UINTAH BASIN ENERGY ZONES
2012 GENERAL SESSION
STATE OF UTAH
Chief Sponsor: Kevin T. Van Tassell
House Sponsor: John G. Mathis
LONG TITLE
General Description:
This bill modifies Title 63J, Chapter 8, State of Utah Resource Management Plan for
Federal Lands, by creating the Uintah Basin Energy Zone.
Highlighted Provisions:
This bill:
defines the term "Uintah Basin Energy Zone";
creates the Uintah Basin Energy Zone;
• adopts an energy exploration, access, and development policy for the Uintah Basin
Energy Zone, including:
• promoting full, responsible development of energy and mineral resources within
the Uintah Basin Energy Zone; and
• achieving and maintaining sustainable levels of energy, hard rock, and natural
resources in the Uintah Basin Energy Zone;
 promotes local, state, and federal collaboration to develop energy and mineral
resources in the Uintah Basin Energy Zone; and
makes technical changes.
Money Appropriated in this Bill:
None
Other Special Clauses:
This bill provides an immediate effective date.
Utah Code Sections Affected:
AMENDS:

	S.B. 83 Enrolled Copy
30	63J-4-401, as last amended by Laws of Utah 2009, Chapter 121
31	63J-8-102 , as enacted by Laws of Utah 2011, Chapter 49
32	63J-8-105 , as enacted by Laws of Utah 2011, Chapter 49
33	ENACTS:
34	63J-8-105.5 , Utah Code Annotated 1953
35	
36	Be it enacted by the Legislature of the state of Utah:
37	Section 1. Section 63J-4-401 is amended to read:
38	63J-4-401. Planning duties of the planning coordinator and office.
39	(1) The state planning coordinator shall:
40	(a) act as the governor's adviser on state, regional, metropolitan, and local
41	governmental planning matters relating to public improvements and land use;
42	(b) counsel with the authorized representatives of the Department of Transportation,
43	the State Building Board, the Department of Health, the Department of Workforce Services,
44	the Labor Commission, the Department of Natural Resources, the School and Institutional
45	Trust Lands Administration, and other proper persons concerning all state planning matters;
46	(c) when designated to do so by the governor, receive funds made available to Utah by
47	the federal government;
48	(d) receive and review plans of the various state agencies and political subdivisions
49	relating to public improvements and programs;
50	(e) when conflicts occur between the plans and proposals of state agencies, prepare
51	specific recommendations for the resolution of the conflicts and submit the recommendations
52	to the governor for a decision resolving the conflict;
53	(f) when conflicts occur between the plans and proposals of a state agency and a
54	political subdivision or between two or more political subdivisions, advise these entities of the
55	conflict and make specific recommendations for the resolution of the conflict;
56	(g) act as the governor's planning agent in planning public improvements and land use
57	and, in this capacity, undertake special studies and investigations;

(h) provide information and cooperate with the Legislature or any of its committees in conducting planning studies;

- (i) cooperate and exchange information with federal agencies and local, metropolitan, or regional agencies as necessary to assist with federal, state, regional, metropolitan, and local programs;
- (j) make recommendations to the governor that the planning coordinator considers advisable for the proper development and coordination of plans for state government and political subdivisions; and
- (k) oversee and supervise the activities and duties of the public lands policy coordinator.
 - (2) The state planning coordinator may:

- (a) perform regional and state planning and assist state government planning agencies in performing state planning;
- (b) provide planning assistance to Indian tribes regarding planning for Indian reservations; and
- (c) assist city, county, metropolitan, and regional planning agencies in performing local, metropolitan, and regional planning, provided that the state planning coordinator and the state planning coordinator's agents and designees recognize and promote the plans, policies, programs, processes, and desired outcomes of each planning agency whenever possible.
- (3) When preparing or assisting in the preparation of plans, policies, programs, or processes related to the management or use of federal lands or natural resources on federal lands in Utah, the state planning coordinator shall:
- (a) incorporate the plans, policies, programs, processes, and desired outcomes of the counties where the federal lands or natural resources are located, to the maximum extent consistent with state and federal law, provided that this requirement shall not be interpreted to infringe upon the authority of the governor;
- (b) identify inconsistencies or conflicts between the plans, policies, programs, processes, and desired outcomes prepared under Subsection (3)(a) and the plans, programs,

processes, and desired outcomes of local government as early in the preparation process as possible, and seek resolution of the inconsistencies through meetings or other conflict resolution mechanisms involving the necessary and immediate parties to the inconsistency or conflict;

- (c) present to the governor the nature and scope of any inconsistency or other conflict that is not resolved under the procedures in Subsection (3)(b) for the governor's decision about the position of the state concerning the inconsistency or conflict;
- (d) develop, research, and use factual information, legal analysis, and statements of desired future condition for the state, or subregion of the state, as necessary to support the plans, policies, programs, processes, and desired outcomes of the state and the counties where the federal lands or natural resources are located;
- (e) establish and coordinate agreements between the state and federal land management agencies, federal natural resource management agencies, and federal natural resource regulatory agencies to facilitate state and local participation in the development, revision, and implementation of land use plans, guidelines, regulations, other instructional memoranda, or similar documents proposed or promulgated for lands and natural resources administered by federal agencies; and
- (f) work in conjunction with political subdivisions to establish agreements with federal land management agencies, federal natural resource management agencies, and federal natural resource regulatory agencies to provide a process for state and local participation in the preparation of, or coordinated state and local response to, environmental impact analysis documents and similar documents prepared pursuant to law by state or federal agencies.
- (4) The state planning coordinator shall comply with the requirements of Subsection 63C-4-102(8) before submitting any comments on a draft environmental impact statement or on an environmental assessment for a proposed land management plan, if the governor would be subject to Subsection 63C-4-102(8) if the governor were submitting the material.
- (5) The state planning coordinator shall cooperate with and work in conjunction with appropriate state agencies and political subdivisions to develop policies, plans, programs,

114 processes, and desired outcomes authorized by this section by coordinating the development of 115 positions: 116 (a) through the Resource Development Coordinating Committee; 117 (b) in conjunction with local government officials concerning general local government 118 plans; 119 (c) by soliciting public comment through the Resource Development Coordinating 120 Committee: and 121 (d) by working with the Public Lands Policy Coordinating Office. 122 (6) The state planning coordinator shall recognize and promote the following principles 123 when preparing any policies, plans, programs, processes, or desired outcomes relating to federal lands and natural resources on federal lands pursuant to this section: 124 125 (a) (i) the citizens of the state are best served by applying multiple-use and 126 sustained-yield principles in public land use planning and management; and 127 (ii) multiple-use and sustained-yield management means that federal agencies should 128 develop and implement management plans and make other resource-use decisions that: 129 (A) achieve and maintain in perpetuity a high-level annual or regular periodic output of 130 mineral and various renewable resources from public lands; 131 (B) support valid existing transportation, mineral, and grazing privileges at the highest reasonably sustainable levels; 132 (C) support the specific plans, programs, processes, and policies of state agencies and 133 134 local governments; 135 (D) are designed to produce and provide the desired vegetation for the watersheds, 136 timber, food, fiber, livestock forage, and wildlife forage, and minerals that are necessary to 137 meet present needs and future economic growth and community expansion without permanent 138 impairment of the productivity of the land; 139 (E) meet the recreational needs and the personal and business-related transportation 140 needs of the citizens of the state by providing access throughout the state;

