TABLE OF CONTENTS – EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Section Page

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY ES-1

Introduction ES-1
Purpose of and Need for Action ES-2
Planning Process and Public Collaboration ES-2
Scoping ES-2
Distribution and Availability of the Draft RMP/EIS ES-3
Comments Received on the Draft RMP/EIS ES-4
Distribution and Availability of the Proposed RMP/Final EIS ES-4
Issue Identification ES-4
Issues Considered but Not Further Analyzed ES-5
Management Alternatives ES-5
General Description of Each Alternative ES-7
Alternative A ES-8
Alternative B (Proposed Resource Management Plan) ES-9
Alternative C ES-12
Alternative D ES-13
Alternatives Considered but Not Analyzed in Detail ES-14
Updates From the Draft Resource Management Plan to the Proposed Resource Management Plan ES-15
Changes to Alternative B (Preferred Alternative) (Chapter 2) ES-15
Changes to the Affected Environment (Chapter 3) ES-17
Changes to Appendices (Volumes II and III) ES-17
Changes to Maps (Volume IV of the Cottonwood Draft RMP/EIS) ES-18
Environmental Consequences ES-19
Consultation and Coordination ES-19

LIST OF TABLES

Table Page

ES-1 Land Status within the Planning Area ES-1
ES-2 CFO Planning Area Management Goals by Resource ES-6
ES-3 Evaluation of Areas of Critical Environmental Concern ES-10
ES-4 Summary of Effects by Alternative ES-21

This page intentionally left blank.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

INTRODUCTION

The United States (US) Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management (BLM) has prepared this proposed~~draft~~ resource management plan (RMP) and final environmental impact statement (EIS) to provide direction for managing public lands under the jurisdiction of the Cottonwood Field Office (CFO) and to analyze the environmental effects resulting from implementing the alternatives addressed in this ~~draft~~ proposed RMP.

The CFO boundary defines the planning area ~~assessed~~, which encompasses over 8.8 million acres in Latah, Clearwater, Nez Perce, Lewis, Idaho, and Adams Counties of north-central Idaho. The BLM administers about 1.4~~1.~~ percent, or ~~143,830~~132,526 acres, of the planning area. This acreage figure reflects the recent transfer of approximately 11,304~~0~~ acres of public land to the Bureau of Indian Affairs to be held in trust for the benefit of the Nez Perce Tribe. The transfer was made in accordance with the Snake River Water Rights Act of 2004 (Settlement Act), Public Law 108-447, Division J, Title X, Section 6. Acreage figures or references used throughout the remainder of this Executive Summary and the RMP/EIS have not been updated to reflect this recent land transfer which represents only 0.2 percent of the public land managed by the CFO. An acreage figure of 143,830 acres has been carried through the RMP/EIS.

The BLM manages the surface and subsurface of federal lands under its jurisdiction and, in some cases, has administrative duties for mineral activities on lands managed by other federal agencies or on private split-estate lands.

A majority of the 132,526 acres of BLM-administered land consists of scattered tracts intermingled ~~Land ownership in the planning area is intermingled~~ with other lands administered by the federal government, the Nez Perce Tribe, State of Idaho, and private property. Approximately 65 percent of the planning area is administered by the federal government, including the BLM; US Department of Agriculture, Forest Service (Forest Service); National Park Service; and US Army Corps of Engineers. **Table ES-1** highlights the ownership pattern of the planning area.

Table ES-1
Land Status within the Planning Area

Land Status	Acres	Percentage of Planning Area
BLM	143,830[1]	1.6
Forest Service	5,528,167	62.5
US Army Corps of Engineers	46,134	0.5
National Park Service	1,885	.02
Nez Perce tribal lands	94,705[1]	1.1
State of Idaho	444,791	5.0
Private	2,581,685	29.2
Total	**8,841,197**	100

[1] Figures do not reflect the recent land transfer as mentioned above.
Source: BLM 2004a

Due to the small amount of public land and the scattered land ownership, relatively few issues were raised during the public scoping period or in comments on the Draft RMP. There are no sage grouse within the planning area and limited, if any, energy-related issues. The range of alternatives for several program areas is limited for these and other reasons, including on-going restoration actions; implementation of rangeland standards and guidelines; use of best management practices (BMPs); as well as laws and regulations pertinent to the management of public land and resources.

Management direction and actions outlined in the RMP apply only to BLM-managed public lands in the CFO planning area and to approximately 84,000 acres of additional federal mineral estate lands under BLM jurisdiction that may lie beneath other surface ownership (split-estate). The CFO manages numerous blocks of BLM land, ranging in size from less than 40 acres to over 12,000 acres. No specific management measures have been developed in this RMP for private and state lands, or other federal lands. However, given that private, state, and other federal lands are interspersed with BLM-managed public lands, these lands could be influenced or could be indirectly affected by BLM management actions.

The RMP is being prepared using the BLM's planning regulations and guidance issued under the authority of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976. An EIS is incorporated into this document to meet the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA), Council on Environmental Quality regulations for implementing NEPA (40 Code of Federal Regulations 1500-1508), and requirements of the BLM's NEPA Handbook, H-1790-1.

PURPOSE OF AND NEED FOR ACTION

The RMP is being prepared to provide the BLM CFO with a comprehensive framework for managing lands in the planning area under its jurisdiction. The purpose of the RMP is to develop a public, detailed management document that defines management polices and actions and determines land use allocations on these lands in order to maintain or restore conditions and help provide community stability through resource use and enjoyment.

The RMP is needed for the following reasons:

- Ecological, socioeconomic, institutional, and regulatory conditions have changed since the approval of the Chief Joseph Planning Unit Management Framework Plan (MFP) (BLM 1981a) and amendments to the MFP.
- Public use of federal lands and impacts from this use has changed, requiring new management direction.

PLANNING PROCESS AND PUBLIC COLLABORATION ~~(SCOPING)~~

Scoping

The planning process for this ~~draft~~ RMP began on September 3, ~~in~~ 2004 with publication of the N~~n~~otice of I~~i~~ntent in the *Federal Register* ~~(September 3, 2004)~~. ~~To assist in the process, t~~The BLM CFO initiated~~mplemented~~ an extensive public scoping and collaboration program~~;. The BLM began this program by~~ producing and distributing a project newsletter~~, mailed~~ on October 15, 2004~~,~~ to over 1,200 federal, state, and local agencies, interest groups, and members of the general public. The newsletter~~,. The BLM CFO compiled the mailing list, which included over 1,200 entries and~~ was also made available for public viewing on the Internet.

~~The newsletter informed the recipients of the BLM and RMP planning process, provided background information on the project, introduced the public scoping process and suggested methods for public involvement, and provided notice of three scoping open houses and community economic profile workshops. The scoping and collaboration program also included establishing a project Web site (www.cottonwoodrmp.com) and publishing news releases and newspaper advertisements, all to further assist with disseminating project information to interested stakeholders.~~

~~The scoping~~O~~-o~~pen house-style meetings~~s~~ were held in~~throughout north-central Idaho, in~~ Riggins, Grangeville, and Lewiston, Idaho on November 1, 3, and 4, 2004, respectively. ~~An open house format was chosen over the more formal public meeting format to encourage broader participation, to allow attendees to learn about the project at their own pace, and to enable people to ask questions of~~ BLM representatives were available in an informal, one-on-one setting. Attendees had~~had the opportunity to~~ access to the project Web site from a laptop computer and f~~. F~~act sheets and handouts ~~about the project and a map of the planning area~~ were made available, as were~~s was a~~ lists of the preliminary planning issue themes and planning criteria related to the project.

On November 9, 2004, the BLM hosted a community economic profile workshop in Grangeville, Idaho, led by an economist. Members of the public and local government representatives discussed economic growth and developing visions for the future of their communities. The attendees also discussed how BLM management of public lands could help support economic growth in local communities. Visions were developed for the areas around the towns of Cottonwood, Elk City, and Grangeville and were considered during the development of this ~~draft~~ RMP/EIS. These visions are documented in the Cottonwood RMP Scoping Report (BLM 2005b).

Distribution and Availability of the Draft RMP/EIS

The Draft RMP/EIS was published on August 25, 2006. A Notice of Availability (NOA) was published by the US Environmental Protection Agency in the *Federal Register* on that date and by the BLM on September 1, 2006 (**Appendix R**, Federal Register Notices). These NOAs notified the public of the availability of the Draft RMP/EIS and solicited written public comments during the 90-calendar-day review period that ended on November 27, 2006. The Draft RMP/EIS was available for downloading on the project Web site (www.cottonwoodrmp.com) and at five public libraries in the towns of Lewiston, Grangeville, Moscow, Cottonwood, and Riggins, Idaho. Newspaper advertisements and press releases were issued in August and October 2006 to notify the public of the Draft RMP/EIS availability, to announce three open houses, and to request public comments.

In total, 199 parties received copies of the Draft RMP/EIS. Included in all mailings were instructions on how to provide written comments by the November 27, 2006 deadline. Paper or CD-ROM copies of the Draft RMP/EIS also were available by request to the BLM in Cottonwood and Boise, Idaho.

Open houses were held in the towns of Riggins, Grangeville, and Lewiston, Idaho, during the 90-day public review period of the Draft RMP/EIS. Each open house featured displays, maps, and an interdisciplinary team of resource specialists who provided information and answered questions. A total of 15 people attended the open houses.

Comments Received on the Draft RMP/EIS

The comment period closed on November 27, 2006. A total of 30 written submissions, two from the same party, were received. Most of the 30 written submissions contained multiple comments on different topics. A total of 376 individual comments were made in the 30 submissions. Comments were received concerning a variety of resource issues. The majority of comments pertained to Wildland Fire Ecology and Management (45 comments or 13 percent). All information received through these comments has been evaluated, verified, and incorporated into the Proposed RMP/Final EIS, as appropriate. Copies of all accepted written submissions are provided in **Appendix U** (Volume III), and the BLM's response to each separate comment within each submission is printed to the right of each comment.

