

# **PART II**

## **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT**

Pocatello Resource Management Plan  
and  
Environmental Impact Statement

Draft

Final

Lead Agency

U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management

Type of Action

Administrative

Legislative

Abstract

This draft resource management plan and environmental impact statement describes and analyzes five alternative plans for managing 264,481 acres of BLM - administered surface lands and 648,901 acres of Federal mineral estate in the Pocatello Resource Area of the Idaho Falls District. Alternative A would continue present management. Alternative B, the Preferred Alternative, would allow production and use of commodity resources while protecting natural systems for nonconsumptive resource uses. Alternative C would emphasize increases in commodity production, consumptive uses and more intensive development. Alternative D emphasizes nonconsumptive uses, favors wildlife and fisheries habitat enhancement, recreational values, cultural resource management, and watershed protection. Alternative E emphasizes mineral development on the public lands. The objective is to manage the Federal mineral estate to allow optimum exploration and development, while minimizing unnecessary impacts to other resources.

For further information contact:

Lloyd H Ferguson  
Bureau of Land Management  
940 Lincoln Road  
Idaho Falls, Idaho 83401  
Telephone (208) 529-1020

APR 30 1987

Comments should be submitted to the above address by \_\_\_\_\_

PART II

DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
SUMMARY	S - 1
CHAPTER 1: PURPOSE AND NEED	
Introduction	1 - 1
Topics for Analysis in this EIS	1 - 1
Topics Not Analyzed in Detail	1 - 4
CHAPTER 2: ALTERNATIVES	
Alternatives Including the Proposed Action	2 - 1
Alternatives Considered but not Analyzed in Detail	2 - 1
Alternatives Considered in Detail	2 - 2
Alternative A	2 - 2
Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)	2 - 6
Alternative C	2 - 11
Alternative D	2 - 16
Alternative E	2 - 21
Comparative Impacts Summary	2 - 27
CHAPTER 3: AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT	
Introduction	3 - 1
Minerals Management	3 - 1
Lands	3 - 11
Range Management	3 - 13
Wildlife, Threatened, Endangered, and Sensitive Species Management	3 - 16
Recreation and Visual Resource Management	3 - 23
Natural History	3 - 29
Cultural Resource Management	3 - 31
Paleontological Resources	3 - 33
Forest Management	3 - 35
Riparian and Water Quality Management	3 - 36
Soils and Watershed Management	3 - 37
Fire Management	3 - 38
Economic Conditions	3 - 39
Access	3 - 50
CHAPTER 4: ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES	
Assumptions	4 - 1
Alternative A	4 - 2
Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)	4 - 24
Alternative C	4 - 40
Alternative D	4 - 56
Alternative E	4 - 71
Short-term Use Versus Long-term Productivity	4 - 87
Irreversible or Irretrievable Commitments of Resources	4 - 89

	Page
<b>CHAPTER 5: CONSULTATION AND COORDINATION</b>	
Public Participation	5 - 1
List of Preparers	5 - 5
References	5 - 8
Acronyms	5 - 12
Glossary	5 - 13
Index	5 - 32

**LIST OF FIGURES**

Figure #

- 3.F1 Unemployment in Idaho and PRA
- 3.F2 Average Weekly Earnings
- 3.F3 Cash Receipts from Marketing

**LIST OF TABLES**

Table #

S.1 Alternative Summary	S - 9
2.1 Proposed Habitat Management Plans, Alternative B	2 - 8
2.2 Proposed Habitat Management Plans, Alternative C	2 - 13
2.3 Proposed Habitat Management Plans, Alternative D	2 - 18
2.4 Proposed Habitat Management Plans, Alternative E	2 - 23
2.5 Comparative Impact Summary	2 - 27
3.1 Mineral Status of Lands with the PRA	3 - 3
3.2 Annual Tonnage and Royalty for Production for Selected Phosphate Operations	3 - 5
3.3 Range Condition Comparison	3 - 14
3.4 Recreation Visitor Use Estimates	3 - 24
3.5 Present Off-Road-Vehicle Designations	3 - 26
3.6 Recreation Management Areas and BLM Developed and Undeveloped Use Sites	3 - 27
3.7 Research Natural Areas	3 - 30
3.8 Vertebrate Fossils	3 - 34
3.9 Fire Occurrences in the PRA	3 - 39
3.10 1983 Earnings by Industry	3 - 40
3.11 1983 Wage and Salary Employment	3 - 40
3.12 Gross Output Multipliers and Earning/Gross Output Ratio Bureau of Economic Analysis Economic Area	3 - 41
3.13 Distribution of Recreation Expenditures	3 - 48
3.14 Revenues Generated Fiscal Year 1985	3 - 50
4.1 Mineral Potential/Availability	4 - 4
4.2 Visitor Use Days by Alternative	4 - 15

