Coal</p>				
<p>Management Actions</p>				
<p>Alternative N (No Action)</p>	<p>Alternative A</p>	<p>Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)</p>	<p>Alternative C</p>	<p>Alternative D</p>
<p>Consider leasing coal resources on the following lands currently identified as acceptable—</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 107,414 acres of Federal mineral estate in the Henry Mountains are identified as acceptable for consideration of leasing by underground mining with 19,255 acres subject to no surface facilities. • 73,952 acres of Federal 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consider applications for exploration licenses for lands that are subject to leasing as defined at 43 CFR 3400.2. Licenses would be subject to the surface disturbing restrictions and the provisions for exceptions, modifications, and waivers, similar to the oil and gas restrictions as consistent with the regulations at 43 CFR 3400. • Consider proposals for coal leasing on public lands determined to be acceptable for further consideration for leasing in the coal unsuitability analysis (Appendix 8), if and when there is interest. Prior to leasing, complete a multiple use analysis (43 CFR 3420.1 (3)), consult with other surface owners (43 CFR 3420.1-5 (4) (i)), and address other applicable requirements of 43 CFR 3400 Coal Management. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – In the Henry Mountains coal field, 50,512 acres of BLM lands are identified as having development potential by underground mining methods. – In the Emery coal field, 9,624 acres of BLM lands and 3,542 acres of National Forest are identified as having development potential by underground mining methods. 			

Table 2-19. Minerals and Energy Decisions

<p>mineral estate in the Wasatch Plateau and Emery coal fields are identified as acceptable for consideration of leasing with 43,567 acres subject to no surface facilities.</p>				
<p>Consider no coal leasing proposals in VRM Class I areas. VRM Class II, III and IV areas would be subject to coal exploration and development mitigation requirements, with VRM Class II being most restrictive and VRM IV least restrictive.</p>	<p>Consider no coal leasing proposals in VRM Class I or II areas.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consider no coal leasing proposals in VRM Class I or II areas. • Consider no coal leasing proposals in non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics. 		
<p>Issue: Management of Non-Energy Solid Leasable Minerals</p>				
<p>Management Actions</p>				
<p>Common to All Alternatives</p>				
<p>Mineral use authorizations for non-energy solid leasable minerals include: prospecting permits, exploration licenses, preference right leases, competitive leases, fringe acreage leases, lease modifications, and use permits. As used herein, the term <i>leasing</i> is used to refer to any of the mineral use authorizations, because if the area is not open to leasing, then an exploration authorization or lease modification would not be considered. Any mineral use authorization issued after the RMP is approved would be subject to the stipulations developed in the RMP. The open and closed areas for leasing of non-energy solid leasable minerals would be the same as provided for oil and gas leasing, including exceptions, modifications, and waivers.</p>				
<p>Management Actions</p>				
<p>Alternative N (No Action)</p>	<p>Alternative A</p>	<p>Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)</p>	<p>Alternative C</p>	<p>Alternative D</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continue to prohibit leasing in WSAs, within one-quarter mile of eligible wild and scenic rivers, and within ACECs. • Leasing is allowed where it is consistent with the existing land use plans and has been addressed in a NEPA analysis. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Manage leasing as shown on Map 2-39. • Areas closed to leasing (WSAs): –446,900 acres • Areas open to leasing subject to standard conditions of approval: –860,600 acres • Areas open to leasing subject to controlled surface use and/or timing limitations: 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Manage leasing as shown on Map 2-40. • Prohibit leasing in WSAs, within one-quarter mile of the two wild and scenic rivers recommended as suitable, and in North Caineville Mesa ACEC. • Areas closed to leasing: –450,500 acres • Areas open to leasing subject to standard conditions of approval: 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Manage leasing as shown on Map 2-41. • Prohibit leasing in WSAs, within one-quarter mile of the 12 wild and scenic rivers recommended as suitable, and within the following ACECs: –Dirty Devil/North Wash ACEC –Fremont Gorge/Cockscomb ACEC 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Manage leasing as shown on Map 2-42. • Prohibit leasing in WSAs, non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics, within one-quarter mile of the 12 wild and scenic rivers recommended as suitable, and within the following ACECs: –Dirty Devil/North Wash ACEC –Fremont Gorge/Cockscomb

Table 2-19. Minerals and Energy Decisions

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> –820,500 acres • Areas open to leasing subject to no surface occupancy: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> –0 acres 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> –545,000 acres • Areas open to leasing subject to controlled surface use and/or timing limitations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> –1,021,600 acres • Areas open to leasing subject to no surface occupancy: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> –110,900 acres 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> –Badlands ACEC –Henry Mountains ACEC –Horseshoe Canyon ACEC –Little Rockies ACEC –Rainbow Hills ACEC • Areas closed to leasing: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> –586,300 acres • Areas open to leasing subject to standard conditions of approval: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> –491,900 acres • Areas open to leasing subject to controlled surface use and/or timing limitations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> –901,100 acres • Areas open to leasing subject to no surface occupancy: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> –148,800 acres 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ACEC –Badlands ACEC –Henry Mountains ACEC –Horseshoe Canyon ACEC –Little Rockies ACEC –Rainbow Hills ACEC • Areas closed to leasing: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> –1,160,500 acres • Areas open to leasing subject to standard conditions of approval: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> –290,200 acres • Areas open to leasing subject to controlled surface use and/or timing limitations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> –634,000 acres • Areas open to leasing subject to no surface occupancy: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> –43,300 acres
Issue: Management of Locatable Minerals				
Management Actions				
Common to All Alternatives				
<p>Existing operations would continue to be subject to the stipulations developed for the notice or plan of operations. The BLM would evaluate all operations authorized by the mining laws in the context of its requirement to prevent unnecessary and undue degradation of Federal lands and resources and the non-impairment standards of the Federal regulations at 43 CFR 3802 and the IMP for WSAs. Consistent with the rights afforded claimants under the mining laws, operations conducted after the RMP is approved would be required to conform to the stipulations developed in the RMP and as generally provided in the oil and gas stipulations. The oil and gas stipulations would be a general guideline and may not apply uniformly to all operations under the mining laws. Operations on BLM-administered lands open to mineral entry must be conducted in compliance with all of the BLM’s surface management regulations. The BLM surface management regulations apply to public lands, including split estate lands where the minerals are reserved to the U.S., but the regulations do not apply to surface lands managed by other Federal agencies. A withdrawal may be necessary if a no surface occupancy stipulation without provisions for exceptions, modifications, and waivers for oil and gas leasing is applied as a management prescription for locatable minerals. All public lands with Federal mineral estate are open to mining claim location unless specifically withdrawn from mineral entry by Secretarial order or by a public land law. Therefore, other than the existing withdrawals and those recommended by this RMP, all public lands within the RFO remain open to mineral entry under the mining laws. The BLM may recommend future withdrawals in areas identified as closed or with a no surface occupancy stipulation for oil and gas leasing, if it becomes necessary to prevent unacceptable resource impacts.</p>				

Table 2-19. Minerals and Energy Decisions

Management Actions				
Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)	Alternative C	Alternative D
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Continue to allow location, exploration, and development of locatable minerals while preventing unnecessary and undue degradation of other resources and preventing impairment to wilderness suitability of WSAs. Continue existing withdrawals (154,700 acres). Recommend withdrawing four existing ACECs (14,780 acres) from mineral entry. <p>Total acres: 169,480</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Allow location, exploration, and development of locatable minerals while preventing unnecessary and undue degradation of other resources and preventing impairment to wilderness suitability of WSAs. Continue existing withdrawals (154,700 acres). <p>Total acres: 154,700</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Allow location, exploration, and development of locatable minerals on public lands while preventing unnecessary and undue degradation of other resources and preventing impairment to wilderness suitability of WSAs. Continue existing withdrawals (154,700 acres). Recommend withdrawing the following areas from mineral entry: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Developed Recreation Sites including Lonesome Beaver Campground, McMillan Spring Campground, Starr Springs Campground, Dandelion Flat Picnic Area, Hog Springs Picnic Area, Otter Creek Reservoir Recreation Sites, Kingston Canyon Recreation Site, and Koosharem Picnic Area – North Caineville Mesa ACEC – Old Woman Front ACEC – Dirty Devil and Fremont Gorge Suitable Wild and Scenic Rivers (within a one-quarter mile corridor along each side of the 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Allow location, exploration, and development of locatable minerals on public lands while preventing unnecessary and undue degradation of other resources and preventing impairment to wilderness suitability of WSAs. Continue existing withdrawals (154,700 acres). Recommend withdrawing the following areas from mineral entry: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Developed Recreation Sites including Lonesome Beaver Campground, McMillan Spring Campground, Starr Springs Campground, Dandelion Flat Picnic Area, Hog Springs Picnic Area, Otter Creek Reservoir Recreation Sites, Kingston Canyon Recreation Site, and Koosharem Picnic Area – Dirty Devil/North Wash ACEC (VRM Class II area) – Fremont Gorge/Cockscomb ACEC (VRM Class II area) – Badlands ACEC (VRM 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Allow location, exploration, and development of locatable minerals on public lands while preventing unnecessary and undue degradation of other resources and preventing impairment to wilderness suitability of WSAs. Continue existing withdrawals (154,700 acres). Recommend withdrawing the following areas from mineral entry: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Developed Recreation Sites including Lonesome Beaver Campground, McMillan Spring Campground, Starr Springs Campground, Dandelion Flat Picnic Area, Hog Springs Picnic Area, Otter Creek Reservoir Recreation Sites, Kingston Canyon Recreation Site, and Koosharem Picnic Area – Dirty Devil/North Wash ACEC (VRM Class II area) – Fremont Gorge/Cockscomb ACEC (VRM Class II area) – Badlands ACEC (VRM

Table 2-19. Minerals and Energy Decisions

		<p>river) The proposed new withdrawals would encompass 21,500 acres. Total acres: 176,200</p>	<p>Class II area) –Henry Mountains ACEC (VRM Class II area) –Horseshoe Canyon ACEC (VRM Class II area) –Little Rockies ACEC (VRM Class II area) –Rainbow Hills ACEC –All suitable Wild and Scenic Rivers within a one-quarter mile corridor along each side of the river The proposed new withdrawals would encompass 176,400 acres. Total acres: 331,100</p>	<p>Class II area) –Henry Mountains ACEC (VRM Class II area) –Horseshoe Canyon ACEC (VRM Class II area) –Little Rockies ACEC (VRM Class II area) –Rainbow Hills ACEC –All suitable Wild and Scenic Rivers within a one-quarter mile corridor along each side of the river –All non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics. The proposed new withdrawals would encompass 749,200 acres. Total acres: 903,900</p>
Issue: Management of Salable Minerals (Mineral Materials)				
Management Actions				
Common to All Alternatives				
<p>Authorizations for mineral materials include: exploration permits, exclusive sale contracts, free use permits, community pits and common use areas. As used herein, the term <i>disposal</i> is used as inclusive of any mineral material authorization, because exploration permits would not be issued in areas closed to disposals. Existing disposals would continue to be subject to the existing stipulations and conditions for that disposal. Disposals issued or designated after the RMP is approved would be subject to the stipulations developed in the RMP. The open and closed areas for mineral material disposals would be the same as provided for oil and gas leasing, including exceptions, modifications, and waivers.</p>				
Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)	Alternative C	Alternative D
<p>Continue to prohibit disposal of mineral materials in WSAs, within one-quarter mile of eligible wild and scenic rivers, and ACECs. Allow mineral material disposals on a case-by-case basis subject to site-specific</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Manage disposal of mineral materials as shown on Map 2-39. • Areas closed to mineral material disposals (WSAs): –446,900 acres 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Manage disposal of mineral materials as shown on Map 2-40. • Allow no disposal of mineral materials in WSAs, within one-quarter mile of suitable wild and scenic rivers, and in North 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Manage disposal of mineral materials as shown on Map 2-41. • Allow no disposal of mineral materials in WSAs, within one-quarter mile of suitable wild and scenic rivers, and within 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Manage disposal of mineral materials as shown on Map 2-42. • Allow no disposal of mineral materials in WSAs, non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics, within one-

Table 2-19. Minerals and Energy Decisions

<p>environmental analysis outside of these areas.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Areas open to disposal of mineral materials subject to standard conditions of approval: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> –860,600 acres • Areas open to disposal of mineral materials subject to controlled surface use and/or timing limitations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> –820,500 acres • Areas open to disposal of mineral materials subject to no surface occupancy: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> –0 acres 	<p>Caineville Mesa ACEC.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Areas closed to mineral material disposals: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> –450,500 acres • Areas open to disposal of mineral materials subject to standard conditions of approval: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> –545,000 acres • Areas open to disposal of mineral materials subject to controlled surface use and/or timing limitations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> –1,021,600 acres • Areas open to disposal of mineral materials subject to no surface occupancy: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> –110,900 acres 	<p>the following ACECs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> –Dirty Devil/North Wash ACEC –Fremont Gorge/Cockscomb ACEC –Badlands ACEC –Henry Mountains ACEC –Horseshoe Canyon ACEC –Little Rockies ACEC –Rainbow Hills ACEC • Areas closed to mineral material disposals: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> –586,300 acres • Areas open to disposal of mineral materials subject to standard conditions of approval: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> –491,900 acres • Areas open to disposal of mineral materials subject to controlled surface use and/or timing limitations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> –901,100 acres • Areas open to disposal of mineral materials subject to no surface occupancy: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> –148,800 acres 	<p>quarter mile of suitable wild and scenic rivers, and within the following ACECs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> –Dirty Devil/North Wash ACEC –Fremont Gorge/Cockscomb ACEC –Badlands ACEC –Henry Mountains ACEC –Horseshoe Canyon ACEC –Little Rockies ACEC –Rainbow Hills ACEC • Areas closed to mineral material disposals: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> –1,160,500 acres • Areas open to disposal of mineral materials subject to standard conditions of approval: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> –290,200 acres • Areas open to disposal of mineral materials subject to controlled surface use and/or timing limitations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> –634,000 acres • Areas open to disposal of mineral materials subject to no surface occupancy: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> –43,300 acres
---	---	---	---	--

2.6.3 Special Designations

2.6.3.1 Wilderness Study Areas

Table 2-20. Wilderness Study Areas Decisions

Desired Outcomes (Goals and Objectives)				
Continue to manage wilderness study areas (WSAs) in a manner that does not impair their suitability for designation as wilderness in accordance with FLPMA Section 603 and the <i>Interim Management Policy for Lands Under Wilderness Review</i> .				
Issue: Interim Management of Wilderness Study Areas				
Management Action				
Common to All Alternatives				
Manage WSAs according to the IMP (BLM-H-8550-1). The BLM is statutorily (FLPMA Section 603(c)) required to manage these areas to protect their suitability for Congressional designation into the National Wilderness Preservation System unless and until Congress either designates an area as wilderness or releases it from further consideration. The BLM's discretion to make planning decisions on management of WSAs is limited to designating WSAs as VRM Class I and determining if the WSAs will be limited or closed to OHV use.				
Issue: Oil and Gas Leasing in WSAs				
Management Action				
Common to All Alternatives				
All WSAs are closed to leasing pursuant to the Federal Onshore Oil and Gas Leasing Reform Act of 1987.				
Issue: Visual Resource Management and Designation in WSAs				
Management Actions				
Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)	Alternative C	Alternative D
Manage WSAs as VRM Class I.	Designate all WSAs as VRM Class I.			
Issue: Off-highway Vehicle Area Designation in WSAs				
Management Actions				
Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)	Alternative C	Alternative D
Continue managing WSAs as closed or limited to OHV use as identified in existing land use plans and shown on Map 2-12.	Designate WSAs as limited to OHV use as shown on Map 2-13. A total of 60 miles of inventoried vehicle routes would be designated for use subject to the IMP (see Travel Management Section 2.6.2.4).	Designate WSAs as closed or limited to OHV use as shown on Map 2-14. A total of 45 miles of inventoried vehicle routes would be designated for use subject to the IMP (see Travel Management Section	Close WSAs to OHV use as shown on Map 2-15.	Close WSAs to OHV use as shown on Map 2-16.