(F) meet the recreational needs of the citizens of the state;

142	(G) meet the needs of wildlife;
143	(H) provide for the preservation of cultural resources, both historical and
144	archaeological;
145	(I) meet the needs of economic development;
146	(J) meet the needs of community development; and
147	(K) provide for the protection of water rights;
148	(b) managing public lands for "wilderness characteristics" circumvents the statutory
149	wilderness process and is inconsistent with the multiple-use and sustained-yield management
150	standard that applies to all Bureau of Land Management and U.S. Forest Service lands that are
151	not wilderness areas or wilderness study areas;
152	(c) all waters of the state are:
153	(i) owned exclusively by the state in trust for its citizens;
154	(ii) are subject to appropriation for beneficial use; and
155	(iii) are essential to the future prosperity of the state and the quality of life within the
156	state;
157	(d) the state has the right to develop and use its entitlement to interstate rivers;
158	(e) all water rights desired by the federal government must be obtained through the
159	state water appropriation system;
160	(f) land management and resource-use decisions which affect federal lands should give
161	priority to and support the purposes of the compact between the state and the United States
162	related to school and institutional trust lands;
163	(g) development of the solid, fluid, and gaseous mineral resources of the state is an
164	important part of the economy of the state, and of local regions within the state;
165	(h) the state should foster and support industries that take advantage of the state's
166	outstanding opportunities for outdoor recreation;
167	(i) wildlife constitutes an important resource and provides recreational and economic
168	opportunities for the state's citizens;
169	(j) proper stewardship of the land and natural resources is necessary to ensure the

health of the watersheds, timber, forage, and wildlife resources to provide for a continuous supply of resources for the people of the state and the people of the local communities who depend on these resources for a sustainable economy;

- (k) forests, rangelands, timber, and other vegetative resources:
- (i) provide forage for livestock;

- (ii) provide forage and habitat for wildlife;
- (iii) provide resources for the state's timber and logging industries;
 - (iv) contribute to the state's economic stability and growth; and
- (v) are important for a wide variety of recreational pursuits;
 - (l) management programs and initiatives that improve watersheds, forests, and increase forage for the mutual benefit of wildlife species and livestock, logging, and other agricultural industries by utilizing proven techniques and tools are vital to the state's economy and the quality of life in Utah; and
 - (m) (i) land management plans, programs, and initiatives should provide that the amount of domestic livestock forage, expressed in animal unit months, for permitted, active use as well as the wildlife forage included in that amount, be no less than the maximum number of animal unit months sustainable by range conditions in grazing allotments and districts, based on an on-the-ground and scientific analysis;
 - (ii) the state opposes the relinquishment or retirement of grazing animal unit months in favor of conservation, wildlife, and other uses;
 - (iii) (A) the state favors the best management practices that are jointly sponsored by cattlemen's, sportsmen's, and wildlife management groups such as chaining, logging, seeding, burning, and other direct soil and vegetation prescriptions that are demonstrated to restore forest and rangeland health, increase forage, and improve watersheds in grazing districts and allotments for the mutual benefit of domestic livestock and wildlife;
 - (B) when practices described in Subsection (6)(m)(iii)(A) increase a grazing allotment's forage beyond the total permitted forage use that was allocated to that allotment in the last federal land use plan or allotment management plan still in existence as of January 1,

2005, a reasonable and fair portion of the increase in forage beyond the previously allocated total permitted use should be allocated to wildlife as recommended by a joint, evenly balanced committee of livestock and wildlife representatives that is appointed and constituted by the governor for that purpose;

- (C) the state favors quickly and effectively adjusting wildlife population goals and population census numbers in response to variations in the amount of available forage caused by drought or other climatic adjustments, and state agencies responsible for managing wildlife population goals and population census numbers will give due regard to both the needs of the livestock industry and the need to prevent the decline of species to a point where listing under the terms of the Endangered Species Act when making such adjustments;
- (iv) the state opposes the transfer of grazing animal unit months to wildlife for supposed reasons of rangeland health;
- (v) reductions in domestic livestock animal unit months must be temporary and scientifically based upon rangeland conditions;
- (vi) policies, plans, programs, initiatives, resource management plans, and forest plans may not allow the placement of grazing animal unit months in a suspended use category unless there is a rational and scientific determination that the condition of the rangeland allotment or district in question will not sustain the animal unit months sought to be placed in suspended use;
- (vii) any grazing animal unit months that are placed in a suspended use category should be returned to active use when range conditions improve;
- (viii) policies, plans, programs, and initiatives related to vegetation management should recognize and uphold the preference for domestic grazing over alternate forage uses in established grazing districts while upholding management practices that optimize and expand forage for grazing and wildlife in conjunction with state wildlife management plans and programs in order to provide maximum available forage for all uses; and
- (ix) in established grazing districts, animal unit months that have been reduced due to rangeland health concerns should be restored to livestock when rangeland conditions improve,

and should not be converted to wildlife use.

227

228

229

230

231

232

233

234

235

236

237

238

239

240

241

242

245

246

(7) The state planning coordinator shall recognize and promote the following findings in the preparation of any policies, plans, programs, processes, or desired outcomes relating to federal lands and natural resources on federal lands under this section:

- (a) as a coholder of R.S. 2477 rights-of-way with the counties, the state supports its recognition by the federal government and the public use of R.S. 2477 rights-of-way and urges the federal government to fully recognize the rights-of-way and their use by the public as expeditiously as possible;
- (b) it is the policy of the state to use reasonable administrative and legal measures to protect and preserve valid existing rights-of-way granted by Congress under R.S. 2477, and to support and work in conjunction with counties to redress cases where R.S. 2477 rights-of-way are not recognized or are impaired; and
- (c) transportation and access routes to and across federal lands, including all rights-of-way vested under R.S. 2477, are vital to the state's economy and to the quality of life in the state, and must provide, at a minimum, a network of roads throughout the resource planning area that provides for:
 - (i) movement of people, goods, and services across public lands;
- 243 (ii) reasonable access to a broad range of resources and opportunities throughout the resource planning area, including:
 - (A) livestock operations and improvements;
 - (B) solid, fluid, and gaseous mineral operations;
- 247 (C) recreational opportunities and operations, including motorized and nonmotorized recreation;
- (D) search and rescue needs;
- 250 (E) public safety needs; and
- 251 (F) access for transportation of wood products to market;
- 252 (iii) access to federal lands for people with disabilities and the elderly; and
- 253 (iv) access to state lands and school and institutional trust lands to accomplish the

purposes of those lands.