**LIST OF MAPS**

Map #

- 1 General Location Map
- 2 Alternative A
- 3 Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)
- 4 Alternative C
- 5 Alternative D
- 6 Alternative E
- 7 Status Map (color)
- 8 Access

LIST OF MAPS

Map #

- 9 Phosphate Potential and Development
- 10 Oil and Gas Potential and Development
- 11 Locatable Minerals
- 12 Mineral Materials
- 13 Grazing Allotments
- 14 Big Game Winter Range
- 15 Selected Bird Distribution
- 16 Recreation and ORV Designations
- 17 Erosive Soils
- 18 Wildlife Seasonal Restrictions

Note: Maps 2-7 and Map 9, 13, 16, and 18 are in a map packet at the back of this document.

## SUMMARY

The Pocatello Resource Management Plan is being prepared to provide the Bureau of Land Management, Idaho Falls District Office, with a comprehensive framework for managing 264,481 acres of BLM-administered public land over the next 15 or more years. With increasing demands for various resources, prudent stewardship of public lands can no longer be accomplished without comprehensive land use planning.

The RMP/EIS is divided into three parts.

Part I of this document is the Draft Resource Management Plan for the Pocatello Resource Area, Idaho Falls District (see Map 1 for location).

Part II of this document is the Environmental Impact Statement which deals with the expected environmental impacts associated with the alternatives. Each alternative represents a possible plan for the Pocatello Resource Area. Alternative B is the preferred alternative.

Part III, Appendix, consists of specific data on which Part I and Part II are based. More detailed information is available for inspection at the Idaho Falls District Office.

The preferred alternative reflects BLM's effort to resolve resource conflicts and ensure that the public lands are managed in accordance with principles of multiple use and sustained yield.

## ISSUES

The following planning issues were identified through public participation. The issues presented here are those that received major emphasis in the public responses and ones that require a land use decision in the RMP.

Two of the issues identified dealt primarily with BLM policy. As a result, these issues were addressed in the Standard Operating Procedures section located in Part I of this document. These two issues are: the Control of Grasshoppers and Noxious Weeds on Public Lands and Shoshone-Bannock Off-Reservation Rights.

Also refer to Part I to see how the following issues were addressed.

### Availability of Lands for Phosphate, Competitive and Non-Competitive Leasing and Oil and Gas Leasing.

1. What public lands are open to leasing?
2. What is the mineral potential of the public lands open to leasing?

3. What special restriction should be placed on mineral leasing to protect other resources?

#### Mineral Development

1. Should specific public lands be closed to mineral development and exploration?
2. What special conditions should be placed on mineral exploration and development?

#### Land Ownership Adjustments

1. What public lands should be transferred out of public ownership or consolidated with other public lands?
2. What should be done with isolated public land tracts?
3. Which public lands have rights-of-way restrictions?

#### Rangeland Management

1. How should the range resource be managed to meet existing and future livestock demands?
2. How much forage should be designated for livestock use?
3. What special conditions should be placed on livestock grazing?

#### Protection of Wildlife Habitat

1. How should the range resource be managed to meet existing and future wildlife demands?
2. How much forage should be designated for wildlife use?

#### Off-Road-Vehicle use on Public Lands

What areas should be designated as open, closed, or limited to motorized vehicles?

#### Timber and Firewood Utilization

1. Should any areas be closed to timber harvesting?
2. Should restrictions be placed on timber harvesting?

#### Protection of Riparian Habitat and Water Quality

1. Which riparian areas need to be improved and which maintained?

2. What special management conditions should be placed on riparian areas?

#### Legal and Physical Access to Public Lands

1. What public lands need public access?
2. How many acres of public land would be made available to the public as a result of acquiring additional access?