Table 2-20. Wilderness Study Areas Decisions

	2.6.2.4).	
Issue: Wilderness Study Areas if Released by Congress		
Management Action		
Common to All Alternatives		
<p>Only Congress can release a WSA from wilderness consideration. Should any WSA, in part or in whole, be released from wilderness consideration, the BLM would examine proposals in the released area on a case-by-case basis for consistency with the goals and objectives of the RMP decisions. Actions inconsistent with RMP goals and objectives would be deferred until completion of requisite plan amendments. Because the management direction of the released land would continue in accordance with the goals and objectives established in the RMP, there is no separate analysis required in this land use plan to address resource impacts if any WSAs are released by Congress.</p>		

2.6.3.2 Wild and Scenic Rivers

Table 2-21. Wild and Scenic Rivers Decisions

Desired Outcomes (Goals and Objectives)				
<p>Manage to protect the outstandingly remarkable values, tentative classifications, and free-flowing nature of eligible/suitable river segments.</p>				
Issue: Determine Suitability of Eligible Wild And Scenic River Segments				
Management Actions				
Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)	Alternative C	Alternative D
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Existing land use plans contain no decisions regarding wild and scenic rivers. As directed by BLM Instruction Memorandum IM-2004-196, Clarification of Policy in the BLM Manual Section 8351, Wild and Scenic Rivers, with Respect to Eligibility Criteria and Protective Management, manage all of the eligible river segments (135 miles) to protect their outstandingly 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recommend no eligible river segments as suitable for inclusion in the National Wild and Scenic River System. Provide no special management for outstandingly remarkable values. 	<p>Recommend and manage the following eligible rivers as suitable for inclusion in the National Wild and Scenic River System—</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Dirty Devil River (54 miles)* Fremont River in Fremont Gorge(5 miles)* <p>*All or portions of these eligible WSRs overlay WSAs which are managed pursuant to the IMP.</p>	<p>Recommend and manage all of the eligible rivers as suitable for inclusion in the National Wild and Scenic River System—</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Dirty Devil River (54 miles)* Beaver Wash Canyon (6.8 miles)* Larry Canyon (4 miles)* No Man's Canyon (7.1 miles)* Robbers Roost Canyon (31 miles)* Sams Mesa Box Canyon (9.5 miles)* Twin Corral Box Canyon (9 miles)* Fish Creek (0.25 mile) Fremont River <ul style="list-style-type: none"> —Fremont Gorge (5 miles) —Below Capitol Reef National Park to Caineville Ditch Diversion (4 miles) Maidenwater Creek (3 miles) 	

Table 2-21. Wild and Scenic Rivers Decisions

<p>remarkable values, free-flowing nature, and tentative classification, as follows—</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – 126.4 miles of river segments tentatively classified as “wild” – 3.25 miles of river segments tentatively classified as “scenic” – 5.4 miles of river segments tentatively classified as “recreational” <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In accordance with BLM Manual 8351, 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 BLM has authority (e.g., BLM lands within the corridor) and within the parameters of decisions made in the previous planning documents until such time as suitability determinations are made. 			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quitchupah Creek (1.4 miles) <p>*All or portions of these eligible WSRs overlay WSAs which are managed pursuant to the IMP.</p>	
Issue: Management of Dirty Devil River (54 miles)				
Management Actions				
Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)	Alternative C	Alternative D
Manage all eligible segments to protect their outstandingly	Do not manage the Dirty River as eligible or suitable	Manage the Dirty Devil River (54 miles) as suitable for inclusion in the National Wild and Scenic River System and tentatively classified as a wild river.		

Table 2-21. Wild and Scenic Rivers Decisions

remarkable values, free-flowing nature, and tentative classification to the degree that BLM has authority (e.g., BLM lands within the corridor) and within the parameters of decisions made in the previous planning documents until such time as suitability determinations are made.	for inclusion in the in the National Wild and Scenic River System. Manage the river corridor in the manner identified under other resource headings for Alternative A.	Manage to protect the outstandingly remarkable values, including scenic, recreation, geologic, and fish and wildlife. Specific management prescriptions within one-quarter mile of each side of the river include— <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Close to OHVs except for Poison Spring Road crossing • Close to oil and gas leasing • Recommend withdrawing from mineral entry 		
Issue: Management of Fremont River – Fremont Gorge (5 miles)				
Management Actions				
Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)	Alternative C	Alternative D
Manage all eligible streams to protect their outstandingly remarkable values, free-flowing nature, and tentative classification to the degree that BLM has authority (e.g., BLM lands within the corridor) and within the parameters of decisions made in the previous planning documents until such time as suitability determinations are made.	Do not manage the Fremont River - Fremont Gorge as eligible or suitable for inclusion in the National Wild and Scenic River System. Manage the river corridor in the manner identified under other resource headings for Alternative A.	Manage the Fremont River in Fremont Gorge (5 miles) as suitable for inclusion in the National Wild and Scenic River System and tentatively classified as a wild river. Management would protect the outstandingly remarkable scenic values. Specific management prescriptions within one-quarter mile of each side of the river include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Manage as open to oil and gas leasing with no surface occupancy; • Close to OHV use; • Recommend for withdrawal from mineral entry. 	Manage the Fremont River in Fremont Gorge (5 miles) as suitable for inclusion in the National Wild and Scenic River System and tentatively classified as a wild river. <p>Manage to protect the outstandingly remarkable scenic values. Specific management prescriptions within one-quarter mile of each side of the river include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Close to oil and gas leasing; • Close to OHV use; • Recommend withdrawing from mineral entry. 	
Issue: Management of Fremont River—Capitol Reef National Park to Caineville Ditch Diversion (4 miles)				
Management Actions				
Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)	Alternative C	Alternative D
Manage all eligible streams	Do not manage the Fremont	Do not manage the Fremont	Manage the Fremont River from Capitol Reef National Park to	

Table 2-21. Wild and Scenic Rivers Decisions

<p>to protect their outstandingly remarkable values, free-flowing nature, and tentative classification to the degree that BLM has authority (e.g. public lands within the corridor) and within the parameters of decisions made in the previous planning documents until such time as suitability determinations are made.</p>	<p>River - Capitol Reef National Park to Caineville Ditch Diversion as eligible or suitable for inclusion into the National Wild and Scenic River System. Manage the river corridor in the manner identified under other resource headings for Alternative A.</p>	<p>River - Capitol Reef National Park to Caineville Ditch Diversion as eligible or suitable for inclusion into the National Wild and Scenic River System. Manage the river corridor in the manner identified under other resource headings for Alternative B.</p>	<p>Caineville Ditch Diversion (4 miles) as suitable for inclusion in the National Wild and Scenic River System and tentatively classified as a recreational/ river.</p> <p>Manage to protect the outstandingly remarkable values including scenic and geologic. Specific management prescriptions within one-quarter mile of each side of the river include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Close to oil and gas leasing; • Close to OHV use; • Recommend withdrawing from mineral entry. 	
Issue: Management of Beaver Wash Canyon (6.8 miles)				
Management Actions				
Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)	Alternative C	Alternative D
<p>Manage all eligible streams to protect their outstandingly remarkable values, free-flowing nature, and tentative classification to the degree that BLM has authority (e.g., BLM lands within the corridor) and within the parameters of decisions made in the previous planning documents until such time as suitability determinations are made. Beaver Wash Canyon is also located within the Beaver Wash Canyon ACEC and would be managed according to those management prescriptions.</p>	<p>Do not manage Beaver Wash Canyon as eligible or suitable for inclusion into the National Wild and Scenic River System. Manage the river corridor in the manner identified under other resource headings for Alternative A.</p>	<p>Do not manage Beaver Wash Canyon as eligible or suitable for inclusion into the National Wild and Scenic River System. Manage the river corridor in the manner identified under other resource headings for Alternative B.</p>	<p>Manage Beaver Wash Canyon (6.8 miles) as suitable for inclusion in the National Wild and Scenic River System and tentatively classified as a wild river.</p> <p>Manage to protect the outstandingly remarkable values including scenic and ecologic. Specific management prescriptions within one-quarter mile of each side of the river include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Close to oil and gas leasing; • Close to OHV use • Recommend withdrawing from mineral entry. 	
Issue: Management of Larry Canyon (4 miles)				
Management Actions				
Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)	Alternative C	Alternative D
<p>Manage all eligible streams</p>	<p>Do not manage Larry</p>	<p>Do not manage Larry</p>	<p>Manage Larry Canyon (4 miles) as suitable for inclusion in the</p>	

Table 2-21. Wild and Scenic Rivers Decisions

<p>to protect their outstandingly remarkable values, free-flowing nature, and tentative classification to the degree that BLM has authority (e.g., BLM lands within the corridor) and within the parameters of decisions made in the previous planning documents until such time as suitability determinations are made.</p>	<p>Canyon as eligible or suitable for inclusion into the National Wild and Scenic River System. Manage the river corridor in the manner identified under other resource headings for Alternative A.</p>	<p>Canyon as eligible or suitable for inclusion into the National Wild and Scenic River System. Manage the river corridor in the manner identified under other resource headings for Alternative B.</p>	<p>National Wild and Scenic River System and tentatively classified as a wild river.</p> <p>Manage to protect the outstandingly remarkable values including scenic, recreation, wildlife, and ecologic. Specific management prescriptions within one-quarter mile of each side of the river include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Close to oil and gas leasing; • Close to OHV use; • Recommend withdrawing from mineral entry. 	
Issue: Management of No Man's Canyon (7.1 miles)				
Management Actions				
Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)	Alternative C	Alternative D
<p>Manage all eligible streams to protect their outstandingly remarkable values, free-flowing nature, and tentative classification to the degree that BLM has authority (e.g., BLM lands within the corridor) and within the parameters of decisions made in the previous planning documents until such time as suitability determinations are made.</p>	<p>Do not manage No Man's Canyon as eligible or suitable for inclusion in the National Wild and Scenic River System. Manage the river corridor in the manner identified under other resource headings for Alternative A</p>	<p>Do not manage No Man's Canyon as eligible or suitable for inclusion in the National Wild and Scenic River System. Manage the river corridor in the manner identified under other resource headings for Alternative B.</p>	<p>Manage No Man's Canyon (7.1 miles) as suitable for inclusion in the National Wild and Scenic River System and tentatively classified as a wild river.</p> <p>Manage to protect the outstandingly remarkable values including scenic and recreation. Specific management prescriptions within one-quarter mile of each side of the river include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Close to oil and gas leasing; • Close to OHV use; • Recommend withdrawing from mineral entry. 	
Issue: Management of Robbers Roost Canyon (31 miles)				
Management Actions				
Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)	Alternative C	Alternative D
<p>Manage all eligible streams to protect their outstandingly remarkable values, free-flowing nature, and tentative classification to the degree that BLM has authority (e.g., BLM lands within the</p>	<p>Do not manage Robbers Roost Canyon as eligible or suitable for inclusion in the National Wild and Scenic River System. Manage the river corridor in the manner identified under other</p>	<p>Do not manage Robbers Roost Canyon as eligible or suitable for inclusion in the National Wild and Scenic River System. Manage the river corridor in the manner identified under other</p>	<p>Manage Robbers Roost Canyon (31 miles) as suitable for inclusion in the National Wild and Scenic River System and tentatively classified as a wild river.</p> <p>Manage to protect the outstandingly remarkable values including scenic, recreation, and cultural (historic). Specific management prescriptions within one-quarter mile of each</p>	

Table 2-21. Wild and Scenic Rivers Decisions

corridor) and within the parameters of decisions made in the previous planning documents until such time as suitability determinations are made.	resource headings for Alternative A.	resource headings for Alternative B.	side of the river include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Close to oil and gas leasing; • Close to OHV use; • Recommend withdrawing from mineral entry. 	
Issue: Management of Sams Mesa Box Canyon (9.5 miles)				
Management Actions				
Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)	Alternative C	Alternative D
Manage all eligible streams to protect their outstandingly remarkable values, free-flowing nature, and tentative classification to the degree that BLM has authority (e.g., BLM lands within the corridor) and within the parameters of decisions made in the previous planning documents until such time as suitability determinations are made.	Do not manage Sams Mesa Box Canyon as eligible or suitable for inclusion in the National Wild and Scenic River System. Manage the river corridor in the manner identified under other resource headings for Alternative A.	Do not manage Sams Mesa Box Canyon as eligible or suitable for inclusion in the National Wild and Scenic River System. Manage the river corridor in the manner identified under other resource headings for Alternative B.	Manage Sams Mesa Box Canyon (9.5 miles) as suitable for inclusion in the National Wild and Scenic River System and tentatively classified as a wild river. Manage to protect the outstandingly remarkable values including scenic and wildlife. Specific management prescriptions within one-quarter mile of each side of the river include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Close to oil and gas leasing; • Close to OHV use; • Recommend withdrawing from mineral entry. 	
Issue: Management of Twin Corral Box Canyon (9 miles)				
Management Actions				
Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)	Alternative C	Alternative D
Manage all eligible streams to protect their outstandingly remarkable values, free-flowing nature, and tentative classification to the degree that BLM has authority (e.g., BLM lands within the corridor) and within the parameters of decisions made in the previous planning documents until such time as suitability determinations are made.	Do not manage Twin Corral Box Canyon as eligible or suitable for inclusion in the National Wild and Scenic River System. Manage the river corridor in the manner identified under other resource headings for Alternative A.	Do not manage Twin Corral Box Canyon as eligible or suitable for inclusion in the National Wild and Scenic River System. Manage the river corridor in the manner identified under other resource headings for Alternative B.	Manage Sams Twin Corral Box Canyon (9 miles) as suitable for inclusion in the National Wild and Scenic River System and tentatively classified as a wild river. Manage to protect the outstandingly remarkable values including scenic and wildlife. Specific management prescriptions within one-quarter mile of the river include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Close to oil and gas leasing; • Close to OHV use; • Recommend withdrawing from mineral entry. 	