(8) The state planning coordinator shall recognize and promote the following findings in the preparation of any plans, policies, programs, processes, or desired outcomes relating to federal lands and natural resources on federal lands pursuant to this section:

- (a) the state's support for the addition of a river segment to the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System, 16 U.S.C. Sec. 1271 et seq., will be withheld until:
 - (i) it is clearly demonstrated that water is present and flowing at all times;
- (ii) it is clearly demonstrated that the required water-related value is considered outstandingly remarkable within a region of comparison consisting of one of the three physiographic provinces in the state, and that the rationale and justification for the conclusions are disclosed;
- (iii) it is clearly demonstrated that the inclusion of each river segment is consistent with the plans and policies of the state and the county or counties where the river segment is located as those plans and policies are developed according to Subsection (3);
- (iv) the effects of the addition upon the local and state economies, agricultural and industrial operations and interests, outdoor recreation, water rights, water quality, water resource planning, and access to and across river corridors in both upstream and downstream directions from the proposed river segment have been evaluated in detail by the relevant federal agency;
- (v) it is clearly demonstrated that the provisions and terms of the process for review of potential additions have been applied in a consistent manner by all federal agencies;
- (vi) the rationale and justification for the proposed addition, including a comparison with protections offered by other management tools, is clearly analyzed within the multiple-use mandate, and the results disclosed;
- (vii) it is clearly demonstrated that the federal agency with management authority over the river segment, and which is proposing the segment for inclusion in the National Wild and Scenic River System will not use the actual or proposed designation as a basis to impose management standards outside of the federal land management plan;

282

283

284

285

286

287

288

289

290

291

292

293

294

295

296

297

298

299

300

301

302

303

304

305

306

307

308

309

(viii) it is clearly demonstrated that the terms and conditions of the federal land and resource management plan containing a recommendation for inclusion in the National Wild and Scenic River System: (A) evaluates all eligible river segments in the resource planning area completely and fully for suitability for inclusion in the National Wild and Scenic River System; (B) does not suspend or terminate any studies for inclusion in the National Wild and Scenic River System at the eligibility phase; (C) fully disclaims any interest in water rights for the recommended segment as a result of the adoption of the plan; and (D) fully disclaims the use of the recommendation for inclusion in the National Wild and Scenic River System as a reason or rationale for an evaluation of impacts by proposals for projects upstream, downstream, or within the recommended segment; (ix) it is clearly demonstrated that the agency with management authority over the river segment commits not to use an actual or proposed designation as a basis to impose Visual Resource Management Class I or II management prescriptions that do not comply with the provisions of Subsection (8)(t); and (x) it is clearly demonstrated that including the river segment and the terms and conditions for managing the river segment as part of the National Wild and Scenic River System will not prevent, reduce, impair, or otherwise interfere with: (A) the state and its citizens' enjoyment of complete and exclusive water rights in and to the rivers of the state as determined by the laws of the state; or

- (B) local, state, regional, or interstate water compacts to which the state or any county is a party;
- (b) the conclusions of all studies related to potential additions to the National Wild and Scenic River System, 16 U.S.C. Sec. 1271 et seq., are submitted to the state for review and action by the Legislature and governor, and the results, in support of or in opposition to, are included in any planning documents or other proposals for addition and are forwarded to the United States Congress;

(c) the state's support for designation of an Area of Critical Environmental Concern (ACEC), as defined in 43 U.S.C. Sec. 1702, within federal land management plans will be withheld until:

- (i) it is clearly demonstrated that the proposed area satisfies all the definitional requirements of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976, 43 U.S.C. Sec. 1702(a);
- (ii) it is clearly demonstrated that the area proposed for designation as an ACEC is limited in geographic size and that the proposed management prescriptions are limited in scope to the minimum necessary to specifically protect and prevent irreparable damage to the relevant and important values identified, or limited in geographic size and management prescriptions to the minimum required to specifically protect human life or safety from natural hazards;
- (iii) it is clearly demonstrated that the proposed area is limited only to areas that are already developed or used or to areas where no development is required;
- (iv) it is clearly demonstrated that the proposed area contains relevant and important historic, cultural or scenic values, fish or wildlife resources, or natural processes which are unique or substantially significant on a regional basis, or contain natural hazards which significantly threaten human life or safety;
- (v) the federal agency has analyzed regional values, resources, processes, or hazards for irreparable damage and its potential causes resulting from potential actions which are consistent with the multiple-use, sustained-yield principles, and the analysis describes the rationale for any special management attention required to protect, or prevent irreparable damage to the values, resources, processes, or hazards;
- (vi) it is clearly demonstrated that the proposed designation is consistent with the plans and policies of the state and of the county where the proposed designation is located as those plans and policies are developed according to Subsection (3);
- (vii) it is clearly demonstrated that the proposed ACEC designation will not be applied redundantly over existing protections provided by other state and federal laws for federal lands or resources on federal lands, and that the federal statutory requirement for special management

attention for a proposed ACEC will discuss and justify any management requirements needed in addition to those specified by the other state and federal laws;

- (viii) the difference between special management attention required for an ACEC and normal multiple-use management has been identified and justified, and that any determination of irreparable damage has been analyzed and justified for short and long-term horizons;
 - (ix) it is clearly demonstrated that the proposed designation:

338

339

340

341

342

343

344

345

346

347

348

349

350

351

352

353

354

355

356

357

358

359

360

361

362

363

364

- (A) is not a substitute for a wilderness suitability recommendation;
- (B) is not a substitute for managing areas inventoried for wilderness characteristics after 1993 under the BLM interim management plan for valid wilderness study areas; and
- (C) it is not an excuse or justification to apply de facto wilderness management standards; and
- (x) the conclusions of all studies are submitted to the state, as a cooperating agency, for review, and the results, in support of or in opposition to, are included in all planning documents;
- (d) sufficient federal lands are made available for government-to-government exchanges of school and institutional trust lands and federal lands without regard for a resource-to-resource correspondence between the surface or mineral characteristics of the offered trust lands and the offered federal lands;
- (e) federal agencies should support government-to-government exchanges of land with the state based on a fair process of valuation which meets the fiduciary obligations of both the state and federal governments toward trust lands management, and which assures that revenue authorized by federal statute to the state from mineral or timber production, present or future, is not diminished in any manner during valuation, negotiation, or implementation processes;
- (f) agricultural and grazing lands should continue to produce the food and fiber needed by the citizens of the state and the nation, and the rural character and open landscape of rural Utah should be preserved through a healthy and active agricultural and grazing industry, consistent with private property rights and state fiduciary duties;
 - (g) the resources of the forests and rangelands of the state should be integrated as part

of viable, robust, and sustainable state and local economies, and available forage should be evaluated for the full complement of herbivores the rangelands can support in a sustainable manner, and forests should contain a diversity of timber species, and disease or insect infestations in forests should be controlled using logging or other best management practices;

- (h) the state opposes any additional evaluation of national forest service lands as "roadless" or "unroaded" beyond the forest service's second roadless area review evaluation and opposes efforts by agencies to specially manage those areas in a way that:
- (i) closes or declassifies existing roads unless multiple side by side roads exist running to the same destination and state and local governments consent to close or declassify the extra roads;
 - (ii) permanently bars travel on existing roads;

366

367

368

369

370

371

372

373

374

375

376

377

378

379

380

381

382

383

384

385

386

387

388

389

390

391

392

- (iii) excludes or diminishes traditional multiple-use activities, including grazing and proper forest harvesting;
- (iv) interferes with the enjoyment and use of valid, existing rights, including water rights, local transportation plan rights, R.S. 2477 rights, grazing allotment rights, and mineral leasing rights; or
- (v) prohibits development of additional roads reasonably necessary to pursue traditional multiple-use activities;
- (i) the state's support for any forest plan revision or amendment will be withheld until the appropriate plan revision or plan amendment clearly demonstrates that:
 - (i) established roads are not referred to as unclassified roads or a similar classification;
- (ii) lands in the vicinity of established roads are managed under the multiple-use, sustained-yield management standard; and
- (iii) no roadless or unroaded evaluations or inventories are recognized or upheld beyond those that were recognized or upheld in the forest service's second roadless area review evaluation;
- (j) the state's support for any recommendations made under the statutory requirement to examine the wilderness option during the revision of land and resource management plans by