#### ALTERNATIVES

Five alternatives were considered in developing the Pocatello RMP. These alternatives comply with the National Environmental Policy Act and at the same time address the issues identified. One alternative considered but not developed for the RMP was the No Grazing Alternative. The alternatives, general guidelines for developing alternatives, key management actions, and a brief discussion of alternatives are discussed below.

#### Alternative A

This alternative represents the existing situation and will serve as the baseline for analyzing other alternatives. The present level of management on the public lands would be continued, while measures would be taken to prevent or correct deteriorating conditions. Any changes in management would be brought about through monitoring studies and the environmental analysis process. All proposed changes would be handled on a case by case basis.

As defined by BLM policy, Alternative A is the preferred alternative for livestock grazing.

#### Management Action Summary

A total of 604,064 acres would be open to non-energy leasables (phosphate) and 38,895 acres would be closed. There would be 354,508 acres open to fluid mineral leasing, 329,687 acres open to fluid mineral leasing with seasonal and standard stipulations, and 24,821 acres open with No-Surface-Occupancy restrictions. A total of 38,895 acres would be closed to fluid mineral leasing. A total of 330,250 acres would be open to locatable mineral entry and 57,211 acres closed. For mineral materials, 318,857 acres would be open and 68,604 acres closed.

Approximately 22,229 acres would be identified for disposal (transfer out of public ownership) through sale, exchanges or the Recreation and Public Purposes Act process. About 242,252 acres would be identified for retention in Federal ownership. Approximately 228,322 acres would be open for rights-of-way application.

Alternative A would provide 24,061 AUMs of livestock forage in the short-term (1-5 years) and 24,361 AUMs in the long-term.

Alternative A would provide forage for 516 elk and 6,748 deer. Approximately 78,007 acres of big game range would be maintained in satisfactory condition.

Under this Alternative, 198,350 acres would be designated open to ORVs, 320 acres would be closed, and there would be 65,811 acres with limited restrictions.

Approximately 13,467 acres of public forest land would be open to commercial harvest under existing regulations, restrictions, and stipulations. There would also be 28,210 acres of woodlands available for public use.

Under Alternative A, 87.97 miles of stream would be managed to maintain existing fisheries, water quality and riparian habitat in current satisfactory condition. An additional 3.15 miles of stream would be improved.

#### Environmental Consequences Summary

In Alternative A, the acres of land available for mineral development would remain the same. There would be a moderate decrease in the acres of land retained in public ownership. There would be a moderate increase in livestock AUMs and range condition would remain basically the same. There would be no changes in wildlife habitat conditions and forage would be available for existing numbers. Water quality would continue to decrease in areas currently in a downward trend. Recreation opportunities would remain the same.

#### Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)

This alternative represents a mix of resource uses that takes a balanced approach to public land management. Production and use of commodity resources and commercial use authorizations would occur, but fragile resources, wildlife habitat, cultural values, and other nonconsumptive resource uses would be protected. It would require funding at approximately the present level.

#### Management Action Summary

A total of 598,581 acres would be open to non-energy leasables and 44,378 acres would be closed. There would be 354,508 acres open to fluid mineral leasing, 324,009 acres open with seasonal and standard stipulations and 30,499 acres open with no-surface-occupancy restrictions. A total of 38,895 acres would be closed to fluid mineral leasing. A total of 330,250 acres would be open to locatable mineral entry and 57,211 acres closed. For mineral materials, 311,793 acres would be open and 75,668 acres closed.

Approximately 17,078 acres would be identified for disposal through sale, exchange or the R&PP process. About 247,413 acres would be identified for retention. Approximately 191,561 acres would be open for rights-of-way application.

Alternative B would provide 29,969 AUMs of livestock forage in the short-term and 34,276 AUMs in the long-term.

Alternative B would provide forage for 543 elk and 7,105 deer. Approximately 82,138 acres of big game range would be maintained in satisfactory condition.

Under this Alternative, 75,115 acres would be designated open to ORVs, 3,537 acres would be closed, and 185,829 acres would have limited restrictions.

Approximately 13,255 acres of public forest land would be open to commercial harvest under existing regulations, restrictions, and stipulations. There would also be 28,011 acres of woodlands available for public use. Under Alternative B, 7.89 miles of stream would be managed to maintain existing fisheries, water quality, and riparian habitat in the current satisfactory condition. An additional 20.15 miles of stream would be improved.

Under Alternative B, public access would be obtained to approximately 37,300 acres of public land.