Table 2-21. Wild and Scenic Rivers Decisions

Issue: Management of Fish Creek (one-quarter mile)				
Management Actions				
Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)	Alternative C	Alternative D
Manage eligible streams to protect their outstandingly remarkable values, free-flowing nature, and tentative classification to the degree that BLM has authority (e.g., BLM lands within the corridor) and within the parameters of decisions made in the previous planning documents until such time as suitability determinations are made.	Do not manage Fish Creek as eligible or suitable for inclusion in the National Wild and Scenic River System. Manage the river corridor in the manner identified under other resource headings for Alternative A.	Do not manage Fish Creek as eligible or suitable for inclusion in the National Wild and Scenic River System. Manage the river corridor in the manner identified under other resource headings for Alternative B.	Manage Fish Creek (one-quarter mile) as suitable for inclusion in the National Wild and Scenic River System and tentatively classified as a scenic river. Manage to protect the outstandingly remarkable cultural resource values. Specific management prescriptions within one-quarter mile of each side of the river include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Close to oil and gas leasing; • Close to OHV use; • Recommend withdrawing from mineral entry. 	
Issue: Management of Maidenwater Creek (3 miles)				
Management Actions				
Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)	Alternative C	Alternative D
Manage eligible streams to protect their outstandingly remarkable values, free-flowing nature, and tentative classification to the degree that BLM has authority (e.g., BLM lands within the corridor) and within the parameters of decisions made in the previous planning documents until such time as suitability determinations are made.	Do not manage Maidenwater Creek as eligible or suitable for inclusion in the National Wild and Scenic River System. Manage the river corridor in the manner identified under other resource headings for Alternative A.	Do not manage Maidenwater Creek as eligible or suitable for inclusion in the National Wild and Scenic River System. Manage the river corridor in the manner identified under other resource headings for Alternative B.	Manage Maidenwater Creek (3 miles) as suitable for inclusion in the National Wild and Scenic River System and tentatively classified as a scenic river. Manage to protect the outstandingly remarkable values including scenic, recreation, geologic, fish, wildlife, and cultural. Specific management prescriptions within one-quarter mile of the river include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Close to oil and gas leasing; • Close to OHV use; • Recommend withdrawing from mineral entry. 	
Issue: Management of Quitchupah Creek (1.4 miles)				
Management Actions				
Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)	Alternative C	Alternative D
Manage all eligible streams	Do not manage Quitchupah	Do not manage Quitchupah	Manage Quitchupah Creek (1.4 miles) as suitable for inclusion	

Table 2-21. Wild and Scenic Rivers Decisions

<p>to protect their outstandingly remarkable values, free-flowing nature, and tentative classification to the degree that BLM has authority (e.g., BLM lands within the corridor) and within the parameters of decisions made in the previous planning documents until such time as suitability determinations are made.</p>	<p>Creek as eligible or suitable for inclusion in the National Wild and Scenic River System. Manage the river corridor in the manner identified under other resource headings for Alternative A.</p>	<p>Creek as eligible or suitable for inclusion in the National Wild and Scenic River System. Manage the river corridor in the manner identified under other resource headings for Alternative B.</p>	<p>in the National Wild and Scenic River System and tentatively classified as a recreational river.</p> <p>Manage to protect the outstandingly remarkable values including cultural. Specific management prescriptions within one-quarter mile of the river include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Close to oil and gas leasing; • Close to OHV use; • Recommend withdrawing from mineral entry.
--	--	--	--

2.6.3.3 Areas of Critical Environmental Concern

Table 2-22. Areas of Critical Environmental Concern Decisions

Desired Outcomes (Goals and Objectives)				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Manage ACECs with special management attention to protect and prevent irreparable damage to important historic, cultural, or scenic values; fish, wildlife and plant resources, or other natural system or processes; or to protect life and safety from natural hazards. 				
Issue: Designate and Manage Areas of Critical Environmental Concern				
Management Actions				
Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)	Alternative C	Alternative D
<p>Continue designation and management of four existing ACECs (Map 3-16)—</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • North Caineville Mesa (2,200 acres) • South Caineville Mesa (4,100 acres)* • Gilbert Badlands (3,680 acres)* • Beaver Wash Canyon (4,800 acres)* <p>Total acres: 14,780</p>	<p>Designate no ACECs.</p>	<p>Designate and manage the following areas as ACECs (Map 2-43)—</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • North Caineville Mesa (2,200 acres) • Old Woman Front (330 acres) <p>Total acres: 2,530</p>	<p>Designate and manage the following areas as ACECs (Map 2-44)—</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Badlands (includes existing North and South Caineville Mesas and Gilbert Badlands ACECs, 88,900 acres)* • Bull Creek Archaeological District (4,800 acres) • Dirty Devil (includes Beaver Wash Canyon ACEC, 205,300 acres)* • Fremont Gorge/Cockscomb (34,300 acres)* • Henry Mountains (includes No Man’s Mesa Potential ACEC, 288,200 acres)* • Horseshoe Canyon (Richfield RFO portion only, 40,900 acres)* • Kingston Canyon (22,100 acres) 	

Table 2-22. Areas of Critical Environmental Concern Decisions

<p>*All or portions of these potential ACECs overlay WSAs which are managed pursuant to the IMP.</p>			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Little Rockies (49,200 acres)* • Lower Muddy Creek (Richfield RFO only, 16,200 acres) • Old Woman Front (330 acres) • Parker Mountain (107,900 acres) • Quitchupah (180 acres) • Rainbow Hills (4,000 acres) • Sevier Canyon (8,900 acres) • Thousand Lakes Bench (500 acres) • Special Status Species (15,100 acres)* <p>Total acres: 886,810</p> <p>*All or portions of these potential ACECs overlay WSAs which are managed pursuant to the IMP.</p>	
Issue: Designation and Management of North Caineville Mesa ACEC (2,200 acres)				
Management Actions				
Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)	Alternative C	Alternative D
<p>Continue designation of the North Caineville Mesa ACEC (Map 3-16).</p> <p>Manage to protect the relevant and important relict vegetation values:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allow no uses that would cause irreparable damage to relevant and important values • Close to OHV use • Manage as open to oil and gas leasing with major constraints (no surface occupancy) • Unavailable for livestock grazing • Identify area as withdrawn from consideration for leasing for surface coal mining 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do not designate the North Caineville Mesa ACEC. • Manage the North Caineville Mesa area in the manner identified under other resource headings for Alternative A. 	<p>Continue designation of the North Caineville Mesa ACEC (Map 2-43).</p> <p>Manage to protect the relevant and important relict vegetation values:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allow no uses that would cause irreparable damage to relevant and important values • Close to OHV use • Manage as open to oil and gas leasing with major constraints (no surface occupancy) • Unavailable for livestock grazing • Identify area as unsuitable for surface coal mining • Acquire inholdings within ACEC 	<p>Manage the North Caineville Mesa area as part of the Badlands ACEC. (See the Badlands ACEC for special management prescriptions.)</p>	

Table 2-22. Areas of Critical Environmental Concern Decisions

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Acquire inholdings within ACEC Consider withdrawing from mineral entry 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recommend withdrawing from mineral entry. 		
Issue: Designation and Management of South Caineville Mesa ACEC (4,100 acres)				
Management Actions				
Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)	Alternative C	Alternative D
<p>Continue designation of the South Caineville Mesa ACEC (Map 3-16).</p> <p>Manage the area to protect the relevant and important values:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Allow no uses that would cause irreparable damage to relevant and important values Close to OHV use Manage as open to oil and gas leasing with major constraints (no surface occupancy) Unavailable for livestock grazing Identify area as withdrawn from consideration for leasing for surface coal mining Nominate cabin on South Caineville Mesa to National Register of Historic Places Increase public awareness of cultural resources, increase law enforcement presence and if necessary, fence or otherwise directly protect 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do not designate the South Caineville Mesa ACEC. Manage the South Caineville Mesa area in the manner identified under other resource headings for Alternative A. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do not designate the South Caineville Mesa ACEC. Manage the South Caineville Mesa area in the manner identified under other resource headings for Alternative B. 		<p>Manage the South Caineville Mesa area as part of the Badlands ACEC. (See the Badlands ACEC for special management prescriptions.)</p>

Table 2-22. Areas of Critical Environmental Concern Decisions

<p>important sites, and maintain stability of cabin on South Caineville Mesa</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consider withdrawal from mineral entry, if area is released from wilderness consideration. 				
Issue: Designation and Management of Beaver Wash Canyon ACEC (4,800 acres)				
Management Actions				
Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)	Alternative C	Alternative D
<p>Continue Beaver Wash Canyon ACEC designation, to be managed for protection of relevant and important ecologic (riparian) values (Map 3-16).</p> <p>Manage Beaver Wash with the following special management to protect the relevant and important values from irreparable damage:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Close to OHV use • Close to oil and gas leasing • Pursue land tenure adjustment, including acquisition through exchange of all state sections in the area. • Unavailable for livestock grazing from south boundary of Section 25 northward. • Recommend withdrawing from mineral entry. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do not designate the Beaver Wash Canyon ACEC. • Manage the Beaver Wash Canyon area in the manner identified under other resource headings for Alternatives A and B. 			<p>Manage the Beaver Wash Canyon area as part of the Dirty Devil ACEC. See Dirty Devil ACEC (below) for special management prescriptions.</p>

Table 2-22. Areas of Critical Environmental Concern Decisions

Issue: Designation and Management of Gilbert Badlands ACEC (3,680 acres)				
Management Actions				
Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)	Alternative C	Alternative D
<p>Continue Gilbert Badlands ACEC and Research Natural Area (RNA) designations, to be managed for protection of relevant and important natural systems or processes and in accordance with 43 CFR 8223.1 (Map 3-16).</p> <p>Manage the Gilbert Badlands ACEC with the following special management to protect the relevant and important values from irreparable damage—</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Close to OHV use • Manage as open to oil and gas leasing with major constraints (no surface occupancy) • Consider withdrawing from mineral entry • Prohibit all surface disturbing activities • Acquire in-holdings within ACEC 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do not designate the Gilbert Badlands ACEC or RNA. • Manage the Gilbert Badlands area in the manner identified under other resource headings for Alternatives A and B. 		<p>Manage the Gilbert Badlands area as part of the Badlands ACEC. (See the Badlands ACEC for special management prescriptions.)</p>	
Issue: Designation and Management of Potential Badlands ACEC (88,900 acres)				
Management Actions				
Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)	Alternative C	Alternative D
<p>Continue managing the existing North Caineville, South Caineville, and Gilbert Badlands ACECs to protect their relevant and important</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do not designate the Badlands ACEC or Research Natural Area. • Manage identified under other resource headings for Alternatives A and B. 		<p>Designate the Badlands ACEC and RNA, to be managed to protect relevant and important values, including scenic, special status plants, natural processes, and riparian and relict vegetation from irreparable damage (Map 2-44). Special management of the area to protect these values includes:</p>	

Table 2-22. Areas of Critical Environmental Concern Decisions

<p>values as prescribed above.</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allow no uses that would cause irreparable damage to relevant and important values. <p>Vegetation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continue unavailability for grazing on North and South Caineville Mesas to protect relict vegetation <p>Cultural Resources</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase public awareness of cultural resources, increase law enforcement presence and if necessary, fence or otherwise directly protect important sites, and maintain stability of cabin on South Caineville Mesa. Fencing or other surface disturbing activities would not be allowed in non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics in Alternative D. <p>Visual Resources</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Designate Class A scenery (outside of WSAs and outside of non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics (Alternative D only)) as VRM Class II, and implement VRM best management practices. <p>Special Status Species</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase law enforcement patrols, educate the public about values of listed cacti, evaluate proposed upstream water developments to determine impacts on fish species, and, based on that evaluation, take appropriate action to protect special status species. <p>Travel Management</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Close mesa tops to OHV use. In Alternative D, close non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics to OHV use. Limit OHV use to designated routes in the remainder of the ACEC to prevent irreparable damage to cultural resources, badlands topography, listed species of cacti, and scenic values. <p>Lands and Realty</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommend withdrawing the non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics (Alternative D only) and Class A scenery outside WSA from mineral entry. <p>Minerals</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Close to oil and gas leasing.
------------------------------------	--	---

Table 2-22. Areas of Critical Environmental Concern Decisions

Issue: Management of Potential Bull Creek Archaeological ACEC (4,800 acres)				
Management Actions				
Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)	Alternative C	Alternative D
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do not designate the Bull Creek Archaeological District as an ACEC. Manage the Bull Creek Archaeological District consistent with properties listed on the National Register of Historic Places. 				<p>Designate the Bull Creek Archaeological District as an ACEC for the purpose of protecting relevant and important cultural resource values (Map 2-44). Special management to protect these values from irreparable damage includes:</p> <p>Cultural Resources</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increase public awareness of cultural resource values, increase law enforcement presence, and if necessary, install fencing or other direct protection of important sites. Fencing or other surface disturbing activities would not be allowed in non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics in Alternative D. <p>Travel Management</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Limit OHV use to designated routes to protect cultural resources from damage. In Alternative D, close non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics to OHV use.

Table 2-22. Areas of Critical Environmental Concern Decisions

Issue: Designation and Management of Potential Dirty Devil/North Wash ACEC (205,300 acres)				
Management Actions				
Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)	Alternative C	Alternative D
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Manage Beaver Wash Canyon ACEC (a portion of the potential Dirty Devil ACEC) according to the management prescriptions outlined above for that ACEC. • Manage remainder of the potential Dirty Devil ACEC according to other decisions outlined in the 1982 Henry Mountain MFP, as amended. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do not designate the Dirty Devil/North Wash potential ACEC. • Manage the Dirty Devil/North Wash area in the manner identified under other resource headings for Alternative A. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do not designate the Dirty Devil/North Wash potential ACEC. • Manage the Dirty Devil River corridor to protect the outstandingly remarkable values associated with its suitability for inclusion in the National Wild and Scenic River System. The area is also included in the Dirty Devil SRMA, and would be managed according to those prescriptions. Areas not included within the Dirty Devil SRMA or Wild and Scenic River corridor would be managed in the manner identified under other resource headings for Alternative B. 	<p>Designate the Dirty Devil/North Wash area as an ACEC for protection of relevant and important values, including scenic, cultural, paleontological, wildlife, and special status species (Map 2-44). Special management for protection of these values includes:</p> <p>Prevent Irreparable Damage</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allow no uses that would cause irreparable damage to relevant and important values. <p>Riparian</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Restore, maintain, and improve riparian areas to proper functioning condition (PFC). • Fence riparian areas to exclude livestock. Fencing or other surface disturbing activities would not be allowed in non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics in Alternative D. • Rehabilitate springs. • Plant willows and cottonwoods. <p>Fire and Fuels Management</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allow no prescribed or wildland fire use in Mexican spotted owl core areas and nest protection areas at any time. • Suppress wildland fires that threaten Mexican spotted owl core areas and nest protection areas. <p>Cultural Resources</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduce vandalism of cultural resources by increasing public awareness of their value, increasing law enforcement presence and, if necessary, fencing or otherwise directly protecting important sites. Fencing or other surface disturbing activities would not be allowed in non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics in Alternative D. <p>Visual Resources</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Designate Class A scenery outside of WSAs (Alternatives C and D) and outside of non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics (Alternative D) as VRM Class II. • Designate remainder of ACEC (outside of non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics - Alternative D only) as VRM Class III. 	

Table 2-22. Areas of Critical Environmental Concern Decisions

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implement best management practices appropriate to the VRM class to protect scenic values. <p>Special Status Species</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Manage the Mexican spotted owl in cooperation with USFWS and UDWR. • Restrict motorized access in sensitive plant areas. • Increase law enforcement patrols. <p>Wildlife</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Manage desert bighorn sheep in cooperation with UDWR. • Allow water developments that would benefit desert bighorn sheep. Water developments would not be allowed in non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics (Alternative D only). <p>Livestock grazing</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Permit no domestic sheep grazing to protect bighorn sheep from disease. • Keep Beaver Wash unavailable for grazing to protect riparian values. <p>Recreation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Construct no camping facilities in the Mexican spotted owl nest protection core areas or within non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics (Alternative D only). • Reduce harassment to bighorn sheep and Mexican spotted owls by regulating the number of recreational parties, party size, and season of use. • Limit recreation use through use of permits, if determined necessary to protect relevant and important values. <p>Travel Management</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limit OHVs to designated routes to protect scenic values. During management plan development for this ACEC, OHV route designations would be reviewed and revised if necessary (with appropriate NEPA review) to protect scenic values. In Alternative D, close non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics to OHV use. • Discourage recreation use within one-half mile of known Mexican spotted owl nest sites during breeding season (February 1 to August 31). <p>Lands and Realty</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Avoid authorizing rights-of-way in VRM Class I or II areas.
--	--	--	--

Table 2-22. Areas of Critical Environmental Concern Decisions

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Retain ACEC in public ownership. • Acquire inholdings within the ACEC from willing sellers. • Recommend withdrawing Class A scenery designated as VRM Class II from mineral entry. <p>Minerals</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Manage VRM Class II areas as open to oil and gas leasing with major constraints, such as no surface occupancy. • Close non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics (Alternative D only) to oil and gas leasing. • Manage remainder of ACEC as open to oil and gas leasing subject to controlled surface use and/or timing limitations. • Use best management practices to protect scenic values. • Include seasonal restriction stipulations in lease permits during the Mexican spotted owl breeding season (February 1 to August 31) for all mineral development activities within one-half mile around known nest sites. • Restrict oil and gas exploration and development activities from February 1 through August 31 in Mexican spotted owl nest protection areas. 	
Issue: Designation and Management of Potential Fremont Gorge/Cockscomb ACEC (34,300 acres)				
Management Actions				
Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)	Alternative C	Alternative D
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do not designate the Fremont Gorge/Cockscomb ACEC. • Manage the Fremont Gorge/Cockscomb area in accordance with existing land use plan. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do not designate the Fremont Gorge/Cockscomb ACEC. • Manage the Fremont Gorge/Cockscomb area in the manner identified under other resource headings for Alternative A. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do not designate the Fremont Gorge/Cockscomb ACEC. • Manage the Fremont Gorge/Cockscomb area in the manner identified under other resource headings for Alternative B. • The area is located within the Capitol Reef Gateway SRMA, and would be managed according to those prescriptions. 	<p>Designate the Fremont Gorge/ Cockscomb area as an ACEC for protection of relevant and important values, including cultural, scenic, riparian, plant, and wildlife (Map 2-44). Special management for protection of these values includes:</p> <p>Prevent Irreparable Damage</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allow no uses that would cause irreparable damage to relevant and important values. <p>Riparian</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evaluate proposed upstream water developments to determine possible adverse impacts on riparian areas. • Limit recreation use in riparian areas, if needed to protect riparian values. <p>Cultural Resources</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduce vandalism of cultural resources by increasing public awareness of their value, increasing law enforcement 	

