

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

ES.1 INTRODUCTION

The United States (US) Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management (BLM) has prepared this Proposed Resource Management Plan (RMP) and final environmental impact statement (EIS). The purposes of the document are to provide direction for managing public lands under the jurisdiction of the Idaho Falls District, Pocatello Field Office (PFO), in southeastern Idaho and to analyze the environmental effects that could result from implementing the alternatives addressed in this plan.

The PFO boundary defines the planning area, which encompasses 5,142,100 acres in Bannock, Bear Lake, Bingham, Bonneville, Caribou, Cassia, Franklin, Oneida, and Power Counties of southeastern Idaho. The BLM administers about 613,800 acres, or 12 percent of the planning area. Land ownership in the planning area is mixed and includes other lands administered by the federal government, the Fort Hall Indian Reservation, State of Idaho lands, and private property. Over 34 percent of the planning area is administered by the federal government, including the BLM, the US Department of Agriculture, Forest Service (Forest Service), and US Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS). **Table ES-1** highlights the ownership pattern of the planning area.

Table ES-1. Acres of Land Status within the Planning Area

Land Status	Acres	Percentage of Planning Area
BLM	613,800	12%
Forest Service	1,102,400	21%
US Fish and Wildlife Service refuges	35,900	1%
Fort Hall Indian Reservation	519,800	10%
State of Idaho	324,400	6%
Water	99,500	2%
Private	2,446,300	48%
TOTAL	5,142,100	100%

Note: Numbers are rounded to nearest 100 acres.

Management direction and actions outlined in this document apply only to BLM-managed public lands in the planning area and to federal mineral estate under BLM jurisdiction that may lie beneath other surface ownership. No specific measures have been developed for private, state, or other federal lands. However, given that private, state, and other federal lands are interspersed with public lands, these lands could be influenced or be indirectly affected by BLM management actions.

This document is being prepared using the BLM's planning regulations and guidance issued under the authority of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act (FLPMA) 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, Sections 1500-1508), and requirements of the BLM's NEPA Handbook, H-1790-1 (BLM 2008a).

ES.2 PURPOSE OF AND NEED FOR ACTION

The resource management planning process is a key tool that the BLM uses, in collaboration with tribal, federal, state, and local governments, and interested public parties, to ensure a coordinated and consistent approach to managing public lands. The RMP is being prepared to provide the PFO 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 multiple use management polices and actions on these lands.

The RMP is needed for the following reasons:

- Ecological, socioeconomic, institutional, and regulatory conditions have changed since the approval of the Malad Management Framework Plan (MFP) in 1981 and the Pocatello RMP in 1988;
- User demands and impacts have evolved, requiring new management direction; and
- The use of two separate plans to manage one administrative unit represents a fragmented approach and complicates decision making.

ES.3 PLANNING PROCESS AND PUBLIC COLLABORATION

ES.3.1 SCOPING

The planning process for this RMP began on November 14, 2001, with publication of the Notice of Intent in the *Federal Register*. To assist in the process, a public scoping and collaboration program was implemented and included producing a public scoping letter and briefing package. The BLM mailed these items on April 23, 2003, to the Shoshone-Bannock Tribal Council, Land Use Policy Commission, federal, state, and local agencies, interest groups, and members of the general public. The BLM PFO compiled the mailing list, which included over 800 entries. The scoping letter and briefing package were also made available for public view on the Internet in April 2003. The briefing package served to inform the recipients of the public scoping process, the scheduled open house scoping meetings, and background information on the purpose and need for the planning activity and identified the need for change topics. The scoping and collaboration program also included producing project newsletters, establishing a project Web site (www.id.blm.gov/planning/pocrmp), publishing newspaper articles, and issuing press releases.

The open house scoping meetings were held throughout southeastern Idaho in Montpelier on May 28, 2003, in Malad on May 29, 2003, in Fort Hall on June 5, 2003, in Pocatello on June 10, 2003, and in Soda Springs on June 11, 2003. The BLM provided the local media with press releases announcing the time, location, and purpose of these meetings. The format for the scoping meetings featured informal one-on-one discussions by individual interdisciplinary team members with members of the public.

ES.3.2 DISTRIBUTION AND AVAILABILITY OF THE DRAFT RMP/EIS

The Draft RMP/EIS was published and released in January 2007. On January 6, 2007, both the US Environmental Protection Agency and the BLM published a Notice of Availability in the

Federal Register. This 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 April 4, 2007.

The BLM issued a press release on January 4, 2007, and on January 25, 2007, which announced the availability of the Draft RMP/EIS and that four open houses would be held. The BLM also provided instructions on how to submit public comments in the press releases.

On January 5, 2007, the Draft RMP/EIS was available for downloading from the Idaho BLM Web site at www.blm.gov/id/st/en/fo/pocatello/planning/pocatello_resource.html. On the same day, the BLM distributed paper and electronic (CD-ROM) copies of the Draft RMP/EIS to approximately 365 parties, including elected officials, regulatory agencies, and members of the public. The BLM accommodated additional requests for paper or electronic copies of the Draft RMP/EIS after the initial distribution.

Open houses were held in Soda Springs, Malad City, Pocatello, and Fort Hall, Idaho, during the 90-day public review period. Each open house featured displays, maps, handouts, and interdisciplinary team resource specialists who provided information and answered questions. A total of 88 people attended the open houses.

ES.3.3 COMMENTS RECEIVED ON THE DRAFT RMP/EIS

The comment period closed on April 4, 2007. All written comments sent before 12:00 AM on April 5, 2007, were accepted as official comments. These included those sent by US mail postmarked on April 4, 2007, and electronic mail messages and facsimiles sent on April 4, 2007, regardless of when they were received. Some comments were duplicated with an electronic mail message and a letter submitted via US mail. Identical comments from the same party were considered only once.

Fifty-two written submissions were received, including one form e-mail sent by multiple parties (over 1,150 recorded e-mails), but they were counted only once in the totals. Most of the 52 written submissions contained multiple comments on different topics, for a total of 1,404 individual comments. 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** (Comments Received on Pocatello Draft RMP/EIS), and the BLM's response to each separate comment within each submission appears to the right of each comment.

ES.3.4 DISTRIBUTION AND AVAILABILITY OF THE PROPOSED RMP/FINAL EIS

A Notice of Availability will be published in the *Federal Register* to notify the public of the availability of the Proposed RMP/Final EIS. The Notice of Availability will also outline protest procedures during the 30-calendar-day protest period. The Proposed RMP/Final EIS will be available for downloading from the Idaho BLM Web site at www.blm.gov/id/st/en/fo/pocatello/planning/pocatello_resource.html. The Proposed RMP/Final EIS will also be available for review at the PFO. Press releases will be issued to notify the public of the Proposed RMP/Final EIS availability.

All recipients of the Draft RMP/EIS and all parties who submitted written comments on the Draft RMP/EIS will receive the Proposed RMP/Final EIS in either a hard copy or CD or will be

able to download it electronically from the Idaho BLM Web site. The PFO will notify those who previously received the Draft RMP/EIS electronically. The PFO maintains the distribution list for the Proposed RMP/EIS, which is available on request.

ES.4 NEED FOR CHANGE TOPICS AND 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, based on the need for change topics presented at the open house meetings. The planning team members identified these topics through an extensive review of the Malad MFP (1981) and the Pocatello RMP (1988). The need for change topics and land management direction to be developed for these topics is described in **Table ES-2**.

Table ES-2. Description of Need for Change/Management Direction by Resource/Use

Resource/Use	Description of Need for Change/Management Direction
Vegetation	Management direction is needed to 1) identify desired future condition of vegetation types, 2) maintain or move riparian areas toward proper functioning condition, and 3) identify reclamation guidance for rehabilitating public lands after disturbance, including mining activities, fire, or other ground-disturbing activities.
Special Status Species	Management direction is needed for all special status species habitat (flora and fauna), including greater sage-grouse, and other associated resource uses. This direction would be based on the most recent scientific guidance for the management of affected species.
Fire Management	Management direction is needed to 1) identify wildland fire use areas, 2) treatment levels, and 3) fire management restrictions.
Recreation	Management direction is needed to 1) identify off-highway vehicle (OHV) areas as open, limited, or closed, 2) identify over snow vehicle use limitations, 3) consider identifying the Oneida Narrows as a Special Recreation Management Area (SRMA) to provide enhanced direction for the increasing recreational use, and 4) protect river values and uses for the Blackfoot SRMA.
Lands and Realty	Management direction is needed to 1) identify management areas or zones of public lands planned for retention or available to be considered for disposal and 2) identify areas available for potential alternative energy development, such as wind, solar, or biomass, consistent with the President's National Energy Policy.
Minerals	Management direction is needed to address the process of mining and reclamation to ensure containment and control of hazardous substances, such as selenium and other potential contaminants, to make sure post mining land use is safe and productive, providing for future well-suited resources and uses.
Special Designations	Management direction is needed for the consideration of an Area of Critical Environmental Concern (ACEC) and Wild and Scenic River segments.

Therefore, while some programs, such as livestock grazing, were not initially identified as a need for change topic, their management direction may vary by alternative in order to address other resource concerns and specific management direction of other resources. Public comments received by the planning team on these need for change topics were reviewed, categorized, and analyzed to identify specific issues and concerns to be addressed in the Pocatello RMP. The

comments were analyzed and a scoping summary report was finalized in September 2003 (BLM 2003a). After considering public responses, the BLM identified six major planning issues, as follows:

ISSUE 1: OFF-HIGHWAY VEHICLE (OHV) MANAGEMENT

How will the increasing OHV use and associated conflicts be managed within the planning area?

ISSUE 2: PHOSPHATE MINING AND SELENIUM RELEASE

How does the BLM best manage the process of mining and reclamation to ensure containment and control of hazardous substances such as selenium and other potential contaminants?

ISSUE 3: PUBLIC ACCESS - ACQUIRING/MAINTAINING

How will the planning process address the need for acquiring and maintaining access to public lands while also protecting private property rights?

ISSUE 4: RECREATION MANAGEMENT

How will the increase in recreational use and demand for quality recreational opportunities be balanced within the planning area?

ISSUE 5: SAGEBRUSH ECOSYSTEMS

What effects will future management of sagebrush ecosystems have on greater sage-grouse and sagebrush-obligate species?

ISSUE 6: SOCIOECONOMICS

How will social and economic benefits of commodity and amenity uses be balanced within the planning area?

These issues drive the formulation of the plan alternatives, and addressing them has resulted in a range of management options presented in four alternatives. While other concerns are addressed in the plan, management related to them may or may not change by alternative. Additional discussion on each issue can be found in Chapter 1.

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 instead is applied as “Management Common to All Alternatives.”

The scoping report (BLM 2003a) provides a comprehensive list of issues outside the scope of the RMP. The major issues considered but not analyzed further are summarized below and will not be analyzed further for the reasons stated.

Eliminate all livestock grazing. The BLM is mandated to provide for multiple uses, including livestock grazing. The Idaho Standards for Rangeland Health and Guidelines for Livestock Grazing Management provides guidance to the BLM for evaluating the conditions of allotments. The BLM can adjust grazing activities to respond to land conditions.

Plan and zone private lands. The BLM does not have any authority to determine how private lands are used. Planning and zoning is done on a local level by county or municipal governments.

Control populations of beaver, raccoons, and predators, stock fish, and other wildlife management. The BLM manages habitat rather than populations and does not have the authority to determine what species will be or should be controlled or reintroduced. The RMP may identify areas or parameters to be considered when other agencies propose wildlife management activities.

Implementation of Grasslands Reserve Program initiatives. The Grasslands Reserve Program is not administered by the BLM, rather by the US Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service.

Conduct special research. Various commenters requested that the BLM conduct specialized research, such as effects of pesticides and herbicides on aquatic species and effects of power lines, energy corridors, and wind energy sites on wildlife populations. The BLM periodically conducts specific research related to implementation activities on a project basis but is not a research agency. Instead, the BLM contributes funding to other agencies or institutions to conduct research, which is implemented on a case-by-case basis.

Provide a designated transportation network. The RMP provides direction in terms of what areas would be closed, restricted to designated trails or roads, or open. A travel management plan that would provide specific route designations would be prepared after the travel management direction is approved as part of this RMP.

Control the flow of water through the Oneida Narrows. The BLM does not have the authority to manage the release of water through the Oneida Narrows. Management direction in the RMP recognizes the use of the water and flow variability.

Designate roadless areas as Wilderness Study Areas (WSA). The BLM is not proposing any additional WSAs. Thirteen existing ACECs¹ (six ACECs and seven Research Natural Areas (RNAs)) are redesignated in the proposed resource management plan with the Petticoat Peak RNA being proposed and evaluated.

¹ During the RMP planning process 7 ACECs and 7 RNAs were revisited and reviewed for appropriateness of the designation and management. However, during the summer of 2006 a wildland fire destroyed historical structures associated with the Van Komen Homestead ACEC. Thus, of the total 14 original ACECs and RNAs, 13 are proposed to be redesignated. In the Proposed RMP, management direction has been updated in which the Van Komen Homestead ACEC designation has been removed, with the area no longer managed as an ACEC.

ES.5 MANAGEMENT ALTERNATIVES

The basic goal of developing alternatives was to prepare different combinations of resource uses to address issues and to resolve conflicts among uses. Alternatives must meet the purpose and need, must be reasonable, must provide a mix of resource protection, management use, and development, must be responsive to the issues (each issue must be addressed in at least one alternative), must meet the established planning criteria (Chapter 1), and must meet federal laws, regulations, policies, and standards, including the multiple use mandates of FLPMA.

Four alternatives were developed and carried forward for detailed analysis in the Draft RMP/EIS. Alternative A, continuation of current management, was developed using available inventory data, existing planning and management documents and policies, and established land use allocations. The action alternatives (B, C, and D) were developed with input from public scoping and the BLM interdisciplinary team. Alternative B (identified as the Preferred Alternative in the Draft RMP/EIS) has been revised for the Proposed RMP/Final EIS based on public comments received on the Draft RMP/EIS. **Table ES-8** is a comparison between the Proposed Alternative and the other three alternatives.

All management under the Proposed RMP would comply with applicable laws, regulations, and BLM policy and guidance. All public lands would be managed in accordance with the Idaho Standards for Rangeland Health and Guidelines for Livestock Grazing Management.

ALTERNATIVE A (NO ACTION ALTERNATIVE)

The goal of Alternative A is to continue implementing the direction and actions contained in existing guidance, laws, plans, and policies that are currently in effect, in compliance with the Pocatello RMP and the Malad MFP. Current levels, methods, and mix of multiple use resource management of public lands in the planning area would continue. The current rate of accomplishment of all activities being implemented within the planning area would continue. A key component of Alternative A is managing the following:

- Special status species and their vegetation habitats to provide for their continued presence in accordance with applicable laws and regulations;
- Land tenure adjustments to protect resources while supporting appropriate development and improved public access to public lands;
- Minerals and energy resources and recreation to balance development and protect resources; and
- OHV designations would remain the same.

ALTERNATIVE B (PROPOSED RMP)

The actions described in this section would generally focus on a balanced combination of resource protection and resource use that would provide benefits for the broadest range of public uses. Constraints to protect resources would be implemented but would be less restrictive than under Alternative C. The Proposed RMP would accommodate a higher level of production of food, fiber, minerals, and services through use of public lands than would Alternative C, though to a lesser degree than under Alternative D. Resource values and special status species habitat

would be restored and enhanced, but to a lesser extent than under Alternative C. A key component of Alternative B is managing the following:

- Special status species and vegetation, with an emphasis on maintaining and improving important vegetation habitats (such as sagebrush steppe ecosystem) to provide for species' continued presence and conservation;
- Land tenure adjustments to improve administrative efficiency and protect resources, while supporting appropriate development and improved public access to public lands, with some emphasis on acquiring nonfederal lands;
- Minerals and energy resources to balance development and protect resources;
- OHV opportunities and use by designating public lands as "Limited" to existing routes, maintaining existing routes, limiting mechanized travel to designated routes in SRMAs and WSAs, moderate control of OHVs and minimal intensive use routes; and
- Fire, to include treatments with an emphasis on a broad range of vegetation types (such as Encroached Juniper, Low-Elevation Shrub, Mid-Elevation Shrub, Mountain Shrub, and Wet/Cold Conifer) to move toward Fire Regime Condition Class (FRCC-1).

ALTERNATIVE C

Alternative C would emphasize natural, cultural, scenic, wilderness, and recreation resources. Production of commodities from public lands would be secondary to protecting and enhancing resources, reflecting a reduction in resource production goals for food, fiber, and minerals in comparison to Alternatives B and D. In some cases and some areas, production would be excluded to protect sensitive resources. Management provisions under this alternative would accommodate undeveloped and nonmotorized recreation activities to a greater degree than the other alternatives. Some special management areas would be created to protect special status species and unique vegetative communities. A key component of Alternative C is managing the following:

- Special status species and vegetation, with an emphasis on maintaining and improving important habitats and managing habitats for both flora and fauna in identified priority areas;
- Land tenure adjustments to improve administrative efficiency and protect resources, while supporting appropriate development and improved public access to public lands and with a greater emphasis on acquiring nonfederal lands;
- Minerals and energy resources to provide for development but with an increased emphasis on conservation and protection of resources;
- OHV opportunities and use by designating public lands as "Limited" to existing routes, limiting mechanized travel to designated routes in SRMAs and WSAs, moderate to high control of OHVs, and expanding nonmotorized opportunities by reducing the number of designated routes. Controls and restrictions would be implemented to emphasize the conservation and protection of resources, such as wildlife, special status species, vegetation, soils, and riparian areas; and

- Fire, to include treatments with an emphasis on a broad range of vegetation types, such as seeding, Encroached Juniper, Low-Elevation Shrub, Mid-Elevation Shrub, Mountain Shrub, and Wet/Cold Conifer) to move toward FRCC 1, with an emphasis on actions to improve and restore greater sage-grouse habitat.

ALTERNATIVE D

The goal of Alternative D is to manage public lands in the planning area to develop and maintain a variety of recreation and other multiple-use opportunities. Economic benefits tied to livestock grazing and other commercial uses of public lands would also be promoted, and commodity production of resources within the planning area would be emphasized. Of the three action alternatives, this would have the least resource protection, but management would comply with land health standards. A key component of Alternative D is managing the following:

- Special status species and vegetation, with an emphasis on maintaining and improving important native vegetation habitats but at a lower level than either Alternative B or C. Management treatments would emphasize fiber and biomass production in the forested habitat types;
- Land tenure adjustments to improve administrative efficiency and protect resources, while supporting appropriate development and improved public access to public lands, with a greater emphasis on acquiring nonfederal lands, but only when necessary to enhance multiple use, to protect significant resource values, and to improve public lands administration;
- Minerals and energy resources to emphasize development but also to meet the minimal needs for conserving and protecting resources;
- OHV opportunities and use by designating public lands as “Limited” through maintaining and expanding designated OHV routes using existing trails and routes, minimal control of OHVs, and not restricting nonmotorized uses; and
- Fire, to include treatments with an emphasis on the broad range of vegetation types in the PFO to move toward FRCC 1, but with an emphasis on actions to mimic historical conditions, but reducing wildland fire by one-half.

ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED BUT NOT ANALYZED IN DETAIL

The following four alternatives were eliminated from further consideration because they violated the planning criteria established for the RMP: (1) developing, producing, or protecting one resource at the expense of other resources or uses, (2) designating all areas as either open or closed to OHV use, (3) restoring crested wheatgrass seedings to native species associated with the Low-Elevation Shrub vegetation type, and (4) not issuing new phosphate leases.

ES.6 CHANGES FROM THE DRAFT RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PLAN TO THE PROPOSED RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PLAN

As a result of public comment and internal BLM review, the BLM’s Preferred Alternative, identified as Alternative B as presented in the October 2006 Pocatello Draft RMP/EIS has been modified and is now considered the Proposed RMP for managing BLM-administered public lands in the PFO. The Proposed RMP is a refinement of Alternative B from the Draft RMP/EIS,

with consideration given to public comments, correction, and rewording for clarification of purpose and intent. The Draft RMP/EIS was available for a 90-day comment period ending on April 4, 2007. The Proposed RMP/Final EIS is designed to be used in conjunction with the Draft RMP/EIS for references to appendices and in regard to page numbers cited in the Proposed RMP/Final EIS comment and response section (**Appendix U**).

Modifications to Alternative B focused on addressing public comments, while continuing to meet the BLM's legal and regulatory mandates. 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 in **Appendix U** (Volume III).

New text throughout this Proposed RMP/Final EIS generally includes the following:

- Adjustments to Alternative B (the Proposed RMP);
- Additions to Chapter 3, Affected Environment;
- Clarifications to better explain the purpose and intent of management proposed in the Draft RMP/EIS or the environmental consequences;
- Incorporation of new information;
- Revisions to Chapter 4, Environmental Consequences, to make corrections and to reflect changes in management direction (Proposed RMP) and subsequent impact analysis;
- 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 is included in Chapter 2, **Table 2-1**. The environmental consequences of implementing the Proposed RMP (Alternative B from the Draft RMP/EIS, as edited) are described in Chapter 4.