Distribution and Availability of the Proposed RMP/Final EIS

An NOA will be published in the *Federal Register*, which notifies the public of the availability of the Proposed RMP/Final EIS. The NOA also will outline protest procedures for the 30-calendar-day protest period. The Proposed RMP/Final EIS will be available for downloading from the project Web site, www.cottonwoodrmp.com. The Proposed RMP/Final EIS also will be available for review and photocopying at seven public libraries in the towns of Lewiston, Grangeville, Moscow, Cottonwood, and Riggins, Idaho. Newspaper advertisements and a press release will be issued to notify the public of the Proposed RMP/Final EIS availability. All 199 recipients of the Draft RMP/EIS, all 29 parties who submitted written comments on the Draft RMP/EIS (some of whom are the same parties), and an additional 40 private organizations, will receive a postcard or letter via US Mail announcing the availability of the Proposed RMP/Final EIS.

ISSUE IDENTIFICATION

Issue identification is the first step of the nine-step BLM planning process. A planning issue is a major controversy or dispute regarding management of resources or uses on the public lands that could be addressed in a variety of ways. A key component of the scoping process was to provide the public with the opportunity to identify issues and concerns to be addressed in the RMP. After considering public scoping comments, the BLM identified nine major planning issues as follows:

Issue 1: Invasive Plant Species. How will the problem of invasive plant species be addressed?

Issue 2: Forest Vegetation. How will forest vegetation be managed to attain desired stand structure and/or meet the range of natural variability?

Issue 3: Special Status Species. How will special status species and their habitats be managed?

Issue 4: Watershed Management. How will priority watersheds or areas be determined for conservation and/or restoration strategies?

Issue 5: Transportation and Travel Management. How will motorized and nonmotorized travel be managed to provide access, while minimizing impacts on natural and cultural resources?

Issue 6: Commercial Land Uses. At what levels will commercial uses (minerals, forest products, livestock grazing, and recreation) be authorized?

Issue 7: Fuels Reduction Treatments. Where and what types of fuels reduction will be implemented to reduce risk to the public, firefighters, property, and natural and cultural resources?

Issue 8: Public Land Management. How will public land resources be managed in scattered or isolated parcels, given varied resource values and priorities?

Issue 9: Recreational Demands. How will future demands for recreation on public lands be addressed?

The criteria used to identify issues to be addressed in the Cottonwood RMP included identifying if the effects of actions designed to respond to the issue would:

- Approach or exceed accepted standards;
- Substantially change a resource;
- Be controversial;
- Offer a wide range of opportunities; or
- Cause disagreement regarding their environmental impact.

These issues drove the formulation of the RMP alternatives and addressing them has resulted in a range of management options presented in four alternatives (Chapter 2). Each fully developed alternative represents a different land use plan that addresses or resolves the identified planning issues in different ways. While other concerns are addressed in the RMP, management related to them may or may not change by alternative.

Issues Considered but Not Further Analyzed

During scoping, several concerns were raised that are beyond the scope of this planning effort or represented questions on how the BLM would go about the planning process and implementation. There are several issues raised in scoping that are clearly of concern to the public but that are governed by existing laws and regulations (for example, water quality). Where certain management is already dictated by law or regulation, alternatives have not been developed, but management will instead be applied common to all alternatives. The Cottonwood RMP Scoping Report provides a comprehensive list of issues outside the scope of the RMP (BLM 2005b).

MANAGEMENT ALTERNATIVES

In combination with the nine planning issues identified previously~~above~~, the BLM has identified management goals for each resource addressed in the CFO planning area. While each of the four alternatives represents a different land use plan approach to address the identified planning issues, the goals for all resources remain consistent. **Table ES-2** provides the goals identified by the BLM for each resource.

Table ES-2
CFO Planning Area Management Goals by Resource

Resource	Goal(s)
Air Quality	Comply with laws and regulations to meet public health and safety requirements.
Geology	Provide opportunities for the use of geologic resources, while protecting resource values.
Soils	Maintain and restore watershed health, soil productivity, and areas of fragile soils.
Water Resources	Manage water resources to protect beneficial uses and to meet or exceed state and federal water quality standards. Maintain or improve the chemical, physical, and biological integrity of water resources.
Vegetation—Forests	Manage forests to maintain or improve ~~forest vigor~~forest health, composition, structure, ~~and~~ diversity consistent with site potential, and Historical Range of Variability.
Vegetation—Weeds	Prevent establishment of new invasive plant species and reduce infested acreage of established invasive plant species.
Vegetation—Rangelands	Maintain or improve rangeland plant community health (diversity, composition, function, and vigor) relative to site potential.
Vegetation—Riparian and Wetlands	Maintain or improve riparian and wetland areas to achieve proper functioning condition. Manage for riparian plant community types appropriate for the site.
Wildlife and Special Status Wildlife	Manage habitat to contribute to the conservation of special status species habitats and to maintain biological diversity of wildlife.
Aquatic Resources, Fish, and Special Status Fish	Manage habitat to contribute to the conservation of special status and native fish species.
Special Status Plants	Maintain or restore special status species and their habitat to contribute to species recovery.
Wildland Fire Management	Manage fuels and wildland fires to protect life and property and to protect or enhance resource values.
Cultural Resources	Preserve and protect significant cultural resources and ensure that they are available for appropriate uses; and Reduce imminent threats and resolve potential conflicts from natural or human-caused deterioration, or potential conflict with other resources uses, by ensuring that all authorizations for land use and resource use will comply with National Historic Preservation Act, Section 106.
Paleontological Resources	Preserve and protect significant paleontological resources and ensure that they are available for appropriate uses.
Visual Resources	Manage activities to maintain scenic quality.
Resource Uses	
Forest Products	Provide forest products to help meet local and national demands.
Livestock Grazing	Provide opportunities for grazing, while meeting rangeland health standards.
Minerals	Make federal mineral resources available for exploration, acquisition, and production consistent with other resource goals. The federal mineral resource consists of 143,830 acres of public lands (federal surface and mineral) and approximately 84,000 acres of reserved minerals (non-federal surface, federal mineral).

Table ES-2
CFO Planning Area Management Goals by Resource *(continued)*

Resource	Goal(s)
Recreation	Manage public lands and waters to provide a broad spectrum of recreation experiences and benefits. Emphasize resource-based river recreation. Ensure that developed facilities and sites are appropriate for the resource setting, well maintained, safe, secure, and accessible. Provide high value recreation opportunities and receive a fair return for commercial and specialized recreation use.
Renewable Energy	Provide opportunities for the development of renewable energy resources, while minimizing adverse impacts to other resource values.
Transportation and Travel Management	Manage travel, roads, primitive roads, and trails to provide access and recreational opportunities, while minimizing resource impacts and user conflicts.
Lands and Realty	Meet the needs of government agencies and the public for various realty authorizations, access, and land ownership adjustments; and Meet the needs of government agencies and the public for resource protection through public land and minerals withdrawals, acquisition of conservation easements, and resolution of unauthorized use.
Special Designations	
Areas of Critical Environmental Concern and Research Natural Areas	Maintain or enhance relevant resource values of more than local importance, or protect life and promote safety where natural hazards exist.
National Trails	Manage National Trails to protect the values for which they were designated.
Wild and Scenic Rivers	Fulfill the BLM's obligations under Section 5(d)(1) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act for the life of this RMP.
Wilderness and Wilderness Study Areas	Manage wilderness areas and Wilderness Study Areas to maintain wilderness characteristics.
Watchable Wildlife Viewing Sites	Maintain or enhance wildlife habitats and opportunities for wildlife viewing areas.
Social and Economic Conditions	
Native American Tribal Uses	Manage natural and cultural resources consistent with treaty and trust responsibilities to Native American tribes.
Public Safety—Abandoned Mines and Hazardous Materials	Protect the public and the environment from exposure to hazards associated with hazardous materials and abandoned mine lands.
Social and Economic Conditions	Provide varied social and economic opportunities through multiple use management.

General Description of Each Alternative

Four alternatives were developed and carried forward for detailed analysis in the Draft RMP/EIS. Alternative A, a continuation of current management, was developed using available inventory data, existing planning and management documents and policies, and established land use allocations. Alternatives B, C and D were developed by the BLM with input from the scoping process, the BLM interdisciplinary team, and citizen/agency groups.

Each alternative was written to address~~es~~ the goals of each resource and be responsive to the identified planning issues. All management under any of the alternatives would comply with state and federal laws, regulations, policies, and standards. ~~Adaptive management would be incorporated across all alternatives as a process of monitoring, evaluating, and incorporating new and changing information into the ongoing management of resources and their uses. A summary of each alternative's objectives is provided below.~~

Alternative A

Alternative A is the continuation of current management. Referred to as the no action alternative, it would continue present management practices based on the existing land use plan and plan amendments. The Chief Joseph MFP (BLM 1981a), as well as all amendments and revisions identified in Chapter 1, **Table 1-3~~1-4~~** (Identification of Chief Joseph Planning Unit MFP Amendments and Other Documents Considered for Implementation-Level Planning), would continue to guide management actions on CFO-administered lands. Direction contained in existing laws, regulations, policies, and standards would also continue to be implemented, sometimes superseding provisions of the 1981 MFP. Key components of Alternative A include the following:

- Continue managing special status species and their habitats to provide for their continued presence in accordance with applicable laws and regulations;
- Manage wildland fire to protect people, property, and cultural and natural resources;
- Continue to manage resource uses, such as grazing, mineral and energy development, and recreation to balance development and protect resources;
- Offer about 6,600 thousand board feet (MBF) as an Allowable Sale Quantity of saw timber per year from the commercial forest land base of 35,757 acres~~ (estimate treating 358 acres per year)~~;
- Continue to manage land tenure adjustments to protect resources while supporting appropriate development and improved public access to public lands;
- Continue to manage in accordance with Interim Strategies for Managing Anadromous Fish-producing Watersheds in Eastern Oregon and Washington, Idaho, and Portions of California (PACFISH) guidance (MFP Supplement for Fisheries and Water Quality Objectives [BLM 1985d]) to achieve or maintain riparian management objectives. Implement Riparian Habitat Conservation Area buffers totaling 24,290 acres to protect riparian areas and wetlands;
- Manage to achieve or maintain water quality and fisheries objectives within 39 prescription watersheds totaling 66,077 acres;
- Do not apply Desired Future Condition standards on forest lands;
- Use Recreation Opportunity Spectrum (ROS) criteria to manage recreation activities, including 14,381 acres Primitive; 18,816 acres Semi-primitive Nonmotorized; 26,206 acres Semi-primitive Motorized; 55,988 acres Roaded-Natural; 27,349 acres Semi-Urban; 40 acres Urban; and 1,046 acres undesignated;
- Manage the Salmon River Scenic (16,245 acres), Salmon River Recreational (6,899 acres) and Clearwater River (3,583 acres) Special Recreation Management Areas (SRMA) for intensive recreation management;

- On 60 percent of BLM-administered lands in the CFO, continue to allow the public to travel cross-country (Open designation) with motorized vehicles. On 28 percent of BLM-administered lands, limit motorized vehicle to designated routes (Limited designation). On 12 percent of BLM-administered lands, do not allow motorized vehicle travel by the public yearlong (Closed designation); and
- Continue to manage existing special management areas, which include four Areas of Critical Environmental Concern (ACECs) (Craig Mountain, Elk City Landfill and American Hill Lake, Lower Lolo Creek, and Lower Salmon River ACECs totaling (23,366 acres) and six ACEC/Research Natural Areas (RNAs) (Captain John Creek, Lower and Middle Cottonwood Islands, Lucile Caves, Wapshilla Ridge, Long Gulch, and Skookumchuck ACEC/RNAs totaling 2,231 acres).

Alternative B (Proposed Resource Management Plan)

Alternative B is the agency's preferred alternative based on interdisciplinary team recommendations, analysis of environmental consequences of the alternatives, and public input during scoping, and comments received on the Draft RMP. Alternative B is the Proposed RMP. Alternative B emphasizes a balanced level of protection, restoration, and commodity production to meet needs for resource protection and resource use. This alternative reflects recommendations made by the interdisciplinary team in response to issues identified through the assessment of current management and concerns raised during public scoping. Key components of Alternative B include the following:

- Manage special status species with an emphasis on maintaining and improving habitat to provide for species' continued presence and conservation;
- Treat fuels on 40 percent of CFO lands (wildland-urban interface [WUI] or non-WUI) classified as moderate or high risk Fire Regime Condition Class (FRCC) 2 or 3 in any five-year period;
- Manage minerals and energy resources to balance development and protect resources;
- Offer 3,129 MBF as a Probable Sale Quantity (PSQ) of saw timber per year from the commercial forest land base of 40,598 acres (estimate treating 242 acres per year);
- Manage land tenure adjustments to improve resource management efficiency and protect public benefit, while supporting appropriate development and improved public access to public lands;
- Protect high-value resources through land withdrawals and protect resources through conservation easements;
- Implement the Aquatic and Riparian Management Strategy to achieve or maintain riparian management objectives. Implement Riparian Conservation Area buffers totaling 22,847 acres to protect riparian areas and wetlands;
- Strive to achieve or not preclude attainment of fisheries and riparian management objectives within 32 28 restoration watersheds and one three conservation watersheds totaling 64,481 acres;
- Apply Desired Future Condition standards on 28,789 acres of forest lands;

- Use ROS criteria to manage recreation activities, including 6,200 acres Primitive; 36,495 acres Semi-primitive Nonmotorized; 23,593 acres Semi-primitive Motorized; 54,867 acres Roaded-Natural; 22,478 acres Rural; and 40 acres Urban (the same as Alternatives C and D);
- Manage the Salmon River Scenic (16,245 acres), Salmon River Recreational (6,899 acres), Clearwater River (3,583 acres), Lolo Creek (3,635 acres), Craig Mountain Wildlife Management Area (24,884 acres) SRMAs for intensive recreation management (the same as Alternatives C and D);
- On BLM-administered lands in the CFO, do not allow the public to travel cross-country (Open designation) with motorized vehicles. On 87 percent of BLM-administered lands, limit motorized vehicle to designated routes (Limited designation). On 13 percent of BLM-administered lands, do not allow motorized vehicle travel by the public yearlong (Closed designation); and
- Create new special management areas where special values warrant such designation. Management would create or expand six ACECs (Lower Salmon River, East Fork American River, American River Historic Sites District, Salmon River, Upper Lolo Creek, and Lower Lolo Creek ACECs totaling 34,187 acres)~~five ACECs (32,562 acres)~~, would maintain or reduce in size six existing ACEC/RNAs (Captain John Creek, Lower and Middle Cottonwood Islands, Wapshilla Ridge, Long Gulch, Lucile Caves, and Skookumchuck ACEC/RNAs totaling 1,966 acres, an overall reduction from Alternative A), and would manage to protect ~~recommend~~ four river segments (Lolo, Lake, Hazard, and Hard Creeks totaling 29.34 miles) found eligible and suitable for inclusion in the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System (NWSRS). (See **Table ES-3**.)

Table ES-3
Evaluation of Areas of Critical Environmental Concern

Area Name	Values of Concern	Resource Use Limitations[1]	Acres	Preferred Alternative Direction
Wapshilla Ridge (Existing RNA/ACEC – 1989)	Natural processes, designated RNA for canyon grasslands and BLM Idaho Watch List plant (Idaho RNA cell for basalts).	1, 2	401 existing	Continue as RNA/ACEC 401 acres
Lower and Middle Cottonwood Islands (Existing RNA/ACEC – 1989)	Natural processes, designated RNA, riparian, Palouse prairie remnant, Clearwater River islands	3	43 existing	Continue as RNA/ACEC 43 acres
Captain John Creek (Existing RNA/ACEC 1989)	Natural processes, designated RNA for canyon grasslands, Douglas fir, and riparian (Idaho cell). Captain John Creek provides habitat for listed steelhead and spring/summer chinook salmon, and Idaho BLM sensitive wildlife, amphibians, reptiles, and plants.	1	1,321 existing	Continue as RNA/ACEC 1,321 acres

Table ES-3
Evaluation of Areas of Critical Environmental Concern *(continued)*

Area Name	Values of Concern	Resource Use Limitations[1]	Acres	Preferred Alternative Direction
Long Gulch (Existing RNA/ACEC 1989)	Natural processes, designated RNA for federally listed MacFarlane's four-o'clock.	4	47 existing	Continue as RNA/ACEC 47 acres
Lucile Caves (Existing RNA/ACEC 1989)	Natural processes, designated RNA, federally listed MacFarlane's four-o'clock, Idaho BLM sensitive plants, wildlife and snails; limestone cave and spring; geology	4	404 existing	Continue as RNA/ACEC 136 acres
Skookumchuck (Existing RNA/ACEC – 1989)	Natural processes, designated RNA for federally listed MacFarlane's four-o'clock.	4	18 existing	Continue as RNA/ACEC 18 acres
Craig Mountain (Existing ACEC 1989)	Designated ACEC, scenic, cultural, federally listed fish, bald eagle, and Spalding's catchfly; Idaho BLM sensitive wildlife, amphibians, reptiles, and plants	2	3,956 existing	Discontinue as ACEC
Elk City/American Hill Lake (Existing ACEC 1989)	Natural hazards, designated ACEC because of concerns for safety and public welfare	5, 6	30 existing	Discontinue as ACEC
Lower Lolo Creek (Existing ACEC 1989)	Designated ACEC, cultural, scenic, federally listed fish; Idaho BLM sensitive wildlife, amphibians, reptiles, and plants; National historic trail	7, 8, 9	3,678 existing	Continue as ACEC 3,678 acres
Lower Salmon River (Confluence to White Bird Creek) (Existing ACEC 1989)	Designated ACEC, cultural, scenic, federally listed fish, bald eagle, and Spalding's catchfly; Idaho BLM sensitive wildlife, amphibians, reptiles, and plants; geology, natural processes	3, 4	15,702 existing	Continue as ACEC 16,199 acres
Upper Lolo Creek	Idaho BLM sensitive wildlife, amphibians, reptiles and plants, cultural, scenic.	7, 10	1,625 proposed	~~Do not add~~ Add as ACEC 1,625 acres
Partridge/Elkhorn	Natural processes, old growth ponderosa pine, Idaho BLM sensitive wildlife	14	576 proposed	Do not add as ACEC
Little Salmon	Natural processes, old growth ponderosa pine, Idaho BLM sensitive wildlife	14	590 proposed	Do not add as ACEC
Upper Salmon River (White Bird Creek to French Creek)	Cultural, scenic, federally listed fish, bald eagle, and MacFarlane's four-o'clock; Idaho BLM sensitive wildlife, amphibians, reptiles, and plants; geology, natural processes	4	5,759 proposed	Add as ACEC 5,759 acres

Table ES-3
Evaluation of Areas of Critical Environmental Concern *(continued)*

Area Name	Values of Concern	Resource Use Limitations[1]	Acres	Preferred Alternative Direction
East Fork of American River	Listed fish, Idaho BLM sensitive wildlife, amphibians, reptiles, fish, and plants; natural processes; riparian and wetlands; and old growth Engelmann spruce.	3, 11, 12	570 proposed	Add as ACEC 570 acres
American River Historic Sites District	Cultural resources, historic mining	13	6,356 proposed	Add as ACEC 6,356 acres

[1] Resource Use Limitations:
1 = timber harvest only to support stand health
2 = exclude livestock grazing
3 = prohibit soil or vegetation disturbance not supporting improved condition (long term)
4 = no actions resulting in long-term adverse impacts to listed plants
5 = closed to cross-country motorized use
6 = no ground-disturbing activities other than rehabilitation
7 = no construction of hydroelectric facilities
8 = no new road construction within 300 feet of Lolo Creek or on slopes exceeding 50%
9 = custodial timber management
10 = timber harvest activities on slopes over 50% utilize aerial or high-lead systems
11 = decommission temporary within three years of construction
12 = no road construction within Riparian Conservation Areas
13 = use mining plan of operations
14 = minimize road construction