#### Environmental Consequences Summary

Under Alternative B, there would be a minor decrease in the amount of land available for minerals development. There would be a minor decrease in lands available for transfer from Federal ownership. Range conditions would improve due to vegetation manipulations and range improvements. Livestock AUMs would show a moderate increase. Deer and elk numbers would increase. There would also be a minor increase in big game habitat. Acres designated open for ORVs would decrease and increase for limited designation. Commercial forest lands available for management would increase. There would be a moderate increase in water quality, fisheries, and riparian condition. Economic conditions would improve over the existing situation with a possible increase of 32 jobs. Legal access would be obtained increasing management efficiency, no environmental consequences anticipated.

#### Alternative C

Alternative C favors production and use of commodity resources and commercial use authorizations. Management direction would favor higher livestock stocking levels, more range improvements, land disposal for agricultural development, and transfer of isolated or difficult to manage parcels out of Federal ownership. Restrictions on mining, mineral leasing, mineral material removal, and ORV use would be minimized.

#### Management Action Summary

A total of 604,064 acres would be open to non-energy leasable and 38,895 acres would be closed. There would be 361,508 acres open to fluid mineral leasing, 332,587 acres open with seasonal and standard stipulations, and 28,921 acres open with No-Surface-Occupancy. A total of 31,895 acres would be closed to

fluid mineral leasing. A total of 330,250 acres would be open to locatable mineral entry and 57,211 acres closed. For mineral materials, 313,788 acres would be open and 73,673 acres closed.

Approximately 23,098 acres would be identified for disposal through sale, exchange or R&PP process. About 241,383 acres would be identified for retention. Approximately 221,521 acres would be open for rights-of-way application.

Alternative C would provide 31,251 AUMs of livestock forage in the short-term and 36,990 AUMs in the long-term.

Alternative C would provide forage for 510 elk and 6,662 deer. Approximately 77,019 acres of big game range would be maintained in satisfactory condition.

Under this Alternative, 198,350 acres would be designated open to ORVs, 320 acres would be closed, and 65,811 acres would have limited restrictions.

Approximately 10,757 acres of public forest land would be open to commercial harvest under existing regulations, restrictions, and stipulations. There would also be 26,706 acres of woodlands available for public use.

Under Alternative C, 64.04 miles of stream would be managed to maintain existing fisheries, water quality, and riparian habitat in current satisfactory condition. No additional miles of stream would be improved.

Access would be acquired to approximately 37,300 acres of public land.

#### Environmental Consequences Summary

Under Alternative C, there would be a minor increase in the amount of land available for minerals management. There would be a moderate increase in lands available for transfer from Federal ownership. Range condition and livestock AUMs would show a moderate increase. Deer and elk numbers would decrease. There would also be a minor decrease in big game habitat. Acres designated open for ORVs would increase and decrease for limited designation. Commercial forest lands available for management would decrease. There would be a decrease in water quality, fisheries, and riparian condition. Economic conditions would show an increase for the area, same as Alternative B.

#### Alternative D

Alternative D emphasizes wildlife and fisheries habitat enhancement, recreational values, cultural resources management, and watershed protection.

#### Management Action Summary

A total of 598,581 acres would be open to non-energy leasables and 44,378 acres would be closed. There would be 354,508 acres open to fluid mineral leasing, 313,799 acres open with seasonal and standard stipulations, and

40,709 acres open with No-Surface-Occupancy. A total of 38,895 acres would be closed to fluid mineral leasing. A total of 329,273 acres would be open to locatable mineral entry and 58,188 acres closed. For mineral materials, 301,583 acres would be open and 85,878 acres closed.

Approximately 8,124 acres would be identified for disposal through sale, exchange, or the R&PP process. About 256,357 acres would be identified for retention. Approximately 178,916 acres would be open for rights-of-way application.

Alternative D would provide 28,840 AUMs of livestock forage in the short-term and 29,519 AUMs in the long-term.

Alternative D would provide forage for 554 elk and 7,243 deer. Approximately 83,731 acres of big game range would be maintained in satisfactory condition.

Under this Alternative, 22,676 acres would be designated open to ORVs, 47,972 acres would be closed, and 193,833 acres would have limited restrictions.