CHANGES TO THE ALTERNATIVES (CHAPTER 2)

Alternative B from the Draft RMP/EIS has been modified and now represents the Proposed RMP. Modifications to Alternative B from the Draft RMP/EIS include the following, which is based on public comment and internal review:

- Additional discussion regarding a no grazing alternative was added to the section, Alternatives Considered but Eliminated from Detailed Analysis;
- Cultural Resources—Language has been added to clarify the management of cultural resources;
- Tribal Treaty Rights and Interest—A new goal with an objective and management actions was added recognizing tribal Treaty Rights and Interests related to traditional/cultural uses and the health of the land and water resources (including the 1868 Fort Bridger Treaty);

- Soils and Water—New management direction has been added regarding roads and trails adjacent to streams or riparian areas that impact water quality;
- Vegetation—For the Aspen/Aspen Conifer Mix and Dry Conifer vegetation types, the objective has been updated, increasing the desired percent of Land Health Condition (LHC) in LHC-B and reducing the percentage in LHC-C;
- Special Status Species
 - Action has been edited to clarify the BLM’s intent on managing for special status species. Conservation measures and guidelines that the BLM would consider have been clarified. Text has been added regarding management for the bald eagle, which has been delisted. Additional management direction has been added under the Wildland Fire Management subsection, clarifying that human life and firefighter safety and property take priority over species protection;
 - Management direction has been edited to reference the Conservation Plan for the Greater Sage-grouse in Idaho (2006).
 - Additionally, “key habitat” was added as a priority for protecting and maintaining greater sage-grouse suitable habitat, and the distance to protect leks from permitted activities was updated;
 - Greater sage-grouse references (e.g., Connelly et. al.) used in the RMP/Draft EIS (2006) are identical to those in the Conservation Plan for the Greater sage-grouse in Idaho (July 2006). However, since the RMP/Draft EIS was in final production prior to the release of the Idaho conservation plan, references for sage-grouse, such as Connelly et al were used. Subsequently sage-grouse references have been updated to the Conservation Plan for the Greater sage-grouse in Idaho (July 2006) in the Proposed Plan/Final EIS to reflect current knowledge and information for sage-grouse and in refining management direction for buffers consistent with guidelines in the Idaho plan.
 - Management direction to protect sage-grouse leks from disturbances was clarified, using buffers of 0.6 and 2.0 miles as identified in the Conservation Plan for the Greater Sage-grouse in Idaho (2006) to distinguish between temporary human disturbance near active leks and permanent infrastructure surface occupancy near occupied leks. This distinction between buffers for active and occupied leks is more discriminating because of the temporary or permanent nature of the disturbance but resulted in approximately the same number of acres being analyzed as in the RMP/Draft EIS and does not represent an addition or expansion to any allocation identified in the Draft EIS. This difference in acres can be attributed to the fact that most leks are not located on BLM-administered public lands.
 - Management direction has been rewritten to clarify management for Columbian sharp-tailed grouse, revising the mileage requirement from known leks for maintaining vegetation in suitable condition (LHC-A) for nesting and brood rearing. Additionally, the distance to protect Columbian sharp-tailed grouse leks from permitted activities was updated;
 - Management direction has been modified to clarify the BLM’s intent regarding management of migratory bird species habitat and management of large spring

systems, to prevent possible extirpation of spring-dependent species, such as springsnails;

- Wildland Fire Management
 - Actions have been added regarding the BLM's collaborative efforts between federally recognized tribes (e.g., Shoshone-Bannock Tribes) during proposed fire and nonfire vegetation treatments;
 - A new objective and management direction has been added to indicate that the BLM will use appropriate management response for fire suppression to protect listed species and related habitat;
 - Management direction has been revised to clarify the BLM's intent regarding fire and nonfire vegetation treatments as they relate to restoring or improving natural or cultural resource values. Additional management direction has been added to clarify fire and nonfire vegetation treatment restrictions for listed species' occupied habitat and designated critical habitat;
 - Changes have been made to management actions to further explain the BLM's intent on managing public lands to protect, improve, or enhance resources and values at risk;
 - The amount of footprint acres treated for the Aspen/Aspen Conifer vegetation type has been modified;
 - Objectives and management actions have been added to address wildland fire management and its effect on greater sage-grouse source habitats, restoration, and key habitats;
- Livestock Grazing
 - Changes have been made to further clarify the BLM's management direction regarding livestock grazing management following wildland fires and fire and nonfire vegetation treatments;
 - Management direction has been modified regarding the Blackfoot Stock Driveway allotments;
- Minerals and Energy Resources
 - Management direction has been modified to further clarify split-estate land stipulations, mitigation, and reclamation requirements;
 - Changes have been made to modify management direction within development areas. The operational guidelines have been modified to clarify direction regarding mine pits;
 - Changes have been made to the "Standards for CWA Regulated Surface Waters" table, specifying contaminants and micrograms per liter;
 - The objective identifying acres available for fluid minerals leasing has been revised. In addition to WSAs identified as closed to fluid mineral leasing, the Curlew area is identified as administratively unavailable in order to protect the Sagebrush Steppe habitat, other sagebrush obligate species habitat and winter ranges, and special status species, such as greater sage-grouse and sharp-tailed grouse. Management direction regarding no surface occupancy for fluid minerals has been revised to clarify those areas and resources that are protected also;

- Management direction has been updated to clarify actions on field drainages or mineral trespass of federally reserved minerals;
- Recreation
 - Management direction has been updated to include the Campground SRMA;
 - Management direction has been updated to clarify OHV use on public lands. Additionally, language has been modified prohibiting cross-country travel;
 - Big game winter range has been added to the list of area restrictions for snowmobiling;
 - Criteria and prioritization for travel management planning has been modified;
- Administrative Designations
 - Language has been added to clarify management direction for WSAs if Congress releases them from wilderness consideration;
 - A management objective has been modified identifying the number of designated ACEC/RNAs from 14 to 13;
 - A management objective has been added to remove the ACEC designation for the Van Komen Homestead because it was burned in a wildland fire; and
 - A management objective has been added to designate Petticoat Peak as an ACEC.

CHANGES TO THE AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT (CHAPTER 3)

Chapter 3 of the Draft RMP/EIS has been adjusted as follows:

- Section 3.2.1, Air Quality, has been updated to reflect that, on August 14, 2006, the Portneuf Valley area was redesignated to attainment for the PM₁₀ National Ambient Air Quality Standards;
- Section 3.2.2, Cultural Resources, has been edited to add an additional subsection (3.2.2.4., Tribal Treaty Rights and Interest);
- Section 3.2.5, Vegetation, has been updated to:
 - Reflect additional information on microbiotic crusts;
 - Add information regarding the number of stream miles that support riparian vegetation (165 miles), as well as the percentages of PFO riparian area conditions in proper functioning condition and those in nonfunctioning condition; and
 - Add information regarding invasive species/noxious weeds;
- Section 3.2.7, Special Status Species, has been updated to:
 - Reflect the bald eagle delisting effective June 28, 2007;
 - Add new information on the greater sage-grouse, specifically the most recent conservation plan published in 2006 by the Idaho Sage-Grouse Advisory Committee; and
 - Add information on the greater sage-grouse including additional discussion on threats to sage-grouse within Idaho.
- Section 3.2.9, Water Resources, has been updated to add information about 303(d) streams. **Figure 3-10** has been added, and **Table 3-16** has been updated;

- Section 3.3.3, Livestock Grazing, has been updated to illustrate that lands adjacent to the Blackfoot Reservoir and Grays Lake National Wildlife Refuge have been withdrawn to the Bureau of Indian Affairs, in connection with the Fort Hall Irrigation Project;
- Section 3.3.4, Mineral Resources, has been updated to explain scheduling for investigating selenium releases from four active phosphate mines and 11 inactive mines;
- Section 3.4.1, Areas of Critical Environmental Concern, has been updated to add information regarding the wildland fire that destroyed the structures of the Van Komen Homestead ACEC in August 2006;
- Section 3.5.1, Socioeconomic Resources, has been updated to:
 - Add information regarding the percentage of people in each county with no high school education; and
 - Add information regarding the Fort Hall Indian Reservation (Section 3.5.2.3).

CHANGES TO THE ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES (CHAPTER 4)

Chapter 4 of the Draft RMP/EIS has been modified as follows:

- This chapter has been edited to improve readability, clarify intent, and make corrections that reflect BLM changes and comments provided by the public;
- In consideration of and response to public comments, the Curlew area has been identified as administratively unavailable to fluid minerals leasing. The analysis associated with this management direction change has been updated throughout Chapter 4 for affected resources and resource uses; and
- Analysis of greater sage-grouse direction was clarified.

CHANGES TO APPENDICES (VOLUME III OF DRAFT RMP/EIS)

The Draft RMP/EIS appendices have been adjusted as follows:

- Appendix B—New text has been added to recognize an additional Executive Order and the Fort Bridger Treaty;
- Appendix C—Numbering of management actions and objectives have been updated to be consistent with the Proposed RMP;
- Appendix D—Text has been revised for clarity (purpose and intent) and to correct noted typographical errors;
- Appendix E—Numbering of management actions and objectives have been updated to be consistent with the Proposed RMP;
- Appendix F—Disposal parcels from the Malad MFP were added and header text was modified;
- Appendix H—Text has been updated regarding seasonal restrictions;
- Appendix I—Numbering of management actions and objectives have been updated to be consistent with the Proposed RMP;
- Appendix Q—Clarification language has been added regarding the processing of Notices of Intent and Applications for a Permit to Drill for fluid mineral exploration;

- Appendix S— Shoshone-Bannock Tribes Policy Statements ;
- Appendix T— Biological Assessment, Addendums, and USFWS Concurrence Memos; and
- Appendix U— Draft RMP/EIS Public Comment Letters and the BLM’s response.

CHANGES TO MAPS (VOLUME III OF DRAFT RMP/EIS)

The Draft RMP/EIS maps (Volume III of the Draft RMP/EIS) have been modified as follows:

- **Figure 3-2** has been updated to remove information about the Portneuf non-attainment area (NAA), which is now in attainment;
- Attributes for steep slopes, highly erodible soils, and riparian vegetation have been added to **Figures 2-8, 2-18, 2-31, and 2-39**. The administratively unavailable Curlew area and all No Surface Occupancy stipulations within the PFO area were revised in **Figure 2-18**;
- Management direction for phosphate lease closures has been updated; as a result, **Figure 2-32** has been deleted and phosphate lease closures for Alternative C are now shown on **Figure 2-19**;
- Management direction for OHV designations has been updated; as a result, **Figure 2-34** has been deleted and OHV designations for Alternative C are now shown on **Figure 2-22**. Big game winter range was added to **Figure 2-22** as an area where snowmobile use would be restricted to designated routes; and
- **Figure 3-10**, Key Water Features, was added.

Figures 2-32 through 2-40 and Figures 3-10 through 3-20 have been renumbered from the Draft RMP/EIS to reflect the revision denoted above.

ES.7 ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES

Alternative A (No Action Alternative) would be a continuation of current management. Alternative B (the Proposed RMP) 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 a greater impact on the local economies and businesses that depend on the public lands in the planning area for tourism, recreation, and resource extraction. Conversely, Alternative D offers the greatest economic potential but greatest potential impact on the physical and biological environment.

Impacts under Alternative B (the Proposed RMP) tend to be within the range of Alternatives C and D. 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 unavoidable adverse impacts of the alternatives. **Table ES-9** provides a summary of the environmental impacts and differences of each alternative, including in the Proposed RMP.

ES.8 RATIONALE FOR THE IDENTIFICATION OF THE PROPOSED RMP— ALTERNATIVE B

Alternative A, the No Action Alternative, minimally addresses relevant issues identified through public scoping and required components of the land use planning document. Thus Alternative A was dismissed because it did not adequately address issues/concerns identified by the public, required planning components, and concerns of the planning team.

Alternatives C and D address both the identified relevant issues and required components necessary in a land use planning document with varying degrees of flexibility, protection, conservation, and establishment of allowable uses. Alternatives C and D address the public's issues/concerns through identified management direction, as well as the purpose and need, but they lack a balance between resources and resource use allocations.

Alternative B—The Proposed RMP, after tribal and public comments received have been analyzed and changes incorporated (see Chapter 1, Section 1.13, and Chapter 2, Section 2.6), provides the most reasonable and practical approach to managing the public lands resources and uses while addressing the relevant issues and purpose and need. It provides a balanced approach to public lands management, with an appropriate level of flexibility to meet the overall needs of the resources and use allocations. This alternative represents proactive management and provides flexibility to adjust to changing conditions over time, while emphasizing a level of protection, restoration, enhancement, and use of resources and services into the future.

ES.9 ADDRESSING RELEVANT ISSUES IN THE ALTERNATIVES

Public comments received during the public scoping open houses helped to identify issues that shaped the formulation and development of the action alternatives. In turn, the alternatives may address one or more specific relevant issues to varying degrees, or an action alternative may simply be silent for a particular issue. Section 1.4.3 in Chapter 1 provides more detail on issue identification.

Following is a general discussion of how each of the six “relevant issues” identified for this planning process may or may not be addressed by the action alternatives.

Issue 1: How would increasing OHV use and associated conflicts be managed?

The BLM proposes to actively manage OHVs in order to provide a quality OHV experience, while protecting resources and providing opportunities for other user groups (e.g., primitive recreation). Under the action alternatives, the BLM would close about 12,700 acres to protect resources and prevent user conflicts and would limit OHV use on public lands throughout the planning area. These limitations may include restricting the number or types of vehicles, limiting the time or season of use, restricting to permitted or licensed use only, and limiting use to existing and designated roads and trails. The BLM may place other limitations to protect resources, particularly in areas that OHV enthusiasts use intensively or where they participate in competitive events. To avoid conflicts between winter users and to protect sensitive habitats, the alternatives vary in how and where snowmobiling can take place. **Table ES-3** summarizes the OHV designations by alternative, identifying those acreages that are “Open,” “Limited,” “Closed,” or “Not Designated.”

Table ES-3. Summary of OHV Designations by Alternative

OHV Designation	Alternative (acres)			
	A	B	C	D
Open	61,300	0.0	0.0	0.0
Limited	199,000	601,100	601,100	601,100
All vehicles limited to designated routes, snowmobiling not allowed	N/A	[62,100]	[62,100]	[28,700]
All vehicles limited to designated routes, including snowmobiles	N/A	[286,500]	[286,500]	[0.0]
All vehicles limited to designated routes, except snowmobiles, which would not be restricted	N/A	[252,500]	[252,500]	[572,400]
Closed	1,300	12,700	12,700	12,700
Not Designated	352,200	0.0	0.0	0.0

Note: Bracketed numbers are subset acres that total the Limited acres for each alternative.

After the RMP is implemented, the BLM would conduct a public travel management planning process to further define how OHV use would be managed in the “Limited” areas. Each alternative provides a different emphasis regarding motorized, nonmotorized, and mechanized type travel.

- Alternative A would maintain a passive management approach, favoring open travel. While providing the most unencumbered OHV experience, it would not protect resources or resolve user conflicts;
- Alternative B provides for legitimate intensive uses, such as rock crawling, motocross riding, or any other valid motorized activities by emphasizing designated appropriate areas for these activities in front country or rural settings. Intensive use areas would not exceed 80 acres;
- Alternative C emphasizes establishing fewer designated routes for motorized vehicles, especially in important sensitive species habitat, winter range, and calving/fawning areas; and
- Alternative D provides for legitimate intensive uses, such as rock crawling, motocross riding, or any other valid motorized activities, by emphasizing designated appropriate areas for these activities in front country or rural settings. Intensive use areas would not exceed a “footprint” larger than 320 acres.

Issue 2: How would mining/reclamation efforts be managed to ensure containment of hazardous substances (e.g., selenium) and other contaminants?

Under all alternatives, the BLM would implement a number of objectives and actions to address this issue. Below is a representative sample of such actions (see Management Guidance Common to Action Alternatives, Minerals and Energy for more information):

- Operational Standards and Guidelines are proposed and would be implemented to reduce impacts from mineral exploration and development;

- Idaho Standards for Rangeland Health would be used to determine success of reclamation efforts;
- Interagency contaminant levels for groundwater, surface water, and vegetation are established for reclamation efforts;
- Best management practices or other appropriate techniques would be applied to control sedimentation and release of contaminants;
- In reclamation, plants known to reduce the risk of bioaccumulation would be used if a hazard is present;
- Sites would be monitored and vegetation would be tested for bioaccumulation; and
- Phosphate mine site plans would be designed to meeting the goals of the Interagency Area-Wide Investigation of Phosphate Mine Contamination and Final Risk Management.

Issue 3: How would the need for acquiring and maintaining access to public lands be addressed, while protecting private property rights?

Under all action alternatives, the BLM would implement a goal focused specifically on maintaining and acquiring access to public lands. A variety of realty tools (e.g., fee acquisition, easements, conservation easements, and donation) would be used to acquire access from willing sellers. The BLM would focus on priority acquisition areas, which include known access conflicts. All land tenure adjustments (including acquisition and disposal) would include public access as part of the proposed screening process. Access to public lands would be retained across lands transferred out of federal ownership. The BLM would coordinate with other entities, such as counties, to identify legal access and use the Cooperative Rights-of-Way Agreement between the BLM and the State of Idaho to acquire access across state lands, as needed.

Issue 4: How would increasing use of and demand for quality recreation opportunities be balanced with other resources and uses?

Under all alternatives, SRMAs would be proposed to provide specific structured recreational opportunities, such as activity, experience, and benefit opportunities. SRMAs would be priority areas for recreational funding and would be managed to target specific activities, thereby controlling user conflicts. As shown on **Table ES-4**, Alternatives B and C propose the most SRMAs (four) and Alternatives A and D the fewest (two).

Table ES-4. Comparison of Special Recreation Management Areas and Extensive Recreation Management Areas (ERMAs)

SRMA/ERMA	Alternative (acres)			
	A	B	C	D
Pocatello SRMA	33,400	33,400	33,400	33,400
Blackfoot River SRMA	21,800	21,800	21,800	21,800
Oneida Narrows SRMA	N/A	3,600	3,600	N/A
Campgrounds SRMA	N/A	430	430	N/A
Pocatello ERMA	558,600	554,570	554,570	558,600

The remaining public lands in the planning area would be managed as an extensive recreation management area (ERMA), which generally provides a less developed, primitive experience. Under all alternatives, management of ERMAs is clarified and focuses on minimizing user conflicts and monitoring for visitor satisfaction.

As discussed above, the BLM proposes to actively manage OHV use to protect resources and minimize conflicts with other user groups. Future travel management planning would incorporate the intent and purpose of the SRMAs to maximize user experiences and protect resources.

Issue 5: How would the sagebrush ecosystem be managed to balance resources and use demands with greater sage-grouse and sagebrush obligate species?

All alternatives focus on managing shrub steppe vegetation to achieve LHC A, which represents a healthy and diversified sagebrush ecosystem. Among the alternatives, the BLM is proposing a variety of fire and nonfire vegetation treatments to achieve LHC A. **Table ES-5** provides the expected acreage of the public lands shrub steppe type, achieving the different LHCs at year 30 post treatments.

Table ES-5. Projected Acres of Shrub Steppe by Land Health Condition Class at Year 30

LHC	Current	Alternative (acres)			
		A	B	C	D
A	295,972	344,500	359,000	344,500	368,700
B	111,596	63,100	0.0	0.0	0.0
C	77,632	77,600	126,200	140,700	116,500

In addition to vegetation treatments, all action alternatives propose closing and limiting OHV travel (see above). This would help protect remaining healthy sagebrush ecosystems. Management of ACECs and RNAs, most notably the Dairy Hollow RNA, would help protect sagebrush from conflicting uses.

Issue 6: How would social and economic benefits of commodity and amenity uses be balanced?

As discussed in Chapter 1, the vision of the RMP is to sustain healthy and functional ecosystems, while meeting the multiple use mandate of FLPMA. All alternatives follow this vision and meet all federal laws, but they vary to some degree in the level of resource protection, opportunities for resource extraction, and recreational benefits. None of the action alternatives are expected to notably alter local population trends, employment levels, demands for public services, or other demographics. There would be intrinsic tradeoffs between market-based economic benefits and nonmarket social benefits among the alternatives. For example, Alternatives B and D would provide the greatest long-term economic opportunities because they contain the fewest encumbrances to development and resource extraction, while Alternative C provides more nonmarket values, such as preserving sensitive areas and promoting primitive nonmotorized experiences. Under Alternatives B and C, up to five percent of public lands may be disposed of, while up to 10 percent may be disposed of under Alternative D. Most of these lands are in fragmented ownership patterns, so any market-based activities, such as grazing, would likely continue. **Table ES-6** provides some indicators to highlight some of the social and economic

benefits and tradeoffs. Due to the personal preference of assessing benefits, these indicators should be considered only as examples.

Table ES-6. Comparison of Alternatives by Example Social and Economic Tradeoff Indicators

Indicator	Alternative (approximate acres ¹)			
	A	B	C	D
Acres available for livestock grazing	556,300	560,000	555,300	527,800
Open to solid minerals leasing	591,200	582,400	582,400	597,500
Discretionary closure for solid leasable minerals	11,400	20,200	20,200	5,100
Discretionary closure for mineral materials	21,500	20,200	57,800	5,100

Table ES-6. Comparison of Alternatives by Example Social and Economic Tradeoff Indicators (continued)

Indicator	Alternative (approximate acres ¹)			
	A	B	C	D
Discretionary closure for locatable minerals	1,500	19,200	19,200	1,500
Wildlife habitat protected by fluid Mineral a No Surface Occupancy (NSO) stipulation	80,600	98,000	143,500	84,100
Proposed acres for possible disposal	32,000	28,150	24,950	60,700
Acres excluded to land use authorizations (e.g., rights-of-way)	30,700	1,900	1,900	0.0
Acres in WSAs, ACECs and RNAs	22,600	22,100	22,100	22,600

¹ All acre figures are rounded to nearest 100 acres.