Table 2-22. Areas of Critical Environmental Concern Decisions

			<p>presence, and, if necessary, fencing or otherwise directly protecting important sites. Fencing or other surface disturbing activities would not be allowed in non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics under Alternative D.</p> <p>Visual Resources</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Designate Class A scenery outside of WSAs (Alternatives C and D) and outside of non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics (Alternative D) as VRM Class II. • Designate remainder of ACEC (outside of non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics - Alternative D only) as VRM Class III. • Implement VRM best management practices appropriate to VRM Class to protect scenic values. <p>Fire</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Suppress wildfire in crucial mule deer habitat containing browse species. <p>Recreation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limit recreation use in Fish Creek Cove and Beas Lewis Flats to protect cultural resources, if needed. <p>Travel Management</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Manage OHVs as limited to designated routes to protect scenic values. In Alternative D, close non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics to OHV use. <p>Lands and Realty</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maintain crucial mule deer habitat in public ownership. • Recommend withdrawing Class A scenery outside WSA and non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics (Alternative D only) from mineral entry. <p>Minerals</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Manage VRM II areas as open to oil and gas leasing with major constraints, such as no surface occupancy. • Manage VRM III areas as open to leasing subject to controlled surface use and/or timing limitations. • Manage VRM Class I areas in non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics (Alternative D only) as closed to oil and gas leasing.
<p>Issue: Designation and Management of Proposed Henry Mountains ACEC (288,200 acres)</p>			<p>Management Actions</p>

Table 2-22. Areas of Critical Environmental Concern Decisions

Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)	Alternative C	Alternative D
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do not designate the Henry Mountains ACEC. Manage the Henry Mountains area in accordance with the existing land use plan (Alternative N) and in the manner identified under other resource headings for Alternatives A and B. 			<p>Designate the Henry Mountains area as an ACEC for protection of relevant and important values, including wildlife (e.g., bison and deer), special status species (e.g., Townsend's big-eared bat, ferruginous hawk, burrowing owl, hole-in-the-rock prairie clover, Dana's milkvetch, and Barneby milkvetch), scenic, and ecological values (Map 2-44). Special management for protection of these values includes:</p> <p>Prevent Irreparable Damage</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Allow no uses that would cause irreparable damage to relevant and important values. <p>Riparian</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Restore, maintain, and improve riparian areas to bring them into PFC. Surface disturbing activities would not be allowed in non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics under Alternative D. Maintain erosion control structures in Nasty Flat area. <p>Vegetation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Manage vegetation to benefit mule deer and bison habitat. Manage No Man's Mesa to protect relict vegetation. <p>Cultural Resources</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reduce vandalism of cultural resources by increasing public awareness of their value, increasing law enforcement presence and, if necessary, fencing or otherwise directly protecting important sites. Fencing or other surface disturbing activities would not be allowed in non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics under Alternative D. Close Starr Ranch to recreation/interpretation use until stabilization can be accomplished. <p>Visual Resources</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Designate Class A scenery outside of WSAs (Alternatives C and D) and outside of non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics (Alternative D) as VRM Class II. Designate remainder of ACEC as VRM Class III in order to allow manipulation of habitat to benefit wildlife and mule deer; in all cases, apply appropriate VRM class best management practices. <p>Special Status Species</p>	

Table 2-22. Areas of Critical Environmental Concern Decisions

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Restrict motorized access in sensitive plant areas. • Increase law enforcement patrols. <p>Wildlife</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Manage mule deer and bison habitat in cooperation with UDWR. • Allow manipulation of habitat to benefit wildlife. Surface disturbing activities would not be allowed in non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics in Alternative D. • Allow range improvements that benefit wildlife. Fencing or other surface disturbing activities would not be allowed in non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics under Alternative D. • Develop a Habitat Management Plan for bison and mule deer within the ACEC. <p>Fire and Fuels Management</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use appropriate management response to protect and enhance relevant and important values. • Suppress all fires near Starr Ranch to protect historical values. <p>Livestock Grazing</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Change class of livestock on the Pennell Allotment from sheep to cattle. <p>Recreation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allow continued maintenance, upgrade, and use of existing campgrounds and picnic facilities within the ACEC at Starr Springs, Lonesome Beaver, McMillan Spring, and Dandelion Flat. Additional recreation facilities may be developed in response to user demand and for resource protection if it will not cause irreparable damage to relevant and important values. <p>Travel Management</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limit OHV use in the Nasty Flat area to designated routes. • Limit OHV use to designated routes to protect scenic and cultural resources and bison habitat. During management plan development for this ACEC, OHV route designations would be reviewed and revised if necessary (with appropriate NEPA review) to protect these relevant and important values. • Close No Man’s Mesa to OHVs. In Alternative D, close
--	---

Table 2-22. Areas of Critical Environmental Concern Decisions

<p>non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics to OHV use.</p> <p>Lands and Realty</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Authorize no new rights-of-way in VRM Class I and II areas. • Retain ACEC in public ownership. • Acquire inholdings from willing sellers within the ACEC. • Recommend withdrawing No Man’s Mesa and areas with Class A scenery designated as VRM Class II from mineral entry. <p>Minerals</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Manage VRM Class II areas and non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics (Alternative D only) as closed to oil and gas leasing. • Manage VRM Class III areas as open to oil and gas leasing subject to controlled surface use and/or timing limitations. • Close No Man’s Mesa to oil and gas leasing. 				
<p>Issue: Designation and Management of Potential Horseshoe Canyon ACEC (40,900 acres - RFO only)</p>				
<p>Management Actions</p>				
<p>Alternative N (No Action)</p>	<p>Alternative A</p>	<p>Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)</p>	<p>Alternative C</p>	<p>Alternative D</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do not designate the Horseshoe Canyon ACEC. • Manage the Horseshoe Canyon area in accordance with the existing land use plan (Alternative N) and in the manner identified under other resource headings for Alternatives A and B. 			<p>Designate the Horseshoe Canyon area as an ACEC for protection of relevant and important values including scenic, cultural (e.g., Cowboy Cave), riparian, and special status species (e.g., Townsend’s big-eared bat) (Map 2-44). Special management for protection of these values includes:</p> <p>Prevent Irreparable Damage</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allow no uses that would cause irreparable damage to relevant and important values. <p>Riparian</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rehabilitate springs to bring them into PFC. • Plant willows and cottonwoods in riparian areas. <p>Cultural Resources</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduce vandalism of cultural resources by increasing public awareness of their value, increasing law enforcement presence and, if necessary, fencing or otherwise directly protecting important sites. Fencing or other surface disturbing activities would not be allowed in non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics in Alternative D. <p>Visual Resources</p>	

Table 2-22. Areas of Critical Environmental Concern Decisions

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Designate Class A scenery outside of WSAs (Alternatives C and D) and outside of non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics (Alternative D) as VRM Class II. <p>Livestock Grazing</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fence riparian areas to exclude livestock. Fencing or other surface disturbing activities would not be allowed in non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics in Alternative D. <p>Recreation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limit recreation use through use of permits, if needed, to protect sensitive resources. <p>Travel Management</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limit OHVs to designated routes to protect scenic, special status species, and cultural values. During management plan development for this ACEC, OHV route designations would be reviewed and revised if necessary (with appropriate NEPA review) to protect these relevant and important values. In Alternative D, close non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics to OHV use. <p>Lands and Realty</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Authorize no new rights-of-way in VRM Class I and II areas. • Retain ACEC in public ownership. • Acquire inholdings from willing sellers within the ACEC. • Recommend withdrawing areas with Class A scenery designated as VRM Class II from mineral entry. <p>Minerals</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Manage VRM Class II areas as open to oil and gas leasing with major constraints, such as no surface occupancy. • Manage VRM Class I areas in non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics (Alternative D only) as closed to oil and gas leasing. 				
Issue: Designation and Management of Potential Kingston Canyon ACEC (22,100 acres)				
Management Actions				
Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)	Alternative C	Alternative D
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do not designate the Kingston Canyon ACEC. • Manage the Kingston Canyon area in accordance with the existing land use plan (Alternative N) and in the manner identified under other resource headings for Alternatives A and B. 			Designate and manage the Kingston Canyon area as an ACEC for protection of relevant and important values including riparian and mule deer habitat (Map 2-44). Special management for protection of these values includes:	

Table 2-22. Areas of Critical Environmental Concern Decisions

					<p>Prevent Irreparable Damage</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allow no uses that would cause irreparable damage to relevant and important values. <p>Fire</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Suppress unwanted wildland fire in crucial deer winter range. <p>Travel Management</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limit OHV use to designated routes. • In Alternative D, close non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics to OHV use. • Limit OHV use with seasonal closures (December 15 through April 15) to protect mule deer habitat. <p>Lands and Realty</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Acquire in-holdings in the riparian corridor. • Retain the ACEC in public ownership.
Issue: Designation and Management of Potential Little Rockies ACEC (49,200 acres)					
Management Actions					
Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)	Alternative C	Alternative D	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do not designate the Little Rockies ACEC. • Manage the Little Rockies area in accordance with the existing land use plan (Alternative N) and in the manner identified under other resource headings for Alternatives A and B. 			<p>Designate the Little Rockies area as an ACEC for protection of relevant and important values, including scenic and wildlife values, notably desert bighorn sheep and Townsend’s big-eared bat, special status plant species including hole-in-the-rock prairie clover, and ecologic values (Map 2-44). Special management for protection of these values includes:</p> <p>Prevent Irreparable Damage</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allow no uses that would cause irreparable damage to relevant and important values. <p>Visual Resources</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Designate Class A scenery outside of WSAs (Alternatives C and D) and outside of non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics (Alternative D) as VRM Class II. <p>Wildlife</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Manage desert bighorn sheep in cooperation with UDWR in accordance with the Henry Mountains Desert Bighorn Habitat Management Plan, as revised. • Continue to cooperate with UDWR in transplants of desert bighorn sheep into the area consistent with carrying 		

Table 2-22. Areas of Critical Environmental Concern Decisions

<p>capacity.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allow range improvements that would benefit desert bighorn, primarily water developments. Surface disturbing activities would not be allowed in non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics under Alternative D. <p>Livestock Grazing</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Convert domestic sheep use in Trachyte Allotment to cattle to prevent transmitting disease to desert bighorn sheep. <p>Recreation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regulate recreation impacts by limiting party size, season of use, and/or location to minimize harassment of desert bighorn sheep, if needed. • Limit recreation access and party size in Maidenwater and Trachyte canyons to protect ecological values, if needed. <p>Travel Management</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limit OHV use to designated routes. In Alternative D, close non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics to OHV use. <p>Lands and Realty</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Authorize no new rights-of-way in non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics (Alternative D only) or in areas with Class A scenery. • Retain ACEC in public ownership. • Acquire inholdings from willing sellers within the ACEC. • Recommend withdrawing Class A scenery designated as VRM Class II from mineral entry. <p>Minerals</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Manage VRM II areas as open to oil and gas leasing with major constraints, such as no surface occupancy. • Close in non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics (Alternative D only) to oil and gas leasing. 				
Issue: Designation and Management of Potential Lower Muddy Creek ACEC (16,200 acres - RFO portion)				
Management Actions				
Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)	Alternative C	Alternative D
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do not designate the Lower Muddy Creek ACEC. • Manage the Lower Muddy Creek area in accordance with the existing land use plan (Alternative N) and in the manner identified under other resource headings for Alternatives A and B. 			<p>Designate the Lower Muddy Creek area as an ACEC for protection of relevant and important values, including scenic, riparian, and special status plant (e.g., Wright fishhook and Heil's beavertail cacti) values (Map 2-44). Special</p>	

Table 2-22. Areas of Critical Environmental Concern Decisions

<p>management for protection of these values includes: Prevent Irreparable Damage</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allow no uses that would cause irreparable damage to relevant and important values. <p>Visual Resources</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Designate Class A scenery outside of WSAs (Alternatives C and D) and outside of non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics (Alternative D) as VRM Class II. <p>Special Status Species</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase law enforcement patrols to deter illegal cacti collecting. • Increase public education. <p>Travel Management</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limit OHVs to designated routes to protect listed plant species. During management plan development for this ACEC, OHV route designations would be reviewed and revised if necessary (with appropriate NEPA review) to protect listed plant species. In Alternative D, close non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics to OHV use. <p>Lands and Realty</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Authorize rights-of-way consistent with VRM Class II objectives. No new rights-of-way would be authorized in non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics (Alternative D only). • Retain ACEC in public ownership. • Acquire inholdings within the ACEC from willing sellers. <p>Minerals</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Close area to oil and gas leasing. 				
Issue: Designation and Management of Potential Old Woman Front ACEC (330 acres)				
Management Actions				
Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)	Alternative C	Alternative D
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do not designate the Old Woman Front ACEC and RNA. • Manage the Old Woman Front area in accordance with the existing land use plan (Alternative N) and in the manner identified under other resource headings for Alternative A. 		<p>Designate the Old Woman Front area as an RNA ACEC for protection of the relevant and important values of relict vegetation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Coordinate special management for protection of relict vegetation with the USFS Old Woman Cove RNA Plan. • Manage the area for multiple use, while protecting the relict vegetation. <p>Ecological Processes</p>		

Table 2-22. Areas of Critical Environmental Concern Decisions

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Permit no human activities that directly or indirectly modify ecological processes. <p>Wildlife</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allow no wildlife habitat manipulation. • Prohibit the introduction or spread of exotic animal species. <p>Fire and Fuels Management</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allow natural fires to burn only within the parameters of an approved fire plan and only under a prescription designed to accomplish the objectives of the area. • Suppress fires using minimal impact tools and techniques. • Avoid the use of heavy equipment. • Avoid post-fire rehabilitation; if needed, use seed of indigenous species, and locally adapted ecotypes. <p>Forest Products</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allow no logging or harvest of woodland products, fuelwood gathering, or Christmas tree cutting. <p>Livestock Grazing</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unavailable for livestock grazing. • Construct no range improvements. <p>Recreation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Issue no special recreation permits. <p>Travel Management</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Close area to OHV use. <p>Facilities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Authorize no roads, new trails, fences, signs, buildings, or other physical improvements. <p>Lands and Realty</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommend withdrawing from mineral entry. <p>Minerals</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Manage as open to oil and gas leasing with major constraints, such as no surface occupancy. 				
Issue: Designation and Management of Potential Parker Mountain ACEC (107,900 acres)				
Management Actions				
Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)	Alternative C	Alternative D
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do not designate Parker Mountain ACEC. • Manage the Parker Mountain area in accordance with the existing land use plan (Alternative N) and in the manner identified under other resource headings for Alternatives A and B. Continue to consider ongoing land management practices, vegetative treatments, 			Designate Parker Mountain area as an ACEC for protection of relevant and important values including sagebrush-steppe habitat and wildlife values, notably the greater sage grouse, Utah prairie dog, and pygmy rabbit (Map 2-44). Special	

