LIST OF APPENDICES

Appendix A	Maps
Appendix B	Stipulations Applicable to Oil and Gas Leasing and Other Surface-Disturbing Activities
Appendix C	State of Utah Air Quality Monitoring
Appendix D	SHPO Correspondence
Appendix E	USFWS Correspondence
Appendix F	Utah Standards and Guidelines for Rangeland Health
Appendix G	Best Management Practices and Standard Operating Procedures Applicable to Oil and Gas Appendix Operations and Other Public Land-Use Authorizations
Appendix H	Monitoring
Appendix I	Fire Management
Appendix J	Tracts Identified for Disposal
Appendix K	Recreation Management Guidelines
Appendix L	Guidance for Pipeline Crossings
Appendix M	Finalized Conservation Measures and Best Management Practices for T&E Species of Utah from the Land Use Plan Programmatic BAs and Section 7 Consultations
Appendix N	Best Management Practices for Raptors and Their Associated Habitats in Utah
Appendix O	Travel Plan
Appendix P	Wild and Scenic Rivers

APPENDIX B. STIPULATIONS APPLICABLE TO OIL AND GAS LEASING AND OTHER SURFACE-DISTURBING ACTIVITIES

STIPULATIONS APPLICABLE TO OIL AND GAS LEASING AND OTHER SURFACE-DISTURBING ACTIVITIES

This appendix lists the stipulations for oil and gas leasing referred to throughout this proposed RMP and EIS. These stipulations would also apply, where appropriate and practical, to other surface-disturbing activities (and occupancy) associated with land use authorizations, permits, and leases issued on BLM lands. The stipulations would not apply to activities and uses where they are contrary to laws, regulations, or specific program guidance. The intent is to maintain consistency to the extent possible, in applying stipulations to all surface-disturbing activities.

Surface-disturbing activities are those that normally result in more than negligible disturbance to public lands and/or resources. These activities normally involve use and/or occupancy of the surface and cause disturbance to soils and vegetation which may accelerate the natural erosion process. This level of surface disturbance usually, but not always, requires reclamation and is typically caused by motorized or mechanical actions. They include, but are not limited to: the use of mechanized earth-moving equipment or truck-mounted drilling equipment; off-road vehicle travel in areas designated as limited or closed to Off-Road vehicle use; construction of facilities such as power lines, pipelines, oil and gas well locations, recreation sites, and improvements for livestock and wildlife; new road construction; and, use of pyrotechnics and explosives. Surface disturbance is not normally caused by casual use activities. Activities that are not considered surface disturbing include, but are not limited to: livestock grazing, cross-country hiking, minimum impact filming, and vehicular travel on designated routes.

Although some activities would not require use or occupation of the surface, stipulations may still be applied if the activity requires BLM authorization and it is determined that the activity may result in more than negligible resource impacts. One example would be activities that require the use of low flying aircraft in crucial wildlife areas.

DESCRIPTION OF STIPULATIONS

The following Table shows resources of concern and stipulations including exceptions, modifications, and waivers. Three types of stipulations could be applied to land use authorizations: 1) no surface occupancy (NSO), 2) timing limitations (TL), and 3) controlled surface use (CSU). Although not a stipulation, areas that are closed to oil and gas leasing and other surface-disturbing activities are also identified in the table.

All other areas are open to oil and gas leasing subject to standard terms and conditions.

Areas identified as NSO are open to oil and gas leasing but surface-disturbing activities cannot be conducted on the surface of the land. Access to oil and gas deposits would require horizontal drilling from outside the boundaries of the NSO areas. NSO areas would be avoidance areas for rights-of-way; no rights-of-ways would be granted in NSO areas unless there are no feasible alternatives. An NSO stipulation cannot be applied to operations authorized under the mining laws without a withdrawal. A withdrawal is not a land use planning decision because it must be approved by the Secretary of Interior. Therefore, unless withdrawn, all public lands are open to

operations conducted under the mining laws subject only to TL and CSU stipulations that are consistent with rights granted under the mining laws.

Areas identified as TL are open to oil and gas leasing but would be closed to surface-disturbing activities during identified time frames. This stipulation would not apply to operation and maintenance activities, including associated vehicle travel, unless otherwise specified.

Areas identified as CSU are open to oil and gas leasing but would require that proposals for surface-disturbing activities be authorized according to the controls and constraints specified.

CLOSED AREAS

Areas identified as closed are not open to oil and gas leasing or other surface-disturbing activities. Closed areas are exclusion areas for rights-of-way. Exceptions, modifications, and waivers do not apply to oil and gas leasing.

EXCEPTIONS, MODIFICATIONS, AND WAIVERS

Stipulations could be excepted, modified, or waived by the authorized officer. An exception exempts the holder of the land use authorization document from the stipulation on a one-time basis. A modification changes the language or provisions of a surface stipulation, either temporarily or permanently. A waiver permanently exempts the surface stipulation. The documented environmental analysis for site specific proposals would need to address proposals to exempt, modify, or waive a surface stipulation.

STANDARD, TERMS, AND CONDITIONS

All surface-disturbing activities are subject to standard terms and conditions. These include the restrictions that are required for proposed actions in order to protect special status species and to comply with the Endangered Species Act. Standard oil and gas lease terms and conditions provide for relocation of proposed operations up to 200 meters and provide for prohibiting surface disturbing operations for a period not to exceed 60 days. The stipulations that are within the parameters of 200 meters and 60 days are considered open to oil and gas leasing subject to standard terms and conditions.

Section 6 of the standard lease terms allows the BLM authorized officer to require such reasonable measures as may be necessary to minimize adverse impacts to other resource values, land uses or users not addressed in the lease stipulations. These measures include, but are not limited to, the environmental best management practices (BMPs) and standard operating procedures shown in Appendix I.

Resource of Concern	Applicable Area	Stipulation Code	Stipulation Description
Floodplains, Riparian areas, Springs, and Public Water Reserves	Planning Area	NSO	No surface-disturbing activities are allowed in active floodplains, public water reserves or within 100 meters of riparian areas along perennial streams and springs. **Exception**: An exception could be authorized if: (a) there are no practical alternatives, (b) impacts could be fully mitigated, or (c) the action is designed to enhance the riparian resource values. **Modification**: None **Waiver:** None **Purpose:** Protect and conserve riparian and floodplains and associated vegetation.
Visual	The following VRM Class II areas (as well as other areas not listed): ● Tables of the Sun mesa tops; Indian Creek SRMA (from I.C. ACEC to FS boundary and Davis and Lavender Canyons); ● Harmony Flat; ● Dripping Canyon/Chicken Corners Area; ● White Canyon and northern tributaries; and ● Lower Castle Creek • Lockhart Basin	CSU	Surface-disturbing activities must meet VRM Class II objectives. **Exception:** Allow for short term use/activities**.** **Modification:** None **Waiver:** None **Purpose:** Protect high quality visual resources.
Scenic Values	Indian Creek ACEC	NSO	Surface-disturbing activities are not allowed. **Exception:** An exception could be granted if activities are short term or if, after an analysis, the authorized officer determines that the project could meet VRM I objectives. Small signs, kiosks, route designators, etc. used to manage activities or resources could also be allowed. **Modification:** None

Resource of Concern	Applicable Area	Stipulation Code	Stipulation Description
			Waiver: None **Purpose:** Protect relevant and important scenic values.
Scenic Values	Valley of the Gods ACEC	Closed	Closed to oil and gas leasing and other surface-disturbing activities. **Exception**: Allow for addition of utilities in existing utility corridors that may overlap the ACEC. Other projects may be allowed if activities are short term or if, after an analysis, the authorized officer determines that the project could meet VRM I objectives. Small signs, kiosks, route designators, etc. used to manage activities or resources could also be allowed. **Modification**: None **Waiver**: None **Purpose**: Protect relevant and important scenic values.
Scenic, Fish, Recreation, wildlife, cultural, and ecological ORVs	Colorado River #2 WSR	NSO	Surface-disturbing activities are not allowed. **Exception**: An exception may be granted if, after an analysis, the authorized officer determines that the disturbance would be short term or could benefit the outstandingly remarkable values. Small signs, kiosks, route designators, etc used to manage activities or resources could also be allowed. **Waiver: None** **Modification: None** **Purpose:** Protect Outstandingly Remarkable Values (ORVs).
Scenic, Fish, Recreation, wildlife, cultural, and ecological ORVs	Colorado River #3 WSR	Closed	Closed to oil and gas leasing and other surface-disturbing activities. **Exception**: None **Modification**: None **Waiver**: None **Purpose:** Protect Outstandingly Remarkable Values (ORVs).
Scenic, Recreation, and wildlife ORVs.	Dark Canyon WSR	Closed	Closed to oil and gas leasing and other surface-disturbing activities. **Exception**: None **Modification**: None **Waiver**: None **Purpose**: Protect Outstandingly Remarkable Values (ORVs).

Resource of Concern	Applicable Area	Stipulation Code	Stipulation Description
Scenic, fish, recreation, wildlife, and ecological ORVs.	San Juan River #5 WSR	Closed	Closed to oil and gas leasing and other surface-disturbing activities. **Exception**: None **Modification**: None **Waiver**: None **Purpose**: Protect Outstandingly Remarkable Values (ORVs).
Non-WSA Lands with Wilderness Characteristics	Mancos Mesa; Grand Gulch; Nokai Dome East; and Nokai Dome West	Closed	Closed to oil and gas leasing and other surface-disturbing activities. **Exception**: An exception may be granted if activities are short term or if, after an analysis, the authorized officer determines that the project would meet VRM Class II objectives and would not impair or could benefit maintenance of wilderness characteristics. Small signs, kiosks, route designators, etc. used to manage activities or resources could be allowed. **Modification**: None **Waiver**: None **Purpose**: Protect wilderness characteristics.
Non-WSA Lands with Wilderness Characteristics	Dark Canyon	NSO	Closed to surface-disturbing activities. **Exception**: An exception may be granted if activities are short term or if, after an analysis, the authorized officer determines that the project would meet VRM Class II objectives and would not impair or could benefit maintenance of wilderness characteristics. Small signs, kiosks, route designators, etc. used to manage activities or resources could be allowed. **Modification**: None **Waiver**: None **Purpose**: Protect wilderness characteristics.
Wilderness Values	Wilderness Study Areas (WSAs)	Closed	Closed to oil and gas leasing and other surface-disturbing activities. **Exception**: None **Modification**: None **Waiver**: None **Purpose**: Protect wilderness values.

Resource of Concern	Applicable Area	Stipulation Code	Stipulation Description
Fragile Soils/Slopes	Planning Area	CSU	New surface disturbance/construction on slopes between 21-40% would require: an erosion control strategy, reclamation and site plan with a design approved by the BLM prior to construction and maintenance. **Exception:** None **Modification:** None **Waiver:** None **Purpose:** Protect soils and avoid erosion on sloped embankments.
Fragile Soils/Slopes	Planning Area	NSO	New surface-disturbing activities are not allowed on slopes greater than 40%. **Exception:** If after an analysis the authorized officer determines that it would cause undue or unnecessary degradation to pursue other placement alternatives; surface occupancy in the NSO may be authorized. Additionally, a plan would be submitted by the operator and approved by BLM prior to construction and maintenance. **Modification:** None **Waiver:** None **Purpose:** Protect soils, avoid erosion, and maintain public health and safety in sloped embankments.
Cultural	Planning Area	CSU	Cultural properties eligible for or listed on the National Register of Historic Places would be surrounded by an avoidance area sufficient to avoid impacts. (Although oil and gas activity must also meet this standard, a CSU lease stipulation is not necessary since this can be accomplished under the terms of the standard lease form.) **Exceptions:** An exception could be granted if the BLM authorized officer determines that avoidance of direct and indirect impacts to historic properties is not feasible (e.g. avoidance may cause unacceptable damage to other public land resources or affect valid existing rights). **Modification:** None **Waiver:** None **Purpose:** Protect and preserve cultural resources and/or sites of religious significance to Native Americans.
Cultural	Alkali Ridge , National Historic Landmark (2146 acres)	NSO	No surface-disturbing activities are allowed. **Exceptions:** An exception could be granted if after an analysis the authorized officer determines that the project would be in the public

Resource of Concern	Applicable Area	Stipulation Code	Stipulation Description
			interest. **Modification:** None **Waiver:** None **Purpose:** Protect and preserve cultural resources and/or sites of religious significance to Native Americans.
Cultural	Alkali Ridge ACEC	CSU	Cultural properties eligible for or listed on the National Register of Historic Places would be surrounded by an avoidance area sufficient to avoid direct and indirect impacts. When siting oil and gas facilities, avoidance may require that a facility be moved farther than allowed under the standard lease terms and conditions. **Exceptions**: An exception could be granted if the BLM authorized officer determines that avoidance of direct and indirect impacts to historic properties is not feasible (e.g. avoidance may cause unacceptable damage to other public land resources or affect valid existing rights). **Modification:** None **Waiver:** None **Purpose:** Maintain the relevant and important cultural and historic values.
Cultural	Cedar Mesa SRMA (Comb Ridge Mngt. Zone) 30,752 acres	NSO	No surface-disturbing activities are allowed. **Exceptions:** An exception could be granted if after an analysis the authorized officer determines that the project would be in the public interest. **Modification:** None **Waiver:** None **Purpose:** Protect and preserve cultural resources and/or sites of religious significance to Native Americans.
Cultural	Hovenweep ACEC (visual emphasis zone 880 acres)	NSO	No surface-disturbing activities are allowed. **Exceptions:** An exception could be granted if after an analysis the authorized officer determines that the project would be in the public interest. **Modification:** None **Waiver:** None **Purpose:** Protect visual resources as seen from the Monument.

Resource of Concern	Applicable Area	Stipulation Code	Stipulation Description
Cultural	Hovenweep ACEC (area exclusive of visual emphasis zone)	CSU	Cultural properties eligible for or listed on the National Register of Historic Places would be surrounded by an avoidance area sufficient to avoid direct and indirect impacts. When siting oil and gas facilities, avoidance may require that a facility be moved farther than allowed under the standard lease terms and conditions. **Exceptions:** An exception could be granted if the BLM authorized officer determines that avoidance of direct and indirect impacts to historic properties is not feasible (e.g. avoidance may cause unacceptable damage to other public land resources or affect valid existing rights). **Modification:** None **Waiver:** None **Purpose:** Maintain the relevant and important cultural and historic values.
Cultural	Shay Canyon ACEC	NSO	No surface-disturbing activities are allowed. **Exceptions:** An exception could be granted if after an analysis the authorized officer determines that the project would not impair or could benefit the relevant and important values. **Modification:** None **Waiver:** None **Purpose:** Maintain the relevant and important cultural and historic resource values.
Relict Vegetation and Visual	Lavender Mesa ACEC	NSO	Surface-disturbing activities are not allowed on the mesa top. **Exceptions:** An exception could be granted for test plots and facilities necessary to study the plant communities, restoration/reclamation activities if, after an analysis, the authorized officer determines that the project would not impair or could benefit the relevant and important values. **Modification:** None **Waiver:** None **Purpose:** Protect relevant and important vegetation and visual values.
Scenic, Cultural, and Wildlife Values	San Juan River ACEC	NSO	No surface-disturbing activities are allowed. **Exception:** An exception could be granted if activities are short term or after an analysis the authorized officer determines that the project would benefit the relevant and important values. Small signs, kiosks, route designators, etc used to manage activities or resources could also be allowed.

Resource of Concern	Applicable Area	Stipulation Code	Stipulation Description
			Modification: None **Waiver:** None **Purpose:** Protect relevant and important scenic, cultural and wildlife values.
Recreation (Developed recreation sites)	Planning Area	NSO	No surface-disturbing activities allowed within one quarter mile of campgrounds and within 200 meters of other developed recreation sites. **Exception:** An exception could be granted if the disturbance is related to recreational infrastructure support or if, after an assessment, it is determined that the visual intrusions and noise can be mitigated so as to not adversely affect the visitor experience. **Modification:** None **Waiver:** None **Purpose:** Preserve and protect the federal investment in recreation sites and enhance visitor experiences.
Recreation	San Juan River SRMA (except segment #5 WSR)	NSO	No surface-disturbing activities are allowed. **Exceptions:** An exception may be granted if, after an analysis, the authorized officer determines that the disturbance is related to or can be shown to benefit recreational experiences. **Modification:** None. **Waiver:** None. **Purpose:** Preserve and protect the federal investment in developed and potential recreation sites, and the recreational opportunities and visitors' San Juan River experience.
Wildlife – Desert Bighorn Sheep	Desert Bighorn Lambing and Rutting Areas (Map 14)	TL	No surface-disturbing activities or occupancy are allowed from April 1 to June 15 for lambing and from October 15 to December 15 for rutting. **Exception:** The Field Manager may grant an exception after an analysis by the authorized officer determines that the animals are not present in the project area or the activity can be completed so as to not adversely affect the animals. Routine operation and maintenance is allowed. **Modification:** The Field Manager may modify the boundaries of the stipulation area if a portion of the area is not being used as desert bighorn lambing or rutting grounds. **Waiver:** A waiver may be granted if the habitat is determined as unsuitable for lambing and/or rutting grounds.

Resource of Concern	Applicable Area	Stipulation Code	Stipulation Description
			Purpose: To minimize disturbance within desert bighorn lambing and rutting grounds.
Wildlife - Gunnison Sage-grouse	Lek Habitat – Within 0.6 miles of active strutting ground (Map 14)	CSU	No surface-disturbing activities are allowed within 0.6 miles of an active strutting ground. **Exception:** The Field Manager my grant an exception if, after an analysis, the authorized officer determines that the animals are not present in the project area or the activity can be completed so as to not adversely affect the animals. **Modification**: The Field Manager may modify the boundaries of the stipulation area if a portion of the area is not being used as sage-grouse habitat. **Waiver:** A waiver may be granted if the habitat is determined as unsuitable for sage-grouse. **Purpose:** To protect and conserve Gunnison Sage-grouse and their habitat.
Wildlife – Gunnison Sage-grouse	Year-round Habitat (between 0.6 and 4.0 miles of active strutting ground) (Map 14)	CSU	Avoid surface-disturbing activities within year round habitat. If activities cannot be avoided, then an operating plan which incorporates the applicable conservation measures outlined in the Gunnison Sage-grouse Rangewide Conservation Plan (2005, as amended) must be approved by the BLM prior to surface-disturbing activities. Conservation measures from this plan include, but are not limited to: Fences would be fitted with visual devices to minimize grouse collisions; Road length and width would be minimized and vehicles not exceed 35 mph; Bury power lines or place raptor perching deterrents on power poles; Any necessary equipment would produce minimal noise, including compressors, vehicles, and other sources of noise by using mufflers or noise suppression devices. **Exception:** The Field Manager may grant an exception after an analysis the authorized officer determines that the animals are not present in the project area. **Modification**: The Field Manager may modify the boundaries of the stipulation area if a portion of the area is not being used as sage-grouse habitat. **Waiver:** A waiver may be granted if the habitat is determined as unsuitable for sage-grouse.

Resource of Concern	Applicable Area	Stipulation Code	Stipulation Description
			Purpose: To protect and conserve Gunnison Sage-grouse and their habitat.
Wildlife – Antelope	Pronghorn Fawning Grounds (Map 14)	TL	No surface-disturbing activities from May 1 to June 15 within pronghorn fawning grounds. (Although oil and gas activity must also meet this requirement, a lease stipulation is not necessary since this can be accomplished under the terms of the standard lease form.) **Exception:** The Field Manager may grant an exception after an analysis the authorized officer determines that the animals are not present in the project area or the activity can be completed so as to not adversely affect the animals. Routine operation and maintenance is allowed. **Modification:** The Field Manager may modify the boundaries of the stipulation area if a portion of the area is not being used as pronghorn fawning grounds. **Waiver:** May be granted if the fawning grounds are determined to be unsuitable or unoccupied and there is no reasonable likelihood of future use of the fawning grounds. **Purpose:** To minimize stress and disturbance during crucial antelope birthing time.
Wildlife – Deer	Deer Winter Range (Map 14)	TL	No surface-disturbing activities from November 15 to April 15. **Exception:** The Field Manager may grant an exception if, after an analysis, the authorized officer determines that the animals are not present in the project area or the activity can be completed so as to not adversely affect the animals. Routine operation and maintenance is allowed. **Modification:** The Field Manager may modify the boundaries of the stipulation area if a portion of the area is not being used as deer winter range. **Waiver:** May be granted if the deer winter range is determined to be unsuitable or unoccupied and there is no reasonable likelihood of future use of the deer winter range. **Purpose:** To minimize stress and disturbance to deer during crucial winter months.
Wildlife – Elk	Elk Winter Range (Map 14)	TL	No surface-disturbing activities from November 15 to April 15. **Exception:** The Field Manager may grant an exception if, after an analysis, the authorized officer determines that the animals are not present in the project area or the activity can be completed so as to not adversely

Resource of Concern	Applicable Area	Stipulation Code	Stipulation Description
			affect the animals. Routine operation and maintenance is allowed. **Modification:** The Field Manager may modify the boundaries of the stipulation area if a portion of the area is not being used as elk winter range. **Waiver:** May be granted if the elk winter range is determined to be unsuitable or unoccupied and there is no reasonable likelihood of future use of the elk winter range. **Purpose:** To minimize stress and disturbance to elk during crucial winter months.
Special Status Species – Mexican Spotted Owl (MSO)	MSO Designated Critical Habitat and Suitable Habitat	CSU/TL	In areas that contain suitable habitat for MSO or designated Critical Habitat, actions would be avoided or restricted that may cause stress and disturbance during nesting and rearing of their young. Appropriate measures would depend on whether the action is temporary or permanent and whether it occurs within or outside the owl nesting season. A temporary action is completed prior to the following breeding season leaving no permanent structures and resulting in no permanent habitat loss. A permanent action continues for more than one breeding season and/or causes a loss of owl habitat or displaces owls through disturbances, i.e., creation of a permanent structure. Current avoidance and minimization measures include the following: Surveys will be required prior to implementation of the proposed action. All surveys must be conducted by qualified individual(s) acceptable to the BLM. Assess habitat suitability for both nesting and foraging using accepted habitat models in conjunction with field reviews. Apply the conservation measures below if project activities occur within 0.5 mile of suitable owl habitat. Determine potential effects of actions to owls and their habitat. Document type of activity, acreage and location of direct habitat impacts, type and extent of indirect impacts relative to location of suitable owl habitat. Document if action is temporary or permanent. Activities may require monitoring throughout the duration of the project. To ensure desired results are being achieved, minimization measures will be evaluated, and, if necessary, Section 7 consultation reinitiated. Any activity that includes water production should be managed to ensure maintenance of enhancement of riparian habitat.

Resource of Concern	Applicable Area	Stipulation Code	Stipulation Description
			Where technically and economically feasible, use directional drilling or multiple wells from the same pad to reduce surface disturbance and eliminate drilling in canyon habitat suitable for MSO nesting. For all temporary actions that may impact owls or suitable habitat: 1. If the action occurs entirely outside of the owl breeding season from **March 1 through August 31**, and leaves no permanent structure or permanent habitat disturbance, the action can proceed without an occupancy survey. 2. If the action will occur during a breeding season, a survey for owls is required prior to commencing the activity. If owls are found, the activity should be delayed until outside of the breeding season. 3. Rehabilitate access routes created by the project through such means as raking out scars, re-vegetation, gating access points, etc. For all permanent actions that may impact owls or suitable habitat: 1. Survey two consecutive years for owls according to accepted protocol prior to commencing activities. 2. If owls are found, no disturbing actions will occur within 0.5 mile of an identified site. If nest site is unknown, no activity will occur within the designated current and historic Protected Activity Center (PAC). 3. Avoid permanent structures within 0.5 mile of suitable habitat unless surveyed and not occupied. 4. Reduce noise emissions (e.g., use hospital-grade mufflers) to 45 dBA at 0.5 mile from suitable habitat, including canyon rims. Placement of permanent noise-generating facilities should be contingent upon a noise analysis to ensure noise does not encroach upon a 0.5 mile buffer for suitable habitat, including canyon rims. 5. Limit disturbances to and within suitable habitat by staying on designated and/or approved routes. 6. Limit new access routes created by the project. Modifications to the Surface Use Plan of Operations may be required in order to protect the MSO and/or habitat in accordance with Section 6 of the lease terms, the Endangered Species Act, and the regulations at 43 CFR 3101.1-2.

Resource of Concern	Applicable Area	Stipulation Code	Stipulation Description
			Purpose: To protect MSO habitat. **Exception:** An exception may be granted by the Field Manager if authorization is obtained from USFWS (through applicable provisions of the ESA). The Field Manager may also grant an exception if an analysis indicates that the nature or the conduct of the actions would not impair the primary constituent element determined necessary for the survival and recovery of the MSO and USFWS concurs with this determination. **Modification:** The Field Manager may modify the boundaries of the stipulation area if an analysis indicates and USFWS (through applicable provisions of the ESA) determines a portion of the area is not being used as Critical Habitat. **Waiver:** A waiver may be granted if the MSO is de-listed and the Critical Habitat is determined by USFWS as not necessary for the survival and recovery of the MSO.
Special Status Species – Bald Eagles	Nest sites and winter roost areas within suitable habitat	CSU/TL	In areas that contain habitat for the Bald Eagle, actions would be avoided or restricted that may cause stress and disturbance during roosting and/or nesting and rearing of their young. Appropriate measures will depend on whether the action is temporary or permanent, and whether it occurs within or outside the Bald Eagle breeding or roosting season. A temporary action is completed prior to the following breeding or roosting season leaving no permanent structures and resulting in no permanent habitat loss. A permanent action continues for more than one breeding or roosting season and/or causes a loss of eagle habitat or displaces eagles through disturbances, i.e., creation of a permanent structure. Current avoidance and minimization measures include the following: 1. Surveys would be required prior to operations unless species occupancy and distribution information is complete and available. All surveys must be conducted by qualified individual(s), and be conducted according to protocol. 2. Lease activities would require monitoring throughout the duration of the project. To ensure desired results are being achieved, minimization measures would be evaluated. 3. Water production would be managed to ensure maintenance or enhancement of riparian habitat. 4. Temporary activities within 1.0 mile of nest sites would not occur during the breeding season of **January 1 to August 31**, unless the area has been surveyed according to protocol and determined

Resource of Concern	Applicable Area	Stipulation Code	Stipulation Description
			to be unoccupied. 5. Temporary activities within O.5 miles of winter roost areas, e.g., cottonwood galleries, would not occur during the winter roost season of **November 1 to March 31**, unless the area has been surveyed according to protocol and determined to be unoccupied. 6. No permanent infrastructure would be placed within 1.0 mile of nest sites. 7. No permanent infrastructure would be placed within 0.5 miles of winter roost areas. 8. Remove big game carrion to 100 feet from on lease roadways occurring within Bald Eagle foraging range. 9. Avoid loss or disturbance to large cottonwood gallery riparian habitats. 10. Where technically and economically feasible, use directional drilling or multiple wells from the same pad to reduce surface disturbance and eliminate drilling in suitable habitat. Utilize direction drilling to avoid direct impacts to large cottonwood gallery riparian habitats. Ensure that such direction drilling does not intercept or degrade alluvial aquifers. 11. All areas of surface disturbance within riparian areas and/or adjacent uplands should be re-vegetated with native species. Additional measures may also be employed to avoid or minimize effects to the species between the lease stage and lease development stage. These additional measures would be developed and implemented in coordination with the USFWS to ensure continued compliance with the Bald Eagle Protection Act. **Purpose:** To protect Bald Eagle habitat. **Exception:** An exception may be granted by the Field Manager if authorization is obtained from USFWS. The Field Manager may also grant an exception if an analysis indicates that the nature of the conduct of the actions, as proposed or conditioned, would not impair the habitat and physical requirements determined necessary for the survival of the Bald Eagles. **Modification:** The Field Manager may modify the boundaries of the stipulation area if an analysis indicates, and USFWS determines that a portion of the area is not being used as Bald Eagle nesting or roosting territories.

Resource of Concern	Applicable Area	Stipulation Code	Stipulation Description
			Waiver: May be granted if there is no reasonable likelihood of site occupancy over a minimum 10 year period.
Special Status Species – Southwestern Willow Flycatcher and (Western) Yellow-billed Cuckoo	Southwestern Willow Flycatcher and (Western) Yellow-billed Cuckoo Habitat	CSU/TL	In areas that contain riparian habitat within the range for the Southwestern Willow Flycatcher and Western Yellow-billed Cuckoo, actions would be avoided or restricted that may cause stress and disturbance during nesting and rearing of their young. Appropriate measures will depend on whether the action is temporary or permanent, and whether it occurs within or outside the nesting season. A temporary action is completed prior to the following breeding season leaving no permanent structures and resulting in no permanent habitat loss. A permanent action continues for more than one breeding season and/or causes a loss of habitat or displaces flycatchers through disturbances, i.e., creation of a permanent structure. Current avoidance and minimization measures include the following: 1. Surveys would be required prior to operations unless species occupancy and distribution information is complete and available. All surveys must be conducted by qualified individual(s) and be conducted according to protocol. 2. Activities would require monitoring throughout the duration of the project. To ensure desired results are being achieved, minimization measures would be evaluated and, if necessary, Section 7 consultation reinitiated. 3. Water production would be managed to ensure maintenance or enhancement of riparian habitat. 4. Where technically and economically feasible, use directional drilling or multiple wells from the same pad to reduce surface disturbance and eliminate drilling in suitable riparian habitat. Ensure that such directional drilling does not intercept or degrade alluvial aquifers. 5. Activities would maintain a 300 feet buffer from suitable riparian habitat year long. 6. Activities within 0.25 mile of occupied breeding habitat would not occur during the breeding season of **May 1 to August 15**. 7. Ensure that water extraction or disposal practices do not result in change of hydrologic regime that would result in loss or degradation of riparian habitat. 8. Re-vegetate with native species all areas of surface disturbance within riparian areas and/or adjacent land.

Resource of Concern	Applicable Area	Stipulation Code	Stipulation Description
			Additional measures to avoid or minimize effects to the species may be developed and implemented in consultation with the USFWS between the lease sale stage and lease development stage to ensure continued compliance with the ESA. **Purpose:** To protect Southwestern Willow Flycatcher habitat. **Exception:** An exception may be granted by the Field Manager if authorization is obtained from USFWS (through applicable provisions of the ESA). The Field Manager may also grant an exception if an environmental analysis indicates that the nature of the conduct of the actions, as proposed or conditioned, would not impair the primary constituent element determined necessary for the survival and recovery of the Southwestern Willow Flycatcher and USFWS concurs with this determination. **Modification:** The Field Manager may modify the boundaries of the stipulation area if an environmental analysis indicates, and USFWS (through applicable provisions of the ESA) determines that a portion of the area is not being used as Southwestern Willow Flycatcher habitat. **Waiver:** May be granted if the Southwestern Willow Flycatcher is de-listed and if USFWS determines it is not necessary for the survival and recovery of the Southwestern Willow Flycatcher.
Special Status Species – Critical Habitat of the Endangered Colorado River Fishes	Colorado River, San Juan River, and all associated back waters 48,513 acres	NSO	Surface-disturbing activities within the 100 year floodplain of the Colorado River and San Juan River would not be allowed. Other avoidance and minimization measures include: • Surveys will be required prior to operations unless species occupancy and distribution information is complete and available. All surveys must be conducted by qualified individuals. • Lease activities will require monitoring throughout the duration of the project. To ensure desired results are being achieved, minimization measures will be evaluated and, if necessary, Section 7 consultation reinitiated. • Water production will be managed to ensure maintenance or enhancement of riparian habitat. • Avoid loss or disturbance of riparian habitats. • Conduct watershed analysis for leases in designated critical habitat and overlapping major tributaries in order to determine toxicity risk

Resource of Concern	Applicable Area	Stipulation Code	Stipulation Description
			from permanent facilities • Implement the Utah Oil and Gas Pipeline Crossing Guidance. • In areas adjacent to 100 year floodplains, particularly in systems prone to flash floods, analyze the risk for flash floods to impact facilities, and use closed loop drilling, and pipeline burial or suspension according to the Utah Oil and Gas Pipeline Crossing Guidance, to minimize the potential for equipment damage and resulting leaks or spills. **Purpose:** To protect critical habitat of the endangered Colorado River fishes. **Exception:** An exception may be granted by the Field Manager if: 1) There is no practical alternative, and 2) the development would enhance riparian/aquatic values. This exception would require consultation with the USFWS. The Field Manager may also grant an exception if an environmental analysis indicates that the nature or the conduct of the actions, as proposed or conditioned, would not impair the primary constituent element determined necessary for the survival and recovery of the Endangered Colorado River fishes. **Modification:** The Field Manager may modify the boundaries of the stipulation area if an environmental analysis indicates, and USFWS (through applicable provisions of the ESA) determines a portion of the area is not being used as Critical Habitat. **Waiver:** A waiver may be granted if the Endangered Colorado River Fishes are de-listed and the Critical Habitat is determined by USFWS as not necessary for the survival and recovery of the Endangered Colorado River fishes.

Resource of Concern	Applicable Area	Stipulation Code	Stipulation Description
Special Status Species – California Condor	Nest sites and roost areas within suitable habitat.	CSU/TL	In areas that contain habitat for California Condors, actions would be avoided or restricted if the area is known or suspected to be used by condors that may cause stress and disturbance to condors. Application of appropriate measures will depend on whether the action is temporary or permanent, and whether it occurs within or outside potential habitat. A temporary action is completed prior to the following important season of use, leaving no permanent structures and resulting in no permanent habitat loss. This would include consideration for habitat functionality. A permanent action continues for more than one season of habitat use, and/or causes a loss of condor habitat function or displaces condors through continued disturbance (i.e. creation of a permanent structure requiring repetitious maintenance, or emits disruptive levels of noise). Current avoidance and minimization measures include the following: 1. Surveys will be required prior to operations unless species occupancy and distribution information is complete and available. All Surveys must be conducted by qualified individual(s) approved by the BLM, and must be conducted according to approved protocol. 2. If surveys result in positive identification of condor use, all lease activities will require monitoring throughout the duration of the project to ensure desired results of applied mitigation and protection. Minimization measures will be evaluated during development and, if necessary, Section 7 consultation may be reinitiated. 3. Temporary activities within 1.0 mile of nest sites will not occur during the breeding season. 4. Temporary activities within 0.5 miles of established roosting sites or areas will not occur during the season of use, August 1 to November 31, unless the area has been surveyed according to protocol and determined to be unoccupied. 5. No permanent infrastructure will be placed within 1.0 mile of nest sites. 6. No permanent infrastructure will be placed within 0.5 miles of established roosting sites or areas. 7. Remove big game carrion to 100 feet from on lease roadways occurring within foraging range.

Resource of Concern	Applicable Area	Stipulation Code	Stipulation Description
			8. Where technically and economically feasible, use directional drilling or multiple wells from the same pad to reduce surface disturbance and eliminate drilling in suitable habitat. Utilize directional drilling to avoid direct impacts to large cottonwood gallery riparian habitats. Ensure that such directional drilling does not intercept or degrade alluvial aquifers. 9. Reinitiating of section 7 consultation with the Service will be sought immediately if mortality or disturbance to California Condors is anticipated as a result of project activities. Additional site-specific measures may also be employed to avoid or minimize effects to the species. These additional measures will be developed and implemented in consultation with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service to ensure continued compliance with the ESA. Additional measures may also be employed to avoid or minimize effects to the species between the lease sale and lease development stages. These additional measures will be developed and implemented in consultation with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service to ensure continued compliance with the Endangered Species Act. **Purpose:** To protect California Condor habitat. **Exception:** An exception may be granted by the Field Manager if authorization is obtained from USFWS. The Field Manager may also grant an exception if an analysis indicates that the nature of the conduct of the actions, as proposed or conditioned, would not impair the primary constituent element determined necessary for the survival and recovery of the California Condor and USFWS concurs with this determination. **Modification:** The Field Manager may modify the boundaries of the stipulation area if an analysis indicates, and USFWS determines that a portion of the area is not being used as California Condor nesting or roosting territories. **Waiver:** May be granted if there is no reasonable likelihood of site occupancy over a minimum 10-year period.
Special Status Species – Navajo Sedge	Navajo sedge habitat	CSU	In areas that contain habitat for Navajo sedge, actions would be avoided or restricted if that area is known or suspected to be habitat for Navajo sedge and the action may cause stress or disturbance to the plant. 1. Site inventories: a. Must be conducted to determine habitat suitability,

Resource of Concern	Applicable Area	Stipulation Code	Stipulation Description
			b. Are required in known or potential habitat for all areas proposed for surface disturbance prior to initiation of project activities, at a time when the plant can be detected, and during appropriate flowering periods, c. Documentation should include, but not be limited to individual plant locations and suitable habitat distributions, and d. All surveys must be conducted by qualified individuals. 2. Lease activities will require monitoring throughout the duration of the project. To ensure desired results are being achieved, minimization measures will be evaluated and, if necessary, Section 7 consultation reinitiated. 3. Project activities must be designed to avoid direct disturbance to populations and to individual plants: a. Designs will avoid concentrating water flows or sediments into plant occupied habitat. b. Construction will occur down slope of plants and populations where feasible; if well pads and roads must be sited upslope, buffers of 100 feet minimum between surface disturbances and plants and populations will be incorporated. c. Where populations occur within 200 ft. of well pads, establish a buffer or fence the individuals or groups of individuals during and post-construction. d. Areas for avoidance will be visually identifiable in the field, e.g., flagging, temporary fencing, rebar, etc. e. For surface pipelines, use a 10 foot buffer from any plant locations: i. If on a slope, use stabilizing construction techniques to ensure the pipelines don't move towards the population. 4. For riparian/wetland-associated species, e.g. Navajo Sedge, avoid loss or disturbance of riparian habitats: a. Ensure that water extraction or disposal practices do not result in change of hydrologic regime. 5. Limit disturbances to and within suitable habitat by staying on designated routes. 6. Limit new access routes created by the project.

Resource of Concern	Applicable Area	Stipulation Code	Stipulation Description
			7. Place signing to limit ATV travel in sensitive areas. 8. Implement dust abatement practices near occupied plant habitat. 9. All disturbed areas will be re-vegetated with native species comprised of species indigenous to the area. 10. Post construction monitoring for invasive species will be required. 11. Where technically and economically feasible, use directional drilling or multiple wells from the same pad to reduce surface disturbance and eliminate drilling in plant habitat. Ensure that such directional drilling does not intercept or degrade alluvial aquifers. Additional measures to avoid or minimize effects to the species may be developed and implemented in consultation with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service between the lease sale stage and lease development stage to ensure continued compliance with the ESA. **Purpose**: To protect Navajo Sedge habitat **Exception**: An exception may be granted by the Field Manager if authorization is obtained from USFWS (through applicable provisions of the ESA). The Field Manager may also grant an exception if an environmental analysis indicated that the nature of the conduct of the actions, as proposed or conditioned, would not impair the survival and recovery of the Navajo Sedge and USFWS concurs with this determination. **Modification:** The Field Manager may modify the boundaries of the stipulation area if an environmental analysis indicates, and USFWS (through applicable provisions of the ESA) determines that a portion of the area is no longer suitable habitat for Navajo Sedge. **Waiver:** May be granted if the Navajo Sedge is delisted and if USFWS determines it is not necessary for the survival and recovery of the Navajo Sedge.
Wildlife – Shorebirds and Waterfowl	Hovenweep ACEC (Cajon Pond)	TL	No surface-disturbing activities allowed from March 1 to June 30. **Exceptions**: None **Modification**: None **Waiver**: None **Purpose**: To minimize stress and disturbance to waterfowl during courtship and nesting season.

APPENDIX C. STATE OF UTAH AIR QUALITY MITIGATION

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK.

State of Utah

JON M. HUNTSMAN, JR.
Governor

GARY R. HERBERT
Lieutenant Governor

June 6, 2008

Selma Sierra
State Director
BLM Utah State Office
P.O. Box 45155
Salt Lake City, Utah 84145-0155

Dear Director Sierra:

This letter addresses air quality mitigation strategies for the six proposed Resource Management Plans being updated within the State of Utah. The state appreciates BLM's interest in this important issue.

It is the policy of the State of Utah to protect public health and the environment from the harmful effects of air pollution, to ensure that the air in Utah meets standards established under federal and state law, and to maintain an environment that is conducive to continued economic vitality and growth.

The Department of Interior monitors ozone at National Parks in the intermountain west, including: Mesa Verde National Park in Colorado, Grand Canyon National Park in Arizona, Great Basin National Park in Nevada, and Canyonlands National Park in Utah. These sites reflect conditions in areas that have not been subject to intensive development and are therefore generally indicative of background conditions. Monitoring data at these locations demonstrates a gradual upward trend in ozone levels, raising questions about ozone levels region-wide. The state believes additional information is needed regarding current conditions and the potential impacts from increasing development activity, including oil and gas activity. This information should inform future BLM decision making, but managers should not defer management actions in anticipation of better information.