As discussed above, the BLM implemented an extensive public collaboration process to solicit and address public input. In addition, the BLM conducted formal public scoping and prepared a scoping report summarizing public input. The Shoshone-Bannock Tribes, USFWS, and Idaho Department of Fish and Game (IDFG) are participating agencies with whom the BLM collaborated in developing the RMP. The BLM also coordinated with private landowners and other special interest groups. Additionally, the BLM consulted and coordinated with federal, state, county, and local government elected officials and representatives. Communication is ongoing and will continue through the implementation of the plan. Chapter 5 provides a discussion of coordination and consultation.

An interdisciplinary team of resource specialists from the BLM PFO prepared this document. Tetra Tech, Inc., and Maxim Technologies, Inc., a subsidiary of Tetra Tech, assisted the BLM in preparing these documents and in the planning process (**Table ES-7**). Also providing assistance were Yvette Tuell and Claude Broncho of the Shoshone-Bannock Tribes, Jim Mende of IDFG,

Troy Smith and Deb Mignogno of the USFWS, Lloyd W. Briggs of the Idaho Falls District Resource Advisory Committee, and the US Department of Agriculture, Forest Service.

Table ES-7. List of Preparers

Name	Years Experience	Role/Responsibility	Education
POCATELLO FIELD OFFICE			
Candida Aguirre	16	Lands and Realty	BLM Lands and Realty Professional Development Studies
Jim Bowmer	3	Forestry, Vegetation	BS, Forest Resources
Ray Brainard	30 (Retired)	Forestry, Vegetation	BS, Forestry Management MS, Forestry
Jeff Cundick	17	Minerals, Oil and Gas, Geothermal Resources	BS, Mining Engineering MBA, Business

Table ES-7. List of Preparers (continued)

Name	Years Experience	Role/Responsibility	Education
Cleve B. Davis	6	Special Status Species (flora), Vegetation	BS, Botany
Amy Lapp	3	Cultural Resources	MS, Anthropology, BA, Anthropology
Geoff Hogander	28 (Retired)	Fish and Wildlife, Vegetation, Air, Soils and Geology	BS, Fish and Wildlife Management
Brian Holmes	4	GIS	BS, Zoology MS, Biology
James Kumm	19	Fish and Wildlife, Special Status Species (fauna), Vegetation	BS, Wildlife Biology MS, Wildlife Sciences
Becky Lazdauskas	12	Lands and Realty	BS, Natural Science
Blaine Newman	13	Recreation, Visual Resources, Special Designations	BS, Wildland Recreation Management
Paul Oakes	33 (Retired)	RMP/EIS Planning Coordinator	BA, Biology, Graduate studies in soils
Dave Pacioretty	20	Field Office Manager	BS, Rangeland Science
Matt Rendace	25	Vegetation, Livestock Grazing	BS, Range Management
Terry Lee Smith	21	RMP/EIS Project Manager, Fire Management, Socioeconomics, Cultural/Paleontology, and Vegetation	BS, Agriculture MS, Forestry and Range Management
Mitch Werner	18	Writer, Editor	BBA, Marketing/Film and Video Production
US FISH AND WILDLIFE			
Troy Smith	1	Wildlife, Special Status Species	BS, Wildlife Resources MS, Forest Science
IDAHO FISH AND GAME			
Martha Wackenhut	8	Wildlife, Special Status Species	BS, Wildlife MS, Biology/Zoology
CONTRACTOR – TETRA TECH, INC.			
Cynthia Adornetto	24	Project Manager, Greater Sage-Grouse Analysis, QA/QC, Document Production, Administrative Record	MEPM, Environmental Policy and Management, University of Denver; BS, Natural Resources Management, Colorado State University

Table ES-7. List of Preparers (continued)

Name	Years Experience	Role/Responsibility	Education
Kevin T. Doyle	18	Cultural Resources and Paleontological Resources, Tribal Treaty Rights and Interests	BA, University of California, Santa Barbara
Michael Egan*	17	Mineral Resources	BS, Geology, Montana State University
Cameo Flood	20	Forestry, Fire Management	BS, Forest Resource Management, University of Montana
Derek Holmgren	7	Lands and Realty, Visual Resources	MPA, Environmental Policy and Administration and MSES, Indiana University; BS and BA, Oregon State University
W. Wynn John*	5	Air Quality	MS, Geological Engineering, University of Utah; BS, Environmental Earth Science, University of Utah
Genevieve Kaiser	15	Socioeconomics, GIS	MS, Energy Management and Policy, University of Pennsylvania; BA, Economics, College of William and Mary; Professional Certification: GIS, University of Denver
David Kane*	18	Vegetation, Invasive Species Management, Fire Management, Livestock Grazing	PhD, Ecology and Conservation Biology, University of Denver; BS, Wildlife Ecology, University of Wyoming
Matt Loscalzo	6	QA/QC, Document Production, Administrative Record	MS, Environmental Studies, University of Colorado; BA, Political Science, Binghamton University
Neil Lynn*	6	Biological Assessment, Greater Sage-Grouse Analysis, Administrative Record	BS, Wildlife Biology, Colorado State University
Mike Manka*	12	Special Status Species, Fish and Wildlife, Wilderness Study Areas, Wild and Scenic Rivers	BS, Biological Sciences, Ecology and Systematics, Cornell University
Joy McLain	9	Water Quality, Special Status Species	BS, Environmental Health/Biology minor, Boise State University
Bindi Patel*	4	Socioeconomics, Environmental Justice	MEM, Duke University; BA, Washington and Lee University
David Steed	14	Initial Assistant Project Manager	BS, Idaho State University
Randolph Varney	16	Writer, Editor	MFA in Writing, University of San Francisco; BA, Technical and Professional Writing, San Francisco State University
Walt Vering	12	Aquatic Resources	MS, University of Wisconsin, Stevens Point; BA, Wartburg College
Valerie Waldorf*	10	GIS, Socioeconomic Support, Public Participation (newsletters)	MBA, University of Utah; BS, Westminster College

Table ES-7. List of Preparers (continued)

Name	Years Experience	Role/Responsibility	Education
Ed Yates*	14	Compliance Oversight	JD, Law, University of San Diego School of Law; BA, Political Science, University of California, Davis
Ann Zoidis	12	QA/QC	MS, Physiology and Behavioral Biology, San Francisco University; BA, Geological Sciences, Smith College
SUBCONTRACTOR – EMPSi: ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT AND PLANNING SOLUTIONS, INC.			
Angie Adams*	13	Recreation, Administrative Designations	BA, Biology, Drake University
David Batts*	15	Project Manager, Water Resources and Soils	MS, Natural Resource Planning, Michigan State University; BS, International Development, Lewis and Clark College
Holly Prohaska*	8	Livestock Grazing	MS, Environmental Management, University of San Francisco; BA, Marine Science, Biological Pathway, University of San Diego
Kate Wynant*	3	Document Production/ Technical Review, Administrative Record	BA, Environmental Studies, University of Colorado
Jennifer Zakrowski*	10	Project Manager, Recreation and Administrative Designations	MSM, Project Management, Regis University; BS, Public Affairs, emphasis in Natural Resource Management, Indiana University

*Former employee of Tetra Tech, Inc.

ES.12 COMPARISON OF THE ALTERNATIVES AND ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES

Table ES-8 provides a summary of the primary differences between the Proposed RMP (Alternative B in the Draft RMP/EIS published October 2006) and the other three alternatives. In general, only those resources and uses that have been identified as being a planning issue or need for change topic have differences between the alternatives.

Table ES-9 provides a summary of the impacts on the human and natural environment in terms of environmental, social, and economic consequences that are proposed to occur from implementing the Proposed RMP (Alternative B in the Draft RMP/EIS published October 2006) and the three other alternatives presented in Chapter 2.

Table ES-8. Summary Comparison of Alternatives

General (GE)			
ALTERNATIVE A	PROPOSED RMP	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
<p>Goal GE-1. Continuously update resource and use information/data in order to proactively address changing needs and or conditions. (GE-1)</p> <p>Objective CA-GE-1.1. Inventories and surveys documenting the condition and extent of resources/uses are given sufficient emphasis to monitor changes in conditions, provide "measurements" of ecosystem health or baseline data/information, and enable specialists to respond to changes when needed. (PP-GE-1.1)</p>			
<p>Goal GE-2. Consistent with multiple use management and sustained yield, achieve desired resource and use conditions while providing for an ecologically healthy environment. (GE-2)</p> <p>Objective CA-GE-2.1. Reduce impacts from management actions, and maintain or improve resource conditions. (PP-GE-2.1)</p>			
<p>Goal GE-3. Provide for proper nutrient cycling, hydrological cycling and energy flow consistent with multiple use management and sustained productivity. (GE-3)</p> <p>Objective AA-GE- 3.1. Restore or improve the public lands adversely affected by major surface disturbance resulting from activities such as but not limited to mineral and energy development, wildland fire, and rights-of way (ROW) development. (PP-GE-3.1)</p>			
RESOURCES			
Air Quality (AQ)			
ALTERNATIVE A	PROPOSED RMP	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
<p>Goal AQ-1. Comply with existing laws and regulations to meet health and safety requirements.</p>			
Objective CA-AQ-1.1. Reduce particulate impacts from uncontrolled wildland fires.	No similar objective	Objective CA-AQ-1.1. Reduce particulate impacts from uncontrolled wildland fires.	Objective CA-AQ-1.1. Reduce particulate impacts from uncontrolled wildland fires.
Objective CA-AQ-1.2. Control the particulate level impacts from permitted/authorized activities. (PP-AQ-1.1)			

Cultural Resources (CR)			
ALTERNATIVE A	PROPOSED RMP	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
<p>Goal CR-1. Provide for the identification, protection, and enhancement of historical and cultural sites to ensure scientific and socio-cultural values are maintained and are available for appropriate uses by present and future generations. (CR-1)</p> <p>Objective CA-CR-1.1. Manage important known and future identified cultural and historical sites to maintain and preserve their educational, scientific, and public benefit. (PP-CR-1.1.)</p> <p>Objective CA-CR-1.2. Reduce imminent threats from natural or human-caused deterioration, or potential conflict with other resource uses. (PP-CR-1.2.)</p>			
Tribal Treaty Rights and Interests (TR)			
ALTERNATIVE A	PROPOSED RMP	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
<p>New Goal. Provide for Tribal Treaty Rights and Interests on unoccupied public lands and public lands with the ceded reservation boundary. (TR-1)</p> <p>New Objective: Maintain traditional/cultural use values and the health of land and water resources so treaty rights and interests can be fulfilled by tribal members on unoccupied public lands and those public lands within the ceded reservation boundary. (PP-TR-1.1)</p>			
Soil and Water (SW)			
ALTERNATIVE A	PROPOSED RMP	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
<p>Goal SW-1. Provide for soil quality, productivity, and hydrological function within naturally sustainable limits. (SW-1)</p> <p>Objective CA-SW-1.1. Incorporate resource protections to minimize soil loss when the long-term health of soil function and productivity is at risk. (PP-SW-1.1)</p>			
<p>Goal SW-2. Protect and maintain watersheds so that they appropriately capture, retain, and release water of quality that meets state and national standards and do not impair source water protection areas. (SW-2)</p> <p>Objective CA-SW-2.1. Manage public land activities to maintain or contribute to the long term improvement of surface and ground water quality. (PP-SW-1.2)</p>			
Paleontological Resources (PR)			
ALTERNATIVE A	PROPOSED RMP	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
<p>Goal PR-1. Provide for the identification, protection, and management of paleontological resources for the preservation, interpretation and scientific uses by present and future generations. (PR-1)</p> <p>Objective CA-PR-1.1. Maintain and protect paleontological resources for their educational and scientific benefits. (PP-PR-1.1)</p>			

Vegetation (VE)			
ALTERNATIVE A	PROPOSED RMP	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
Goal VE-1. Provide for the proper functioning condition (PFC) of riparian areas. (VE-1)			
Objective CA-VE-1.1. Maintain properly functioning riparian areas and restore/improve those areas that are not at PFC. (PP-VE-1.1)			
Goal VE-2. Prevent the establishment of invasive and/or noxious weed species. (VE-2)			
Objective CA-VE-2.1. Treat invasive/noxious weed species to decrease or control the total number of acres occupied. (PP-VE-2.1)			
	<p>Objective AA-VE-2.1. Treat invasive/noxious weed species to decrease or control the total number of acres occupied. (PP-VE-2.1)</p> <p>Where hay or straw would be used on public lands for permitted/authorized and internal BLM activities, state-certified weed free hay/straw would be required.</p> <p>Public awareness concerning invasive species/noxious weeds control would be promoted including partnerships with other agencies and the Tribes.</p>		
Goal VE-3. Provide for old growth characteristics where forest treatments are implemented. (VE-3)			
Objective CA-VE-3.1. Maintain or contribute towards the restoration of old growth structure and composition in areas where forest treatments, including those authorized under the Healthy Forests Restoration Act, are proposed. (PP-VE-3.1)			
Goal VE-4: Manage vegetation as part of an ecologically healthy system to provide livestock and wildlife with essential habitat components.	Goal VE-6. Manage vegetation types to provide for their continued presence as part of an ecologically healthy system. (VE-4)		
Objective A-VE-4.1. Maintain or increase forage production for wildlife and livestock.	Objective B-VE-6.1. In Low- and Mid-Elevation Shrub and Mountain Shrub types, commensurate with site potential, maintain or increase LHC-A acres as described below so the landscape is composed of a diversity of desirable/native herbaceous and shrub/woody species consisting of at least 15-25% sagebrush canopy cover in greater sage-grouse habitat in the Low- and Mid-Elevation Shrub types and at least 25% shrub cover in the Mountain Shrub type. (PP-VE-4.1)	Objective C-VE-6.1. In Low- and Mid-Elevation Shrub and Mountain Shrub types, maintain or increase LHC-A acres as described below so the landscape is composed of a diversity of desirable/native herbaceous and shrub/woody species consisting of at least 15-25% sagebrush canopy cover in greater sage-grouse habitat in the Low- and Mid-Elevation Shrub type and at least 25% shrub cover in the Mountain Shrub type.	Objective D-VE-6.1. In Low- and Mid-Elevation Shrub and Mountain Shrub types maintain or increase LHC-A acres as described below so the landscape is composed of a diversity of desirable/native herbaceous and shrub/woody species consisting of at least 15-25% sagebrush canopy cover in greater sage-grouse habitat in the Low- and Mid-Elevation Shrub type and at least 25% shrub cover in the Mountain Shrub type.

Vegetation (VE)					
ALTERNATIVE A	PROPOSED RMP		ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	
	Desired LHC Description	Percent LHC Desired		Desired LHC Description	Percent LHC Desired
	LHC-A -All key components are present as identified in land health standards and as described in the definition of FRCC 1.	> 60%		LHC-A -All key components are present as identified in land health standards and as described in the definition of FRCC 1.	> 50%
	LHC-B - Some or all of the key components as identified in land health standards are present and as described in the definition of FRCC 2.	20-25%		LHC-B - Some or all of the key components as identified in land health standards are present and as described in the definition of FRCC 2.	25-30%
	LHC-C - Key components are absent as identified in land health standards and as described in the definition of FRCC 3.	< 20%		LHC-C - Key components are absent as identified in land health standards and as described in the definition of FRCC 3.	< 25%
No similar objective	Objective VE-6.2. In the Aspen/Aspen Conifer Mix and Dry Conifer types, commensurate with site potential, maintain or increase LHC-A and B acres as described below so the landscape is composed of 40% mixed Aspen/Dry Conifer and 60% Aspen dominate areas consisting of 500-1,000 stems/acre w/ 5-15 ft. height resulting in the distribution of age classes of <30 years (40%), 31-80 years (40%), and >80 years (20%). (Carried forward from Alternative C.) (PP-VE-4.2)		Objective C-VE-6.2. In the Aspen/Aspen Conifer Mix and Dry Conifer types, maintain or increase LHC-A and B acres as described below so the landscape is composed of 40% mixed Aspen/Dry Conifer and 60% Aspen dominate areas consisting of 500-1,000 stems/acre w/ 5-15 ft. height resulting in the distribution of age classes of <30 years (40%), 31-80 years (40%), and >80 years (20%).	Objective D-VE-6.2. In the Aspen/Aspen Conifer Mix and Dry Conifer types, maintain or increase LHC-A and B acres as described below so the landscape is composed of 80% Dry Conifer dominate and 20% Aspen/Dry Conifer mix resulting in a distribution of age classes of <30 years (20%), 31-80 years (40%), and >81 years (40%).	

Vegetation (VE)					
ALTERNATIVE A	PROPOSED RMP		ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	
	Desired LHC Description	Percent LHC Desired		Desired LHC Description	Percent LHC Desired
	LHC-A -All key components are present as identified in land health standards and as described in the definition of FRCC 1.	>30		LHC-A -All key components are present as identified in land health standards and as described in the definition of FRCC 1.	>30
	LHC-B - Some or all of the key components as identified in land health standards are present and as described in the definition of FRCC 2.	35-40		LHC-B - Some or all of the key components as identified in land health standards are present and as described in the definition of FRCC 2.	35-40
	LHC-C - Key components are absent as identified in land health standards and as described in the definition of FRCC 3.	<35		LHC-C - Key components are absent as identified in land health standards and as described in the definition of FRCC 3.	<35
<i>No similar management action</i>	Treat Aspen/ Aspen Conifer sites using appropriate treatment methods and harvest rotation cycles to achieve desired age classes.			Treat Aspen/Aspen Conifer Mix and Dry Conifer types using prescribed fire.	
<i>No similar objective</i>	Objective B-VE-6.3. In the Wet/Cold Conifer type, commensurate with site potential, maintain or increase LHC-A and B acres as described below primarily through natural processes so the landscape is comprised of a distribution of age classes of 0-80 years (30%) and > 80 years (70%). (PP-VE-4.3)			Objective C-VE-6.3. In the Wet/Cold Conifer type, increase LHC-A acres as described below so the landscape is comprised of a distribution of age classes of 0-80 years (30%) and > 80 years (70%).	
				Objective D-VE-6.3. Same as Objective C-VE-6.3.	

Vegetation (VE)						
ALTERNATIVE A		PROPOSED RMP		ALTERNATIVE C		ALTERNATIVE D
		Desired LHC Description	Percent LHC Desired			
		LHC-A -All key components are present as identified in land health standards and as described in the definition of FRCC 1.	>5	LHC-A -All key components are present as identified in land health standards and as described in the definition of FRCC 1.	>10	
		LHC-B - Some or all of the key components as identified in land health standards are present and as described in the definition of FRCC 2.	95-100	LHC-B - Some or all of the key components as identified in land health standards are present and as described in the definition of FRCC 2.	85-90	
		LHC-C - Key components are absent as identified in land health standards and as described in the definition of FRCC 3.	<5	LHC-C - Key components are absent as identified in land health standards and as described in the definition of FRCC 3.	<5	
<i>No similar management action</i>		Use appropriate treatment methods and harvest rotation cycles to achieve desired age classes.		Allow for the natural processes to occur to achieve desired age classes. Minimal treatments would be conducted.		Emphasizes the production of Engelmann spruce. Treat areas to obtain desired age class distribution using mechanical or prescribed fire.