Alternative C

Alternative C emphasizes management strategies to preserve and protect ecosystem health across the CFO. This alternative includes active and specific measures to protect and enhance habitat for fish and wildlife, including special status species. This alternative reflects a reduction in resource production goals for forest products, forage, and minerals. Key components of Alternative C include the following:

- Manage special status species and vegetation with an emphasis on maintaining and improving important habitats;
- Treat fuels on 20 percent of CFO lands (WUI or non-WUI) classified as moderate or high risk ~~Fire Regime Condition Class~~FRCC 2 or 3 in any five-year period;
- Manage minerals and energy resources to provide for development, but with an emphasis on maximum conservation and protection of resources;
- Offer 3,101 MBF as a PSQ of saw timber per year from the commercial forest land base of 34,611 acres~~ (estimate treating 191 acres per year)~~;
- Manage land tenure adjustments to improve resource management efficiency and protect public benefit while supporting appropriate development and improved public access to

public lands; place more emphasis on protecting high-value resources through conservation easements;

- Implement the Aquatic and Riparian Management Strategy to maintain riparian management objectives. Implement Riparian Conservation Area buffers totaling 27,624 acres to protect riparian areas and wetlands;
- Strive to achieve or not preclude attainment of fisheries and riparian management objectives within ~~32~~ 37 restoration watersheds and ~~one~~ three conservation watershed totaling 68,359 acres;
- Apply Desired Future Condition standards on 28,087 acres of forest lands;
- Use ROS criteria to manage recreation activities, including 6,200 acres Primitive; 36,495 acres Semi-primitive Nonmotorized; 23,593 acres Semi-primitive Motorized; 54,867 acres Roaded-Natural; 22,478 acres Rural; and 40 acres Urban (the same as Alternatives B and D);
- Manage the Salmon River Scenic (16,245 acres), Salmon River Recreational (6,899 acres), Clearwater River (3,583 acres), Lolo Creek (3,635 acres), Craig Mountain Wildlife Management Area (24,884 acres) SRMAs for intensive recreation management (the same as Alternatives B and D);
- On BLM-administered lands in the CFO, do not allow the public to travel cross-country (Open designation) with motorized vehicles. On 87 percent of BLM-administered lands, limit motorized vehicle to designated routes (Limited designation). On 13 percent of BLM-administered lands, do not allow motorized vehicle travel by the public yearlong (Closed designation). Under Alternative C, additional controls and restrictions would be implemented to emphasize the conservation and protection of resources such as wildlife, special status species, vegetation, soils, air quality, and riparian areas, while providing opportunities for off-highway vehicle use through the development of trails and decreasing route densities; and
- Create new special management areas where special values warrant such designation. Management would create or expand nine ACECs (American River Historic Sites District, Craig Mountain, East Fork American River, Little Salmon River, Upper Lolo Creek, Lower Lolo Creek, Lower Salmon River, Partridge/Elkhorn, and Salmon River ACECs totaling 58,695 acres), would maintain or reduce in size six existing ACEC/RNAs (Captain John Creek, Lower and Middle Cottonwood Islands, Wapshilla Ridge, Long Gulch, Lucile Caves, and Skookumchuck ACEC/RNAs totaling 1,966 acres), and would recommend four river segments (Lake, Hazard, Hard, and Lolo Creeks totaling 29.34 miles) found eligible and suitable for inclusion in the NWSRS.

Alternative D

Alternative D emphasizes commodity production, amenities, and services. Preservation would be secondary to restoring ecosystem health and vigor in forests, upland, and riparian areas. Economic return and community stability would be key considerations in management direction. Protection and enhancement of resources would be secondary, except as mandated by laws, regulations, and policies. Key components of Alternative D include the following:

- Manage special status species and habitats with an emphasis on maintaining and improving important terrestrial and aquatic habitats, but at a lower level than under Alternatives B and C;

- Treat fuels on 60 percent of CFO lands (WUI or non-WUI) classified as moderate or high risk ~~Fire Regime Condition Class~~FRCC 2 or 3 in any five-year period;
- Manage minerals and energy resources to maximize development, while meeting the minimal needs for the conservation and protection of resources;
- Offer 4,823 MBF as a PSQ of saw timber per year from the commercial forest land base of 45,190 acres ~~(estimate treating 361 acres per year)~~;
- Manage land tenure adjustments to improve resource management efficiency and protect public benefit, while supporting appropriate development and improved public access to public lands;
- Implement the Aquatic and Riparian Management Strategy to achieve or maintain riparian management objectives. Implement Riparian Conservation Area buffers totaling 20,710 acres to protect riparian areas and wetlands;
- Strive to achieve or not preclude attainment of fisheries and riparian management objectives within ~~27~~ 24 restoration watersheds and ~~one~~ three conservation watersheds totaling 52,118 acres;
- Do not apply Desired Future Condition standards on forest lands;
- Use ROS criteria to manage recreation activities, including 6,200 acres Primitive; 36,495 acres Semi-primitive Nonmotorized; 23,593 acres Semi-primitive Motorized; 54,867 acres Roaded-Natural; 22,478 acres Rural; and 40 acres Urban (the same as Alternatives B and C);
- Manage the Salmon River Scenic (16,245 acres), Salmon River Recreational (6,899 acres), Clearwater River (3,583 acres), Lolo Creek (3,635 acres), Craig Mountain Wildlife Management Area (24,884 acres) SRMAs for intensive recreation management (the same as Alternatives B and C);
- On 16 percent of BLM-administered lands in the CFO, allow the public to travel cross-country (Open designation) with motorized vehicles. On 71 percent of BLM-administered lands, limit motorized vehicle to designated routes (Limited designation). On 13 percent of BLM-administered lands, do not allow motorized vehicle travel by the public yearlong (Closed designation); and
- Continue to manage two ACECs (Lower Salmon River and Salmon River ACECs totaling 21,958 acres) and maintain or reduce six ACEC/RNAs (Long Gulch, Lower and Middle Cottonwood Islands, Captain John Creek, Wapshilla Ridge, Lucile Caves, and Skookumchuck ACEC/RNAs totaling 1,966 acres). and would manage to protect four river segments (Lolo, Lake, Hazard, and Hard Creeks totaling 29.34 miles) found eligible and suitable for inclusion in the NWSRS~~One river segment found eligible and suitable for inclusion in the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System would be recommended for inclusion~~.

Alternatives Considered but Not Analyzed in Detail

Three alternatives were considered but eliminated from consideration because they do not meet the purpose of and need for the RMP, or they violate laws, regulations, policies, or the BLM's multiple use mandate. These alternatives are to maximize resource protection by eliminating some or all human use in the CFO, to allow exclusive use or protection, and to allow unregulated recreation.

UPDATES FROM THE DRAFT RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PLAN TO THE PROPOSED RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PLAN

As a result of public comment and internal review of the Draft RMP/EIS, Alternative B (the Preferred Alternative in the draft) has been modified and now represents the BLM's Proposed RMP/Final EIS. Changes regarding alternatives focused on adjustments to Alternative B in order to address public concerns, while continuing to meet the BLM's legal and regulatory mandates. Additional information, clarifications and rewording have been inserted as needed and changes have been made throughout Chapters 1 through 5 and the Appendices. Chapter 5 of the Proposed RMP/Final EIS contains a summary of the public comment process and the comments received on the Draft RMP/EIS. All comment letters received and the BLM's responses are located in **Appendix U** (Volume III).

The Proposed RMP/Final EIS is designed to be used in conjunction with the Draft RMP/EIS for reference to maps and in regard to page numbers cited in the comment and response section (**Appendix U**). Both the Proposed RMP/Final EIS and Draft RMP/EIS are available on the project Web site, www.cottonwoodrmp.com.

Updates to the Draft RMP/EIS are shown throughout this Proposed RMP/Final EIS by underlining new text (added since the Draft RMP/EIS) and striking out deleted text (~~text~~) (deleted since the Draft RMP/EIS). Changes generally include the following:

- Adjustments to Alternative B (the Proposed RMP);
- Additions to Chapter 3, Affected Environment;
- Clarifications to better explain the management proposed in the Draft RMP/EIS or the environmental consequences;
- Incorporation of new information;
- Changes to information based on inventory updates after May 2006;
- Revisions to Chapter 4, Environmental Consequences, to make corrections and reflect inventory updates;
- Additions to Chapter 5, Consultation and Coordination, to describe the public comment process on the Draft RMP/EIS;
- Additions to Chapter 6, References, to include additional references cited in the document; and
- Minor corrections, such as typographical errors.

The detailed description of the Proposed RMP (Alternative B, as edited) is included in Chapter 2, and the environmental consequences of implementing the Proposed RMP (Alternative B, as edited) are described in Chapter 4.

CHANGES TO ALTERNATIVE B (PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE) (CHAPTER 2)

Alternative B has been adjusted as follows, based on public comment and internal review:

- Actions have been added regarding avoidance of impacts to sources of drinking water (Water Resources, Objective 1, Action 3; Objective 2, Action 6; and Objective 7, Action 1).