394 the U.S. Forest Service will be withheld until it is clearly demonstrated that:

(i) the duly adopted transportation plans of the state and county or counties within the planning area are fully and completely incorporated into the baseline inventory of information from which plan provisions are derived;

- (ii) valid state or local roads and rights-of-way are recognized and not impaired in any way by the recommendations;
- (iii) the development of mineral resources by underground mining is not affected by the recommendations;
- (iv) the need for additional administrative or public roads necessary for the full use of the various multiple-uses, including recreation, mineral exploration and development, forest health activities, and grazing operations is not unduly affected by the recommendations;
- (v) analysis and full disclosure is made concerning the balance of multiple-use management in the proposed areas, and that the analysis compares the full benefit of multiple-use management to the recreational, forest health, and economic needs of the state and the counties to the benefits of the requirements of wilderness management; and
- (vi) the conclusions of all studies related to the requirement to examine the wilderness option are submitted to the state for review and action by the Legislature and governor, and the results, in support of or in opposition to, are included in any planning documents or other proposals that are forwarded to the United States Congress;
- (k) the invasion of noxious weeds and undesirable invasive plant species into the state should be reversed, their presence eliminated, and their return prevented;
- (l) management and resource-use decisions by federal land management and regulatory agencies concerning the vegetative resources within the state should reflect serious consideration of the proper optimization of the yield of water within the watersheds of the state;
 - (m) (i) it is the policy of the state that:
- 420 (A) mineral and energy production and environmental protection are not mutually 421 exclusive;

122	(B) it is technically feasible to permit appropriate access to mineral and energy
123	resources while preserving nonmineral and nonenergy resources;
124	(C) resource management planning should seriously consider all available mineral and
125	energy resources;
426	(D) the development of the solid, fluid, and gaseous mineral resources of the state and
127	the renewable resources of the state should be encouraged;
128	(E) the waste of fluid and gaseous minerals within developed areas should be
129	prohibited; and
430	(F) requirements to mitigate or reclaim mineral development projects should be based
431	on credible evidence of significant impacts to natural or cultural resources;
132	(ii) the state's support for mineral development provisions within federal land
433	management plans will be withheld until the appropriate land management plan environmental
434	impact statement clearly demonstrates:
435	(A) that the authorized planning agency has:
436	(I) considered and evaluated the mineral and energy potential in all areas of the
137	planning area as if the areas were open to mineral development under standard lease
438	agreements; and
139	(II) evaluated any management plan prescription for its impact on the area's baseline
440	mineral and energy potential;
441	(B) that the development provisions do not unduly restrict access to public lands for
142	energy exploration and development;
143	(C) that the authorized planning agency has supported any closure of additional areas
144	to mineral leasing and development or any increase of acres subject to no surface occupancy
145	restrictions by adhering to:
146	(I) the relevant provisions of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976, 43
147	U.S.C. Sec. 1701 et seq.;
148	(II) other controlling mineral development laws; and
149	(III) the controlling withdrawal and reporting procedures set forth in the Federal Land

450 Policy and Management Act of 1976, 43 U.S.C. Sec. 1701 et seq.;

(D) that the authorized planning agency evaluated whether to repeal any moratorium that may exist on the issuance of additional mining patents and oil and gas leases;

- (E) that the authorized planning agency analyzed all proposed mineral lease stipulations and considered adopting the least restrictive necessary to protect against damage to other significant resource values;
- (F) that the authorized planning agency evaluated mineral lease restrictions to determine whether to waive, modify, or make exceptions to the restrictions on the basis that they are no longer necessary or effective;
- (G) that the authorized federal agency analyzed all areas proposed for no surface occupancy restrictions, and that the analysis evaluated:
- (I) whether directional drilling is economically feasible and ecologically necessary for each proposed no surface occupancy area;
- (II) whether the directional drilling feasibility analysis, or analysis of other management prescriptions, demonstrates that the proposed no surface occupancy prescription, in effect, sterilizes the mineral and energy resources beneath the area; and
- (III) whether, if the minerals are effectively sterilized, the area must be reported as withdrawn under the provisions of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act; and
- (H) that the authorized planning agency has evaluated all directional drilling requirements in no surface occupancy areas to determine whether directional drilling is feasible from an economic, ecological, and engineering standpoint;
- (n) motorized, human, and animal-powered outdoor recreation should be integrated into a fair and balanced allocation of resources within the historical and cultural framework of multiple-uses in rural Utah, and outdoor recreation should be supported as part of a balanced plan of state and local economic support and growth;
- (o) off-highway vehicles should be used responsibly, the management of off-highway vehicles should be uniform across all jurisdictions, and laws related to the use of off-highway vehicles should be uniformly applied across all jurisdictions;

478 (p) (i) rights-of-way granted and vested under the provisions of R.S. 2477 should be 479 preserved and acknowledged; 480 (ii) land use management plans, programs, and initiatives should be consistent with 481 both state and county transportation plans developed according to Subsection (3) in order to 482 provide a network of roads throughout the planning area that provides for: 483 (A) movement of people, goods, and services across public lands; 484 (B) reasonable access to a broad range of resources and opportunities throughout the 485 planning area, including access to livestock, water, and minerals; 486 (C) economic and business needs; 487 (D) public safety; 488 (E) search and rescue; 489 (F) access for people with disabilities and the elderly; 490 (G) access to state lands; and 491 (H) recreational opportunities; 492 (q) transportation and access provisions for all other existing routes, roads, and trails 493 across federal, state, and school trust lands within the state should be determined and 494 identified, and agreements should be executed and implemented, as necessary to fully authorize 495 and determine responsibility for maintenance of all routes, roads, and trails; 496 (r) the reasonable development of new routes and trails for motorized, human, and 497 animal-powered recreation should be implemented; 498 (s) (i) forests, rangelands, and watersheds, in a healthy condition, are necessary and beneficial for wildlife, livestock grazing, and other multiple-uses; 499 500 (ii) management programs and initiatives that are implemented to increase forage for 501 the mutual benefit of the agricultural industry, livestock operations, and wildlife species should 502 utilize all proven techniques and tools; 503 (iii) the continued viability of livestock operations and the livestock industry should be 504 supported on the federal lands within the state by management of the lands and forage

resources, by the proper optimization of animal unit months for livestock, in accordance with

506	the multiple-use provisions of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976, 43
507	U.S.C. 1701 et seq., the provisions of the Taylor Grazing Act of 1934, 43 U.S.C. 315 et seq.,
508	and the provisions of the Public Rangelands Improvement Act of 1978, 43 U.S.C. 1901 et seq.;
509	(iv) provisions for predator control initiatives or programs under the direction of state
510	and local authorities should be implemented; and
511	(v) resource-use and management decisions by federal land management and
512	regulatory agencies should support state-sponsored initiatives or programs designed to stabilize
513	wildlife populations that may be experiencing a scientifically demonstrated decline in those
514	populations; and
515	(t) management and resource use decisions by federal land management and regulatory
516	agencies concerning the scenic resources of the state must balance the protection of scenery
517	with the full management requirements of the other authorized uses of the land under
518	multiple-use management, and should carefully consider using Visual Resource Management
519	Class I protection only for areas of inventoried Class A scenery or equivalent.
520	(9) Notwithstanding any provision of Section 63J-8-105.5, the state is committed to
521	establishing and administering an effective statewide conservation strategy for greater sage
522	grouse.
523	[(9)] (10) Nothing contained in this section may be construed to restrict or supersede
524	the planning powers conferred upon state departments, agencies, instrumentalities, or advisory
525	councils of the state or the planning powers conferred upon political subdivisions by any other
526	existing law.
527	[(10)] (11) Nothing in this section may be construed to affect any lands withdrawn
528	from the public domain for military purposes, which are administered by the United States
529	Army, Air Force, or Navy.
530	Section 2. Section 63J-8-102 is amended to read:
531	63J-8-102. Definitions.
532	As used in this chapter:
533	(1) "ACEC" means an area of critical environmental concern.