Vegetation (VE)											
ALTERNATIVE A	PROPOSED RMP	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D								
<i>No similar objective</i>	<p>Objective B-VE-6.4. Maintain or increase natural occurring Juniper LHC-A and B acres, commensurate with site potential, as described below through primarily natural processes so the landscape is dominated by widely spaced old juniper trees greater than 300 years. (PP-VE-4.4)</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Desired LHC Description</th> <th>Percent LHC Desired</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>LHC-A -All key components are present as identified in land health standards and as described in the definition of FRCC 1.</td> <td>>5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>LHC-B - Some or all of the key components as identified in land health standards are present and as described in the definition of FRCC 2.</td> <td>95-100</td> </tr> <tr> <td>LHC-C - Key components are absent as identified in land health standards and as described in the definition of FRCC 3.</td> <td><5</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Desired LHC Description	Percent LHC Desired	LHC-A -All key components are present as identified in land health standards and as described in the definition of FRCC 1.	>5	LHC-B - Some or all of the key components as identified in land health standards are present and as described in the definition of FRCC 2.	95-100	LHC-C - Key components are absent as identified in land health standards and as described in the definition of FRCC 3.	<5	<p>Objective C-VE-6.4. Same as Objective B-VE-6.4.</p>	<p>Objective D-VE-6.4. Same as Objective B-VE-6.4.</p>
Desired LHC Description	Percent LHC Desired										
LHC-A -All key components are present as identified in land health standards and as described in the definition of FRCC 1.	>5										
LHC-B - Some or all of the key components as identified in land health standards are present and as described in the definition of FRCC 2.	95-100										
LHC-C - Key components are absent as identified in land health standards and as described in the definition of FRCC 3.	<5										
<i>No similar management action</i>	Use appropriate methods to maintain or promote juniper dominated range sites.	Same as Alternative B.	Same as Alternative B.								
Goal VE-5. Manage rangeland seedings (e.g. crested wheatgrass) for maximum forage production.	<i>No similar goal</i>	<i>No similar goal</i>	<i>No similar goal</i>								
Objective A-VE-5.1. Maintain or improve rangeland seeding forage production.	<i>No similar objective</i>	<i>No similar objective</i>	<i>No similar objective</i>								

Fish and Wildlife (FW)			
ALTERNATIVE A	PROPOSED RMP	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
<p>Goal FW-1. Manage the wildlife habitats so vegetation composition and structure assures the continued presence of fish and wildlife as part of an ecologically healthy system.</p> <p>Objective CA-FW-1.1. Maintain and improve wildlife habitats to support IDFG management objectives.</p>			
<p>Goal FW-2. Provide for the diversity of native and desired non-native species as part of an ecologically healthy system.</p> <p>Objective CA-FW- 2.1. Maintain or improve native and desired non-native species habitat and the connectivity among habitats.</p>			

Special Status Species (SS)			
ALTERNATIVE A	PROPOSED RMP	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
<p>Goal SS-1. Manage special status species and their habitats to provide for their continued presence and conservation as part of an ecologically healthy system.</p> <p>Objective CA-SS-1.1. Conserve, inventory, and monitor special status species. (PP-SS-1.1.)</p> <p>Objective CA-SS-1.2. Maintain or improve the quality of listed (threatened or endangered) species habitat by managing public land activities to support species recovery and the benefit of those species. (PP-SS-1.2.)</p> <p>Objective CA-SS-1.3. Maintain or improve the quality of sensitive species habitat by managing public land activities to support species recovery and the benefit of those species. (PP-SS-1.3.)</p>			
<p>Objective A-SS-1.1. Maintain or improve the quality of listed (threatened or endangered) species habitat by managing public land activities to support species recovery and the benefit of those species.</p> <p>See Chapter 2 for a complete list of management actions for the following listed species:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bald eagle • Gray wolf • Utah valvata snail 	<p>Objective B-SS-1.1. (PP-SS-1.2.)</p> <p>Same as Objective A-SS-1.1.</p>	<p>Objective C-SS-1.1.</p> <p>Same as Objective A-SS-1.1.</p>	<p>Objective D-SS-1.1.</p> <p>Same as Objective A-SS-1.1.</p>
<p>Objective A-SS-1.2. Maintain or improve the quality of sensitive species habitat by managing public land activities to support species recovery and the benefit of those species.</p>	<p>Objective B-SS-1.2. (PP-SS-1.3)</p> <p>Same as Objective A-SS-1.2</p>	<p>Objective C-SS-1.2.</p> <p>Same as Objective A-SS-1.2.</p>	<p>Objective D-SS-1.2.</p> <p>Same as Objective A-SS-1.2</p>

Special Status Species (SS)			
ALTERNATIVE A	PROPOSED RMP	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
Special Status Species: FAUNA			
<p>For Objective A-SS-1.2 see Chapter 2 for a complete list of management actions for the following fauna species:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pygmy rabbits • Boreal toads/leopard frogs • Bear Lake endemic fish • Ferruginous hawk • American white pelican • Yellowstone/Bonneville cutthroat trout 	<p>For Objective B-SS-1.2. (PP-SS-1.3) see Chapter 2 for a complete list of management actions for the following fauna species:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pygmy rabbits (Same as Alternative A) • Boreal toads/leopard frogs (Same as Alternative B) • Bear Lake endemic fish (Same as Alternative A) • Ferruginous hawk (Same as Alternative A) • American white pelican Yellowstone/Bonneville cutthroat trout • Springsnails (<i>Carried forward from Alternative C.</i>) • Migratory birds (<i>Carried forward from Alternative C.</i>) 	<p>For Objective C-SS-1.2 see Chapter 2 for a complete list of management actions for the following fauna species:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pygmy rabbits (Same as Alternative A) • Boreal toads/leopard frogs (Same as Alternative B) • Bear Lake endemic fish • Ferruginous hawk (Same as Alternative A) • American white pelican (Same as Alternative A) • Yellowstone/Bonneville cutthroat trout (Same as Alternative B) • Springsnails • Migratory birds 	<p>For Objective D-SS-1.2 see Chapter 2 for a complete list of management actions for the following fauna species:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pygmy rabbits (Same as Alternative A) • Boreal toads/leopard frogs (Same as Alternative A) • Bear Lake endemic fish (Same as Alternative A) • Ferruginous hawk (Same as Alternative A) • American white pelican (Same as Alternative A) • Yellowstone/Bonneville cutthroat trout (Same as Alternative A)
<p><i>No similar management action</i></p>	<p><i>No similar management action</i></p>	<p>Management guidance to enhance and/or prevent the loss of special status species habitat for the following priority areas and identified species would be as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Curlew Valley - Columbian sharp-tailed and Greater sage-grouse and other sagebrush obligate species • Bear Lake Plateau/Sheep Creek Hills - Greater sage-grouse and sagebrush obligate species • Pleasantview Hills/Samaria Mountains - Columbian sharp-tailed and greater sage-grouse and other sagebrush obligates • Lower Blackfoot River - Greater sage-grouse, raptors, riparian associated species and sagebrush obligates • Deep Creek Mountains - Columbian sharp-tailed and greater sage-grouse 	<p><i>No similar management action</i></p>

Special Status Species (SS)			
ALTERNATIVE A	PROPOSED RMP	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
		(See Chapter 2 for a complete list of management actions for the above priority areas.)	
<p>The following guidelines for greater sage-grouse habitats would be implemented as adapted from Giesen and Connelly (1993):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maintain and enhance existing greater sage-grouse habitats used during each stage of the life cycle. • Minimize human activities that disrupt greater sage-grouse habitats during their seasons of use particularly during the breeding and winter seasons. • Minimize undesired habitat modifications resulting from authorized activities such as land-tenure adjustments, road and facility construction, etc. • Minimize undesired habitat modifications from adverse natural disturbances (wildland fire, insects, disease, etc.) 	<p>To the extent possible and to promote conservation, sage-grouse would be managed consistent with the intent of the <i>Conservation Plan for Greater Sage-grouse in Idaho</i> (Idaho Sage-grouse Advisory Committee, 2006) or any future revisions/amendments and/or current BLM guidance. Appropriate actions, conservation measures, and guidelines that may be considered include, but are not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continue efforts to map populations and habitat for greater sage-grouse. Map seasonal (lek, nesting, brood-rearing and winter) habitats along with source and isolated populations. • Establish goals for greater sage-grouse habitat conservation at the local level in conjunction with IDFG and local working groups for protection and maintenance of existing populations and restoration goals. • Protect and maintain suitable habitats and reconnect separated populations based upon the following priorities: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Key habitats 2. Source habitats (S1) 3. Restoration areas (R1, R2) 4. Areas that link isolated populations • Commensurate with site potential, manage key habitat for a range of sagebrush canopy cover averaging 15 to 25 percent (11 to 31 inches in height); at least 15 percent grass cover; and 10 percent cover of a diversity of forbs. 	Same as Alternative B.	Same as Alternative A.

Special Status Species (SS)			
ALTERNATIVE A	PROPOSED RMP	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Monitor progress and adjust activities to make progress towards greater sage-grouse goals and objectives. • In areas where grouse habitats are fragmented by land ownership pattern, cooperate with IDFG and local working groups to identify and maintain long-term habitat by acquiring conservation easements or bringing crucial habitats into public ownership. • In cooperation with IDFG identify areas where application of pesticides for grasshopper or Mormon cricket control may negatively affect grouse broods. Identify a cooperative strategy to review requests for pesticide application in these identified locations • <u>Active sage-grouse leks</u> would be protected during the lekking season from temporary human disturbance (e.g., routine maintenance, inspections, and construction activities) by requiring a minimum buffer of 0.6 miles. • New infrastructure facilities/structures (e.g., major power transmission lines, power distribution lines, communications towers, and temporary meteorological towers) requiring permanent surface occupancy would be sited in a manner that avoids sage-grouse habitat to the extent possible and would be placed at least 2.0 miles from <u>occupied leks</u> or other important sage-grouse seasonal habitats as identified locally. • Future permitted/authorized activities would be evaluated on a site specific basis for potential 		

Special Status Species (SS)			
ALTERNATIVE A	PROPOSED RMP	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
	<p>threats consistent with the Conservation Plan for Greater Sage-grouse in Idaho (Idaho Sage-grouse Advisory Committee, 2006) and mitigated through the NEPA process. Restore shrub-steppe habitats in the following priority:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. source areas, 2. restoration areas 3. areas that link isolated populations 		
<p>Nesting and brood rearing habitat would be maintained in suitable condition for approximately 1.2 miles from known leks for Columbian sharp-tailed grouse. When assessing the condition of the habitat, adjacent land uses within two miles of these areas would be considered. (Adapted from Giesen and Connelly, 1993).</p>	<p>As appropriate, the following guidelines (as adapted from Geisen and Connelly 1993), or the most current management document and/or BLM policy, would be used in the management of the Columbian sharp-tailed grouse habitat.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As appropriate based upon a site specific habitat assessment, maintain vegetation in suitable condition (LHC-A) for nesting and brood rearing for 2.0 miles from known leks. Any manipulation of habitats must not be greater than 10 percent of the 2.0 mile radius. • As appropriate based upon a site specific habitat assessment, maintain availability of deciduous shrubs (e.g. serviceberry, chokecherry) within 4 miles of leks to protect winter habitat. • Coordinate with IDFG as population targets and monitoring locations are established for Columbian sharp-tailed grouse. Monitoring would be conducted for populations in key or source areas and restorations areas in that order. • In areas where grouse habitats are fragmented by land ownership pattern, cooperate with IDFG and local working groups to identify 	<p>Guidelines would be implemented for Columbian sharp-tailed grouse habitats as adapted from Giesen and Connelly (1993):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maintain vegetation in suitable condition (LHC-A) for nesting and brood rearing for 1.5 miles from known leks. • Within source, key or connective habitats manipulation of sagebrush habitats must be not be greater than 10 percent of the total sagebrush community within a 1.5 mile radius of leks. • Minimize disturbance of deciduous shrubs within 4 miles of leks to protect winter habitat. • Cooperate with IDFG to establish population targets and monitoring routes for Columbian sharp-tailed grouse. Monitoring would be conducted for populations in key or source areas and restorations areas in that order. • In areas where grouse habitats are fragmented by land ownership pattern, cooperate with IDFG and local working groups to identify and maintain long-term habitat by acquiring conservation easements or bringing crucial habitats into 	<p>Same as Alternative A.</p>

Special Status Species (SS)			
ALTERNATIVE A	PROPOSED RMP	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
	<p>and maintain long-term habitat by acquiring conservation easements or bringing crucial habitats into public ownership.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In cooperation with IDFG identify areas where application of pesticides for grasshopper or Mormon cricket control may negatively affect grouse broods. Identify a cooperative strategy to review requests for pesticide application in these identified locations. • As appropriate based upon a site specific habitat assessment, protect leks from disturbances from permitted activities for 0.6 mile from March 1 to May 31. 	<p>public ownership.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In cooperation with IDFG identify areas where application of pesticides for grasshopper or Mormon cricket control may negatively affect grouse broods. Identify a cooperative strategy to review requests for pesticide application in these identified locations. • Protect leks from disturbances from permitted activities for 0.6 mile from March 1 to May 31. 	

Special Status Species (SS)			
ALTERNATIVE A	PROPOSED RMP	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
Special Status Species: FLORA			
<p>The following general management actions would be considered to promote healthy, naturally functioning ecosystems in sensitive plant habitat:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Avoid actions that cause concentrated use or disturbance (e.g. trampling, OHVs, dozer lines, range improvements) in habitat. • Avoid spraying of pesticides within a 1/4 mile of occupied habitat unless clearly beneficial to sensitive plants. • Avoid seeding within occupied habitat unless clearly beneficial to sensitive plants. • Methods of weed spraying within or near (1/4 mile) habitat would be formulated on site specific and species specific basis. • Promote healthy naturally functioning ecosystem components within a 1/4 mile of habitat to support a viable population. • Inventory potential habitat. • Monitor flora sensitive species population trends. 	<p>Site/project specific assessments for special status plants would be required prior to authorizing activities to determine:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The presence or absence of special status species, and 2. Appropriate mitigation/guidelines (e.g. avoidance of occupied areas, distances from occupied habitat). Examples of mitigation/guidelines to be considered may include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reducing adverse impacts to special status plant habitats from permitted/authorized activities. • Limiting water developments and mineral supplements near special status plant populations sufficient to protect these species. • Avoiding pesticide and herbicide applications near occupied habitat to preserve pollinators and non-target species. • Promoting seeding within occupied habitat only when clearly beneficial for special status plants. • Formulate methods of weed spraying near special status habitat on site specific and species specific basis. • Special status plant areas would be priority for weed treatment. • Inventory and monitor special status plant habitats. 	<p>Site/project specific assessments for special status plants would be identical to the Proposed RMP (Alternative B).</p>	<p>The following general management actions would be considered to promote healthy, naturally functioning ecosystems in sensitive plant habitat:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Avoid actions that cause concentrated use or disturbance (e.g. trampling, OHVs, dozer lines, range improvements) in habitat. • Avoid spraying of pesticides within a 1/4 mile of occupied habitat unless clearly beneficial to sensitive plants. • Avoid seeding within occupied habitat unless clearly beneficial to sensitive plants. • Methods of weed spraying within or near (1/4 mile) habitat would be formulated on site specific and species specific basis. • Promote healthy naturally functioning ecosystem components within a 1/4 mile of habitat to support a viable population. • Inventory potential habitat for flora sensitive species monitor population trends.

Visual Resources (VR)			
ALTERNATIVE A	PROPOSED RMP	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
Goal VR-1. Maintain scenic qualities consistent with the management of resources and uses.			
Objective CA-VR-1.1. Manage visual resources according to established guidelines for visual resource management (VRM) classes. (PP-VR-1.1.)			
Wildland Fire Management (WF)			
ALTERNATIVE A	PROPOSED RMP	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
Goal WF-1. Minimize impacts to natural and human resources from various fire related practices, including both wildland fire suppression and fuels management activities.			
Objective CA-WF-1.1. Utilize the appropriate management response (AMR) for fire suppression activities to protect natural and cultural resource values. (PP-WF-1.1.)			
Objective CA-WF-1.2. Assure fire and non-fire vegetation treatments maintain, restore or improve natural or cultural resource values. (PP-WF-1.3.)			
No similar objective	New Objective: Choose the AMR when suppressing wildfire to protect Listed Species and related habitat. (PP-WF-1.2)	No similar objective	No similar objective
	Goal WF-3: Protect life, property, and resources. (WF-2)		
	Objective AA-WF-3.1. Manage public land in and around WUI areas to reduce fire hazards. (PP-WF-2.1)		
	Objective AA-WF-3.2. Manage public lands to protect, improve, or enhance resources /values at risk. (PP-WF-2.2)		
Goal WF-2: Provide for the protection of life and property and suppression of wildland fires for the protection of natural resources.	Goal WF- 4: Return fire to a more natural role in the ecosystem to improve FRCC and achieve desired LHC.		
Objective A-WF-2.1. Emphasize protection from wildland fire and ES&R within the WUI.	Objective B-WF-4.1. Manage the Low-Elevation Shrub and Perennial Grass vegetation types in order to move towards FRCC 1 (LHC-A) so wildland fire occurs less frequently and at a smaller scale on the landscape. (PP-WF-3.1)	Objective C-WF-4.1. Same as Objective B-WF-4.1.	Objective D-WF-4.1. Same as Objective B-WF-4.1
No similar management action	The AMR would be used to safely manage wildland fires, reducing acres burned to a rate similar to historic levels. AMR in Low-Elevation Shrub would be suppression of all wildland fire starts to protect existing sagebrush communities.	Chemical, mechanical, seeding, prescribed fire and WFU treatments would be used as appropriate. In Perennial Grass and Juniper encroached vegetation types, the sagebrush steppe would be restored with an aggressive sagebrush seeding effort, utilizing the appropriate sagebrush species for treatment areas.	Use prescribed fires. Treatments would be strategically placed on a landscape scale to prevent fire from spreading toward WUI areas, Low-Elevation Shrub communities, or other resources at risk using the entire array of mechanical, chemical, and small-scale prescribed fire operations to thin, reduce and control hazardous fuels.

Wildland Fire Management (WF)			
ALTERNATIVE A	PROPOSED RMP	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
Objective A-WF-2.2. Reduce fine fuels and invasive exotic plants to create perennial vegetation communities so that wildland fire occurs less frequently than currently and at a smaller scale on the landscape.	Objective B-WF-4.2. Manage the Mid-Elevation Shrub, Juniper, Dry Conifer, Aspen/Conifer, and Mountain Shrub vegetation types in order to move towards FRCC 1 (LHC-A) so wildland fire mimics historical conditions. (PP-WF-3.2)	<i>No similar objective</i>	Objective D-WF-4.2. Manage the Mid-Elevation Shrub, Juniper, Dry Conifer, Aspen/Conifer, and Mountain Shrub vegetation types by increasing the use of wildland fire and prescribed fire in order to mimic historical conditions (FRCC 1 [LHC-A]).
AMR in Low-Elevation Shrub to protect existing sagebrush communities would be suppression of all wildland fire starts. Following wildland fire, utilize chemical, mechanical, and seeding treatments with appropriate plant materials to provide the best opportunity to stabilize sites and prevent dominance of invasive annual vegetation and noxious weeds. The use of native plant materials would be emphasized. Prescribed fire may be used to prepare areas for subsequent chemical, mechanical, and/or seeding treatments.	The AMR would be used to safely manage wildland fires.	<i>No similar objective</i>	Mechanical and chemical treatments would be used to prepare areas in Fire Condition Class 2 and 3 for prescribed fire and WFU. Where prescriptive parameters, resource conditions, and vegetation conditions allow, WFU or prescribed fire would be use to increase annual average wildland fire acres to a rate similar to historical conditions. Site-specific NEPA analysis would be completed prior to implementation.
<i>No similar objective</i>	Objective C-WF-4.2. Maintain, protect, and expand greater sage-grouse Source Habitats. (Carried forward from Alternative C.) (PP-WF-3.7)	Objective C-WF-4.2. Maintain, protect, and expand greater sage-grouse Source Habitats.	<i>No similar objective</i>
<i>No similar management action</i>	Wildland fires would be suppressed in Source Habitats except where WFU could benefit the habitat, which would require site specific project level coordination with IDFG. Vegetation treatments would be conducted in areas that pose a wildland fire risk to Source Habitats, and areas to be treated within Source Habitats would be those that have low resiliency characterized by low species diversity, undesirable composition, and dead or decadent sagebrush. (Carried forward from Alternative C.)	Wildland fires would be suppressed in Source Habitats except where WFU could benefit the habitat, which would require site specific project level coordination with IDFG. Vegetation treatments would be conducted in areas that pose a wildland fire risk to Source Habitats, and areas to be treated within Source Habitats would be those that have low resiliency characterized by low species diversity, undesirable composition, and dead or decadent sagebrush.	<i>No similar management action</i>

Wildland Fire Management (WF)			
ALTERNATIVE A	PROPOSED RMP	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
	Objective B-WF-4.3. Maintain Wet/Cold Conifer, Riparian and Other/Vegetated Lava vegetation types fire frequencies within the historical range of variability, FRCC 1 (LHC-A). (PP-WF-3.3)		
<i>No similar objective</i>	Objective C-WF-4.3. Maintain and improve greater sage-grouse Restoration and Key Habitats. (Carried forward from Alternative C.) (PP-WF-3.8)	Objective C-WF-4.3. Maintain and improve greater sage-grouse Restoration and Key Habitats.	<i>No similar objective</i>
<i>No similar management action</i>	WFU may be used in greater sage-grouse Restoration and Key Habitats for the benefit of the habitat only after site specific project level coordination with IDFG. Vegetation treatments would be conducted to reduce risk of wildland fire and reconnect Restoration and Key Habitats, and areas treated would be those that have low resiliency characterized by low species diversity. (Carried forward from Alternative C.)	WFU may be used in greater sage-grouse Restoration and Key Habitats for the benefit of the habitat only after site specific project level coordination with IDFG. Vegetation treatments would be conducted to reduce risk of wildland fire and reconnect Restoration and Key Habitats, and areas treated would be those that have low resiliency characterized by low species diversity.	<i>No similar management action</i>
Objective A-WF-2.3. Conduct vegetation treatments for resource benefits in Mid-Elevation Shrub, Juniper, Dry Conifer, Aspen/Conifer, and Mountain Shrub.	Objective C-WF-4.4 – Manage the Aspen/Aspen Dry Conifer Mix, Dry Conifer, Wet/Cold Conifer, Riparian, and Other/Vegetated Lava vegetation types in order to maintain vegetation conditions and wildland fire regimes similar to historical conditions (FRCC 1 [LHC-A]). (Carried forward from Alternative C.) (PP-WF-3.9)	Objective C-WF-4.4 – Manage the Aspen/Aspen Dry Conifer Mix, Dry Conifer, Wet/Cold Conifer, Riparian, and Other/Vegetated Lava vegetation types in order to maintain vegetation conditions and wildland fire regimes similar to historical conditions (FRCC 1 [LHC-A]).	Objective D-WF-4.3. In Wet/Cold Conifer, Riparian, and Other/Vegetated Lava vegetation types and/or areas in Fire Condition Class 1, (LHC-A) maintain vegetation conditions using mechanical, chemical, prescribed fire, or WFU treatments, such that wildland fire regimes are similar to historical conditions (FRCC 1) (i.e., maintain the current level of fire in these vegetation types).
Objective A-WF-2.4. Manage 0.0 acres as suitable for WFU.	Objective B-WF-4.4. Manage for WFU on approximately 265,000 acres identified as suitable. (PP-WF-3.4)	Objective C-WF-4.5. Manage for WFU on approximately 212,600 acres identified as suitable.	Objective D-WF-4.4. Manage for WFU on approximately 468,900 acres identified as suitable.