Fortunately, ozone related impacts can be reduced if certain mitigation measures are required on new oil and gas related emission sources. In fact, several neighboring states currently encourage application of just such measures. BLM should include interim nitrogen oxide control measures provided by the state as a required condition of lease approval. These control measures are consistent with control measures suggested by neighboring states and jurisdictions. The state recognizes that performance standards will continue to evolve and supports technological flexibility, provided control measures are at least as effective as those in place elsewhere within the region at the time of site-specific authorization. Performance standards representing the current regional standard can be found in the *Four Corners Air*

Quality Task Force Report of Mitigation Options, DRAFT: Version 7, June 22, 2007. These standards are 2 g/bhp-hr for engines less than 300 HP and 1 g/bhp-hr for engines over 300 HP.

The State of Utah will continue to work with the BLM and others through efforts such as the Four Corners Task Force to address these issues. The state appreciates your cooperation in working to protect air quality related values. If you have any questions about our position, please contact me at (801) 537-9802.

Sincerely,

John Harja
Director
Public Lands Policy Coordination
5110 State Office Building
Salt Lake City, Utah 84114-1107
(801) 537-9802

Cheryl Heying
Director
Division of Air Quality
150 North, 1950 West
Salt Lake City, Utah 84114
(801) 536-4000

APPENDIX D. STATE HISTORIC PRESERVATION OFFICE CORRESPONDENCE

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK.

State of Utah

JON M. HUNTSMAN, JR.
Governor

GARY R. HERBERT
Lieutenant Governor

Department of Community and Culture

PALMER DePAULIS
Executive Director

State History

PHILIP F. NOTARIANNI
Division Director

August 25, 2008

Thomas Heinlein
Manager, Monticello Field Office
Bureau of Land Management
P. O. Box 7
Monticello UT 84535

RE: Monticello Field OFfice Resource Management Plan

In Reply Please Refer to Case No. 07-2037

Dear Mr. Heinlein:

The Utah State Historic Preservation Office received your request for our comment on the above-referenced project on August 20, 2008.

We concur with your determinations of **No Adverse Effect** for the management plan.

This letter serves as our comment on the determinations you have made, within the consultation process specified in §36CFR800.4. If you have questions, please contact me at (801) 533-3555 or jdykman@utah.gov.

As ever,

James L. Dykmann
Deputy State Historic Preservation Officer - Archaeology

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK.

APPENDIX E. UNITED STATES FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE CORRESPONDENCE

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK.

United States Department of the Interior
FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE
UTAH FIELD OFFICE
2369 WEST ORTON CIRCLE, SUITE 50
WEST VALLEY CITY, UTAH 84119

October 29, 2008

In Reply Refer To
FWS/R6
ES/UT
08-F-0068
6-UT-08-F-024

Memorandum

To: Field Office Manager, Bureau of Land Management, Monticello Field Office, P.O. Box 7, Monticello, Utah 84535

From: Utah Field Supervisor, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services, West Valley City, Utah

Subject: Biological Opinion for BLM Resource Management Plan, Monticello Field Office

This document transmits the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service's (Service) biological opinion based on our review of potential activities described and authorized under the Resource Management Plan (RMP) for the Bureau of Land Management's (BLM) Monticello Field Office (MFO) and their potential effects on the federally threatened Mexican spotted owl (*Strix occidentalis lucida*), Navajo sedge (*Carex specuicola)*, and federally endangered southwestern willow flycatcher (*Empidonax traillii extimus*), California condor (*Gymnogyps californianus*), Colorado pikeminnow (*Ptychocheilus lucius*), humpback chub (*Gila cypha*), bonytail (*Gila elegans*), and razorback sucker (*Xyrauchen texanus*) in accordance with Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act (Act) of 1973, as amended (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.). In addition, this document includes the Conference Opinion for the candidate species yellow-billed cuckoo (*Coccyzus americanus*), and the experimental, non-essential population of the endangered California condor (*Gymnogyps californianus*). Critical habitat designated for the Mexican spotted owl on February 01, 2001 was re-designated on August 31, 2004 (66 FR 8530, 69 FR 53181). Critical habitat was designated for the listed Colorado fish (Colorado pikeminnow, humpback chub, bonytail, and razorback sucker) on March 21, 1994 (59 FR 13374). Critical habitat was designated for the southwestern willow flycatcher on October 12, 2004 (69 FR 60705); critical habitat for this species does not occur within the MFO planning area. Your request for initiation of formal consultation for all aforementioned species was received on September 30, 2008.

Proposed activities identified in the proposed Monticello RMP are categorized into 19 programs, as follows:

Air Quality
Cultural Resource Management
Paleontological Resources Management
Fire Management
Healthy and Safety Management
Lands and Realty Management
Livestock Grazing Management
Minerals Management
Non-WSA Lands with Wilderness Characteristics Management
Recreation Management
Riparian Area Management
Soils and Watershed Management
Special Designations Management
Special Status Species Management
Travel Management
Vegetation Management
Visual Resource Management
Wildlife and Fisheries Management
Woodland Resources Management

This biological opinion is based on information provided in the September 30th Biological Assessment, personal communications between the Service's biologists and the BLM's biologists, telephone conversations, e-mail correspondence, conference calls, planning meetings, and other sources of information. A complete administrative record of this consultation is on file at this office.

Consultation History

This section summarizes significant steps in the consultation process. Additional correspondence, email transmissions, telephone conversation records, and conference calls that occurred between December 15, 2004, and October 31, 2008 are documented in the administrative record for this consultation.

Previous Section 7 consultations have been conducted for activities located within the Monticello planning area that have resulted in the development of the terms and conditions and conservation measures that will be a part of the committed mitigation of the proposed plan. These consultations include the following:

- Programmatic Section 7 Consultation on Existing Land Use Plans. A biological opinion was received from USFWS on June 19, 2007 (USFWS 2007). Finalized Conservation Measures and Best Management Practices for T&E Species of Utah were developed and are included in the current land use plan revisions effort.

- Programmatic Section 7 Consultation on the oil and gas leasing program (USFWS 2004, BLM 2005). This consultation has been updated from time to time and the latest lease notices have also been included in the current revision effort.
- Consultation on the Fire Management Land Use Amendment (UFWS 2005a; USFW 2005b). Fire Management Resource Protection Measures were developed and are included in Appendix C.

Consultation activities specific to the current RMP revision effort include the following:

- March 18, 2008: The BLM electronically sent a draft Biological Assessment to determine impacts from the new Monticello Resource Management Plan.
- March 18 – May 21, 2008: The Service reviewed and provided comments on the draft Biological Assessment;
- August 8, 2008: The BLM electronically sent a second draft Biological Assessment to the Service;
- August 26, 2008: The Service reviewed and provided more comments on the draft Biological Assessment;
- September 30, 2008: We received the final version of the Biological Assessment and initiated formal consultation.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK.

APPENDIX F. LIVESTOCK GRAZING ALLOTMENTS

F.1 STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES FOR GRAZING MANAGEMENT

The Bureau of Land Management (BLM) has developed the following Fundamentals of Rangeland Health and their companion rules, Standards for Rangeland Health and Guidelines for Grazing Management for the BLM in Utah ([BLM-UT-GI-97-001-4000] U.S. Department of Interior BLM, Utah State Office, 1997).

F.1.1 FUNDAMENTALS OF RANGELAND HEALTH

As provided by regulations, developed by the Secretary of the Interior on February 22, 1995, the following conditions must exist on BLM lands:

1. Watersheds are in, or making significant progress toward, properly functioning physical condition, including their upland, riparian/wetland, and aquatic components; soil and plant conditions support infiltration, soil moisture storage, and the release of water that are in balance with climate and landform and maintain or improve water quality, and timing and duration of flow.
2. Ecological processes, including the hydrologic cycle nutrient cycle, and energy flow, are maintained, or there is significant progress toward their attainment, in order to support healthy biotic populations and communities.
3. Water quality complies with state water quality standards and achieves or is making significant progress towards achieving established BLM management objectives such as meeting wildlife needs.
4. Habitats are being—or are making significant progress toward being—restore or maintained for federal threatened and endangered species, federal proposed, Category 1 and 2 federal candidate and other special status species.

In 1997, the BLM in Utah developed rules to carry out the fundamentals of rangeland health. These are called standards for rangeland health and guidelines for grazing management.

Standards spell out conditions to be achieved on BLM lands in Utah, and **guidelines** describe practices that will be applied in order to achieve the standards.

D.1.2 STANDARDS FOR RANGELAND HEALTH

STANDARD 1. Upland soils exhibit permeability and infiltration rates that sustain or improve site productivity, considering the soil type, climate, and landform.

As indicated by:

1. sufficient cover and litter to protect the soil surface from excessive water and wind erosion; to promote infiltration; detain surface flow; and retard soil moisture loss by evaporation;
2. the absence of indicators of excessive erosion such as rills, soil pedestals, and actively eroding gullies;
3. the appropriate amount, type, and distribution of vegetation reflecting the presence of (1) the desired plant community IDPCI, where identified in a land-use plan, or (2) where the

PVC is not identified, a community that equally sustains the desired level of productivity and properly functioning ecological conditions.

STANDARD 2. Riparian and wetland areas are in properly functioning condition. Stream channel morphology and functions are appropriate to soil type, climate, and landform.

As indicated by:

1. Stream bank vegetation consisting of or showing a trend toward species with root masses capable of withstanding high stream flow events. Vegetative cover adequate to protect stream banks and dissipate stream flow energy associated with high-water flows. Protect against accelerated erosion, capture sediment, and provide for groundwater recharge.
2. Vegetation reflecting: Desired Plant Community. Maintenance of riparian and wetland soil moisture characteristics, diverse age structure and composition, high vigor, large woody debris when site potential allows, and providing food, cover, and other habitat needs for dependent animal species.
3. Revegetating point bars: Lateral stream movement associated with natural sinuosity: channel width, depth, pool frequency, and roughness appropriate to landscape position.
4. Active floodplain.

STANDARD 3. Desired species, including native, threatened.

As indicated by:

1. Frequency, diversity, density, age classes, and productivity of desired native species necessary to ensure reproductive capability and survival.
2. Habitats connected at a level to enhance species survival.
3. Native species reoccupy habitat niches and voids caused by disturbances unless management objectives call for introduction or maintenance of nonnative species.
4. Appropriate amount, type, and distribution of vegetation reflecting the presence of (1) the Desired Plant Community DPC, where identified in a land-use plan conforming to these standards, or (2) where the DPC is identified a community that equally sustains the desired level of productivity and properly functioning ecologic processes.

STANDARD 4. The BLM will apply and comply with water quality standards established by the State of Utah (R.317-2) and the Federal Clean Water and Safe Drinking Water Acts. Activities on BLM lands will fully support the designated beneficial uses described in the Utah Water Quality Standards {R.317-2) for surface and groundwater.

As indicated by:

1. Measurement of nutrient loads, total dissolved solids, chemical constituents, fecal coliform, water temperature, and other water quality parameters.
2. Macroinvertebrate communities that indicate water quality meets aquatic objectives.

Because BLM lands provide forage for grazing of wildlife, wild horses and burros, and domestic livestock, the following rules have been developed to assure that such grazing is consistent with the standards listed here.

1. The BLM will continue to coordinate monitoring water quality activities with other federal, state, and technical agencies.

F.1.3 GUIDELINES FOR GRAZING MANAGEMENT

1. Grazing management practices will be implemented that:
   a. Maintain sufficient residual vegetation and litter on both upland and riparian sites to protect the soil from wind and water erosion and support ecological functions.
   b. Promote attainment or maintenance of proper functioning condition riparian/wetland areas, appropriate stream channel morphology, desired soil permeability and permeability and infiltration, and appropriate soil conditions and kinds and amounts of plants and animals to support the hydrologic cycle, nutrient cycle, and energy flow.
   c. Meet the physiological requirements of desired plants and facilitate reproduction and maintenance of desired plants to the extent natural conditions allow.
   d. Maintain viable and diverse populations of plants and animals appropriate for the site.
   e. Provide or improve within the limits of site potentials, habitat for threatened or endangered species.
   f. Avoid grazing management conflicts with other species that have the potential of becoming protected or special status species.
   g. Encourage innovation, experimentation and the ultimate development of alternatives to improve rangeland management practices.
   h. Give priority to rangeland improvement projects and land treatments that offer the best opportunity for achieving the standards.
2. Any spring or seep developments will he designed and constructed to protect ecological process and functions and improve livestock, wild horse, and wildlife distribution.
3. New rangeland projects for grazing will be constructed in a manner consistent with the standards. Considering economic circumstances and site limitations, existing rangeland projects and facilities that conflict with the achievement or maintenance of the standards will be relocated and/or modified.
4. Livestock salt blocks and other nutritional supplements will be located away from riparian/wetland areas or other permanently located, or other natural water sources. It is recommended that the locations of these supplements be moved every year.
5. The use and perpetuation of native species will be emphasized. However, when restoring or rehabilitating disturbed or degraded rangelands nonintrusive, nonnative plant species are appropriate for use where native species (a) are not available, (b) are not economically feasible, (c) can not achieve ecological objectives as well as nonnative species, and/or (d) cannot compete with already established native species.
6. When rangeland manipulations are necessary, the best management practices, including biological processes, fire, and intensive grazing, will be utilized prior to the use of chemical or mechanical manipulations.
7. When establishing grazing practices and rangeland improvements, the quality of the outdoor recreation experience is to be considered. Aesthetic and scenic values, water, campsites, and opportunities for solitude are among those considerations.
8. Feeding of hay and other harvested forage (which does not refer to miscellaneous salt, protein, and other supplements) for the purpose of substituting for inadequate natural forage will not be conducted on BLM lands other than in (a) emergency situations where no other resource exists and animal survival is in jeopardy, or (b) situations where an

authorized officer determines such a practice will assist in meeting a standard or attaining a management objective.

9. In order to eliminate, minimize, or limit the spread of noxious weeds, (a) only hay cubes, hay pellets, or certified weed-free hay will be fed on BLM lands, and (b) reasonable adjustments in grazing methods, methods of transport, and animal husbandry practices will be applied.
10. To avoid contamination of water sources and in advertent damage to non-target species, aerial application of pesticides will not be allowed within 100 feet of a riparian wetland area unless the product is registered for such use by the EPA.
11. On rangelands where a standard is not being met, and conditions are moving toward meeting the standard, grazing may be allowed to continue. On lands where a standard is not being met, conditions are not improving toward meeting the standard or other management objectives, and livestock grazing is deemed responsible, administrative action with regard to livestock will be taken by the authorized officer pursuant to CUR 4180.2(c).
12. Where it can he determined that more than one kind of grazing animal is responsible for failure to achieve a standard, and adjustments in management are required. Those adjustments will be made to each kind of animal, based on interagency cooperation as needed in proportion to their degree of responsibility.
13. Rangelands that have been burned, reseeded, or otherwise treated to alter vegetative composition will be closed to livestock grazing as follows: (1) burned rangelands, whether by wildfire or prescribed burning, will be ungrazed for a minimum of one complete growing season following the burn; and (2) rangelands that have been reseeded or otherwise chemically or mechanically treated will be ungrazed for a minimum of two complete growing seasons.
14. Conversions in kind of livestock (such as from sheep to cattle) will be analyzed in light of rangeland health standards. Where such conversions are not adverse to achieving a standard, or they are not in conflict with BLM land-use plans, the conversion will be allowed.

Allotment Situation Summary

Allotment Status	Number	Percent
Permitted	73	NA
Number of Allotments by Class of Livestock		
Cattle	60	NA
Cattle/Horses	13	NA
Animal Unit Months		
Active (Cattle)	77,255	NA
Active (Horses)	1,221	NA
Total Active Use	78,476	NA
Suspended	18,090	NA
Exchange of Use (Other Ownership)	7,299	NA
Livestock Grazing System		

Allotment Situation Summary

Allotment Status	Number	Percent
Season-long	34	NA
Deferred	11	NA
Deferred Rotation	28	NA
Total Acres within Allotments	**2,268,736**	NA
BLM	1,761,351	77.6%
State of Utah	190,366	8.4%
Private	53,704	2.4%
National Park Service	261,574	11.5%
Total Acres Excluded from Livestock Grazing	**134,277**	**6.1%**
Allotment Category		
Maintain	9	NA
Improve	31	NA
Custodial	33	NA

D.1 F.2 CRITERIA USED TO DETERMINE ALLOTMENT MANAGEMENT CATEGORY

The criteria used for the placement of the allotments into the category are based on resource potential, resource use conflict, or controversy, opportunity for positive economic return on public investments, and the present management situation. In each category, all items may apply to the allotment or there may be only one specific item that causes the allotment to be placed into the specific category. Specific criteria used for each category is as follows:

D.1.1 F.2.1 CATEGORY "M"–MAINTAINING EXISTING RESOURCE CONDITIONS

- Present range condition is satisfactory and present management appears satisfactory.
- These allotments are in generally good condition and have no serious resource conflicts under present management.
- Allotments have moderate or high resource production potential, and are producing near their potential (or trend is moving in that direction).
- There are no serious resource conflicts with livestock grazing.
- Opportunities may exist for positive economic return from public investments.

D.1.2 F.2.2 CATEGORY "I"–IMPROVE EXISTING RESOURCE CONDITIONS

- These allotments have unsatisfactory range condition and present management appears unsatisfactory.
- Allotments have moderate to high resource production potential and are producing at low to moderate levels.
- These allotments have potential to improve, or have conflicts that can be resolved through changes in grazing management or investments in range improvement projects.
- These allotments have serious resource use conflicts.
- There is potential for positive economic return on public investment.

D.1.3 F.2.3 CATEGORY "C"–CUSTODIAL MANAGEMENT

- Allotments have low resource production potential, and are producing near their potential.
- Present range condition is not a factor.
- Present management appears satisfactory, or is the only logical practice under existing resource conditions.
- Opportunities for BLM management are limited because the percentage of public land is low or the acreage of public lands is small.
- Limited resource use conflicts may exist.
- Opportunities for positive economic return on public investments do not exist, or are constrained by technological or economic factors.

ALLOTMENT SITUATION

MONTICELLO FIELD OFFICE

Allotment Name	Alkali Canyon	Alkali Point	Bear Trap	Big Indian	Big Westwater	Black Steer	Blue Mountain	Bluff Bench
Allotment Number	#06801	#06802	#04821	#04826	#06826	#06804	#06835	#06803
Allotment Status	Permitted	Permitted	Permitted	Permitted	Permitted	Permitted	Permitted	Permitted
Kind(s) of Permitted Livestock	Cattle/Horses	Cattle/Horses	Cattle	Cattle	Cattle	Cattle	Cattle	Cattle
Season of Use	11/1–5/31	6/1–11/30	9/1–12/12	12/5–5/10	10/15–12/15 4/1–5/31	11/16–3/31	7/1–9/30	11/20–2/28
Animal Unit Months(s)								
Active (Cattle)	2,290	304	130	810	50	336	30	64
Active (Horses)	72	36						
Suspended								
Exchange of Use (Other Ownership)		63		22				
Livestock Grazing System	Deferred Rotation	Deferred Rotation	Season-long	Deferred Rotation	Deferred Rotation	Season-long	Season-long	Season-long
Total Acres within Allotment	26,408	9,334	1,492	10,413	480	9,133	298	951
BLM	23,730	7,473	1,446	7,955	480	4,827	298	216
State of Utah	2,186	1,853		894				104
Private	492	8	45	1,564		4,307		632
National Park Service								
Allotment Category	Improve	Improve	Custodial	Improve	Custodial	Custodial	Custodial	Custodial

ALLOTMENT SITUATION, continued

MONTICELLO FIELD OFFICE

Allotment Name	Brown Canyon	Bug Squaw	Bulldog	Cave Canyon	Church Rock	Comb Wash	Corral	Cottonwood
Allotment Number	#06805	#06846	#06806	#06808	#04827	#06836	#06838	#06849
Allotment Status	Permitted	Permitted	Permitted	Permitted	Permitted	Permitted	Permitted	Permitted
Kind(s) of Permitted Livestock	Cattle	Cattle	Cattle	Cattle/Horses	Cattle	Cattle	Cattle	Cattle
Season of Use	11/16–3/15	11/15–5/20	5/18–9/30	11/1–5/15	12/1–5/31	10/16–5/31	5/20–7/19	10/16–6/10
Animal Unit Months(s)								
Active (Cattle)	60	1,465	368	3,184	30	3,796	16	1,434
Active (Horses)				65				
Suspended				2,824		10		746
Exchange of Use (Other Ownership)		33		403		329		125
Livestock Grazing System	Season-long	Deferred Rotation	Season-long	Season-long	Season-long	Deferred Rotation	Season-long	Deferred Rotation
Total Acres within Allotment	858	18,045	8,253	34,810	5,282	73,591	212	40,638
BLM	858	16,021	8,214	29,324	413	65,398	212	33,404
State of Utah		1,058	1	3,847	3,050	7,139		2,897
Private		967	38	1,639	1,818	1,055		4,337
National Park Service								
Allotment Category	Custodial	Improve	Custodial	Improve	Custodial	Improve	Custodial	Improve

Allotment Name	Cross Canyon	Devils Canyon	Dodge Point	Dry Farm	Dry Valley-Deer Neck	East Canyon	East League
Allotment Number	#06811	#06812	#06814	#04804	#04820	#04814	#06815
Allotment Status	Permitted	Permitted	Permitted	Permitted	Permitted	Permitted	Permitted
Kind(s) of Permitted Livestock	Cattle	Cattle	Cattle	Cattle	Cattle	Cattle	Cattle
Season of Use	11/1–5/31	7/7–8/31	6/1–10/31	5/5–6/4	12/1–4/30	12/1–4/15	11/1–5/15
Animal Unit Months(s)							
Active (Cattle)	3,600	212	30	27	994	1,191	1,359
Active (Horses)							
Suspended	2,198						
Exchange of Use (Other Ownership)	903	4					1,029
Livestock Grazing System	Deferred Rotation	Deferred Rotation	Season-long	Season-long	Deferred Rotation	Deferred Rotation	Deferred Rotation
Total Acres within Allotment	42,109	10,825	193	730	6,914	5,379	19,549
BLM	33,634	9,653	175	726	4,172	4,311	14,140
State of Utah	4,740	1,150			927	1,044	5,401
Private	3,735	23	18	4	1,815	23	8
National Park Service							
Allotment Category	Improve	Maintain	Custodial	Custodial	Maintain	Maintain	Maintain

ALLOTMENT SITUATION, continued
MONTICELLO FIELD OFFICE

Allotment Name	East Summit	Hart Draw	Hart Point	Horse Canyon	Horsehead Canyon	Hurrah Pass	Indian Creek	Indian Rock
Allotment Number	#04810	#04811	#04825	#06848	#06816	#04813	#04815	#04822
Allotment Status	Permitted	Permitted	Permitted	Permitted	Permitted	Permitted	Permitted	Permitted
Kind(s) of Permitted Livestock	Cattle	Cattle	Cattle	Cattle	Cattle	Cattle/Horses	Cattle	Cattle
Season of Use	4/1–12/31	10/16–6/15	3/1–5/31	11/1–3/31	5/16–10/31	11/25–4/15	10/1–6/15	11/15–4/15
Animal Unit Months(s)								
Active (Cattle)	13	2,460	1,080	425	144	215	8,518	384
Active (Horses)						47		
Suspended						172		
Exchange of Use (Other Ownership)		72	123	80			150	
Livestock Grazing System	Deferred Rotation	Deferred Rotation	Deferred Rotation	Season-long	Season-long	Deferred Rotation	Deferred Rotation	Season-long
Total Acres within Allotment	133	80,329	20,003	2,734	4,904	20,253	272,458	4,384
BLM	133	69,470	17,738	2,661	4,904	15,712	228,184	3,785
State of Utah		8,060	2,266	71		4,178	19,485	241
Private		2,799		3		362	4,192	358
National Park Service							20,596	
Allotment Category	Custodial	Improve	Improve	Custodial	Custodial	Improve	Improve	Maintain

ALLOTMENT SITUATION, continued

MONTICELLO FIELD OFFICE

Allotment Name	Johnson Creek	Laws	Lake Canyon	Little Boulder	Lone Cedar	Long Canyon	Lyman	Mail Station
Allotment Number	#06818	#06839	#06833	#06819	#04801	#06820	#06821	#04819
Allotment Status	Permitted	Permitted	Permitted	Permitted	Permitted	Permitted	Permitted	Permitted
Kind(s) of Permitted Livestock	Cattle	Cattle	Cattle/Horses	Cattle	Cattle	Cattle	Cattle	Cattle
Season of Use	6/5–10/14	4/16–11/15	10/6–6/5	5/1–8/31	12/1–4/30	6/16–10/15	3/1–2/28	11/1–4/30
Animal Unit Months(s)								
Active (Cattle)	90	5	4,799	280	1,966	140	6	1,340
Active (Horses)			96					
Suspended			2,040		369			
Exchange of Use (Other Ownership)			1,402					200
Livestock Grazing System	Season-long	Season-long	Deferred Rotation	Deferred Rotation	Deferred Rotation	Season-long	Season-long	Deferred Rotation
Total Acres within Allotment	779	1,549	623,013	7,084	20,633	1,558	354	7,891
BLM	779	1,280	395,882	6,321	18,426	1,508	317	6,499
State of Utah			41,220	154	1,623		22	1,257
Private		269	4	609	584	50	15	135
National Park Service			185,907					
Allotment Category	Custodial	Custodial	Improve	Maintain	Improve	Custodial	Custodial	Improve

ALLOTMENT SITUATION, continued
MONTICELLO FIELD OFFICE

Allotment Name	McCracken Wash	Montezuma Canyon	Monticello Cowboy	Monument Canyon	Muley Point	Northeast Summit	Owens Dugout	Pearson Point
Allotment Number	#06822	#06823	#04806	#06825	#02485	#06852	#06824	#06845
Allotment Status	Permitted	Permitted	Permitted	Permitted	Permitted	Permitted	Permitted	Permitted
Kind(s) of Permitted Livestock	Cattle	Cattle	Cattle	Cattle/Horses	Cattle	Cattle	Cattle	Cattle
Season of Use	11/15–5/15	11/1–5/31+	11/16–4/30	3/1–2/28	11/1–5/31	4/1–12/31	2/1–4/30	4/15–12/15
Animal Unit Months(s)								
Active (Cattle)	950	1,900	814	721	882	20	275	125
Active (Horses)				429	0			
Suspended		196			413			
Exchange of Use (Other Ownership)			229		492			
Livestock Grazing System	Deferred Rotation	Deferred Rotation	Season-long	Deferred Rotation	Deferred Rotation	Season-long	Deferred Rotation	Deferred Rotation
Total Acres within Allotment	17,227	39,051	4,826	38,441	37,582	829	2,309	2,777
BLM	16,928	31,464	4,178	35,302	32,450	468	2,273	2,229
State of Utah	195	4,419	639	3,139	3,772		1	549
Private	104	3,168	8			361	35	
National Park Service					1,360			
Allotment Category	Improve	Improve	Maintain	Improve	Improve	Custodial	Custodial	Maintain

Allotment Name	Perkins Brothers	Peters Canyon	Peters Point	Piute Knoll	Roundup Corral	Sage Flat	Sage-grouse
Allotment Number	#06827	#04807	#04805	#06841	#06847	#06833	#06716
Allotment Status	Permitted	Permitted	Permitted	Permitted	Permitted	Permitted	Permitted
Kind(s) of Permitted Livestock	Cattle/Horses	Cattle	Cattle	Cattle	Cattle	Cattle	Cattle
Season of Use	10/1–5/31	11/16–5/16	4/20–12/15	5/1–10/31	6/30&10/1 (over-night)	7/30–10/31	5/1–5/30
Animal Unit Months(s)							
Active (Cattle)	7,191	90	180	30	8	13	7
Active (Horses)	368						
Suspended							
Exchange of Use (Other Ownership)	594						
Livestock Grazing System	Deferred Rotation	Deferred Rotation	Deferred Rotation	Season-long	Season-long	Season-long	Season-long
Total Acres within Allotment	126,693	2,268	4,726	158	57	1,132	2,622
BLM	101,515	665	4,071	141	57	787	320
State of Utah	8,370	943	642				
Private	3,304	660	13	17		345	2,302
National Park Service	13,504						
Allotment Category	Improve	Improve	Improve	Custodial	Custodial	Custodial	Custodial

ALLOTMENT SITUATION, continued
MONTICELLO FIELD OFFICE

Allotment Name	Shumway Point	Slickhorn	South Canyon	South Vega	Spring Creek	Spring Creek West	Squaw Canyon1	Stateline
Allotment Number	#06850	#06834	#04824	#04800	#04823	#04812	#06828	#04831
Allotment Status	Permitted	Permitted	Permitted	Permitted	Permitted	Permitted	Permitted	Permitted
Kind(s) of Permitted Livestock	Cattle	Cattle/Horses	Cattle	Cattle	Cattle/Horses	Cattle	Cattle	Cattle
Season of Use	12/1–4/30	10/16–6/15	5/16–11/30	1/6–2/28	5/1–10/31	6/16–10/15	12/1–2/28 4/29–5/31	9/1–12/6
Animal Unit Months(s)								
Active (Cattle)	680	1,755	117	15	134	150	789	16
Active (Horses)		40			10			
Suspended	300	1,113						
Exchange of Use (Other Ownership)	80	320						
Livestock Grazing System	Deferred	Deferred Rotation	Season-long	Season-long	Season-long	Season-long	Deferred Rotation	Season-long
Total Acres within Allotment	3,554	146,131	7,431	615	3,692	1,289	8,465	239
BLM	2,905	128,625	6,840	455	1,993	1,280	7,565	239
State of Utah	646	9,387	441				900	
Private	4	640	150	160	1,699	9		
National Park Service		7,479						
Allotment Category	Maintain	Improve	Custodial	Custodial	Improve	Improve	Improve	Custodial

[1]This allotment is being administered by the Durango Field Office

ALLOTMENT SITUATION, continued
MONTICELLO FIELD OFFICE

Allotment Name	Stevens	Summit Canyon	Tank Bench-Brushy Basin	Tank Draw	Texas Flat	Upper East Canyon	Upper Mail Station	Vega Creek
Allotment Number	#06830	#04818	#06831	#04802	#02484	#04817	#04893	#04803
Allotment Status	Permitted	Permitted	Permitted	Permitted	Permitted	Permitted	Permitted	Permitted
Kind(s) of Permitted Livestock	Cattle/Horses	Cattle	Cattle	Cattle	Cattle/Horses	Cattle	Cattle	Cattle
Season of Use	3/1–2/28	7/1–8/31	10/8–6/30	12/1–4/30	11/1–5/31	5/1–10/31	11/14–/28	7/1–7/31
Animal Unit Months(s)								
Active (Cattle)	58	41	3,973	1,647	1,046	18	106	80
Active (Horses)	24				28			
Suspended			1,410		504			
Exchange of Use (Other Ownership)			525					
Livestock Grazing System	Season-long	Deferred Rotation	Deferred Rotation	Deferred Rotation	Deferred Rotation	Season-long	Season-long	Season-long
Total Acres within Allotment	1,391	1,664	79,367	11,306	32,541	1,433	2,092	1,283
BLM	1,076	1,560	66,755	9,454	28,826	670	1,821	445
State of Utah			11,216	1,726	3,715			
Private	315	104	1,396	126		763	271	839
National Park Service								
Allotment Category	Custodial	Custodial	Improve	Improve	Improve	Custodial	Custodial	Custodial

ALLOTMENT SITUATION, continued

MONTICELLO FIELD OFFICE

Allotment Name	Verdure Creek	White Canyon	White Mesa	Monu-colo**
Allotment Number	#06832	#06837	#06840	#08038
Allotment Status	Permitted	Permitted	Permitted	Permitted
Kind(s) of Permitted Livestock	Cattle	Cattle/Horses	Cattle/Horses	Cattle
Season of Use Animal Unit Months(s)	10/15–5/15	3/1–2/28	12/1–5/31	4/1–5/1
Active (Cattle)	96	5,400	4,302	41
Active (Horses)		144	72	
Suspended		1,863	3,932	
Exchange of Use (Other Ownership)			502	
Livestock Grazing System	Season-long	Deferred Rotation	Deferred Rotation	Season-long
Total Acres within Allotment	3,309	226,299	60,892	620
BLM	2,660	171,989	50,304	620
State of Utah	484	17,866	6,418	
Private	165	1,023	4,175	
National Park Service		35,421		
Allotment Category	Custodial	Improve	Improve	Custodial

**This allotment is part of the Durango Field Office, but administered by the Monticello Field Office, and not included in the summary page.

APPENDIX G. BEST MANAGEMENT PRACTICES AND STANDARD OPERATING PROCEDURES APPLICABLE TO OIL AND GAS OPERATIONS AND OTHER PUBLIC LAND-USE AUTHORIZATIONS

ENVIRONMENTAL BEST MANAGEMENT PRACTICES FOR OIL AND GAS OPERATIONS[1]

The following environmental best management practices (BMPs) will be applied to Applications for Permit to Drill and associated rights-of-way in the Monticello Field Office (Monticello FO) where applicable. These procedures are based on WO IM 2007-021 and the *Surface Operating Standards and Guidelines for Oil and Gas Development (Gold Book), 2006*.

The following BMPs will be considered in nearly all circumstances:

- Interim reclamation of the well and access road will begin as soon as practicable after a well is placed in production. Facilities will be grouped on the pads to allow for maximum interim reclamation. Interim reclamation will include road cuts and fills and will extend to within close proximity of the wellhead and production facilities.
- All aboveground facilities including power boxes, building doors, roofs, and any visible equipment will be painted a color selected from the latest national color charts that best allows the facility to blend into the background.
- All new roads will be designed and constructed to a safe and appropriate standard, "no higher than necessary," to accommodate intended vehicular use. Roads will follow the contour of the land where practical. Existing roads which are used to support oil and gas activity and that are in eroded condition or contribute to other resource concerns will be brought to Bureau of Land Management (BLM) standards within a reasonable period of time.
- Final reclamation of all oil and gas disturbance will involve (a) recontouring of all disturbed areas, including access roads, to the original contour or a contour that blends with the surrounding topography and (b) revegetating all disturbed areas.

The following are examples of BMPs to be considered on a case-by-case basis. They do not comprise an all-inclusive list:

- Consider placing raptor-perch avoidance devices on all new power lines and existing lines that present a potential hazard to raptors.
- Consider burying power lines and flow lines in or adjacent to access roads.
- In developing oil and gas fields, consider centralizing all production facilities to avoid tanks and associated facilities on each well pad.
- The use of submersible pumps will be considered, especially in VRM Class II or III areas.
- The use of partial or completely below-grade wellheads will be considered in VRM Class II or III areas.
- Multiple wells will be drilled from a single well pad wherever feasible.

[1] Please note that this list is not inclusive of all BLM BMPs.

- Noise reduction techniques and designs will be considered to reduce noise from compressors or other motorized equipment.
- Seasonal restrictions on public vehicular access will be evaluated where there are wildlife conflicts or road damage/maintenance issues.
- Avoid the placement of production facilities on hilltops and ridgelines.

STANDARD OPERATING PROCEDURES[1]

- No construction or routine maintenance activities shall be performed during periods when excessive ruts will be created because the soil is too wet to adequately support construction equipment.
- Construction sites shall be maintained in a sanitary condition at all times; waste materials at those sites shall be disposed of promptly at an appropriate waste-disposal site. "Waste" means all discarded matter, including human waste, trash, garbage, refuse, oil drums, petroleum products, ashes, and equipment.
- The holder shall remove only the minimum amount of vegetation necessary for the construction of structures and facilities. Topsoil shall be conserved during excavation and reused as cover on disturbed areas to facilitate regrowth of vegetation.
- The holder shall restore drainages, to the greatest extent possible, to the original bank configuration, stream bottom width, and channel gradient. Loose soil, fill, and culverts shall be removed from drainage channels.
- The holder shall protect existing telephone, telegraph, and transmission lines, roads, trails, fences, ditches, and like improvements during construction, operation, maintenance, and termination of the system. Holder shall not obstruct any road or trail without the prior approval of the authorized officer. Damage caused by holder to utilities and improvements shall be promptly repaired by holder to a condition which is satisfactory to the authorized officer.
- In areas where grading is necessary, the holder shall recontour the disturbed area and obliterate all earthwork by removing embankments, backfilling excavation, and grading to reestablish the approximate original contours of the land on the right-of-way.
- After site restoration, holder shall construct waterbars along graded areas of the right-of-way as required by the authorized officers.
- The holder shall protect all survey monuments found within the right-of-way. Survey monuments include, but are not limited to, General Land Office and BLM Cadastral Survey Corners, reference corners, witness points, U.S. Coastal and Geodetic benchmarks and triangulation stations, military control monuments, and recognizable civil (both public and private) survey monuments. In the event of obliteration or disturbance of any of the above, the holder shall immediately report the incident, in writing, to the authorized officer and the respective installing authority if known. Where General Land Office or BLM right-of-way monuments or references are obliterated during operations, the holder shall secure the services of a registered land surveyor or a BLM cadastral surveyor to restore the disturbed monuments and references using surveying procedures found in the *Manual of Surveying Instructions for the Survey of the*

1 Please note that this list is not inclusive of all BLM SOPs.

Public Lands in the United States, latest edition. The holder shall record such survey in the appropriate county and send a copy to the authorized officer. If the BLM cadastral surveyors or other federal surveyors are used to restore the disturbed survey monument, the holder shall be responsible for the survey cost.

- Permittees may not leave unattended personal property on public lands administered by the BLM for a period of more than 48 hours without written permission of the authorized officer, with the exception that vehicles may be parked in designated parking areas for up to 14 consecutive days. Unattended personal property is subject to disposition under the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 as amended.
- Cans, rubbish, and other trash shall not be discarded, buried, or dumped on public lands or related waters. Wet garbage such as egg shells, orange peels, leftover solid food, bones, melon rinds, etc., must be carried out. Trash cleanup at campsites and day use areas will include all litter or discarded items including small items such as bottle caps and cigarette butts.
- Washing or bathing with soap is not permitted in tributary streams, springs, or other natural water sources. Dishwater must be strained prior to dispersal. Dishwater and bathwater may not be dumped within 100 feet of streams, springs, or other natural water sources. Only biodegradable soap may be used.

No camping is permitted within 300 feet of a known prehistoric or historic site. No camping is allowed within cultural sites or archaeological resources as defined in ARPA.

- No camping is permitted within 300 feet of a water source other than perennial streams unless prior authorization is received from the authorizing officer.
- Personal sanitation and disposal of human waste is not permitted within 200 feet of a water source, trail, or campsite. Human waste will be deposited in a cat hole (six inches deep) and covered with soil. Groups of eight or more people are required to dig a trench to accommodate the group size and to consolidate the waste to one area.
- Acts of nature present risks which the permit holder assumes. The user is responsible for inspecting and locating campsite and immediate adjoining area for dangerous trees, hanging limbs, possibility of flash flood or wildfire, and other hazardous conditions. Permits and permit fees are not guaranteed against such acts of God, including inclement weather and difficult trail condition. The use of rock-climbing equipment to access archaeological sites is not allowed. Using a safety rope as an aid along a hiking route is permissible.
- All riding and pack animals must be fed certified weed-free feed for 48 hours in advance of and for the duration of the trip on public lands.
- Riding and pack animals may not be tied for more than one hour to live trees.
- Livestock shall not be tied, hobbled, or picketed for more than one hour within 300 feet of a natural water source other than perennial streams.
- All animals will be under control en route and in camp to protect wildlife, other livestock, and range forage.
- Corrals located on public lands may not be available for public or permittee use. Prior authorization is required for the use of such corrals.
- No climbing or rappelling is allowed over petroglyphs.

- On climbing and rappelling sites, no permanent protection (bolts or fixed pitons) will be used other than the minimum necessary to rappel.
- Camping is permitted and encouraged in well-used campsites. Backpacker camping is not allowed within a mile of the San Juan River in either Grand Gulch or Slickhorn Canyon.
- No in-canyon fires (no charcoal fires or fires from wood harvested on site or brought into the canyons) for warming or cooking in all Cedar Mesa Canyons, including Grand Gulch.

Best management practices and other standard operating procedures described in this appendix are measures designed to assist in achieving the RMP objectives. The BMPs are dynamic and should not be interpreted as specific direction at the same level as the RMP decisions. These BMPs are selected and implemented as necessary, based on site-specific conditions, to meet resource objectives for specific management actions.