Table 2-22. Areas of Critical Environmental Concern Decisions

<p>and grazing regimes, and continue to coordinate management efforts with Parker Mountain Adaptive Resource Management (PARM), BLM, UDWR, USFWS, and Utah State University to address vegetative treatments specific to improving the sagebrush-steppe community.</p>		<p>management for protection of these values includes: Prevent Irreparable Damage</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allow no uses that would cause irreparable damage to relevant and important values. <p>Vegetation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Actively manage invasive species. • Evaluate potential vegetation treatments to ensure they are beneficial to sagebrush-steppe habitat and pygmy rabbits, greater sage grouse, and Utah prairie dogs. <p>Wildlife</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Educate hunters on pygmy rabbit identification. <p>Fire and Fuels Management</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Suppress unwanted wildland fire in sagebrush-steppe habitat. <p>Livestock Grazing</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continue to implement proper grazing management through coordination with PARM. • Base stocking rates on timing and amount of precipitation and the condition of the range. <p>Travel Management</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limit OHV use to designated routes. <p>Lands and Realty</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Retain ACEC in public ownership. • Acquire inholdings within the ACEC from willing sellers. 		
Issue: Management of Potential Quitchupah ACEC (180 acres)				
Management Actions				
Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)	Alternative C	Alternative D
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do not designate the Quitchupah ACEC. • Manage the Quitchupah area in accordance with the existing land use plan (Alternative N) and in the manner identified under other resource headings for Alternatives A and B. 			<p>Designate the Quitchupah area as an ACEC for protection of relevant and important cultural and riparian values (Map 2-44). Special management for protection of these values includes: Prevent Irreparable Damage</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allow no uses that would cause irreparable damage to relevant and important values. <p>Cultural Resources</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduce vandalism of cultural resources by increasing public awareness of their value, increasing law enforcement 	

Table 2-22. Areas of Critical Environmental Concern Decisions

					<p>presence and, if necessary, fencing or otherwise directly protecting important sites. Fencing or other surface disturbing activities would not be allowed in non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics in Alternative D.</p> <p>Travel Management</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Restrict OHV use to designated routes to protect cultural and ecological resources and riparian areas from damage. Under Alternative D, close non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics to OHV use. <p>Lands and Realty</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Avoid granting new rights-of-way; if rights-of-way are granted, mitigate impacts to ACEC values. Under Alternative D, new rights-of-way would not be authorized in non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics.
Issue: Designation and Management of Potential Rainbow Hills ACEC (4,000 acres)					
Management Actions					
Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)	Alternative C	Alternative D	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do not designate the Rainbow Hills ACEC. Manage the Rainbow Hills area in accordance with the existing land use plan (Alternative N) and in the manner identified under other resource headings for Alternatives A and B. 			<p>Designate the Rainbow Hills area as an ACEC for protection of relevant and important values including mule deer habitat, natural systems, and special status species, including Utah phacelia, Arapien stickleaf, Ward's penstemon, rainbow rabbitbrush, Sigurd townsendia, and Glenwood milkvetch (Map 2-44). Special management for protection of these values includes:</p> <p>Prevent Irreparable Damage</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Allow no uses that would cause irreparable damage to relevant and important values. <p>Mule Deer</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Suppress unwanted wildland fire in crucial mule deer winter range to protect important browse species. <p>Travel Management</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Close to OHV use. <p>Lands and Realty</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Retain ACEC in public ownership. Acquire inholdings from willing sellers. Avoid granting new rights-of-way. Recommend withdrawing from mineral entry. 		

Table 2-22. Areas of Critical Environmental Concern Decisions

					<p>Minerals</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Allow leasing with no surface occupancy to protect special status and endemic plants and the naturally functioning system from major human disturbances.
Issue: Designation and Management of Potential Sevier Canyon ACEC (8,900 acres)					
Management Actions					
Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)	Alternative C	Alternative D	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do not designate the Sevier Canyon ACEC. Manage the Sevier Canyon area in accordance with the existing land use plan (Alternative N) and in a manner identified under other resource headings for Alternatives A and B. 			<p>Designate the Sevier Canyon area as an ACEC for protection of relevant and important values, including mule deer habitat, riparian, and special status species values (Map 2-44). Special management for protection of these values includes:</p> <p>Prevent Irreparable Damage</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Allow no uses that would cause irreparable damage to relevant and important values. <p>Fire and Fuels Management</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Suppress unwanted wildland fire in crucial mule deer winter range to protect important browse species. <p>Travel Management</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Limit OHV use to designated routes. Limit OHVs seasonally (December 15 through April 15) to protect mule deer habitat. <p>Lands and Realty</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Retain ACEC in public ownership. Acquire inholdings from willing sellers. 		
Issue: Designation and Management of Potential Thousand Lakes Bench ACEC (500 acres)					
Management Actions					
Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)	Alternative C	Alternative D	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do not designate the Thousand Lakes Bench ACEC. Manage the Thousand Lakes Bench area in accordance with the existing land use plan (Alternative N) and in the manner identified under other resource heading for Alternatives A and B. 			<p>Designate the Thousand Lakes Bench area as an ACEC for protection of relevant and important values, including cultural resources, special status plants, and riparian areas (Map 2-44). Special management for protection of these values includes:</p> <p>Prevent Irreparable Damage</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Allow no uses that would cause irreparable damage to relevant and important values. 		

Table 2-22. Areas of Critical Environmental Concern Decisions

<p>Cultural Resources</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduce vandalism of cultural resources by increasing public awareness of their value, increasing law enforcement presence and, if necessary, fencing or otherwise directly protecting important sites. Fencing or other surface disturbing activities would not be allowed in non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics under Alternative D. <p>Special Status Species</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase law enforcement presence to deter collection of Wright fishhook cactus. <p>Travel Management</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limit OHVs to designated routes to protect cultural resources, riparian areas, and special status plants. During management plan development for this ACEC, OHV route designations would be reviewed and revised if necessary (with appropriate NEPA review) to protect these relevant and important values. Under Alternative D, close non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics to OHV use. 				
<p>Issue: Designation and Management of Potential Special Status Species ACEC (15,100 acres)</p>				
<p>Management Actions</p>				
<p>Alternative N (No Action)</p>	<p>Alternative A</p>	<p>Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)</p>	<p>Alternative C</p>	<p>Alternative D</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do not designate the Special Status Species ACEC. • Manage the Special Status Species ACEC area in accordance with existing land use plans (Alternative N) and in the manner identified under other resource headings for Alternatives A and B. • Manage special status species and their habitats in coordination with the USFWS, UDWR, and other resource management agencies. 			<p>Designate the Special Status Species ACEC to protect relevant and important special status species values listed above (Map 2-44). Special management for protection of these values includes:</p> <p>Prevent Irreparable Damage</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allow no uses that would cause irreparable damage to relevant and important values. <p>Vegetation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Avoid or mitigate impacts to special status species and their habitats when conducting vegetative treatments. <p>Special Status Species</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase law enforcement patrols to deter collecting and poaching. <p>Recreation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If monitoring shows that adverse impacts are or could occur 	

	<p>to special status species, limit recreation use as necessary.</p> <p>Travel Management</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limit OHVs to designated routes in special status species habitat. During management plan development for this ACEC, OHV route designations would be reviewed and revised if necessary (with appropriate NEPA review) to protect these special status species. <p>Lands and Realty</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Retain special status species documented locations in public ownership. • Where determined necessary to acquire important habitat for special status species, pursue acquisition of non-Federal lands from willing sellers. • Avoid granting rights-of-way and other land use authorizations that would impact special status species and their habitats. <p>Minerals</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Manage special status species areas as open to oil and gas leasing subject to controlled surface use and/or timing limitations. • Manage special status species areas as open to disposal of mineral materials subject to controlled surface use and/or timing limitations.
--	--

2.6.4 Transportation

Table 2-23. Transportation Facilities Decisions

Desired Outcomes (Goals and Objectives)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide a safe and effective transportation system across public lands.
Issue: Management of Transportation Facilities
Management Actions
Common to All Alternatives
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continue to maintain roads for resource management purposes. • Continue to support Sanpete, Sevier, Piute, Garfield and Wayne Counties and the State of Utah in providing a network of roads for movement of people, goods, and services across public lands. • Review requests for administrative access on a case-by-case basis. • Develop, implement and maintain cooperative agreements with Counties and the State of Utah for maintenance of the transportation system.

- Require reclamation of redundant road systems and/or roads that no longer serve their intended purpose in order to reduce road density and reduce habitat fragmentation.
- Manage designated scenic byway and backway corridors for the purposes for which they were designated.
- Install directional, informational, regulatory and interpretive signs at appropriate locations throughout the planning area.
- There are a number of locations throughout the RFO that are commonly known and consistently used for aircraft landing and departure activities that, through such casual use, have evolved into backcountry airstrips (the definition contained in Section 345 of Public Law 106-914, the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriation Act of 2001). In accordance with that law, any closure of an aircraft landing strip would require full public notice, consultation with local and State government officials, the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), and compliance with all applicable laws including NEPA.

2.6.5 Health and Safety

Table 2-24. Health and Safety

Desired Outcomes (Goals and Objectives)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The BLM would strive to ensure that human health and safety concerns on public lands remain a major priority. • All hazardous or potentially hazardous sites and situations, including hazardous materials, hazardous or solid wastes, abandoned mine sites, abandoned well sites, and other potential hazards on public lands would be mitigated or eliminated. • The potential for intentional or accidental releases of hazardous materials or wastes and solid wastes onto public lands would be minimized or eliminated.
Issue: Management of Abandoned Mine Lands
Management Actions
Common to All Alternatives
<p>In conformance with BLM's long-term strategies and National Policies regarding Abandoned Mine Lands (AML), this RMP recognizes the need to work with state agencies toward identifying and addressing physical safety and environmental hazards at all AML sites on public lands. In order to accomplish this long-term goal, the following criteria would be established to assist in determining priorities for site and area mitigation and reclamation.</p> <p>The criteria that would be used to establish physical safety hazard program priorities are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The highest priority of the AML physical safety program would be the cleaning up of those AML sites where (a) a death or injury has occurred, (b) the site is situated on or in immediate proximity to developed recreation sites and areas with high visitor use, and (c) upon formal risk assessment, a high or extremely high risk level is indicated; • AML would be factored into future recreation management area designations, land use planning assessments, and all applicable use authorizations; • Sites listed or eligible for listing would be entered in the Abandoned Mine Site Cleanup Module of Protection and Response Information System; and • AML hazards should be, to the extent practicable, mitigated or remediated. <p>The criteria that would be used to establish water-quality based AML program priorities are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Watersheds identified by the state as a priority based on (a) one or more water laws or regulations; (b) a threat to public health or safety; and (c) a threat to the environment; • Projects reflecting a collaborative effort with other land managing agencies; • Sites listed or eligible for listing in the Abandoned Mine Site Cleanup Module of the Protection and Response Information System; and • Projects that would be funded by contributions from collaborating agencies. <p>The State Multi-Year Work Plan would be maintained and updated as needed to reflect current policies for identifying program physical safety and water quality</p>

AML sites priorities for reclamation or remediation.

Public access to abandoned mine and well sites would be controlled by providing warning signage and barriers, as appropriate.

Issue: Management of Hazardous Materials

Management Actions

Common to All Alternatives

- Identify and clean up unauthorized dumping sites and hazardous materials spills in the RFO as required to comply with applicable state, local, and Federal laws and regulations.
- Clean up and restore areas known to have hazardous materials, hazardous wastes, or solid wastes. Areas that have been cleaned up and restored would be maintained and monitored.
- The BLM would actively seek responsible parties to reimburse hazardous materials cleanup costs.

2.7 IMPACTS SUMMARY TABLE

Table 2-25 provides a summary of impacts that would occur from implementing the five alternatives described in this chapter. Chapter 4 provides more detailed impact analysis.

Table 2-25. Summary Comparison of Impacts

Resource	Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Alternative B (Preferred)	Alternative C	Alternative D
Air Quality	None of the proposed decisions in Chapter 2 would have a major impact on air quality. Rather, it is more likely that impacts to air quality within the planning area over the next 15 to 20 years would result from activities on private lands, including growth of cities and towns, increased vehicle traffic on highways and roads, and industrial development (e.g., coal-fired power plants). The public land activity likely to have the greatest impact on air quality would be wildland fire and fuels management, which varies by alternative as shown below.				
	Alternative N's minimal wildland fire use, prescribed fire, and non-fire fuel treatments would minimize smoke and other emissions in the short-term, but would result in increased fuel build-up, more frequent and larger wildland fires, and greater emissions in the long-term.	The types of impacts experienced under these alternatives would be similar to those described for Alternative N except that under Alternatives A and B treatments would average 73,600 acres annually with a maximum acreage limit set over the life of the plan (up to 1,472,000 acres). In contrast with Alternative N, Alternatives A and B would potentially decrease the level of suppression being used on wildfires through AMR, a strategy to meet Fire Management Unit (FMU) objectives. In the short-term, more acres could burn and smoke and particulate emissions could increase. In the long-term, the potential for severe and uncontrollable types of wildfires would be predicted to decrease, enabling BLM to manage wildfire and associated emissions more effectively. In the short-term, smoke management is a critical component of wildland fire use planning and it is considered in developing the AMR for each wildland fire.	The types of impacts experienced under these alternatives would be similar to those described for Alternatives A and B except that under Alternatives C and D the average annual treatment acres (26,000) and maximum acreage over the life of the plan (520,000) would be less. Similar to Alternatives A and B, Alternatives C and D would potentially decrease the level of suppression being used on wildfires through adoption of AMR (including smoke management considerations). In the short-term, relying on prescribed fire as the main fuels management tool would likely increase the acres burned and accompanying smoke and particulate emissions compared with Alternatives A and B. In the long-term, the potential for severe and uncontrollable types of wildfires would likely decrease, but not as much as under Alternatives A and B due to the limitations on fuels treatments. The consequent impacts to air quality could be greater than Alternatives A and B but less than Alternative N.		
Soil Resources	The potential for impacts to soils under Alternative N would be greatest among all the alternatives, due to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allowing cross- 	The potential for impacts to soils under Alternative A would be less than under Alternative N but greater than Alternatives B, C or D because of	The potential for impacts to soils under Alternative B would be less than Alternatives N or A but greater than Alternatives C and D because of	The potential for impacts to soils under Alternative C would be less than under Alternatives N, A and B but greater than	The potential for impacts to soils would be least under Alternative D because of limitations on surface disturbing activities resulting from:

Resource	Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Alternative B (Preferred)	Alternative C	Alternative D
Soil Resources	<p>country OHV use on 77% of the RFO.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Allowing oil and gas leasing on 78% of the RFO. Designating 75% of the RFO as VRM Classes III or IV. 	<p>the potential for surface disturbing activities resulting from:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Allowing cross-country OHV use on 21% of the RFO. Allowing oil and gas leasing on 79% of the RFO. Designating 79% of the RFO as VRM Classes III or IV. Recommending no ACECs or suitable wild and scenic rivers. 	<p>limitations on surface disturbing activities resulting from:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Allowing cross-country OHV use on less than 1% of the RFO. Closing to leasing or allowing no surface occupancy on 26% of the RFO. Designating 31% of the RFO as VRM Classes I or II. Recommending two eligible wild and scenic river segments as suitable. 	<p>Alternative D because of limitations on surface disturbing activities resulting from:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Allowing no cross-country OHV use. Closing to oil and gas leasing or allowing no surface occupancy on 35% of the RFO. Designating 32% of the RFO as VRM Classes I or II. In addition to existing withdrawals, recommending withdrawal of 8% of the RFO from mineral entry. Designating all potential ACECs. Recommending all eligible wild and scenic river segments as suitable. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Allowing no cross-country OHV use. Closing to oil and gas leasing or allowing no surface occupancy on 57% of the RFO. Designating 56% of the RFO as VRM Classes I or II. In addition to existing withdrawals, recommending withdrawal of 35% of the RFO from mineral entry. Designating all potential ACECs. Recommending all eligible wild and scenic river segments as suitable. Protecting all non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics.
Water Resources	<p>Surface disturbing activities would be restricted within 500 feet of all waters, limiting damage to riparian vegetation and sedimentation into streams.</p>	<p>Surface disturbing activities would be restricted within 330 feet of all waters, which would protect water sources, although less than Alternatives N, C or D.</p>		<p>Surface disturbing activities would be restricted within 660 feet of all waters, which would protect water sources more than Alternatives N, A and B.</p>	
	<p>Allowing cross-country OHV use on 77% of the RFO and designating 4,315 miles of routes with 539 stream crossings would result in the greatest potential for</p>	<p>Allowing cross-country use on 21% of the RFO, and designating 4,312 miles of routes with 443 stream crossings would have less potential for impacts to water</p>	<p>Allowing cross-country OHV use on less than 1% of the RFO reduces potential impacts over Alternatives A and B, and would be similar to Alternatives C and D.</p>	<p>No cross-country OHV use would be allowed which would be similar to Alternatives B and D. The potential for impacts to water resources under Alternative C would be</p>	<p>As in Alternative C, no cross-country OHV use would be allowed. The potential for impacts to water resources would be least under Alternative D because of</p>