Wildland Fire Management (WF)			
ALTERNATIVE A	PROPOSED RMP	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
Objective A-WF-2.5. For the vegetation types identified, implement over 10 years approximately 3,400 footprint acres of treatment using various treatment methods (e.g. mechanical, chemical, seeding, and prescribed fire), as appropriate.	Objective B-WF-4.5. For the vegetation types identified, implement over 10 years approximately 124,250 footprint acres of treatment using various treatment methods (e.g. WFU, mechanical, chemical, seeding, and prescribed fire), as appropriate. (PP-WF-3.5)	Objective C-WF-4.6. For the vegetation types identified, implement over 10 years approximately 54,920 footprint acres of treatment using various treatment methods (e.g. WFU, mechanical, chemical, seeding, and prescribed fire), as appropriate.	Objective D-WF-4.5. For the vegetation types identified, implement over 10 years approximately 162,170 footprint acres of treatment using various treatment methods (e.g. WFU, mechanical, chemical, seeding, and Prescribed fire), as appropriate.
Low-Elevation Shrub 0.0	Low-Elevation Shrub 18,950	Low-Elevation Shrub 0.0	Low-Elevation Shrub 9,500
Mid-Elevation Shrub 0.0	Mid-Elevation Shrub 25,400	Mid-Elevation Shrub 16,650	Mid-Elevation Shrub 64,000
Mountain Shrub 0.0	Mountain Shrub 16,500	Mountain Shrub	Mountain Shrub
Perennial Grass/Seeding 0.0	Perennial Grass/Seeding 50,200	Perennial Grass/Seeding 1,300	Perennial Grass/Seeding 53,300
Juniper (Natural Only) 0.0	Juniper (Natural Only) 0.0	Juniper (Natural Only) 16,600 0.0	Juniper (Natural Only) 15,000 0.0
Aspen/Aspen Conifer Mix/Dry Conifer 3,400	Aspen/Aspen Conifer Mix/Dry Conifer	Aspen/Aspen Conifer Mix/Dry Conifer	Aspen/Aspen Conifer Mix/Dry Conifer 20,000
Wet/Cold Conifer 0.0	Wet/Cold Conifer 0.0	Wet/Cold Conifer 70	Wet/Cold Conifer 70
Riparian 0.0	Riparian	Riparian	Riparian
Other/Vegetated Lava 0.0	Other/Vegetated Lava 0.0	Other/Vegetated Lava	Other/Vegetated Lava 100
Total footprint acres 3,400	Total footprint acres 131,050	Total footprint acres 100,920 54,920	Total footprint acres 100,200 162,170
Objective A-WF-2.6. Implement priorities for wildland fire ignitions, suppression and fire and non-fire treatments.	Objective B-WF-4.6. Implement priorities for wildland fire suppression and vegetation treatments. (PP-WF-3.6) 20,000	Objective C-WF-4.7. Same as Objective B-WF-4.6 20,000	Objective D-WF-4.6. Same as Objective B-WF-4.6

RESOURCE USES			
Forestry (FO)			
ALTERNATIVE A	PROPOSED RMP	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
<p>Goal FO-1. Use a variety of silvicultural techniques and harvest systems to provide for an ecologically healthy system while offering products and services. (FO-1)</p> <p>Objective CA-FO-1.1. Maintain a sustainable forest management program. (PP-FO-1.1)</p>			
<p>Goal FO-2. Provide the Tribes and public opportunities for the use of forest/vegetal products to promote an ecologically healthy system. (FO-2)</p> <p>Objective CA-FO-2.1. Maintain approximately 45,700 acres of commercial forest land in order to offer on a yearly basis 600-900 thousand board feet as a “not to exceed” annual probable sale quantity. (PP-FO-2.1)</p> <p>Objective CA-FO-2.2. Based upon tribal and public demand allow for the collection of forest and vegetal products. (PP-FO-2.2)</p>			
Lands and Realty (LR)			
ALTERNATIVE A	PROPOSED RMP	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
<p>Goal LR-1.Consolidate public land to retain and acquire land that is important to the public and protection of resources and to dispose of parcels that are small, isolated and unmanageable.</p> <p>Objective A-LR-1.1. Implement land tenure adjustments through exchange or sale.</p> <p>A public land base of approximately 581,600 acres would be retained for long-term management in federal ownership and approximately 32,200 acres considered for disposal actions.</p>	<p>Goal: LR-5. Improve administrative management efficiency, natural resources management and protection, and public benefit. (LR-5)</p> <p>Objective AA-LR-5.1. Adjust and consolidate public lands ownership patterns through land tenure adjustments. (PP-LR-5.1)</p>		
<p>Objective A-LR-1.1. Implement land tenure adjustments through exchange or sale.</p> <p>A public land base of approximately 581,600 acres would be retained for long-term management in federal ownership and approximately 32,200 acres considered for disposal actions.</p>	<p>Objective B-LR-5.1. Maintain the overall public land base, acquire nonfederal lands or interest in nonfederal lands through exchange, purchase, easement or donation which enhance multiple-use, protect significant resource values and which improve the management and administration of the public lands. (PP-LR-5.2)</p>	<p>Objective C-LR-5.1. Maintain the overall public land base, acquire nonfederal lands or interest in nonfederal lands through exchange, purchase, easement or donation which enhance multiple-use, protect significant resource values and improve the management and administration of the public lands.</p>	<p>Objective D-LR-5.1. Maintain the overall public land base, acquire nonfederal lands or interest in nonfederal lands through exchange, purchase, easement or donation which enhance multiple-use, protect significant resource values and improve the management and administration of the public lands.</p>
<p><i>No similar management action</i></p>	<p>A land tenure adjustment program would be implemented based upon a four zone concept.</p> <p>Zone 1: Approximately 50,800 acres</p> <p>Zone 2: Approximately 365,700 acres</p> <p>Zone 3: Approximately 141,000 acres</p> <p>Zone 4: Approximately 56,300 acres</p>	<p>A land tenure adjustment program would be implemented based upon a four zone concept.</p> <p>Zone 1: Approximately 50,800 acres</p> <p>Zone 2: Approximately 418,900 acres</p> <p>Zone 3: Approximately 94,200 acres</p> <p>Zone 4: Approximately 49,900 acres</p>	<p>A land tenure adjustment program would be implemented based upon a four zone concept.</p> <p>Zone 1: Approximately 50,800 acres</p> <p>Zone 2: Approximately 18,400 acres</p> <p>Zone 3: Approximately 423,200 acres</p> <p>Zone 4: Approximately 121,400 acres</p>

Lands and Realty (LR)			
ALTERNATIVE A	PROPOSED RMP	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
Goal LR-2. Balance development of public land, such as ROWs and utility corridors, with the protection of natural resources and public enjoyment and recreation, consistent with natural resource values and uses.	Goal LR-6. Balance development of public land, such as ROW, utility corridors and alternative energy development (e.g. wind, solar, biomass) with the protection of natural resources and public enjoyment and recreation, consistent with natural resource values and uses. (LR-6)		
Objective A-LR-2.1. Implement management actions for ROWs and utility corridors.	Objective B-LR-6.1. Issue land use authorizations consistent with following management actions (See Chapter 2 for complete list of management actions) (PP-LR-6.1)	Objective C-LR-6.1. Same as Objective B-LR-6.1	Objective D-LR-6.1. Same as Objective B-LR-6.1
For ROWs which include energy and non-energy related ROWs and land use authorizations, 562,900 acres would be managed as Open; 20,200 acres would be managed as Avoidance; and 30,700 acres would be managed as Exclusion areas.	For ROWs which include energy and non-energy related ROWs and land use authorizations, 590,000 acres would be managed as open areas; 21,900 acres would be managed as avoidance areas and 1,900 acres would be managed as exclusion areas.	Same as Alternative B	For ROWs which include energy and non-energy related ROWs and land use authorizations, 590,000 acres would be managed as open areas; 23,800 acres would be managed as avoidance areas. No areas would be managed as exclusion area acres.
Goal LR-3. Maintain and acquire legal access to public land. (LR-3)			
Objective A-LR-3.1. Implement management actions for public access.	Objective AA-LR-3.1. Maintain existing access and acquire public and administrative access consistent with resource values and to ensure efficient administration of public lands. (PP-LR-3.1)		
Goal LR-4. Assure land classifications and withdrawals of public lands are appropriate to protect important resource values. (LR-4)			
Objective A-LR-4.1 Manage approximately 60,700 acres of land classified as withdrawn from the general land laws for the specific purposes intended.	Objective B-LR-4.1. Continue to manage approximately 84,760 acres of land classified as withdrawn from the general land laws for the specific purposes intended. (PP-LR-4.1)	Objective C-LR-4.1. Same as Objective B-LR-4.1	Objective D-LR-4.1. Continue to manage approximately 67,060 acres of land classified as withdrawn from the general land laws for the specific purposes intended.
Withdrawal of public lands from mineral entry would be pursued on approximately 1,500 acres for the following areas: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cheatbeck Canyon RNA Dairy Hollow RNA Formation Cave RNA Oneida Narrows RNA Pine Gap RNA 	Finalize the withdrawal classification process for the following areas consisting of approximately 19,200 acres : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cheatbeck Canyon RNA Dairy Hollow RNA Formation Cave RNA Oneida Narrows RNA Pine Gap RNA 	Same as Alternative B	Finalize the withdrawal classification process for the following RNA's consisting of approximately 1,500 acres : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cheatbeck Canyon RNA Dairy Hollow RNA Formation Cave RNA Oneida Narrows RNA Pine Gap RNA

Lands and Realty (LR)			
ALTERNATIVE A	PROPOSED RMP	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Robbers Roost RNA Travertine Park RNA 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Robbers Roost RNA Travertine Park RNA Petticoat Peak RNA Soda Springs Hills Management Area Bowen Canyon Bald Eagle Sanctuary ACEC 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Robbers Roost RNA Travertine Park RNA

Livestock Grazing (LG)			
ALTERNATIVE A	PROPOSED RMP	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
Goal LG-1. Provide forage for livestock grazing consistent with other resources/uses as part of an ecologically healthy system consistent with multiple use and sustained yield. (LG-1)			
Objective A-LG-1.1. Maintain approximately 556,300 acres available for livestock grazing and approximately 57,500 acres not available for livestock grazing.	Objective B-LG-1.1. Maintain approximately 560,000 acres available for livestock grazing and approximately 53,800 acres not available for livestock grazing. (PP-LG-1.1)	Objective C-LG-1.1. Maintain approximately 555,300 acres available for livestock grazing and approximately 58,500 acres not available for livestock grazing.	Objective D-LG-1.1. Maintain approximately 527,800 acres available for livestock grazing and approximately 86,000 acres not available for livestock grazing.
Objective A-LG-1.2. Consistent with Idaho Standards for Rangeland Health and maintaining a thriving ecological balance and multiple use relationships provide annually a total preference (active + suspended) of approximately 86,900 AUMs .	Objective B-LG-1.2. Consistent with maintaining a thriving ecological balance and multiple use relationships provide annually a total preference (active + suspended) of approximately 87,500 AUMs . (PP-LG-1.2)	Objective C-LG-1.2. Consistent with maintaining a thriving ecological balance and multiple use relationships provide annually a total preference (active + suspended) of approximately 86,600 AUMs .	Objective D-LG-1.2. Consistent with maintaining a thriving ecological balance and multiple use relationships provide annually a total preference (active + suspended) of approximately 82,200 AUMs .
<i>No similar objective</i>	Objective B-LG-1.3. Implement the Secretarial Order (Congressional Withdrawal #157, Idaho #9) which established the BSD. (PP-LG-1.3)	Objective C-LG-1.3. Implement the Secretarial Order (Congressional Withdrawal #157, Idaho #9) which established the BSD and which did not provide for grazing allotments within the driveway.	Objective D-LG-1.3. Implement the Secretarial Order (Congressional Withdrawal #157, Idaho #9) which established the BSD and did not include the creation of grazing allotments within the driveway.

Minerals and Energy (ME)			
ALTERNATIVE A	PROPOSED RMP	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
<p>Goal ME-1. Develop mineral resources (oil and gas, geothermal, solid minerals) consistent with other resource and use direction. (ME-1)</p> <p>Objective CA-ME-1.1. Fulfill Indian Trust Responsibilities related to minerals management. (PP-ME-1.1)</p> <p>Objective CA-ME-1.2. Coordinate with federal agencies (e.g. Bureau of Indian Affairs, BOR, Forest Service, and USFWS) on minerals development proposals related to the federal mineral estate where such agencies have surface management responsibilities. (PP-ME-1.2)</p>			
<p>Goal ME-2. Develop mineral resources (oil and gas, geothermal, solid minerals) consistent with other resources and uses as part of an ecologically healthy ecosystem. (ME-2)</p>			
	<p>Objective AA-ME-2.1. Coordinate with private surface owners on minerals development proposals related to federal mineral estates. (PP-ME-2.1)</p> <p>Objective AA-ME-2.2. Maintain or reestablish the hydrologic function, integrity, quality, and other surface resource values of lands affected by mining actions consistent with the disturbed site potential. (PP-ME-2.2)</p> <p>Objective AA-ME 2.3. Regulate mineral development activities to prevent or control sediment and the release of contaminants such as selenium and metals into the environment. (PP-ME-2.3)</p>		
Objective A-ME-2.1. Manage approximately 602,600 acres of the federal mineral estate as open for fluid minerals leasing (e.g. oil, gas, and geothermal resources).	Objective B-ME-2.1. Manage approximately 344,500 acres of the federal mineral estate as open for fluid minerals leasing (e.g. oil, gas, and geothermal resources). (PP-ME-2.4)	Objective C-ME-2.1. Same as Objective A-ME-2.1	Objective D-ME-2.1. Same as Objective A-ME-2.1
On approximately 314,000 acres , lease with an NSO stipulation.	On approximately 226,000 acres , lease with a NSO stipulation. Approximately 258,100 acres of public lands in the Curlew area would be administratively unavailable (i.e., postponed from lease offering) (Figure 2-18) pending further NEPA analysis to demonstrate that the objectives for initially holding such public lands from lease offering can be alternatively met or no longer apply. Identified objectives are to maintain and protect important resources such as the sagebrush steppe ecosystem; sagebrush obligate species; sensitive species habitat, such as sage and sharp-tailed grouse, and the globally important ferruginous hawk population and habitat.	On approximately 347,300 acres lease with a NSO stipulation.	On approximately 315,400 acres , lease with a NSO stipulation.

Minerals and Energy (ME)			
ALTERNATIVE A	PROPOSED RMP	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
Objective A-ME-2.2. Manage approximately 591,200 acres of the federal mineral estate (leasable minerals) as open to solid minerals leasing (e.g. phosphate) subject to standard lease terms, and conditions.	Objective B-ME-2.2. Manage approximately 582,400 acres of the federal mineral estate (leasable minerals) as open to solid minerals leasing (e.g. phosphate) subject to standard lease terms, and conditions. (PP-ME-2.5)	Objective C-ME-2.2. Manage approximately 582,400 acres of the federal mineral estate (leasable minerals) as open to solid minerals leasing (e.g. phosphate) subject to standard lease terms, and conditions.	Objective D-ME-2.2. Manage approximately 597,500 acres of the federal mineral estate (leasable minerals) as open for solid minerals leasing (e.g. phosphate) subject to standard lease terms, and conditions.
Discretionary closures (agency administrative) consisting of approximately 11,400 acres would be in effect for ACECs and RNAs : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Downey Watershed ACEC Juniper Town Site ACEC Indian Rocks ACEC Bowen Canyon Bald Eagle Sanctuary ACEC Travertine Park ACEC Stump Creek ACEC Van Komen Homestead ACEC Dairy Hollow RNA Formation Cave RNA Oneida Narrows RNA Travertine Park RNA Pine Gap RNA Robber's Roost RNA Cheatbeck Canyon RNA 	Discretionary closures (agency administrative) would be in effect on approximately 20,200 acres as identified below: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Petticoat Peak RNA Dairy Hollow RNA Formation Cave RNA Oneida Narrows RNA Travertine Park RNA Pine Gap RNA Robber's Roost RNA Cheatbeck Canyon RNA Soda Springs Hills Management Area (LWCF/BPA and public lands portions) 	Discretionary closures (agency administrative) would be in effect on approximately 20,200 acres as identified below: Identified areas are identical to Alternative B.	Discretionary closures (agency administrative) would be in effect on approximately 5,100 acres as identified below: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Dairy Hollow RNA Formation Cave RNA Oneida Narrows RNA Travertine Park RNA Pine Gap RNA Robber's Roost RNA Cheatbeck Canyon RNA Soda Springs Hills Management Area (Only LWCF/BPA acquired lands)
Objective A-ME-2.3 Manage approximately 581,100 acres of the federal mineral estate (salable minerals) as open to mineral material disposal subject to standard permit terms, and conditions.	Objective B-ME-2.3. Manage approximately 582,400 acres of the federal mineral estate (salable minerals) as open to mineral material disposal subject to standard permit terms, and conditions. (PP-ME-2.6)	Objective C-ME-2.3. Manage approximately 544,800 acres of the federal mineral estate (salable minerals) as open to mineral material disposal subject to standard permit terms, and conditions.	Objective D-ME-2.3. Manage approximately 597,500 acres of the federal mineral estate (salable minerals) as open for mineral material disposal subject to standard permit terms, and conditions.
Discretionary closures (agency administrative) consisting of approximately 21,500 acres would be in effect for all water and power withdrawals, communication sites, RNAs, and historical sites/trails as identified: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Withdrawal - Bear River Reclamation Project Withdrawal - Soda Point 	Discretionary closures (agency administrative) would be in effect on approximately 20,200 acres as identified below: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Petticoat Peak RNA Dairy Hollow RNA Formation Cave RNA Oneida Narrows RNA 	Discretionary closures (agency administrative) would be in effect on approximately 57,800 acres as listed below: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Withdrawal - Bear River Reclamation Project Withdrawal - Soda Point Withdrawal - Last Chance 	Discretionary closures (agency administrative) would be in effect on approximately 5,100 acres as identified listed below: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Dairy Hollow RNA Formation Cave RNA Oneida Narrows RNA Travertine Park RNA

Minerals and Energy (ME)			
ALTERNATIVE A	PROPOSED RMP	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Withdrawal - Last Chance • Withdrawal - Fort Hall Irrigation Project • Withdrawal - Soda Springs Project • Withdrawals - Public Water Reserves (125 & 107) • Withdrawals - Power Sites and Generating Facilities • Communications sites • Downey Watershed ACEC • Dairy Hollow RNA • Formation Cave RNA • Oneida Narrows RNA • Travertine Park RNA • Pine Gap RNA • Robber's Roost RNA • Cheatbeck Canyon RNA • Historical Sites/Trails 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Travertine Park RNA • Pine Gap RNA • Robber's Roost RNA • Cheatbeck Canyon RNA • Soda Springs Hills Management Area (LWCF/BPA and public lands portions) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Withdrawal - Fort Hall Irrigation Project • Withdrawal - Soda Springs Project • Withdrawals - Public Water Reserves (125 & 107) • Withdrawals - Power Sites and Generating Facilities • Malad Air Navigation Site • Water/Power - Minidoka Reclamation Project • Communications sites • Downey Watershed ACEC • Dairy Hollow RNA • Formation Cave RNA • Oneida Narrows RNA • Travertine Park RNA • Pine Gap RNA • Robber's Roost RNA • Petticoat Peak RNA • Cheatbeck Canyon RNA • Soda Springs Hills Management Area • Rare and Sensitive Plant Habitat • Blackfoot Stock Driveway 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pine Gap RNA • Robber's Roost RNA • Cheatbeck Canyon RNA • Soda Springs Hills Management Area (Only LWCF/BPA acquired lands)
<p>Objective A-ME-2.4 Manage approximately 582,600 acres of the federal mineral estate (locatable minerals) managed as open to location of mining claims.</p>	<p>Objective B-ME-2.4. Manage approximately 564,900 acres of the federal mineral estate (locatable minerals) as open to location of mining claims. (PP-ME-2.7)</p>	<p>Objective C-ME-2.4. Same as Objective B-ME-2.4</p>	<p>Objective D-ME-2.4 Same as Objective A-ME-2.4</p>
<p>A mineral entry withdrawal (discretionary closure, agency administrative) would be pursued on approximately 1,500 acres for the following RNAs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cheatbeck Canyon RNA • Dairy Hollow RNA • Formation Cave RNA • Oneida Narrows RNA • Pine Gap RNA • Robbers Roost RNA 	<p>A mineral entry withdrawal (discretionary closure, agency administrative) would be pursued on approximately 19,200 acres for the following areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cheatbeck Canyon RNA • Dairy Hollow RNA • Formation Cave RNA • Oneida Narrows RNA • Pine Gap RNA • Robbers Roost RNA 	<p>A mineral entry withdrawal (discretionary closure, agency administrative) would be pursued on approximately 19,200 acres for the following areas:</p> <p>Identified areas are identical to Alternative B.</p>	<p>A mineral entry withdrawal (discretionary closure, agency administrative) would be pursued on approximately 1,500 acres for the following areas:</p> <p>Identified areas are identical to Alternative B.</p>

Minerals and Energy (ME)			
ALTERNATIVE A	PROPOSED RMP	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Travertine Park RNA 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Travertine Park RNA • Petticoat Peak RNA • Soda Springs Hills Management Area • Bowen Canyon Bald Eagle Sanctuary ACEC 		
<p>Nondiscretionary closures of approximately 29,700 acres would be in effect for the following areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Withdrawal - Bear River Reclamation Project • Withdrawal - Soda Point • Withdrawal - Last Chance • Withdrawal - Fort Hall Irrigation Project • Withdrawal - Soda Springs Project • Withdrawal - Downey Watershed • Withdrawals - Public Water Reserves (125 & 107) • Withdrawals - Power Generating Facilities • Recreation and Public Purpose Patents • Recreation and Public Purpose Leases • Soda Springs Hills Management Area (only LWCF/BPA acquired lands) 	<p>Nondiscretionary closures would be in effect for approximately 29,700 acres as identified below:</p> <p>Identified areas are identical to those under Alternative A.</p>	<p>Nondiscretionary closures would be in effect for approximately 29,700 acres as identified below</p> <p>Identified areas are identical to those under Alternative A.</p>	<p>A nondiscretionary closure of approximately 29,700 acres would be in effect on the following identified areas:</p> <p>Identified areas are identical to those under Alternative A.</p>

Recreation (RE)			
ALTERNATIVE A	PROPOSED RMP	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
Goal RE-1: Manage lands for dispersed recreation. (RE-1)			
Objective A-RE-1.1. Continue to manage for dispersed recreation.	Objective B-RE-1.1. Manage lands for a variety of non-motorized, mechanized, and motorized opportunities. (PP-RE-1.1)	Objective C-RE-1.1. Manage lands for a variety of non-motorized, mechanized, and motorized opportunities, with an emphasis on non-motorized and mechanized opportunities.	Objective D-RE-1.1. Manage lands for non-motorized, mechanized, and motorized activities in a variety of settings, with an emphasis on motorized activities.
<i>No similar objective</i>	Objective B-RE-1.2. Recreation facility development and permitted	Objective C-RE-1.2. Same as	Objective D-RE-1.2. Same as Alternative B.