- 534 (2) "AUM" means animal unit months, a unit of grazing forage.
- 535 (3) "BLM" means the United States Bureau of Land Management.
- 536 (4) "FLPMA" means the Federal Land Policy Management Act of 1976, 43 U.S.C. Sec.
- 537 1701 et seq.
- 538 (5) "Forest service" means the United States Forest Service within the United States
- 539 Department of Agriculture.
- 540 (6) "Multiple use" means proper stewardship of the subject lands pursuant to Section
- 541 1031(C) of FLPMA, 43 U.S.C. Sec. 170(C).
- 542 (7) "OHV" means off-highway vehicle as defined in Section 41-22-2.
- 543 (8) "Settlement Agreement" means the written agreement between the state and the
- 544 Department of the Interior in 2003 (revised in 2005) that resolved the case of State of Utah v.
- 545 Gale Norton, Secretary of Interior (United States District Court, D. Utah, Case No.
- 546 2:96cv0870).
- 547 (9) "SITLA" means the School and Institutional Trust Lands Administration as created in Section 53C-1-201. 548
- 549 (10) (a) "Subject lands" means the following non-WSA BLM lands:
- 550 (i) in Beaver County:
- 551 (A) Mountain Home Range South, Jackson Wash, The Toad, North Wah Wah
- 552 Mountains, Central Wah Wah Mountains, and San Francisco Mountains according to the
- region map entitled "Great Basin Central" linked in the webpage entitled "Citizen's Proposal 553
- 554 for Wilderness in Utah" at http://www.protectwildutah.org/proposal/index.html as the webpage
- 555 existed on February 17, 2011; and
- 556 (B) White Rock Range, South Wah Wah Mountains, and Granite Peak according to the
- 557 region map entitled "Great Basin South" linked in the webpage entitled "Citizen's Proposal for
- 558 Wilderness in Utah" at http://www.protectwildutah.org/proposal/index.html as the webpage
- 559 existed on February 17, 2011;
- 560 (ii) in Box Elder County: Little Goose Creek, Grouse Creek Mountains North, Grouse
- 561 Creek Mountains South, Bald Eagle Mountain, Central Pilot Range, Pilot Peak, Crater Island

562

563

564

565

566

567

568

569

570

571

572

573

574

575

576

577

578

579

580

581

582

583

584

585

586

587

588

589

West, Crater Island East, Newfoundland Mountains, and Grassy Mountains North according to the region map entitled "Great Basin North" linked in the webpage entitled "Citizen's Proposal for Wilderness in Utah" at http://www.protectwildutah.org/proposal/index.html as the webpage existed on February 17, 2011; (iii) in Carbon County: Desbrough Canyon and Turtle Canyon according to the region map entitled "Book Cliffs" linked in the webpage entitled "Citizen's Proposal for Wilderness in Utah" at http://www.protectwildutah.org/proposal/index.html as the webpage existed on February 17, 2011; (iv) in Daggett County: Goslin Mountain, Home Mountain, Red Creek Badlands, O-wi-yu-kuts, Lower Flaming Gorge, Crouse Canyon, and Diamond Breaks according to the region map entitled "Dinosaur" linked in the webpage entitled "Citizen's Proposal for Wilderness in Utah" at http://www.protectwildutah.org/proposal/index.html as the webpage existed on February 17, 2011; (v) in Duchesne County: Desbrough Canyon according to the region map entitled "Book Cliffs" linked in the webpage entitled "Citizen's Proposal for Wilderness in Utah" at http://www.protectwildutah.org/proposal/index.html as the webpage existed on February 17, 2011; (vi) in Emery County: (A) San Rafael River and Sweetwater Reef, according to the region map entitled "Canyonlands Basin" linked in the webpage entitled "Citizen's Proposal for Wilderness in Utah" at http://www.protectwildutah.org/proposal/index.html as the webpage existed on February 17, 2011: (B) Flat Tops according to the region map entitled "Glen Canyon," which is available by clicking the link entitled "Dirty Devil" at the webpage entitled "Citizen's Proposal for Wilderness in Utah" at http://www.protectwildutah.org/proposal/index.html as the webpage existed on February 17, 2011; and (C) Price River, Lost Spring Wash, Eagle Canyon, Upper Muddy Creek, Molen Reef,

Rock Canyon, Mussentuchit Badland, and Muddy Creek, according to the region map entitled

590	"San Rafael Swell" linked at the webpage entitled "Citizen's Proposal for Wilderness in Utah"
591	at http://www.protectwildutah.org/proposal/index.html as the webpage existed on February 17,
592	2011;
593	(vii) in Garfield County:
594	(A) Pole Canyon, according to the region map entitled "Great Basin South" linked in
595	the webpage entitled "Citizen's Proposal for Wilderness in Utah" at
596	http://www.protectwildutah.org/proposal/index.html as the webpage existed on February 17,
597	2011;
598	(B) Dirty Devil, Fiddler Butte, Little Rockies, Cane Spring Desert, and Cane Spring
599	Desert Adjacents, according to the region map entitled "Glen Canyon," which is available by
500	clicking the link entitled "Dirty Devil" at the webpage entitled "Citizen's Proposal for
501	Wilderness in Utah" at http://www.protectwildutah.org/proposal/index.html as the webpage
502	existed on February 17, 2011;
503	(C) Lampstand, Wide Hollow, Steep Creek, Brinkerhof Flats, Little Valley Canyon,
504	Death Hollow, Studhorse Peaks, Box Canyon, Heaps Canyon, North Escalante Canyon, Colt
505	Mesa, East of Bryce, Slopes of Canaan Peak, Horse Spring Canyon, Muley Twist Flank,
506	Pioneer Mesa, Slopes of Bryce, Blue Hills, Mud Springs Canyon, Carcass Canyon, Willis
507	Creek North, Kodachrome Basin, and Kodachrome Headlands, according to the region map
608	entitled "Grand Staircase Escalante" linked at the webpage entitled "Citizen's Proposal for
509	Wilderness in Utah" at http://www.protectwildutah.org/proposal/index.html as the webpage
510	existed on February 17, 2011; and
511	(D) Notom Bench, Mount Ellen, Bull Mountain, Dogwater Creek, Ragged Mountain,
512	Mount Pennell, Mount Hillers, Bullfrog Creek, and Long Canyon, according to the region map
513	entitled "Henry Mountains" linked at the webpage entitled "Citizen's Proposal for Wilderness
514	in Utah" at http://www.protectwildutah.org/proposal/index.html as the webpage existed on
515	February 17, 2011;
616	(viii) in Iron County: Needle Mountains, Steamboat Mountain, Broken Ridge, Paradise
517	Mountains, Crook Canyon, Hamlin, North Peaks, Mount Escalante, and Antelope Ridge,