Approximately 13,255 acres of public forest land would be open to commercial harvest under existing regulations, restrictions, and stipulations. There would also be 28,210 acres of woodlands available for public use. Under Alternative D, 59.64 miles of stream would be managed to maintain existing fisheries, water quality, and riparian habitat in current satisfactory condition. An additional 34.15 miles of stream would be improved.

Access would be acquired to approximately 37,300 acres of public land.

#### Environmental Consequences Summary

Under Alternative D lands available for minerals management would decrease. There would be a decrease in lands available for transfer from Federal ownership. Range conditions would improve and livestock AUMs would show a minor decrease. Deer and elk numbers would increase. There would also be a minor increase in big game habitat. Acres designated open for ORVs would decrease and increase for limited designations. Commercial forest lands available for management would remain about the same. There would be a major increase in water quality, fisheries, and riparian conditions. The economic conditions project an increase over the existing situation, but a decrease when compared to Alternatives B, C and E.

#### Alternative E

Alternative E emphasizes mineral development on the public lands. The objective is to manage the Federal mineral estate to allow optimum exploration and development, while minimizing unnecessary impacts to other resources.

### Management Action Summary

A total of 614,578 acres would be open to non-energy leaseables and 28,381 acres would be closed. There would be 361,508 acres open to fluid mineral leasing, 332,587 acres open with seasonal and standard stipulations, and 28,921 acres open with No-Surface-Occupancy. A total of 31,895 acres would be closed to fluid mineral leasing. A total of 330,250 acres would be open to locatable mineral entry and 57,211 acres closed. For mineral materials, 313,788 acres would be open and 73,673 acres closed.

Approximately 17,585 acres would be identified for disposal through sale, exchange, or the R&PP process. About 246,896 acres would be identified for retention. Approximately 221,521 acres would be open for rights-of-way application.

Alternative E would provide 29,969 AUMs of livestock forage in the short-term and 34,276 AUMs in the long-term.

Alternative E would provide forage for 555 elk and 7,251 deer. Approximately 83,822 acres of big game range would be maintained in satisfactory condition.

Under this Alternative, 198,350 acres would be designated open to ORVs, 320 acres would be closed, and 65,811 acres would have limited restrictions.

Approximately 10,757 acres of public forest land would be open to commercial harvest under existing regulations, restrictions, and stipulations. There would also be 27,106 acres of woodlands available for public use.

Under Alternative E, 83.84 miles of stream would be managed to maintain existing fisheries, water quality, and riparian habitat in the current satisfactory condition. An additional 6.75 miles of stream would be improved.

Access would be acquired to approximately 37,300 acres of public land.

### Environmental Consequences Summary

Under Alternative E, there would be an increase in the amount of land available for minerals management. There would be a decrease in lands available for transfer from Federal ownership. Range conditions would increase and livestock AUMs would show a minor increase. Deer and elk numbers would increase slightly due to improvements. Acres designated open for ORVs would be the same as Alternatives C. Commercial forest lands available for management would also be the same as Alternative C, showing a minor decrease in acreage. There would be a minor increase in water quality, fisheries, and riparian condition over the existing situation. The economic conditions would improve over the existing situation.