Recreation (RE)			
ALTERNATIVE A	PROPOSED RMP	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
	recreation activities would be consistent with other resource goals of the area in which they are located. (PP-RE-1.2)	Alternative B.	
<i>No similar management action</i>	Facility development and improvements would be focused on existing recreation sites and SRMAs.	Same as Alternative B.	No focus on facility development and improvements in existing recreation sites and SRMAs.
Goal RE-2. Manage motorized vehicular (OHV) use.	Goal RE-4: Establish a comprehensive approach to travel planning and management (RE-4) Objective AA-RE-4.1 Provide on-the-ground travel management operations and maintenance programs to sustain and enhance recreation opportunities and experiences, visitor access and safety, and resource conservation. (PP-RE-4.1)		
Objective A-RE-2.1. Manage BLM-administered lands as Open, Limited, or Closed for OHV use.	Objective B-RE-4.1. Designate all public lands in the planning area as Open, Limited, or Closed. (PP-RE-4.2)	Objective C-RE-4.1. Same as Alternative B	Objective D-RE-4.1. Same as Alternative B
<u>OHV acreage designations:</u> Approximately 61,300 acres: Open to all vehicles. Approximately 1,300 acres: Closed to all vehicles. Approximately 199,000 acres: All vehicles limited to designated/existing routes. Approximately 352,200 acres not yet designated	<u>OHV acreage designations:</u> WSAs and RNAs (approximately 12,700 acres) would be designated Closed to OHV use and all remaining public lands (approximately 601,100 acres) would be designated Limited for OHV use. Cross country travel would not be allowed on public lands, and upon completion of the travel management plans, motorized travel off designated routes (identified on travel maps) would not be allowed.	<u>OHV acreage designations:</u> WSAs and RNA's (approximately 12,700 acres) would be designated Closed to OHV use and all remaining public lands (approximately 601,100 acres) would be designated as Limited for OHV use.	<u>OHV acreage designations:</u> WSAs and RNA's (approximately 12,700 acres) would be designated Closed to OHV use and all remaining public lands (approximately 601,100 acres) would be designated as Limited for OHV use.
<i>No similar management action</i>	During travel management planning, provide intensive use areas for valid motorized activities (e.g., rock crawling, motocross riding) by designating appropriate routes for these activities in front country or rural settings. These areas would not exceed a "footprint" larger than 80 acres.	During travel management planning, intensive use areas for valid motorized activities (e.g., rock crawling, motocross riding) would not be provided.	During travel management planning, provide intensive use areas for valid motorized activities (e.g. rock crawling, motocross riding) by designating appropriate routes for these activities in front country or rural settings. These areas would not exceed a "footprint" larger than 320 acres
<i>No similar objective</i>	Objective B-RE-4.2 Implement comprehensive travel management planning utilizing strategies for motorized, mechanized, and non-motorized recreation. (PP-RE-4.3)	Objective C-RE-4.2 Same as Objective B-RE-4.2	Objective D-RE-4.2 Same as Objective B-RE-4.2
<i>No similar management action</i>	Roads, routes and trails would be inventoried and mapped using best	Same as Alternative B	Same as Alternative B

Recreation (RE)			
ALTERNATIVE A	PROPOSED RMP	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
	<p>available technology, such as GPS and GIS.</p> <p>Areas would be prioritized for travel management planning based upon the following criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Known conflicts with other resources/uses, • Proximity of areas to population centers, • Special management areas and special designations, • Areas of contiguous public land, particularly those that have not been fragmented by motorized routes, and • Wildlife habitat, such as wintering habitat for ungulates or sage-grouse, or breeding habitat. 		
Goal RE-3. Provide for a variety of recreational opportunities and experiences. (RE-3)			
Objective A-RE-3.1. Continue to recognize recreation as the principal use on approximately 55,200 acres of public lands within existing SRMAs.	Objective B-RE-3.1. Recognize recreation as the principal use on approximately 59,230 acres of public lands within SRMAs. (PP-RE-3.1)	Objective C-RE-3.1. Recognize recreation as the principal use on approximately 59,200 acres of public lands within SRMAs.	Objective D-RE-3.1. Recognize recreation as the principal use on approximately 55,200 acres of public lands within SRMAs.
The Blackfoot River SRMA (approximately 21,800 acres) would continue to be managed to maintain existing physical, social, and administrative settings, providing various recreational activities, experiences and benefits for a “ Destination ” market base of southeast Idaho.	<p>The Blackfoot River SRMA (approximately 21,800 acres) would continue to be managed to maintain and/or enhance targeted recreational opportunities, experiences and benefits with a primary market based strategy being “Destination” for a market base of southeast Idaho.</p> <p>The SRMA would be managed to provide various recreational opportunities and outcomes (activities, experiences and benefits) based on a unique niche in each of the 5 RMZs identified below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wolverine Canyon (approximately 4,300 acres) • Campground (approximately 	Same as Alternative B.	Same as Alternative B.

Recreation (RE)			
ALTERNATIVE A	PROPOSED RMP	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
	<p>80 acres)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reservoir (approximately 7,200 acres) • Mid River (approximately 7,800 acres) • Lower River (approximately 2,400 acres) 		
<p>The Pocatello SRMA (approximately 33,400 acres) would continued to be managed to maintain existing physical, social, and administrative settings, providing various recreational activities, experiences and benefits for a “Community” market base of southeast Idaho.</p>	<p>The Pocatello SRMA (approximately 33,400 acres) would continue to be managed to maintain and/or enhance targeted recreational opportunities, experiences and benefits with a primary market based strategy being “Community” for a market base of southeast Idaho.</p> <p>The SRMA would be managed to provide various recreational opportunities and outcomes (activities, experiences and benefits) based on a unique niche in each of the 5 RMZ identified below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • West Bench (approximately 4,100 acres) • Blackrock (approximately 15,100 acres) • Papoose (approximately 3,400 acres) • East Bench (approximately 1,400 acres) • Dispersed (approximately 9,400 acres) 	<p>Same as Alternative B.</p>	<p>Same as Alternative B.</p>
<p><i>No similar management action</i></p>	<p>The Oneida Narrows SRMA (approximately 3,600 acres) would be identified and managed to maintain and/or enhance targeted recreational opportunities, experiences, and benefits with the primary market based strategy being “Destination” for a market base of SE Idaho and northern Utah.</p> <p>The SRMA would be managed to provide various recreational opportunities and outcomes (activities, experiences and</p>	<p>Same as Alternative B.</p>	<p><i>No similar management action.</i></p>

Recreation (RE)			
ALTERNATIVE A	PROPOSED RMP	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
	benefits) based on a unique niche in each of the 2 RMZ identified below: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • River (approximately 1,900 acres) • Reservoir (approximately 1,700 acres) 		
<i>No similar management action</i>	The Campground SRMA (approximately 430 acres) would be identified and managed to maintain and/or enhance targeted recreational opportunities, experiences and benefits with the primary market based strategy being " Destination " for a market base of southeast Idaho and northern Utah. The SRMA would be managed to provide various recreational opportunities and outcomes (activities, experiences and benefits) based on a unique niche in each of the 3 RMZ identified below: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hawkins Reservoir (approximately 120 acres) • Goodenough (approximately 280 acres) • Pipeline (approximately 30 acres) (<i>Carried forward from Alternative C.</i>) 	The Campground SRMA (approximately 430 acres) would be identified and managed to maintain and/or enhance targeted recreational opportunities, experiences and benefits with the primary market based strategy being " Destination " for a market base of southeast Idaho and northern Utah. The SRMA would be managed to provide various recreational opportunities and outcomes (activities, experiences and benefits) based on a unique niche in each of the 3 RMZ identified below: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hawkins Reservoir (approximately 120 acres) • Goodenough (approximately 280 acres) • Pipeline (approximately 30 acres) 	<i>No similar management action.</i>
Objective A-RE-3.2 - Continue to manage approximately 558,600 acres as an ERMA.	Objective B-RE-3.2 - Continue to manage approximately 554,600 acres as an ERMA. (PP-RE-3.2)	Objective C-RE-3.2 - Continue to manage approximately 554,600 acres as an ERMA.	Objective D-RE-3.2 - Continue to manage approximately 558,600 acres as an ERMA.

SPECIAL DESIGNATIONS

ADMINISTRATIVE DESIGNATIONS (AD)

ALTERNATIVE A	PROPOSED RMP	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
Goal AD-1. Provide for public land areas suitable for administrative designations. (AD-1)			
Objective CA-AD-1.1. Continue to manage WSAs to maintain wilderness characteristics. (PP-AD-1.1)			
Objective CA-AD-1.2. Continue to manage the 5 designed Watchable Wildlife Viewing Sites. (PP-AD-1.2)			

ADMINISTRATIVE DESIGNATIONS (AD)			
ALTERNATIVE A	PROPOSED RMP	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
Objective CA-AD-1.3. Continue to manage Oregon/California historic trails and alternate routes for a meaningful historic recreational and educational experience. (PP-AD-1.3)			
Objective A-AD-1.1. Manage eligible river segments for the values identified in the wild and scenic river evaluation.	Objective AA-AD-1.1. Determine which eligible river segments are suitable for inclusion in the NWSRS. (PP-AD-1.4)		
<i>No similar management action</i>	Objective B-AD-1.1 - Designate approximately 400 acres as the Petticoat Peak RNA due to the areas unique and undisturbed vegetative communities. (PP-AD-1.5)	Objective C-AD-1.1 Same as Objective B-AD-1.1	<i>No similar management action.</i>
Objective A-AD-1.2. Continue to manage the 7 ACECs (approximately 9,900 acres) and 7 RNAs (approximately 1,500 acres) designated for the unique geological, vegetative, visual, cultural, historical and/or wildlife resource values.	Objective B-AD-1.2. Continue to manage the 6 ACECs (approximately 9,900 acres) and 7 RNAs (approximately 1,500 acres) designated for the unique geological, vegetative, visual, cultural, historical and/or wildlife resource values. (PP-AD-1.6)	Objective C-AD-1.2. Continue to manage the 7 ACECs (approximately 9,900 acres) and 7 RNAs (approximately 1,500 acres) designated for the unique geological, vegetative, visual, cultural, historical and/or wildlife resource.	Objective D-AD-1.1. Continue to manage the 7 ACECs (approximately 9,900 acres) and 7 RNAs (approximately 1,500 acres) designated for the unique geological, vegetative, visual, cultural, historical and/or wildlife resource values.
See Chapter 2 for management actions specific to Alternative A for each ACEC and RNA.	See Chapter 2 for management actions specific to Alternative B for each ACEC and RNA.	See Chapter 2 for management actions specific to Alternative C for each ACEC and RNA.	See Chapter 2 for management actions specific to Alternative D for each ACEC and RNA.
<i>No similar objective</i>	New Objective: The Van Komen ACEC (approximately 3 acres) designation would be removed with the area no longer managed as an ACEC. (PP-AD-1.7)	<i>No similar objective.</i>	<i>No similar objective.</i>
<i>No similar management action</i>	The Van Komen area would be managed as adjacent public lands under the general land laws. If interested or willing parties would desire to restore/develop the Van Komen Homestead, BLM would work with such parties to the extent possible.	<i>No similar management action.</i>	<i>No similar management action.</i>

Table ES-9. Summary Comparison of Environmental Consequences

RESOURCES			
Air Quality (AQ)			
ALTERNATIVE A	PROPOSED RMP	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
Approximately 968 tons of PM ₁₀ and approximately 821 tons of PM _{2.5} would result from fire treatments and slash pile burning during the first 10 years of plan implementation. Since fire suppression would be emphasized, zero emissions would result from WFU.	Approximately 9,953 tons of PM ₁₀ and 8,417 tons of PM _{2.5} would be produced by fire treatments, such as prescribed burns and WFU, and slash pile burning, during the first 10 years of plan implementation.	Approximately 12,603 tons of PM ₁₀ and 10,680 tons of PM _{2.5} would be produced by fire treatments, such as prescribed burns and WFU, and slash pile burning, during the first 10 years of plan implementation.	Approximately 13,546 tons of PM ₁₀ and 11,451 tons of PM _{2.5} would be produced by fire treatments, such as prescribed burns and WFU, and slash pile burning, during the first 10 years of plan implementation.
Current particulate emissions resulting from phosphate mining in the planning area are estimated to average 30,555 tons of PM ₁₀ and 6,110 tons of PM _{2.5} over a ten year period.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.
Sand and gravel quarrying on public lands are estimated to produce approximately 10 tons of PM ₁₀ and 2 tons of PM _{2.5} emissions over a ten year period.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.
Approximately 1 ton of PM ₁₀ and approximately 0.15 ton of PM _{2.5} would result from fluid mineral development over a ten year period.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.
Particulate emissions (fugitive dust) from activities associated with recreation, forestry, grazing and range improvement projects, and ROW development are anticipated to continue at current levels.	Same as Alternative A, however, impacts on air quality due to OHV use may decrease due to the designation of all BLM-administered lands as "limited" for OHV use.	Same as Alternative B.	Substantially increased acreages (compared to all other alternatives) of lands available for sale or exchange under this alternative could result in various impacts (negative or positive) on air quality, depending on the current or intended future use of the lands.

Cultural Resources (CR)			
ALTERNATIVE A	PROPOSED RMP	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
Current management would result in the least risk of direct impacts on cultural resources from land tenure adjustments, ROW development, and vegetation treatments. Risks to cultural resources from open or undesignated OHV use would be the greatest under this Alternative as would the long-term risk to cultural resources from catastrophic wildland fire resulting from limited vegetation treatment.	The risk of impacts on cultural resources would be reduced by limiting OHV use to designated routes. This Alternative would also increase the acres withdrawn and acres closed to locatable minerals.	The risk of impacts on cultural resources would be the least by limiting OHV use to designated routes, increasing the acres withdrawn and acres closed to locatable minerals, disposing the least amount of federal land while increasing NSO or closure provisions for mineral and energy development to the greatest area of land. These actions would provide indirect protection to cultural resources from surface-disturbing or other incompatible activities.	This Alternative would result in the greatest risk to cultural resources because it anticipates the most surface disturbance and provides the fewest constraints on potentially incompatible activities. This Alternative would limit OHV use to designated routes reducing the risk of impacts. However, it would dispose of the most acres of public lands, treat the most area of vegetation, allow WFU on the most acreage, and close the smallest area of land to locatable minerals, mineral material disposal, and non-energy leasing.

Fish And Wildlife (FW)			
ALTERNATIVE A	PROPOSED RMP	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
An estimated 4,200 acres of deer winter range would potentially be lost due to specific public land parcels identified for sale and/or exchange. This would be the least acres of all alternatives.	An estimated 15,700 acres of deer winter range would potentially be lost due to zone concept land tenure adjustment program (sale/exchange). This would be approximately 4 times greater than Alternative A.	Same as Alternative B.	An estimated 46,000 acres of deer winter range would potentially be lost due to zone concept land tenure adjustment program (sale/exchange). This would be approximately 11 times greater than Alternative A.
An estimated 80,600 acres of wildlife habitat would be protected by fluid minerals NSO stipulation which would be the least acres of all alternatives.	An estimated 98,000 acres of wildlife habitat would be protected by fluid minerals NSO stipulation.	An estimated 143,500 acres of wildlife habitat would be protected by fluid minerals NSO stipulation which would be approximately 2 times greater than Alternative A and the greatest number of acres of all alternatives.	An estimated 84,100 acres of wildlife habitat would be protected by fluid minerals NSO stipulation.
Seasonal occupancy restrictions would protect an estimated 439,000 acres of wildlife habitat.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.
An estimated 36 riparian-stream miles would be maintained in PFC.	Management actions would result in a likely increase in total riparian-stream miles in proper function condition over Alternative A.	Same as Alternative B.	Same as Alternative B.

Fish And Wildlife (FW)			
ALTERNATIVE A	PROPOSED RMP	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
Acres achieving desired canopy cover (15-25%) for key wildlife vegetation types at 30 years following fire and non-fire vegetation treatments are displayed below:			
Low-Elevation Shrub 37,500	Low-Elevation Shrub 27,800	Low-Elevation Shrub 36,400	Low-Elevation Shrub 37,500
Mid-Elevation Shrub 29,600	Mid-Elevation Shrub 41,500	Mid-Elevation Shrub 37,400	Mid-Elevation Shrub 51,600
Mountain Shrub 187,000	Mountain Shrub 187,000	Mountain Shrub 187,000	Mountain Shrub 187,000
Crested wheatgrass Seedings 0.0	Crested wheatgrass Seedings 34,600	Crested wheatgrass Seedings 1,300	Crested wheatgrass Seedings 42,100

Soil and Water (SW)			
ALTERNATIVE A	PROPOSED RMP	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
Greatest potential long-term impacts to sensitive (wind and water erodible) soils from catastrophic wildland fire compared to Alternatives B, C, and D. No acres identified as suitable for WFU. Identifies the fewest number of acres (3,400) as suitable for fire and non-fire vegetation treatments following suppression.	Vegetation treatments, including prescribed burning and WFU, would have a short term impact by increasing erosion potential. As sites become revegetated, long term potential for improving soil conditions from existing conditions. 124,250 acres are proposed for vegetation treatments and 265,000 acres as suitable for WFU.	Same as Alternative B. 54,920 acres identified for fire and non-fire vegetation treatment and 212,600 acres identified as suitable for WFU.	Same as Alternative B. 162,170 acres identified for fire and non-fire vegetation treatment and 468,900 acres identified as suitable for WFU.
Greatest risk of impacts from OHV use. Erosion and compaction impacts would continue to occur at current rates. Approximately 1,300 acres would be closed to all vehicles; 61,300 acres would be open to all vehicles; 352,000 acres would be undesignated, and 199,000 acres would be limited to designated routes.	Would likely result in fewer impacts than Alternative A. Approximately 12,700 acres would be closed to all vehicles; 0.0 acres would be open to all vehicles; and all vehicles would be limited to designated routes on 601,100 acres .	Same as Alternative B.	Same as Alternative B.
Greatest risk of impacts from OHV use; 361,572 acres of wind erodible soils and 215,830 acres of water erodible soils would occur in open, undesignated, and limited OHV use areas.	Lower risk than Alternative A for impacts from OHV use; 361,572 acres of wind erodible soils and 215,830 acres of water erodible soils would occur in open, undesignated, and limited OHV use areas.	Same as Alternative B.	Same as Alternative B.
Soils would be indirectly protected from minerals development. Fluid leasable minerals; 314,000 acres would have an NSO stipulation. Solid leasable minerals;	Fluid leasable minerals; 226,000 acres would have an NSO stipulation and 258,100 acres would be administratively unavailable. Solid leasable minerals;	Fluid leasable minerals; 347,300 acres would have an NSO stipulation. Solid leasable minerals; 31,400 acres subject to discretionary and nondiscretionary	Fluid leasable minerals; 315,300 acres would have an NSO stipulation. Solid leasable minerals; 16,300 acres subject to discretionary and nondiscretionary

Soil and Water (SW)			
ALTERNATIVE A	PROPOSED RMP	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
22,600 acres subject to discretionary and nondiscretionary closure. Minerals materials; 32,700 acres subject to discretionary and nondiscretionary closure. Locatable mineral claims; 31,200 acres subject to discretionary and non-discretionary closure.	31,400 acres subject to discretionary and nondiscretionary closure. Mineral materials; 31,400 acres subject to discretionary and nondiscretionary closure. Locatable mineral claims; 48,900 acres subject to discretionary and non-discretionary closures.	closure. Mineral materials; 69,000 acres subject to discretionary and nondiscretionary closure. Locatable mineral claims; 48,900 acres subject to discretionary and non-discretionary closure.	closure. Mineral materials; 16,300 acres subject to discretionary and nondiscretionary closure. Locatable mineral claims; 31,200 acres subject to withdrawal.
Livestock grazing has the potential to reduce vegetation cover, disturb the surface, and compact soil in areas of concentrated use such as salting and watering areas. Livestock grazing could also contribute to nutrient loading in surface runoff in localized areas. Under Alternative A 556,300 acres would be available for grazing.	Under Alternative B 560,000 acres would be available for grazing, the most of any of the alternatives.	Under Alternative C 555,300 acres would be available for grazing. Six allotments would specifically be closed to benefit riparian areas.	Under Alternative D 527,800 acres would be available for grazing, the least of any of the alternatives.
An estimated 36 riparian-stream miles would be maintained in PFC. Riparian areas in PFC generally support stable stream banks and desirable vegetative cover; therefore, their condition is not contributing to sedimentation and they may serve as a filter to control pollutants from adjacent lands	Management actions would result in a likely increase in total riparian-stream miles over Alternative A.	Same as Alternative B.	Same as Alternative B.