This appendix does not provide an exhaustive list of BMPs. Additional BMPs may be identified during an interdisciplinary process when evaluating site-specific management actions. BMPs may also be updated as new technology emerges. Applicants may also suggest alternate practices that could accomplish the same intended result. Implementation and effectiveness of BMPs need to be monitored to determine whether the practices are achieving the RMP goals and objectives. Adjustments could be made as necessary to ensure goals and objectives are met, as well as to conform to changes in BLM regulations, policy, direction, or new scientific information.

As warranted and necessary, the standard operating procedures and guidelines for all treatment methods identified in the 2007 Record of Decision, Vegetation Treatments Using Herbicides Final Programmatic EIS as outlined in its corresponding Appendices B and C will be utilized.

Dispersed vehicle camping will be allowed only in previously disturbed areas within 150 feet of designated routes (on each side of a centerline).

APPENDIX H. MONITORING

Resource and RMP Goal/Objective	Suggested Monitoring Methodology
Air Quality Ensure that authorized uses on public lands meet or comply with and support federal, state, and local laws and regulations.	Monitoring of air resource conditions for the purposes of evaluating BLM activities is done in accordance with the BLM Air Resource Management Monitoring Strategy (BLM, January 3, 2006). Air Quality Monitoring for regulatory compliance purposes is primarily conducted by Utah Department of Environmental Quality, Division of Air Quality (UDAQ) with oversight by the Environmental Protection Agency. The BLM Air Monitoring Strategy relies heavily on existing monitoring networks such as the Interagency Monitoring of Protected Visual Environments (IMPROVE) network, National Atmospheric Deposition Program (NADP), and Clean Air Status and Trends Network (CASTNET) and the UDAQ Air Monitoring Network. Smoke emissions are tracked and monitored in accordance with the state administrative rule, R307-204 and as described in the Utah Smoke Management Plan (which can be found at: http://gacc.nifc.gov/egbc/predictive/weather/smoke.htm). Much of this air quality data is available in "real time", and is also provided in monthly or annual summaries. On a periodic basis these summaries and state monitoring reports will be reviewed to ensure that BLM activities are achieving the goals for air quality stated in the PRMP.
Cultural Resources Identify, preserve, and protect important cultural resources and ensure that they are available for appropriate uses by present and future generations (FLPMA, Section 103[c], 201 [a] and [c]; National Historic Preservation Act, Section 110 [a]; Archaeological Resources Protection Act, Section 14 [a]). Seek to reduce imminent threats and resolve potential conflicts from natural- or human-caused deterioration, or potential conflict with other resource uses (FLPMA, Section 103 [c], NHPA 106, 110 [a][2]) by ensuring that all authorizations for land use and resource use comply with the NHPA Section 106.	Specific management plans would be developed for up to seven culturally sensitive areas unless integrated into other activity plans. These plans would include developing a site monitoring system for those areas. Ensure that those monitoring systems are established and implemented. Monitor other sites field office wide as determined necessary. A periodic review of the cultural resource program will be conducted to ensure that the program is meeting requirements established under Sections 106 and 110 of the National Historic Preservation Act. Monitor the effectiveness of protective measures established and implemented for specific sites and areas.
Fire Management Fire management would adopt the comprehensive Utah Land Use Plan Amendment for Fire and Fuels Management, September 2005 (LUP Amendment; BLM 2005c). This document may be found at	The monitoring program for the MFD includes sampling of established plots within areas treated for hazardous fuel removal as well as BLM lands that have received ES&R treatments. Collection and interpretation of qualitative and quantitative

Resource and RMP Goal/Objective	Suggested Monitoring Methodology
www.ut.blm.gov/fireplanning/index/htm. Direction and guidance approved by the LUP Amendment is incorporated by reference into this RMP. Refer to Map 3, which identifies the Fire Management Areas. Specific decisions for other resources that could impact fire management are found throughout this table. However, the content and purpose of the LUP Amendment is adopted and is summarized as follows: • Establishes landscape-level fire management goals and objectives. • Describes Desired Wildland Fire Conditions (DWFC) and the management strategies and actions to meet DWFC goals. • Describes areas where fire may be restored to the ecosystem through wildland fire use for resource benefit and areas where wildland fire use is not appropriate. • Identifies Resource Protection Measures (RPMs) for fire management practices to protect natural and cultural resource values. • Identifies criteria used to establish fire management priorities.	data is ongoing and data is recorded and compiled for analysis. The results from these ongoing analyses are then incorporated into fuels management decisions. For example, monitoring results can influence treatment methods in an area susceptible to invasive species or may determine which seed species are most likely to flourish in a particular treatment area. The MFD has also been proactive in collaborating with other federal agencies and local partners to map all fire-affected areas as well as those lands that have been treated with planned fire and non-fire activities. GIS data and maps are now shared among partners to support a landscape-scale approach to hazardous fuels reduction, fire prevention in WUI areas and ESR activities.
Health and Safety Effectively manage hazardous risks on public lands to protect the health and safety of public land users and stewards; protect the natural and environmental resources; minimize future hazardous and related risks, costs, and liabilities; and mitigate physical hazards in compliance with all applicable laws, regulations, and policies.	Site clean-ups will be monitored to protect and safeguard human health, restore environmental damage, and limit the BLM's liability. Reclamation and mitigation work done on abandoned mine sites will be monitored to ensure compliance with laws and regulations.
Lands and Realty The BLM would retain lands within its administration except where necessary to accomplish resource goals and objectives outlined in the plan. The BLM would transfer lands out of federal ownership or acquire non-federal lands or conservation easements where needed to accomplish resource goals and objectives, improve administration of public lands, or to meet essential community needs. Make public land available for a variety of ROWs, alternative energy sources, and permits where consistent with resource, goals, objectives, and prescriptions.	Land use authorizations will be monitored through periodic field examinations to ensure compliance with the terms and conditions of the authorizing document and the effectiveness of these terms and conditions in mitigating impacts. On-the-ground monitoring will occur immediately upon issuance of the authorization and periodically throughout the life of the authorization.
Livestock Grazing Achieve Rangeland Health Standards (BLM 1997) and other desired resource conditions.	Collect monitoring data, including trend, utilization, actual use, and climate data to determine if existing livestock management practices are meeting land-use planning and resource objectives and Rangeland Health Standards.

Resource and RMP Goal/Objective	Suggested Monitoring Methodology
	Long-term adjustments to livestock use (term permits adjustments) require the evaluation of monitoring data including climate, actual grazing use, current or historic impacts, utilization mapping, and long-term trend data, as well as utilization levels.
Minerals Resources Continue to meet local and national energy and other public mineral needs to the extent possible. Provide opportunities for environmentally responsible exploration and development of mineral and energy resources subject to appropriate BLM policies, laws, and regulations. Ensure a viable long-term industry related to leasable, locatable, and salable mineral development while providing reasonable and necessary protections to other resources. Establish conditions of use through land-use planning to protect other resource values. The following principles would be applied: 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; Process applications, permits, operating plans, mineral exchanges, leases, and other use authorizations for public lands in accordance with policy and guidance; and Monitor salable and leasable mineral operations to ensure proper resource recovery and evaluation, production verification, diligence and inspection, and enforcement of the lease, sale, or permit terms.	Monitoring for leasable minerals will be done to ensure compliance with applicable laws, regulations, terms and conditions of leases, and the requirements of approved exploration/development plans/applications for permit to drill. Monitoring activities will include: 1. Periodic field inspections of leasable mineral activities. Inspections will be conducted to determine compliance with applicable laws, regulations, lease stipulations, and the requirements of approved exploration and development plans, applications for permit to drill, and sundry notices. 2. Monitoring of oil and gas drilling/production/reclamation activities in the planning area. Total gross surface disturbance and net surface disturbance from all drilling will be tracked. An accurate accounting of production will also be tracked on producing leases, as specified in annual inspection strategies. Acres of new disturbance, acres re-claimed, and production numbers from producing leases will be reported in the Annual Program Summary and Planning Update. Monitoring of mining operations will be done to ensure compliance with 43 CFR 3809, 3802 and 3715 and other regulations and conditions of approval, specifically preventing "unnecessary or undue degradation". When applicable and practical, Plan and Notice review, inspections and associated compliance work will be coordinated with the Utah Division of Oil, Gas and Mining (DOGM). Coordination with Utah DOGM will help ensure adequate monitoring. Each Plan of Operation and Notice has or will have mitigation measures that cover the life of the operation. Field inspections will look for compliance with these measures and include monitoring weed control, reclamation of disturbed areas, revegetation and protection of the environment and public health and safety. Findings for each inspection will be documented and placed in the case file. Any non-compliance items will be noted and appropriate regulatory procedures followed. 43 CFR 3809 regulations require inspections at

Resource and RMP Goal/Objective	Suggested Monitoring Methodology
	least four times a year for operations that use cyanide or other leachate or where there is significant potential for acid drainage. Inspections for active operations will occur twice a year and all others will be inspected once per year. Operations in sensitive areas or operations with a high potential for greater than usual impacts will require inspections more often. Monitoring of salable minerals will be done to ensure compliance with applicable laws, regulations, BLM policy contained in BLM Manual Section 3600 and Handbook H-3600- 1. Field inspections of common use areas, exclusive sale sites and other operations will be done on a periodic basis and will determine compliance with applicable laws, regulations, and the requirements of the approved mining plan. Inspections will specifically note compliance with reclamation, weed control and the protection of the environment and public health and safety. Operations in sensitive environmental areas or operations with a high potential for greater than usual impacts will be inspected more often. Identification and resolution of salable mineral trespasses will also be performed.
Non-WSA Lands with Wilderness Characteristics Protect, maintain and preserve wilderness characteristics (appearance of naturalness and outstanding opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation or solitude) of non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics as appropriate, considering manageability and the context of competing resource demands. Manage these primitive lands and backcountry landscapes for their undeveloped character, and to provide opportunities for primitive recreational activities and experiences of solitude, as appropriate.	Monitor approximately 15,000 acres annually of non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics during the months the areas are accessible by the public. These areas may be monitored more frequently if necessary because of potential use activities or other resource conflicts to ensure that naturalness is retained.
Paleontological Resources Identify area-wide criteria or site-specific use restrictions where necessary to protect paleontological resources from surface-disturbing activities and to promote the scientific, educational, and recreational uses of fossils. Foster public awareness and appreciation of the paleontological heritage.	Monitor known localities of paleontological resources to determine condition, impacts, deterioration and use of these sites/areas. Monitor the effectiveness of site and or project specific restrictions designed to protect paleontological resources.
Recreation To provide for multiple recreational uses of the public lands and to sustain a wide range of recreation opportunities and potential experiences for visitors and residents while supporting local	Recreation monitoring will emphasize developed recreation sites and Special Recreation Management Areas. Monitoring will include checking on signing, visitor use, recreation-related impacts, and user conflicts. Monitoring will emphasize identification of areas where there may

Resource and RMP Goal/Objective	Suggested Monitoring Methodology
economic stability and sustaining the recreation resource base and other sensitive resource values.	be problems with compliance with rules and regulations resulting in user conflicts or resource damage. Monitor recreation activity in the Monticello ERMA to maintain recreation opportunities and protect resource values. Monitor recreation visitor numbers on a continual basis. Special Recreation Permits will be monitored for compliance with the terms of the permit.
Riparian Resources Manage riparian resources for desired future conditions, ensuring ecological diversity, stability, and sustainability, including the desired mix of vegetation types, structural stages, and landscape/riparian/watershed function and provide for native and special status plant, fish, and wildlife habitats. Manage riparian areas for properly functioning condition (PFC) and ensure stream channel morphology and functions are appropriate to the local soil type, climate, and landform. Avoid or minimize the destruction, loss or degradation of riparian, wetland and associated floodplains, and preserve and enhance natural and beneficial values. Public lands would be managed in accordance with laws, executive orders, and regulations on floodplain and wetland areas to reduce resource loss from floods and erosion. The BLM would take appropriate actions to maintain water quality in streams within Monticello PA to meet state and federal water quality standards, including designated beneficial uses and anti-degradation requirements.	Conduct proper functioning condition assessments using the procedures outlined in BLM Technical References 1737-15 and 1737-16.
Soil and Water Resources Manage soils and water resources to maintain watershed health, thereby insuring ecological diversity and sustainability. Provide for favorable conditions of water flow (quality, quantity, and timing), and maintain stable and efficient stream channels as required and provide for fish and wildlife habitat, recreation, and livestock.	BLM would work with partners to implement Best Management Practices (BMPs) and continue BLM's cooperative work with the Utah Divisions of Water Rights and Water Quality in accordance with the administrative memorandum of understanding (MOU) and the cooperative agreement addressing water quality monitoring.

Resource and RMP Goal/Objective	Suggested Monitoring Methodology
Vegetation Manage vegetation resources for desired future conditions, as determined by site-specific BLM objectives and rangeland functionality and health, thereby ensuring ecological diversity, stability, and sustainability, including the desired mix of vegetation types, structural stages, and landscape/riparian/watershed function, and provide for native plant, fish, and wildlife habitats. Provide sustainable forage for livestock and wildlife with a plant community that incorporates and meets the standards for rangeland health. Provide opportunities for plant material gathering (seed collection, plant collection, etc.) of various vegetation types while protecting other resources. Maintain existing vegetative treatment areas as appropriate. Sustain the integrity of the sagebrush steppe community type to provide the amount, continuity, and quality of habitat that is necessary to maintain sustainable populations of sage-grouse and other sagebrush obligate species. Control invasive and non-native weed species and prevent the introduction of new invasive species through the implementation of a comprehensive weed program, including coordination with partners; prevention and early detection; education; inventory and monitoring; and principles of integrated weed management. Control invasive and non-native weed species and prevent the introduction of new invasive species through the implementation of the BLM National Strategy and Action Plan as outlined in documents such as, "Pulling Together: National Strategy for Invasive Plant Management Initiative" and "Partners Against Weeds" (1994). Control insect pest species as necessary to protect vegetation resources in conjunction with Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service (APHIS).	Monitor the control of invasive and non-native weed species in accordance with national guidance and in cooperation with local weed management plans. Conduct monitoring for new noxious weeds, concentrating in areas where ground disturbing activities have occurred. Visit known noxious weed sites and evaluate for effectiveness of control. Gather necessary vegetation information and continue monitoring to assess if planning objectives are being met. Monitor drought conditions to assess whether drought management actions should be implemented. Monitor trends towards DFC for vegetation using the rangeland health assessment process.
Special Designations **Areas of Critical Environmental Concern** Designate, modify, and manage areas as ACECs where special management attention is required to protect and prevent irreparable damage to important historic, cultural, or scenic values, fish and wildlife resources, other natural systems or processes, or to protect life and safety from natural hazards.	Cultural Resource Management Plans will be written for cultural ACEC's. These plans would include developing a site monitoring system. Periodically monitor the impacts and effectiveness of mitigation measures of the management actions on the relevant and important resource values.
Special Designations **Wild and Scenic Rivers** To the extent of the BLM's authority (limited to BLM	Conduct compliance monitoring to ensure that the outstandingly remarkable values are not compromised on river segments determined

Resource and RMP Goal/Objective	Suggested Monitoring Methodology
lands within the river corridor), maintain and enhance the free-flowing character, preserve and enhance the ORVs, and allow no activities within the river corridor that would alter the tentative classification of those river segments determined suitable for congressional designation into the NWSRS until Congress acts on the designation.	suitable for congressional designation into the NWSRS . These include Colorado Segment # 2, Colorado Segment # 3, Dark Canyon and San Juan River Segment #5.
Special Designations **Wilderness Study Areas** Manage FLPMA Section 603 WSAs in a manner that does not impair their suitability for congressional designation into the National Wilderness Preservation System.	Wilderness Study Areas will be monitored in accordance with direction provided in the Interim Management Policy for Lands Under Wilderness Review (BLM Handbook H-8550-1), Chapter 2 section D. The policy requires monitoring of all WSAs at least once per month during the months the area is accessible by the public. Suitable monitoring methods will include both aerial and ground surveillance. As allowed by the IMP, alternative monitoring schedules may be prepared and implemented if approved by the State Director. Monitor approximately 315,000 acres of WSAs annually during the months the areas are accessible by the public, or more frequently if necessary because of potential use activities or other resource conflicts.
Special Designations **Historic Trails** The designated Old Spanish National Historic Trail would be managed to protect the resource values for which it was designated (Public Law 107-325). Hole in the Rock Trail would be managed for Heritage Tourism in consultation with Utah State Historic Preservation Office and Native American tribes, as well as interested stakeholder groups. The BLM would coordinate with the NPS and other managing agencies in management of the Old Spanish National Historic Trail. All interpretation projects would be done in consultation with Native Americans and other interested parties including the Old Spanish Trail Association and NPS.	Monitoring will be conducted on the Old Spanish Trail in accordance with the *Old Spanish Trail Comprehensive Management Plan.*

Resource and RMP Goal/Objective	Suggested Monitoring Methodology
Special Status Species (Threatened, Endangered, and Sensitive) Maintain, protect, and enhance habitats (including but not limited to designated critical habitat) of federally listed Threatened, Endangered, or Candidate plant or animal species to actively promote recovery to the point that they no longer need protection or prevent the listing of species under the Endangered Species Act. Maintain, protect, and enhance habitats of the BLM State Director's sensitive plant and animal species to ensure that actions requiring authorization or approval by the BLM are consistent with the conservation needs of special status species and do not contribute to the need to list any special status species, either under provisions of ESA or other provisions in the BLM Manual 6840 (BLM 2001c). Develop and implement conservation measures to minimize long-term habitat fragmentation through avoidance and site-specific reclamation to provide habitat quality and quantity adequate to fulfill the life history requirements and to support a natural diversity of species.	As required by the Endangered Species Act, monitoring, using approved protocol, would be required on listed and non-listed special status species and their habitat that may be affected by BLM authorization of any activities within that habitat. Support and implement special status plant and animal species Management Plans. Coordinate actions with USFWS, UDWR and other involved entities. Support population and habitat monitoring. Support and implement current and future special status plant and animal species Conservation Plans, Strategies, and Agreements. Coordinate actions with USFWS and other involved entities. Support population and habitat monitoring. Develop cooperative agreements with other agencies or entities to inventory and/or monitor species and their existing or potential habitat for listed and non-listed special status plant and animal species. Plan and implement assessment and monitoring plans for T&E and BLM Sensitive species. Allow translocations and population augmentation of special status species to aid in conservation and recovery efforts. Implement necessary habitat manipulations and monitoring to ensure successful translocation efforts. Monitor and protect known Protected Activity Center (PAC) sites according to USFWS recommendations and MSO Recovery Plan. Monitor and protect known nesting sites according to USFWS recommendations and SWFL Recovery Plan. Manage prairie dogs and their habitats in coordination with the UDWR. Apply habitat management guidance and population monitoring strategies as recommended in the newly developed multi-agency Gunnison's Prairie Dog Management Plan.
Travel Management The BLM would provide opportunities for a range of motorized recreation experiences on public lands while protecting resources and minimizing conflicts among various users. All BLM lands would be designated as open, limited, or closed. Seasonal restrictions can be applied to the limited category. Any fire, military, emergency, or law enforcement vehicle being used for emergency or administrative purposes is exempt from OHV decisions. OHV vehicle use would be managed in accordance	Travel management and OHV use monitoring within the planning area will focus on compliance with specific route and area designations and restrictions, with primary emphasis on those routes or areas causing or with the potential to cause the highest levels of user conflicts or adverse impacts to resources. Various methods of monitoring may be employed including; aerial monitoring, ground patrol, "citizen watch," and appropriate methods of remote surveillance such as traffic counters, etc. Evaluate trail impacts on natural resources through visual inspections,and photos at problem areas (erosion, users short cutting, etc). Use trail traffic

Resource and RMP Goal/Objective	Suggested Monitoring Methodology
with the BLM's National OHV strategy.	counters where appropriate to determine visitor use levels. Involve volunteers to assist in trail monitoring where appropriate and feasible. Periodically check that routes meet the objectives set forth in the RMP to ensure resource conditions such as water quality, wildlife/fish habitat, or recreational values are maintained and available to communities and users, and ensure resource values are not compromised. Route or area closures will be regularly monitored for compliance. Cooperation with other agencies in travel management and OHV use monitoring will continue to be emphasized, and improved wherever possible.
Visual Resources Management Designate VRM classes. Manage activities consistent with VRM management class objectives.	Any project design features or mitigation measures identified to address visual resource management concerns will be monitored to ensure compliance with established VRM classes. Where appropriate, monitoring will include the use of the visual contrast rating system, described in BLM Manual 8400 during project review and upon project completion to assess the effectiveness of project design features and any mitigating measures.
Wildlife and Fisheries Resources Maintain, protect, and enhance habitats to support natural wildlife diversity, reproductive capability, and a healthy, self-sustaining population of wildlife and fish species. Recognize crucial and nonfragmented habitats as management priorities. Maintain or improve vegetation condition and/or avoid long-term disturbance in habitat sites for wildlife and fish species. Minimize long-term habitat fragmentation as much as possible through avoidance and site-specific reclamation to provide habitat quality and quantity adequate to fulfill the life history requirements and to support a natural diversity of species. Maintain and enhance aquatic and wildlife resources, and provide for biological diversity of plants and wildlife resources while ensuring healthy ecosystems.	In conjunction with other federal, state, or private agencies, continue to monitor wildlife populations and habitats in the planning area. Do this for individual species such as mule deer, elk, bighorn sheep, and pronghorn; and groups of species associated with source habitats such as sagebrush-steppe, juniper, and mixed conifer forest.

Resource and RMP Goal/Objective	Suggested Monitoring Methodology
Woodland Products Manage woodlands for Desired Future Condition (DFC), ensuring ecological diversity, stability, and sustainability (including the desired mix of structural stages and landscape/watershed functions), and provide for native plant and wildlife habitats. Provide woodland products on a sustainable basis to meet local needs where such use does not limit the accomplishment of goals for the management of other resources. Provide opportunities for pine nut gathering on a sustainable basis while protecting other resources. Encourage, where feasible, the harvest of woodland products in areas of proposed or existing vegetative treatments to lessen the need for additional treatment or land disturbance, and in areas that need restoration for ecological benefits (for example, *Pinus edulis*). Use the document, "Recommended Old-Growth Definitions and Description, USDA Forest Service Southwestern Region (Sept. 1992)." Identify, maintain, and restore forest and woodland old-growth stands to a pre-fire suppression condition. The Monticello FO would adopt the USFS old growth definitions and identification standards as per the USFS document "Characteristics of Old-Growth Forests in the Intermountain Region (April 1993)" in instances where the area of application in the previous document doesn't apply (for example, pinyon pine).	Monitor small-sale public use permits to ensure compliance. Monitor areas where woodland harvest is prohibited to ensure compliance.
Drought and Natural Disasters	During periods of prolonged drought or in areas that have experienced natural disasters, increase monitoring noted under the other resources, uses, and special designations to ensure that RMP goals and objectives are met during these periods of increased vulnerability.

APPENDIX I. FIRE MANAGEMENT

DESIRED WILDLAND FIRE CONDITION AND CONDITION CLASS

Major Vegetation Group (% in Planning Area)	DWFC and Actions Needed to Meet DWFC
Salt Desert Scrub (29%)	The DWFC, both outside and inside the WUI, is native, open salt desert scrub vegetation with little to no invasive species cover. Fire would be mostly excluded from these vegetation types. Due to the historical lack of surface fuels, the historical fire return interval is extremely infrequent (Final EIS 2004). • Due to the historical lack of fire and current potential for cheatgrass invasion, do not allow wildland fire to burn into salt desert scrub vegetation types. Wildland fire is not desired due to high potential for cheatgrass invasion following wildfire and loss of native salt desert scrub communities. • Treat salt desert scrub types using a combination of mechanical, chemical, seeding and biological treatments to reduce cheatgrass cover and restore native communities. Prescribed fire may be used in conjunction with seeding when part of a cheatgrass control objective (Pellant 2002). Due to the high incidence of cheatgrass in this vegetation type, consider seeding following any surface-disturbing activity. • Following wildland fire, aggressively seed to reduce potential for cheatgrass and other noxious weed invasion.
Pinyon and Juniper Woodland (26%)	Where pinyon and juniper occurred historically, the DWFC both outside and inside the WUI, is open stands of pinyon and juniper with native grass and shrub understory (Miller and Wigand 1994, Final EIS 2004). Where pinyon and juniper did not occur historically, the DWFC is the native shrub, grass and forest communities that the pinyon and juniper have invaded. The historical role of fire (estimated 15–50 year fire return interval) prevented encroachment of pinyon and juniper into other vegetation communities (Heyerdahl et al. 2004, Miller and Tausch 2001, Bradley et al. 1992, Romme et al. 2002). Most pinyon and juniper encroachment has occurred in the past 100 years (Miller and Wigand 1994). Follow treatments with seeding in stands that lack native understory vegetation (Final EIS 2004). Avoid treatments in old-growth (i.e., pre-settlement stands) pinyon and juniper. Historical occurrence of pinyon and juniper is difficult to map, but pre-settlement trees are generally located in shallow, rocky soils and tend to have a unique growth form characterized by rounded, spreading canopies; large basal branches; large irregular trunks; and furrowed fibrous bark (Miller and Rose 1999). Historic fire return intervals in these protected sites are greater than 100 years (Romme et al. 2002). • When possible, allow wildland fire to play its natural role that mimics the historical fire-return interval and severity in stands that have some cover of native understory vegetation. Due to the high risk of losing key ecosystem components in stands with extremely depauperate native understory, avoid wildland fires in these areas. Prescribed fires should be applied to pinyon and juniper communities when native surface fuels will carry fire and when there is low risk of invasive species.

Major Vegetation Group (% in Planning Area)	DWFC and Actions Needed to Meet DWFC
	• Prescribed fire should be used to approximate historical fire return intervals and promote recovery of the pre-settlement vegetation cover types. Remove most young (<100 years old) pinyon and juniper trees through fire or mechanical treatments (Brockway et al. 2002). In the WUI, construct fuel breaks between BLM and private land or other values at risk. • Following wildfire in areas lacking native understory, aggressively seed to reduce invasive species establishment and to restore native communities.
Sagebrush (18%)	The DWFC, both outside and inside the WUI, is healthy sagebrush defined as diverse age classes with an understory of native grasses and forbs (Paige and Ritter 1999). Research suggests that stand-replacement fires burned every 7–110 years depending on the particular sagebrush species and its associated habitat (Miller 2002, Brown 2000, Final EIS 2004). Fire management actions in sagebrush must be carefully balanced between invasive species concerns, wildlife habitat and the need to restore fire. • When possible, allow fire to play its natural role, which mimics the historical fire-return interval and severity in lands that have a low potential for cheatgrass invasion. Areas with low potential for cheatgrass invasion include higher elevation sites and/or sites that have very low incidence of cheatgrass pre-fire. • Treat dense sagebrush (>30%) (Winward 1991) with fire, mechanical, seeding or chemical treatments to reduce sagebrush canopy cover and improve native grass and forb density and cover; an additional objective in treating sagebrush is to remove encroaching pinyon and juniper trees (Miller and Tausch 2001). In the WUI, construct fuel breaks between BLM and private land (or other values at risk) in dense stands of sagebrush. • Following wildfire in lands lacking native understory vegetation, aggressively seed to promote native understory grasses and forbs and reduce invasion of cheatgrass and noxious weeds. Consider including sagebrush in seeding mixes or planting sagebrush seedlings in high-value wildlife areas following large, high-severity wildfires when natural seed sources would be lacking.
Grassland (12%)	Where native grasslands occurred historically, the DWFC outside and inside the WUI consists of native grass and forb communities. Native grasslands have been lost to pinyon and juniper encroachment, cheatgrass invasion and non-native plant seedings (e.g., crested wheatgrass, perennial ryegrass, etc.). Where non-native grasslands occur, the DWFC is the restoration of the native grassland or shrub community. The historical role of fire in Utah's grasslands was similar to pinyon and juniper and sagebrush community types with fires every 15–50 years (Paysen et al. 2000). • When possible, allow fire to play its natural role, which mimics the historical fire-return interval and severity. • Treat native grasslands with fire, mechanical or chemical treatments to reduce encroaching trees (mainly juniper),

Major Vegetation Group (% in Planning Area)	DWFC and Actions Needed to Meet DWFC
	shrubs and invasive plants. Fire treatments alone should be avoided where there is potential for cheatgrass invasion (areas below 7000 feet that have adjacent cheatgrass populations) (Pellant 2002). In the WUI, consider green stripping between BLM and private lands and other values at risk (Harrison et al. 2002). • Following wildfire in lands lacking native grasses, aggressively seed to reduce potential for cheatgrass and other invasive weeds.
Blackbrush (6%)	The DWFC, both outside and inside the WUI, is composed of dense-to scattered shrubs and dense-to-open native grasses. Evidence suggests Utah's blackbrush communities fail to re-establish following fire (Final EIS 2004). • Wildland fire should be avoided in blackbrush communities due to invasive species concerns, historical lack of fire and poor regeneration of blackbrush following fire (Callison et al. 1985). • There is little research on non-fire treatments in blackbrush. Any treatments should be of relatively small size and closely monitored. In the WUI, consider fuels breaks between dense blackbrush stands on BLM land and private land. • Following wildfire, aggressively seed to reduce potential for invasion of cheatgrass and noxious weeds.
Mountain Shrub (2%)	The DWFC outside of the WUI is stands with patches of differing age classes. In the WUI, the DWFC is greatly reduced vegetation density or a conversion to less-flammable vegetation, between BLM and private lands or other values at risk. • When possible, allow fire to play its natural role, which mimics the historical fire-return interval and severity. • Treat large expanses of even-aged, dense, homogenous stands to result in patches of diverse age classes [see Rondeau (2001) for patch size guidance]. To achieve greater habitat diversity and decreased potential for large-scale high-severity fire, reduce invasion of pinyon and juniper and reduce the average age of stands through fire, mechanical or biological (i.e., grazing goats) treatments. In the WUI, consider aggressive vegetation manipulation to create fire breaks in highly flammable shrub types (e.g., Gambel's oak) when there are values at risk. • Since most of these species sprout following wildfire, consider seeding only to reduce potential for invasive weeds.
Mixed Conifer (<1%)	The DWFC outside the WUI is landscapes with a mosaic of age classes (Arno 2000). In the WUI, the DWFC is reduced canopy density and reduced ladder fuels between BLM and private lands and other values at risk. • When possible, allow fire to play its natural role, which mimics the historical fire-return interval and severity in stands with low to moderate fuel loading. In dense stands with high fuel loading, consider mechanical treatments prior to re-introducing fire.

Major Vegetation Group (% in Planning Area)	DWFC and Actions Needed to Meet DWFC
	• Treat areas to result in a landscape of diverse age classes while retaining patches of large old trees. In the WUI, remove ladder fuels and create shaded fuel breaks between BLM and private land when values are at risk. • Consider tree planting following wildland fire to restore or rehabilitate the forest resource to promote forest regeneration.
Ponderosa Pine (<1%)	The DWFC, both outside and in the WUI, is open stands with a native grass and forb understory. • When possible, allow fire to play its natural role, which mimics the historical fire-return interval and severity. Restore fire (natural or prescribed fire) to stands with open to moderately-dense canopies and with native understory. • Consider mechanical treatments in dense stands until they reach a lower FRCC before restoring fire. Reduce juniper encroachment through fire (preferred when fuels conditions allow) or mechanical treatments. In the WUI, remove ladder fuels and create fuel breaks between BLM and private land and other values at risk. • Following wildfires, consider seeding to reduce invasive weeds and planting ponderosa pine seedlings for forest restoration and rehabilitation.
Creosote Bursage (<1%)	The DWFC is for fire to be mostly excluded from these vegetation types. Historically, fire seldom or rarely occurs due to the lack of surface fuels in these communities (Final EIS 2004). • Do not allow fire to burn into these vegetation types since fire rarely occurred and the potential for cheatgrass invasion is high. • Treat creosote and bursage types using mechanical, chemical or biological treatments to reduce annual grass cover. • Following wildfire, aggressively seed to reduce potential for annual grasses and other invasive weeds.
Riparian Wetland (<1%)	The DWFC, both outside and inside the WUI, are riparian and wetland areas with the appropriate composition of native species (e.g., reduction of tamarisk and other invasive species). • When possible, allow fire to play its natural role, mimicking the historical fire-return interval and intensity. Allow low to moderate severity fire to burn into riparian and wetland areas when natural ignitions are managed as wildland fire use. • Restore native riparian and wetland species through fire and mechanical treatments. Reduce flammable invasive species along riparian corridors (e.g., tamarisk) through mechanical, chemical, biological and fire treatments. For prescribed fire, allow low intensity fire to back into riparian and wetland areas through ignition outside of these areas. Mechanical treatment as the initial treatment would be emphasized where there is a moderate to high potential for riparian and wetland to be burned to a high severity. • Consider active restoration options when native riparian and

Major Vegetation Group (% in Planning Area)	DWFC and Actions Needed to Meet DWFC
	wetland communities are unlikely to recover with passive restoration (due to invasive species, stream bank erosion, etc).
Aspen (<1%)	The DWFC, both outside and inside the WUI, is healthy clones with diverse age classes represented and ample regeneration. • When possible, allow fire to play its natural role that mimics the historical fire-return interval and severity since aspen readily sprouts following fire. • Treat aspen stands with fire or mechanical treatments to reduce encroaching junipers and conifers and to stimulate sprouting. If treated aspen stands are small, consider excluding big game and livestock until the regeneration can withstand grazing. In the WUI, consider increasing aspen cover if possible to create a shaded fuel break between private land (and other high value areas) and the more flammable conifer trees on BLM land. • Following wildfire, most aspen stands would need little stabilization, except soil stabilization on steep slopes. However, burned areas may need to be fenced to exclude wildlife and livestock until the regeneration can withstand grazing.

FIRE MANAGEMENT RESOURCE PROTECTION MEASURES

Resource Protection Measures (RPM) and Applicable Fire Management Practices

RPM CODE	SUP: Wildfire Suppression RX: Prescribed Fire ESR: Emergency Stabilization and Rehabilitation	WFU: Wildland fire use for resource benefit NF: Non-fire fuel treatments
NATURAL, BIOLOGICAL, AND CULTURAL RESOURCES		
Air		
A-1	Evaluate weather conditions, including wind speed and atmospheric stability, to predict impacts from smoke from prescribed fires and wildland fire use. Coordinate with Utah Department of Environmental Quality for prescribed fires and wildland fire use. (RX, WFU)	
A-2	When using chemical fuels reduction methods, follow all label requirements for herbicide application. (NF)	
Soil and Water		
SW-1	Avoid heavy equipment use on highly erosive soils (soils with low soil loss tolerance), wet or boggy soils and slopes greater than 30%, unless otherwise analyzed and allowed under appropriate NEPA evaluation with implementation of additional erosion control and other soil protection mitigation measures. (SUP, WFU, RX, NF, ESR)	
SW-2	There may be situations where high intensity fire will occur on sensitive and erosive soil types during wildland fire, wildland fire use or prescribed fire. If significant areas of soil show evidence of high severity fire, evaluate area for soil erosion potential and downstream values at risk and implement	

Resource Protection Measures (RPM) and Applicable Fire Management Practices

RPM CODE	SUP: Wildfire Suppression RX: Prescribed Fire ESR: Emergency Stabilization and Rehabilitation WFU: Wildland fire use for resource benefit NF: Non-fire fuel treatments
	appropriate or necessary soil stabilization actions such as mulching or seeding to avoid excessive wind and water erosion. (SUP, WFU, RX)
SW-3	Complete necessary rehabilitation on firelines or other areas of direct soil disturbance, including but not limited to waterbarring firelines, covering and mulching firelines with slash, tilling and/or subsoiling compacted areas, scarification of vehicle tracks, OHV closures, seeding and/or mulching for erosion protection. (SUP, WFU, RX)
SW-4	When using mechanical fuels reduction treatments, limit tractor and heavy equipment use to periods of low soil moisture to reduce the risk of soil compaction. If this is not practical, evaluate sites, post treatment and if necessary, implement appropriate remediation, such as subsoiling, as part of the operation. (NF)
SW-5	Treatments such as chaining, plowing and roller chopping shall be conducted as much as practical on the contour to reduce soil erosion (BLM ROD 13 Western States Vegetation Treatment EIS 1991). (NF, ESR)
SW-6	When using chemical fuel reduction treatments follow all label directions, additional mitigations identified in project NEPA evaluation and the Approved Pesticide Use Proposal. At a minimum, provide a 100-ft-wide riparian buffer strip for aerial application, 25 ft for vehicle application and 10 ft for hand application. Any deviations must be in accordance with the label. Herbicides would be applied to individual plants within 10 ft of water where application is critical (BLM ROD 13 Western States Vegetation Treatment EIS 1991). (NF)
SW-7	Avoid heavy equipment in riparian or wetland areas. During fire suppression or wildland fire use, consult a resource advisor before using heavy equipment in riparian or wetland areas. (SUP, WFU, RX, NF, ESR)
SW-8	Limit ignition within native riparian or wetland areas. Allow low-intensity fire to burn into riparian areas. (RX)
SW-9	Suppress wildfires consistently with compliance strategies for restoring or maintaining the restoration of water quality impaired [303(d) listed] waterbodies. Do not use retardant within 300 feet of water bodies. (SUP, WFU)
SW-10	Plan and implement projects consistent with compliance strategies for restoring or maintaining the restoration of water quality impaired [303(d) listed] waterbodies. Planned ~ activities should take into account the potential impacts on water quality, including increased water yields that can threaten fisheries and aquatic habitat; improvements at channel crossings; channel stability; and downstream values. Of special concern are small headwaters of moderate to steep watersheds; erosive or saline soils; multiple channel crossings; at-risk fisheries; and downstream residents. (RX, NF, ESR)

Resource Protection Measures (RPM) and Applicable Fire Management Practices

RPM CODE	SUP: Wildfire Suppression RX: Prescribed Fire ESR: Emergency Stabilization and Rehabilitation	WFU: Wildland fire use for resource benefit NF: Non-fire fuel treatments
Vegetation		
V-1	When restoring or rehabilitating disturbed rangelands. non-intrusive, nonnative plant species are appropriate for use when native species: (I) are not available; (2) are not economically feasible; (3) cannot achieve ecological objectives as well as nonnative species; and/or (4) cannot compete with already established native species (Noxious Weeds Executive Order 13112 2/3/1999; BLM Manual 9015; BLM ROD 13 Western States Vegetation Treatment EIS 1991). (RX, NF, ESR)	
V-2	In areas known to have weed infestations, aggressive action should be taken in rehabilitating firelines, seeding and follow-up monitoring and treatment to reduce the spread of noxious weeds. Monitor burned areas and treat as necessary. All seed used would be tested for purity and for noxious weeds. Seed with noxious weeds would be rejected (ROD 13 Western States Vegetation Treatment EIS 1991). (SUP, WFU. RX, NF. ESR)	
Special Status Species		
SSS-1	Initiate emergency Section 7 consultation with United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) upon the determination that wildfire suppression may pose a potential threat to any listed threatened or endangered species or adverse modification of designated critical habitat. (SUP)	
SSS-2	Prior to planned fire management actions, survey for listed threatened and endangered and non-listed sensitive species. Initiate Section 7 consultation with USFWS as necessary if proposed project may affect any listed species. Review appropriate management, conservation and recovery plans and include recovery plan direction into project proposals. For non-listed special status plant and animal species, follow the direction contained in the BLM 6840 Manual. Ensure that any proposed project conserves non-listed sensitive species and their habitats and ensure that any action authorized, funded or carried out by BLM does not contribute to the need for any species to become listed. (RX, NF, ESR)	
SSS-3	See site-specific conservation measures that will be identified in the Biological Assessment (BA) (BLM 2005). (SUP, WFU, RX, NF, ESR)	
Fish and Wildlife		
FW-1	Avoid treatments during nesting, fawning, spawning, or other critical periods for wildlife or fish. (RX, NF, ESR)	
FW-2	Avoid if possible or limit the size of, wildland fires in important wildlife habitats such as, mule deer winter range, riparian and occupied Gunnison sage-grouse habitat. Use resource advisors to help prioritize resources and develop Wildland Fire Situation Analyses (WFSAs) and Wildland Fire Implementation Plans (WFIPs) when important habitats may be impacted. (SUP, WFU)	
FW-3	Minimize wildfire size and frequency in sagebrush communities where sage-grouse habitat objectives will not be met if a fire occurs. Prioritize wildfire suppression in sagebrush habitat with an understory of invasive, annual species. Retain unburned islands and patches of sagebrush unless there are compelling safety, private property and resource protection or control objectives at risk. Minimize burn-out operations (to minimize burned acres) in	