- An action has been added regarding project design in restoration watersheds limiting predicted increased water yield or peak flows (Water Resources, Objective 2, Action 7).
- The Vegetation—Forests goal has been edited to clarify the BLM's desire.
- Various changes have been made to further explain the BLM's forested vegetation management actions (in Vegetation—Forests). Language has been added to clarify the types of resources to which the various actions refer. This includes adding new Actions 2 and 3 to Objective 2.
- Vegetation—Forests Objective 2, Actions 2 and 3 have been moved to the Wildland Fire Ecology and Management section for clarity and consistency.
- Various changes have been made to further explain the BLM's management actions in Vegetation—Riparian and Wetlands. Language has been added to clarify the types of resources to which the various actions refer.
- Vegetation—Riparian and Wetlands, Objective 1, Action 3, Category 4 has been edited to indicate that the riparian conservation area is the area from the edges of the stream channel, wetland, the extent of riparian vegetation or 100 feet slope distance, whichever is greatest.
- Wildlife and Special Status Wildlife, Objective 9, Action 1 has been edited to reference the Elk Habitat Management Coordinating Guidelines.
- Actions 9, 10, and 11 have been added to Wildlife and Special Status Wildlife, Objective 9, regarding the BLM's public education efforts regarding wildlife, designing vegetation projects in big game habitat, and providing migratory bird habitat, respectively.
- Wildlife and Special Status Wildlife, Objective 11, Action 3 has been clarified to recognize the Idaho Department of Fish and Game's role as the agency responsible for management of wildlife and fish in Idaho, and to clarify the BLM's coordination efforts with other agencies.
- Action 4 has been added to Wildlife and Special Status Wildlife, Objective 11, regarding collaborative management efforts that maintain high quality or improve wildlife habitat, travel corridors, habitat connectivity, and wildlife security.
- Wildlife and Special Status Wildlife, Objective 13, Action 2 has been modified to indicate the BLM's coordination efforts with agencies, grazing lessees, and partners on population and habitat management of bighorn sheep within Hells Canyon (Snake River drainage) and Salmon River drainage, and to allow for transplants, reintroductions, and natural expansion of bighorn sheep populations.
- Wildlife and Special Status Wildlife, Objective 13, Action 3 has been edited, and Actions 4, 5, 6, and 7 added, to clarify the BLM's management with regards to bighorn sheep, domestic sheep, and domestic goats.
- Various changes have been made to further explain the BLM's management actions in Aquatic Resources, Fish, and Special Status Fish. Language has been added to clarify the types of resources to which the various actions refer.
- Aquatic Resources, Fish, and Special Status Fish, Objective 1, Action 10 has been added regarding the BLM's public education efforts.
- Clarifications have been made to Livestock Grazing actions to indicate allotment allocations and grazing types.

- Livestock Grazing, Objective 1, Actions 11, 15, and 16 have been edited or added to clarify the BLM's management with regards to bighorn sheep, domestic sheep, and domestic goats.
- ACECs and RNAs, Objective 10 have been edited to include the designation of the Upper Lolo Creek ACEC.
- Wild and Scenic Rivers, Actions to recommend suitable segments for congressional designation in the NWSRS have been changed to do not recommend suitable segments in order to comply with the Memorandum of Understanding with the BLM, Forest Service, and State of Idaho (State of Idaho et al. 1991). Suitability determinations have not changed.

CHANGES TO THE AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT (CHAPTER 3)

Chapter 3 has been adjusted as follows:

- Two species were recently delisted by the US Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), which include the bald eagle (effective August 8, 2007) and the gray wolf (effective March 28, 2008). The PRMP/FEIS still includes reference to these species as being federally listed, however it is acknowledged that future management will be in accord with applicable state and federal laws and regulations.
- Section 3.2.9, Wildlife and Special Status Wildlife, has been edited to add information regarding big game species and habitat, bighorn sheep, wildlife habitat vegetation cover types, and wildlife habitat trends.
- Section 3.2.13, Cultural Resources, has been edited to add information to address new directives for land use planning with respect to categorizing known and expected cultural resources according to their nature and relative preservation value.
- Section 3.3.7, Lands and Realty, Withdrawals, has been updated to reflect renewal of the Salmon River mineral withdrawal.

CHANGES TO APPENDICES (VOLUMES II AND III)

The appendices have been adjusted as follows:

- **Appendix B** (Best Management Practices – Alternatives B, C, and D) has been revised to clarify BMPs.
- **Appendix C** (Conservation and Restoration Watersheds – Alternatives B, C, and D) has been revised to clarify and provide consistent supporting rationale for identification of conservation and restoration watersheds for specific alternatives. Identification of various management strategies that may occur in conservation and restoration watersheds was also added to this appendix.
- **Appendix D** (Desired Future Conditions for Forest Vegetation/Wildlife Habitat – Alternatives B and C) has been revised to provide additional clarification for desired future conditions for forest vegetation and wildlife habitat, and additional management direction for snag management.
- **Appendix F** (Aquatic and Riparian Management Strategy – Alternatives B, C, and D) has been revised to incorporate additional Interior Columbia Basin Ecosystem Management Project direction, recommendations from reviewers, and identified during the Endangered Species Act (ESA) consultation process.

- **Appendix I** (Grazing AUMs by Allotment – Alternatives A, B, C, and D) has been revised to include the type of livestock use on each allotment.
- **Appendix K** (Final Wild and Scenic Rivers Eligibility and Suitability Study) has been revised to finalize the study.
- **Appendix R** (Federal Register Notices) has been revised to include all Federal Register notices printed to date for this project.
- **Appendix S** (Species-specific Habitat Definitions) has been revised to incorporate additional clarification and definitions identified during the ESA consultation process.
- New **Appendix U** (Comments Received on Cottonwood Draft RMP/EIS) has been added to capture all written comments on the Draft RMP/EIS and the BLM's response to each comment.
- New **Appendix V** (Conservation Measures for Listed Species) has been added to incorporate species-specific conservation measures that were identified and recommended during the ESA consultation process.
- New **Appendix W** (Desired Condition and Watershed and Aquatic Condition Indicators) has been added to provide additional information and clarification concerning the rating criteria for watershed and aquatic condition indicators.

CHANGES TO MAPS (VOLUME IV OF THE COTTONWOOD DRAFT RMP/EIS)

No maps have been substantially revised since the Cottonwood Draft RMP/EIS. One map depicting the Planning Area Surface Management after Snake River Water Rights Act 2004 was added to Section 3.3.7 to show the administrative transfer of 11,304 acres effective May 15, 2007. One minor change has been made to **Figure 38** (Volume IV of the Cottonwood Draft RMP/EIS). That map inadvertently omits a 25-acre area that should have been shown as an area for disposal. The 25-acre area is currently leased to Bennett Forest Industries. The area was a former industrial site and is being vacated. The final disposal acres will be determined by an implementation-level ~~follow-on~~ NEPA analysis at a later date.

Minor changes have been made to **Figures 3**, **4**, and **5** (Volume IV of the Cottonwood Draft RMP/EIS). Several watersheds identified as Conservation or Restoration watersheds (see **Appendix C**) were not mapped as such. Refer to **Tables C-1**, **C-2**, and **C-3** (Volume II) for the complete listing of these watersheds.

The Draft RMP/EIS included a discrepancy in the Marshall Mountain Wilderness Study Area (WSA) map, **Figure 46** (Volume IV of the Cottonwood Draft RMP/EIS). The WSA boundary mistakenly did not include an area excluded from the original wilderness inventory. The excluded area was included in the maps in the *North Idaho Proposed MFP Amendment and Final EIS for Wilderness* (BLM 1986a). This excluded area includes a road, cabins, and mining operation. The map and acreage have been corrected. The acreage difference is less than one percent of the current total acreage.

Because no substantial changes have been made to maps, the only map (**Figure 1**) included with this Proposed RMP/Final EIS is related to the May 15, 2007, administrative transfer of 11,304 acres, in Chapter 1. All other maps are incorporated herein by reference and are included in the Cottonwood Draft RMP/EIS, Volume IV. Copies of the Cottonwood Draft RMP/EIS Volume IV maps are

available on the project website at www.cottonwoodrmp.com, or upon request from BLM (telephone (208) 962-3784-3245 or email information@cottonwoodrmp.com).

ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES

Alternative A would be a continuation of current management. Alternative B would allow for many uses to continue but could constrain certain activities in order to maintain or improve land health conditions. Alternative C would have the least potential impact on physical and biological resources but the potential for greater adverse impact on the local economies and businesses that depend on BLM-administered lands for tourism, recreation, and resource extraction. Conversely, Alternative D offers the greatest economic potential but greatest potential impact on the physical and biological environment. A summary comparison of the environmental consequences for each alternative is presented in **Table ES-4**.

Adopting the no action alternative, or current management (Alternative A), would preclude opportunities to incorporate new BLM direction and regulatory protective measures for newly listed species without undertaking numerous land use plan amendments. Detailed descriptions of impacts of the four alternatives are provided in Chapter 4, along with a discussion of the cumulative impacts, irretrievable and irreversible commitments of resources, and the alternatives' unavoidable adverse impacts.

CONSULTATION AND COORDINATION

The Cottonwood RMP provides guidance for a widely dispersed area of public land in north-central Idaho and necessarily requires the coordination of a variety of organizations with interests in the area. As discussed above, the BLM implemented an extensive public collaboration process to solicit and address these interests. In addition, the BLM conducted formal public scoping and prepared a scoping report summarizing public input.

The BLM met with various collaborators about the Cottonwood RMP, as follows:

- The Nez Perce Tribe;
- Clearwater County Commissioners;
- Idaho County Commissioners;
- Idaho State Department of Environmental Quality;
- Nez Perce Tribe Resource Specialists;
- Idaho Department of Fish and Game ~~Department~~, Clearwater Region; and
- USFWS and National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, National Marine Fisheries Service (National Marine Fisheries Service) (BLM entered into a Consultation Agreement/Memorandum of Understanding with USFWS, Snake River Office and National Marine Fisheries Service to facilitate a joint planning effort for the RMP and ESA Section 7 consultation [BLM et al. 2005]).

No agencies entered into formal agreements as Cooperating Agencies. The BLM did coordinate with private landowners and other special interest groups and consulted and coordinated with federal, state, county, and local government elected officials and representatives. Communication is ongoing and will continue throughout development and implementation of the RMP.

The Coeur d'Alene District Resource Advisory Council is a citizen-based group that provides northern Idaho citizens with a voice in managing BLM-administered public lands to help improve their health and productivity. The 15-member council represents~~includes~~ a cross-section of Idaho residents from around northern Idaho. ~~and currently includes a federal grazing permittee, two timber representatives, a rights-of-way and transportation representative, an Off-highway vehicle recreation representative, three representatives of dispersed recreation, a representative of wild horse and burro management, two elected officials, a state employee, and an academician. There are vacancies for an environmental representative and an at-large representative.~~ The BLM updated~~gave~~ the council~~ an update~~ on~~ of~~ the purpose and status of the Cottonwood RMP at Resource Advisory Council meetings on December 3, 2004, and May 18, 2005. The meetings were open to the public and were announced in the *Federal Register*. Meeting summaries are available at www.blm.gov/rac/id/cda/. Chapter 5 provides a discussion of coordination and consultation.