Paleontological Resources (PR)			
ALTERNATIVE A	PROPOSED RMP	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
Presence or potential for paleontological resources would remain unchanged from current conditions.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.
The extent of change associated with management, the potential for ground-disturbing activities, and increases in access or activity areas to modify the risk of impacts on scientifically important paleontological resources would remain unchanged from current conditions.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.

Special Status Species (SS)			
ALTERNATIVE A	PROPOSED RMP	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
Fauna			
No SS Species geographical areas identified. Management of SS species habitat would continue to maintain existing habitat and not contribute to the potential listing of SS species.	Same as Alternative A.	An estimated 267,400 acres (SS Species geographical areas) would benefit from enhanced management of habitat (e.g., nesting, brood rearing) for SS species. Management of geographical areas would enhance habitat reducing the potential listing of SS species.	Same as Alternative A.
Least risk of potential impacts from public lands disposal resulting in an estimated potential loss of 8,100 acres of combined Colombian sharp-tailed grouse winter/ nesting habitat and greater sage-grouse habitat.	Risk of potential impacts from public lands disposal resulting in an estimated potential loss of 49,400 acres of combined Colombian sharp-tailed grouse winter/ nesting habitat and greater sage-grouse habitat. Risk is greater than Alternatives A and C, but less than Alternatives D.	Risk of potential impacts from public lands disposal resulting in an estimated potential loss of 44,300 acres of combined Colombian sharp-tailed grouse winter/nesting habitat and greater sage-grouse habitat. Risk is greater than Alternative A, but less than Alternatives B and D.	Risk is greatest with potential impacts from public lands disposal, resulting in an estimated potential loss of 102,200 acres of combined Colombian sharp-tailed grouse winter/nesting habitat and greater sage-grouse habitat.
At 30 years following fire and non-fire vegetation treatments, an estimated 254,100 acres of Shrub Steppe (Low-, Mid- and Mountain Shrub) would achieve a desired canopy cover of 15-25%.	At 30 years following fire and non-fire vegetation treatments, an estimated 256,300 acres of Shrub Steppe (Low-, Mid- and Mountain Shrub) would achieve a desired canopy cover of 15-25%.	At 30 years following fire and non-fire vegetation treatments, an estimated 260,800 acres of Shrub Steppe (Low-, Mid- and Mountain Shrub) would achieve a desired canopy cover of 15-25%.	At 30 years following fire and non-fire vegetation treatments, an estimated 276,100 acres of Shrub Steppe (Low-, Mid- and Mountain Shrub) would achieve a desired canopy cover of 15-25%.
An estimated 36 riparian-stream miles would be maintained in PFC.	Management actions would result in a likely increase in total riparian-stream miles in PFC over Alternative A.	Same as Alternative B.	Same as Alternative B.
Flora			
Least risk of potential direct impacts from fire and non-fire vegetation treatment, and WFU.	Increased risk of potential direct impacts from fire and non-fire vegetation treatment and WFU. More than Alternatives A and C, but less than Alternative D.	Increased risk of potential direct impacts from fire and non-fire vegetation treatments, and WFU. Greater than Alternative A, but less than Alternatives B and C.	Greatest risk of potential direct impacts from fire and non-fire vegetation treatment, and WFU.
Impacts to SS plant species would be potentially greater than Alternative C from surface disturbing activities. Site specific inventory and mitigation measures would be implemented as appropriate to avoid potential impacts or disturbance.	Same as Alternative A.	Impacts to SS plant species would be the least from surface disturbing activities. A ¼ mile buffer zone around SS plant species habitat would minimize potential impacts or disturbance. Establishment of priority areas for SS	Same as Alternative A.

Special Status Species (SS)			
ALTERNATIVE A	PROPOSED RMP	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
		plants (approximately 280 acres) would provide additional protective measures to improve/enhance SS plants/habitats while minimizing surface disturbing activities.	
Due to surface disturbing activities (e.g., OHV use, mineral resource development, livestock grazing, and fire and non-fire vegetation treatments), the threat of noxious/invasive weeds impacting SS plant habitat would remain unchanged. Alternative A poses the greatest risks to SS plants with the most acres open/ undesignated to motorized OHVs.	Due to surface disturbing activities (e.g., OHV use, mineral resource development, livestock grazing, and fire and non-fire vegetation treatments), the threat of noxious/invasive weeds impacting SS plant habitat would be the same as Alternative A, less than Alternative D, but greater than Alternative C.	Due to surface disturbing activities (e.g., OHV use, mineral resource development, livestock grazing, and fire and non-fire vegetation treatments), the threat of noxious/invasive weeds impacting SS plant habitat would be less than Alternative A. Non-motorized used would be emphasized under this alternative and would put SS plants at the lowest risk compared to alternatives.	Due to surface disturbing activities (e.g., OHV use, mineral resource development, livestock grazing, and fire and non-fire vegetation treatments), the threat of noxious/invasive weeds impacting SS plant habitat would be greatest. Motorized use would be emphasized under this alternative and would put SS plants at higher risk than Alternatives B and C.

Vegetation (VE)			
ALTERNATIVE A	PROPOSED RMP	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
Treatment footprint acres would be 3,400. However, the long term LHC and distribution of vegetation classes within all vegetation types would be comparable to the more intensively treated Alternatives. Vegetation treatments focus on stabilizing, restoring, and rehabilitating vegetation resources using chemical and mechanical treatments and biological control agents. Wildland fire suppression would continue to be emphasized.	Treatment footprint acres would be 124,250. Vegetation treatments would focus on stabilizing, restoring, and rehabilitating vegetation resources, and similar to Alternative A, they would be more reactive than proactive responses to wildland fire as wildfire suppression would continue to be emphasized.	Treatment footprint acres would be 54,920. Treatments would focus on stabilizing, restoring, and rehabilitating vegetation resources with minimal human intervention. Treatments would occur on one-third of the acres treated under Alternative B and one-quarter of those acres treated under Alternative D. This alternative would de-emphasize wildfire suppression.	Treatment footprint acres would be 162,200. Treatments would focus on stabilizing, restoring, and rehabilitating vegetation resources and are more proactive rather than reactive responses to wildland fire. Wildfire suppression would be emphasized and priority would be placed on protecting, maintaining, and providing resources and resource uses for commercial use.
No acreage in Shrub Steppe (Low-Elevation Shrub, Mid-Elevation Shrub, and Mountain Shrub) types would be treated. The lack of proactive restorative treatment to reestablish sagebrush in the Low Elevation Shrub type under Alternative A would increase the risk of losing this vegetation type.	Approximately 111,000 acres in the Shrub Steppe are proposed for treatment. This Alternative would have a greater effect on restoring vegetation types in the Shrub Steppe than under Alternatives A, but the long-term beneficial effect for representative Shrub Steppe species would be less than under Alternatives C or D.	Approximately 35,000 acres in the Shrub Steppe are proposed for treatment. This Alternative would emphasize maintenance of sagebrush structure within Shrub Steppe to maximally protect greater sage-grouse and Colombian sharp-tailed grouse nesting and brooding habitats and other representative sagebrush species.	Approximately 142,000 acres in the Shrub Steppe are proposed for treatment. This Alternative would have about the same long-term effect on restoring vegetation cover types in the Shrub Steppe as well as improving habitat conditions for representative sagebrush species as Alternatives A and C.
3,400 acres of vegetation treatment is proposed in the Aspen/Aspen-conifer Mix/Dry Conifer type.	Greater emphasis on pure aspen management and over the long term maintains the second most acreage (42,400 acres) in LHC class A. Impacts	Greater emphasis on pure aspen management and over the long term, maintains the most acreage (56,900 acres) in LHC class A. Impacts from	Less emphasis on pure aspen management and, over the long term, maintains the least acreage (12,600 acres) in LHC class A. Impacts from

Vegetation (VE)			
ALTERNATIVE A	PROPOSED RMP	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
	from treatments within the Aspen/Aspen-Conifer Mix/Dry Conifer type would be similar to Alternatives A and C and likely would be greater than under Alternative D.	treatments within the Aspen/Aspen-Conifer Mix/Dry Conifer type would be similar to those under Alternatives A and B and likely would be greater than under Alternative D. This alternative also calls for a very minimal amount of treatment in the Wet/Cold Conifer, Riparian, and Other types, totaling approximately 400 acres.	treatments within the Aspen/Aspen-Conifer Mix/Dry Conifer type would be less than under the other three alternatives. This alternative also calls for a very minimal amount of treatment in the Wet/Cold Conifer, Riparian, and Other types, totaling 400 acres.
Land Health Condition Class Acres Achieved Following Fire and Non-Fire Vegetation Treatments at 30 Years			
Low-Elevation Shrub LHC-A: 102,800 LHC-B: 0.0 LHC-C: 41,900	Low-Elevation Shrub LHC-A: 111,500 LHC-B: 0.0 LHC-C: 33,300	Low-Elevation Shrub LHC-A: 102,800 LHC-B: 0.0 LHC-C: 41,900	Low-Elevation Shrub LHC-A: 112,900 LHC-B: 0.0 LHC-C: 31,900
Mid-Elevation Shrub LHC-A: 52,500 LHC-B: 56,800 LHC-C: 32,700	Mid-Elevation Shrub LHC-A: 58,200 LHC-B: 0.0 LHC-C: 83,800	Mid-Elevation Shrub LHC-A: 49,700 LHC-B: 0.0 LHC-C: 92,300	Mid-Elevation Shrub LHC-A: 63,900 LHC-B: 0.0 LHC-C: 78,100
Mountain Shrub LHC-A: 187,100 LHC-B: 0.0 LHC-C: 0.0	Mountain Shrub LHC-A: 187,100 LHC-B: 0.0 LHC-C: 0.0	Mountain Shrub LHC-A: 187,100 LHC-B: 0.0 LHC-C: 0.0	Mountain Shrub LHC-A: 187,100 LHC-B: 0.0 LHC-C: 0.0
Naturally-occurring Juniper LHC-A: 0.0 LHC-B: 14,100 LHC-C: 0.0	Naturally-occurring Juniper LHC-A: 0.0 LHC-B: 14,100 LHC-C: 0.0	Naturally-occurring Juniper LHC-A: 0.0 LHC-B: 14,100 LHC-C: 0.0	Naturally-occurring Juniper LHC-A: 0.0 LHC-B: 14,100 LHC-C: 0.0
Shrub Steppe (includes Low-Elevation, Mid-Elevation, and Mountain Shrub) LHC-A: 344,500 LHC-B: 63,100 LHC-C: 77,600	Shrub Steppe (includes Low-Elevation, Mid-Elevation, and Mountain Shrub,) LHC-A: 359,000 LHC-B: 0.0 LHC-C: 126,200	Shrub Steppe (includes Low-Elevation, Mid-Elevation, and Mountain Shrub) LHC-A: 344,500 LHC-B: 0.0 LHC-C: 140,700	Shrub Steppe (includes Low-Elevation, Mid-Elevation, and Mountain Shrub) LHC-A: 368,700 LHC-B: 0.0 LHC-C: 116,500
Aspen/Aspen-Conifer Mix/Dry Conifer LHC-A: 38,800 LHC-B: 0.0 LHC-C: 51,500	Aspen/Aspen-Conifer Mix/Dry Conifer LHC-A: 42,400 LHC-B: 0.0 LHC-C: 47,900	Aspen/Aspen-Conifer Mix/Dry Conifer LHC-A: 56,900 LHC-B: 0.0 LHC-C: 33,400	Aspen/Aspen-Conifer Mix/Dry Conifer LHC-A: 12,600 LHC-B: 36,100 LHC-C: 41,500

Vegetation (VE)			
ALTERNATIVE A	PROPOSED RMP	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
Wet/Cold Conifer LHC-A: 0.0 LHC-B: 700 LHC-C: 0.0	Wet/Cold Conifer LHC-A: 0.0 LHC-B: 700 LHC-C: 0.0	Wet/Cold Conifer LHC-A: 0.0 LHC-B: 700 LHC-C: 0.0	Wet/Cold Conifer LHC-A: 0.0 LHC-B: 700 LHC-C: 0.0
Approximate acres dominated by juniper due to juniper encroachment.			
Approximate acres dominated by juniper due to juniper encroachment would be 11,300 acres.	Approximate acres dominated by juniper due to juniper encroachment would be 5,650 acres.	Approximate acres dominated by juniper due to juniper encroachment would be 0.0 acres.	Approximate acres dominated by juniper due to juniper encroachment would be 0.0 acres.
An estimated 36 riparian-stream miles would be maintained in PFC.	Management actions would result in a likely increase in total riparian-stream miles in PFC over Alternative A.	Same as Alternative B.	Same as Alternative B.

Visual Resources (VR)			
ALTERNATIVE A	PROPOSED RMP	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
ROW exclusion areas and withdrawn areas would remain the same. Approximately 5 % of public lands would continue to be closed to ROW development and approximately 11% would continue to be withdrawn from mineral entry.	Approximately 3% of public lands would be closed to ROW development resulting in greater ROW development than Alternative A. Approximately 14% of lands would be withdrawn from mineral entry, resulting in less mineral entry access than Alternative A.	ROW exclusion areas and mineral entry withdrawals would be the same as Alternative B. However, greater protection to visual resources would be provided by routing ROW development at minimum of ¼ mile from known special status species (flora and fauna) habitat.	There would be no ROW exclusion areas. Mineral entry withdrawals would be the same as Alternative A
Ongoing recreation actions that affect visual resources would remain the same. Visual resources on lands without OHV use designations may deteriorate from the continuation of route pioneering in "Open" and undesignated areas.	With the exception of potential individual areas no larger than 80 acres that may be identified and designated "Open" during travel management planning, all public lands would be designated as "Limited" for motorized and mechanized travel.	All public lands would be designated as "Limited" for motorized and mechanized travel.	With the exception of potential individual areas no larger than 320 acres that may be identified and designated "Open" during travel management planning, all public lands would be designated as "Limited" for motorized and mechanized travel.

Wildland Fire Management (WF)			
ALTERNATIVE A	PROPOSED RMP	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
Acquiring 44 miles of ROW and opening 37,300 acres to public recreation would contribute to human caused fire but would also provide easier access for fire suppression.	Would not acquire additional ROWs or open additional acres to public recreation for fire suppression.	Same as Alternative B.	Same as Alternative B.
64,400 acres identified as isolated tracts available for disposal (Zone 4); however of these identified lands, disposal of 50% would result in improved fire management planning and suppression activities on 32,200 acres.	56,300 acres identified as isolated tracts available for disposal (Zone 4); however, disposal of 50% of these identified lands would result in improved fire management planning and suppression activities on 28,150 acres.	49,900 acres identified as isolated tracts available for disposal (Zone 4); however, disposal of 50% of these lands would result in improved fire management planning and suppression activities on 24,950 acres.	121,400 acres identified as isolated tracts available for disposal (Zone 4); however, disposal of 50% of these lands would result in improved fire management planning and suppression activities on 60,700 acres.
Maintaining and enhancing existing greater sage-grouse habitat would eliminate planned fire management actions in Low-elevation Shrub. Restrictions on activities for protection of wolves would not affect fire management.	Maintaining and enhancing existing greater sage-grouse habitat could restrict some planned fire management actions. Over 10 years, approximately 69,150 acres in Low-Elevation Shrub would be treated. Restrictions on activities for protection of wolves would not affect fire management.	Greater sage-grouse habitat requirements would limit fire management actions in Low-Elevation Shrub (Perennial Grass/Seeding) (1,300 acres) and Mid-Elevation Shrub (16,650 acres). Restrictions on activities for wolf protection may limit springtime fuel reduction in denning areas.	Maintaining and enhancing existing greater sage-grouse habitat could restrict some planned fire management actions. Approximately 62,800 acres in Low-Elevation Shrub would be treated. Restrictions on activities for wolf protection may limit springtime fuel reduction in denning areas.
Current fire management direction would continue suppression of all wildland fires. No treatments would occur in any vegetation types with the exception of Aspen/Aspen Conifer Mix/Dry Conifer (3,400 acres).	Over a period of 10 years, footprint fire and non-fire vegetation treatments are planned on 69,150 acres Low-Elevation Shrub/ Perennial Grass/Seedings, 25,400 acres Mid-Elevation Shrub, 16,500 acres Mountain Shrub, 7,000 acres Aspen/ Aspen Conifer Mix and 6,200 acres Dry Conifer.	Over a period of 10 years, footprint fire and non-fire vegetation treatments are planned on 1,300 acres Low-Elevation Shrub/ Perennial Grass/Seedings, 16,650 acres Mid-Elevation Shrub, 16,600 acres Mountain Shrub, 20,000 acres Dry Conifer, 70 acres Wet/Cold Conifer, 100 acres Riparian, and 200 acres Other/Vegetated Lava.	Over a period of 10 years, footprint fire and non-fire vegetation treatments are planned on 62,800 acres Low-Elevation Shrub/ Perennial Grass/Seedings, 64,000 acres Mid-Elevation Shrub, 15,000 acres Mountain Shrub, 20,000 acres Dry Conifer, 70 acres Wet/Cold Conifer, 100 acres Riparian, and 200 acres Other/Vegetated Lava.
Full-scale suppression would continue to be the primary tool in reacting to wildland fires. The least amount of acreage in WUI areas would be treated (1,980) under Alternative A. Risk from unwanted wildland fire is moderate in 3 of the 11 WUI polygons.	Alternative B treats 55 times more acres in the WUI areas than Alternative A. Potential risk from unwanted wildland fire would be low in all of the 11 WUI polygons.	Alternative C treats the fewest acres of all the action alternatives (42% as many as Alternative B); however it has low potential risks in WUI polygons.	Alternative D treats 35% more acres in the WUI areas than Alternative B. Potential risk from unwanted wildland fire would be low in all of the 11 WUI polygons.
FRCC in 30 years (all vegetation types currently FRCC 2, except the Aspen/Aspen-Conifer Mix/Dry Conifer type is FRCC 3)			
Low- Elevation Shrub: 1	Low- Elevation Shrub: 1	Low- Elevation Shrub: 1	Low- Elevation Shrub: 1
Mid-Elevation Shrub: 2	Mid-Elevation Shrub: 2	Mid-Elevation Shrub: 2	Mid-Elevation Shrub: 2
Mountain Shrub: 2	Mountain Shrub: 1	Mountain Shrub: 1	Mountain Shrub: 1

Wildland Fire Management (WF)			
ALTERNATIVE A	PROPOSED RMP	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
Naturally-occurring Juniper: 2	Naturally-occurring Juniper: 2	Naturally-occurring Juniper: 2	Naturally-occurring Juniper: 2
Aspen/Aspen-Conifer Mix/Dry Conifer: 3	Aspen/Aspen-Conifer Mix/Dry Conifer: 2	Aspen/Aspen-Conifer Mix/Dry Conifer: 2	Aspen/Aspen-Conifer Mix/Dry Conifer: 2
Wet/Cold Conifer: 2	Wet/Cold Conifer: 2	Wet/Cold Conifer: 2	Wet/Cold Conifer: 2

RESOURCE USES			
Forestry (FO)			
ALTERNATIVE A	PROPOSED RMP	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
Commercial Forestry			
The probable sale quantity would remain unchanged, approximately 600-900 thousand board feet per year.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.
Commercial forest lands would remain unchanged, approximately 45,700 acres .	Commercial forest lands would potentially be reduced by approximately 3,700 acres through land tenure adjustments (Zone 4 disposal).	Same as Alternative A.	Commercial forest lands would potentially be reduced by approximately 13,700 acres through land tenure adjustments (Zone 4 disposal).
Proposed fuel reduction and fire management activities are planned for a total of 3,400 footprint acres of forested vegetation types (Aspen/Aspen-Conifer/Dry Conifer types) within a 10-year period (340 acres per year).	Proposed fuel reduction and fire management activities are planned for a total of 13,200 footprint acres of forested vegetation types (Aspen/Aspen-Conifer/Dry Conifer and Wet Cold Conifer vegetation types) within a 10-year period (1,320 acres per year).	Proposed fuel reduction and fire management activities are planned for a total of 20,000 footprint acres of forested vegetation types (Aspen/Aspen-Conifer/Dry Conifer and Wet Cold Conifer vegetation types) within a 10-year period (2,070 acres per year).	Same as Alternative C.
Commercial timber harvesting could account for a portion (120 to 180 acres annually) of fuel reduction and fire management treatments within this 10-year period.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.
Minerals and Energy development (oil and gas, geothermal and phosphate leasing) could potentially impact approximately 15,070 acres of commercial forest lands.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.

Non-Commercial Forestry			
Fire and non-fire vegetation treatments would annually treat approximately 160-220 acres of Aspen/Aspen Conifer Mix/Dry Conifer non-commercial forest lands.	Fire and non-fire vegetation treatments would annually treat approximately 1140-1200 acres of Aspen/Aspen Conifer Mix/Dry Conifer non-commercial forest lands.	Fire and non-fire vegetation treatments would annually treat approximately 1820-1880 acres of Aspen/Aspen Conifer Mix/Dry Conifer non-commercial forest lands.	Same as Alternative A.
The least amount, approximately 2,300 acres of non-commercial forest lands, would potentially be disposed through land tenure adjustments (Zone 4 disposal).	Approximately 8,000 acres of non-commercial forest lands would potentially be disposed through land tenure adjustments (Zone 4 disposal).	Approximately 7,000 acres of non-commercial forest lands would potentially be disposed through land tenure adjustments (Zone 4 disposal).	The greatest amount, approximately 22,100 acres non-commercial forest lands, would potentially be disposed through land tenure adjustments (Zone 4 disposal).
Minerals and Energy development (oil and gas, geothermal and phosphate leasing) could potentially impact approximately 31,200 acres of non-commercial forest lands.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.