Impacts Summary Table

Resource	Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Alternative B (Preferred)	Alternative C	Alternative D
	impacts to water resources.	resources than Alternative N, but greater than Alternatives B, C and D.	There would be 4,176 miles of designated routes with 400 stream crossings which would have greater potential for impacts to water resources over Alternatives C and D.	less than under Alternatives N, A and B but greater than Alternative D because of the designation of 3,216 miles of routes with 273 stream crossings.	the designation of only 3,067 miles of routes with 266 stream crossings.
Vegetation	Managing fire using a full suite of tools would allow for the graduated movement to a more ecologically sustainable condition and reduction of hazardous fuels. Continuing minimal treatments on a case-by-case basis could continue the existing trend of pinyon-juniper woodland encroachment and increase the risk of large or intense wildfires. Vegetation across a large portion of the RFO (77%) would continue to be subject to potential impacts from cross-country OHV use.	Adopting an appropriate management response strategy to wildfire would reduce pinyon-juniper woodland encroachment and decrease the risk of large or intense wildfires and their effects on vegetation. Vegetation on 21% of the RFO would continue to be subject to potential impacts from cross-country OHV use, less than Alternative N but more than Alternatives B, C and D. Options for managing vegetation would be greatest under Alternative A because it provides the most tools for managing vegetation and the fewest restrictions.	Adopting an appropriate management response strategy to wildfire would reduce pinyon-juniper woodland encroachment and decrease the risk of large or intense wildfires (same as Alternative A). Managing less than 1% of the RFO as open for cross-country OHV use could result in the removal of existing vegetation and soil compaction, but on dramatically less acres than Alternatives N and A. Tools for managing vegetation are the same as Alternative A, but visual resource management and other restrictions would reduce opportunities for vegetation management in some areas.	Adopting an appropriate management response strategy to wildfire would reduce pinyon-juniper woodland encroachment and decrease the risk of large or intense wildfires (same as Alternatives A, B and D). There would be no areas open for cross-country OHV use, eliminating these impacts to vegetation. Alternative C would protect existing vegetation from disturbance because of its restrictions on VRM, off-highway vehicles, and vegetation management tools. However, it would allow less flexibility for vegetation management than Alternatives N, A and B because some of these same restrictions could limit the effective management of pinyon-juniper woodland and sagebrush-steppe vegetation communities.	Adopting an appropriate management response strategy to wildfire would reduce pinyon-juniper woodland encroachment and decrease the risk of large or intense wildfires (same as Alternatives A, B and C). There would be no areas open for cross-country OHV use, eliminating these impacts to vegetation. Alternative D would best protect existing vegetation from disturbance because of its restrictions on VRM, off-highway vehicles, and vegetation management tools. However, it would allow the least flexibility for vegetation management among the alternatives because some of these same restrictions could limit the effective management of pinyon-juniper woodland and sagebrush-steppe vegetation communities.

Impacts Summary Table

Resource	Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Alternative B (Preferred)	Alternative C	Alternative D
Vegetation - Riparian	Surface disturbing activities are the primary cause of adverse impacts to riparian resources. Conversely, proposed decisions to limit surface disturbing activities would help protect riparian resources. Significant impacts to riparian resources would not be anticipated under any of the alternatives. Under all alternatives, actions in riparian areas would be guided by the Utah Riparian Management Policy and the decisions made through this planning effort.				
	Management of riparian and wetland areas includes the avoidance of surface disturbing activities within 500 feet of riparian areas. This would benefit riparian vegetation.	Impacts would be similar to those under Alternative N except that the size of the buffer zone in which no surface disturbance would be allowed is 330 feet on each side of the riparian area. Thus, Alternatives A and B would protect a smaller area around the riparian/wetland zones from surface disturbance than Alternative N. However, projects to improve habitat conditions within these riparian zones could still be performed, even within the buffer zone.	The types of impacts experienced as a result of riparian management would be similar to those described for Alternative N except that the size of the buffer zone in which no surface disturbance would be allowed is 660 feet on each side of the riparian area. Thus, these alternatives would protect a larger area around the riparian/wetland zones from surface disturbing activities than Alternatives N, A, or B.		
	The potential for impacts to riparian resources under Alternative N would be greatest among all the alternatives, due to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allowing cross-country OHV use on 77% of the RFO. • 539 stream crossings from OHV routes. 	The potential for impacts to riparian resources under Alternative A would be less than under Alternative N but greater than Alternatives B, C or D because of the potential for surface disturbing activities resulting from: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allowing cross-country OHV use on 21% of the RFO. • 443 stream crossings from OHV routes. • Recommending no ACECs or suitable wild and scenic rivers. 	The potential for impacts to riparian resources under Alternative B would be less than Alternatives N or A, but greater than Alternatives C and D because of limitations on surface disturbing activities resulting from: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allowing cross-country OHV use on less than 1% of the RFO. • 400 stream crossings from OHV routes. • Closing to leasing or allowing no surface occupancy on 26% of the RFO. • Designating 31% of the RFO as VRM Classes I or II. • Recommending two eligible wild and scenic rivers as suitable. • Designating two 	The potential for impacts to riparian resources under Alternative C would be less than Alternatives N, A and B but greater than Alternative D because of limitations on surface disturbing activities resulting from: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allowing no cross-country OHV use. • 273 stream crossings from OHV routes. • Closing to oil and gas leasing or allowing no surface occupancy on 35% of the RFO. • Designating 32% of the RFO as VRM Classes I or II. • In addition to existing withdrawals, recommending withdrawal of 8% of the RFO from mineral entry. • Designating all potential ACECs. 	The potential for impacts to riparian resources would be least under Alternative D because of limitations on surface disturbing activities resulting from: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allowing no cross-country OHV use. • 266 stream crossings from OHV routes. • Closing to oil and gas leasing or allowing no surface occupancy on 56% of the RFO. • Designating 56% of the RFO as VRM Classes I or II. • In addition to existing withdrawals, recommending withdrawal of 35% of the RFO from mineral entry. • Designating all potential ACECs. • Recommending all eligible wild and scenic rivers as

Impacts Summary Table

Resource	Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Alternative B (Preferred)	Alternative C	Alternative D
			ACECs (2,500 acres)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recommending all eligible wild and scenic rivers as suitable. 	suitable. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Protecting all non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics.
Vegetation – Invasive, Non-Native Species	Alternatives N, A, and B would allow a full range of weed control methods (mechanical, biological, manual, fire, and chemical) to be utilized and would afford the best opportunity for controlling weeds.			Alternatives C and D would preclude the use of mechanical, manual and chemical methods. Control of some noxious weeds under these alternatives would not be possible in some areas because of lack of suitable substitute treatments, potentially allowing the weeds to spread.	
	Weed seeds are often transported from one place to another on the tires and undercarriages of vehicles. Allowing motorized access into more areas and on more routes would increase the potential for expanding noxious weeds infestations; limiting access decreases the potential.				
	The potential for the spread of weeds by vehicles would be greatest under Alternative N because cross-country OHV use would continue to be allowed on 77% of the RFO and 10% would be closed to OHV use.	The potential for the spread of weeds by vehicles under Alternative A would be less than under Alternative N but greater than Alternatives B, C or D because cross-country OHV use would be allowed on 21% of the RFO and no areas would be closed to OHV use.	The potential for the spread of weeds by vehicles under Alternative B would be less than under Alternatives N and A but greater than Alternatives C or D because cross-country OHV use would be allowed on less than 1% of the RFO and 10% would be closed to OHV use.	The potential for the spread of weeds by vehicles under Alternative C would be less than under Alternatives N, A and B but greater than Alternative D because no cross-country OHV use would be allowed and 32% of the RFO would be closed to OHV use.	The potential for the spread of weeds by vehicles under Alternative D would be least among all alternatives because no cross-country OHV use would be allowed and 54% of the RFO would be closed to OHV use.
Cultural Resources	All permitted activities regulated by the BLM are subject to the legal and policy protections and mitigation afforded cultural resources. Unregulated uses that could impact cultural resources include wildland fire suppression, dispersed recreation, and OHV use in areas designated as open. Special designations such as WSAs, ACECs, and WSRs, and decisions to protect non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics (Alternative D only) would have a largely beneficial impact on cultural resources because the management prescriptions associated with those designations limit surface disturbing activities.				
	The potential for inadvertent impacts to cultural resources under Alternative N would be greatest among all the alternatives, due to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Allowing cross- 	The potential for inadvertent impacts to cultural resources under Alternative A would be less than under Alternative N but greater than Alternatives B, C or	The potential for inadvertent impacts to cultural resources under Alternative B would be less than Alternatives N or A but greater than Alternatives C and D	The potential for inadvertent impacts to cultural resources under Alternative C would be less than under Alternatives N, A and B but greater than	The potential for inadvertent impacts to cultural resources would be least under Alternative D because of limitations on surface disturbing activities

Resource	Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Alternative B (Preferred)	Alternative C	Alternative D
	<p>country OHV use on 77% of the RFO.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Allowing oil and gas leasing on 78% of the RFO. Designating 75% of the RFO as VRM Classes III or IV. 	<p>D because of the potential for surface disturbing activities resulting from:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Allowing cross-country OHV use on 21% of the RFO. Allowing oil and gas leasing on 79% of the RFO. Designating 79% of the RFO as VRM Classes III or IV. Recommending no ACECs or suitable wild and scenic rivers. 	<p>because of limitations on surface disturbing activities resulting from:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Allowing cross-country OHV use on less than 1% of the RFO. Closing to leasing or allowing no surface occupancy on 26% of the RFO. Designating 31% of the RFO as VRM Classes I or II. Recommending two eligible wild and scenic rivers as suitable. 	<p>Alternative D because of limitations on surface disturbing activities resulting from:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Allowing no cross-country OHV use. Closing to leasing or allowing no surface occupancy on 35% of the RFO. Designating 32% of the RFO as VRM Classes I or II. In addition to existing withdrawals, recommending withdrawal of 8% of the RFO from mineral entry. Designating all potential ACECs. Recommending all eligible wild and scenic rivers as suitable. 	<p>resulting from:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Allowing no cross-country OHV use. Closing to leasing or allowing no surface occupancy on 57% of the RFO. Designating 56% of the RFO as VRM Classes I or II. In addition to existing withdrawals, recommending withdrawal of 35% of the RFO from mineral entry. Designating all potential ACECs. Recommending all eligible wild and scenic rivers as suitable. Protecting all non-WSA with wilderness characteristics.
Paleontological Resources	<p>All permitted activities regulated by the BLM are subject to the legal and policy protections and mitigation afforded paleontological resources. Impacts on paleontological resources occur from natural weathering and erosion, surface disturbing activities, excavation, and theft or vandalism. Unregulated uses that could impact paleontological resources include wildland fire suppression, dispersed recreation, and OHV use in areas designated as open. Special designations such as WSAs, ACECs, and WSRs, and decisions to protect non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics (Alternative D only) would have a largely beneficial impact on paleontological resources because the management prescriptions associated with them limit surface disturbing activities.</p>				
	<p>The potential for inadvertent impacts to paleontological resources under Alternative N would be greatest among all the alternatives, due to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Allowing cross-country OHV use on 77% of the RFO. 	<p>The potential for inadvertent impacts to paleontological resources under Alternative A would be less than under Alternative N but greater than Alternatives B, C or D because of the potential for surface</p>	<p>The potential for inadvertent impacts to paleontological resources under Alternative B would be less than Alternatives N or A but greater than Alternatives C and D because of limitations on surface disturbing</p>	<p>The potential for inadvertent impacts to paleontological resources under Alternative C would be less than under Alternatives N, A and B but greater than Alternative D because of limitations on surface</p>	<p>The potential for inadvertent impacts to paleontological resources would be least under Alternative D because of limitations on surface disturbing activities resulting from:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Allowing no cross-country OHV use.

Resource	Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Alternative B (Preferred)	Alternative C	Alternative D
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Allowing oil and gas leasing on 78% of the RFO. Designating 75% of the RFO as VRM Classes III or IV. 	disturbing activities resulting from: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Allowing cross-country OHV use on 21% of the RFO. Allowing oil and gas leasing on 79% of the RFO. Designating 79% of the RFO as VRM Classes III or IV. Recommending no ACECs or suitable wild and scenic rivers. 	activities resulting from: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Allowing cross-country OHV use on less than 1% of the RFO. Closing to leasing or allowing no surface occupancy on 26% of the RFO. Designating 31% of the RFO as VRM Classes I or II. Recommending two eligible wild and scenic rivers as suitable. 	disturbing activities resulting from: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Allowing no cross-country OHV use. Closing to leasing or allowing no surface occupancy on 35% of the RFO. Designating 32% of the RFO as VRM Classes I or II. In addition to existing withdrawals, recommending withdrawal of 8% of the RFO from mineral entry. Designating all potential ACECs. Recommending all eligible wild and scenic rivers as suitable. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Closing to leasing or allowing no surface occupancy on 57% of the RFO. Designating 56% of the RFO as VRM Classes I or II. In addition to existing withdrawals, recommending withdrawal of 35% of the RFO from mineral entry. Designating all potential ACECs. Recommending all eligible wild and scenic rivers as suitable. Protecting all non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics.
Visual Resources	Under Alternative N, 25% of the RFO would be designated VRM Classes I or II. This would provide more protection for scenic resources than Alternative A and less than Alternatives B, C and D.	Under Alternative A, 21% of the RFO would be designated VRM Classes I or II, providing the least protection for scenic resources among the alternatives.	Under Alternative B, 31% of the RFO would be designated VRM Classes I or II. This would provide more protection for scenic resources than Alternatives N or A and less than Alternatives C and D.	Under Alternative C, 32% of the RFO would be designated VRM Classes I or II. This would provide more protection for scenic resources than Alternatives N, A or B and less than Alternative D.	Under Alternative C, 56% of the RFO would be designated VRM Classes I or II, providing the greatest protection for scenic resources among the alternatives.
	Under Alternative N, 77% of the RFO would be open to cross-country OHV use, including 206,000 acres in VRM Class II areas. The potential for impacts to	Under Alternative A, 21% of the RFO would be open to cross-country OHV use. The potential for impacts to scenic resources from OHV use would be less than	Under Alternative B, less than 1% of the RFO would be open to cross-country OHV use, reducing the potential for impacts substantially over Alternatives N and	No cross-country OHV use would be allowed, eliminating the potential for impacts to scenic resources from OHV use. Alternatives C and D provide the greatest protection for scenic resources.	