A consultation agreement (memorandum of understanding) regarding consultation on the Cottonwood RMP was developed and signed by the CFO, USFWS, and National Marine Fisheries Service in the summer of 2005. Level 1 Consultation Team meetings between the CFO, USFWS, and National Marine Fisheries Service for the development of the Cottonwood RMP have been ongoing since 2005. Coordination with the Idaho State Historic Preservation Office regarding cultural and historic sections of the RMP has been ongoing.

Table ES-4
Summary of Effects by Alternative

Alternative A (Current Management)	Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)	Alternative C	Alternative D
SUMMARY OF EFFECTS ON AIR QUALITY			
Air quality would be protected, although short-term impacts could occur from fire activities, fuel reduction activities, or dust generated by motorized use or mining. Smoke from regional and local wildland fires could affect Class I visibility areas within the CFO boundary. Alternative A would have the least potential acres managed by prescribed fire.	Similar to Alternative A, except: More potential acres than Alternative A would be managed by prescribed fire.	Similar to Alternative A, except: Most potential acres would be managed by prescribed fire.	Same as Alternative B.
SUMMARY OF EFFECTS ON GEOLOGY			
Management of resources is not expected to affect geology.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.

Table ES-4
Summary of Effects by Alternative *(continued)*

Alternative A (Current Management)	Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)	Alternative C	Alternative D
SUMMARY OF EFFECTS ON SOILS			
Greatest risk for soil compaction and erosion from cross-country travel. Impacts from timber harvest activities would potentially affect 358 acres per year. Soil-protection measures would be provided by PACFISH (BLM and Forest Service 1995) direction, BMPs, and prescription watersheds direction.	No allowed cross-country travel would reduce risk of soil compaction and erosion. Impacts from timber harvest activities would potentially affect 242 acres per year. Soil protection measures would be provided by Aquatic and Riparian Management Strategy, BMPs, and restoration/conservation watersheds direction.	Similar to Alternative B, except: Impacts from timber harvest activities would potentially affect 191 acres per year.	Similar to Alternative A, except: Less cross-country travel would be allowed than under Alternative A. Impacts from timber harvest activities would potentially affect 361 acres per year. Soil protection measures would be provided by Aquatic and Riparian Management Strategy, BMPs, and restoration/conservation watersheds direction.
SUMMARY OF EFFECTS ON WATER RESOURCES			
Off-road motorized travel would cause soil erosion and sediment delivery to streams. More riparian area protection would occur through Riparian Habitat Conservation Area management than Alternatives B and D. Provides least emphasis on increasing Proper Functioning Condition acres/miles.	Off-road motorized travel would be eliminated, reducing the potential for erosion and sediment delivery. More riparian area protection would occur through Riparian Conservation Area management than Alternative D. Provides more emphasis on increasing Proper Functioning Condition acres/miles than Alternative A.	Similar to Alternative B, except: Provides the most riparian area protection through Riparian Conservation Area management. Provides most emphasis on increasing Proper Functioning Condition acres/miles.	Similar to Alternative A, except: Provides the least riparian area protection through Riparian Conservation Area management. Provides more emphasis on increasing Proper Functioning Condition acres/miles than Alternative A.

Table ES-4
Summary of Effects by Alternative *(continued)*

Alternative A (Current Management)	Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)	Alternative C	Alternative D
SUMMARY OF EFFECTS ON VEGETATION—FORESTS			
Focus on providing timber for harvest while protecting the basic natural components of the environment. ~~Focus is on the production of commercial timber.Highest level of treatments to maintain and improve forest vigor.~~ Least emphasis on management to maintain or enhance old growth forest.	Higher level of treatments than Alternative C to maintain and improve ~~forest vigor~~forest health. Greater emphasis on management to maintain or enhance old growth forest than Alternatives A and D.	Lowest level of treatments to maintain and improve ~~forest vigor~~forest health. Greatest emphasis on management to maintain or enhance old growth forest.	Higher level of treatments to maintain and improve ~~forest vigor~~forest health than Alternatives B and C, lower than Alternative A. Greater emphasis to maintain or enhance old growth forest than Alternative A.
SUMMARY OF EFFECTS ON VEGETATION—WEEDS			
Continued cooperation through Weed Management Areas would allow for a regional approach to addressing noxious weeds. Potential for slow but steady increase in weeds under current management.	Similar to Alternative A., except: Additional protective measures and BMPs for management activities should decrease current weed populations and help avoid their further spread more than Alternative A.	Similar to Alternative B, except: Least potential for spread of weeds due to least amount of soil-disturbing activities and greatest amount of acreage managed under ACEC designation.	Similar to Alternative B, except: Greatest potential for spread of weeds due to greatest amount of soil-disturbing activities and least amount of acreage managed under ACEC designation.

Table ES-4
Summary of Effects by Alternative *(continued)*

Alternative A (Current Management)	Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)	Alternative C	Alternative D
SUMMARY OF EFFECTS ON VEGETATION—RANGELANDS			
Meeting Idaho Standards for Rangeland Health and Guidelines for Livestock Grazing Management requires that existing native plant communities be maintained. 11,171 acres of rangeland would be open to cross-country motorized travel, creating greatest potential for disturbance of soils and vegetation, as well as increased weed spread.	Similar to Alternative A, except: May increase amount of native vegetation through emphasis management. No rangeland would be open to cross-country motorized travel, resulting in reduced soil and vegetation disturbance and weed spread from Alternative A.	Similar to Alternative B; except: Native seedlings would be used to restore and enhance composition and structure. Greater potential than Alternative B for weed occurrences to decrease.	Similar to Alternative B, except: Greater potential than Alternatives B and C for weed occurrences to increase, with 3,159 acres of rangeland open to cross-country motorized travel.
SUMMARY OF EFFECTS ON VEGETATION—RIPARIAN AND WETLANDS			
24,290 acres of riparian habitat would be protected as Riparian Habitat Conservation Areas. 69 miles of streams and associated riparian zones would be in prescription watersheds with stream restoration emphasis.	22,847 acres of riparian habitat would be protected as Riparian Conservation Areas. 80 miles of streams and associated riparian zones would be in restoration and conservation emphasis watersheds.	27,264 acres of riparian habitat would be protected as Riparian Conservation Areas, offering the most protection of riparian areas. 81 miles of streams and associated riparian zones would be in restoration and conservation emphasis watersheds.	20,710 acres of riparian habitat would be protected as Riparian Conservation Areas, offering the least protection of riparian areas. 65 miles of streams and associated riparian zones would be in restoration and conservation emphasis watersheds.

Table ES-4
Summary of Effects by Alternative *(continued)*

Alternative A (Current Management)	Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)	Alternative C	Alternative D
SUMMARY OF EFFECTS ON WILDLIFE AND SPECIAL STATUS WILDLIFE			
Least protection of special habitats through designations of ACECs, candidate wild and scenic river segments, WSAs, and existing wilderness. Highest level of potential disturbance through timber harvest. Does not provide specific management for all special status species or emphasis for conservation or restoration.	More protection of special habitats through designations of ACECs, candidate wild and scenic river segments, WSAs, and existing wilderness than Alternative A. Lower level of potential disturbance through timber harvest than Alternatives A and D. Moderate potential for improvement in population parameters of several species based on moderate levels of ground-disturbing activities and restrictions on these activities.	Greatest protection of special habitats through designations of ACECs, candidate wild and scenic river segments, WSAs, and existing wilderness. Lowest level of potential disturbance through timber harvest. Greatest potential for improvement in population parameters of several species based on lowest levels of ground-disturbing activities and highest levels of restrictions on these activities.	Less protection of special habitats through designations of ACECs, candidate wild and scenic river segments, WSAs, and existing wilderness than Alternative B. Level of potential disturbance through timber harvest slightly less than Alternative A. Least potential for improvement in population parameters of several species based on highest levels of ground-disturbing activities and the least restrictions on these activities.
SUMMARY OF EFFECTS ON AQUATIC RESOURCES, FISH, AND SPECIAL STATUS FISH			
Fish habitat quality would be improved for 66,077 acres in 39 prescription watersheds.	Similar to Alternative A, except: Fish habitat quality would be improved for 64,481 acres in ~~32~~ 28 restoration watersheds and ~~1~~ 3 conservation watersheds.	Similar to Alternative A, except: Fish habitat quality would be improved for 68,359 acres in ~~40~~ 37 restoration watersheds and 3 conservation watersheds.	Similar to Alternative A, except: Fish habitat quality would be improved for 52,118 acres in ~~27~~ 24 restoration watersheds and ~~1~~ 3 conservation watersheds.
SUMMARY OF EFFECTS ON SPECIAL STATUS PLANTS			
Least potential for ~~increases~~ improvements in special status plant population conditions and trends due to protective and recovery measures.	More potential for improvements ~~increases~~ in special status plant population conditions and trends than Alternative A.	Greatest potential for improvements ~~increases~~ in special status plant population conditions and trends due to protective and recovery measures.	Less potential for improvements ~~increases~~ in special status plant population conditions and trends than Alternative B.