Lands and Realty (LR)			
ALTERNATIVE A	PROPOSED RMP	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
Approximately 5% (32,200 acres) of public lands would be disposed of while retaining a public lands base of approximately 581,600 acres . Specific parcels currently identified for land tenure adjustment would not change.	Approximately 5% (28,150 acres) of public lands would be disposed based upon a zone concept while retaining a public lands base of approximately 585,650 acres .	Approximately 4% (24,950 acres) of public lands would be disposed based upon a zone concept while retaining a public lands base of approximately 588,850 acres .	Approximately 10% (60,700 acres) of public lands would be disposed based upon a zone concept while retaining a public lands base of approximately 553,100 acres .
Current classification of public lands identified as "Open", "Avoidance", or "Exclusion" areas for land use authorizations (e.g., ROW) would not change.	Public lands would be identified as "Open", "Avoidance", or "Exclusion" areas for land use authorizations (e.g., ROW). Acres for these three areas would change in comparison to Alternative A. Acres of "Open and Avoidance" areas would increase approximately 5 and 8% respectively and "Exclusion" areas would decrease by approximately 94%.	Same as Alternative B. In addition to the "Avoidance and Exclusion" areas a 1/4 mile buffer around SS plant habitat would be observed.	Public lands would be identified as "Open" or "Avoidance" areas for land use authorizations (e.g., ROW). Acres for these three areas would change in comparison to Alternatives A, B and C. Acres of "Open" areas would be the same as Alternatives B and C. Acres of "Avoidance" areas would increase approximately 18%.
"Open" – 562,900 acres "Avoidance" - 20,200 acres "Exclusion" - 30,700 acres	"Open" - 590,000 acres "Avoidance" - 21,900 acres "Exclusion" - 1,900 acres	"Open" - 590,000 acres "Avoidance" - 21,900 acres "Exclusion" - 1,900 acres	"Open" – 590,000 acres "Avoidance" - 23,800 acres

Lands and Realty (LR)			
ALTERNATIVE A	PROPOSED RMP	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
Land withdrawal management would not change. Seven RNAs, totaling 1,500 acres (< 1% of public lands) would be withdrawn from locatable mineral entry.	Approximately 19,200 acres of public land (approximately 3%) consisting of eight RNAs and the Soda Springs Hills Management Area would be withdrawn from locatable mineral entry.	Same as Alternative B.	Same as Alternative A.
Approximately 44 miles of specific road and trail legal access would be acquired to open approximately 37,300 acres to the public primarily for recreation purposes and to support other resource programs.	Key priority areas are identified for acquisition of legal road and trail access to public lands. Public access would be retained in all land tenure adjustments.	Same as Alternative B.	Same as Alternative B.

Livestock Grazing (LG)			
ALTERNATIVE A	PROPOSED RMP	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
Current grazing management would remain unchanged. Approximately 556,300 acres would be available for livestock grazing and 57,500 acres would not be available with a preference/permitted use of 86,900 AUMS .	Approximately 560,000 acres would be available for livestock grazing and 53,800 acres would not be available with a preference/permitted use of 87,500 AUMS .	Approximately 555,300 acres would be available for livestock grazing and 58,500 acres would not be available with a preference/permitted use of 86,600 AUMS .	Approximately 527,800 acres would be available for livestock grazing and 86,000 acres would not be available with a preference/permitted use of 82,200 AUMS .
Acres unavailable to livestock grazing resulting from specific resources and uses management actions include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land Tenure Adjustments (32,200 acres) • Minerals and Energy Development (480 acres) • Fluid Minerals Development (300 acres) 	Acres unavailable to livestock grazing resulting from specific resources and uses management actions include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land Tenure Adjustments (28,150 acres) • Minerals and Energy Development (480 acres) • Fluid Minerals Development (300 acres) • Available acres not permitted/ leased would be reclassified as unavailable acres (330 acres) 	Acres unavailable to livestock grazing resulting from specific resources and uses management actions include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land Tenure Adjustments (24,950 acres) • Minerals and Energy Development (480 acres) • Fluid Minerals Development (300 acres) • Available acres not permitted/ leased would be reclassified as unavailable acres (7,500 acres) 	Acres unavailable to livestock grazing resulting from specific resources and uses management actions include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land Tenure Adjustments (60,700 acres) • Minerals and Energy Development (480 acres) • Fluid Minerals Development (300 acres)
Fire and non-fire vegetation treatments (3,400 acres) would temporarily reduce preference/permitted use annually by 120 AUMS during the 10 year treatment period.	Fire and non-fire vegetation treatments (124,300 acres) would temporarily reduce preference/permitted use annually by 4,200 AUMS during the 10 year treatment period.	Fire and non-fire vegetation treatments (54,900 acres) would temporarily reduce preference/permitted use annually by 1,800 AUMS during the 10 year treatment period.	Fire and non-fire vegetation treatments (162,200 acres) would temporarily reduce preference/permitted use annually by 5,400 AUMS during the 10 year treatment period.

Livestock Grazing (LG)			
ALTERNATIVE A	PROPOSED RMP	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
Long-term forage quality and quantity due to limited vegetation treatments would not improve.	Long-term forage quality and quantity as a result of increased fire and non-fire vegetation treatments would improve compared to Alternative A.	Long-term forage quality and quantity as a result of increased fire and non-fire vegetation treatments would improve more than Alternative A but less than Alternative B.	Long-term forage quality and quantity as a result of fire and non-fire vegetation treatments would improve the greatest.
Livestock grazing within the BSD would remain unchanged.	Livestock use within the BSD would be limited to trailing only. Approximately 1,400 AUMS would be available for trailing purposes. Allotments within the BSD would be closed entirely and portions of allotments within the BSD would be closed.	Same as Alternative B.	Same as Alternative B.

Minerals and Energy (ME)			
ALTERNATIVE A	PROPOSED RMP	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
Reclamation conducted in accordance with current regulations and approved site specific operations plan.	Idaho Standards for Rangeland Health would be incorporated into reclamation requirements for all Minerals and Energy development to provide clear reclamation direction and objective criteria from which to design reclamation activities and measure the adequacy of final reclamation. Long term reclamation costs may be reduced by having clear reclamation direction and avoiding situations where reclamation would be judged inadequate and have to be revisited in the future.	Same as Alternative B.	Same as Alternative B.
No similar action under Alternative A.	For all Minerals and Energy operations, operational standards and guidelines would be implemented to protect hydrologic function and surface resource values and to prevent the release of contaminants into the environment resulting in operators having to expand or modify reclamation activities and possibly adding to overall operational costs and complexity of Minerals and Energy development.	Same as Alternative B.	Same as Alternative B.

Minerals and Energy (ME)			
ALTERNATIVE A	PROPOSED RMP	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
Non-discretionary closures for Solid Leasable Minerals, Mineral Materials and Locatable Minerals would be in effect for approximately 11,200 – 29,700 acres (1.8 – 4.8% of total public lands) depending on type of mineral.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.
Seasonal timing restrictions to protect special status species and wildlife habitat would be in effect for approximately 439,000 acres (72% of total public lands).	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.
The following acreages would be discretionarily closed under this alternative <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Solid Leasable Minerals - 11,400 acres • Mineral Materials - 21,500 acres • Locatable Minerals – 1,500 acres 	The following acreages would be discretionarily closed under this alternative. Number in parentheses indicates percent increase/decrease from Alternative A: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Solid Leasable Minerals - 20,200 acres (77%) • Mineral Materials - 20,200 acres (-11%) • Locatable Minerals - 19,200 acres (155.3%) 	The following acreages would be discretionarily closed under this alternative. Number in parentheses indicates percent increase/decrease from Alternative A: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Solid Leasable Minerals - 20,200 acres (0.0%) • Mineral Materials - 57,800 acres (330%) • Locatable Minerals - 19,200 acres (0.0%) 	The following acreages would be discretionarily closed under this alternative. Number in parentheses indicates percent increase/decrease from Alternative A: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Solid Leasable Minerals - 5,100 acres (133%) • Mineral Materials - 5,100 acres (462%) • Locatable Minerals - 1,500 acres (155%)
Fluid Leasable Minerals			
Approximately 602,600 acres (98%) would be “open” to fluid mineral leasing and 11,200 acres would be closed.	Approximately 344,500 acres (98%) would be “open” to fluid mineral leasing. 258,100 acres would be “administratively unavailable” and 11,200 acres would be “closed” for fluid mineral leasing.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.
Approximately 314,000 acres (51%) open to leasing (Oil and Gas and Geothermal resources) would be managed with an NSO stipulation to protect resources, wildlife habitat, special status species, and special designations.	Approximately 226,000 acres (37%) open to leasing (Oil and Gas and Geothermal resources) would be managed with an NSO stipulation to protect resources, wildlife habitat, special status species, and special designations.	Approximately 347,300 acres (57%) open to leasing (Oil and Gas and Geothermal resources) would be managed with an NSO stipulation to protect resources, wildlife habitat, special status species, and special designations.	Approximately 315,400 acres (51%) open to leasing (Oil and Gas and Geothermal resources) would be managed with an NSO stipulation to protect resources, wildlife habitat, special status species, and special designations.
Approximately 66,800 acres open to leasing in the “ High ” potential <u>Oil and Gas</u> area would be leased with an NSO stipulation to protect resources, wildlife	Approximately 74,200 acres open to leasing in the “ High ” potential <u>Oil and Gas</u> area would be leased with an NSO stipulation to protect resources, wildlife	Approximately 99,700 acres open to leasing in the “ High ” potential <u>Oil and Gas</u> area would be leased with an NSO stipulation to protect resources, wildlife	Same as Alternative A.

Minerals and Energy (ME)			
ALTERNATIVE A	PROPOSED RMP	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
habitat, special status species, and special designated areas.	habitat, special status species, and special designated areas. This is an 11% increase over Alternative A.	habitat, special status species, and special designated areas. This is a 49% increase over Alternative A.	
Approximately 8,200 acres open to leasing in " High " <u>Geothermal</u> potential areas would be leased with an NSO stipulation to protect resources, wildlife habitat, special status species, and special designated areas.	Same as Alternative A.	Approximately 11,400 acres open to leasing in " High " <u>Geothermal</u> potential areas would be leased with an NSO stipulation to protect resources, wildlife habitat, special status species, and special designated areas. This is a 39% increase over Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.
Over the next 20 years under a reasonably foreseeable development scenario approximately 185 acres would be developed for Oil and Gas and 129 acres for Geothermal resources.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.
Solid Leasable Minerals			
Approximately 591,200 acres (96%) would be "open" for leasing.	Approximately 582,400 acres (95%) would be "open" for leasing. This is a 1% decrease in acres from Alternative A.	Same as Alternative B.	Approximately 597,500 acres (97%) would be "open" for leasing. This is a 1% increase in acres from Alternative A.
No similar action under Alternative A.	Where selenium and other contaminants are known to be problematic, action levels would be established as concentration release standards for reclamation of phosphate mines.	Same as Alternative B.	Same as Alternative B.
Mineral Materials			
Approximately 581,100 acres (95%) would be "open".	Approximately 582,400 acres (95%) would be "open". This is a slight increase in acres from Alternative A.	Approximately 544,800 acres (89%) would be "open". This is a 6% decrease in acres from Alternative A.	Approximately 597,500 acres (97%) would be "open". This is a 2% increase in acres from Alternative A.
Locatable Minerals			
Approximately 582,600 acres (95%) would be "open".	Approximately 564,900 acres (92%) would be "open". This is a 3% decrease in acres from Alternative A.	Same as Alternative B.	Same as Alternative A

Recreation (RE)			
ALTERNATIVE A	PROPOSED RMP	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
Developed recreational opportunities would remain the same with two SRMAs totaling approximately 55,200 acres .	Developed recreational opportunities would be increase over Alternative A with the identification of the Oneida Narrows SRMA (approximately 3,600 acres) and the identification of the Campground SRMA (approximately 430 acres). Recreation would be recognized as the principle use providing opportunities and experiences on approximately 59,230 acres .	Same as Alternative B.	Same as Alternative A.
Dispersed recreation opportunities would remain the same. Approximately 558,600 acres would be available for recreational purposes.	Dispersed recreation opportunities would decrease slightly from Alternative A. Approximately 555,000 acres would be available for such purposes.	Dispersed recreation opportunities would decrease slightly from Alternative A. Approximately 554,570 acres would be available for such purposes.	Same as Alternative A.
Travel management would be the least restrictive.	Travel management would have more restrictions in comparison to Alternative A.	Travel management restrictions would further increase in comparison to Alternative B.	Travel management would have fewer restrictions that Alternative B and C, but more than Alternative A.
There would be no changes in current conditions and OHV designations would remain unchanged.	12,700 acres would be designated as "Closed" to OHVs. All remaining public lands (601,100 acres) would be designated as "Limited" – restricting motorized and mechanized travel to designated routes which would reduce surface disturbance impacts to vegetation, wildlife habitat, erosive soils and water quality.	Same as Alternative B	Same as Alternative B
"Open/Undesignated" - 413,500 acres "Limited" - 199,000 acres "Closed" - 1,300 acres	"Open/Undesignated" - 0.0 acres "Limited" - 601,100 acres "Closed" - 12,700 acres	Same as Alternative B	Same as Alternative B
No similar action under Alternative A.	Within areas designated as "Limited" to OHVs, snowmobiling would not be allowed on 62,100 acres to protect winter range habitat.	Same as Alternative B	Within areas designated as "Limited" to OHVs, snowmobiling would not be allowed on 28,700 acres to protect winter range habitat.
No similar action under Alternative A.	Snowmobiling would be restricted to designated routes on 286,500 acres within big game winter range.	Snowmobiling would be restricted to designated routes on 286,500 acres within big game winter range.	No similar action under Alternative D.
No similar action under Alternative A.	Snowmobiling would be unrestricted on 252,500 acres .	Snowmobiling would be unrestricted on 252,500 acres .	Snowmobiling would be unrestricted on 572,400 acres .

Recreation (RE)			
ALTERNATIVE A	PROPOSED RMP	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
No similar action under Alternative A.	Travel management planning would provide for legitimate intensive use routes not to exceed a “footprint” larger than 80 acres .	Travel management planning would not provide for legitimate intensive use routes.	Travel management planning would provide for legitimate intensive use routes not to exceed a “footprint” larger than 320 acres .

SPECIAL DESIGNATIONS			
ADMINISTRATIVE DESIGNATIONS (AD)			
ALTERNATIVE A	PROPOSED RMP	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
Wilderness Study Areas			
Current WSA designations of approximately 11,200 acres would be retained. No activities are anticipated to impact WSA management.	Current WSA designations of approximately 11,200 acres would be retained. No activities are anticipated to impact WSA management. WSAs would be “Closed” to OHV.	Same as Alternative B.	Same as Alternative B.
National Wild and Scenic Rivers System (NWSRS)			
Current Bear River and Blackfoot River eligible segments, totaling approximately 17 miles , would be managed to protect the values for which they were identified. Management would be applied to protect values when activities are proposed.	Of the 10 eligible river segments identified for the Bear River and the one eligible river segment identified for the Blackfoot River, none would be recommended for inclusion in the NWSRS.	Same as Alternative B.	Same as Alternative B.
Areas of Critical Environmental Concern and Research Natural Areas			
Seven established ACECs (approximately 9,900 acres) would continue to be managed for the values for which they were established. Management would be applied to protect relevant and important values when activities are proposed.	Six established ACECs (approximately 9,900 acres) would continue to be managed for the values for which they were established. Management would be applied to protect relevant and important values when activities are proposed.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.
No similar action under Alternative A.	The Van Komen ACEC (approximately 3 acres) designation would be removed and the area no longer managed as an ACEC.	No similar action under Alternative C.	No similar action under Alternative D.

ADMINISTRATIVE DESIGNATIONS (AD)			
ALTERNATIVE A	PROPOSED RMP	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
Seven established RNAs (approximately 1,500 acres) would continue to be managed for the values for which they were established. All RNAs would be "Closed" to OHV. Management would be applied to protect relevant and important values when activities are proposed.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A. In addition, all public lands within established RNAs would be unavailable to livestock grazing.	Same as Alternative A.
No new RNAs would be designated.	One area, approximately 400 acres , would be designated as the Petticoat Peak RNA. The RNA would be closed to OHV, Solid Leasable, Mineral Materials and Locatable Materials with an NSO stipulation for Fluid Minerals. ROWs would be excluded from the RNA.	Same as Alternative B. In addition, all public lands within the designated Petticoat Peak RNA would be unavailable to livestock grazing.	Same as Alternative A.

Socio-Economics (SO)			
ALTERNATIVE A	PROPOSED RMP	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
No changes in population trends, local housing market, demand for public services and facilities, employment rates, and total income or earnings.	Same as Alternative A except for the following. Decreasing the lands available for minerals and energy entry could decrease minerals and energy employment, income, and earnings if actual minerals and energy activity were to decrease as a result. Reductions in available AUMS could increase costs and decrease incomes of permittees.	Same as Alternative A except for the following. Decreasing the lands available for minerals and energy entry could decrease minerals and energy employment, income, and earnings; however this is not expected because actual minerals and energy activity is not expected to change. Greater reductions in available AUMS than in Alternative B could increase costs and decrease incomes of permittees to a greater extent.	Same as Alternative A except for the following. Increasing the lands available for minerals and energy entry could increase minerals and energy employment, income, and earnings; however this is not expected because actual minerals and energy activity is not expected to change. The greatest reduction in available AUMS could increase costs and decrease incomes of permittees to the greatest extent of all of the alternatives.
Land tenure adjustments over the period of full implementation of the RMP would result in a potential reduction in the Payment In Lieu of Taxes (PILT) of \$38,640 and a potential increase in property taxes of \$16,905.	Land tenure adjustments over the period of full implementation of the RMP would result in a potential reduction in the PILT of \$33,780 and a potential increase in property taxes of \$14,910.	Land tenure adjustments over the period of full implementation of the RMP would result in a potential reduction in the PILT of \$29,940 and a potential increase in property taxes of \$13,100.	Land tenure adjustments over the period of full implementation of the RMP would result in a potential reduction in the PILT of \$72,840 and a potential increase in property taxes of \$31,870.

Socio-Economics (SO)			
ALTERNATIVE A	PROPOSED RMP	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
Potential temporary loss to BLM in livestock grazing fee receipts (\$1,672) and increased cost to ranchers (\$13,405 to \$45,600) to replace forage temporarily lost over the first 10 years during vegetation and fuel treatments. Direct expenditures within the local economy by BLM for fuels treatments would provide an additional indirect annual economic stimulus of \$24,990.	Potential temporary loss to BLM in livestock grazing fee receipts (\$58,653) and increased cost to ranchers (\$469,224 to \$1,596,000) to replace forage temporarily lost over the first 10 years during vegetation and fuel treatments. Direct expenditures within the local economy by BLM for fuels treatments would provide an additional indirect annual economic stimulus of \$913,238.	Potential temporary loss to BLM in livestock grazing fee receipts (\$25,137) and increased cost to ranchers (\$201,096 to \$684,000) to replace forage temporarily lost over the first 10 years during vegetation and fuel treatments. Direct expenditures within the local economy by BLM for fuels treatments would provide an additional indirect annual economic stimulus of \$403,662.	Potential temporary loss to BLM in livestock grazing fee receipts (\$75,411) and increased cost to ranchers (\$603,288 to \$2,052,000) to replace forage temporarily lost over the first 10 years during vegetation and fuel treatments. Direct expenditures within the local economy by BLM for fuels treatments would provide an additional indirect annual economic stimulus of \$1,191,950.
Management actions would not result in a change in the number of available AUMs. No changes in potential loss to BLM in livestock grazing fee receipts and no potential increased cost to ranchers due to loss of AUMs over the first 10 years of the plan.	Management actions would result in changes in the number of available of AUMs (a reduction of 3,505). Compared to Alternatives A and D, greater potential loss to BLM in livestock grazing fee receipts (\$5,152) and potential increased cost to ranchers (\$41,219 to \$140,200) over the first 10 years of the plan.	Management actions would result in changes in the number of available of AUMs (200). Compared to Alternatives B and D, smallest potential loss to BLM in livestock grazing fee receipts (\$294) and potential increased cost to ranchers (\$2,352 to \$8,000) over the first 10 years of the plan.	Management actions would result in changes in the number of available of AUMs (8,800). Compared to Alternatives A, B, and C, greatest potential loss to BLM in livestock grazing fee receipts (\$12,936) and potential increased cost to ranchers (\$103,488 to \$352,000) over the first 10 years of the plan.
Greatest number of acres available for minerals and energy development without surface occupancy restrictions). 292,700 acres would be available for minerals energy or development. More lands available for minerals entry and development could result in greater employment, income, and overall local economic activity, depending on the level of minerals development activity and future interest in minerals development.	122,700 acres would be open to mineral resource development.	259,500 acres would be open to mineral resource development.	291,400 acres would be open to mineral resource development.
Potential revenues from power plant operation due the reasonably foreseeable development of fluid minerals would be \$19.7 million annually. Potential loss in grazing fees over 10 years of \$460 and potential increased cost to ranchers) to replace forage in areas of development of \$3,650 to \$12,400 over 10 years.	Potentially reduced revenues from power plant operation from the reasonably foreseeable development of fluid minerals, as a result of a 58 percent decrease in total lands available to fluid minerals activities with no NSO restrictions	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.
No change in environmental justice issues, possible effects on tribal uses due to land disposal potentially lower than Alternative D.	Low-income and minority groups would not be disproportionately affected; possible effects on tribal uses due to land disposal potentially lower than Alternatives A and D.	Low-income and minority groups would not be disproportionately affected; possible effects on tribal uses due to land disposal potentially lower than all alternatives.	Low-income and minority groups would not be disproportionately affected; possible effects on tribal uses due to land disposal potentially higher than all alternatives.