Resource	Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Alternative B (Preferred)	Alternative C	Alternative D
	scenic resources from OHV use would be greatest under this alternative.	Alternative N, but greater than Alternatives B, C and D.	A.		
Special Status Species	<p>The implementation of decisions that would have the greatest potential adverse effects on special status species would be actions that allow surface disturbing activities. The implementation of decisions that would have the greatest potential beneficial effects to special status species would be actions that would directly protect special status species and their habitat or indirectly protect special status species through surface restrictions. These actions would include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Special status species management • Protecting non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics • Special Designations (ACECs, wild and scenic rivers, wilderness study areas) • Visual Resource Management Class I or II designations 				
	<p>The potential for impacts to special status species under Alternative N would be greatest among all the alternatives, due to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allowing cross-country OHV use on 77% of the RFO. • Minimal restrictions on other surface disturbing activities. 	<p>The potential for impacts to special status species under Alternative A would be less than under Alternative N but greater than Alternatives B, C or D because of the potential for surface disturbing activities resulting from:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allowing cross-country OHV use on 21% of the RFO. • Minimal restrictions on other surface disturbing activities. • Recommending no ACECs or suitable wild and scenic rivers. 	<p>The potential for impacts to special status species under Alternative B would be less than Alternatives N or A, but greater than Alternatives C and D because of limitations on surface disturbing activities resulting from:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allowing cross-country OHV use on less than 1% of the RFO. • Closing to leasing or allowing no surface occupancy on 26% of the RFO. • Designating 31% of the RFO as VRM Classes I or II. • Recommending two eligible wild and scenic rivers as suitable. • Designating two 	<p>The potential for impacts to special status species under Alternative C would be less than under Alternatives N, A and B but greater than Alternative D because of limitations on surface disturbing activities resulting from:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allowing no cross-country OHV use. • Closing to oil and gas leasing or allowing no surface occupancy on 35% of the RFO. • Designating 32% of the RFO as VRM Classes I or II. • In addition to existing withdrawals, recommending withdrawal of 8% of the RFO from mineral entry. • Designating all potential ACECs. 	<p>The potential for impacts to special status species would be least under Alternative D because of limitations on surface disturbing activities resulting from:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allowing no cross-country OHV use. • Closing to oil and gas leasing or allowing no surface occupancy on 57% of the RFO. • Designating 56% of the RFO as VRM Classes I or II. • In addition to existing withdrawals, recommending withdrawal of 35% of the RFO from mineral entry. • Designating all potential ACECs. • Recommending all eligible wild and scenic rivers as

Resource	Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Alternative B (Preferred)	Alternative C	Alternative D
			ACECs (2,530 acres)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recommending all eligible wild and scenic rivers as suitable. 	suitable. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Protecting all non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics.
Fish and Wildlife	<p>Under Alternative N, managing fire using a full suite of tools would allow for the graduated movement to a more ecologically sustainable condition and reduction of hazardous fuels. However, continuing minimal treatments on a case-by-case basis could contribute to fuel loading, setting the stage for catastrophic fires, and consequent loss of wildlife habitat. Current forage allocations would continue, providing no additional benefits to wildlife. Seventy-seven percent of the lands managed by the RFO would remain open to cross-country OHV use, leaving wildlife vulnerable to displacement and harassment and habitat susceptible to degradation.</p>	<p>Under Alternative A, implementing an appropriate management response strategy would allow the use of wildland fire as a vegetation management tool, benefiting wildlife species and habitat. A full range of tools would be available for fuels management and other vegetation treatments, allowing the greatest amount of flexibility to enhance wildlife habitats. Current forage allocations would continue, providing no additional benefits to wildlife. Twenty-one percent of the lands managed by the RFO would remain open to cross-country OHV use, reducing the potential for wildlife displacement and harassment, and habitat degradation compared to Alternative N.</p>	<p>Under Alternative B, implementing an appropriate management response strategy would allow the use of wildland fire as a vegetation management tool, benefiting wildlife species and habitat (same as Alternative A). A full range of tools would be available for fuels management and other vegetation treatments, allowing the greatest amount of flexibility to enhance wildlife habitats (same as Alternative A). Less than 1% of the lands managed by the RFO would remain open to cross-country OHV use, greatly reducing the potential for wildlife displacement and harassment, and habitat degradation compared to Alternatives N and A.</p>	<p>Under Alternatives C and D, implementing an appropriate management response strategy would allow the use of wildland fire as a vegetation management tool, benefiting wildlife species and habitat (same as Alternatives A and B). Only prescribed fire and other natural means would be used to manage fuel and other vegetation, limiting options for treatment that in some cases might not be effective, reducing the benefit to wildlife compared with Alternatives A and B. None of the lands managed by the RFO would remain open to cross-country OHV use, eliminating the possibility of displacement, harassment, and habitat degradation. Establishing the Henry Mountains ACEC for bison and mule deer values would recognize the relevance and importance of these resources and provide special management emphasis to enhance them.</p>	
	<p>Alternatives N and A, with their accommodation for oil and gas development and cross-country OHV use, would have the greatest adverse impacts on fish, wildlife and their habitats.</p>	<p>Alternative B would balance the impacts of development with the need to protect fish, wildlife and their habitats.</p>	<p>Alternatives C and D, with their special designations and emphasis on conservation, would be most beneficial to fish, wildlife and their habitats.</p>		

Resource	Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Alternative B (Preferred)	Alternative C	Alternative D
Wild Horses and Burros	<p>The preliminary appropriate management level for the wild burros would maintain a viable population. Forage allocations are sufficient for the wild burros in the northern portions of the HMA; however, there could be competition for forage resources in the southern portions. The potential for displacement of wild burros from OHV use exists.</p>		<p>Establishing a formal wild burro AML would maintain the viability of the population, and result in the long-term maintenance of wild burro habitat components. This alternative could eliminate habitat competition between livestock and wild burros, but displacement from OHV use would continue. None of the impacts are anticipated to be significant.</p>	<p>The wild burro AML would be the largest of the alternatives, which could increase competition for habitat resources with wildlife and livestock.</p>	
Fire and Fuels Management	<p>Under all alternatives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Maintaining State of Utah air quality standards could result in fewer acres burned using prescribed fires or wildland fire use because National Ambient Air Quality Standards could be exceeded. If the air quality of Class I airsheds were adversely impacted, wildland fire use and prescribed fires could be suspended. Consideration of regional haze could increase the restrictions on wildland fire use or prescribed fire. Managing WSAs under the IMP precludes the use of mechanical (chaining, harrowing) and manual (chainsaw) fuels reduction treatments. This could limit the ability to maintain or restore properly functioning vegetation and reduce hazardous fuels in WSAs, including those in the Dirty Devil, Horseshoe Canyon and Henry Mountains areas. 				
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Allowing vegetation treatment using mechanical, wildland and/or prescribed fire, and chemical treatments on a case-by-case basis would move vegetation toward a more ecologically sustainable condition over a multiple year period. Proposed decisions for visual resource management could 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Allowing use of a full range of vegetation management tools including mechanical, biological, manual, prescribed and wildland fire use, and chemical (herbicides) would complement the ability to maintain and restore properly functioning vegetation and reduce hazardous fuels. Proposed decisions for visual resource 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Allowing use of a full range of vegetation management tools including mechanical, biological, manual, prescribed and wildland fire use, and chemical (herbicides) would complement the ability to maintain and restore properly functioning vegetation and reduce hazardous fuels. Proposed decisions for visual resource 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Restrictions on the use of non-fire treatments which would limit the ability to maintain or restore properly functioning vegetation and reduce hazardous fuels in some areas. Proposed decisions for visual resource management could preclude some types of treatments within the 21% of the RFO designated as VRM 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Restrictions on the use of non-fire treatments which would limit the ability to maintain or restore properly functioning vegetation and reduce hazardous fuels in some areas. Proposed decisions for visual resource management could preclude some types of treatments within the 53% of the RFO designated as VRM

Resource	Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Alternative B (Preferred)	Alternative C	Alternative D
	<p>impact the design of non-fire treatment projects, particularly within the 25% of the RFO designated as VRM Class II.</p>	<p>management could preclude some types of treatments within the 21% of the RFO designated as VRM Class I, less than in Alternative N.</p>	<p>management could preclude some types of treatments within the 21% of the RFO designated as VRM Class I and impact the design of non-fire fuels treatment projects, particularly in VRM Class II areas (10%) in the Henry Mountains and near the towns of Torrey, Grover, and Teasdale. Treatment acres and success may be reduced over Alternative N and A, but would be greater than under Alternative C and D.</p>	<p>Class I and impact the design of non-fire fuels treatment projects, particularly in VRM Class II areas (11%) in the Henry Mountains and near the towns of Torrey, Grover, and Teasdale. Treatment acres and success would be reduced over Alternatives N, A and B, but would be greater than under Alternative D.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposed management direction for suppressing wildfires in the Fremont Gorge/Cockscomb, Henry Mountains, Kingston Canyon, Parker Mountain, and Sevier Canyon ACECs could limit the ability to maintain or restore properly functioning vegetation and reduce hazardous fuels. 	<p>Class I and impact the design of non-fire fuels treatment projects, particularly in VRM Class II areas (3%) in the Henry Mountains and near the towns of Torrey, Grover, and Teasdale. Alternative D would restrict treatment projects on the greatest amount of acres.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposed management direction for suppressing wildfires in the Fremont Gorge/Cockscomb, Henry Mountains, Kingston Canyon, Parker Mountain, and Sevier Canyon ACECs could limit the ability to maintain or restore properly functioning vegetation and reduce hazardous fuels. Protecting the non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics would preclude the use of mechanical (chaining, harrowing) and manual (chainsaw) fuels reduction treatments on these lands. This could limit the ability to maintain

Impacts Summary Table

Resource	Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Alternative B (Preferred)	Alternative C	Alternative D
					or restore properly functioning vegetation and reduce hazardous fuels in some areas, such as parts of the Henry Mountains.
Non-WSA Lands with Wilderness Characteristics	<p>Impacts to non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics would be the greatest among the alternatives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 96% of these lands would be open to cross-country OHV use. • 85% of these lands would be open to oil and gas leasing with standard stipulations. • 13% of these lands would be open to oil and gas leasing with minor constraints. • 1% of these lands would be open to oil and gas leasing with major constraints (NSO). 	<p>Impacts to non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics would be less than Alternative N and greater than Alternatives B, C and D:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 32% of these lands would be open to cross-country OHV use. • 48% of these lands would be open to oil and gas leasing with standard stipulations. • 52% of these lands would be open to oil and gas leasing with minor constraints. 	<p>Impacts to the non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics would be less than Alternatives N and A and greater than Alternatives C and D:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Less than 1% of these lands would be open to cross-country OHV use. • 35% of these lands would be open to oil and gas leasing with standard stipulations. • 51% of these lands would be open to oil and gas leasing with minor constraints. • 13% of these lands would be open to oil and gas leasing with major constraints (NSO). • 2% of these lands would be recommended for withdrawal from mineral entry. 	<p>Impacts to non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics would be less than Alternatives N, A and B but greater than Alternative D:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None of these lands would be open to cross-country OHV use. • 30% of these lands would be open to oil and gas leasing with standard stipulations. • 39% of these lands would be open to oil and gas leasing with minor constraints. • 1% of these lands would be recommended for withdrawal from mineral entry. 	<p>Impacts to non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics would be the least among the alternatives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None of these lands would be open to cross-country OHV use. • None of these lands would be open to oil and gas leasing. • All of these lands would be recommended for withdrawal from mineral entry. • All would be Class I VRM.

Resource	Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Alternative B (Preferred)	Alternative C	Alternative D
Forestry and Woodland Products	Alternative N would continue restrictions on timber harvesting and commercial woodland product sales included in current management plans. The potential production of forest and woodland resources would likely be less than Alternatives A and B, but more than Alternatives C and D.	Alternative A would allow timber sales, woodland products harvesting and seed and live plant collecting on the most acres with the most tools and fewest restrictions among the alternatives. This alternative would provide the greatest availability of forest and woodland products and the greatest opportunities to restore, maintain, and improve forest and woodland health.	Alternative B would allow timber sales, woodland products harvesting, and seed and live plant collecting with the same tools as Alternative A, but on slightly less acres due to the addition of two suitable WSR corridors that would be restricted. The potential production of forest and woodland products and potential forest and woodland health could be slightly less than Alternative A but more than Alternatives N, C or D.	Under Alternative C, commercial timber sales would be precluded, greatly diminishing the availability of timber products for commercial use. Woodland products harvesting and seed and live plant collecting would be the same as Alternatives A and B but on less acres due to restrictions in all 12 suitable WSR corridors. The potential production of forest and woodland products and potential forest and woodland health would be less than Alternatives A and B, similar to Alternative N, but more than Alternative D.	Under Alternative D, commercial timber sales would be precluded, no commercial or non-commercial use of forest and woodland products or seed and live plants would be allowed within suitable WSR corridors and non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics. This alternative would result in the least production of forest and woodland products and could result in the greatest impacts to forest and woodland health.
	<p>Under all alternatives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Oil and gas development could reduce land available for livestock grazing under all alternatives by a maximum of 3,080 acres based on the Reasonably Foreseeable Development (RFD) Scenario for Oil and Gas, equating to a loss of 385 AUMs and possibly affecting the viability of some allotments. Increasing recreational use could increase conflicts between recreationists and livestock. Increasing OHV use could increase conflicts between OHVs and livestock in some areas. 				
Livestock Grazing	<p>Decisions likely to impact grazing opportunities include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Continuing to allow cross-country OHV use on 77% of the RFO. 	<p>Decisions likely to impact grazing opportunities include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Allowing cross-country OHV use on 21% of the RFO. Disposing of 13,400 acres of public land (Section 203 sales) that would reduce available and could impact the viability of 	<p>Decisions likely to impact grazing opportunities include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Disposing of 13,400 acres of public land (Section 203 sales) that would reduce available AUMs and could impact the viability of some allotments. 	<p>Under Alternatives C and D, decisions likely to impact grazing opportunities include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fewer acres identified for vegetation treatment than Alternatives A and B. Limitations on the use of chemicals (pesticides and herbicides) for treating noxious weed and insect pest problems. 	