Resource Protection Measures (RPM) and Applicable Fire Management Practices

RPM CODE	SUP: Wildfire Suppression RX: Prescribed Fire ESR: Emergency Stabilization and Rehabilitation WFU: Wildland fire use for resource benefit NF: Non-fire fuel treatments
	occupied sage-grouse habitats when there are no threats to human life and/or important resources. (SUP)
FW-4	Establish fuel treatment projects at strategic locations to minimize size of wildfires and to limit further loss of sagebrush. Fuel treatments may include greenstripping to help reduce .the spread of wildfires into sagebrush communities. (RX, NF)
FW-5	Use wildland fire to meet wildlife objectives. Evaluate impacts to sage-grouse habitat in areas where wildland fire use for resource benefit may be implemented. (WFU, RX)
FW-6	Create small openings in continuous or dense sagebrush (>30% canopy cover) to create a mosaic of multiple-age classes and associated understory diversity across the landscape to benefit sagebrush-dependent species. (WFU, RX, NF)
FW-7	On sites that are currently occupied by forests or woodlands, but historically supported sagebrush communities, implement treatments (fire, cutting, chaining, seeding etc.) to re- establish sagebrush communities. (RX, NF)
FW-8	Evaluate and monitor burned areas and continue management restrictions until the recovering and/or seeded plant community reflect the desired condition. (SUP, WFU, RX, ESR)
FW-9	Utilize the Emergency Stabilization and Rehabilitation program to apply appropriate post-fire treatments within crucial wildlife habitats, including sage-grouse habitats. Minimize seeding with non-native species that may create a continuous perennial grass cover and restrict establishment of native vegetation. Seed mixtures should be designed to reestablish important seasonal habitat components for sage-grouse. Leks should not be re-seeded with plants that change the vegetation height previously found on the lek. Forbs should be stressed in early and late brood-rearing habitats. In situations of limited funds for ESR actions, prioritize rehabilitation of sage-grouse habitats. (ESR)
Wild Horses and Burros	
WHB-1	Avoid fencing that would restrict access to water. (RX, NF, ESR)
Cultural Resources	
CR-1	Cultural resource advisors should be contacted when fires occur in areas containing sensitive cultural resources. (SUP)
CR-2	Wildland fire use is discouraged in areas containing sensitive cultural resources. A Programmatic Agreement is being prepared to cover the finding of adverse effects to cultural resources associated with wildland fire use. (WFU)
CR-3	Potential impacts of proposed treatment should be evaluated for compliance with the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) and the Utah Statewide Protocol. This should be conducted prior to the proposed treatment. (RX, NF, ESR)

Resource Protection Measures (RPM) and Applicable Fire Management Practices

RPM CODE	SUP: Wildfire Suppression RX: Prescribed Fire ESR: Emergency Stabilization and Rehabilitation	WFU: Wildland fire use for resource benefit NF: Non-fire fuel treatments
Paleontology		
P-1	Planned projects should be consistent with BLM Manual and Handbook H-8270-1, Chapter III (A) and III (B) to avoid areas where significant fossils are known or predicted to occur or to provide for other mitigation of possible adverse effects.(RX, NF, ESR)	
P-2	In the event that paleontological resources are discovered in the course of surface fire management activities, including fires suppression, efforts should be made to protect these resources. (SUP, WFU, RX, NF, ESR) Resource Uses:	
Forestry		
F-1	Planned projects should be consistent with HFRA Section IO2(e) (2) to maintain or contribute to the restoration of old-growth stands to a pre-fire suppression condition and. to retain large trees contributing to old-growth structure. (SUP, WFU, RX, NF)	
F-2	During planning, evaluate opportunities to utilize forest and woodland products prior to implementing prescribed fire activities. Include opportunities to use forest and woodland product sales to accomplish non-fire fuel treatments. In forest and woodland stands, consider developing silvicultural prescriptions concurrently with fuel treatments prescriptions. (RX, NF)	
Livestock Grazing		
LG-1	Coordinate with permittees regarding the requirements for non-use or rest of treated areas. (SUP, WFU, RX, NF, ESR)	
LG-2	Rangelands that have been burned, by wildfire, prescribed fire or wildland fire use, would be ungrazed for a minimum of one complete growing season following the burn. (SUP, WFU, RX)	
LG-3	Rangelands that have been re-seeded or otherwise treated to alter vegetative composition, chemically or mechanically, would be ungrazed for a minimum of two complete growing seasons. (RX, NF, ESR)	
Recreation and Visitor Services		
Rec-1	Wildland fire suppression efforts would preferentially protect Special Recreation Management Areas and recreation site infrastructure in line with fire management goals and objectives. (SUP)	
Rec-2	Vehicle tracks created off established routes would be obliterated after fire management actions in order to reduce unauthorized OHV travel. (SUP, WFU, RX, NF, ESR)	
Lands and Realty		
LR-1	Fire management practices would be designed to avoid or otherwise ensure the protection of authorized rights-of-way and other facilities located on the public lands, including coordination with holders of major rights-of-way systems within rights-of-way corridors and communication sites. (WFU, RX, NF, ESR)	
LR-2	Fire management actions must not destroy, deface, change or remove to another place any monument or witness tree of the Public Land Survey	

Resource Protection Measures (RPM) and Applicable Fire Management Practices

RPM CODE	SUP: Wildfire Suppression RX: Prescribed Fire ESR: Emergency Stabilization and Rehabilitation	WFU: Wildland fire use for resource benefit NF: Non-fire fuel treatments
	System. (SUP, WFU, RX, NF, ESR)	
Hazardous Waste		
HW-1	Recognize hazardous wastes and move fire personnel to a safe distance from dumped chemicals, unexploded ordnance, drug labs, wire burn sites or any other hazardous wastes. Immediately notify BLM Field Office hazmat coordinator or state hazmat coordinator upon discovery of any hazardous materials, following the BLM hazardous materials contingency plan. (SUP, WFU, RX, NF, ESR)	
Mineral Resources		
M-1	A safety buffer should be maintained between fire management activities and at-risk facilities. (SUP, WFU, RX)	
SPECIAL DESIGNATIONS		
Wilderness and Wilderness Study Areas (WSAs)		
Wild-1	The use of earth-moving equipment must be authorized by the field office manager. (SUP, WFU, RX, ESR)	
Wild-2	Fire management actions would rely on the most effective methods of suppression that are least damaging to wilderness values, other resources and the environment, while requiring the least expenditure of public funds.(SUP, WFU)	
Wild-3	A resource advisor should be consulted when fire occurs in Wilderness and WSA. (SUP, WFU)	

APPENDIX J. LANDS AND REALTY

TRACTS IDENTIFIED FOR DISPOSAL

Designation	Legal Description	Geographic Area	Acres
E	T. 36 S., R. 22 E. Sec. 12: lots 1, 2, 4, 6; E½NE¼; SE¼SE¼ Sec. 13: E½NE¼	At Recapture Lake	363.80
A, D	T. 31 S., R. 23 E. Sec. 34: NW¼NW¼	Near U-211 at Photograph Gap	40.00
A, D	T. 32 S., R. 23 E. Sec. 18: NE¼NW¼ Sec. 24: SE¼SW¼ Sec. 35: NW¼SW¼	 Harts Draw Peters Hill Northwest of Monticello Airport	 40.00 40.00 40.00
A, D	T. 35 S., R. 23 E. Sec. 16: NE¼NW¼ Sec. 19: NW¼SE¼	Devils Canyon	80.00
A, D	T. 36 S., R 23 E. Sec. 8: NW¼NW¼ Sec. 20: NE¼SE¼	 Northeast of Recapture Lake Northeast of Blanding	 40.00 40.00
A, D	T. 39 S., R. 23 E. Sec. 23: SE¼SE¼	In Navajo Indian Reservation	40.00
A, B, D	T. 39 S., R. 24 E. Sec. 17: S½ Sec. 18: SE¼ Sec. 20: NE¼ Sec. 21; NE¼, S½ Sec. 22: S½ Sec. 27: W½ Sec. 28: NE¼	In Navajo Indian Reservation	1,920.00
A, D	T. 39 S., R. 25 E. Sec 6: NE¼SE¼, S½SE¼ Sec. 7: Lot 2, E½NE¼, SW¼NE¼, SE¼NW¼	In Navajo Indian Reservation	317.85
A, D	T. 31 S., R. 25 E. Sec. 23: S½NE¼, SE¼NW¼, N½SW¼, NE¼SE¼	West Summit Point	240.00
A, D	T. 32 S., R 25 E. Sec. 1: SE¼SW¼ Sec. 12: SW¼NE¼	Summit/West Summit Point	80.00
A, D	T. 38 S., R. 25 E. Sec. 31: Lots 2, 3, 4	North of Hatch Trading Post	109.17

TRACTS IDENTIFIED FOR DISPOSAL

Designation	Legal Description	Geographic Area	Acres
A, D	T. 39 S., R. 25 E. Sec. 15: S½	East of Hatch Trading Post	320.00
A, D	T. 32 S., R. 26 E. Sec. 14: Lots 1, 2, 3, 4 Sec 15 SE¼SW ¼ Sec. 23: Lots 1, 2, 3, 4 Sec. 26: Lots 1, 2, 3, 4	East Summit	232.35
A, D	T. 35 S., R. 26 E. Sec. 31: S½NW¼, N½SW¼, SW¼SW¼	Cedar Point	200.00
P	T. 37 S., R. 25 E. Sec. 7: S½NW¼	Bug Point	80.00
P	T. 38 S., R. 24 E. Sec. 13: E½SE¼	Bug Point	80.00
P	T. 36 S., R. 22 E Sec. 13: Lot 7	North of Blanding	40.00
P	T. 35 S., R. 23 E. Sec. 16: S½S½ Sec. 21 NE¼, E½SE¼	Devil's Canyon	400.00
P	T. 35 S., R. 26 E. Sec. 3: S½NW¼, S½NE¼, NE¼, NE¼, SE¼SW¼	Cedar Point Sage Grouse Habitat	260.00
P	T. 35 S., R. 24 E. Sec. 17: E½ (-10 acres NE corner)	Dodge Point	320.00
P	T. 33 S., R.23 E., Sec. 26 SW¼SW¼ Sec. 35 N½NW¼,W½NW¼NE¼NW¼	Monticello City Water Treatment Facility	82.30
P	T. 42 S., R. 19 E., Sec. 7 Lots 35, 51, 52	Mexican Hat Water Treatment Facility	44.25
P	T. 41 S., R. 21 E., Sec. 5 NW¼, NW¼NE¼, N½SW¼ Sec. 6 E½NE¼, NE¼SE¼	Bluff Airstrip	72.00 (ROW acreage)
P	T. 35 S., R. 24 E., Section 27 NE¼NW¼	Montezuma Creek	9.00

TRACTS IDENTIFIED FOR DISPOSAL

Designation	Legal Description	Geographic Area	Acres
P	T. 33 S., R. 23 E. Section 17 NW¼NE¼, S½NE¼, SE¼, SE¼SW¼, SW¼NW, N½NW¼	North of Monticello Water Development area for San Juan County	440.0
P	T. 38 S., R. 12 E. Section 34 and 35 T. 39 S., R. 12 E. Section 3, All make up tract 37.	Cal Black Memorial Airport	370.42
P	T. 35 S., R. 18 E., Section 30 SE¼NE¼	Sandy & Gale Johnson Hideout Cabin	40.0
P	T. 36 S., R. 16 E., Section 27 SE¼SW¼	Sandy & Gale Johnson Fry Canyon Cabin	160.0
P	T. 36 S., R. 22 E., Section 21 NW¼	Blanding Shooting Range Trespass	40.0
Total Acres			**6,581.14**

Legend: Each parcel is designated by letter as to the type(s) of disposal for which it is suitable, and under what authority:

- A Tracts uneconomic to manage, suitable for sale under authority of Section 203(a)(1) of FLPMA
- B Acquired tracts, suitable for sale under authority of Section 203(a)(2) of FLPMA
- C Public objective tracts, suitable for sale under authority of Section 203(a)(3) of FLPMA
- D Tracts suitable for sale under authority of Section 206(a) of FLPMA
- E Tracts suitable for recreation and public purpose (R&PP) patent under authority of the R&PP Act of 1926 and Section 212 of FLPMA
- F Tracts suitable for desert land entry (DLE patent) under authority of the Act of March 3, 1877, as amended by the Act of March 3, 1891
- P Nominations from the public made subsequent to the 1991 RMP

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK.

APPENDIX K RECREATION

K.1 STANDARDS FOR PUBLIC LAND HEALTH AND GUIDELINES FOR RECREATION MANAGEMENT FOR BLM LANDS IN UTAH

K.1.1 INTRODUCTION

The mission of the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) is to sustain the health, diversity, and productivity of the public lands for the use and enjoyment of present and future generations. The resources of these lands include timber, minerals, soils, riparian areas, water, air, and vegetation, historical and archaeological sites, wildlife habitats, threatened and endangered species habitats, and wilderness. Recreational use of public land is a highly regarded social value of our society. Recognizing that social and economic factors must be considered in achieving healthy public lands, the Utah BLM, will consult with citizens, interest groups and local governments, to conduct planning, and to establish partnerships with stakeholders to manage and to pursue funding sources. Public lands will be managed so that various services, activities, and all renewable resources of the land are environmentally sustainable and nonrenewable resources are recovered in ways that ensure the long-term health of the land.

Standards for Rangeland Health of BLM lands in Utah, and grazing management guidelines to meet these standards, were adopted in May 1997. The following guidelines for recreational use of the public lands are intended to assist in meeting not only the Rangeland Health Standards but also to minimize harm to public land values as listed above. A premise of these guidelines is that health of the land and quality of the recreation experience are inseparable.

It is the intent of the following guidelines to encourage and allow for outdoor recreational opportunities, to enhance the quality of the outdoor experience, and to serve diverse recreational interests while minimizing conflicts between various kinds of users. However, recreation on public land is a limited and precious resource whose long-term use is dependent on the users' responsible and ethical behavior.

Field managers are encouraged to establish partnerships with stakeholders affected by guideline implementation. Communication protocols will be implemented to inform and involve those affected stakeholders.

K.1.2 RECREATION MANAGEMENT GUIDELINES

RANGELAND HEALTH STANDARD 1

Upland soils exhibit permeability and infiltration rates that sustain or improve site productivity, considering the soil type, climate, and land form.

1. Designate areas for intensive recreational use or cross-country motorized travel where disturbance of soil and vegetation is acceptable, either because impacts are insignificant and/or temporary or because the value of intensive use of the land outweighs whatever ecological changes may occur. Decisions on such designation should take into account conflicts with other users as well as adverse effects on archaeological or historical sites,

threatened or endangered species habitat, wildlife habitat, or social values such as beauty, solitude, and quiet.

2. In all other areas, travel routes and other disturbances should be kept to the minimum necessary to provide access and visitor facilities appropriate to the area. Through blocking, signing, and public education, unneeded travel routes should be eliminated and rehabilitated and unplanned development of new ones discouraged.
3. It may be necessary to manage some areas to be entirely free of planned travel routes.

RANGELAND HEALTH STANDARD 2

Riparian and wetland areas are in properly functioning condition and stream channel morphology and functions are appropriate to soil type, climate, and land form.

1. Where feasible, and consistent with user safety, developed travel routes should be located/relocated away from sensitive riparian and wetland areas.
2. Camping in riparian areas should be avoided and must be managed, monitored, and modified as conditions dictate to reduce vegetation disturbance and sedimentation.
3. Stream crossings will be limited to the number dictated by the topography, geology, and soil type. Design any necessary stream crossings to minimize sedimentation, soil erosion, and compaction.

RANGELAND HEALTH STANDARD 3

Desired species, including native, threatened, endangered, and special status species, are maintained at a level appropriate for the site and species involved.

1. Protect against the establishment and/or spread of noxious or other weeds from intensive recreation, including the use of riding and pack animals, hiking, motorized, or other mechanized vehicles.
   a. Conduct an educational campaign to inform recreational users about the damage caused by noxious weeds and how their spread can be minimized.
   b. Where appropriate, apply restrictions, e.g., don't permit surface disturbing activities.
2. Protect wildlife and/or habitat by:
   a. Preserving connectivity and avoiding fragmentation.
   b. Controlling recreational activities that would interfere with critical wildlife stages such as nesting, reproduction, or seasonal concentration areas.
   c. Avoiding creation of artificial attractions such as the feeding of wild animals or improper disposal of garbage.
3. Where necessary, control recreational use by changing location or kind of activity, season, intensity, distribution, and/or duration in order to protect plant and animal communities, especially those containing threatened, endangered, or candidate species.

RANGELAND HEALTH STANDARD 4

The BLM will apply and comply with water quality standards established by the State of Utah (R. 317-2) and the Federal Clean Water and Safe Drinking Water Acts. Activities on BLM lands will fully support the designated beneficial uses described in the Utah Water Quality Standards (R. 317-2) for surface and groundwater.

1. Manage recreational uses in coordination with other uses on public lands to comply with applicable water quality standards by:
   a. Identifying areas where recreational activities may seriously impair water quality.
   b. Establishing thresholds for numbers, types, and duration of visitor use, and when those thresholds are reached, by developing facilities and/or possibly limiting or relocating use.
2. Monitor and control disposal of human or domesticated animal waste, trash, and other pollutants to prevent serious impairment of water quality.

K.1.3 IMPLEMENTING THE RECREATION GUIDELINES

The Recreation Guidelines integrate the recreation program with the standards for rangeland health and broadly define the procedures that would be applied to achieve the standards for rangeland health within the recreation program. Implementing the Recreation Guidelines would define a more specific management approach and recommend actual practices that could be followed to implement the Guidelines. The Guidelines in this document are designed as tools to assist managers in implementing recreation management decisions and actions. At this stage, the environmental effects of implementing the guidelines are too broad, speculative, or conjectural to lend themselves to meaningful environmental analysis under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). Furthermore, implementing actions will be subject to further NEPA review and analysis. Therefore, the adoption of the guidelines is categorically excluded from NEPA analysis (516 DM, Chapter 6, Appendix 5, 5.4, categorical exclusions).

As consistent with existing policies, guidance, and budgetary constraints, it is recommended that the BLM do the following:

- Recognize that in some cases various levels of regulations and limits on users are necessary. Restrictions and limitations on public uses should be as small as possible without compromising the primary goal.
- Use on-the-ground presence as a tool to protect public lands.
- Where long-term damage by recreational uses is observed or anticipated, limit or control activities through specialized management tools such as designated campsites, permits, area closures, and limitations on number of users and duration of use. Revise recreation management plans and management framework plans when they prove to be either overly restrictive or inadequate to maintain public land health.
- Coordinate with federal and state agencies, county and local governments, and tribal nations in recreation planning and managing traffic, search and rescue operations, trash control and removal, and public safety.
- Consider and, where appropriate, implement management methods to protect the resource as well as maintain the quality of experience of the various user groups. These could include limitation of numbers, types, timing, season of use and duration of uses.
- Encourage the location of public land recreational activities near highway corridors by placement of appropriate visitor use infrastructure. Provide restrooms and other facilities adequate for anticipated uses at designated campgrounds, trail heads, and other areas where there is a concentration of recreational users.

K.1.4 BUILDING A STEWARDSHIP ETHIC FOR PUBLIC LAND USE

A critical step in achieving and maintaining public land health and enjoyment of the public land is that the users of the public land practice responsible stewardship ethics. All users, from recreationists to commodity producers, should understand, practice and promote behavior that does not damage the environment. Below are recommended strategies to instill principles of public land-user ethics:

- Use information and interpretative services as major tools to protect public land health as well as significant natural, cultural, and recreational resources. Where feasible, improve public knowledge by locating kiosks, interpretive signs, and visitor information facilities at visitor contact points. Provide guidebooks and pamphlets for users.
- Incorporate information about public land values and user ethics into the terms and conditions of permits and land-use authorizations.
- Increase efforts to educate public land visitors and users about an ethic of responsible use through programs such as Tread Lightly, Leave No Trace, Project Archaeology, the International Mountain Bike Association's Rules of the Trail, and Public Lands Watch program.
- Communicate to the members of the public their individual rights and responsibilities in the use and preservation of public lands, including the recognition of the rights and responsibilities of others.
- Initiate and maintain collaborative partnerships among government agencies, local governments, business communities, volunteers, user groups, stakeholders, educational institutions, individuals, and the private sector to achieve Rangeland Health Standards and implement associated guidelines.
- Encourage the development of a concise educational program to be implemented at the initial point of contact with the public and public land users. The program should promote public land values, knowledge of rights and responsibilities, environmental awareness, and communication between the BLM and the public. It should inform the public about changing management practices and policies. In addition, the educational program should demonstrate the connection between the health of the public land and the benefits users and local communities receive from those lands.
- Encourage the private sector to conduct responsible marketing of activities available on public lands while avoiding use of products and services in ways that may harm public lands.
- Educate the public in proper human and solid waste disposal techniques.

K.1.5 GLOSSARY

Guidelines, Recreation: Recreation management tools, methods, and techniques designed to provide activities, experiences, and benefits for the recreating public while maintaining or achieving healthy public lands as defined by the standards. The recreation guidelines contained in this document are directed toward maintaining or achieving public land health.

Mechanized Vehicle: Any motorized or nonmotorized vehicle capable of, or designed for, travel on or immediately over land. An example of a mechanized, but not motorized vehicle is a mountain bike. All motorized vehicles are mechanized.

Motorized Vehicle: Synonymous with off-road and off-highway vehicle. Examples of this type of vehicle include all-terrain vehicles (ATV), sport utility vehicles (SUV), motorboats, and snowmobiles.

Non-Motorized Use: Recreational human and animal foot traffic. Examples include horses, llamas, and other domestic animals. Wheel chairs designed for indoor use as a medical appliance are not considered mechanized.

Protect: To take actions to guard against or minimize injury or loss.

Riparian: Of, on, or relating to the bank of a natural course of water.

Special Status Species/Sensitive Species: Those species designated by a state director, usually in cooperation with the state agency responsible for managing the species as sensitive.

Standards for Public Land Health: A description of conditions needed to sustain public land health; the standards relate to all uses of the public lands in Utah.

Threatened and Endangered Species: Those species officially listed as threatened or endangered by the Secretary of the Interior under the provisions of the Endangered Species Act.

Visitor Use Infrastructure: Amenities such as roads, parking areas, and facilities, to protect the resource and support the recreation user in his/her pursuit of activities, experiences, and benefits.

K.2 BENEFITS BASED MANAGEMENT (BBMS) GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

K.2.1 Cedar Mesa Special Recreation Management Area

Market Strategy	Destination
Market	International, National, Regional, and Local visitors seeking premier and unique cultural tourism opportunities.
Niche	Cedar Mesa offers visitors the chance to experience a very unique remote canyon system, containing a very high density of world-renowned cultural sites
Management Goals	Integrated management between the BLM and NPS to provide outstanding recreational opportunities and visitor experiences, while protecting natural and cultural resource values.
Management Objectives	By the year 2013, manage this zone to provide opportunities for visitors to engage in backcountry, middlecountry, frontcountry, and rural cultural appreciation recreation, providing no less than 75% of responding visitors and affected community residents at least a moderate realization of these benefits: (i.e., 3.0 on a probability scale where 1 = not at all, 2 = somewhat, 3 = moderate, 4 = total realization).

Targeted Outcomes		
Primary Activities	**Experiences**	**Benefits**
Cultural site visitation Rock art viewing Backcountry hiking and backpacking Horseback riding Camping OHV riding Wilderness education Research Photography Ranger Station visitation	Achievement/stimulation Sense of leadership Risk Family togetherness Learning about nature Introspection Nostalgia Exercise/physical fitness Physical rest Escape physical pressure Teaching others Sense of place	***Personal:*** Psychological (mental health maintenance) Personal development and growth Personal appreciation and satisfaction Improved physical health ***Household and Community:*** Greater household awareness of and appreciation for cultural heritage Reduced numbers of at-risk youth Enhanced lifestyle ***Economic:*** Reduced health maintenance costs Positive contributions to local-regional economic stability Increased local job opportunities Greater diversification of local job offerings Increased local tourism revenue ***Environmental:*** Maintenance of distinct recreation setting character Reducing looting and vandalism of historic and pre-historic sites Sustaining community's cultural heritage Increased awareness and protection of natural landscapes

K.2.1 Cedar Mesa Special Recreation Management Area

Setting Prescriptions		
Physical	**Social**	**Administrative**
Backcountry, middlecountry, frontcountry, and rural, which is generally natural in appearance.	See Summary of Impacts Table, Table 2.1 of Chapter 2.	Brochures are available for information opportunities. Agency presence is frequent (Kane Gulch Ranger Station) Mandatory fee permit system Maintain nonmotorized and motorized recreation.

K.2.2 Dark Canyon Special Recreation Management Area

Market Strategy	**Undeveloped**
Market	National, Regional, and Local Visitors seeking premier and unique hiking and backpacking experiences (including Commercial Wilderness Groups).
Niche	Dark Canyon offers visitors the chance to experience a very unique remote canyon system, which begins in the sub-alpine ecological zone and ends in the desert zone on the banks of the Colorado River.
Management Goals	Integrated management between the BLM, USFS and NPS to provide outstanding recreational opportunities and visitor experiences, while protecting natural and cultural resource values.
Management Objectives	By the year 2013, manage this zone to provide opportunities for visitors to engage in Backcountry muscle-powered exercise and cultural appreciation recreation, providing no less than 75% of responding visitors and affected community residents at least a moderate realization of these benefits: (i.e., 3.0 on a probability scale where 1 = not at all, 2 = somewhat, 3 = moderate, 4 = total realization).

Targeted Outcomes		
Primary Activities	**Experiences**	**Benefits**
Backcountry hiking and backpacking Canyoneering Horseback riding Rock Art viewing Cultural site visitation Swimming Wilderness therapy and education	Achievement/stimulation Sense of leadership Risk Family togetherness Learning about nature Introspection Nostalgia Exercise/physical fitness Physical rest Escape physical pressure Teaching others Sense of place	***Personal:*** Psychological (mental health maintenance) Personal development and growth Personal appreciation and satisfaction Improved physical health ***Household and Community:*** Greater household awareness of and appreciation for cultural heritage Reduced numbers of at-risk youth Enhanced lifestyle ***Economic:*** Reduced health maintenance costs Positive contributions to local-regional economic stability Increased local job opportunities Greater diversification of local job

K.2.2 Dark Canyon Special Recreation Management Area

		offerings Increased local tourism revenue ***Environmental:*** Maintenance of distinct recreation setting character Reducing looting and vandalism of historic and pre-historic sites Sustaining community's cultural heritage Increased awareness and protection of natural landscapes
Setting Prescriptions		
Physical Primarily backcountry, which is generally natural in appearance and is primarily nonroaded due to its Wilderness Study Area designation.	**Social** See Summary of Impacts Table, Table 2.1 of Chapter 2.	**Administrative** Brochures are available for information opportunities. Agency presence is minimal Maintain nonmechanized recreation other than designated access roads.

K.2.3 Indian Creek Special Recreation Management Area

Market Strategy	Destination
Market	International, National, Regional, and Local visitors (including commercial groups) seeking premier and unique climbing, hiking, camping, scenic, photographic, and OHV recreation opportunities and experiences in a spectacular American southwest landscape, including Newspaper Rock National Historic Landmark, and is the direct route to the Needles District of Canyonlands National Park.
Niche	Indian Creek offers visitors the chance to experience a very unique remote landscape, which contains a world-renowned sandstone crack climbing area, a high number of cultural sites, a popular OHV access area, rare paleontological formations, and camping opportunities.
Management Goals	Integrated management between the BLM, NPS, and The Nature Conservancy to provide outstanding recreational opportunities and visitor experiences, while protecting natural and cultural resource values.
Management Objectives	By the year 2013, manage this zone to provide opportunities for visitors to engage in Backcountry, Middlecountry, Frontcountry, and Rural activities and cultural appreciation recreation, providing no less than 75% of responding visitors and affected community residents at least a moderate realization of these benefits: (i.e., 3.0 on a probability scale where 1 = not at all, 2 = somewhat, 3 = moderate, 4 = total realization).

K.2.3 Indian Creek Special Recreation Management Area

Targeted Outcomes		
Primary Activities Rock climbing OHV riding Backcountry hiking and backpacking Horseback riding Rock art viewing Sight-seeing Cultural site visitation Swimming Camping Wilderness education Research	**Experiences** Achievement/stimulation Sense of leadership Risk Family togetherness Learning about nature Introspection Nostalgia Exercise/physical fitness Physical rest Escape physical pressure Teaching others Sense of place	**Benefits** ***Personal:*** Psychological (mental health maintenance) Personal development and growth Personal appreciation and satisfaction Improved physical health ***Household and Community:*** Greater household awareness of and appreciation for cultural heritage Reduced numbers of at-risk youth Enhanced lifestyle ***Economic:*** Reduced health maintenance costs Positive contributions to local-regional economic stability Increased local job opportunities Greater diversification of local job offerings Increased local tourism revenue ***Environmental:*** Maintenance of distinct recreation setting character Reducing looting and vandalism of historic and pre-historic sites Sustaining community's cultural heritage Increased awareness/protection of natural landscapes
Setting Prescriptions		
Physical Backcountry, middlecountry, frontcountry, and rural which is generally natural in appearance.	**Social** See Summary of Impacts Table, Table 2.1 of Chapter 2.	**Administrative** Brochures are available for information opportunities. Agency presence is frequent Maintain nonmotorized and motorized recreation.

K.2.4 San Juan River Special Recreation Management Area

Market Strategy	Destination
Market	International, National, Regional, and Local visitors (including numerous commercial groups) seeking premier and unique river recreation opportunities and experiences in a spectacular American southwest canyon.
Niche	The San Juan River offers visitors the chance to experience a very unique remote canyon river system, which passes through world-renowned geological formations and riverside cultural sites.
Management Goals	Integrated management between the BLM, NPS, and the Navajo Nation to provide outstanding recreational opportunities and visitor experiences, while protecting natural and cultural resource values.
Management Objectives	By the year 2013, manage this zone to provide opportunities for visitors to engage in Backcountry river-running, camping, and cultural appreciation recreation, providing no less than 75% of responding visitors and affected community residents at least a moderate realization of these benefits: (i.e., 3.0 on a probability scale where 1 = not at all, 2 = somewhat, 3 = moderate, 4 = total realization).

Targeted Outcomes

Primary Activities	Experiences	Benefits
Backcountry river-running	Achievement/stimulation	***Personal:***
Backcountry hiking and backpacking	Sense of leadership	Psychological (mental health maintenance)
Horseback riding	Risk	Personal development and growth
Rock art viewing	Family togetherness	Personal appreciation and satisfaction
Cultural site visitation	Learning about nature	Improved physical health
Swimming	Introspection	***Household and Community:***
Fishing	Nostalgia	Greater household awareness of and appreciation for cultural heritage
Camping	Exercise/physical fitness	Reduced numbers of at-risk youth
Wilderness education	Physical rest	Enhanced lifestyle
Commercial river-running	Escape physical pressure	***Economic:***
River-related research	Teaching others	Reduced health maintenance costs
	Sense of place	Positive contributions to local-regional economic stability
		Increased local job opportunities
		Greater diversification of local job offerings
		Increased local tourism revenue
		Environmental:
		Maintenance of distinct recreation setting character
		Reducing looting and vandalism of historic and pre-historic sites
		Sustaining community's cultural heritage
		Increased awareness and protection of natural landscapes

K.2.4 San Juan River Special Recreation Management Area

Setting Prescriptions		
Physical	**Social**	**Administrative**
Primarily backcountry and middlecountry, which is generally natural in appearance and is primarily nonroaded.	See Summary of Impacts Table, Table 2.1 of Chapter 2.	Brochures are available for information opportunities. Agency presence is frequent (Sand Island Ranger Station) Mandatory fee permit system Maintain nonmechanized recreation other than designated access roads.

K.2.5 White Canyon Special Recreation Management Area

Market Strategy	**Undeveloped**
Market	Regional and Local Visitors seeking premier and unique slot canyon hiking and backpacking experiences.
Niche	White Canyon offers visitors the chance to experience unique slot canyons and the backcountry surrounding Natural Bridges National Monument.
Management Goals	Integrated management between the BLM and NPS (including the Glen Canyon National Recreation Area and Natural Bridges National Monument) to provide outstanding recreational opportunities and visitor experiences, while protecting natural and cultural resource values.
Management Objectives	By the year 2013, manage this zone to provide opportunities for visitors to engage in Backcountry recreation, including camping, providing no less than 75% of responding visitors and affected community residents at least a moderate realization of these benefits: (i.e., 3.0 on a probability scale where 1 = not at all, 2 = somewhat, 3 = moderate, 4 = total realization).

Targeted Outcomes		
Primary Activities	**Experiences**	**Benefits**
Backcountry hiking and backpacking Canyoneering Rock art viewing Cultural site visitation Wilderness therapy and education	Achievement/stimulation Sense of leadership Risk Family togetherness Learning about nature Introspection Nostalgia Exercise/physical fitness Physical rest Escape physical pressure Teaching others Sense of place	***Personal:*** Psychological (mental health maintenance) Personal development and growth Personal appreciation and satisfaction Improved physical health ***Household and Community:*** Greater household awareness of and appreciation for cultural heritage Reduced numbers of at-risk youth Enhanced lifestyle ***Economic:*** Reduced health maintenance costs Positive contributions to local-regional economic stability Increased local job opportunities Greater diversification of local job

K.2.5 White Canyon Special Recreation Management Area

		offerings Increased local tourism revenue ***Environmental:*** Maintenance of distinct recreation setting character Reducing looting and vandalism of historic and pre-historic sites Sustaining community's cultural heritage Increased awareness and protection of natural landscapes
Setting Prescriptions		
Physical Primarily backcountry and middlecountry, which is generally natural in appearance and is primarily nonroaded.	**Social** See Summary of Impacts Table, Table 2.1 of Chapter 2.	**Administrative** Agency presence is minimal Maintain nonmechanized recreation other than designated access roads. Provide primitive campground opportunities May implement permit system, as necessary

APPENDIX L. GUIDANCE FOR PIPELINE CROSSINGS

HYDRAULIC CONSIDERATIONS FOR PIPELINE CROSSINGS OF STREAM CHANNELS

Pipeline crossings of perennial, intermittent, and ephemeral stream channels should be constructed to withstand floods of extreme magnitude to prevent breakage and subsequent accidental contamination of runoff during high-flow events. Surface crossings must be constructed high enough to remain above the highest possible stream flows at each crossing, and subsurface crossings must be buried deep enough to remain undisturbed by scour throughout passage of the peak flow. To avoid repeated maintenance of such crossings, hydraulic analysis should be completed in the design phase to eliminate costly repair and potential environmental degradation associated with pipeline breaks at stream crossings.

SURFACE CROSSINGS

Pipelines that cross stream channels on the surface should be located above all possible flood flows that may occur at the site. At a minimum, pipelines must be located above the 100-year flood elevation, and preferably above the 500-year flood elevation. Procedures for estimating 100-year and 500-year flood magnitudes are described in the U.S. Geological Survey's National Flood Frequency Program (Jennings et al. 1994). Two sets of relationships for estimating flood frequencies at ungauged sites in Utah are included in the NFF program: Thomas and Lindskov (1983) use drainage basin area and mean basin elevation for flood estimates for six Utah regions stratified by location and basin elevation. Thomas et al. (1997) also use drainage area and mean basin elevation to estimate magnitude and frequency of floods throughout the southwestern U.S., including five regions that cover the entire state of Utah. Results from both sets of equations should be examined to estimate the 100- and 500-year floods, since either of the relations may provide questionable results if the stream crossing drains an area near the boundary of a flood region or if the data for the crossing approach or exceed the limits of the data set used to develop the equations.

Estimating the depth of flow, or conversely the elevation of the pipeline at the crossing, may be approached a number of ways. The simplest procedure would be based solely on a field reconnaissance of the site, using basic geomorphic principles. Identification of the bank-full elevation and the active floodplain (i.e., floodplain formed by the present flow regime) provides inadequate conveyance for extreme flood events. Past floodplains/present terraces also must be identified, since these represent extreme floods in the present flow regime, especially in arid and semiarid environments. Pipeline crossings should be constructed to elevate the pipeline above the level of the highest and outermost terrace at the crossing. This level represents the geomorphic surface likely to be associated with the maximum probable flood. Since this method is entirely based on a geomorphic reconnaissance of the site, no flood-frequency analysis is required and no recurrence interval is assigned to the design elevation. While this is the simplest approach to design of the crossing, it likely will result in the most conservative estimate (i.e., highest elevation) for suspension of the pipeline.

A slightly more intensive approach to crossing design is based on the Physiographic Method described by Thomas and Lindskov (1983) for estimating flood depths at ungauged sites. The procedure utilizes regional regression equations (similar to the flood-frequency equations described above) to estimate depth of flow associated with a specified recurrence-interval flood. Flood depth is then added to a longitudinal survey of the stream channel in the vicinity of the crossing, resulting in a longitudinal profile of the specified flood. Elevation of the flood profile at the point of pipeline crossing is the elevation above which the pipeline must be suspended. While this procedure requires a field survey and calculation of actual flood depths, it may result in a lower crossing elevation (and possibly lower costs) for the pipeline. Also, since the regional regression equations estimate flood depth for specified recurrence-interval floods, it is possible to place a recurrence interval on the crossing design for risk calculations.

It may be possible to reduce pipeline construction costs associated with channel crossings even further with a water-surface-profile model of flow through the crossing site. The water-surface-profile model requires a detailed survey of both the longitudinal channel profile and several cross-sections along the stream. Design flows (e.g., 100-year and 500-year floods) are calculated for the channel at the crossing (with the regional regression equations described above) and routed through the surveyed channel reach utilizing a step-backwater analysis. The step-backwater analysis uses the principles of conservation of mass and conservation of energy to calculate water-surface elevations at each surveyed cross-section. Since the computation utilizes a detailed channel survey, it is probably the most accurate method to use; however, it is likely the most expensive method for the same reason. The step-backwater computations require an estimate of the Manning n-value as an indicator of resistance to flow, and assume fairly stable channel boundaries. Estimates of the n-value for ungauged sites are a matter of engineering judgment, but n-values typically are a function of slope, depth of flow, bed-material particle size, and bedforms present during the passage of the flood wave. Guidance is available in many hydraulic references (e.g., Chow 1959). The assumption of fairly stable channel boundaries is not always met with sand-bed channels, and is an issue of considerable importance for designing subsurface pipeline crossings as well (see below).

SUBSURFACE (BURIED) CROSSINGS

Since many of the pipelines are small and most of the channels are ephemeral, it is commonplace to bury the pipelines rather than suspending them above the streams. The practice of burying pipelines at channel crossings likely is both cheaper and easier than suspending them above all flood flows; however, an analysis of channel degradation and scour should be completed to ensure the lines are not exposed and broken during extreme runoff events. Without such an analysis, pipeline crossings should be excavated to bedrock and placed beneath all alluvial material.

Buried pipelines may be exposed by stream bed lowering resulting from channel degradation, channel scour, or a combination of the two. Channel degradation occurs over a long stream reach or larger geographic area and is generally associated with the overall lowering of the landscape. Degradation also may be associated with changes in upstream watershed or channel conditions impacting the water and sediment yield of the basin. Channel scour is a local phenomenon associated with passage of one or more flood events and/or site-specific hydraulic conditions that may be natural or man-caused in origin. Either process can expose buried pipelines to excessive

forces associated with extreme flow events, and an analysis of each is required to ensure integrity of the crossing.

Detection of long-term channel degradation must be attempted, even if there is no indication of local scour. Plotting bed elevations against time permits evaluation of bed-level adjustment and indicates whether a major phase of channel incision has passed or is ongoing. However, comparative channel survey data are rarely available for the proposed location of a pipeline crossing. In instances where a gauging station is operated at or near the crossing, it's usually possible to determine long-term aggradation or degradation by plotting the change in stage through time for one or more selected discharges. The procedure is called a specific gauge analysis and is described in detail in the Stream Corridor Restoration manual published by the Federal Interagency Stream Restoration Working Group (1998). When there is no gauging station near the proposed pipeline crossing, nearby locations on the same stream or in the same river basin may provide a regional perspective on long-term channel adjustments. However, specific gauge records indicate only the conditions in the vicinity of the particular gauging station and do not necessarily reflect river response farther upstream or downstream of the gauge. Therefore, it is advisable to investigate other data in order to make predictions about potential channel degradation at a site.

Other sources of information include the biannual bridge inspection reports required in all states for bridge maintenance. In most states, these reports include channel cross-sections or bed elevations under the bridge, and a procedure similar to specific gauge analysis may be attempted. Simon (1989, 1992) presents mathematical functions for describing bed level adjustments through time, fitting elevation data at a site to either a power function or an exponential function of time. Successive cross-sections from a series of bridges in a basin also may be used to construct a longitudinal profile of the channel network; sequential profiles so constructed may be used to document channel adjustments through time.