Table ES-4
Summary of Effects by Alternative *(continued)*

Alternative A (Current Management)	Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)	Alternative C	Alternative D
SUMMARY OF EFFECTS ON WILDLAND FIRE MANAGEMENT			
Appropriate Management Response would guide suppression efforts.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.
Wildland fire use would be implemented in all Fire Management ~~Units~~ Areas as NEPA and Wildland Fire Implementation Plans are completed. Currently, one Fire Management ~~Unit~~ Area (Craig Mountain) has NEPA completed.	Wildland fire use would be limited compared to Alternative A. It would be restricted to portions of two Fire Management ~~Units~~Areas. This EIS would be the implementing NEPA for wildland fire use.	Wildland fire use would be implemented in all Fire Management ~~Units~~ Areas as ~~NEPA and~~ Wildland Fire Implementation Plans are completed. This EIS would be the implementing NEPA for wildland fire use.	Wildland fire use would be limited compared to Alternative A. It would be allowed in all Fire Management ~~Units~~Areas, however it would be restricted to areas without commercial forestry or grazing. This EIS would be the implementing NEPA for wildland fire use.
Prioritizing areas for fuel treatment according to WUI and FRCC status would reduce risk in the WUI and potentially reduce FRCC where treatments occur. This prioritization would result in treating the most affected vegetation types and promote restoration in these areas.	Prioritizing areas for treatment according to hazard in WUI would result in reduced risk in priority areas. This alternative would likely result in substantially less WUI fuels reduction than Alternative A (see below).	Prioritizing areas for treatment according to hazard in WUI would result in reduced risk in priority areas. This alternative would likely result in substantially less WUI fuels reduction than Alternative A (see below).	Prioritizing areas for treatment according to hazard in WUI would result in reduced risk in priority areas. This alternative would likely result in slightly more WUI fuels reduction than Alternative A (see below).
	Prioritizing treating FRCC 2 and 3 outside WUI would result in treating the most affected vegetation types and promote restoration in these areas.	Prioritizing treating FRCC 2 and 3 outside WUI would result in treating the most affected vegetation types and promote restoration in these areas.	Prioritizing treating FRCC 2 and 3 outside WUI would result in treating the most affected vegetation types and promote restoration in these areas.

Table ES-4
Summary of Effects by Alternative *(continued)*

Alternative A (Current Management)	Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)	Alternative C	Alternative D
SUMMARY OF EFFECTS ON WILDLAND FIRE MANAGEMENT *(continued)*			
Forest management activities generally contribute to accomplishing fuel reduction goals. Alternative A established a decadal area treatment (3,576 acres) higher than all alternatives except Alternative D (3,610 acres). The difference between these alternatives is less than one percent. Fuel management treatments will also occur beyond the commercial forest base.~~Forest management activities on a commercial forest base of 35,757 acres would result in the largest amount of fuels reduction and biomass utilization due to higher allowable sale quantity (6,600 thousand board feet [MBF] annually).~~	Forest management activities generally contribute to accomplishing fuel reduction goals. Alternative B established a commercial forest base of 40,598 acres, but a decadal area treatment of 2,420 acres, which is 32 percent less than Alternative A. Fuel management treatments will also occur beyond the commercial forest base.~~Forest management activities on a commercial forest base of 40,598 acres would result in 53% less fuels reduction and biomass utilization than Alternative A (probable sale quantity [PSQ] of 3,129 MBF annually).~~	Forest management activities generally contribute to accomplishing fuel reduction goals. Alternative C established a commercial forest base of 34,611 acres, but a decadal area treatment of 1,910 acres, which is 47 percent less than Alternative A. Fuel management treatments will also occur beyond the commercial forest base~~Forest management activities on a commercial forest base of 34,611 acres would result in 53% less fuels reduction and biomass utilization than Alternative A (PSQ of 3,101 MBF annually).~~.	Forest management activities generally contribute to accomplishing fuel reduction goals. Alternative D established a commercial forest base of 45,190 acres, but a decadal area treatment of 3,610 acres, which is less than one percent higher than Alternative A. Fuel management treatments will also occur beyond the commercial forest base~~Forest management activities on a commercial forest base of 45,190 acres would result in 27% less fuels reduction and biomass utilization than Alternative A (PSQ of 4,823 MBF annually).~~.

Alternative A (Current Management)	Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)	Alternative C	Alternative D
SUMMARY OF EFFECTS ON WILDLAND FIRE MANAGEMENT *(continued)*			
The potential WUI 5-year treatment of FRCC 2 and FRCC 3 lands is 54,763 acres and could result in the following changes to FRCC: Current FRCC FRCC 1: 10% FRCC 2: 33% FRCC 3: 57% Plan Life FRCC Potential Change FRCC 1: ~~11~~20% - ~~14~~40% FRCC 2: ~~32~~12% - ~~40~~33% FRCC 3: ~~51~~29% - ~~55~~50%	The potential WUI 5-year treatment of FRCC 2 and FRCC 3 lands would be 37,395 acres, 32% less than Alternative A, and could result in the following changes to FRCC: Plan Life FRCC Potential Change FRCC 1: 17% - ~~22~~38% FRCC 2: 12% - ~~37~~33% FRCC 3: 29% - 50~~41~~%	The potential WUI 5-year treatment of FRCC 2 and FRCC 3 lands would be 18,697 acres, 66% less than Alternative A, and could result in the following changes to FRCC: Plan Life FRCC Potential Change FRCC 1: 15% FRCC 2: 35% FRCC 3: 50%	The potential WUI 5-year treatment of FRCC 2 and FRCC 3 lands would be 56,092 acres, 2% more than Alternative A, and could result in the following changes to FRCC: Plan Life FRCC Potential Change FRCC 1: 28% FRCC 2: 39% FRCC 3: 33%

Table ES-4
Summary of Effects by Alternative *(continued)*

Alternative A (Current Management)	Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)	Alternative C	Alternative D
SUMMARY OF EFFECTS ON CULTURAL RESOURCES			
Potential impacts to cultural resources from ground-disturbing activities and cross-country motorized travel would be greatest under this alternative.	Eliminates cross-country motorized travel resulting in less potential for effects on cultural resources. Moderate level of ground-disturbing activities.	Eliminates cross-country motorized travel resulting in less potential for effects on cultural resources. Lowest level of ground-disturbing activities.	Less area than Alternative A would be open to cross-country motorized travel. Similar levels of ground-disturbing activities to Alternative A.
SUMMARY OF EFFECTS ON PALEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCES			
Risk of impacts to paleontological resources would be very low due to low potential for occurrence of these resources.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.
SUMMARY OF EFFECTS ON VISUAL RESOURCES			
Manages scenic quality somewhat less than Alternative C.	Manages scenic quality slightly less or similarly to Alternative A.	Scenic quality is most intensely managed.	Least-intensive management of scenic quality.
SUMMARY OF EFFECTS ON FOREST PRODUCTS			
Production of forest products would continue at current levels with an allowable sale quantity of 6,600 MBF.	PSQ of 3,129 MBF annually (a 42% decrease from current management) would provide less opportunity to obtain forest products from BLM-administered lands than Alternatives A or D, but slightly more opportunities than Alternative C.	PSQ of 3,101 MBF annually (a 47% decrease from current management) would provide the least opportunity to obtain forest products from BLM-administered lands of all the alternatives.	PSQ of 4,823 MBF annually (a 32% decrease from current management) would provide less opportunity than Alternative A to obtain forest products from BLM-administered lands, but more opportunities than Alternatives B or C.

Table ES-4
Summary of Effects by Alternative *(continued)*

Alternative A (Current Management)	Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)	Alternative C	Alternative D
SUMMARY OF EFFECTS ON LIVESTOCK GRAZING			
Approximately ~~7,204~~7,200 animal unit months (AUM) on 122,732 acres are currently allocated for livestock grazing. Continued implementation of BLM Idaho Standards for Rangeland Health and Guidelines for Livestock Grazing Management would prevent or minimize environmental degradation and ensure good long-term site productivity, properly functioning conditions for riparian and wetland areas, ecologically healthier vegetation communities, improved water quality, and desirable native and nonnative plant and animal species and habitats.	Similar to Alternative A, except: Approximately ~~6,254~~6,263 AUMs on 105,619 acres would be allocated for livestock grazing, a 13% decrease in AUMs from current management.	Similar to Alternative A, except: Approximately 6,020 AUMs on 101,350 acres would be allocated for livestock grazing, a 16% decrease in AUMs from current management. Alternative C would provide the least opportunities for grazing.	Similar to Alternative A, except: Approximately ~~8,540~~8,549 AUMs on 135,850 acres would be allocated for livestock grazing, a 19% increase in AUMs from current management. Alternative D would the most provide opportunities for grazing.

Table ES-4
Summary of Effects by Alternative *(continued)*

Alternative A (Current Management)	Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)	Alternative C	Alternative D
SUMMARY OF EFFECTS ON MINERALS			
16% of BLM lands currently withdrawn from mining. 10% closed to mineral leasing. Wilderness area and WSAs closed to mineral material sale. No Surface Occupancy (NSO) and Controlled Surface Use (CSU) restrictions are applied on a case-by-case basis, resulting in the least restrictions (the most areas open to unrestricted mineral exploration and development).	Similar to Alternative A, except: More NSO and CSU restrictions than Alternatives A and D, but less than Alternative C. NSO lease stipulations would occur on 30% of BLM public lands and CSU on 29%.	Similar to Alternative A, except: Most NSO and CSU restrictions (the least areas open to unrestricted mineral exploration and development). NSO lease stipulations would occur on 48% of BLM public lands and CSU on 40%.	Similar to Alternative A, except: More NSO and CSU restrictions than Alternative A, but less than Alternatives B and C. NSO lease stipulations would occur on 24% of BLM public lands and CSU on 22%.
SUMMARY OF EFFECTS ON RECREATION			
Recreation would be intensely managed in three SRMAs. Most emphasis on motorized recreation opportunities and includes the most acreage for off-highway vehicle cross-country travel (see Transportation and Travel Management, below). Minor displacement of recreational activities due to surface-disturbing activities such as vegetation treatments and mineral development.	Recreation would be more intensely managed and the current setting protected through designation of an additional two SRMAs. Best meets the goal of providing a broad spectrum of recreation settings and opportunities. Greater potential for displacement of recreational activities due to surface-disturbing activities than Alternative C, but less than Alternatives A or D.	Similar to Alternative B, except: Emphasizes less motorized recreation in more primitive settings. Least displacement of recreational activities due to less surface-disturbing activities.	Similar to Alternative B, except: More emphasis on motorized recreation opportunities than Alternatives B and C. Greatest displacement of recreational activities due to surface-disturbing activities, which could further reduce the quality of recreational experiences.