Resource	Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Alternative B (Preferred)	Alternative C	Alternative D
		some allotments.			
Recreation	<p>Alternative N would provide the greatest opportunities for motorized recreation uses and would cause the greatest adverse impacts to non-motorized uses. Seventy-seven percent of the RFO would continue to be open to cross-country OHV use and 4,315 miles of routes would continue to be open to motor vehicles, the most under any of the alternatives. One SRMA (managed by the Fillmore FO) would continue, but no new SRMAs would be established. There would be no VRM Class I areas, 25% of the RFO would be managed as VRM Class II, which supports primitive and semi-primitive recreation opportunities. Seventy-five percent of the RFO would be managed as VRM Classes III and IV supporting all types of recreation, including motorized use. Conflicts between motorized and non-motorized users would continue and adverse effects on primitive and semi-</p>	<p>Alternative A would provide fewer opportunities for motorized recreation than Alternative N, but more than Alternatives B, C and D. Twenty-one percent of the RFO would be open to cross-country OHV use. The open areas include those currently used for cross-country travel, plus additional areas for growth. OHV use in 79% of the RFO would be limited to designated trails. Designated routes would total 4,312 miles, essentially the same as those open under Alternative N. No areas would be closed to OHVs. The Dirty Devil SRMA would provide opportunities for primitive and semi-primitive motorized and non-motorized recreation; the Factory Butte, Sahara Sands and Big Rocks SRMAs would provide opportunities for cross-country OHV use; and the Otter Creek SRMA would provide opportunities for dispersed camping. Twenty-one percent of</p>	<p>Alternative B would provide a balance of motorized and non-motorized recreation opportunities. It would provide fewer opportunities for motorized recreation than Alternatives N and A, but more than Alternatives C and D. Less than 1% of the RFO would be open to cross-country OHV use; however, the five open areas, Big Rocks, Factory Butte, Glenwood, Mayfield, and Aurora, are the areas currently most used by riders. OHVs would be limited to designated trails on 90% of the RFO's land. Designated routes would total 4,176 miles. Ten percent of the lands managed by the RFO would be closed to OHVs. The Henry Mountains, Capitol Reef Gateway, and Dirty Devil SRMAs would provide opportunities for primitive and semi-primitive motorized and non-motorized recreation; the Factory Butte and Big Rocks SRMAs would provide</p>	<p>Alternative C would provide more opportunities for non-motorized recreation than Alternatives N, A and B and more opportunities for motorized recreation than Alternative D. No areas would be open to cross-country OHV use. OHVs would be limited to designated routes on 68% of the RFO. Designated routes would total 3,192 miles, 74% of the routes open under Alternative N. Thirty-two percent of the lands managed by the RFO would be closed to OHVs. The Henry Mountains, Capitol Reef Gateway, Dirty Devil, and Sevier Canyon SRMAs would provide opportunities for primitive, semi-primitive motorized and non-motorized, and roaded natural recreation. Thirty-two percent of the RFO would be designated as VRM Classes I and II supporting primitive and semi-primitive recreation, 68% would be designated as VRM Classes III and IV,</p>	<p>Alternative D would provide the greatest opportunities for non-motorized recreation, the fewest opportunities for motorized recreation uses, and have the greatest adverse impact on motorized users. No areas would be open to cross-country OHV use. OHVs would be limited to designated routes on 46% of the RFO. Designated routes would total 3,043 miles, 71% of the routes open under Alternative N. Fifty-four percent of the RFO would be closed to OHVs. Seven SRMAs would be established to provide opportunities for primitive, semi-primitive motorized and non-motorized recreation. Portions of two of these SRMAs would provide some areas with opportunities for dispersed recreation. Fifty-six percent of the RFO would be designated as VRM Classes I and II supporting primitive and semi-primitive recreation; 44% would be designated as VRM Classes III and IV</p>

Resource	Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Alternative B (Preferred)	Alternative C	Alternative D
Recreation	primitive recreation settings would continue to increase.	the RFO would be designated as VRM Class I supporting primitive recreation. No lands would be designated as VRM Class II. Seventy-nine percent of the RFO would be designated as VRM Classes III and IV supporting all types of recreation, including motorized use. The decisions in this alternative would help resolve conflicts between motorized and non-motorized users.	opportunities for cross-country OHV use. Thirty-one percent of the RFO would be designated as VRM Classes I and II supporting primitive and semi-primitive recreation, 69% would be designated as VRM Classes III and IV supporting all types of recreation, including motorized use. The decisions in this alternative would help resolve conflicts between motorized and non-motorized users.	supporting all types of recreation, including motorized use. While this alternative would reduce adverse effects on primitive and semi-primitive recreation settings, conflicts between motorized and non-motorized users could be exacerbated because of the limited opportunities for motorized use.	supporting all types of recreation, including motorized use. While this alternative would reduce adverse effects on primitive and semi-primitive recreation settings, conflicts between motorized and non-motorized users could be exacerbated because of the limited opportunities for motorized use.
Travel Management	Management decisions that involve changes to miles of roads open for public or administrative use, number of acres open to off-road travel, or specific travel restrictions (vehicle size, season restrictions, etc.) would affect access into and across the RFO.				
	Alternative N provides the greatest opportunity for unrestricted motorized use and access with 77% of the RFO designated as open to motorized use, and 13% limited to designated routes (4,315 miles). Access would be restricted within 10% of the RFO designated as closed for the protection of WSAs, ACECs and cultural resources.	Under Alternative A, open motorized use areas would be reduced to 21%, with the remainder of the RFO limited to designated routes (4,312 miles). This alternative provides fewer acres for unrestricted motorized use than Alternative N, but more than Alternatives B, C and D. The miles of routes available would only be reduced by three miles from Alternative N. SRMA management within 49% of the open	Under Alternative B, open motorized use would be reduced significantly from Alternatives N and A, to less than 1% which would impact motorized use and access. Limited acres would be 90%, the most of any alternative. Motorized use would be allowed on 4,176 miles of routes which would be less than Alternatives N and A, but more than Alternatives C and D. SRMA management within 34% of the open areas could enhance the	Under Alternative C, no open motorized use areas would be designated eliminating cross-country travel. Access would be allowed in 68% of the RFO with use limited to designated routes (3,192 miles). The acres and miles of routes available for travel would be less than Alternatives N, A and B, but more than Alternative D. Access would be restricted within 32% of the RFO designated as closed for the protection	Under Alternative D, no open motorized use areas would be designated eliminating cross-country travel. Access would be allowed in 45% of the RFO with use limited to designated routes (3,735 miles). The acres and miles of routes available for travel would be the least of any of the alternatives. Access would be restricted within 54% of the RFO designated as closed for the protection of WSAs, WSR

Impacts Summary Table

Resource	Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Alternative B (Preferred)	Alternative C	Alternative D
		<p>areas could enhance the open motorized experiences in those areas.</p> <p>No areas would be closed under Alternative A.</p>	<p>open motorized experiences in those areas.</p> <p>Access would be restricted within 10% of the RFO designated as closed for the protection of WSAs, WSR corridors, ACECs, and SRMAs. The potential for impacts from closed areas would be the same as Alternative N, greater than alternative A, and less than Alternatives C and D.</p>	<p>of WSAs, WSR corridors, ACECs, and SRMAs. The potential for impacts from closed areas would be greater than Alternatives N, A, and C, but less than Alternative D.</p>	<p>corridors, non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics, ACECs, and SRMAs. The potential for impacts from closed areas would be the greatest under this alternative.</p>
Lands and Realty	<p>Under this alternative, 280 acres are identified as available for FLPMA Section 203 sales. In-holdings within the wilderness study areas and four existing ACECs would be priorities for acquisition.</p>	<p>One hundred and eighteen parcels totaling 13,400 acres would be available for sale under FLPMA Section 203. These sales would improve the manageability of the public land estate by disposing of parcels isolated and/or difficult to manage and could provide opportunities for community expansion. Conversely, grazing land, open space, wildlife habitat and land available for other public land uses would be lost. Inholdings within the WSAs (Alternatives A and B), two suitable wild and scenic river corridors and two areas of critical environmental concern would be priorities for acquisition (Alternative B only).</p>		<p>No lands would be identified as available for sale under FLPMA Section 203; hence there would be no beneficial or adverse impacts. In-holdings within the WSAs, twelve suitable wild and scenic river corridors and 16 areas of critical environmental concern would be priorities for acquisition, the most among the alternatives.</p>	
	<p>The potential for impacts to rights-of-way under Alternative N would be greater than Alternative A, but less than Alternatives B, C, and D, due to management of avoidance/exclusion areas for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WSAs • ACECs 	<p>The potential for impacts to rights-of-way due to management of avoidance/exclusion areas would be the least under this alternative and would include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WSAs • Areas closed to oil and gas leasing 	<p>The potential for impacts to rights-of-way under Alternative B would be greater than Alternatives N and A, but less than Alternatives C and D, due to management of avoidance/exclusion areas for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WSAs • ACECs 	<p>The potential for impacts to rights-of-way under Alternative C would be greater than Alternatives N, A, and B, but less than Alternative D, due to management of avoidance/exclusion areas for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WSAs • ACECs 	<p>The potential for impacts to rights-of-way due to management of avoidance/exclusion areas would be the greatest under this alternative and would include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WSAs • ACECs • Suitable wild and

Resource	Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Alternative B (Preferred)	Alternative C	Alternative D
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Eligible wild and scenic river corridors Areas closed to oil and gas leasing Areas open to oil and gas leasing with no surface occupancy stipulations 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Suitable wild and scenic river corridors Areas closed to oil and gas leasing Areas open to oil and gas leasing with no surface occupancy stipulations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Suitable wild and scenic river corridors Areas closed to oil and gas leasing Areas open to oil and gas leasing with no surface occupancy stipulations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> scenic river corridors Non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics Areas closed to oil and gas leasing Areas open to oil and gas leasing with no surface occupancy stipulations
Leasable Minerals	Seventy-eight percent of the RFO would be open to oil and gas leasing, providing slightly less opportunity than Alternatives A and B and more opportunity than Alternatives C or D.	Seventy-nine percent of the RFO would be open to oil and gas leasing, providing the greatest opportunity for oil and gas exploration and development among the alternatives.	Seventy-nine percent of the RFO would be open to oil and gas leasing (similar to Alternative A). However, more acres would be under controlled surface use and timing stipulations. Fewer acres would be open under standard stipulations.	Seventy-two percent of the RFO would be open to oil and gas leasing, providing less opportunity than Alternatives N, A, and B and more opportunity than Alternative D.	Forty-five percent of the RFO would be open to oil and gas leasing, providing the least opportunity for oil and gas leasing among the alternatives.
Locatable Minerals	Under all alternatives, 154,700 acres (7% of the RFO) currently withdrawn from mineral entry would remain withdrawn, precluding opportunities for mining on those lands.				
	Under Alternative N, 14,780 acres are proposed for withdrawal from mineral entry. Mining opportunities would be less than Alternative A, but greater than Alternatives B, C or D.	Under Alternative A, no additional lands would be proposed for withdrawal from mineral entry, providing the greatest opportunities for mining.	Under Alternative B, 21,500 acres are proposed for withdrawal from mineral entry. Mining opportunities would be less than Alternatives N or A but greater than Alternatives C or D.	Under Alternative C, 176,400 acres are proposed for withdrawal from mineral entry. Mining opportunities would be less than Alternatives N, A or B but greater than Alternative D.	Under Alternative D, 749,200 acres are proposed for withdrawal from mineral entry. Mining opportunities would be the least among the alternatives.
Salable Minerals	Seventy-eight percent of the RFO would be open to mineral material disposal, providing slightly less opportunity than Alternatives A and B and more opportunity than Alternatives C or D.	Seventy-nine percent of the RFO would be open to mineral material disposal, providing the greatest opportunity for the disposal of mineral materials among the alternatives.	Seventy-nine percent of the RFO would be open to mineral material disposal, virtually identical to Alternative A.	Seventy-two percent of the RFO would be open to mineral material disposal, providing less opportunity than Alternatives N, A, and B and more opportunity than Alternative D.	Forty-five percent of the RFO would be open to mineral material disposal, providing the least opportunity for disposal of mineral materials among the alternatives.

Resource	Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Alternative B (Preferred)	Alternative C	Alternative D
Wilderness Study Areas	Under all alternatives, wilderness study area management is guided primarily by BLM Handbook H-8550-1, Interim Management Policy for Lands under Wilderness Review. The IMP directs that WSAs are managed so as not to impair their suitability for preservation as wilderness. Additionally, BLM policy requires that WSAs be closed to oil and gas leasing and designated as VRM Class I. Collectively, this management direction protects the wilderness characteristics of the WSAs.				
	Forty-two miles of routes within 10 of the 11 WSAs would continue to be designated for use by motor vehicles, which would temporarily impact solitude and opportunities for primitive recreation in areas adjacent to the open routes. The rugged terrain of these areas has presented a barrier to vehicle intrusions in the past and would likely continue to do so in the future, although advancing vehicle technology could allow vehicles to enter and impact areas they have not been able to access in the past. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The continued use of these routes is conditioned on non-impairment of wilderness suitability. 	All WSAs would be designated as limited to OHV use and 52 miles of routes would be designated as open to motorized vehicles, the most of any alternative. The potential impacts to naturalness and solitude from vehicle intrusions would be the greatest among the alternatives. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The continued use of these routes is conditioned on non-impairment of wilderness suitability. 	Area designations under Alternative B would be the same as Alternative N. An additional three miles of routes would be designated as open to motor vehicle use (45 miles total), resulting in more potential impacts to wilderness characteristics than Alternatives N, C and D but less than Alternative A. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The continued use of these routes is conditioned on non-impairment of wilderness suitability. 	All WSAs would be closed to motorized use, which would preclude impacts to wilderness characteristics from motorized vehicles.	
Wild and Scenic Rivers	Under all alternatives, all or parts of seven eligible rivers totaling 98 river miles are within WSAs, including most of the Dirty Devil River and its side drainages. This represents 73% of the eligible river miles. The outstandingly remarkable values of these river segments would be protected by WSA management which would preclude oil and gas leasing, designate them as VRM I (under Alternatives A, B, C and D), and otherwise protect the values as prescribed by the IMP.				
	There would be no impacts to outstandingly remarkable values since no suitability	There could be potential impacts to the outstandingly remarkable values of	There would be no impacts to outstandingly remarkable values within the Fremont Gorge and	Under Alternatives C and D, all eligible river segments (135 miles) would be recommended as suitable, precluding impacts to outstandingly remarkable values.	

Impacts Summary Table

Resource	Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Alternative B (Preferred)	Alternative C	Alternative D
	determination would be made and all eligible river segments would be protected.	eligible segments outside WSAs since no eligible river segments would be recommended as suitable.	Dirty Devil eligible river segments (59 miles), which would be recommended as suitable, or to eligible segments inside WSAs. There could be potential impacts to the 13 miles of eligible rivers outside WSAs from various surface disturbing activities that would be allowed.		
ACECs	<p>Continue designation and management of the four existing ACECs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • North Caineville Mesa • South Caineville Mesa • Gilbert Badlands • Beaver Wash Canyon <p>Decisions under Alternative N could pose a threat of irreparable harm to relevant and important values in the following potential ACECs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Badlands (that portion outside the existing South Caineville and Gilbert Badlands ACECs) • Bull Creek • Dirty Devil/North Wash (that portion outside the existing Beaver Wash Canyon ACEC). • Fremont Gorge/Cockscomb 	No ACECs would be designated under Alternative A, with no special management prescriptions for the relevant and important values. Other decisions within this alternative could pose a threat of irreparable harm to relevant and important values.	<p>Decisions under Alternative B could pose a threat of irreparable harm to relevant and important values in the following potential ACECs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Badlands (that portion outside the existing North Caineville Mesa, South Caineville Mesa and Gilbert Badlands ACECs) • Bull Creek • Dirty Devil/North Wash • Fremont Gorge/Cockscomb • Henry Mountains • Horseshoe Canyon • Kingston Canyon • Little Rockies • Lower Muddy Creek • Parker Mountain • Quitchupah • Rainbow Hills • Sevier Canyon 	All potential ACECs would be designated under Alternatives C and D. Consequently, decisions under Alternatives C and D would pose no threat of irreparable harm to any relevant and important values in any of the potential ACECs.	

Impacts Summary Table

Resource	Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Alternative B (Preferred)	Alternative C	Alternative D
ACECs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Henry Mountains Horseshoe Canyon Kingston Canyon Little Rockies Lower Muddy Creek Old Woman Front Parker Mountain Quitcupah Rainbow Hills Sevier Canyon Thousand Lake Bench Special Status Species 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Thousand Lake Bench Special Status Species 		
Socioeconomic Environment	<p>Management decisions under Alternative N would continue to support jobs and associated income in the local economy.</p>	<p>Employment and income could increase over Alternative N due to this alternative's emphasis on motorized access, commodity production, and resource extraction.</p>	<p>Employment and income would be similar to, but slightly less than Alternative N.</p>	<p>Employment and income associated with motorized access, commodity development and resource extraction could decrease compared with Alternative N due to increased restrictions on use of the public lands and harvesting of natural resources. However, businesses that rely on more primitive land uses would benefit.</p>	<p>This alternative places the most restrictions on development and extractive uses of the RFO. This could reduce opportunities to maintain certain aspects of local culture and reduce opportunities for community development. Employment and income associated with motorized access, commodity development and resource extraction could decrease compared with the other alternatives due to increased restrictions on use of the public lands and harvesting of natural resources. However, businesses that rely on more primitive land uses would benefit the most from this alternative.</p>

Impacts Summary Table

Resource	Alternative N (No Action)	Alternative A	Alternative B (Preferred)	Alternative C	Alternative D
Socioeconomic Environment	Livestock grazing would continue to generate some economic benefits from livestock operations (depending on available AUMs), and social values of ranching would continue.				
Environmental Justice	There are no environmental justice populations in the socioeconomic study area, and actions required to identify and mitigate impacts to such populations are not required.				
Health and Safety	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None of the land allocations or prescriptions proposed in Chapter 2 would impact BLM's ability to deal with hazardous and solid wastes within the RFO. • None of the management actions proposed in Chapter 2 would increase public exposure to the risks associated with abandoned mines within the RFO. 				