In the absence of channel surveys, gauging stations, and bridge inspection reports (or other records of structural repairs along a channel), it may be necessary to investigate channel aggradation and degradation using quantitative techniques described in Richardson et al. (2001) and Lagasse et al. (2001). Techniques for assessing vertical stability of the channel include incipient motion analysis, analysis of armoring potential, equilibrium slope analysis, and sediment continuity analysis. Geomorphic indicators of recent channel incision (e.g., obligate and facultative riparian species on present-day stream terraces elevated above the water table) also may be helpful for diagnosing channel conditions.

In addition to long-term channel degradation at the pipeline crossing, local scour of the crossing must be addressed for pipeline safety. Local scour occurs when sediment transport through a stream reach is greater than the sediment load being supplied from upstream and is usually associated with changes in the channel cross-section. Local scour can occur in natural channels wherever a pipeline crosses a constriction in the channel cross-section (contraction scour). Equations for calculating contraction scour generally fall into two categories, depending on the inflow of bed-material sediment from upstream. In situations where there is little to no bed-material transport from upstream (generally coarse-bed streams with gravel and larger bed materials), contraction scour should be estimated using clear-water scour equations. In situations where there is considerable bed-material transport into the constricted section (i.e., for most sand-bed streams), contraction scour should be estimated using live-bed scour equations. Live-

bed and clear-water scour equations can be found in many hydraulic references (e.g., Richardson and Davis 2001). In either case, estimates of local scour in the vicinity of the pipeline crossing must be added to the assessment of channel degradation for estimating the depth of burial for the crossing.

Even in the absence of contraction scour, local scour will still occur in most sand-bed channels during the passage of major floods. Since sand is easily eroded and transported, interaction between the flow of water and the sand bed results in different configurations of the stream bed with varying conditions of flow. The average height of dune bedforms is roughly one-third to one-half the mean flow depth, and maximum height of dunes may nearly equal the mean flow depth. Thus, if the mean depth of flow in a channel was 5 feet, maximum dune height could also approach 5 feet, half of which would be below the mean elevation of the stream bed (Lagasse et al. 2001). Similarly, Simons, Li and Associates (1982) present equations for antidune height as a function of mean velocity, but limit maximum antidune height to mean flow depth. Consequently, formation of antidunes during high flows not only increases mean water-surface elevation by one-half the wave height, it also reduces the mean bed elevation by one-half the wave height. Richardson and Davis (2001) report maximum local scour of one to two times the average flow depth where two channels come together in a braided stream.

Pipeline crossings that are buried rather than suspended above all major flow events should address all of the components of degradation, scour, and channel-lowering due to bedforms described above. In complex situations or where consequences of pipeline failure are significant, consideration should be given to modeling the mobile-bed hydraulics with a numerical model such as HEC-6 (U.S. Army Corps of Engineers 1993) or BRI-STARS (Molinas 1990). The Federal Interagency Stream Corridor Restoration manual (FISRWG 1998) summarizes the capabilities of these and other models, and provides references for model operation and user guides where available.

REFERENCES

Chow, V.T., 1959, Open-channel hydraulics: McGraw Hill, New York, 680 pages.

Federal Interagency Stream Restoration Working Group, 1998, Stream corridor restoration – principle, processes, and practices: National Technical Information Service, Order No. PB98-158348INQ, Washington, D.C.

Jennings, M.E., Thomas, Jr., W.O., and Riggs, H.C., 1994, Nationwide summary of U.S. Geological Survey regional regression equations for estimating magnitude and frequency of floods the ungauged sites, 1993: U.S. Geological Survey Water-Resources Investigations Report 94-4002, 196 pages.

Lagasse, P.F., Schall, J.D., and Richardson, E.V., 2001, Stream stability at highway structures: Hydraulic Engineering Circular No. 20, Third Edition, FHWA NHI 01-002, Federal Highway Administration, Washington, D.C.

Molinas, A., 1990, Bridge stream tube model for alluvial river simulation (BRI-STARS), user's manual: National Cooperative Highway Research Program, Project No. HR 15-11, Transportation Research Board, Washington, D.C.

Richardson, E.V., and Davis, S.R., 2001, Evaluating scour at bridges: Hydraulic Engineering Circular No. 18, Fourth Edition, FHWA NHI 01-001, Federal Highway Administration, Washington, D.C.

Richardson, E.V., Simons, D.B. and Lagasse, P.F., 2001, Highways in the river environment: Report FHWA NHI 01-004, Federal Highway Administration, Hydraulic Design Series No. 6, Washington, D.C.

Simon, A., 1989, A model of channel response in distributed alluvial channels: Earth Surface Processes and Landforms 14(1): 11-26.

Simon, A., 1992, Energy, time and channel evolution in catastrophically disturbed fluvial systems: in Geomorphic systems: geomorphology, ed. J.D. Phillips and W.H. Renwick, vol. 5, pp. 345-372.

Simons, Li and Associates, 1982, Engineering analysis of fluvial systems: SLA, Fort Collins, Colorado.

Thomas, B.E., and Lindskow, K.L., 1983, Methods for estimating peak discharge and flood boundaries of stream in Utah: U.S. Geological Survey Water-Resources Investigations Report 83-4129, 77 pages.

Thomas, B.E., Hjalmarson, H.W., and Waltemeyer, S.D., 1993, Methods for estimating magnitude and frequency of floods in the southwestern United States: U.S. Geological Survey Open-File Report 93-419, 193 pages.

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, 1993, Scour and deposition in rivers and reservoirs, user's manual, HEC-6: Hydrologic Engineering Center, Davis, CA.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK.

APPENDIX M
FINALIZED CONSERVATION MEASURES AND BEST MANAGEMENT PRACTICES (BMPS) FOR T&E SPECIES OF UTAH FROM THE LAND USE PLAN PROGRAMMATIC BAS AND SECTION 7 CONSULTATIONS—2007

As part of the proposed action, the BLM has included conservation measures to minimize or eliminate adverse impacts to federally listed species. These measures are listed by species.

M.1BALD EAGLE (*HALIAEETUS LEUCOCEPHALUS*)

The following list of measures provides species-specific guidance intended to avoid, minimize, or reduce potential adverse impacts from implementation of BLM actions under the authority of current Utah BLM LUPs on the Bald Eagle (*Haliaeetus leucocephalus*). This list is not comprehensive. Additional conservation measures, or other modified versions of these measures, may be applied for any given BLM-authorized activity upon further analysis, review, coordination efforts, and/or appropriate levels of section 7 consultation with the Service.

1. The BLM will place restrictions on all authorized (i.e., permitted) activities that may adversely impact Bald Eagles, their breeding habitat, roosting sites, and known winter concentration areas, in order to avoid or minimize potential impacts.

   Measures have been adapted from guidance published in the Utah Field Office Guidelines for Raptor Protection from Human and Land Use Disturbances (USFWS 2002), as well as coordination between the BLM and the service. Measures include, but may not be limited to, seasonal/daily timing limitations and/or spatial buffers as follows:

   - Temporary activities[1] or habitat alterations that may disturb nesting Bald Eagles will be restricted from January 1 to August 31 within 1.0 mile of Bald Eagle nest sites. Exceptions may be granted where no nesting behavior is initiated prior to June 1.
   - Temporary activities or habitat alterations that may disturb Bald Eagles will be restricted within 0.5 mile of known winter concentration areas from November 1 to March 31. Additionally, where daily activities must occur within these spatial buffers, and are approved through subsequent consultation, activities should be properly scheduled to occur after 9 a.m. and terminate at least one hour before official sunset to ensure that Bald Eagles using these roosts are allowed the opportunity to vacate their roost in the morning and return undisturbed in the evening.
   - No permanent[2] infrastructure will be placed within 1.0 mile of Bald Eagle nest sites or within 0.5 mile of Bald Eagle winter concentration areas.
   - Where activities are authorized within breeding habitats or known winter concentration areas, monitoring efforts would document what, if any, impacts occur during project

[1] Temporary activities are defined as those that are completed prior to the start of the following raptor breeding season, leaving no permanent structures and resulting in no permanent habitat loss.

[2] Permanent activities continue for more than one breeding season and/or cause a loss of habitat or displace individuals through disturbance (e.g., creation of a permanent structure including but not limited to well pads, roads, pipelines, electrical power line).

implementation, and to what extent the species was affected. The results of these monitoring efforts would be carried forward in the design and implementation of future projects as part of the adaptive management process.

2. For all project-related survey and monitoring actions:
   - Reports must be provided to affected field offices within 15 days of completion of survey or monitoring efforts. Reports must follow field office guidance for BLM-specified formats for written and automated databases.
   - Any detection of Bald Eagle presence during survey or monitoring efforts must be reported to the authorized officer within 48 hours of detection.
3. Appropriately timed surveys in suitable Bald Eagle nesting habitat or identified concentration areas shall be conducted in accordance with approved protocols prior to any activities that may disturb Bald Eagles. Surveys would only be conducted by BLM-approved individuals or personnel.
4. The BLM shall in coordination with cooperating agencies and/or partners (e.g., UDWR, Service, etc.), verify annual status (active vs. inactive) of all known Bald Eagle nests, and other identified concentration areas on BLM-administered lands.
5. When project proposals that may affect threatened and endangered species are received, the BLM will coordinate with the Service at the earliest possible date so that the Service can provide necessary information to minimize, or avoid, the need to redesign projects at a later date to include conservation measures that may be determined as appropriate by the Service.
6. BLM-administered lands within 1.0 mile of Bald Eagle nests, or identified communal winter roosts, should not be exchanged or sold. If it is imperative that these lands be transferred out of BLM ownership, then every effort should be made to include conservation easements or voluntary conservation restrictions to protect the Bald Eagles and support their conservation.
7. Proponents of BLM-authorized actions will be advised that roadside carrion can attract foraging Bald Eagles and potentially increase the risk of vehicle collisions with individuals feeding on carrion. When carrion occurs on the road, appropriate officials will be notified for necessary removal.
8. Power lines will be built to standards and guidelines identified by the Avian Protection Plan (APP) Guidelines (APLIC and USFWS 2005).
9. The BLM will make educational information available to project proponents and the general public pertaining to the following topics:
   - appropriate vehicle speeds and the associated benefit of reduced vehicle collisions with wildlife;
   - use of lead shot (particularly over water bodies);
   - use of lead fishing weights; and
   - general ecological awareness of habitat disturbance.
10. Since Bald Eagles are often dependent on aquatic species as prey items, the BLM will periodically review existing water quality records (e.g., UDEQ, UDWR, USGS) from monitoring stations on, or near, important Bald Eagle habitats (i.e., nests, roost, concentration areas) on BLM lands for any conditions that could adversely affect Bald Eagles or their prey. If water quality problems are identified, the BLM will contact the appropriate jurisdictional entity to cooperatively monitor the condition and/or take corrective action.

M.2 MEXICAN SPOTTED OWL (*STRIX OCCIDENTALIS LUCIDA*)

The following list of measures provides species-specific guidance, intended to avoid, minimize, or reduce potential adverse impacts from implementation of BLM actions under the authority of current Utah BLM LUPs on the Mexican Spotted Owl (*Strix occidentalis lucida*). This list is not comprehensive. Additional conservation measures, or other modified versions of these measures, may be applied for any given BLM-authorized activity upon further analysis, review, coordination efforts, and/or appropriate levels of section 7 consultation with the Service.

1. The BLM will place restrictions on all authorized (permitted) activities that may adversely affect the Mexican Spotted Owl in identified PACs, breeding habitat, or designated critical habitat, to reduce the potential for adverse impacts to the species. Restrictions and procedures have been adapted from guidance published in the Utah Field Office Guidelines for Raptor Protection from Human and Land Use Disturbances (USFWS 2002b), as well as coordination between the BLM and the Service. Measures include:
    - Surveys, according to USFWS protocol, will be required prior to any disturbance related activities that have been identified to have the potential to impact Mexican Spotted Owl, unless current species occupancy and distribution information is complete and available. All surveys must be conducted by USFWS certified individuals, and approved by the BLM-authorized officer.
    - Assess habitat suitability for both nesting and foraging using accepted habitat models in conjunction with field reviews. Apply the appropriate conservation measures below if project activities occur within 0.5 mile of suitable owl habitat, dependent in part on if the action is temporary[3] or permanent[4]:
    - For all temporary actions that may impact owls or suitable habitat:
        - If action occurs entirely outside of the owl breeding season, and leaves no permanent structure or permanent habitat disturbance, action can proceed without an occupancy survey.
        - If action will occur during a breeding season, survey for owls prior to commencing activity. If owls are found, activity should be delayed until outside of the breeding season.
        - Eliminate access routes created by a project through such means as raking out scars, revegetation, gating access points, etc.
    - For all permanent actions that may impact owls or suitable habitat:
        - Survey two consecutive years for owls according to established protocol prior to commencing of activity.
        - If owls are found, no actions will occur within 0.5 mile of identified nest site.
        - If nest site is unknown, no activity will occur within the designated Protected Activity Center (PAC).

[3] Temporary activities are defined as those that are completed prior to the start of the following raptor breeding season, leaving no permanent structures and resulting in no permanent habitat loss.

[4] Permanent activities continue for more than one breeding season and/or cause a loss of owl habitat or displaces owls through disturbances, e.g., creation of a permanent structure including but not limited to well pads, roads, pipelines, electrical power line.

- Avoid placing permanent structures within 0.5 mi of suitable habitat unless surveyed and not occupied.
- Reduce noise emissions (e.g., use hospital-grade mufflers) to 45 dBA at 0.5 mile from suitable habitat, including canyon rims (Delaney et al. 1997). Placement of permanent noise-generating facilities should be determined by a noise analysis to ensure noise does not encroach upon a 0.5 mile buffer for suitable habitat, including canyon rims.
- Limit disturbances to and within suitable owl habitat by staying on designated routes.
- Limit new access routes created by the project.

2. The BLM will, as a condition of approval (COA) on any project proposed within identified PACs, designated critical habitat, or within spatial buffers for Mexican Spotted Owl nests (0.5 mile), ensure that project proponents are notified as to their responsibilities for rehabilitation of temporary access routes and other temporary surface disturbances, created by their project, according to individual BLM Field Office standards and procedures, or those determined in the project-specific Section 7 Consultation.
3. The BLM will require monitoring of activities in designated critical habitat, identified PACs, or breeding habitats, wherein it has been determined that there is a potential for take. If any adverse impacts are observed to occur in a manner, or to an extent that was not considered in the project-specific Section 7 Consultation, then consultation must be reinitiated.

   Monitoring results should document what, if any, impacts to individuals or habitat occur during project construction/implementation. In addition, monitoring should document successes or failures of any impact minimization, or mitigation measures. Monitoring results would be considered an opportunity for adaptive management, and as such, would be carried forward in the design and implementation of future projects.

4. For all survey and monitoring actions:
   - Reports must be provided to affected field offices within 15 days of completion of survey or monitoring efforts.
   - Report any detection of Mexican Spotted Owls during survey or monitoring to the authorized officer within 48 hours.
5. The BLM will, in areas of designated critical habitat, ensure that any physical or biological factors (i.e., the primary constituent elements), as identified in determining and designating such habitat, remains intact during implementation of any BLM-authorized activity.
6. For all BLM actions that "may adversely affect" the primary constituent elements in any suitable Mexican Spotted Owl habitat, the BLM will implement measures as appropriate to minimize habitat loss or fragmentation, including rehabilitation of access routes created by the project through such means as raking out scars, revegetation, gating access points, etc.
7. Where technically and economically feasible, use directional drilling from single drilling pads to reduce surface disturbance, and minimize or eliminate needing to drilling in canyon habitats suitable for Mexican Spotted Owl nesting.
8. Prior to surface disturbing activities in Mexican Spotted Owl PACs, breeding habitats, or designated critical habitat, specific principles should be considered to control erosion. These principles include:

- Conduct long-range transportation planning for large areas to ensure that roads will serve future needs. This will result in less total surface disturbance.
- Avoid surface disturbance in areas with high erosion hazards to the greatest extent possible. Avoid mid-slope locations, headwalls at the source of tributary drainages, inner valley gorges, and excessively wet slopes such as those near springs. In addition, avoid areas where large cuts and fills would be required.
- Locate roads to minimize roadway drainage areas and to avoid modifying the natural drainage areas of small streams.

9. Project developments should be designed, and located to avoid direct or indirect loss or modification of Mexican Spotted Owl nesting and/or identified roosting habitats.
10. Water production associated with BLM-authorized actions should be managed to ensure maintenance or enhancement of riparian habitats.

M.3 SOUTHWESTERN WILLOW FLYCATCHER (*EMPIDONAX TRAILLII EXTIMUS*)

The following list of measures provides species-specific guidance intended to avoid, minimize, or reduce potential adverse impacts from implementation of BLM actions under the authority of current Utah BLM LUPs on the Southwestern Willow Flycatcher (*Empidonax traillii extimus*). This list is not comprehensive. Additional conservation measures, or other modified versions of these measures, may be applied for any given BLM-authorized activity upon further analysis, review, coordination efforts, and/or appropriate levels of section 7 consultation with the USFWS.

1. Surveys will be required prior to operations that *"may adversely affect"* the Southwestern Willow Flycatcher unless species occupancy data and distribution information is complete and available. Surveys will only be conducted by BLM-approved personnel. In the event species occurrence is verified, project proponents may be required to modify operational plans at the discretion of the authorized officer. Modifications may include appropriate measures for minimization of adverse effects to the Southwestern Willow Flycatcher and its habitat.
2. The BLM will monitor and restrict, when and where necessary, authorized or casual use activities that *"may adversely affect"* the Southwestern Willow Flycatcher, including but not limited to, recreation, mining, and oil and gas activities. Monitoring results should be considered in the design and implementation of future projects.
3. To monitor the impacts of BLM-authorized projects determined *"likely to adversely affect"* the Southwestern Willow Flycatcher, the BLM should prepare a short report describing progress, including success of implementation of all associated mitigation. Reports shall be submitted annually to the USFWS Utah Field Office by March 1st beginning one full year from date of implementation of the proposed action. The report shall list and describe the following items:
   - Any unforeseen adverse effects resulting from activities of each site-specific project (may also require reinitiation of formal Consultation);
   - When, and if, any level of anticipated incidental take is approached (as allowed by separate Incidental Take Statements of site-specific Formal Section 7 Consultation efforts);
   - When, or if, the level of anticipated take (as allowed by separate Incidental Take Statements from site-specific formal consultations) is exceeded; and

- Results of annual, periodic monitoring which evaluate the effectiveness of the reasonable and prudent measures or terms and conditions of the site-specific Consultation.

4. The BLM should avoid granting activity permits or authorizing development actions in Southwestern Willow Flycatcher habitat. Unoccupied potential habitat should be protected in order to preserve them for future management actions associated with the recovery of the Southwestern Willow Flycatcher.
5. The BLM will ensure project design incorporates measures to avoid direct disturbance to populations and suitable habitats where possible. At a minimum, project designs should include consideration of water flows, slope, seasonal and spatial buffers, possible fencing, and pre-activity flagging of critical areas for avoidance.
6. The BLM will continue to address illegal and unauthorized OHV use and activity upon BLM-administered lands. In order to protect, conserve, and recover the Southwestern Willow Flycatcher in areas of heavy unauthorized use, temporary closures, or use restrictions beyond those which are already in place, may be imposed. As funding allows, the BLM should complete a comprehensive assessment of all OHV use areas that interface with Southwestern Willow Flycatcher populations. Comparison of Southwestern Willow Flycatcher populations and OHV use areas using GIS would give BLM personnel another tool to manage and/or minimize impacts.
7. All surface disturbing activities should be restricted within a 0.25 mile buffer from suitable riparian habitats and permanent surface disturbances should be avoided within 0.5 mile of suitable Southwestern Willow Flycatcher habitat.

   Unavoidable ground disturbing activities in occupied Southwestern Willow Flycatcher habitat should only be conducted when preceded by current year survey, should only occur between August 16 and April 30 (the period when Southwestern Willow Flycatcher are not likely to be breeding), and should be monitored to ensure that adverse impacts to Southwestern Willow Flycatcher are minimized or avoided, and to document the success of project specific mitigation/protection measures. As monitoring is relatively undefined, project specific requirements must be identified.

8. The BLM will properly consider nesting periods for Southwestern Willow Flycatcher when conducting horse gathering operations in the vicinity of habitat.
9. The BLM will ensure that plans for water extraction and disposal are designed to avoid changes in the hydrologic regime that would likely result in loss or undue degradation of riparian habitat.
10. Native species will be preferred over non-native for revegetation of habitat in disturbed areas.
11. The BLM will coordinate with other agencies and private landowners to identify voluntary opportunities to modify current land stewardship practices that may impact the Southwestern Willow Flycatcher and its habitats.
12. Limit disturbances to within suitable habitat by staying on designated routes.
13. Ground-disturbing activities will require monitoring throughout the duration of the project to ensure that adverse impacts to Southwestern Willow Flycatcher are avoided. Monitoring results should document what, if any, impacts to individuals or habitat occur during project construction/implementation. In addition, monitoring should document successes or failures of any impact minimization or mitigation measures. Monitoring results would be considered

an opportunity for adaptive management and, as such, would be carried forward in the design and implementation of future projects.

14. Where technically and economically feasible, use directional drilling or multiple wells from the same pad to reduce surface disturbance and eliminate drilling in Southwestern Willow Flycatcher habitat.
15. Habitat disturbances (i.e., organized recreational activities requiring special use permits, drilling activities, etc.) will be avoided within 0.25 mile of suitable Southwestern Willow Flycatcher habitat from May 1 to August 15.
16. Grazing allotments that contain habitat for the species will be managed with consideration for recommendations provided by the Southwestern Willow Flycatcher Recovery Plan, and other applicable research.

M.4 COLORADO RIVER ENDANGERED FISHES

The following list of measures provides species-specific guidance intended to avoid, minimize, or reduce potential adverse impacts from implementation of BLM actions under the authority of current Utah BLM LUPs on the Colorado pikeminnow (*Ptychocheilus lucius*), Humpback chub (*Gila cypha*), bonytail (*Gila elegans*), and razorback sucker (*Xyrauchen texanus*). This group is herein referred to as the Colorado River fishes. This list is not comprehensive. Additional conservation measures, or other modified versions of these measures, may be applied for any given BLM-authorized activity upon further analysis, review, coordination efforts, and/or appropriate levels of section 7 consultation with the USFWS.

1. Monitoring of impacts of site-specific projects authorized by the BLM will result in the preparation of a report describing the progress of each site-specific project, including implementation of any associated reasonable and prudent measures or reasonable and prudent alternatives. This will be a requirement of project proponents and will be included as a condition of approval (COA) on future proposed actions that have been determined to have the potential for take. Reports will be submitted annually to the USFWS - Utah Field Office, beginning after the first full year of implementation of the project, and shall list and describe:
    - Any unforeseen direct or indirect adverse impacts that result from activities of each site-specific project;
    - Estimated levels of impact or water depletion, in relation to those described in the original project-level Consultation effort, in order to inform the Service of any intentions to reinitiate Section 7 Consultation; and
    - Results of annual, periodic monitoring which evaluates the effectiveness of any site-specific terms and conditions that are part of the formal Consultation process. This will include items such as an assessment of whether implementation of each site-specific project is consistent with that described in the BA, and whether the project has complied with terms and conditions.
2. The BLM shall notify the USFWS immediately of any unforeseen impacts detected during project implementation. Any implementation action that may be contributing to the introduction of toxic materials or other causes of fish mortality must be immediately stopped until the situation is remedied. If investigative monitoring efforts demonstrate that the source of fish mortality is not related to the authorized activity, the action may proceed only after notification of USFWS authorities.

3. Unoccupied, suitable habitat areas should be protected in order to preserve them for future management actions associated with the recovery of the Endangered Colorado River Fish, as well as approved reintroduction, or relocation efforts.
    - The BLM will avoid impacts where feasible, to habitats considered most representative of prime suitable habitat for these species.
    - Surface disturbing activities will be restricted within ¼ mile of the channel centerline of the Colorado, Green, Duchesne, Price, White, and San Rafael Rivers
    - Surface disturbing activities proposed to occur within floodplains or riparian areas will be avoided unless there is no practical alternative or the development would enhance riparian/aquatic values. If activities must occur in these areas, construction will be designed to include mitigation efforts to maintain, restore, and/or improve riparian and aquatic conditions. If conditions could not be maintained, offsite mitigation strategies should be considered.
4. The BLM will ensure project proponents are aware that designs must avoid as much direct disturbance to current populations and known habitats as is feasible. Designs should include:
    - protections against toxic spills into rivers and floodplains;
    - plans for sedimentation reduction;
    - minimization of riparian vegetation loss or degradation;
    - pre-activity flagging of critical areas for avoidance;
    - design of stream-crossings for adequate passage of fish; and
    - measures to avoid or minimize impacts on water quality at the 25-year frequency runoff
5. Prior to surface disturbing activities, specific principles will be considered to control erosion. These principles include:
    - Conduct long-range transportation planning for large areas to ensure that roads will serve future needs. This will result in less total surface disturbance.
    - Avoid, where possible, surface disturbance in areas with high erosion hazards.
    - Avoid mid-slope location of drill pads, headwalls at the source of tributary drainages, inner valley gorges, excessively wet slopes such as those near springs and avoid areas where large cuts and fills would be required.
    - Design and locate roads to minimize roadway drainage areas and to avoid modifying the natural drainage areas of small streams.
6. Where technically and economically feasible, project proponents will use directional drilling or multiple wells from a single pad to reduce surface disturbance and eliminate drilling in suitable riparian habitat. Ensure that such drilling does not intercept or degrade alluvial aquifers. Drilling will not occur within 100 year floodplains that contain listed fish species or their designated critical habitats.
7. The Utah Oil and Gas Pipeline Crossing Guidance (BLM National Science and Technology Center), or other applicable guidance, will be implemented for oil and gas pipeline river/stream crossings.
8. In areas adjacent to 100-year floodplains, particularly in systems prone to flash floods, the BLM will analyze the risk for flash floods to impact facilities. Potential techniques may include the use of closed loop drilling and pipeline burial or suspension as necessary to minimize the potential for equipment damage and resultant leaks or spills.

9. Water depletions from any portion of the Upper Colorado River drainage basin above Lake Powell are considered to adversely affect and adversely modify the critical habitat of these endangered fish species. Section 7 consultation will be completed with the Service prior to any such water depletions.
10. Design stream-crossings for adequate passage of fish (if present), minimum impact on water quality, and at a minimum, a 25-year frequency run-off.

Standard Operating Procedures (SOP) described in this appendix are designed to assist in achieving the RMP objectives. SOPs are dynamic, and should not be interpreted as specific direction at the same level as the RMP decisions. SOPs are selected and implemented as necessary, based on site specific conditions, to meet resource objectives for specific management actions.

This appendix does not provide an exhaustive list of SOPs. Additional SOPs may be identified during an interdisciplinary process when evaluating site-specific management actions. SOPs may also be updated as new technology emerges. Applicants may also suggest alternate practices that could accomplish the same intended result. Implementation and effectiveness of BMPs needs to be monitored to determine whether the practices are achieving the RMP goals and objectives. Adjustments could be made as necessary to ensure goals and objectives are met, as well as to conform to changes in BLM regulations, policy, direction, or new scientific information.

As warranted and necessary, the standard operating procedures and guidelines for all treatment methods identified in the 2007 Record of Decision, Vegetation Treatments Using Herbicides Final Programmatic EIS as outlined in its corresponding Appendices B and C would be utilized.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK.

APPENDIX N. BEST MANAGEMENT PRACTICES FOR RAPTORS AND THEIR ASSOCIATED HABITATS IN UTAH, AUGUST 2006

INTRODUCTION

Raptors, or birds of prey, are found on public lands throughout Utah. Approximately 31 species of raptors use public lands for at least a portion of their life cycle. These include 20 diurnal raptors, including the eagles, hawks, falcons, osprey, turkey vulture, and California Condor, as well as 11 mostly nocturnal owl species. At least 16 of the diurnal raptors are known to nest, roost, and forage on public lands; while 2 others are probable nesters within the southern part of the state. The California Condor is known to utilize public lands for roosting and foraging, but is not currently known to nest within the state. The Rough-legged Hawk is a winter resident that uses public lands for foraging. All of the owl species nest, roost, and forage on public lands in Utah.

Eight of Utah's raptors are considered to be Special Status Species by the BLM, and they currently receive enhanced protection, in addition to the regulatory authority provided by the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA), which covers all raptor species. The Bald Eagle and Mexican Spotted Owl are listed as federally threatened species and are afforded the protection, as well as the Section 7 consultation requirements, of the Endangered Species Act (ESA). The Bald Eagle is currently being proposed for delisting by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Both the Bald Eagle and Golden Eagle are protected by the provisions of the Eagle Protection Act. The California Condor is a federally endangered species, however, the birds found in southern Utah are part of an Experimental Non-essential Population reintroduced to northern Arizona under Section 10(j) of the Endangered Species Act. The BLM is required to treat the condor as a species proposed for listing for Section 7 purposes of the ESA. The Northern Goshawk is managed by a multi-agency Conservation Agreement. The Ferruginous Hawk, Short-eared Owl and Burrowing Owl are listed as Wildlife Species of Concern by the Utah Division of Wildlife Resources (UDWR, May 12, 2006), and are therefore recognized as BLM state-sensitive species under the Bureau's 6840 Manual. The BLM's 6840 Policy states that the "BLM shall…ensure that actions authorized, funded, or carried out…do not contribute to the need for the species to become listed".

Future raptor management on BLM lands in Utah will be guided by the use of these best management practices (BMPs), which are BLM-specific recommendations for implementation of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Utah Field Office's *Guidelines for Raptor Protection From Human and Land Use Disturbances* (Guidelines). The Guidelines were originally developed by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service in 1999, and were updated during 2002 to reflect changes brought about by court and policy decisions and to incorporate Executive Order 13186, *Responsibilities of Federal Agencies to Protect Migratory Birds.* The Guidelines were provided to BLM and other land-managing agencies in an attempt to provide raptor management consistency, while ensuring project compatibility with the biological requirements of raptors, and encouraging an ecosystem approach to habitat management.

These BMPs, or specific elements of the BMPs that pertain to a proposal, should be attached as Conditions of Approval to all BLM use authorizations that have the potential to adversely affect nesting raptors, or that would cause occupied nest sites to become unsuitable for nesting in subsequent years.

Raptor management is a dynamic and evolving science, and consequently, as the science evolves, these BMPs will undergo subsequent revision. As more information becomes available through implementation of these raptor BMPs, and as our knowledge of raptor life cycle requirements increases, findings will be incorporated into future revisions of the BMP document. Additionally, the BLM and the Department of Energy are initiating a 3-year Raptor Radii study that will test traditional spatial and seasonal nest buffers during actual oil and gas development activities for a select suite of species. Study results would be incorporated into new BMP revisions as well.

To adequately manage raptors and their habitats, and to reduce the likelihood of a raptor species being listed under the Endangered Species Act (ESA), BLM-authorized or proposed management activities and/or land-disturbing actions would be subject to the criteria and processes specified within these BMPs. The implementation of raptor spatial and seasonal buffers under the BMPs would be consistent with Table 2 of the Guidelines, included here as Attachment 2. As specified in the Guidelines, modifications of spatial and seasonal buffers for BLM-authorized actions would be permitted, so long as protection of nesting raptors was ensured. State-listed and/or federally listed, proposed, and candidate raptor species, as well as BLM state-sensitive raptor species, should be afforded the highest level of protection through this BMP process; however, all raptor species would continue to receive protection under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act. Modification of the buffers for threatened or endangered species would be considered pending results of Section 7 Consultation with USFWS.

As stated in the Guidelines, spatial and seasonal buffers should be considered as the best available recommendations for protecting nesting raptors under a wide range of activities state-wide. However, they are not necessarily site-specific to proposed projects. Land managers should evaluate the type and duration of the proposed activity, the position of topographic and vegetative features, the sensitivity of the affected species, the habituation of breeding pairs to existing activities in the proposed project area, and the local raptor nesting density, when determining site-specific buffers. The BLM would be encouraged to informally coordinate with UDWR and USFWS anytime a site-specific analysis shows that an action may have an adverse impact on nesting raptors. The coordination would determine if the impact could be avoided or must be mitigated, and if so, to determine appropriate and effective mitigation strategies.

Potential modifications of the spatial and seasonal buffers identified in the Guidelines may provide a viable management option. Modifications would ensure that nest protection would occur, while allowing various management options which may deviate from the suggested buffers within the Guidelines, which, if adequately monitored, could provide valuable information for incorporation into future management actions.

Seasonal raptor buffers from Attachment 2 should be reviewed by local raptor nesting authorities who are knowledgeable of raptor nesting chronologies within their local area. For those nesting raptors for which local nesting chronologies remain uncertain, the seasonal buffers provided in Attachment 2 should serve as the default. However, for those raptor species whose known

nesting chronologies differ from the seasonal buffers provided in Attachment 2, the local seasonal buffers may be utilized as a modification of the Guidelines.

Criteria that would need to be met, prior to implementing modifications to the spatial and seasonal buffers in the Guidelines, would include the following:

1. Completion of a site-specific assessment by a wildlife biologist or other qualified individual. See example (Attachment 1).
2. Written documentation by the BLM Field Office Wildlife Biologist, identifying the proposed modification and affirming that implementation of the proposed modification(s) would not affect nest success or the suitability of the site for future nesting. Modification of the "Guidelines" would not be recommended if it is determined that adverse impacts to nesting raptors would occur or that the suitability of the site for future nesting would be compromised.
3. Development of a monitoring and mitigation strategy by a BLM biologist, or other raptor biologist. Impacts of authorized activities would be documented to determine if the modifications were implemented as described in the environmental documentation or Conditions of Approval, and were adequate to protect the nest site. Should adverse impacts be identified during monitoring of an activity, BLM would follow an appropriate course of action, which may include cessation or modification of activities that would avoid, minimize or mitigate the impact, or, with the approval of DWR and F&WS, the BLM could allow the activity to continue while requiring monitoring to determine the full impact of the activity on the affected raptor nest. A monitoring report would be completed and forwarded to the UDWR for incorporation into the Natural Heritage Program (NHP) raptor database.

In a further effort to provide additional support and expertise to local BLM field biologists, a network of biologists from various agencies with specific expertise in raptor management has been identified and included as Attachment 3. The personnel identified have extensive backgrounds in raptor management issues and are available, upon request, to assist BLM field biologists on a case-by-case basis. Field biologists are encouraged to use this network, via informal conference, with one or more of the individuals identified. This coordination should be clearly distinguished from the consultation process required under Section 7 of the ESA. Individuals on the expert panel should not be expected to provide formal advice, but should serve as a sounding board for discussing potential affects of a proposal, as well as potential mitigation measures on specific projects which may be useful to BLM biologists.

HABITAT ENHANCEMENT

As recommended in the Guidelines, raptor habitat management and enhancement, both within and outside of buffers, would be an integral part of these BMPs, with the understanding that in order for raptors to maintain high densities and maximum diversity, it is necessary that the habitat upon which they and their prey species depend be managed to promote healthy and productive ecosystems. Habitat loss or fragmentation would be minimized and/or mitigated to the extent practical and may include such measures as; drilling multiple wellheads per pad, limiting access roads and avoiding loop roads to well pads, effective rehabilitation or restoration of plugged and abandoned well locations and access roads that are no longer required, rehabilitation or restoration of wildland fires to prevent domination by non-native invasive

annual species, vegetation treatments and riparian restoration projects to achieve Rangeland Health Standards, etc.

In some cases, artificial nesting structures, located in areas where preferred nesting substrates are limited, but where prey base populations are adequate and human disturbances are limited, may enhance some raptor populations, or may serve as mitigation for impacts occurring in other areas.

PROTECTION OF NEST SITES AND BUFFER ZONES

As stated in the Guidelines, protection of both occupied and unoccupied nests is important since not all raptor pairs breed every year, nor do they always utilize the same nest within a nesting territory. Individual raptor nests left unused for a number of years are frequently reoccupied, if all the nesting attributes which originally attracted a nesting pair to a location are still present. Nest sites are selected by breeding pairs for the preferred habitat attributes provided by that location.

Raptor nest buffer zones are established for planning purposes because the nest serves as the focal point for a nesting pair of raptors. The buffer should serve as a threshold of potential adverse affect to nest initiation and productivity. Actions proposed within these buffer zones are considered potentially impacting and, therefore, trigger the need for consideration of site-specific recommendations.

Seasonal (temporal) buffer zones are conservation measures intended to schedule potentially impacting activities to periods outside of the nesting season for a particular raptor species. These seasonal limitations are particularly applicable to actions proposed within the spatial buffer zone of a nest for short duration activities such as, pipeline or powerline construction, seismic exploration activity, vegetative treatments, fence or reservoir construction, permitted recreational events, etc., where subsequent human activity would not be expected to occur.

Spatial buffer zones are those physical areas around raptor nest sites where seasonal conservation measures, or surface occupancy restrictions may be applied, depending on the type and duration of activity, distance and visibility of the activity from the nest site, adaptability of the raptor species to disturbance, etc. Surface occupancy restrictions should be utilized for actions which would involve human activities within the buffer zone for a long duration (more than one nesting season) and which would cause an occupied nest site to become unsuitable for nesting in subsequent years.

UNOCCUPIED NESTS

All Activities, including All Mineral Leases: Surface-disturbing activities, occurring outside of the breeding season (seasonal buffer), but within the spatial buffer, would be allowed during a minimum 3-year nest monitoring period, as long as the activity would not cause the nest site to become unsuitable for future nesting, as determined by a wildlife biologist. Facilities and other permanent structures would be allowed, if they meet the above criteria.

Some examples of typical surface-disturbing actions, occurring outside of the seasonal buffer, which may not be expected to affect nest production or future nesting suitability, would include; pipelines, powerlines, seismographic exploration, communication sites, an oil or gas well with off-site facilities which does not require routine visitation, recreation events, fence or reservoir

construction, vegetative treatments, and other actions with discreet starting and ending times, and for which subsequent human activity or heavy equipment operation within the spatial buffer would not be expected to occur, or could be scheduled outside of the seasonal buffer in subsequent years.

Surface-disturbing activities that would be expected to potentially affect nest production or nest site suitability include oil and gas facilities requiring regular maintenance, sand and gravel operations, road systems, wind energy projects, mining operations, and other actions requiring continual, random human activity or heavy equipment operation during subsequent nesting seasons.

A nest site that does not exhibit evidence of use (e.g., greenery in the nest, fresh whitewash, obvious nest maintenance or the observed presence of adults or young at the nest) for a period of 3 consecutive years, verified through monitoring, would be deemed abandoned, and all seasonal and spatial restrictions would cease to apply to that nest. All subsequent authorizations for permanent activities within the spatial buffer of the nest could be permitted. If the nest becomes reoccupied after authorized activities are completed, conservation measures would be considered to reduce potential adverse affects and to comply with the Migratory Bird Treaty Act and the Eagle Protection Act.

The 3-year non-use standard varies from the Guidelines suggested 7-year non-use standard before declaring nest abandonment. This variation is based upon a similar standard which has been applied for over 20 years in two administrative areas within Utah. Empirical evidence would suggest the 3-year non-use standard has been effective in conserving raptor species. The 3-year standard has been applied without legal challenge or violation of "Take" under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act or the Eagle Protection Act.

Because prey base populations are known to be cyclic, and because raptor nest initiation or nesting success can be affected by drought and other random natural events, care should be taken when applying the 3-year non-activity standard. The 3-year nest occupancy monitoring requirement should be viewed as a minimum time period during those years of optimal raptor nesting conditions. During suboptimal raptor nesting years, when nesting habitat may be affected by drought, low prey base populations, fire, or other events, the monitoring standard should be increased to allow raptors the opportunity to reoccupy nesting sites when nesting conditions become more favorable.

OCCUPIED NESTS

All Activities: Land-use activities that would have an adverse impact on an occupied raptor nest would not be allowed within the spatial or seasonal buffer.

CONSIDERATION OF ALTERNATIVES AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Alternatives, including denial of the proposal, should be identified, considered, and analyzed in a NEPA document anytime an action is proposed within the spatial buffer zone of a raptor nest. Selection of a viable alternative that avoids an impact to nesting raptors should be selected over attempting to mitigate those impacts. If unavoidable impacts are identified, mitigation measures should be applied as necessary to mitigate adverse impacts of resource uses and development on

nesting raptors. Monitoring of the effectiveness of the mitigation measures should be mandatory and should be included as a Condition of Approval.

SPECIFIC STRATEGIES TO BE IMPLEMENTED REGARDING OTHER RESOURCE USES

The following are management strategies designed to reduce or eliminate potential conflicts between raptors and other resource uses. This is a list of examples and is not intended to be an all-inclusive list. In all cases, when an activity on BLM lands is proposed, and a NEPA document developed, the site-specific analysis process identified in Attachment 1 may be implemented to identify and either avoid or mitigate impacts to raptors from the proposal. These strategies apply to both BLM and applicant-generated proposals. The strategies are as follows:

CULTURAL RESOURCES

Excavation and studies of cultural resources in caves and around cliff areas should be delayed until a qualified biologist surveys the area to be disturbed or impacted by the activity for the presence of raptors or nest sites. If nesting raptors are present, the project should be rescheduled to occur outside of the seasonal buffer recommended by the *"Guidelines"*.