618	according to the region map entitled "Great Basin South" linked in the webpage entitled
619	"Citizen's Proposal for Wilderness in Utah" at
620	http://www.protectwildutah.org/proposal/index.html as the webpage existed on February 17,
621	2011;
622	(ix) in Juab County: Deep Creek Mountains, Essex Canyon, Kern Mountains, Wild
623	Horse Pass, Disappointment Hills, Granite Mountain, Middle Mountains, Tule Valley, Fish
624	Springs Ridge, Thomas Range, Drum Mountains, Dugway Mountains, Keg Mountains West,
625	Keg Mountains East, Lion Peak, and Rockwell Little Sahara, according to the region map
626	entitled "Great Basin Central" linked in the webpage entitled "Citizen's Proposal for
627	Wilderness in Utah" at http://www.protectwildutah.org/proposal/index.html as the webpage
628	existed on February 17, 2011;
629	(x) in Kane County:
630	(A) Willis Creek North, Willis Creek, Kodachrome Badlands, Mud Springs Canyon,
631	Carcass Canyon, Scorpion, Bryce Boot, Paria-Hackberry Canyons, Fiftymile Canyon,
632	Hurricane Wash, Upper Kanab Creek, Timber Mountain, Nephi Point, Paradise Canyon,
633	Wahweap Burning Hills, Fiftymile Bench, Forty Mile Gulch, Sooner Bench 1, 2, & 3, Rock
634	Cove, Warm Bench, Andalex Not, Vermillion Cliffs, Ladder Canyon, The Cockscomb, Nipple
635	Bench, Moquith Mountain, Bunting Point, Glass Eye Canyon, and Pine Hollow, according to
636	the region map entitled "Grand Staircase Escalante" linked at the webpage entitled "Citizen's
637	Proposal for Wilderness in Utah" at http://www.protectwildutah.org/proposal/index.html as the
638	webpage existed on February 17, 2011; and
639	(B) Orderville Canyon, Jolley Gulch, and Parunuweap Canyon, according to the region
640	map entitled "Zion/Mohave" linked at the webpage entitled "Citizen's Proposal for Wilderness
641	in Utah" at http://www.protectwildutah.org/proposal/index.html as the webpage existed on
642	February 17, 2011;
643	(xi) in Millard County: Kern Mountains, Wild Horse Pass, Disappointment Hills,
644	Granite Mountain, Middle Mountains, Tule Valley, Swasey Mountain, Little Drum Mountains
645	North, Little Drum Mountains South, Drum Mountains, Snake Valley, Covote Knoll, Howell

646	Peak, Tule Valley South, Ledger Canyon, Chalk Knolls, Orr Ridge, Notch View, Bullgrass
647	Knoll, Notch Peak, Barn Hills, Cricket Mountains, Burbank Pass, Middle Burbank Hills, King
648	Top, Barn Hills, Red Tops, Middle Burbank Hills, Juniper, Painted Rock Mountain, Black
649	Hills, Tunnel Springs, Red Canyon, Sand Ridge, Little Sage Valley, Cat Canyon, Headlight
650	Mountain, Black Hills, Mountain Range Home North, Tweedy Wash, North Wah Wah
651	Mountains, Jackson Wash, and San Francisco Mountains, according to the region map entitled
652	"Great Basin Central" linked in the webpage entitled "Citizen's Proposal for Wilderness in
653	Utah" at http://www.protectwildutah.org/proposal/index.html as the webpage existed on
654	February 17, 2011;
655	(xii) in Piute County: Kingston Ridge, Rocky Ford, and Phonolite Hill, according to
656	the region map entitled "Great Basin South" linked in the webpage entitled "Citizen's Proposal
657	for Wilderness in Utah" at http://www.protectwildutah.org/proposal/index.html as the webpage
658	existed on February 17, 2011;
659	(xiii) in San Juan County:
660	(A) Horseshoe Point, Deadhorse Cliffs, Gooseneck, Demon's Playground, Hatch
661	Canyon, Lockhart Basin, Indian Creek, Hart's Point, Butler Wash, Bridger Jack Mesa, and Shay
662	Mountain, according to the region map entitled "Canyonlands Basin" linked in the webpage
663	entitled "Citizen's Proposal for Wilderness in Utah" at
664	http://www.protectwildutah.org/proposal/index.html as the webpage existed on February 17,
665	2011;
666	(B) Dark Canyon, Copper Point, Fortknocker Canyon, White Canyon, The Needle, Red
667	Rock Plateau, Upper Red Canyon, and Tuwa Canyon, according to the region map entitled
668	"Glen Canyon," which is available by clicking the link entitled "Dirty Devil" at the webpage
669	entitled "Citizen's Proposal for Wilderness in Utah" at
670	http://www.protectwildutah.org/proposal/index.html as the webpage existed on February 17,
671	2011;
672	(C) Hunters Canyon, Behind the Rocks, Mill Creek, and Coyote Wash, according to
673	the region map entitled "Moab/La Sal" linked at the webpage entitled "Citizen's Proposal for

6/4	Wilderness in Utah" at http://www.protectwildutah.org/proposal/index.html as the webpage
675	existed on February 17, 2011; and
676	(D) Hammond Canyon, Allen Canyon, Mancos Jim Butte, Arch Canyon, Monument
677	Canyon, Tin Cup Mesa, Cross Canyon, Nokai Dome, Grand Gulch, Fish and Owl Creek
678	Canyons, Comb Ridge, Road Canyon, The Tabernacle, Lime Creek, San Juan River, and
679	Valley of the Gods, according to the region map entitled "San Juan" linked at the webpage
680	entitled "Citizen's Proposal for Wilderness in Utah" at
681	http://www.protectwildutah.org/proposal/index.html as the webpage existed on February 17,
682	2011;
683	(xiv) in Sevier County: Rock Canyon, Mussentuchit Badland, Limestone Cliffs, and
684	Jones' Bench, according to the region map entitled "San Rafael Swell" linked at the webpage
685	entitled "Citizen's Proposal for Wilderness in Utah" at
686	http://www.protectwildutah.org/proposal/index.html as the webpage existed on February 17,
687	2011;
688	(xv) in Tooele County:
689	(A) Silver Island Mountains, Crater Island East, Grassy Mountains North, Grassy
690	Mountains South, Stansbury Island, Cedar Mountains North, Cedar Mountains Central, Cedar
691	Mountains South, North Stansbury Mountains, Oquirrh Mountains, and Big Hollow, according
692	to the region map entitled "Great Basin North" linked in the webpage entitled "Citizen's
693	Proposal for Wilderness in Utah" at http://www.protectwildutah.org/proposal/index.html as the
694	webpage existed on February 17, 2011, excluding the areas that Congress designated as
695	wilderness under the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006; and
696	(B) Ochre Mountain, Deep Creek Mountains, Dugway Mountains, Indian Peaks, and
697	Lion Peak, according to the region map entitled "Great Basin Central" linked in the webpage
698	entitled "Citizen's Proposal for Wilderness in Utah" at
699	http://www.protectwildutah.org/proposal/index.html as the webpage existed on February 17,
700	2011;
701	(xvi) in Uintah County:

702	(A) White River, Lower Bitter Creek, Sunday School Canyon, Dragon Canyon, Wolf
703	Point, Winter Ridge, Seep Canyon, Bitter Creek, Hideout Canyon, Sweetwater Canyon, and
704	Hell's Hole, according to the region map entitled "Book Cliffs" linked in the webpage entitled
705	"Citizen's Proposal for Wilderness in Utah" at
706	http://www.protectwildutah.org/proposal/index.html as the webpage existed on February 17,
707	2011; and
708	(B) Lower Flaming Gorge, Crouse Canyon Stone Bridge Draw, Diamond Mountain,
709	Wild Mountain, Split Mountain Benches, Vivas Cake Hill, Split Mountain Benches South,
710	Beach Draw, Stuntz Draw, Moonshine Draw, Bourdette Draw, and Bull Canyon, according to
711	the region map entitled "Dinosaur" linked in the webpage entitled "Citizen's Proposal for
712	Wilderness in Utah" at http://www.protectwildutah.org/proposal/index.html as the webpage
713	existed on February 17, 2011;
714	(xvii) in Washington County: Couger Canyon, Docs Pass, Slaughter Creek, Butcher
715	Knife Canyon, Square Top, Scarecrow Creek, Beaver Dam Wash, Beaver Dam Mountains
716	North, Beaver Dam Mountains South, Joshua Tree, Beaver Dam Wilderness Expansion, Red
717	Mountain, Cottonwood Canyon, Taylor Canyon, LaVerkin Creek, Beartrap Canyon, Deep
718	Creek, Black Ridge, Red Butte, Kolob Creek, Goose Creek, Dry Creek, Zion National Park
719	Adjacents, Crater Hill, The Watchman, and Canaan Mountain, according to the region map
720	entitled "Zion/Mohave" linked at the webpage entitled "Citizen's Proposal for Wilderness in
721	Utah" at http://www.protectwildutah.org/proposal/index.html as the webpage existed on
722	February 17, 2011, excluding the areas that Congress designated as wilderness and
723	conservation areas under the Omnibus Public Lands Management Act of 2009; and
724	(xviii) in Wayne County:
725	(A) Sweetwater Reef, Upper Horseshoe Canyon, and Labyrinth Canyon, according to
726	the region map entitled "Canyonlands Basin" linked in the webpage entitled "Citizen's Proposal
727	for Wilderness in Utah" at http://www.protectwildutah.org/proposal/index.html as the webpage
728	existed on February 17, 2011;
729	(B) Flat Tops and Dirty Devil, according to the region map entitled "Glen Canyon,"

- 26 -

730 which is available by clicking the link entitled "Dirty Devil" at the webpage entitled "Citizen's 731 Proposal for Wilderness in Utah" at http://www.protectwildutah.org/proposal/index.html as the 732 webpage existed on February 17, 2011; 733 (C) Fremont Gorge, Pleasant Creek Bench, Notom Bench, Mount Ellen, and Bull 734 Mountain, according to the region map entitled "Henry Mountains" linked at the webpage 735 entitled "Citizen's Proposal for Wilderness in Utah" at 736 http://www.protectwildutah.org/proposal/index.html as the webpage existed on February 17, 737 2011; and 738 (D) Capital Reef Adjacents, Muddy Creek, Wild Horse Mesa, North Blue Flats, Red 739 Desert, and Factory Butte, according to the region map entitled "San Rafael Swell" linked at 740 the webpage entitled "Citizen's Proposal for Wilderness in Utah" at 741 http://www.protectwildutah.org/proposal/index.html as the webpage existed on February 17, 742 2011. 743 (b) "Subject lands" also includes all BLM and Forest Service lands in the state that are 744 not Wilderness Area or Wilderness Study Areas; 745 (c) "Subject lands" does not include the following lands that are the subject of 746 consideration for a possible federal lands bill and should be managed according to the 2008 747 Price BLM Field Office Resource Management Plan until a federal lands bill provides 748 otherwise: 749 (i) Turtle Canyon and Desolation Canyon according to the region map entitled "Book 750 Cliffs" linked in the webpage entitled "Citizen's Proposal for Wilderness in Utah" at 751 http://protectwildutah.org/proposal/index.html as the webpage existed on February 17, 2011; 752 (ii) Labyrinth Canyon, Duma Point, and Horseshoe Point, according to the region map 753 entitled "Canyonlands Basin" linked in the webpage entitled "Citizen's Proposal for Wilderness 754 in Utah" at http://protectwildutah.org/proposal/index.html as the webpage existed on February 755 17, 2011; and 756 (iii) Devil's Canyon, Sid's Mountain, Mexican Mountain, San Rafael Reef, Hondu

Country, Cedar Mountain, and Wild Horse, according to the region map entitled "San Rafael

758	Swell" linked at the webpage entitled "Citizen's Proposal for Wilderness in Utah" at
759	http://protectwildutah.org/proposal/index.html as the webpage existed on February 17, 2011[;].
760	(11) "Uintah Basin Energy Zone" means BLM, Forest Service, and SITLA lands
761	situated in the following townships in Daggett, Duchesne, and Uintah counties, as more fully
762	illustrated in the map prepared by the Uintah County GIS Department in February 2012 entitled
763	"Uintah Basin Utah Energy Zone":
764	(a) in Daggett County, Township 3N Range 17 E, Township 3N Range 18E, Township
765	3N Range 19E, Township 3N Range 20E, Township 3N Range 22E, Township 3N Range 23E,
766	Township 3N Range 24E, Township 3N Range 25E, Township 2N Range 17E, Township 2N
767	Range 18E, Township 2N Range 19E, Township 2N Range 20E, Township 2N Range 21E, and
768	Township 2S Range 25E;
769	(b) in Duchesne County, Township 3N Range 4W, Township 3N Range 3W, Township
770	3N Range 2W, Township 3N Range 1W, Township 2N Range 6W, Township 2N Range 5W,
771	Township 2N Range 4W, Township 2N Range 3W, Township 2N Range 1W, Township 1N
772	Range 9W, Township 1N Range 8W, Township 1N Range 7W, Township 1N Range 6W,
773	Township 1S Range 9W, Township 1S Range 8W, Township 4S Range 9W, Township 4S
774	Range 3W, Township 4S Range 2W, Township 4S Range 1W, Township 8S Range 15E,
775	Township 8S Range 16E, Township 8S Range 17E, Township 5S Range 9W, Township 5S
776	Range 3W, Township 9S Range 15E, Township 9S Range 16E, Township 9S Range 17E,
777	Township 6S Range 9W, Township 6S Range 8W, Township 6S Range 7W, Township 6S
778	Range 6W, Township 6S Range 5W, Township 6S Range 3W, Township 10S Range 15E,
779	Township 10S Range 16E, Township 10S Range 17E, Township 7S Range 9W, Township 7S
780	Range 8W, Township 7S Range 7W, Township 7S Range 6W, Township 7S Range 5W,
781	Township 7S Range 4W, Township 10S Range 11E, Township 10S Range 12E, Township 10S
782	Range 13E, Township 10S Range 14E, Township 10S Range 15E, Township 10S Range 16E,
783	Township 10S Range 17E, Township 11S Range 10E, Township 11S Range 11E, Township
784	11S Range 12E, Township 11S Range 13E, Township 11S Range 14E, Township 11S Range
785	15E, Township 11S Range 16E, and Township 11S Range 17E; and