Table ES-4
Summary of Effects by Alternative *(continued)*

Alternative A (Current Management)	Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)	Alternative C	Alternative D
SUMMARY OF EFFECTS ON RENEWABLE ENERGY			
Least restrictions on renewable energy development. No net change in availability of biomass fuel from fuel treatments and timber harvesting activities.	More restrictions on renewable energy development than Alternatives A and D, and less than Alternative C. Greater opportunities for biomass (due to forest vegetation acres treated) than Alternative C, and less than Alternatives A and D.	Most restrictions on renewable energy development. Fewest opportunities for biomass (due to least forest vegetation acres treated).	More restrictions on renewable energy development than Alternative A, and less than Alternatives B and C. Greater opportunity for biomass (due to more forest vegetation acres treated) than Alternatives B and C, and less than Alternative A.
SUMMARY OF EFFECTS ON TRANSPORTATION AND TRAVEL MANAGEMENT			
Travel management would be the least restrictive. 85,308 acres would be Open to cross-country motorized travel. Within Limited areas, least density of designated routes. Alternative A would have the most potential for resource impacts and user conflicts.	Travel management would be the most restrictive. No areas would be Open to cross-country motorized travel (except snowmobiles). Within Limited areas, greater density of designated routes than Alternative A, but less density than Alternative D. Alternative B would best manage travel, roads, and trails to provide access and recreational opportunities, while minimizing resource impacts and user conflicts.	Similar to Alternative B, except: Alternative C would have more potential for resource impacts and user conflicts than Alternative B, and less than Alternatives A and D.	Travel management would be more restrictive than Alternative A but less restrictive than Alternatives B and C. 23,189 acres would be Open to cross-country motorized travel, a 74% decrease from current management. Within Limited areas, greatest density of designated routes. Alternative D would have more potential for resource impacts and user conflicts than Alternatives B and C, and less than Alternative A.

Table ES-4
Summary of Effects by Alternative *(continued)*

Alternative A (Current Management)	Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)	Alternative C	Alternative D
SUMMARY OF EFFECTS ON LANDS AND REALTY			
21,213 acres where realty authorizations prohibited. Alternative A is the only alternative that would specifically prohibit realty authorizations in ACECs. Retention of 96,465 acres of land and 35,361 acres available for disposal (12,000 acres of Land and Water Conservation Fund lands not available for disposal)	750 acres where realty authorizations prohibited. More land retention (113,728 acres) and less area available for disposal (30,098 acres) than Alternative A.	Same as Alternative B.	Same as Alternative B.
SUMMARY OF EFFECTS ON AREAS OF CRITICAL ENVIRONMENTAL CONCERN AND RESEARCH NATURAL AREAS			
Special management provisions would be applied to 18% of the BLM-administered lands (25,600 acres covered by 10 ACECs), leading to more ACECs than Alternative D, and fewer than Alternatives B and C.	Special management provisions would be applied to ~~24~~25% of the BLM-administered lands (36,153 ~~34,528~~ acres covered by 12~~11~~ ACECs), leading to more ACECs than Alternatives A and D, and fewer than Alternative C.	Special management provisions would be applied to 42% of the BLM-administered lands (60,661 acres covered by 15 ACECs), leading to the most ACECs.	Special management provisions would be applied to 17% of the BLM-administered lands (23,924 acres covered by 8 ACECs), leading to the fewest ACECs.
SUMMARY OF EFFECTS ON NATIONAL TRAILS			
No anticipated impacts to 21 miles of National Trails, with no change in protection and enhancement of National Trails.	Similar to Alternative A, except increased protection and enhancement of National Trails through designation of Upper Lolo Creek ACEC~~Same as Alternative A~~.	Same as Alternative B~~Similar to Alternative A, except increased protection and enhancement of National Trails through designation of Upper Lolo Creek ACEC~~.	Same as Alternative A.

Table ES-4
Summary of Effects by Alternative *(continued)*

Alternative A (Current Management)	Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)	Alternative C	Alternative D
SUMMARY OF EFFECTS ON WILD AND SCENIC RIVERS			
Protective management of 112 miles of the Lower Salmon River and 29 additional miles of suitable river segments along Lolo, Lake, Hazard and Hard Creeks to protect free-flowing and outstandingly remarkable values. Tentative designations could limit or preclude certain activities, uses, or authorizations on public lands.~~Continuing interim management of 112 miles of eligible river segments to protect free-flowing and outstandingly remarkable values. No miles of suitable rivers or river segments recommended for inclusion in the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System.~~	Same as Alternative A except management of 29 miles of preliminarily suitable segments would be coordinated with the Idaho Department of Water Resources to protect river values~~Continuing interim management of 112 miles of eligible river segments to protect free-flowing and outstandingly remarkable values. 29 miles of suitable rivers or river segments recommended for inclusion in the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System. Tentative designations could limit or preclude certain activities, uses, or authorizations~~.	Same as Alternative B. In addition all 29 miles of suitable rivers or river segments would be recommended for inclusion in the NWSRS which would increase the segments chances of becoming designated~~Same as Alternative B~~.	Same as Alternative B~~Similar to Alternative B, except 24 miles of suitable rivers or river segments recommended for inclusion in the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System~~.
SUMMARY OF EFFECTS ON WILDERNESS AND WILDERNESS STUDY AREAS			
Protective management of one Wilderness (750 acres) and two WSAs (10,872 acres) would continue, including discretionary and nondiscretionary closures to minerals, prohibiting motorized and mechanized vehicles in wilderness areas, excluding realty authorizations and managing wilderness areas and WSAs to maintain wilderness characteristics.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.

Table ES-4
Summary of Effects by Alternative *(continued)*

Alternative A (Current Management)	Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)	Alternative C	Alternative D
SUMMARY OF EFFECTS ON WATCHABLE WILDLIFE VIEWING SITES			
Continued management of four watchable wildlife areas on 24,435 acres, with no change in efforts to designate new areas, provide information, and cooperatively manage areas.	Similar to Alternative A, except increased efforts to designate new areas, provide information, and cooperatively manage areas.	Same as Alternative B.	Same as Alternative B.
SUMMARY OF EFFECTS ON NATIVE AMERICAN TRIBAL USES			
No changes in availability, access, or land use that would affect the natural resource base used by the tribes, including fish, game, plants, minerals, and springs would occur, so no net changes in the natural resource base are expected. In time recreational uses and public presence in some areas could affect the availability of resources, disturb culturally significant areas and inhibit religious use.	Vegetation treatment programs and animal habitat enhancement could enhance traditional tribal uses for those species and habitats. However, temporary, seasonal, and permanent closures of roads and other areas for treatment programs, public health and safety, or other reasons, while protecting resources, could also limit tribal access to and availability of resources in those areas. Increased recreational uses and public presence in some areas could affect the availability of resources, disturb culturally significant areas, and inhibit religious use.	Same as Alternative B.	Same as Alternative B.

Table ES-4
Summary of Effects by Alternative *(continued)*

Alternative A (Current Management)	Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)	Alternative C	Alternative D
SUMMARY OF EFFECTS ON NATIVE AMERICAN TRIBAL USES *(continued)*			
No changes to access or impacts on cultural resource sites, ethnographic resources, or traditional cultural properties are expected.	Ground disturbances, possible erosion, and increased public access associated with most resource management objectives could directly affect culturally significant areas and tribal use. Temporary, seasonal, and permanent closures of roads and other areas for treatment programs or other reasons, while protecting resources from additional public access and potential vandalism and looting, could also limit tribal access to and availability of resources in those areas. Additional efforts above and beyond those of current management to increase tribal consultations could better protect tribal use, tribal access, and cultural resources. Alterations in the setting of traditional cultural properties and ethnographic resource collection areas by promoting incompatible uses, such as harvesting, prescribed fires, Visual Resource Management designations, and increased recreational and motorized uses, could affect tribal use and access.	Same as Alternative B.	Same as Alternative B.

Table ES-4
Summary of Effects by Alternative *(continued)*

Alternative A (Current Management)	Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)	Alternative C	Alternative D
SUMMARY OF EFFECTS ON NATIVE AMERICAN TRIBAL USES *(continued)*			
No changes in current management are expected. As more people use the CFO, more demands combined with static management would decrease the general ecosystem health.	Efforts to maintain native plants, animals, and habitats in general could enhance the general ecosystem, water quality, and riparian areas for tribal use.	Same as Alternative B.	Same as Alternative B.
No changes in land tenure or land use are expected. No net changes or impairments to the future exercise of treaty rights are expected.	New restrictions on actions that would otherwise increase the likelihood of impacts on tribal use.	Same as Alternative B.	Same as Alternative B.
SUMMARY OF EFFECTS ON PUBLIC SAFETY—ABANDONED MINES AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS			
No change in potential protection of public health and safety through inventories, corrective actions, closures, and other mitigative measures aimed cleaning up abandoned mine lands and hazardous materials sites.	Increase in inventories, corrective actions, closures, and other mitigative measures over Alternatives A and D with hazardous materials sites closed to motorized vehicles.	Increase in inventories, corrective actions, closures, and other mitigative measures over Alternatives A and B. Alternative C would use ACEC designations to protect significant and at-risk closed and remediated sites.	Increase in inventories, corrective actions, closures, and other mitigative measures over Alternative A.

Table ES-4
Summary of Effects by Alternative *(continued)*

Alternative A (Current Management)	Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)	Alternative C	Alternative D
SUMMARY OF EFFECTS ON SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC CONDITIONS			
Recreation continues and increases (with population growth) as the largest contributor from CFO BLM lands to local economies. Variations across alternatives for levels of PSQ and AUMs and variations in NSO and CSU restrictions could result in small, localized changes to numbers of jobs in the timber, construction, ranching and mining industries. Levels of restoration actions also vary among alternatives resulting in small, localized changes to number of jobs in the contracting and construction industries.	Same as Alternative A	Same as Alternative A	Same as Alternative A