FORESTRY AND HARVEST OF WOODLAND PRODUCTS

Timber harvest would be subject to NEPA analysis and would be conducted in a manner that would avoid impacts to raptor nests. This could also apply to areas identified for wood gathering and firewood sales.

HAZARDOUS FUEL REDUCTION/HABITAT RESTORATION PROJECTS

Hazardous fuels reduction projects and shrub-steppe restoration projects should be reviewed for possible impacts to nesting raptors. Removal of trees containing either stick nests or nesting cavities, through prescribed fire, or mechanical or manual treatments, should be avoided.

It is important to note that certain raptor species are tied to specific habitat types, and that consideration must be made on a site-specific basis when vegetation manipulation projects are proposed, to determine which raptor species may benefit and which may be negatively affected by the vegetation composition post-treatment.

LIVESTOCK GRAZING

Manage rangelands and riparian areas in a manner that promotes healthy, productive rangelands and functional riparian systems. Rangeland Health Assessments should be conducted on each grazing allotment, and rangeland guidelines should be implemented where Rangeland Health Standards are not being met, to promote healthy rangelands.

Locations of sheep camps and other temporary intrusions would be located in areas away from raptor nest sites during the nesting season. Placement of salt and mineral blocks would also be located away from nesting areas.

Season of use, kind of livestock, and target utilization levels of key species affect vegetative community attributes (percent cover, composition, etc.) and influence small mammal and avian species diversity and density. While not all raptor species would be affected in the same way,

livestock management practices which maintain or enhance vegetative attributes, will preserve prey species density and diversity which will benefit the raptor resource.

OHV USE

Special Recreation Management Areas (SRMAs) that are developed for OHV use would not be located in areas that have important nesting, roosting, or foraging habitat for raptors.

Off highway vehicle use would be limited to designated roads, trails and managed open areas. Lands categorized as "Open" for OHV use should not be in areas important to raptors for nesting, roosting, and foraging

When proposals for OHV events are received, the area to be impacted would be surveyed by a qualified wildlife biologist to determine if the area is utilized by raptors. Potential conflicts would be identified and either avoided or mitigated prior to the issuance of any permit.

OIL AND GAS DEVELOPMENT

The Code of Federal Regulations (CFR), 43 CFR 3101.1-2, allows for well site location and timing to be modified from that requested by the lessee to mitigate conflicts at the proposed site, and states that the location can be moved up to 200 meters and the timing of the actual drilling can be delayed for up to 60 days to mitigate environmental concerns. The regulation also allows BLM to move a location more than 200 meters, or delay operations more than 60 days to protect sensitive resources, with supporting rationale and where lesser restrictions are ineffective. The Site Specific Analysis (Attachment 1) would provide the supporting rationale. Provisions are also present within Sections 3 and 6 of the Standard Lease Form which require compliance with existing laws and would allow the BLM to impose additional restrictions at the permitting phase, if the restrictions will prevent violation of law, policy or regulation, or avoid undue and unnecessary degradation of lands or resources.

REALTY

Lands proposed for disposal which includes raptor nesting, roosting, or important foraging areas would be analyzed and evaluated for the relative significance of these resources before a decision is made for disposal or retention.

A priority list of important raptor habitat areas, especially for federally listed or state sensitive raptor species, on state and private lands should be developed and utilized as lands to be acquired by BLM when opportunities arise to exchange or otherwise acquire lands.

Lands and realty authorizations would include appropriate conservation measures to avoid and/or mitigate impacts to raptors.

RECREATION

Development of biking trails near raptor nesting areas would be avoided.

Rock climbing activities would be authorized only in areas where there are no conflicts with cliff nesting raptors.

In high recreation use areas where raptor nest sites have been made unsuitable by existing disturbance or habitat alteration, mitigation should be considered to replace nest sites with

artificial nest structures in nearby suitable habitat, if it exists, and consider seasonal protection of nest sites through fencing or other restrictions.

Dispersed recreation would be monitored to identify where this use may be impacting nesting success of raptors.

WILD HORSE PROGRAM

In areas where wild horse numbers are determined to be in excess of the carrying capacity of the range, removal of horses, as described in the various herd management area plans, would continue, to prevent further damage to rangelands.

INVENTORY AND MONITORING

Each field office should cooperatively manage a raptor database, with UDWR and USFWS, as part of the BLM Corporate database. Raptor data should be collected and compiled utilizing the Utah Raptor Data Collection Standards developed by the Utah State Office, so that personnel from other agencies can access the data. Appropriate protocols for survey and monitoring should be followed, when available. This database should be updated as new inventory and monitoring data becomes available. The data should also be forwarded to UDWR and the Natural Heritage Program, which has been identified as the central repository for raptor data storage for the State of Utah.

Use of seasonal employees and volunteers, as well as "Challenge Cost Share" projects, should be utilized to augment the inventory and monitoring of raptor nests within a planning area, with the data entered into the above-mentioned databases at the close of each nesting season. Project proponents, such as energy development interests, would be encouraged to participate and help support an annual raptor nest monitoring effort within their areas of interest.

Active nest sites should be monitored during all authorized activities that may have an impact on the behavior or survival of the raptors at the nest site. A qualified biologist would conduct the monitoring and document the impacts of the activity on the species. A final report of the impacts of the project should be placed in the EA file, with a copy submitted to the NHP. The report would be made available for review and should identify what activities may affect raptor-nesting success, and should be used to recommend appropriate buffer zones for various raptor species.

As data are gathered, and impact analyses are more accurately documented, "adaptive management" principles should be implemented. Authorization of future activities should take new information into account, better protecting raptors, while potentially allowing more development and fewer restrictions, if data indicates that current restrictions are beyond those necessary to protect nesting raptors, or conversely indicates that current guidance is inadequate for protection of nesting raptors.

Standard Operating Procedures (SOP) described in this appendix are designed to assist in achieving the RMP objectives. SOPs are dynamic, and should not be interpreted as specific direction at the same level as the RMP decisions. SOPs are selected and implemented as necessary, based on site specific conditions, to meet resource objectives for specific management actions.

This appendix does not provide an exhaustive list of SOPs. Additional SOPs may be identified during an interdisciplinary process when evaluating site-specific management actions. SOPs may also be updated as new technology emerges. Applicants may also suggest alternate practices that could accomplish the same intended result. Implementation and effectiveness of BMPs needs to be monitored to determine whether the practices are achieving the RMP goals and objectives. Adjustments could be made as necessary to ensure goals and objectives are met, as well as to conform to changes in BLM regulations, policy, direction, or new scientific information.

As warranted and necessary, the standard operating procedures and guidelines for all treatment methods identified in the 2007 Record of Decision, Vegetation Treatments Using Herbicides Final Programmatic EIS as outlined in its corresponding appendices B and C would be utilized.

ATTACHMENT 1

Site Specific Analysis Data Sheet

Observer(s) _____ Date_____

1. Conduct a site visit to the area of the proposed action and complete the raptor nest site data sheet according to BLM data standards.

2. Area of Interest Documentation (**Bold** items require completion, other information is optional)

State Office _____ Management Unit _____

Project ID#

Location (Description)

Legal T_____, R , Sec. , 1/4, 1/4, or UTM Coordinates

Latitude Longitude

Photos Taken Y( ) N( )

Description of photos:

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Raptor Species Confirmed Unconfirmed

Distance From Proposed Disturbance to: Nest _____
Perch _____
Roost _____

Line of Site Evaluation From: **Nest** _____
Perch _____
Roost _____

Extent of Disturbance: Permanent Temporary _____
Distance from Nest/Roost _____ Acreage _____

Length of Time Timing Variations Disturbance Frequency_____

Other Disturbance Factors: Yes No (If yes, explain what and include distances from nest to disturbances)

Approximate Age of Nest: New **Historical**: (Number of Years)

Evidence of Use (Describe):

Habitat Values Impacted:

Proportion of Habitat Impacted (Relate in terms of habitat available):

Estimated Noise Levels of Project (db):_____

Available Alternative(s) (e.g., location, season, technology):

Associated Activities:

Cumulative Effects of Proposal and Other Actions in Habitat Not Associated With the Proposal:

Potential for site Rehabilitation: High_ Low_____

Notes/Comments:

Summary of Proposed Modifications:
Possible modifications to the spatial and seasonal buffers within the FWS *"Guidelines"* include the following:

Rationale:

Summary of Proposed Mitigation Measures:
Possible mitigation measures related to the proposal include the following:

Rationale:

Summary of Alternatives Considered:
Possible alternatives to the proposal include the following:

Rationale:

Recommendation to FO Manager Based on Above Findings:

_____ _____
Field Office Wildlife Biologist Date

ATTACHMENT 2

Nesting Periods and Recommended Buffers for Raptors in Utah						
Species	**Spatial Buffer (miles)**	**Seasonal Buffer**	**Incubation, # Days**	**Brooding, # Days Post-hatch**	**Fledging, # Days Post-hatch**	**Post-fledge Dependency to Nest, # Days[1]**
Bald Eagle	1.0	1/1-8/31	34-36	21-28	70-80	14-20
Golden Eagle	0.5	1/1-8/31	43-45	30-40	66-75	14-20
Northern Goshawk	0.5	3/1-8/15	36-38	20-22	34-41	20-22
Northern Harrier	0.5	4/1-8/15	32-38	21-28	42	7
Cooper's Hawk	0.5	3/15-8/31	32-36	14	27-34	10
Ferruginous Hawk	0.5	3/1-8/1	32-33	21	38-48	7-10
Red-tailed Hawk	0.5	3/15-8/15	30-35	35	45-46	14-18
Sharp-shinned Hawk	0.5	3/15-8/31	32-35	15	24-27	12-16
Swainson's Hawk	0.5	3/1-8/31	33-36	20	36-40	14
Turkey Vulture	0.5	5/1-8/15	38-41	14	63-88	10-12
California Condor	1.0	NN yet	56-58	5-8 weeks	5-6 months	2 months
Peregrine Falcon	1.0	2/1-8/31	33-35	14-21	35-49	21
Prairie Falcon	0.25	4/1-8/31	29-33	28	35-42	7-14
Merlin	0.5	4/1-8/31	28-32	7	30-35	7-19
American Kestrel	NN[2]	4/1-8/15	26-32	8-10	27-30	12
Osprey	0.5	4/1-8/31	37-38	30-35	48-59	45-50
Boreal Owl	0.25	2/1-7/31	25-32	20-24	28-36	12-14
Burrowing Owl	0.25	3/1-8/31	27-30	20-22	40-45	21-28
Flammulated Owl	0.25	4/1-9/30	21-22	12	22-25	7-14
Great horned Owl	0.25	12/1-9/31	30-35	21-28	40-50	7-14
Long-eared Owl	0.25	2/1-8/15	26-28	20-26	30-40	7-14
Northern Saw-whet Owl	0.25	3/1-8/31	26-28	20-22	27-34	7-14
Short-eared Owl	0.25	3/1-8/1	24-29	12-18	24-27	7-14
Mexican Spotted Owl	0.5	3/1-8/31	28-32	14-21	34-36	10-12
Northern Pygmy Owl	0.25	4/1-8/1	27-31	10-14	28-30	7-14
Western Screech Owl	0.25	3/1-8/15	21-30	10-14	30-32	7-14
Common Barn Owl	NN[2]	2/1-9/15	30-34	20-22	56-62	7-14

[1] Length of post-fledge dependency period to parents is longer than reported in this table. Reported dependency periods reflect the amount of time the young are still dependent on the nest site; i.e. they return to the nest for feeding. [2] Due to apparent high population densities and ability to adapt to human activity, a spatial buffer is not currently considered necessary for maintenance of American Kestrel or Common Barn-owl populations. Actions resulting in direct mortality of individual bird or take of known nest sites is unlawful

ATTACHMENT 3

UTAH RAPTOR MANAGEMENT EXPERTS FROM VARIOUS AGENCIES

The following list of personnel from various agencies in Utah, are recognized experts in the field of raptor ecology or have extensive field experience in managing raptor resources with competing land uses. The list is provided to inform BLM field biologists and managers of this network of specialized expertise that may be able to assist, as time permits, with specific raptor management issues. Individuals in this Utah Raptor Network, also have well established contacts with an informal extended network of highly qualified raptor ecologists outside the state (i.e. USGS, state wildlife agencies, and universities etc.) which could provide an additional regional perspective.

It should be pointed out that this list is not intended to replace or interfere with established lines of communication but rather supplement these lines of communication.

Utah BLM	David Mills	**david_mills@blm.gov**	435-896-1571
Utah BLM	Steve Madsen	**steve_c_madsen@blm.gov**	801-539-4058
Utah DWR	Dr. Jim Parrish	**jimparrish@utah.gov**	801-538-4788
Utah DWR (NERO)	Brian Maxfield	**brianmaxfield@utah.gov**	435-790-5355
USFWS	Laura Romin	**laura_romin@usfws.gov**	801-975-3330
USFWS	Diana Whittington	**diana_whittington@usfws.gov**	801-975-3330
USFS	Chris Colt	**ccolt@fs.fed.us**	801-896-1062
HawkWatch Intl	Jeff Smith	**jsmith@hawkwatch.org**	801-484-6808

ATTACHMENT 4

REFERENCES CITED

Code of Federal Regulations; 43 CFR 3101.1-2, Leasing Regulations.

Endangered Species Act (ESA); 16 U.S.C. 1513-1543

Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA); 16 U.S.C. 703-712

Romin, Laura A. and James A. Muck, 2002, "Utah Field Office Guidelines For Raptor Protection From Human And Land Use Disturbances." U.S. Department of Interior, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Utah Field Office, Salt Lake City, Utah.

Standards for Rangeland Health and Guidelines for Grazing Management; 1997. U.S. Department of Interior, Bureau of Land Management.

U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management; 6840 Manual.

APPENDIX O. TRAVEL PLAN

O.1 INTRODUCTION

Travel management is the process of planning for and managing access and travel systems on the public lands. Comprehensive travel management planning should address all resource use aspects, such as recreational, traditional, casual, agricultural, commercial, and educational, and accompanying modes and conditions of travel on public lands, not just motorized or off-highway vehicle activities (BLM Land Use Planning Handbook 1601-1, Appendix C). This includes travel needs for all resource management programs administered by the BLM, including but not limited to the mineral industry, livestock grazing, and recreation.

Though historically focused on motor vehicle use, comprehensive travel management also encompasses all forms of transportation including travel by foot, horseback and other livestock, mechanized vehicles such as bicycles, as well as the numerous forms of motorized vehicles from two-wheeled (motorcycles) and four-wheeled such as all-terrain vehicles (ATVs) to cars, trucks, and boats motorized and non-motorized.

The term off-road vehicle (ORV) is an outdated term that has the same meaning as off-highway vehicle (OHV), which is currently in use. The term off-highway vehicle (OHV) refers to the latter group noted above – "any motorized vehicle capable of, or designated for, travel on or immediately over land, water, or other natural terrain," as defined in the National Management Strategy for Motorized Off-Highway Vehicle Use on Public Lands, finalized by the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) in January 2001. The intent of the National Strategy was to update and revitalize management of off-highway motor vehicle use on BLM administered lands. The national strategy provides guidance and recommendations to accomplish that purpose.

The process of development and content of the preliminary draft Monticello FO travel plan are described in this document.

O.2 HOW TO READ/USE THIS DOCUMENT

This Travel Plan document addresses the process by which the BLM Monticello FO Interdisciplinary (ID) Team and the BLM cooperators have developed the Draft EIS alternatives for motorized and non-motorized use in the resource area. This document takes the reader through the current process of travel planning within the Monticello FO, and describes the route designations.

- The Land Use Planning portion of the travel plan defines the areas within the field office that are determined to be Open, Limited, or Closed, and the number of miles of designated routes under the Limited category.
- The Implementation portion of the travel plan describes the routes designated, seasonal closures and associated resource and/or user conflicts, mapping and travel information, signing, interagency coordination, use supervision, monitoring, enforcement, maintenance, and cost estimates for the implementation process.

Public scoping and input issues that were brought forward for this travel plan process are described in Section O.6.

The criteria and inventory processes by which the BLM and its cooperators arrived at the routes included in the draft environmental impact statement (DEIS) alternatives are outlined in Sections O.7 and O.8.

The travel plan development process is presented in Section O.9; lists of routes for non - motorized, equestrian/stock, and foot travel are also provided in Section O.9.4. Lists of preliminary motorized route closures can be viewed at the Monticello FO.

The analysis of impacts for the travel plan will be completed within the DEIS of the RMP process; the decisions made for the RMP will be in the Record of Decision (ROD).

Finally, implementation planning including mapping, signing, and public information is outlined in Section O.15 including general monitoring descriptions, proposals for educational programs, and the role of law enforcement in travel management for the Monticello FO. Cost estimates to accomplish the travel plan implementation are included in Section O.15.

Abbreviations and definitions commonly used in addressing off-road vehicle use are found in Attachment A and B, respectively. Lists of proposed route closures in the five draft alternatives as well as the Proposed Plan, preliminary travel maps for the Monticello FO and a summary and comparisons of BLM travel plan to two organizations' proposals can be viewed at the Monticello FO.

O.3 SUMMARY

Land Use Planning – The Code of Federal Regulations (43 CFR Part 8340) and Executive Order 12608 require BLM to designate all public lands as Open, Limited, or Closed for OHV use. These designations are made in the Resource Management Plans (RMPs) or in plan amendments. Additionally, the criteria for route designation are established in the RMP.

The following table represents the Open, Limited, and Closed acreages determined by the Monticello FO ID Team for the Approved RMP.

OHV Designation Categories on BLM Lands	Number of Acres
Open	0
Limited – to designated	1,388,191
Limited use-seasonal	8.0
Limited – to existing	NA
Closed	393,895

The BLM must distinguish between land use plan and implementation decisions in all proposed RMP documents and related decisions, and clearly describe for the public the administrative remedies for each type of decision (BLM H-1610-1, Appendix E, Page 1). The protest procedures in 43 CFR 1610.5-2 provide the public an administrative review of the State Director's proposed land use plan decisions. The BLM Director determines through this process whether the State Director followed established procedure, considered relevant information in reaching proposed decisions, and whether the proposed decisions are consistent with BLM policy, regulation, and stature (BLM H-1610-1, Appendix E, Page 1).

Implementation – Selection and identification of individual roads and trails within the travel plan system are implementation level decisions.

The following table represents the number of miles of routes that would be designated on BLM lands in the Approved RMP.

Miles of Routes	
Open	2,820
Closed	316

Implementation decisions may be appealed to the Interior Board of Land Appeals, Office of the Secretary, in accordance with the regulations contained in 43 CFR 4, and Form 1842-1.

Management Common to All (MCA) alternatives include the following travel plan related action items as developed by the ID Team in preliminary alternative development meetings:

- In areas limited to designated routes, only designated routes are open to motorized use.
- There will be no cross-country travel for game retrieval or antler gathering in areas designated as limited or closed. This policy is consistent with the policies of all the National Forests in Utah, none of which allow this type of off-road use.
- Any fire, military, emergency or law enforcement vehicle when used for emergency purposes is exempted from OHV decisions.
- Wilderness Study Areas are to be either designated as limited or closed to OHV use, and must be managed and monitored to comply with the interim management policy non-impairment standard.

Management of the BLM Monticello FO Travel Plan will follow the decisions made in the signed Resource Management Plan (RMP) / Record of Decision (ROD).

O.4 AUTHORITY AND GUIDANCE

- Federal Land Policy and Management Act (FLPMA), 43 U.S.C 1701 – Land use plans and revision should be based on principles of multiple use and sustained yield.
- National Environmental Policy Act, (NEPA), 42 U.S.C. 4321.
- Executive Order No. 11644, Feb 8, 1972 - This order established criteria by which federal agencies were to develop regulations for the management of ORVs on lands under their management. Agencies are to "monitor the effects" of ORV use on their public lands and, "on the basis of the information gathered, they shall from time to time amend or rescind designation of areas for ORV use "as necessary to further" its policy.
- Executive Order No**.** 11989, May 25, 1977 – This order modified ED 11644 – This order authorized agencies to adopt a policy that particular lands can be considered closed to ORVs once it is determined that OHV use "will cause or is causing considerable adverse effects" to particular resources.
- Executive Order No. 12898, 1994 – Indicates that Federal planning efforts should give consideration to how plans will affect local economies.
- 43 C.F.R. Part 8340 – the ORV Regulations – Establish criteria for designating lands as open, limited, or closed to the use of ORVs.
- Archeological Resources Protection Act (ARPA), 1979, as amended. And other Cultural protection laws and regulations.
- Taylor Grazing Act, 43 U.S.C. 315a.

- Endangered Species Act, 16 U.S.C. 1531 – Federal agencies shall give consideration to ensure agency actions do not jeopardize the continued existence of any endangered species.
- Land and Water Conservation Fund Act, 16 U.S.C. 460 1-6a.
- National Historic Preservation Act, as amended, 1966.
- Wild and Scenic Rivers Act, 16 U.S.C. 1281c.
- National Trails System Act, 16 U.S.C. 1241.
- U.S. Department of the Interior, BLM, Interim Management Policy for Lands Under Wilderness Review, H-8559-1.
- Resource Management Plan, BLM San Juan Resource Area, March 1991.
- IB WO 99-181, OHV Use in WSAs.
- IM UT 2001-090, Implementation of Utah Recreation Guidelines.
- IM WO No. 2004 – Clarification of Cultural Resource Considerations for Off-Highway (OHV) Route Designation and Travel Management.
- IM WO 2004-005, Clarification of OHV Designations and Travel Management in the BLM Land Use Planning Process.
- IM UT 2004-008, Clarification of OHV Designations and Travel Management in the BLM Land Use Planning Process.
- IM UT 2004-061, Designating Off Highway Vehicle Routes in the Land Use Planning Process.
- OHV – National Management Strategy for Motorized Off-Highway Vehicle Use on Public Lands, USDI, BLM, January 2001.
- BLM, Indian Creek Recreation Corridor Environmental Assessment (draft), Monticello FO, Monticello, Utah, 2005.
- Standards for Rangeland Health of BLM Land in Utah, May 1997.

O.5 TRAVEL PLAN DESIGNATION PROCESS

A goal of the BLM Monticello FO planning process is to develop, with its cooperators, a travel plan that provides access to resources and resource areas. The goals and objectives of this travel plan apply to all areas of travel management including resources access, appropriate recreation opportunities that at the same time protect public land resources, ensuring public safety, minimizing conflicts among the various public land uses, and providing for support of the local economy (see also Section O.9.).

O.5.1 HISTORY OF OHV BLM GUIDANCE

The 1991 BLM San Juan Resource Area RMP included designations for Open, Closed, and Limited OHV areas. Under the Limited category there were two sub-categories: 1) limited to existing roads and trails, and 2) limited to designated roads and trails. Over the subsequent decade, due to lack of funding and staff, the actual on-the-ground implementation of designations either by mapping or signing of routes was never completed.

In the current RMP process, state and national guidance for OHV use and travel planning in the sub-categories under the Limited designation has changed. Designating Open, Closed, and Limited areas for OHV use continues to be mandated, but under the Limited category only the

'limited to designated roads and trails' sub-category is recommended. The designation of the sub-category called 'existing roads and trails' is no longer an option. Eliminating the 'existing roads and trails' sub-category prevents confusion and enforcement problems concerning new unauthorized routes being created, and then used by the public because they are then 'existing'.

Designation of routes under the Limited category provides a purposefully designed and clearly delineated travel network, reduces route proliferation, and facilitates travel management and law enforcement.

By policy (IM No. 2004-005) BLM also recommends that as many roads as possible be designated under the Limited category within the RMP planning process. However, the following guidance applies if all routes cannot be designated within the plan:

> If complexity, controversy, or incomplete data make it impossible to complete the selection of a road and trail network for any area designated-as-limited within reasonable time frames or budget availability, the BLM will perform the selection process for all limited areas that can be completed. For any limited areas or sub-area that cannot be completed in the RMP, the BLM will, to the extent possible:
>
> - Incorporate a map of a preliminary road and trail network, including known roads or trails that are expected to be included in the final network;
> - Define short-term management guidance for road and trail access and activities, including interim management guidelines for proper identification of the preliminary road and trail network, including signing and maintenance of open roads and trails;
> - Outline additional data needs and a strategy to collect needed information;
> - Establish a clear planning sequence, including public collaboration, criteria and constraints for subsequent road and trail selection and identification;
> - Produce a schedule to complete the limited area or sub-area road and trail selection process. Normally, this process should not exceed five years, and
> - Install signs, and in some cases, construct barriers or perform restoration on closed roads and trails. (IM No. 2004-005).

Plan maintenance and changes to the route designation plan are addressed in this document in Section O.13.

O.5.2 INTERDISCIPLINARY (ID) TEAM PROCESS

Guidance for developing a Travel Plan includes utilizing the ID Team approach (8342.21A and 43 CFR 1601.1-3). The following individuals participated in the completion of this plan.

Monticello FO Interdisciplinary (ID) Team Members and Cooperators

Name	Resource/Organization
Andy Boone	Co-lead, GIS, Mapping
Maxine Deeter	Co-lead, Lands & Realty, Visual Resource Management
Mark Lambert	Co-lead, Planning, WO
Todd Berkenfield	Co-lead, Planning, WSRs, ACECs

Monticello FO Interdisciplinary (ID) Team Members and Cooperators

Name	Resource/Organization
Sandra Meyers	Field Office Manager
Thomas Heinlein	Field Office Manager
Nick Sandberg	Range, Assistant Field Manager
Gary Torres	Planning Project Manager, NEPA Coordinator
Paul Curtis	Range, Riparian/Wetlands, Water
Summer Schulz	Vegetation, Weeds, Range, Woodlands
Tammy Wallace	Wildlife, Air Quality
Brenda Dale	Fire and Fuels Management
Marie Tuxhorn	Law Enforcement
Jim Ragsdale	Law Enforcement
Ted McDougall	Minerals, Geology
Jeff Brown	Minerals, Hazardous Materials
Scott Berkenfield	Recreation Supervisor, Wilderness
Brad Colin	Recreation
Brian Quigley	Recreation
Paul Leatherbury	GIS, Mapping
Linda Richmond	San Juan River Ranger, Recreation
Mark Meloy	San Juan River Ranger, Recreation
Laura Lantz	Kane Gulch Ranger, Recreation
Scott Edwards	Kane Gulch Ranger, Recreation
Marilyn Low	Permits, Recreation
Nancy Shearin	Cultural, Paleontology
Jim Carter	Cultural – BLM

Between October of 2003 and August of 2005, the ID Team held 31 meetings specifically concerning the travel plan, and 13 coordination meetings with cooperators, other agencies, and with groups that had presented travel routes proposals [meeting minutes are in the RMP Administrative Record].

O.6 IDENTIFICATION OF ISSUES

O.6.1 SCOPING, ISSUES, AND PUBLIC INPUT

OHV/Travel issues were identified by BLM resource specialists in the pre-plan, through the Public Scoping process for the Monticello and Moab FO RMPs, by input from the public in response to Planning Bulletin #3 -- Request for Route Data, and through proposals for travel routes presented to BLM from organizations.

The BLM staff identified the following issues concerning travel in the field office:

- Use designations in the current RMP are outdated and do not address the current level of use.

- Need to incorporate BLM OHV National Strategy and Utah OHV Strategy in planning efforts.
- OHV designations need to be reviewed and revised as necessary to protect other resources.
- Maps need to be developed to identify uses of competing resources, and to show the public where OHV use is allowed.
- Implement designated routes on-the-ground through signing and maps.
- Make certain that OHV designations are consistent with Wilderness Study Areas (WSAs).
- Coordinate with adjacent field offices to match OHV designations.
- Dependence of local industry on public lands.
- Increased recreation use and demand.
- Conflicts between OHV use and other resources including riparian, wildlife, grazing and cultural.
- Conflicts between user groups such as, non-motorized and motorized users, and river runners and OHV users, commercial and private users, OHV use and unregulated camping.

Comments received from public scoping were placed in one of three categories:

- Issues to be addressed in the resource management plan (RMP) – Specific to this travel plan, these are the OHV/Travel issues considered in the Monticello FO;
- Issues that can be addressed through policy or administrative actions; or
- Issues beyond the scope of the plan: The RS 2477 issue is beyond the scope of this plan (see Section O.7).

Comments from the six public scoping meetings included 440 comments on recreation and OHV/Travel or 35% of the total 1,250 comments. Comments received in letters concerning the Monticello FO OHV and Travel program totaled 3,454 or 39% of the total comments, with the remaining 61% of the comments addressing the 14 remaining resource or planning categories (Moab and Monticello RMP Revisions, Scoping Summary, BLM, July 2004).

There is a high level of interest and concern about travel and OHV use in the Monticello FO planning area. The increase in recreational vehicle (OHV) use is indicated by the increase in vehicle registrations in San Juan County from 295 vehicles in 1998 to 1,039 vehicles in 2004, a 350% increase (Utah OHV Transactions by County and Fiscal Year, 2005).

Input from Public Scoping both through the public meetings (June 4, 2003 through December 31, 2004), and through input responses to Planning Bulletin # 3, identified the following issues, many of which are similar to those noted above:

- How can increased recreation use, especially motorized vehicle use, be managed while protecting natural resource values?
- Which areas should be designated as open, limited or closed to OHV use, and which routes should be designated within the limited category?
- What types of recreation travel should be available on designated routes and under what limitations?
- Where could adaptive management be applied in response to unacceptable resource impacts?
- How should recreational uses be managed to limit conflicts with other recreational users?

- How should camping, human waste, fires, and wood collection be managed? [in terms of OHVs]
- How should conflicts with other resource uses be reduced?
- What management actions should be implemented to mitigate damage caused by recreational uses, including vehicles, on other resources and sensitive areas, especially riparian areas?
- How should recreation in the planning areas be managed to ensure public health and safety?
- Where and under what circumstances should permitted recreation uses be available?
- What types of recreational facilities and uses should be available, and what limitation should be required?
- Where can the recreation opportunity spectrum (ROS) be applied?

O.7 DEVELOPING PLANNING CRITERIA

Considerations of both social and physical elements help to define the criteria for a travel plan. The social aspects include public demands, historical uses, existing rights-of-way, permitted uses, public access, resource development, law enforcement and safety, conflicts between existing or potential uses, recreation opportunities, local uses, cultural and economic issues. Physical aspects include the terrain, soils, water and watersheds, connectedness of routes, special designations [ACECs, WSAs], demands for specific types of vehicle use, and manageability considerations.

General planning criteria for the Resource Management Plan (RMP) process includes:

- Decisions - All decisions made in the RMP will only apply to public lands managed by the BLM.
- Existing Rights – The plan recognizes current, valid existing rights.

Specific to the travel plan, the criteria include:

- National OHV Policy - Decisions regarding OHV travel will be consistent with the BLM's National OHV Strategy.
- R.S. 2477 - No regulations to either assert or recognize R.S. 2477 rights-of-way currently exist. While R.S. 2477 claims have been asserted by San Juan County, it is beyond the scope of this document to recognize or reject R.S. 2477 assertions, and this issue is not addressed further in this Travel Plan. Nothing in this document is intended to provide evidence bearing on or addressing the validity of any R.S. 2477 assertions. At such time as a decision is made of R.S. 2477 assertions, BLM will adjust travel routes accordingly, where necessary.
- Access to Utah School and Institutional Trust Lands Administration (SITLA) State Sections - BLM is required to provide access to State lands.

O.7.1 OHV DESIGNATION CRITERIA

Policy guidance in BLM Manual 8343.1 lists the following protection criteria that must be met by BLM in the travel planning process:

1. Cultural and Natural Resources – Designations must minimize damage to all cultural and natural resources. Examples of these include, but are not limited to, the following: historical and archeological sites, soil, water, air, vegetation, and scenic values.

2. Wildlife – Designations must minimize harassment of wildlife and/or significant disruption of wildlife habitat.
3. Endangered Species – Special attention must be given to protect endangered or threatened species and their habitat.
4. Wilderness – Designations must not impair the wilderness suitability of lands under consideration for inclusion in the wilderness system.

User Access Requirements – the following criteria are used to assure adequate consideration for the requirements for each resource activity (i.e., minerals, range, forestry, recreation, etc) as they relate to access needs:

1. Operational needs – designations must consider user access requirements for inventory, exploration, use supervision, maintenance, development, and extraction of public land resources as well as maintenance of facilities on public lands.
2. State and Private Land – designations must consider the access and use needs for areas and trails located within intermingled State and private land.

Public Safety – The designation of areas and trails for ORV use must be completed so as to promote public safety, recognizing that challenge and risk are desirable factors for some uses.

1. Hazards – Designations must minimize or eliminate ORV use in areas of extreme natural or man-made hazards unless such hazards can be mitigated.
2. Safety Factors – Designations must separate uses in situations where public safety factors present unacceptable risks (e.g., rifle ranges, children's play areas, mines, etc.).

Conflict Resolution – The designation of areas and trails for ORV use must assure full consideration of the multiple-use values of public lands consistent with the following criteria:

1. Balanced Approach – Designations must provide as wide and as balanced an approach to public land access as possible to protect public land resource values while at the same time meeting user access needs.
2. Other Uses – Designations must minimize conflicts between ORV use and other existing or proposed uses of the public lands.
3. Compatibility – Designations must ensure the compatibility of ORV uses with existing conditions in populated and other sensitive areas by taking into account noise, air pollution, and other factors of the human environment.

O.7.2 MONTICELLO FIELD OFFICE CRITERIA FOR TRAVEL PLAN

Criteria for travel planning include Standards for Rangeland Health; establishing purpose and need (P/N) for routes per above mentioned guidance; defining conflicts between resources; defining conflicts among users; evaluation and consideration of routes in terms of WSAs; administration and emergency uses; and access to SITLA lands.

Standards for Rangeland Health of BLM land in Utah relate to all uses of public land, including recreation, and describe natural resource conditions that are needed to sustain public land health. The Standards encompass upland soils; riparian systems; plant and animal communities; special,

threatened, and endangered species; and water quality. The Rangeland Health Standards provide guidance for management of resources.

O.7.2.1 PURPOSE AND NEED

The methodology used during the route designation ID Team meetings to develop a well-designed travel network was a combination of guidance received from the BLM State Office (SO) and Washington Office (WO):

- IM UT 2004-061, states that Field Offices should begin the route designation process with existing inventory and data, and then determine purpose and need (P/N) for the existing routes.
- IM WO 2004-005, recommends choosing individual roads and trails for designation, "rather than using inherited roads and trails," because most existing roads "were created by use over time, rather than planned and constructed for specific activities and needs."

The purpose and need for travel routes are examined in terms of the existing situation on-the-ground in terms of why the route is currently utilized. The Monticello Field Office considered the following criteria for routes in the travel plan:

- Desired future conditions
  - Potential for adverse or positive economic impacts
  - Resource and use conflicts
  - Standards for Public Land Health and Guidelines for Recreation
  - Management for BLM Lands in Utah
- Public health and safety
  - Abandoned Mine Lands
  - Hazardous Materials / locations
- Access
  - Routes identified in guide books
  - Scenic overlooks
  - Routes to SITLA lands
  - Elimination of route redundancy
  - Special Recreation Management Areas (SRMAs)
  - Special designation prescriptions including Areas of Critical Environmental Concern (ACECs), Wilderness Study Areas (WSAs), and Wild and Scenic Rivers (WSRs)
- Cultural and Paleontological resources
- Fire considerations
- Mineral resources / Energy development
- Rangeland standards
- Recreation Opportunities / Experiences including ROS
- Watershed resources
  - Erosive Soils
  - Saline Soils

  - At-risk watersheds
  - Municipal watersheds
- Vegetative resources
  - Relict vegetations
  - At-risk vegetative sites
- Wildlife resources
  - Special Status Species
  - Crucial winter habitats
  - Rutting, calving and fawning habitat
  - Raptor nesting locations
  - Migratory Bird Corridors
- Woodlands resources
- Visual / Scenic resources

O.7.2.2 MITIGATION

Mitigation that can be utilized to address conflicts could include:

1. The season and timing of use;
2. The types of vehicle use, motorized and non-motorized;
3. Re-routing of segments; and
4. Other methods of travel.

O.7.2.3 ROUTE NUMBERS

San Juan County has route numbers for each road in their inventory. B roads are identified with three-digits (BXXX), and D routes with four-digits (DXXXX). This system has been carried forward from the county baseline data by the BLM Monticello FO in developing their travel plan. Because many of the routes are already marked on the ground by the county, for consistency in developing maps and information for the public, and because BLM Monticello FO does not have any BLM-specific roads, the field office has chosen to use the same numbers as the county.

In collaboration with the Manti-LaSal National Forest, which has its own numbering system, BLM and San Juan County have suggested that the BLM provide their joint numbering system with the county as an adjunct to that of the National Forest for signing routes on-the-ground. It is possible that routes on the National Forest will bear two different numbered signs, one for the forest and one denoting the route number of the county route on a separate post. These two systems will be incorporated into the implementation plan in mapping and written public information.

O.7.2.4 ROUTE DESIGNATIONS IN WILDERNESS STUDY AREAS (WSAS)

Information Bulletin No. 99-181 BLM directs BLM to comply with the wilderness 'non-impairment' mandate (FLPMA, Section 603(c)). BLM must monitor and regulate the activities of

off-highway vehicles in the Wilderness Study Areas (WSAs) to assure that their use does not compromise these areas by impairing their suitability for designation as wilderness.

The BLM's Off Road Vehicle Regulations (43 CFR 8342.1) require that BLM establish off-road vehicle designations of areas and trails that meet the non-impairment mandate. It is the BLM's policy that cross-country vehicle use in the WSAs does cause the impairment of wilderness suitability. Thus, the BLM should establish off-road vehicle designations in WSAs that limit vehicular access to boundary roads, or "ways" existing inside a WSA that were identified during the inventory phase of the wilderness review (in 1999 for the Monticello FO).

Travel routes within WSAs:

- "Ways" – a trace maintained solely by the passage of vehicles which has not been improved and/or maintained by mechanical means to ensure relatively regular and continuous use (IMP, Glossary, p. 5). Existing way – a "way" (see above) existing on the date of the initial wilderness inventory (IMP, Glossary, p. 1). "Ways" may be designated in a travel plan with rationale for their designation.
- Intrusions – are routes that illegally intrude into WSA boundaries, i.e., they are routes that have developed since [were not present at] the time of the wilderness inventory. There are three in Butler Wash WSA, one in Cheesebox WSA, and one in Indian Creek WSA. These intrusions are listed as closed in all alternatives.

The categories of routes on a large scale map that appear to be within a WSA but are not within the on-the-ground WSA boundary are:

- Cherry-stem route – is usually a dead-end that can form part of a WSA boundary. The narrow area within the cherry-stem is outside of the WSA due to the nature of the route detracting from the wilderness character of the WSA. There are eight cherry stemmed routes in the Monticello travel plan.
- Boundary, or as listed in the Monticello data, a dividing route. This refers to routes that lie at the boundary of WSAs but are not within that boundary. In the Monticello FO there is one such route; it runs between Fish and Road WSAs and is the boundary for each.

MFO received direction from the UTSO on September 17, 2004 (phone conversation with UT OHV Coordinator; Monticello GIS specialist was also present) to avoid designating "ways" in WSAs. A very reasonable and clear justification must be made for "ways" that BLM proposes to designate. This did not pose much of a conflict for Monticello FO, as the ID Team had earlier determined that the majority of WSAs in the resource area would be closed to motorized use.

A 0.08 mile way to access the Moon House trailhead in Fish Creek WSA will remain open to motorized recreation use consistent with an agreement between BLM and San Juan County. In addition, four ways will remain available for administrative access only and are not available for motorized/mechanized recreation use: (1) Two ways in Grand Gulch WSA (Pine Canyon and Slickhorn units) totaling 3.1 miles; (2) One way in Fish Creek WSA (Lower Baullies Mesa) totaling 4.93 miles; and (3) One way in Road Canyon WSA (Perkins Point) totaling 2.67 miles. No recreational use will be allowed on any of these administrative access ways.

O.7.2.5 Administrative Access and Use

Routes considered for Administrative Use Only were discussed by the ID Team. Several routes proposed in the travel plan including routes to ponds and other range improvements, guzzlers, BLM equipment, etc., were considered under the administrative category. MFO could reserve the right to allow travel on these routes to permittees, BLM employees, or whomever it deemed appropriate on a case-by-case basis.