786	(c) in Uintah County: Township 2S Range 18E, Township 2S Range 19E, Township
787	2S Range 20E, Township 2S Range 21E, Township 2S Range 22E, Township 2S Range 23E,
788	Township 2S Range 24E, Township 2N Range 1W, Township 2N Range 1E, Township 2N
789	Range 2E, Township 3S Range 18E, Township 3S Range 19E, Township 3S Range 20E,
790	Township 3S Range 21E, Township 3S Range 22E, Township 3S Range 23E, Township 3S
791	Range 24E, Township 4S Range 19E, Township 4S Range 20E, Township 4S Range 21E,
792	Township 4S Range 22E, Township 4S Range 23E, Township 4S Range 24E, Township 4S
793	Range 25E, Township 5S Range 19E, Township 5S Range 20E, Township 5S Range 21E,
794	Township 5S Range 22E, Township 5S Range 23E, Township 5S Range 24E, Township 5S
795	Range 25E, Township 6S Range 19E, Township 6S Range 20E, Township 6S Range 21E,
796	Township 6S Range 22E, Township 6S Range 23E, Township 6S Range 24E, Township 6S
797	Range 25E, Township 7S Range 19E, Township 7S Range 20E, Township 7S Range 21E,
798	Township 7S Range 22E, Township 7S Range 23E, Township 7S Range 24E, Township 7S
799	Range 25E, Township 8S Range 17E, Township 8S Range 18E, Township 8S Range 19E,
800	Township 8S Range 20E, Township 8S Range 21E, Township 8S Range 22E, Township 8S
801	Range 23E, Township 8S Range 24E, Township 8S Range 25E, Township 9S Range 17E,
802	Township 9S Range 18E, Township 9S Range 19E, Township 9S Range 20E, Township 9S
803	Range 21E, Township 9S Range 22E, Township 9S Range 23E, Township 9S Range 24E,
804	Township 9S Range 25E, Township 10S Range 17E, Township 10S Range 18E, Township 10S
805	Range 19E, Township 10S Range 20E, Township 10S Range 21E, Township 10S Range 22E,
806	Township 10S Range 23E, Township 10S Range 24E, Township 10S Range 25E, Township
807	11S Range 17E, Township 11S Range 18E, Township 11S Range 19E, Township 11S Range
808	20E, Township 11S Range 21E, Township 11S Range 22E, Township 11S Range 23E,
809	Township 11S Range 24E, Township 11S Range 25E, Township 12S Range 20E, Township
810	12S Range 21E, Township 12S Range 22E, Township 12S Range 23E, Township 12S Range
811	24E, Township 12S Range 25E, Township 13S Range 20E, Township 13S Range 21E,
812	Township 13S Range 22E, Township 13S Range 23E, Township 13S Range 24E, Township
813	13S Range 25E, Township 13S Range 26 E, Township 14S Range 21E, Township 14S Range

	S.B. 83 Enrolled Copy
814	22E, Township 14S Range 23E, Township 14S Range 24E, Township 14S Range 25E, and
815	Township 14S Range 26E.
816	[(11)] (12) "Wilderness area" means those BLM and Forest Service lands added to the
817	National Wilderness Preservation System by an act of Congress.
818	[(12)] (13) "WSA" and "Wilderness Study Area" mean the BLM lands in Utah that
819	were identified as having the necessary wilderness character and were classified as wilderness
820	study areas during the BLM wilderness review conducted between 1976 and 1993 by authority
821	of Section 603 of FLPMA and labeled as Wilderness Study Areas within the final report of the
822	President of the United States to the United States Congress in 1993.
823	Section 3. Section 63J-8-105 is amended to read:
824	63J-8-105. Maps available for public review.
825	A printed copy of the maps referenced in [Subsection] Subsections 63J-8-102(10) and
826	(11) shall be available for inspection by the public at the offices of the Utah Association of
827	Counties.
828	Section 4. Section 63J-8-105.5 is enacted to read:
829	63J-8-105.5. Uintah Basin Energy Zone established Findings Management
830	and land use priorities.
831	(1) There is established the Uintah Basin Energy Zone in Daggett, Uintah, and
832	Duchesne Counties for the purpose of maximizing efficient and responsible development of
833	energy and mineral resources.
834	(2) The land area and boundaries of the Uintah Basin Energy Zone are described in
835	Subsection 63J-8-102(11) and illustrated on the map described in Section 63J-8-105.
836	(3) The state finds that:
837	(a) the lands comprising the Uintah Basin Energy Zone contain abundant, world-class
838	deposits of energy and mineral resources, including oil, natural gas, oil shale, oil sands,
839	gilsonite, coal, phosphate, gold, uranium, and copper, as well as areas with high wind and solar

(b) the highest management priority for all lands within the Uintah Basin Energy Zone

840

841

energy potential; and

842	is responsible management and development of existing energy and mineral resources in order
843	to provide long-term domestic energy and supplies for Utah and the United States.
844	(4) The state supports:
845	(a) efficient and responsible full development of all existing energy and mineral
846	resources located within the Uintah Basin Energy Zone, including oil, oil shale, natural gas, oil
847	sands, gilsonite, phosphate, gold, uranium, copper, solar, and wind resources; and
848	(b) a cooperative management approach among federal agencies, state, and local
849	governments to achieve broadly supported management plans for the full development of all
850	energy and mineral resources within the Uintah Basin Energy Zone.
851	(5) The state calls upon the federal agencies who administer lands within the Uintah
852	Basin Energy Zone to:
853	(a) fully cooperate and coordinate with the state and with Daggett, Uintah, and
854	Duchesne Counties to develop, amend, and implement land and resource management plans
855	and to implement management decisions that are consistent with the purposes, goals, and
856	policies described in this section to the maximum extent allowed under federal law;
857	(b) expedite the processing, granting, and streamlining of mineral and energy leases
858	and applications to drill, extract, and otherwise develop all existing energy and mineral
859	resources located within the Uintah Basin Energy Zone, including oil, natural gas, oil shale, oil
860	sands, gilsonite, phosphate, gold, uranium, copper, solar, and wind resources;
861	(c) allow continued maintenance and increased development of roads, power lines,
862	pipeline infrastructure, and other utilities necessary to achieve the goals, purposes, and policies
863	described in this section;
864	(d) refrain from any planning decisions and management actions that will undermine,
865	restrict, or diminish the goals, purposes, and policies for the Uintah Basin Energy Zone as
866	stated in this section; and
867	(e) refrain from implementing a policy that is contrary to the goals and purposes
868	described within this section.
869	(6) The state calls upon Congress to establish an intergovernmental standing

870	commission among federal, state, and local governments to guide and control planning
871	decisions and management actions in the Uintah Basin Energy Zone in order to achieve and
872	maintain the goals, purposes, and policies described in this section.
873	(7) Notwithstanding the provisions of this section, the state's grazing and livestock
874	policies and plans on land within the Uintah Basin Energy Zone shall continue to be governed
875	by Sections 63J-4-401 and 63J-8-104.
876	Section 5. Effective date.
877	If approved by two-thirds of all the members elected to each house, this bill takes effect
878	upon approval by the governor, or the day following the constitutional time limit of Utah
879	Constitution Article VII, Section 8, without the governor's signature, or in the case of a veto,
880	the date of veto override.

Enrolled Copy

S.B. 83