The ID Team discussed whether these routes should either be designated for use or closed. Keeping routes open for administrative use means that the routes might need to be maintained for travel use even though use might be sporadic. In the current listing of routes, 33 routes covering approximately 36.8 miles are under the Administrative Closure category.

O.7.2.6 EMERGENCY USES

By regulation any fire, military, emergency or law enforcement vehicle when used for emergency purposes is exempted from OHV decisions. Emergency uses in WSAs are covered under the IMP, Section I.B.11 and 12.

O.7.2.7 EMERGENCY LIMITATION OR CLOSURE

Whenever the authorized officer determines that OHV use will cause or is causing considerable adverse effects on resources (soil, vegetation, wildlife, wildlife habitat, cultural, historic, scenic, recreation, or other resources), the area must be immediately closed to the type of use causing the adverse effects (43 CFR 8341.2). Such limitation or closures are not OHV designations.

O.8 INVENTORY – DATA AND INFORMATION COLLECTION

O.8.1 SAN JUAN COUNTY – ROUTE DATA

MFO began the process following the Utah BLM State Office (UTSO) approach. In the initial stages of the planning process, it was agreed that San Juan County's route inventory would serve as a baseline for route data since it was the most complete inventory for the field office area. Because of its expertise and local knowledge on this topic, San Juan County's participation in the route designation process is critical in order to develop a viable and well-designed travel network. Monticello FO used a sampling of the San Juan County route data to verify the validity of the inventory (Memorandum MFO Travel Plan Development, October 8, 2004):

The Monticello FO area lies almost entirely within San Juan County with a small acreage in southern Grand County. Field office staff has taken a systematic approach to verifying the county road data by relying on statistical sampling, [mapping,] and aerial photography wherever possible. The purpose of the road verification process is not to draw conclusions as to the condition, extent of use, or function of these road segments, but simply to verify that they exist." (San Juan County Road Verification Process).

BLM used internet statistics software (found at www.azplanit.com/ samplesize.htm) to determine how many road segments would need to be verified in order to establish a 95% confidence interval and a maximum acceptable margin of error of 5 percentage points that the County road data was accurate. The software indicated that a minimum sample size would require a selection of 344 segments.

All road segments were selected randomly. To accomplish this, staff used a random selection tool extension in ArcView 3.3 GIS software to select 344 segments.

Field Office staff could positively verify the existence of 343 of the 344 (or 99.7%) segment sample. One segment was not verifiable by DOQ (digital ortho quad [digital aerial photograph]) because it was located along the edge of the photograph. This segment was found on the 24k topographical map, however. Since the segments examined were a true random sample of the population of interests, BLM can be at least 95% confident that the September 27, 2001 inventory data provided by San Juan County is 99.7% accurate (Memorandum, MFO Travel Plan Development, October 8, 2004, by Bill Stevens, Moab BLM Office).

MFO also chose initially to utilize the County's purpose and need (P/N) determinations for the routes in the inventory. This decision was based on what MFO saw as the logistical problem of verifying P/N for every one of the thousands of segments in the County inventory. A number of county P/N determinations, however, were based merely on the existence of a route on the ground. When it delivered its inventory to BLM, San Juan County asserted that "all roads go somewhere and serve a purpose. Otherwise, they would not be there".

From a BLM standpoint, this statement in itself is insufficient evidence for P/N, and can be construed as being inconsistent with Washington Office guidance. In order to develop a logical travel plan from existing routes, P/N must be determined from existing use (IM UT 004-061, pg. 3). Otherwise, routes that were redundant, created for one-time use such as old seismic lines, fire lines, and chaining routes, and which receive little to no current use, remain part of the travel system simply because there is a mark on the ground. Often these routes serve no current purpose. It is here that San Juan County and BLM differed on the basis for some determinations of P/N.

It is also important to consider the distinct purposes for which the County's inventory was developed, and for which the BLM is developing a travel plan for the Monticello resource area. Reviews of BLM P/N are tied to evaluation of routes based on access, resource uses, and use conflicts.

Coordination with the County has been on-going; county planners were present at meetings regarding OHV area designations and have been involved with the discussion of route designations under the Limited category listed in the range of alternatives.

In a letter dated February 9, 2005, San Juan County noted that in driving the county for their road inventory data gathering, they recognized numerous travel junctions [points] (2,965 including mining roads, routes to oil wells, scenic vistas, state lands, private lands, wildlife guzzlers, and other uses]), which did not currently have a purpose and need. The county identified these with GPS point data but did not drive them or collect any line data.

The County further stated that as they drove the various routes in the county, they "became aware of the many activities occurring along the roads, and realized that only a portion of the purpose and need activities was captured." San Juan County notes that after working with the BLM ID Team, they concluded that the additional collected data would be useful not "only in your [BLM] planning efforts but the overall management of your field office," and provided BLM with the data. They also noted that they made no claim that their data represents all the activities occurring, but only a small portion.

O.8.2 ROUTE DATA INPUT FROM THE PUBLIC

On November 1, 2003, MFO requested from the public (Planning Bulletin #3, Request for Route Data) substantive and verifiable information on routes within the planning area beyond what was in the San Juan County inventory. BLM received additional route information from three individuals and two citizen groups.

O.8.2.1 DATA SUBMITTED BY BER KNIGHT

The data submitted by Mr. Knight included approximately 100 road segments covering approximately 104 miles of roads. The data submitted included GPS data of routes that were not a part of the County road data. These routes range from approximately 0.1 mile to 3 miles in length. The data has been examined by field office personnel and all of the routes in the data set were confirmed to exist when compared with satellite imagery and USGS 1:24,000 scale topographic maps.

Knight's submittals were later determined to have no purpose and need. All of the "new" route information fell under one of the following categories, leading to the determination of no purpose and need:

- Route redundant to more established routes;
- Route leading to no significant location or feature and receiving very little to no current use; and/or
- Route developed due to one-time use, receiving very little to no current use (old seismic lines, fire line, chaining route, etc.).

O.8.2.2 DATA SUBMITTED BY ROBERT NORTON AND ROBERT TELEPAK,

Submittals from individuals Robert Norton and Robert Telepak were examined by field office personnel and determined not to be new. All routes identified were already part of the County's inventory; no further analysis for route verification was needed or conducted.

O.8.2.3 DATA SUBMITTED BY SAN JUAN PUBLIC ENTRY AND ACCESS RIGHTS, INC (SPEAR), (PREVIOUSLY SOUTHEAST UTAH LAND USERS ASSOCIATION [SULU])

Data provided by SPEAR/SULU, under the name The Canyon Rims Trail System Basic Master Plan, includes approximately 535 miles of roads which form loop systems throughout San Juan and Grand Counties. Most of the roads in the proposal are included in the San Juan County road data. Loop systems are mainly along County roads with some parts of the loops including trails and potential new routes. The plan proposes new construction of connector routes on Forest Service, National Park, and BLM lands.

The question arose concerning the evaluation of the SPEAR Canyon Rim Trails Systems proposal as to whether the entire system would be considered as a whole including proposed constructed connections, and routes that were not included in the travel plan, or whether the SPEAR proposal would be compared to the routes designated in the Monticello FO travel plan for the portions that were coincidental. It was decided that the latter comparison would be completed.

BLM agrees that having a route system for ATV travel is a component of the travel plan. However, evaluating the potential construction of connector routes, and the evaluation of route proposals through some specific resource areas would require site-specific NEPA. Therefore, the BLM cannot evaluate the proposal in its entirety in the current planning process.

Maps presented at the February 2005 meeting by the SPEAR group were derivations of the map presented during scoping for the RMP. Also brought to that February meeting were 7 ½ quad maps with markings indicating additional routes and connector routes that SPEAR would like to see included in their planned system. These, as noted above, will be considered on a site-by-site basis activity-level planning.

BLM will complete its travel plan process and in so doing will compare the BLM designated routes with those proposed by SPEAR. In the planning process BLM will make note of the SPEAR routes that are coincidental to the BLM travel plan routes. Summary and comparisons of BLM travel plan to the SPEAR routes can be viewed at the Monticello FO). The BLM will work with SPEAR on proposals in the implementation phase of the travel plan to consider on a site-specific basis NEPA process which routes, connectors, and staging areas are consistent with the goals and objectives of the resource management plan. BLM would recognize infrastructure additions under the Title V process, and will compare the proposed network of routes based on resource evaluations through the NEPA process (see Section O.9.4.2.4).

O.8.2.4 DATA SUBMITTED BY THE REDROCK HERITAGE COALITION (RRHC)

Data submitted by the Redrock Heritage Coalition was in the form of a route designation plan, the "Red Rock Heritage Proposal for Sustainable Economies and Ecosystems". The Redrock Heritage proposal is related to the Red Rock Wilderness Proposal in that the route designation plan limits available routes in areas proposed as wilderness. Available routes are existing routes that are included in the San Juan County road data. When compared with the county's data, the RRHC proposal calls for approximately 1,796 fewer route miles, with approximately 42 fewer miles of Class B roads and 1,830 fewer miles of Class D roads.

This proposal basically limits travel to most existing County B Roads and 45% of existing County D Roads. The RRHC proposal is based on the reasoning that few places exist in the County where one can be more than 0.5 miles from a motorized route, thus, the RRHC proposal increases the opportunity for 'quiet users' to be further away from motorized routes.

BLM analyzed the specific route closures that RRHC proposed in its submittal of September 15, 2004, and made preliminary suggestions to the travel plan alternatives as appropriate (see Section O.9.4.2.5). RRHC noted that 'quiet [user] vs. motorized user opportunities are not currently balanced in this resource area,' which is what RRHC attempts to correct in their proposal. This information has been taken into account in the conservation and balanced alternatives (see BLM's Comment Analysis on RRHC Proposal, April 2005, and RRHC's specific route recommendations analyzed by BLM, both in the Administrative Record).

A comparison of the RRHC proposal and the routes in Alternatives B and C will be made by the BLM staff. However, the data provided by RRHC included the entire resource area including Forest Service lands, National Park Service lands, and Navajo Nation lands. It took some time to re-digitize the data into the BLM shape system to reflect BLM lands, and then make the comparison between what RRHC proposes and the Monticello FO travel plan proposed alternatives. A summary and comparisons of BLM travel plan to two organizations' proposals

can be viewed at the Monticello FO. This comparison was completed before the draft alternatives were completed, and will be analyzed in the DEIS (see Section O.9.4.2.5).

O.8.3 TRAVEL PLAN EVALUATION

A meeting with the San Juan County was held October 8, 2004 to review the process described in this document. It was planned that specific details regarding designated routes would be sent to the County at a later date but prior to any scheduled cooperators' meetings. As mentioned above, the field office's P/N determinations, while made by specialists familiar with the route or area in question, were not field checked, and needed the County's input to verify several of BLM's P/N determinations. Over the ensuing four months, BLM and county planning representatives worked together to share this needed information and comments on the preliminary draft travel plan.

O.9 MONTICELLO FIELD OFFICE TRAVEL PLAN DEVELOPMENT

O.9.1 GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

Goals are statements that describe a desired condition to be achieved some time in the future. Goals are normally expressed in broad, general terms, without any specific date for attainment. The Travel Plan goal is to provide opportunities for a range of motorized access and recreation experiences on public lands while protecting sensitive resources and minimizing conflicts among various users.

Objectives are concise time-specific statements of measurable planned results that move toward pre-established goals. Objectives help define the precise steps to be taken and the resources to be used in achieving identified goals. BLM policy and regulations state that:

- All BLM lands will be designated Open, Limited, or Closed. Limited designation includes designated routes, seasonal routes, and or type of vehicle routes.
- OHV designations for wilderness study areas (WSAs) must be Limited or Closed.
- Implementation planning will be completed for the Monticello FO Travel Plan.

O.9.2 POLICY: BLM OHV DESIGNATIONS

OHV Designation Categories – BLM National Strategy mandates that all public lands administered by the BLM must be designated as Open, Limited, or Closed.

- Open – The BLM designates areas as "open" for intensive ORV use where there are no compelling resource protection needs, user conflicts, or public safety issues to warrant limiting cross-country travel.

  However, motor vehicles may not be operated in a manner causing or likely to cause significant, undue damage to or disturbance of the soil, wildlife, wildlife habitat improvements, cultural or vegetative resources or other authorized uses of the public lands (see 43 CFR 8341).

- Limited – The "limited" designation is used where ORV use must be restricted to meet specific resource management objectives. In the current guidance context, this means limited to designated roads and trails, i.e., a route network designated by the BLM in its RMP.

- These routes may also be limited to:
  1. A time or season of use depending on the resources in the area (i.e., Threatened and Endangered Species' habitat or nesting areas, crucial winter ranges, etc.); and/or
  2. Types of vehicle use (ATV, Motorcycle, four-wheel vehicle, etc.).
- Closed – The BLM designates areas as "closed" if closure to all vehicular use is necessary to protect resources, ensure visitor safety, or reduce resource or use conflicts. Access by means other than motor vehicle access is generally allowed. The Field Manager may allow motor vehicle access on a case-by-case basis or for emergencies.

Monticello FO Open, Limited and Closed Areas

OHV Designation Categories on BLM Lands	Number of Acres
Open	0
Limited – to designated	1,388,191
Limited use-seasonal	8.0
Limited – to existing	NA
Closed	393,895

O.9.3 ROUTE DESIGNATION ID TEAM MEETINGS

Six ID Team meetings to address route/resource conflicts and route designation were held August 26, 27, and September 15, 21, 22, 24, 2004. On-going meetings (20 additional ID Team and 11 coordination meetings) were also held during the fall of 2004 and in 2005 concerning route selection for the range of alternatives. The purpose of the route designation ID Team meetings was two-fold:

- Gather input from ID Team on conflicts identified and mitigation proposed by each resource specialist. If there are conflicts with resources (e.g., popular overlook on route proposed to be closed for protection of wildlife habitat), these conflicts are discussed and resolved during the meeting, and a final proposal for the balanced alternative is established.
- Develop a thoughtfully, purposefully designed system of designated routes that fulfills the management goals and objectives for the resource area.

O.9.4 ROUTE DESIGNATIONS FOR LIMITED AREAS

A majority of the resource area was proposed to be designated as "limited" to OHV use in the five alternatives, as well as in the Proposed Plan. By policy, BLM is required to designate individual routes within the "limited" areas as part of the RMP process. This is the implementation portion of the Travel Plan process and includes identifying roads and trails that will be available for access and public use, and specifying the limitations, if any, placed on use.

O.9.4.1 POTENTIAL CONFLICT IDENTIFICATION BY AREA

The Monticello FO ID Team agreed to utilize the map and boundaries of the Field Office Law Enforcement Patrol Sectors as the baseline polygons for discussing and defining areas for designations, and potential conflicts, both resource and user conflicts.

Three ID Team meetings to address OHV area designations were held July 1, 6 and 7, 2004. San Juan County Planners participated in these meetings, during which areas were identified that could be open, limited, and closed to OHV travel. Notes were made on a large format map, and minutes were recorded of the discussions. On August 19 and 25, 2004, a subcommittee of the ID Team met to correlate the various notes with the purpose of producing three alternative maps of area (Open, Limited , and Closed) designations. These maps were completed on September, 2004. The seven Law Enforcement Patrol sectors and pertinent travel discussions are described below. A map of these sectors can be viewed at the Monticello FO.

1. Indian Creek is located at the northern boundary of the field office from Hurrah Pass south to the Manti-LaSal National Forest. The west boundary of this sector is Canyonlands National Park and the eastern boundary is along the Canyon Rims Moab FO boundary to the Manti-LaSal NF boundary.

Use and resource conflicts noted by ID Team:

- Off-road use / play-riding
- ACECs: Shay Canyon, Lavender Mesa, Bridger Jack Mesa, Butler Wash North,
- Indian Creek; WSA: Indian Creek
- Vegetation and livestock
- Desert Bighorn Sheep area year-round
- Cultural resources
- Wood gathering
- Antler gathering
- Camping and Indian Creek emergency closure (1999)
- Dead-end roads in Lockhart Basin
- Some redundant routes
- Hart's Draw and motorcycle use – potential MSO habitat, riparian bottom, scenic
- Trend: popular place for public and OHV use

2. Dry Valley Summit – is located east of the southern portion of Indian Creek sector (above) and extends eastward to the Colorado state line; it is bounded on the north by the Moab FO boundary and on the south by State Highway 491.

Use and resource conflicts noted by ID Team:

- Wildlife – Gunnison sage grouse leks, MSO, antelope, burrowing owls, Gunnison prairie dogs, and deer and antelope winter range
- Antler hunting/gathering
- O/G – pipeline goes through the area
- Leaving gates open
- Seasonal closure – not clear in current RMP
- Wood cutting and post cutting – may be creating routes
- Hunting in area (private owners posting closed)
- Cultural – typically project a high density in areas

- Mineral development on private lands (copper) in area
- Trend: lots of local and visitor use, antler gathering

3. Montezuma Recapture Drainages – located south of State Highway 491 and bounded at its southern boundary by the Navajo Nation; on the east by the Colorado state line, and on the west by U.S. Highway 191.

Use and resource conflicts noted by ID Team:

- Wood cutting
- Critical DWR habitat in small area on west
- ACECs: Alkali Ridge and Hovenweep for Cultural; NH Landmark within Alkali Ridge ACEC; WSAs: Squaw and Papoose, and Cross Canyon
- Recreation impacting cultural

4. **Butler, Comb, Lime** – is located west of U.S. Highway 191 and on the west at Comb Wash; the northern boundary is the Manti-LaSal National Forest and the southern boundary is the San Juan River.

Use and resource conflicts noted by ID Team:

- Travel is heavy on highways and between highways
- River House Ruins – cultural site on San Juan River – driving into area, and sleeping in ruins
- SRMA for San Juan River boaters
- Proposed OHV trail from Bluff to Butler Wash
- Trapping
- Hiking
- OHVs – see above, area currently open
- Motorcycle use
- Human waste
- Foot traffic between Sand Island and Bluff
- Wildlife, some elk, small amount of MSO
- Cultural – Tank Bench
- Whiskers Draw – OHVs vs. hikers
- Grazing (west of Blanding) and OHVs (West Water Area)
- Illegal building of new OHV routes

5. Cedar Mesa – is located south of State Highway 95 south to the boundary with Glen Canyon National Recreation Area; it is bounded on the east by Comb Wash, and the rim that runs west to Highway 261 on the northern boundary of Valley of the Gods. The area is bounded on the west by State Highway 276 and then south across the highway to the GCNRA boundary.

Use and resource conflicts noted by ID Team:

- SRMA at south end of area
- ACEC: Cedar Mesa

- Wood cutting and OHV use; Cultural sites and OHVs
- Proliferation of de-facto routes
- WSAs - wood cutting and dirt bike use west of Grand Gulch; impacts from OHV use in Cedar Mesa WSAs (8) / cutting wood
- Littering
- Motorized road claim along rim of Fish Creek was closed and not shown on map
- Antler hunting around Polly's Mesa
- Some MSO, fish, and elk around Arch Canyon
- Comb Wash Campground and OHVs and cultural issues
- Horses and pack animals and staging areas mouth of Mule Canyon

6. Southwest Canyons – is located in the southwestern portion of the field office and is bounded on the south and west by GCNRA; on the north by the Dark Canyon rims and on the northeast by Manti-LaSal National Forest.

Use and resource conflicts noted by ID Team:

- Wildlife, crucial habitat, bighorn sheep and OHVs
- Cultural
- Deer near Long Canyon – small area
- MSO
- Other recreation uses and OHVs
- WSA – Mancos Mesa and routes
- County/group wants to make loops
- Wilderness Characteristics and OHVs
- ROS and Primitive
- Grazing in Lake Canyon area, and cultural sites
- Hole in the Rock Trail – protection

7. Dark Canyon, Beef Basin –located west of Manti-LaSal NF, east of GCNRA, north of White Canyon area, and south of Canyonlands NP.

Use and resource conflicts noted by ID Team:

- ACEC (Dark Canyon and Butler Wash North)
- Wildlife – deer and elk, MSO
- National Forest – open to travel but policy doesn't allow commercial horn hunting and hunting retrieval – consistent with NF
- Fable Valley
- Beef Basin spur road and increased camping – cultural sites
- Car-camping is increasing
- Cultural site impacts
- Horse use – corrals, bring own feed
- Elk critical shape/mapped area, deer critical, critical MSO in entire area

- Commercial Special Recreation Permits (SRPs)-three agencies-NPS, FS, BLM
- Trend: increasing use of recreational use

O.9.4.2 MOTORIZED ROUTES – DESIGNATIONS

Open, Limited, and Closed area designations needed to be delineated before any route designations could be made. Once these area designations were established for the draft alternatives, each resource specialist was tasked with identifying resource conflicts with specific routes that could warrant some type of mitigation measures. Conflicts were addressed according to NEPA Critical Elements, as well as other elements associated with OHV use as advised in IM UT 2004-061.

Specialists were given a form to complete for each route/resource conflict. These forms were filled out by two Law Enforcement rangers, and a Range specialist. Several resources had too many route conflicts associated with their resource to warrant filling out a form for each route; this included Wildlife and Recreation. These were compiled by the Wildlife Biologist and Recreation specialists in conjunction with the co-leads for the travel plan.

These resource conflicts were captured using GIS and recorded in tables, which can be viewed at the Monticello FO. Some resource specialists identified no conflicts. All conflict areas were mapped and used for further discussion at ID Team meetings.

As the ID Team began addressing wildlife conflicts at the first meeting, it became apparent that some routes on the baseline map had no P/N from a BLM standpoint. This is the point where MFO began to further address P/N for individual routes. This was primarily done only for routes that were identified as conflicts by the various resource specialists; a limited number of routes not previously identified by resource specialists were also determined to have no P/N based on the ID Team Meeting discussions. These determinations, while made by specialists familiar with the route or area in question, were not field checked, and BLM determined the need for the county's input to verify several of BLM's P/N determinations (see Section O.8.3 for discussion on San Juan County's inventory and participation in route designation process). This was accomplished in subsequent meetings with the county.

During the meetings, each specific conflict was examined, after which the ID Team either proposed management actions to address the conflict (usually in the form of a route or seasonal closure) or it was decided that other management resource programs required access even in light of the conflict. About half of all resource noted identified conflicts were dismissed at the meetings because the conflict was with resource uses that were dependant on the existence of the specific route.

Typically, if a route was determined to have no P/N and a substantive resource or user conflict, then the route was closed. Routes were more likely to be closed because they had multiple resource conflicts and little P/N. Except where specifically noted in a meeting and written minutes, the ID Team's proposed route designation closures applied to the conservation and/or balanced alternative (Alternatives B and/or C).

A record of the discussion and decisions made at each of the meetings were recorded in written minutes (see Administrative Record) and with GIS mapping. The GIS specialist developed data layers (shape files) for all noted conflict areas, and included notes in the closed-route tables by conflict code. These tables can be viewed at the Monticello FO.

O.9.4.2.1 CULTURAL CONFLICTS

Because of the extremely high density of cultural sites in the resource area, an alternative plan was worked out with the MFO cultural specialist to address cultural conflicts as they pertain to route designations. With the guidance and help of the BLM UTSO Archeologist and OHV coordinators, BLM decided to address cultural "priority" areas (cultural ACECs, National Historic Districts, etc.) only, and leave other potential cultural conflicts with routes for future consideration, if necessary (most likely post RMP). This is consistent with a widely-circulated draft IM 2004-005 from the Washington Office allowing for subsequent designation determination (Section O.5.1). The archeologist/cultural specialist was present at the majority of the ID Team meetings to also offer cultural perspective for areas of the field office other than specific cultural resource areas.

Route designation in the Butler Wash cultural priority area was addressed in a specific Butler Wash ID Team meeting between recreation and cultural management programs because of the large number of unresolved cultural conflicts with the recreation uses.

A protocol for compliance with Section 106 of NHPA for designation of routes has been prepared under consultation with the SHPO.

O.9.4.2.2 WILDLIFE CONFLICTS

Wildlife considerations by the ID Team for route designations included evaluations of Crucial Deer, Antelope, Bighorn Sheep, and Elk Habitats; and special status species habitat. Computer shape files / maps were developed with the Utah Department of Wildlife Resources (UDWR) for these habitat areas, as well as on-going consultations with US Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) conducted through cooperators' meetings. The four alternatives developed for the planning process reflect the mapped areas and timing issues (rutting, lambing, nesting, etc.) for each of the species.

O.9.4.2.3 ROUTES WITHIN WILDERNESS STUDY AREAS (WSAS)

At a minimum, the travel management area designation for wilderness study areas (WSAs) must be limited to ways and trails existing at the time the area became a WSA (BLM H-1610-1, Appendix C, D (D) (2)).

MFO received direction from the BLM UTSO on September 17, 2004 (phone conversation with UT OHV Coordinator) to avoid designating "ways" in WSAs. A very reasonable and clear justification must be made for "ways" that BLM proposes to designate in WSAs. This did not pose much of a conflict for MFO, as the ID Team had earlier determined that the majority of WSAs in the resource area would be closed to motorized use. However, a limited number of "ways" were left open in some Cedar Mesa WSAs to provide access to Moon House trailhead (existing agreement with San Juan County) and for administrative purposes. SPEAR Proposal Analysis

The SPEAR routes have been digitized onto a map using the rough hand-drawn map provided by the proponents. Proposed SPEAR routes are compared to the routes that are part of the Monticello travel plan. The majority of SPEAR routes (457 miles of the 519 SPEAR proposed miles) are coincidental with the BLM travel plan. The routes that SPEAR shows as connectors will be proposed by San Jan County for SPEAR on a site-by-site basis for NEPA review. These

'connectors' include 24 routes covering approximately 35 miles (SPEAR route information can be viewed at the Monticello FO; see also Section O.8.2.3).

O.9.4.2.4 Red Rock Heritage Coalition Proposal Analysis

RRHP delivered a map, and transportation plan, and route analysis to BLM during the RMP scoping process. The BLM received the explanation of rationale behind proposed route closures on September 15, 2004 by email from Kevin Walker, one of RRHP's organizers. The BLM's analysis of each route mentioned in the RRHC Proposal and the comment analysis of their general proposals can be viewed at the Monticello FO (see Section O.8.2.4).

O.9.4.3 Motorized Single –Track

There is one route on BLM Monticello FO managed land that is open to foot traffic, mechanized, and motorized single-track riding. The route runs for approximately 0.8 miles from the National Forest boundary near Foy Lake (where it is a single-track on FS Land) to the Indian Creek area near Newspaper Rock where, after crossing the creek, it becomes a two-track county claimed route.

O.9.4.4 Non-Motorized Routes

O.9.4.4.1 Mechanized Routes

Mechanized use includes mechanical devices such as bicycles that are not motorized. There is one route specifically for bicycles at the northern boundary of the Monticello FO area named Jackson Hole. This route is designated Bicycles-Only and was established out of the Moab FO; it occurs on both BLM Monticello and Moab managed lands. Areas open to motorized cross-country travel would continue to be open for cross-country mountain bike use.

O.9.4.4.2 Constructed (Foot) Trails

- Butler Wash Ruins Interpretive Trail: Trailhead – paved parking lot; pit toilet; bulletin board; register box; brochure box with description of an interpretive trail to a cultural site overlook. Trail – Hiking; approximately 0.5 miles, easy to moderate, dirt and slickrock trail.
- Mule Canyon Ruins Interpretive Trail: Trailhead – paved parking lot; pit toilet; register box; interpretive kiosk. Trail – Hiking; a 200 yard paved sidewalk to a reconstructed Ancient Puebloan Kiva and surface pueblo. Handicap accessible.
- Sand Island Petroglyphs: Trailhead – vehicle pullout on sand/dirt road access to Sand Island Campground. Trail – Hiking; easy; a 150 yard dirt/rocky trail along a fence barrier to view prehistoric rock art panels.
- Three Kiva Pueblo – Montezuma Creek: Trailhead – dirt pullout along maintained county road; register box; interpretive sign. Trail – Hiking; pueblo is in view from the parking area; short walk on dirt to view pueblo up close.
- Newspaper Rock Petroglyph Panel: Trailhead – paved parking lot; pit toilet; register box. Trail – Hiking; short walk on a paved and dirt trail to view prehistoric rock art panel. Handicap assessable.

O.9.4.4.3 HIKING (FOOT) AND EQUESTRIAN/STOCK USE

Current Status of Non-Motorized/Non-Mechanized Trails

Trail Name	Foot	Stock Overnight Use[1]	StockDay Use[1]
Kane Gulch	X	X	
Todie Canyon	X		
Bullet Canyon	X	X	X From Grand Gulch to Jailhouse Ruin
Shieks Canyon	X		
Government Trail	X	X	
Collins Canyon	X	X	
Slickhorn Canyon	X		
Point Lookout Canyon	X		
Grand Gulch	X From junction to San Juan River	X From Kane Gulch to the junction of Collins – no stock below Collins	
Fish Canyon	X	X From Comb Wash to confluence with Owl	X 2 miles above the confluence with Owl
Owl Canyon	X		X To Nevill's Arch
Road Canyon	X	X	X
Lime Creek Canyon	X	X	X
North Mule Canyon	X		
South Mule Canyon	X		
Lower Mule Canyon (from Comb Wash)	X	X	X
Mule Canyon or Cave (Canyon Towers)	X		
Arch Canyon	X	X	X
Johns Canyon	X	X	X
Honaker Trail	X		
McLoyd	X	X	X To the impassable pour-off
Moon House Trail	X		
Keeley Trail	X		
Sundance Trail	X		
Dark Canyon	X		
Fable Valley	X	X	
Salt Creek Mesa Trail	X	X	
Newspaper Rock Trail	X		
Salvation Knoll	X		

Current Status of Non-Motorized/Non-Mechanized Trails

Trail Name	Foot	Stock Overnight Use[1]	StockDay Use[1]
Shay Canyon (Petroglyph Trail Area)	X		
Indian Creek Climbing Trails			
Bridger Jack Mesa	X		
Super Crack	X		
Cat Wall	X		
Way Rambo Wall	X		
Broken Tooth Wall	X		
Scarface	X		
Battle of the Bulge	X		
Butler Wash Trails			
Monarch Cave Trail	X		
Fish Mouth Trail	X		
Cold Springs Trail	X		
Wolf Man Panel Trail	X		
Ball Room Cave Trail	X		

[1] Stock users are required to take all feed (non-germinating and certified weed-free) necessary to sustain their animals while on the trip. Use is restricted to existing trails and routes in areas open to recreational stock use. Loose herding of pack and saddle stock is prohibited. All stock must be under physical control. Pack and saddle stock must be tethered at least 100 feet away from any water source, off o the trail, and well away from archaeological sites. Group size is limited to12 people and 10 animals.

Equestrian use is currently available on all trails and D routes in the Field Office area. Coordination with user groups will be on-going to identify specific areas for potential corrals, and potentially restricted trail-use. Development of horse use areas are scheduled for the Comb Wash Campground.

O.9.4.4.4 National Trail – American Discovery Trail (ADT)

The American Discovery Trail stretches across more than 6,800 miles and 15 states. The ADT is currently the only coast-to-coast, non-motorized recreational trail. The ADT links communities, cities, parks, and wilderness and allows people to hike, bicycle, or ride horses for an afternoon or a cross-county adventure. The trail in Utah consists of six segments totaling 593 miles, and includes rural, remote and rugged terrain. The Moab to Hite Crossing on the Colorado River covers 174 miles through portions of San Juan County and the Monticello FO area (see www.discoverytrail.org for information and Utah map)

O.9.4.5 Other Travel Modes

O.9.4.5.1 Airports/Airstrips – with fly-in access

- Cal Black Airport, FAA regulated located on the road to Halls Crossing before reaching the Glen Canyon NRA boundary.

- Bluff Airport, Non-FAA, under Right-of-Way to San Juan County located 3-4 miles west of Bluff, UT south of SR-163.
- Fry Canyon Airstrip, no facility, under Right of Way to Back Country Pilots' Association located south off SR-95 and west of Natural Bridges National Monument.

O.9.4.5.2 BOATING

- San Juan River - permitted motorized and non-motorized travel is allowed on the San Juan River under the current RMP. No up-stream motorized traffic is allowed (against the flow) except in an emergency.
- Colorado River – permitted activities on the BLM portion of the Colorado River are managed through the National Park Service, Canyonlands National Park.

O.9.4.6 NATIONAL SCENIC BYWAYS AND NATIONAL SCENIC BACKWAYS

The following scenic byways and backways (see "Utah! Scenic Byways and Backways," Utah Scenic Byways Committee) are located within the Monticello FO area and described in promotional materials provided to the public by Utah Tourism:

O.9.4.6.1 SCENIC BYWAYS

Indian Creek Corridor Scenic Byway: SR-211 (Junction with US-191 fourteen miles north of Monticello) to its terminus at the Needles District of Canyonlands National Park.

Bicentennial – Trail of the Ancients Scenic Byway: SR-95 from south of Blanding goes west across the Colorado River at Glen Canyon National Park (with a loop through Natural Bridges National Monument). A section also travels south from Blanding to the town of Bluff and then east to Montezuma Creek, and eventually into Colorado.

Monument Valley to Bluff Scenic Byway: US-163 from the Utah / Arizona border to the town of Bluff.

O.9.4.6.2 SCENIC BACKWAYS

Lockhart Basin Road Scenic Backway: From Moab, on the Kane Creek Blvd at the intersection of US-191, to Hurrah Pass onto Monticello FO which becomes the Lockhart Basin Road and ends at SR-211 (this is a 57 mile trail which takes approximately 11 hours to traverse, and is an extremely challenging 4- wheel drive, high clearance trail).

Trail of the Ancients Scenic Backway: Follows SR-261 including the Moki Dugway, from SR-95 to SR-163; and intersects SR-316 to the Goosenecks State Park. The Valley of the Gods road intersects SR-261 below the dugway for a 17 mile dirt and gravel loop drive.

Elk Ridge Road Scenic Backway: Begins 25 miles west of Blanding at the junction of SR-25 and SR-275; it turns onto Forest Road 088 (through the Manti-LaSal National Forest) and ends 48 miles later at the junction of SR-211.

Abajo Loop Scenic Backway: West from Monticello on Forest Road (FR) 105 to the junction of FR 079, and ends 35 miles later in the town of Blanding.

O.10 ALTERNATIVES DEVELOPMENT

After evaluating routes using the Field Office designation criteria, the ID Team began preliminary discussions to develop a range of alternatives for the Monticello FO travel plan. With very few exceptions, decisions made at route designation ID Team meetings pertained only to the balanced alternative. For the most part, the preliminary draft conservation and commodity alternatives are defined by general groups of conflicts.

The conservation alternative generally reflects the following:

- All routes initially identified as conflicts by resource specialists are closed;
- All routes identified as designation conflicts are closed (ways in WSAs, routes in closed areas, etc.).

The commodity alternative is essentially the San Juan County inventory minus WSA intrusions since BLM cannot legally designate intrusions (see Interim Management Policy for WSAs, H-8550-1, I.B.11).

The following table represents the Open, Limited, and Closed acreages determined by the Monticello FO ID Team, and the number of miles under the Limited category of designated routes and trails for the Approved RMP. Route closures and the key for conflict codes for each alternative can be viewed at the Monticello FO.

OHV Designation Categories on BLM Lands	Number of Acres
Open	0
Limited – to designated	1,388,191
Limited use-seasonal	8.0
Limited – to existing	NA
Closed	393,895

Miles of Routes	
Open	2,820
Closed	316

O.11 ANALYSIS OF EFFECTS – DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT (DEIS)

Analysis of the potential impacts to resources and uses by alternative will be completed in the DEIS.

O.12 RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PLAN (RMP) DECISIONS – RECORD OF DECISION (ROD)

Management decisions for resources and uses in the Monticello FO will be made through the Resource Management Plan (RMP) and (ROD).

O.13 PLAN MAINTENANCE AND CHANGES TO ROUTE DESIGNATIONS

The RMP must include indicators to guide future plan maintenance, amendments or revisions related to OHV area designations or the approved road and trail system within limited areas or sub-areas. Indicators for such changes could include results of monitoring data, new information, or changed circumstances (IM 04-005, Attachment 2).

Actual route designations can be modified without completing a plan amendment, although NEPA compliance is still required. 43 CFR 8342.3 states:

> The authorized officer shall monitor effect of the use of off-road vehicles. On the basis of information so obtained, and whenever the authorized officer deems it necessary to carry out the objectives of this part, designations may be amended, revised, revoked, or other action taken pursuant to the regulation in this part.

Within the RMP, a Field Office must establish procedures for making modifications to their designated route network. Because future conditions may require the designation or construction of new routes or closure of routes in order to better address resources and resource use conflicts, a Field office will expressly state how modification would be evaluated. As noted in IM 2004-061, plan maintenance can be accomplished through additional analysis and land use planning, e.g., activity level planning. BLM will collaborate with affected and interested parties in evaluating the designated road and trail network for suitability for active OHV management and envisioning potential changes in the existing system or adding new trails that would help meet current and future demands. In conducting such evaluations, the following factors would be considered:

- Trails suitable for different categories of OHVs including dirt bikes, ATVs, dune buggies, and 4-wheel drive touring vehicles, as well as opportunities for joint trail use;
- Need for parking, trailheads, informational and directional signs, mapping and profiling, and development of brochures or other materials for public dissemination;
- Opportunities to tie into existing or planned trail networks;
- Measures needed to avoid onsite and offsite impacts to current and future land uses and important natural resources; among others, issues include noise and air pollution, erodible solids, stream sedimentation, non-point source water pollutions, listed and sensitive species' habitats, historic and archeological sites, wildlife, special management areas, grazing operations, fence and gate security, needs of non-motorized recreationists, and recognition of property rights for adjacent landowners; and
- Public land roads or trails determined to cause considerable adverse effects or to constitute a nuisance or threat to public safety would be considered for relocation or closure and rehabilitation after appropriate coordination with applicable agencies and partners.

Regulations at 43 CFR 8342.2 require BLM to monitor the effects of OHV use. Changes should be made to the Travel Plan based on the information obtained through monitoring.

O.14 COOPERATORS AND CONSULTATION

O.14.1 COOPERATORS

Copies of meeting minutes are found in the BLM Monticello FO Land Use Plan Administrative Record.

O.14.1.1 STATE OF UTAH, INC, STATE INSTITUTIONAL TRUST LAND ADMINISTRATION (SITLA)

A meeting with SITLA representatives was held February 16, 2005 at the Monticello FO. On-going consultations continue to address BLM and SITLA management concerns including a field meeting July 19, 2005 and a meeting with SITLA and San Juan County on August 2, 2005.

O.14.1.2 STATE OF UTAH, DEPARTMENT OF WILDLIFE RESOURCES (DWR)

DWR participated in the Cooperators' Meetings held May 10-12, 2005 for review and input to the draft alternatives matrix and at subsequent meetings.

O.14.1.3 FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE (USFWS)

Letters from the USFWS concerning on-going issues with Mexican spotted owl habitat in Arch Canyon, and discussions in coordination with BLM and UDWR, are the basis for choices made by the ID team in evaluating draft alternatives.

O.14.1.4 UTAH STATE HISTORIC PRESERVATION OFFICE (USHPO)

The USHPO is consulted on cultural aspects through the RMP process and activity level, site-specific NEPA where cultural resources are concerned. A meeting was held with the Director of USHPO in the Monticello office on June 23, 2005 to review the alternatives matrix for cultural resources.

O.14.1.5 SAN JUAN COUNTY

As described in this document, San Juan County has been an integral part of the Monticello FO's travel plan development.

O.14.1.6 BLM MOAB FO

Coordination with the Moab FO has been consistent from the outset of travel planning and the RMP process. Edge matching of boundaries has been accomplished.

O.14.2 OTHER COORDINATION

O.14.2.1 NATIVE AMERICAN TRIBES

Native American tribes are consulted on all site-specific NEPA where there are cultural concerns and have been invited to participate in the planning process.

O.14.2.2 NATIONAL PARK SERVICE (NPS)

Canyonlands National Park - Canyonlands NP allows only street legal and licensed vehicles to travel on park roads; no ATVs are permitted on park service lands. Coordination with routes that traverse both BLM and Canyonlands areas has been initiated and will be on-going.

There are routes on BLM lands that carry-over onto Canyonlands NP. One route (B122) in the Indian Creek ACEC area shows on the Canyonlands General Management Plan as open to street

licensed vehicles. Route (D0497) in the Davis Canyon area crosses from BLM lands to State lands and then to Canyonlands NP. Canyonlands will post that State land/NPS boundary as open to foot travel only on NPS.

Glen Canyon National Recreation Area NRA – Meetings concerning planning issues have been held between the BLM and GCNRA staff. Travel on the NRA lands is limited to vehicles that are licensed and street legal; no ATVs are permitted to travel on NRA lands.

O.14.2.3 NATIONAL FOREST SERVICE

Manti La Sal National Forest – Coordination between BLM and the Forest is on-going. At the implementation level, joint signing efforts are being worked on with the three agencies (BLM, National Forest, and NPS), the San Juan County planning staff, Utah Parks and Recreation, and ATV user group, SPEAR.

O.14.2.4 CANYONS OF THE ANCIENTS NATIONAL MONUMENT (COANM), COLORADO BLM

The COANM is presently in the development phase of their initial Management Plan. The monument was designated on June 9, 2000 by Presidential Proclamation to protect cultural and natural resources on a landscape scale. An initial meeting with the COANM personnel occurred in October, 2003 with follow-up phone calls concerning wild and scenic rivers determinations, and travel planning, and a meeting in Monticello held on September 6, 2005.

O.15 IMPLEMENTATION PROCESS

Implementation decisions are actions to implement land use plans and generally constitute BLM's final approval allowing on-the-ground actions to proceed. These types of decisions are based on site-specific planning and NEPA analyses and are subject to the administrative remedies set forth in the regulations that apply to each resource management program of the BLM. Implementation decisions are not subject to protest under the planning regulations.

The Monticello FO travel planning and implementation process includes the following:

- A map of roads and trails for all travel modes;
- Notations of any limitation for specific roads and trails;
- Criteria to select or reject roads and trails in the final travel management network, add new roads or trails, and to specify limitations;
- Guidelines for management, monitoring, and maintenance of the system; and
- Needed easements and rights-of-ways (to be issued to the BLM or others) to maintain the existing road and trail network providing public land access.

In addition, travel management networks should be reviewed periodically to ensure that current resource and travel management objectives are being met (43 CFR 8342.3).

In the final RMP, designated OHV routes will be portrayed by a map entitled "Field Office Travel Plan and Map." This map is then the basis for route signing and enforcement. The field office will prioritize actions, resources, and geographic areas for implementation. The implementation goals include completing signage, maps, public information, kiosks, and working with partners.

As part of implementing the route designation decision, each Field Office should input their route information into the FIMMS/MAXIMO systems so that Bureau maintenance funding can be allocated to the route system.

The Resource Advisory Council (RAC) works with the Utah BLM in an advisory capacity to support OHV management. RAC states in its Executive Summary Report on OHV Management that it "believes the explosive growth in off-highway vehicle (OHV) use on public lands in Utah requires that the BLM implement a high priority pro-active statewide OHV management plan."

The RAC has adopted recommendations in their report which include:

- Establish a Coordinated OHV Management Policy
- Designate and Inventory Trails
- Increase Enforcement
- Educate OHV Users
- Develop and Maintain Trails
- Monitor and Adapt the Management Plans

The RAC recommendations will guide the implementation plan for the Monticello FO. Included in their summary of key issues are signage and the lack thereof throughout the state; the lack of user-friendly, accurate maps for areas; the length of time it takes to complete planning; and the plan implementation which in many cases are never completed.

Developing an implementation plan to define and document a specific course of action needed to implement the OHV allocation decision is part of the OHV planning process. The Implementation Plan is an internal BLM document providing guidance to Managers on how to implement designation decisions.

O.15.1 Background Information

Coordination meetings with San Juan County, Manti La Sal National Forest and the National Park Service have initially explored the feasibility of creating a multi-agency travel map of routes as they lie on each agency's lands, and which would be publicly distributed for the area encompassing southeastern Utah. This joint effort is supported by the participating agencies and will be pursued between the BLM, San Juan County, NPS units, and the Manti La Sal National Forest not only in the mapping/signing portion of implementation but also with the educational aspect of access and OHV use.

O.15.2 Pre-Designation Actions

The National Management Strategy for Motorized Off-Highway Vehicle Use on Public Lands is the primary guidance document for implementation of designated routes on BLM lands.

O.15.2.1 MAPPING AND TRAVEL INFORMATION

A coordinated group of BLM, San Juan County, NPS, Forest Service, and Utah State Parks and Recreation personnel will form a working-group to establish guidelines for maps and information that can be published in the form of brochures and route maps for the recreating public.

O.15.2.2 SIGNS

Signing will follow the state-wide OHV Trail Signing Standards as Prepared by the National Resource Coordinating Council (NRCC) Technical Team. To gain consistency throughout the state (Utah), these standards are recommended for all new signs installed to manage off-highway vehicle use after January 1, 2002. A coordinated effort has already begun to review signing on routes; this group includes Utah State Parks and Recreation, San Juan County, Manti La Sal National Forest, National Park Service units in the southeast area of Utah, and the BLM.

Monticello FO will plan the on-the-ground designation of routes process to coordinate with maps and needed signage. This includes working with the BLM Rawlins (WY) Sign Shop to design and produce the needed signage over a period of three to five years. Likewise, planning will include the recommendation to hire seasonal employees, and / or use partners, instruction for them in GIS systems, and providing a vehicle and the equipment needed to install an estimated 1,000 to 1,200 signs a year.

A system of volunteer help will be coordinated with the local OHV and other groups to elicit support in maintaining and repairing signage as necessary, as well as reporting to BLM what on-the-ground needs for signage they discover in their riding areas within the field office.

O.15.2.3 PHYSICAL CONSTRAINTS

In the case of routes that need closure from use, physical restraints such as fences, boulders, or other types of barriers may be put in place.

O.15.2.4 PUBLIC ANNOUNCEMENTS

Outreach efforts will be coordinated through the working group of county and federal agencies to reach user groups of the recreating public. This includes San Juan County, Moab and Monticello BLM, Utah State Parks and Recreation, Glen Canyon NRA, Canyonlands NP, Natural Bridges NM, Hovenweep NM, and the Canyons of the Ancients NM under the jurisdiction of Colorado BLM.

O.15.3 POST-DESIGNATION ACTIONS

O.15.3.1 INSTALLATION

BPS funding was requested beginning in FY 2007 to start on-the-ground installation of signing (see 15.4 below for projected funding needs over the life of the new RMP).

O.15.3.2 USE SUPERVISION

The BLM Monticello and Moab FOs Recreation Programs will supervise the use of routes as outlined in the new RMPs. Law Enforcement and resource specialists will formally and informally monitor the travel plan routes as outlined in a Monitoring Plan.

O.15.3.3 ENVIRONMENTAL MONITORING

A Monitoring Plan will be developed following the signing of the RMP Record of Decision and will address timing and criteria for resource monitoring. Of particular interest for the Monticello Field Office are cultural and wildlife resources management due to the large number of identified and recorded cultural sites and the continuing identification of yet unknown sites, and the areas of habitat for Threatened and Endangered and wildlife species.

Monitoring methodologies, procedures and techniques for OHV use and impacts in the resource area will meet existing resource health standards and guidelines. Monitoring plans will be developed sufficient to detect and evaluate motorized OHV-related impacts so that management changes can occur, if needed. (National Management Strategy for Motorized Off-Highway Vehicle Use on Public Lands, January 2001).

O.15.3.4 ENFORCEMENT

When OHV designation, which may include closures or restrictions, are developed through Resource Management Plans, publication of the Federal Register Notice for the RMP, Record of Decision, is required and is sufficient for legal enforcement (Draft Travel Management Guidelines for the Public Lands in Wyoming, September 21, 2004).

National strategy notes that "law enforcement needs to be a more visible and effective tool for motorized OHV management…Improvements in user education, WSA monitoring and observation, signing, route marking, and other Strategy outcomes will assist motorized OHV law enforcement efforts. But substantially more law enforcement rangers and support resources are needed to ensure compliance with motorized OHV regulations. Currently, each ranger patrols an average of 1.76 million acres of often remote public land" (National Management Strategy for Motorized Off-Highway Vehicle Use on Public Lands, January 2001).

O.15.3.5 MAINTENANCE

With thousands of miles of routes in the field office area, maintenance is an on-going need. The costs in money and personnel time have to be considered, and are included in the cost estimates shown below. It is anticipated that the use of volunteer help will provide an additional support system for the maintenance of the motorized trail systems, just as volunteer work is currently being utilized on the maintenance of non-motorized trails.

O.15.3.6 EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS

These include continuing support and education of the "Leave No Trace" and "Tread Lightly" programs which the BLM helped establish; local interagency coordination with literature, maps and brochures for public distribution; consistent signing throughout the southeastern Utah area; and working with the rider ATV groups with cultural training, wildlife awareness, and safe rider education.

O.15.4 COST ESTIMATES

See table below for listing of estimated costs for implementation scheduled over the potential life of the RMP of approximately 12 years.

O.15.4.1 DIRECT COSTS

Initial Phase – Installation, Years 1-3

- Each sign cost (4/05) is approximately $37 each
- Each post estimated cost is approximately $13 each
- Carsonite Sign Posts, 72" approximately $12 each plus stickers
- Physical Restraints such as boulders, fences, etc.
- Labor estimated at GS 4-5: $28,000 per year (for 10 months per year)
  - Two seasonal employees for 10 months each for three years to install
  - 1,200 signs per year (taking average of I hour each sign plus drive time)
- Vehicle – dedicated 4x4 pick up truck for 3-5 seasons, $6,000/year
- Gas and Per Diem

Secondary Phase – Maintenance and Repair, Year 2-12

- Sign Cost is approximately $37 each (plus 10% for cost increases)
- Post cost estimated at $13 each (plus 10% for cost increases
- Labor estimated GS 4-5: $28,000 per year (for 3 months per year)
  - One seasonal employee for 3 months for years 3-12 to replace and maintain signage;
  - Averaging replacement of 60 signs per year, and maintenance on the rest.
- Vehicle – dedicated 4x4 pick up truck for 3-5 seasons, $6,000/year

O.15.4.2 INDIRECT COSTS

- Law Enforcement – ¼ time of LE Officer, estimated at $15,000 per year - from year 1-12.
- Maps for Distribution to the Public - first year set up, design, printing costs for approximately 5,000 maps. As time progresses, the sale of the maps should reimburse the costs. There is also the possibility of Utah Parks and Recreation helping with providing maps from their OHV registration budget.
- Brochures for Free Distribution to the Public - First year design and printing, then copying year 2-12.

Cost Estimates for Travel Plan Implementation Monticello FO

Fiscal Year	Signs/ Posts	Replace-ments	Labor/ Vehicle	Gas/ Per diem	Physical Restraints	Direct Costs	Law Enforce-ment	Maps/ Brochures	Indirect costs	Totals
Year 1:	1,200 @ $50 each	0	2 @ 10 mos each $50,000 +$6,000	$5,000	$40,000	$161,000	$15,000	$8,500 /$2,500 (for 5,000)	$26,000	**$187,000**
Year 1 Total:	$60,000		$56,000	$5,000	$40,000		$15,000	$11,000		
Year 2:	1,200 @ $50 each	60 @ $50 each	2 @ 10 mos each $50,000 +$6,000	$5,000	$40,000	$164,000	$15,000	$6,000 /$1,500 (for 5,000)	$22,500	**$186,500**
Year 2 Total	$60,000	$3,000	$56,000	$5,000	$40,000		$15,000	$7,500		
Year 3:	1,200 @ $50 each	60 @ $50 each	2 @ 10 mos each $50,000 +$6,000	$5,000	$40,000	$164,000	$15,000	$2,500 /$1,500 (for 5,000)	$19,000	**$183,000**
Year 3 Total	$60,000	$3,000	$56,000	$5,000	$40,000		$15,000	$4,000		
Initial Subtotal:	**$180,000**	**$6,000**	**$168,000**	**$15,000**	**$120,000**	**$489,000**	**$45,000**	**$22,500**	**$67,500**	**$556,500**
Year 4: 2010	1,200 @ $50 each	60 @ $50 each	2 @ 10 mos each $50,000 +$6,000	$4,000	$30,000	$153,000	$15,000	$1,000 /$1,500 (for 5,000)	$17,500	**$170,500**
Year 4 Total	$60,000	$3,000	$56,000	$4,000	$30,000		$15,000	$2,500		
Years 5-12	0	60 @ $50 each = $3,000	1 @ 3 mos $12,000 +$6,000 (8x18K)	$4,000 (8x4k)	$10,000 (8x10k)	$336,000	$15,000	$1,000 /$1,500 (for 5,000)	$140,000	**$476,000**
Subtotal for years 5-12:		**$24,000**	**$200,000**	**$32,000**	**$10,000**		**$120,000**	**$20,000**		
Totals for 12 years:	**$240,000**	**$33,000**	**$424,000**	**$51,000**	**$160,000**	**$978,000**	**$180,000**	**$45,000**	**$225,000**	**1.203**

O.16 DESIGNATION ORDERS AND RECORD

Each field office is required to input their route information in the FIMMS/MAXIMO systems so that Bureau maintenance funding can be allocated to the route system (IM UT 2004-061, p. 6).

O.17 REFERENCES

43 C.F.R. Part 8340

BLMs Comment Analysis on RRHC Proposal, April 2005

BLM Moab and Monticello Field Office, Planning Bulletin #3 – Request for Route Data, November 1, 2003

BLM Moab and Monticello RMP Revisions, Scoping Summary, July 2004

BLM Monticello Field Office, Analysis of Management Situation (AMS), January 2005

BLM Monticello Field Office, Draft Alternatives Matrix, April 15, 2005

BLM Land Use Planning Handbook 1601

Draft Travel Management Guidelines for the Public Lands in Wyoming, September 21, 2004

Memorandum, MFO Travel Plan Development, October 8, 2004

NRCC Technical Team, State-wide OHV Trail Signing Standards (from Utah BLM State Office, September 5, 2001

Natural Resource Coordinating Council (NRCC) Utah Interagency OHV Steering Committee, Final Report, April 1, 2004

Standards for Rangeland Health of BLM Land in Utah, May 1997

U.S. Department of the Interior, BLM, Interim Management Policy for Lands Under Wilderness Review, H-8559-1

U.S. Department of the Interior, BLM, National Management Strategy for Motorized Off-Highway Vehicle Use on Public Lands, January 2001

Utah OHV Transactions by County and Fiscal Year, 2005

Utah!, Scenic Byways and Backways, Utah Scenic Byway Committee, 2002

www.discoverytrail.org

ATTACHMENT A: ABBREVIATIONS

ACEC – Area of Critical Environmental Concern

ATV – All Terrain Vehicle

BLM – Bureau of Land Management

DEIS – Draft Environmental Impact Statement

DWR – Department of Wildlife Resources

EA – Environmental Assessment

EIS – Environmental Impact Statement

MFO – Monticello Field Office

MSO – Mexican spotted owl

NEPA – National Environmental Policy Act

NRCC – Natural Resource Coordinating Council

OHV – Off-highway Vehicle [synonymous with ORV)

ORV – Off-road Vehicle

RAC – Resource Advisory Council

RMP – Resource Management Plan

ROD – Record of Decision

SHPO – State (Utah) Historic Preservation Office

SRMA – Special Recreation Management Area

USFWS – U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

SITLA – School Institutional Trust Land Administration

UTSO – Utah (BLM) State Office

WSA – Wilderness Study Area

WSR – Wild and Scenic River

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK.

ATTACHMENT B: DEFINITIONS

All-Terrain Vehicle (ATV) – A wheeled or tracked vehicle, other than a snowmobile or work vehicle, designed primarily for recreational use of the transportation of property or equipment exclusively on undeveloped road rights of way, marshland, open country or other unprepared surfaces (BLM, National Management Strategy for Motorized Off-Highway Vehicle Use on Public Lands, January 2001).

Closed Designations – Areas or trails are designated closed if closure to all vehicular use is necessary to protect resources, promote visitor safety, or reduce use conflicts (8342.06 E).

Considerable Adverse Impacts – Any ORV related adverse environmental impact that causes: (a) significant damage to cultural or natural resources, including but not limited to historic, archaeological, soil, water, air, vegetation and scenic values, or (b) significant harassment of wildlife and/or significant disruption of wildlife habitats; or (c) significant damage to endangered or threatened species or their habitat, or (d) impairment of wilderness suitability; *and* is irreparable due to the impossibility or impracticality of performing corrective or remedial actions. The significance of these damages is determined on a case-by-case basis by BLM's authorized officers in the field (normally District [Field Office] Managers) in the context of local conditions (BLM Manual 8342.05).

Designation – The formal identification of public land areas and trails where off-road vehicles use has been authorized, limited, or prohibited through publication in the *Federal Register*. The types of designation used by the BLM are open, limited, or closed to off-road vehicle use (BLM Manual 8342.05).

Emergency Limitations or Closures – Limiting use or closing areas and trails on public lands to ORV use under the authority of 43 CFR 8341.2. Such limitations or closures are not ORV designations (BLM Manual 8341.05).

Implementation Plan - A site-specific plan written to implement decisions made in the land use plan. An implementation plan usually selects and applies best management practices (BMP) to meet land use plan objectives. Implementation plans are synonymous with "activity" plans. Examples of implementation plans include interdisciplinary management plans, habitat management plans, and allotment management plans (BLM, National Management Strategy for Motorized Off-Highway Vehicle Use on Public Lands, January 2001).

Land Use Plan - A set of decisions that establish management direction for land within an administrative areas, as prescribed under the planning provisions of FLPMA; and assimilation of land use plan-level; decisions developed through the planning process outlines in 43 CFR 1600, regardless of the scale at which the decisions were developed. (BLM, National Management Strategy for Motorized Off-Highway Vehicle Use on Public Lands, January 2001)

Limited Designations – The limited designation is used where ORV use must be restricted to meet specific resource management objectives. Examples of limitations include: number or types of vehicles; time or season of use; permitted or licensed use only; use limited to designated roads and trails; or other limitations if restrictions are necessary to meet resource management objectives including certain competitive or intensive use areas which have special limitations (BLM Manual 8342.06 F).

Mechanized Travel – Moving by a mechanical device (e.g., bicycle) not powered by a motor.

Minimize ORV Damage – To reduce ORV effects to the maximum extent feasible short of eliminating ORV use, consistent with established land management objectives as determined by economic, legal, environmental, and technological factors (BLM Manual 8342.05).

Motorized Travel – Moving by means of vehicles that are propelled by motors such as cars, trucks, OHVs, motorcycles, boats, etc.

Non-motorized Travel – Moving by foot, stock or pack animal, boat, or mechanized vehicle such as a bicycle.

O**ff-highway Vehicle (OHV) -** OHV is synonymous with, and the more current term for, Off-Road Vehicles (ORV). ORV is defined in 43 CFR 8340.0-5(a): Off-road vehicle means any motorized vehicle capable of, or designed for, travel on or immediately over land, water, or other natural terrain, excluding: 1) Any non-amphibious registered motorboat; 2) Any military, fire, emergency, or law enforcement vehicle while being used for emergency purposes; 3) Any vehicle whose use is expressly authorized by the authorized officer, or otherwise officially approved; 4) Vehicles in official use; and 5) Any combat or combat support vehicle when used in times of national defense emergencies.

OHV area designations - Refers to the land use plan decisions that permit, establish conditions, or prohibit OHV designations (43 CFR 8342.1). The CFR requires all BLM-managed public lands to be designated as open, limited, or closed to off-road vehicles, and provides guidelines for designation. The definitions of open, limited, and closed are provided in 43 CFR 8340-5 (f), (g), and (h), respectively.

Open Designations – Open designations are used for intensive ORV use areas where there are no special restrictions or where there are no compelling resource protection needs, user conflicts, or public safety issues to warrant limiting cross-country travel (8342.06 D).

Preliminary Network - If a final road and trails network is not identified in the RMP process, the plan should include a preliminary network that will be identified for use until a final network is selected through a subsequent implementation plan (Attachment to IM 2004-005).

Resource Management Plan (RMP) Area - Most RMPs cover a large planning and management area. As a result, the planning area may be divided into smaller areas, each with differing values, issues, needs and opportunities that may warrant differing management prescriptions (Attachment to IM 2004-005).

Road and Trail Selection - For each limited area, the BLM should choose a network of roads and trails that are available for motorized use, and other access needs including non-motorized and non-mechanized use, consistent with the goals and objectives and other consideration described in the plan (Attachment to IM 2004-005).

Road and Trail Identification - For the purposes of this guidance, road and trail identification refers to the on-the-ground process (including signs, maps and other means of informing the public about requirements) of implementing the road and trail network selected in the land use plan or implementation plan. Guidance on the identification requirements is in 43 CFR 9342.2(2) (Attachment to IM 2004-005).

"Ways" – Route Designations in Wilderness Study Areas (WSAs).

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK.

APPENDIX P WILD AND SCENIC RIVERS

SUITABILITY STUDY

The 12 eligible segments will be further reviewed as to their suitability for congressional designation into the National System. This will be done within the framework of the ongoing planning process for the Moab Resource Management Plan (RMP), including the development of an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS).

The purpose of the suitability step of the study process is to determine whether eligible rivers would be appropriate additions to the national system by considering tradeoffs between corridor development and river protection. Suitability considerations include the environmental and economic consequences of designation and the manageability of a river if it were designated by Congress.

The WSR Suitability evaluation is designed to answer the following questions:

- Should the river's free-flowing character, water quality, and outstandingly remarkable values (ORVs) be protected? OR, are one or more other uses important enough to warrant doing otherwise?
- Will the river's free-flowing character, water quality, and ORVs be protected through designation? And, is wild and scenic river designation the best method for protecting the river corridor and its values?

In answering these questions, the benefits and impacts of WSR designation must be evaluated, and alternative protection methods considered.

The EIS for the RMP evaluates impacts that would result if the eligible rivers were determined suitable and managed to protect their free-flowing nature, tentative classification, and outstandingly remarkable values. It also addresses impacts that would result if the eligible rivers are not determined suitable and their values are not provided protective management. The range of alternatives include the No Action alternative, which does not address suitability and leaves rivers eligible, and Alternative B, which finds all eligible rivers suitable. Alternative C may find some eligible rivers as suitable, and Alternative D finds no rivers suitable.

Alternative tentative classifications are also evaluated. "Whenever an eligible river segment has been tentatively classified, e.g., as wild, other appropriate alternatives may provide for designation at another classification level (scenic or recreational). There is not another classification alternative for rivers tentatively classified as recreational. As long as a river segment is under study, it must be afforded protection at the tentative classification level it was given when determined eligible, even if another classification is considered as an alternative in the RMP" (BLM Manual Section 8351.33C). For river segments determined nonsuitable in the RMP, the river shall be managed in accordance with the management objectives as outlined in the RMP (BLM Manual Section 8351.53B).

In addition to the impact analysis addressed by alternative, the following suitability considerations are applied to each eligible river in Attachment 5.

- Characteristics which do or do not make the area a worthy addition to the national system
- Status of land ownership and use in the area

- Uses, including reasonably foreseeable potential uses, of the area and related waters, which would be enhanced, foreclosed, or curtailed if the area were included in the national system of rivers; and the values which could be foreclosed or diminished if the area is not protected as part of the national system.
- Interest by federal, tribal, state, local, and other public entities in designation or non-designation of a river, including the extent to which the administration of the river, including the costs thereof, can be shared by the above mentioned entities.
- Ability of the agency to manage and protect the values of a river if it were designated, and other mechanisms to protect identified values other than Wild and Scenic Rivers designation.
- The estimated cost, if necessary, of acquiring lands, interests in lands, and administering the area if it were included in the national system.
- The extent to which administration costs will be shared by local and state governments.

The following table lists the interdisciplinary meetings held during the suitability step of this study process.

Suitability Study Interdisciplinary Meetings

Date	Attending	
February 12, 2004	Evan Lowry, San Juan County Walter Bird, San Juan County Maxine Deeter, Lands/Realty, VRM Ted McDougall, Minerals Mark Meloy, Recreation	Scott Berkenfield, Recreation Tammy Wallace, Wildlife Summer Schulz, Range, Weeds Andy Boone, GIS Todd Berkenfield, WSR, Planning
March 11, 2004	Evan Lowry, San Juan County Ed Scherick, San Juan County Gary Torres, NEPA, Planner Todd Berkenfield, WSR, Planning Summer Schulz, Range, Weeds Roaldn Thompson, Planning	Maxine Deeter, Lands, VRM, OHV Nancy Shearin, Cultural, Paleo Nick Sandberg, Range, Assistant FOM Tammy Wallace, Wildlife Scott Berkenfield, Recreation Paul Curtis, Range

Public comment received on the Draft EIS/RMP will be used to improve the documentation of the suitability considerations presented in Attachment 5 of this document, as well as the documentation of impacts that would result from the various alternatives. The actual determination of whether or not each eligible river segment is suitable is a decision that will be made in the Record of Decision for the Monticello RMP.

Attachment 5. Suitability Considerations by Eligible River Segment

Suitability Considerations	Consideration Applied to Eligible River
Colorado River – 3 Segments	
Characteristics which would or would not make it suitable	The Colorado River possesses outstandingly remarkable scenic, fish, recreation, wildlife, cultural and ecological values. Scenically the Colorado River is a desert waterway with ever changing vistas of grand proportions. The Colorado River provides habitat for species of fish found nowhere else in the world. Water related recreational activities, such as rafting calm water to Class I-IV rapids, are nationally recognizable. The river is a flyway for neo-tropical bird migrations, and important habitat for wildlife. The cultural and historical values of the river range from prehistoric, including Ancestral Puebloan sites, to recent historical sites. The river supports an extensive ecological system within the desert environment.
Land ownership status and current use of the area.	Ownership along the Monticello FO-administered east/south side of the river portion of the river is approximately 73%; the remaining is in state (SITLA 19%), and private (8%) ownership (Moab FO administers the west/north side). - Recreational water related activities, boating, rafting, fishing, sight-seeing. - Available for grazing. - OHV use limited to designated roads and trails.
Uses, including reasonably foreseeable uses, that would be enhanced or curtailed if designated; and values that would be diminished if not designated.	- The Colorado River is navigable, thus the water is controlled by the State of Utah. -[The privately owned Potash facility is located on the west side within the Moab FO segment and opposite the 2.2 mile Monticello FO segment; leases are issued by the State of Utah]. - Interstate [water] compacts are not affected by WSR [WSRA, Sec 13: Jurisdiction of the States]. No water allotment needs are anticipated to provide protection of the ORVs. - There are no withdrawals in the area on the Monticello administered side of the river; however, Moab has withdrawals from mining on the side they administer. - On the lower 12 mile segment mineral leasing is currently Category 1, surface use with standard conditions apply for approximately the first 4 miles of land adjacent to the river. Below approximately river mile 40 to the Canyonlands NP boundary, mineral leasing is Category 2, special conditions apply. - Recreation: no difference if designated or not; NPS issues permits on Colorado R; Moab FO patrols these segments. - Geology: is millions of years old and will not change except for natural weathering/erosion. - Riparian/Vegetative/Wildlife: enhancement or protective mgmt are available under law/policy. - Grazing: most occurs on mesas outside ¼ mile; however, some within ¼ mile at river edge. - SITLA – although the Monticello FO RMP management decisions will not be binding upon trust lands, development of trust land can be drastically affected by management prescriptions applied to adjacent public lands. - WSAs/Wilderness: no WSAs are located within the Colorado River area of the Monticello FO.

Attachment 5. Suitability Considerations by Eligible River Segment

Suitability Considerations	Consideration Applied to Eligible River
Interest of federal, public, state, tribal, local, or other public entity in designation of non-designation, including administration sharing.	Interest/Support: high from national river groups, NPS, some local residents, and environmental organizations; American Rivers, Utah River Council, and NRI listing. Participation: other federal agencies are actively participating in WSR process, and currently (NPS and BLM Moab FO) partner with administration of the river; NPS/Canyonlands NP carries the costs associated with recreation permit process. Interest/Support: low or negative interests or support from some of the local population and from the San Juan County government. Participation: San Juan County notes they do not have the staff or financial ability to participate, share, nor help administer or manage values on a WSR. … San Juan County will not share in either the administration or the cost of WSR designation of the Colorado River. … As stated by San Juan County – The State or its political subdivisions will not participate in the preservation and administration of lands or rivers which are located on federal lands. NPS: the lower portion of the Monticello FO Colorado River eligible segment, as it flows into Canyonlands NP, has the same tentative classification (Wild) as that determined by NPS for the segment within Canyonlands National Park. The (Wild) classification has been changed to Scenic due to the presence of motorized boating on the river. USFS: no eligible river/segments on Colorado River. Other BLM Areas: eligibility determination and tentative classification levels for the Colorado River were determined to be the same (Scenic) by both the BLM Monticello FO (south/east side) and the BLM Moab FO (north/west side).
Manageability of the river if designated, and other means of protecting values.	BLM uses management prescriptions and applicable laws/policies to protect the river and its ORVs. Management prescriptions were included in the 1991 RMP for the Colorado River, which was found eligible in that earlier evaluation process. Currently, recreational use is under a permit system administered by the National Park Service (Canyonlands NP). There are no other current management/protection overlays in the Monticello FO Colorado River area. - SITLA – The presence of trust lands along the WSR corridor could encumber the manageability of the WSR system by over segmentation or by development that is inconsistent with the purpose of the WSRA.
The estimated costs of administering the river, including costs for acquiring lands.	There should be no acquisition costs involved in the potential designation of the Colorado River as a WSR. Administration costs would include staff/time to develop and complete study and management reports.
The extent to which administration costs will be shared by local and state governments.	San Juan County: "Considering the budget status of the State and County, it seems highly unlikely that either would put much priority in managing and/or protecting the non-federal lands in the area."
Indian Creek	
Characteristics which would or would not make it suitable	Indian Creek possesses a cultural value. Indian Creek is a remarkable example of the interface between two prehistoric cultural groups, the Pre Puebloan and the Fremont with Newspaper Rock petroglyph panel listed on the National Register of Historic Places.
Land ownership status and current	Ownership along Indian Creek is 96% BLM with a very small (.2 mile)

Attachment 5. Suitability Considerations by Eligible River Segment

Suitability Considerations	Consideration Applied to Eligible River
use of the area.	4% of state land. - Newspaper Rock Interpretive Site lies within ¼ mile of Indian Creek. - There is a parking lot with toilet at the Newspaper Rock site on the opposite side of the road from Indian Creek, and a primitive campground on the creek side of the road. (Change to this campground is possible in the RMP based on the Indian Creek EA, due to safety issues (flooding). - Scenic Highway 211 runs next to the creek area the length of the eligible segment within ¼ mile of sections of the stream. - The Nature Conservancy owns the Dugout Ranch north of this eligible segment.
Uses, including reasonably foreseeable uses, that would be enhanced or curtailed if designated; and values that would be diminished if not designated.	- There is grazing in the area. - This is a popular corridor for rock climbers to access climbing routes further north. This is a heavily traveled area by visitors to the Needles District of Canyonlands National Park; Rte 211 is the only way into and out of the park. Needles reported visitation of 44,333 vehicles in 2003, and 44,400 through the end of July 2004. Many of these visitors stop at the Newspaper Rock Interpretive Site. - Mineral leasing is Category 2, surface use with special conditions. - SITLA – although the Monticello FO RMP management decisions will not be binding upon trust lands, development of trust land can be drastically affected by management prescriptions applied to adjacent public lands. - Private landowners immediately below this segment use water for domestic and irrigation purposes. The potential to expand this use is possible, per San Juan County.
Interest of federal, public, state, tribal, local, or other public entity in designation of non-designation, including administration sharing.	There is no county support for designation. There is support from the environmental community for determinations of suitability. San Juan County does not feel that the residents support WSR designation for Indian Creek. San Juan County will not share in either the administration or the cost of WSR designation of Indian Creek.
Manageability of the river if designated, and other means of protecting values.	Currently the Indian Creek eligible WSR is within the Shay Canyon ACEC and Canyon Basins SRMA. BLM uses management prescriptions and applicable laws/policies to protect the stream and its ORVs. If designated, other means of management for protecting values will be extrapolated from the impact analysis for the Monticello RMP/EIS. USFS – Indian Creek on Forest Service land was determined not eligible.
The estimated costs of administering the river, including costs for acquiring lands.	There is no private land to acquire. Administration costs would include staff/time to develop and complete study and management reports.
The extent to which administration costs will be shared by local and state governments.	San Juan County stated that considering the budget status of the State and County, it seems highly unlikely that either would put any priority in managing and/or protecting the non-federal lands in the area.

Fable Valley	
Characteristics which would or would not make it suitable	Fable Valley possesses wildlife and ecological values. Fable Valley is a narrow, discontinuous riparian corridor that provides habitat for wildlife, two threatened and endangered (T&E) species, and is on the migration route for neo-tropical birds.
Land ownership status and current use of the area.	Ownership within the stream corridor is 100% BLM land. There is an old jeep trail that runs along the lower portion the valley near the stream.
Uses, including reasonably foreseeable uses, that would be enhanced or curtailed if designated; and values that would be diminished if not designated.	Mineral leasing is Category 4, closed to leasing and mineral entry. There is livestock trailing and emergency grazing allowed during drought or severe winters.
Interest of federal, public, state, tribal, local, or other public entity in designation of non-designation, including administration sharing.	There is no county support for designation. There is support from the environmental community for determinations of suitability. San Juan County will not share in either the administration or the cost of WSR designation of Indian Creek.
Manageability of the river if designated, and other means of protecting values.	BLM uses management prescriptions and applicable laws/policies to protect the river and its ORVs. If designated, other means of management for protecting values will be extrapolated from the impact analysis for the Monticello RMP/EIS. Fable Valley lies within Dark Canyon WSA, partially within Dark Canyon ACEC, and within the Canyon Basins SRMA. Fable Valley is managed according to the Interim Management Policy for Lands Under Wilderness Review (IMP), which provides for primitive recreation.
The estimated costs of administering the river, including costs for acquiring lands.	There is no private land to acquire. Administration costs would include staff/time to develop and complete study and management reports.
The extent to which administration costs will be shared by local and state governments.	San Juan County stated that considering the budget status of the State and County, it seems highly unlikely that either would put much priority in managing and/or protecting the non-federal lands in the area.
Dark Canyon	
Characteristics which would or would not make it suitable	Dark Canyon possesses scenic, recreation and wildlife values. Dark Canyon is an internationally recognized area known for rugged terrain, primitive recreation, and habitat supporting a broad array of wildlife.
Land ownership status and current use of the area.	Ownership within the stream corridor is 100% BLM land.
Uses, including reasonably foreseeable uses, that would be enhanced or curtailed if designated; and values that would be diminished if not designated.	Mineral leasing is Category 4, closed to leasing and mineral entry.
Interest of federal, public, state, tribal, local, or other public entity in designation of non-designation, including administration sharing.	Interest/Support is high from national river groups, other agencies, some local residents, and environmental organizations. San Juan County has expressed support for Dark Canyon as a potential WSR.
Manageability of the river if designated, and other means of protecting values.	BLM uses management prescriptions and applicable laws/policies to protect the river and its ORVs. If designated, other means of management for protecting values will be extrapolated from the impact analysis for the Monticello RMP/EIS. Dark Canyon lies within Dark Canyon WSA, partially within Dark

	Canyon ACEC, and within the Canyon Basins SRMA. Dark Canyon is managed according to the Interim Management Policy for Lands Under Wilderness Review (IMP), which provides for primitive recreation.
The estimated costs of administering the river, including costs for acquiring lands.	There is no private land to acquire. Administration costs would include staff/time to develop and complete study and management reports.
The extent to which administration costs will be shared by local and state governments.	San Juan County stated that considering the budget status of the State and County, it seems highly unlikely that either would put any priority in managing and/or protecting the non-federal lands in the area.
San Juan River – 5 segments	
Characteristics which would or would not make it suitable	The San Juan River possesses scenic, fish, recreation, geology, wildlife, cultural/historic, and ecological values, dependent on the segment. The San Juan River is known for its recreational boating draw, both pre-historical and historical sites, abundant river wildlife and endemic fish populations, and unique geologic formations. The corridor provides an ecological/riparian niche in a desert environment.
Land ownership status and current use of the area.	The north side of the San Juan River is predominantly on BLM federally owned land with BLM ownership on this side of the river corridor approximately 88%, and private ownership slightly less than 12%, with .02% on the north side in Navajo Nation ownership. The entire south side of the San Juan River, from the Colorado state line to the outflow from Lake Powell at the Arizona state line, is owned and under the jurisdiction of the Navajo Nation. There are roads in portions of the San Juan River area, access to the river for irrigation of agricultural fields at various points, the towns of Bluff and Mexican Hat and State Highway 163 are north of the river. State Highway 191 bridge crosses the San Juan below the BLM Sand Island Campground and Boat Launch area; State highway 163 crosses the river at Mexican Hat, and there are dirt roads accessing the river area at approximately river mile 6 near River House Ruin, a well known archeological site for river parties' visitation. The State highway #163 parallels the river but not within sight of the river, and there are dirt roads in the lower segments around the town of Mexican Hat. This is a well used recreational segment of the San Juan River with high levels of both private and commercial boating use on the river. There is development outside the river corridor, including grazing, gravel facilities, and oil and gas development, and a recreational horse facility within the river corridor and a dirt road leading to it along the river's edge, as well as the Town of Mexican Hat.
Uses, including reasonably foreseeable uses, that would be enhanced or curtailed if designated; and values that would be diminished if not designated.	The primary issue with possible designation is the ownership by the Navajo Nation of the south side of the river. The Navajo Nation has expressed concern about and interest in their nation's future water development projects. There are Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) withdrawals along the north side (BLM) of the San Juan River. These withdrawals were made under Power Site Withdrawal 122, and subject to Section 24 of the Federal Power Act. Withdrawals were upon lands that could be required for power development purposes. Lands of interest were reserved to the US government for public purposes and were to be withdrawn and withheld from private appropriation. They were to be dedicated for some public purpose. In this case, for development of water power sites. The lands withdrawn could be covered by water if dams were constructed on the San Juan River. In 1957, the withdrawals were partially revoked to allow for mineral entry.

	Mineral leasing categories vary depending on location along the river. Mineral values such as sand, gravel, oil and gas are extremely important to San Juan County and the local economy. There are presently oil wells along portions of the San Juan River. San Juan County feels that further development is highly probable, and that oil and gas development as well as other mineral extraction activities is incompatible with WSR designation.
Interest of federal, public, state, tribal, local, or other public entity in designation of non-designation, including administration sharing.	Interest/Support is high from national River groups, other agencies, some local residents, and environmental organizations. San Juan County does not support WSR designation on the San Juan River.
Manageability of the river if designated, and other means of protecting values.	BLM uses management prescriptions and applicable laws/policies to protect the river and its ORVs. Management prescriptions were included in the 1991 RMP for the San Juan River, which was found eligible in that earlier evaluation process. The San Juan River is managed as a Special Recreation Management Area. Glen Canyon National Recreation Area participates with BLM in the management of the lower section of the San Juan River.
The estimated costs of administering the river, including costs for acquiring lands.	Costs of land acquisition is unknown at this time, or whether there is any need to acquire land. Administration costs would include staff/time to develop and complete study and management reports.
The extent to which administration costs will be shared by local and state governments.	San Juan County will not share in either the administration or the cost of WSR designation of the SJR.
Arch Canyon	
Characteristics which would or would not make it suitable	Arch Canyon possesses fish, recreation, wildlife, cultural and ecological values. Arch Canyon offers a unique combination of riparian areas supporting fish and wildlife in a desert environment with cultural sites and recreational opportunities.
Land ownership status and current use of the area.	Ownership within the stream corridor is 90% BLM with 10% state lands. A route used for off-highway vehicle OHV motorized travel is present the length of the stream/banks of Arch Canyon and crosses the stream 60 times in 8 miles.
Uses, including reasonably foreseeable uses, that would be enhanced or curtailed if designated; and values that would be diminished if not designated.	Mineral leasing is Category 2 with surface uses limited by special conditions. The area has designated critical habitat for Mexican Spotted Owl, and potential habitat for the Southwestern Willow Flycatcher, both T&E species. There is a fenced cultural site approximately ½ mile from the eastern boundary that has frequent visitation.
Interest of federal, public, state, tribal, local, or other public entity in designation of non-designation, including administration sharing.	Interest/Support is high from national River groups, other agencies, some local residents, and environmental organizations. San Juan County does not support the possible designation of Arch Canyon.
Manageability of the river if designated, and other means of protecting values.	BLM uses management prescriptions and applicable laws/policies to protect the river and its ORVs. Arch Canyon is within Cedar Mesa ACEC and Grand Gulch SRMA. Management for the protection of outstandingly remarkable values could conflict with the OHV route. Although OHV use in this area is considered recreational, the route does not contribute to the outstandingly remarkable recreational value per BLM UTSO and BLM

	WO guidance. Arch Canyon was determined eligible on the Manti–LaSal National Forest land with a tentative classification of Scenic. The route that is present and in use on Forest Service land is closed to motorized vehicle use within the national forest at the FS/BLM boundary where it becomes a foot trail.
The estimated costs of administering the river, including costs for acquiring lands.	There is no private land to acquire. Administration costs would include staff/time to develop and complete study and management reports.
The extent to which administration costs will be shared by local and state governments.	San Juan County stated that considering the budget status of the State and County, it seems highly unlikely that either would put much priority in managing and/or protecting the non-federal lands in the area.