TABLE S.1  
ALTERNATIVE SUMMARY TABLE

Management Objective/Action	(Existing) Alternative A	(Preferred) Alternative B	(Production) Alternative C	(Protection) Alternative D	(Minerals) Alternative E
<b>MINERALS MANAGEMENT</b>					
<b>A. Leasable Minerals</b>					
1) Non-Energy Leasables					
Acres Closed	38,895	44,378	38,895	44,378	28,381
Non-Discretionary	28,381	28,381	28,381	28,381	28,381
Discretionary	10,514	15,997	10,514	15,997	0
Acres Open	604,064	598,581	604,064	598,581	614,578
2) Fluid Leasables Oil and Gas/Geothermal					
Acres Closed	38,895	38,895	31,895	38,895	31,895
Non-Discretionary	28,381	28,381	28,381	28,381	28,381
Discretionary	10,514	10,514	3,514	10,514	3,514
Acres Open	354,508	354,508	361,508	354,508	361,508
No Surface Occupancy	24,821	30,499	28,921	40,709	28,921
Seasonal and Standard Stipulations	329,687	324,009	332,587	313,799	332,587
<b>B. Locatable Minerals</b>					
1) Acres Closed to Entry	57,211	57,211	57,211	58,188	57,211
Congressional	0	0	0	0	0
Executive Branch Agency	51,015	51,015	51,015	51,015	51,015
BLM	6,196	6,196	6,196	7,173	6,196
2) Acres Open to Entry	330,250	330,250	330,250	329,273	330,250
<b>C. Mineral Materials</b>					
1) Acres Closed to Disposal:	68,604	75,668	73,673	85,878	73,673
Non-Discretionary	66,155	66,155	66,155	66,155	66,155
Discretionary	2,449	9,513	7,518	19,723	7,518
2) Acres Available for Disposal	318,857	311,793	313,788	301,583	313,788
<b>LANDS</b>					
<b>A. Disposal Areas</b>					
Total Disposal (Sales, exchanges and R&PP)(Acres)	22,229	17,068	23,098	8,124	17,585
<b>B. Retain in Public Ownership (Acres)</b>					
	242,252	247,413	241,383	256,357	246,896
<b>C. Leases/Permits (Acres)</b>					
	403	403	1,270	222	222
<b>D. Acquire (Acres)</b>					
	3,554	19,567	27,367	21,527	9,754
<b>E. Acres Available for Rights-of-Way (ROW) Applications</b>					
1) Open to ROW Application	228,322	191,561	221,521	178,916	221,521
2) Open with Restriction	24,821	42,251	31,622	40,231	31,622
3) Closed to ROW Application	11,338	30,669	11,338	45,334	11,338
<b>RANGE MANAGEMENT</b>					
<b>A. Areas of Grazing Use</b>					
1) Available Acreage	212,098	217,728	227,201	209,974	218,174
2) Closed/Restricted Acreage	10	1,810	307	1,810	500
3) Unallotted Acreage	15,400	7,200	0	15,400	7,200
4) Unsuitable Acreage	23,566	23,566	23,566	23,566	23,566
<b>B. Range Improvements</b>					
1) Brush Control/Seeding (Acres)	0	11,240	17,600	0	11,240
2) Water Facilities (Each)	20	54	76	76	54
3) Fences (Miles)	8	10	45	82	10
4) Acres of Disturbed Restored	100	1,500	800	1,500	800
<b>C. Preference</b>					
1) Active (AUMs)	29,151	29,151	29,151	29,151	29,151
2) AUM Change after Implementation	24,061	29,969	31,251	28,840	29,969
3) Percent Change from Existing	1/(-17.5%)	2/0% (+2.8%)	+20% (+7%)	+23.1% (-1.1%)	+16.6% (+2.8%)
4) Future (+15 Years)	24,361	34,276	36,990	29,519	34,276
5) Future % Change from Existing	(-16.5%)+1.3%	(+13%)+30%	(+21.2%)+35%	(+2.4%)+18.5%	(+12.6%)+29.9%
<b>D. Allotment Categorization</b>					
1) Maintain	88	88	88	88	88
2) Improve	168	168	168	168	168
3) Custodial	159	159	159	159	159
<b>WILDLIFE MANAGEMENT</b>					
<b>A. Numbers of Animals</b>					
1) Elk	516	543	510	554	555
2) Mule Deer	6,748	7,105	6,662	7,243	7,251
<b>B. Habitat Acres</b>					
1) Big Game Winter Range:					
Satisfactory	78,007	82,138	77,019	83,731	83,822
Unsatisfactory	6,100	3,682	8,801	1,991	4,353
2) Sage Grouse					
Satisfactory	62,310	63,320	58,470	65,526	63,678
Unsatisfactory	7,355	5,640	10,450	3,394	5,722
3) Sharp-tail Grouse					
Satisfactory	23,867	26,072	25,789	26,170	26,072
Unsatisfactory	3,130	3,245	3,528	3,174	3,245
<b>C. Wildlife Improvements</b>					
1) Water Sources (Guzzlers)	2	2	2	2	2
2) Fences (Miles)	4	6	4	6	6
3) Bitterbrush Planting (Acres)	40	417	417	597	417
4) Goose Nest Platforms	4	6	4	13	6

1/ (%) is percent change from active preference 29,151.  
2/ % is change from actual use 24,061.

TABLE S.1 (cont'd)  
ALTERNATIVE SUMMARY TABLE

	(Existing) Alternative	(Preferred) Alternative	(Production) Alternative	(Protection) Alternative	(Minerals) Alternative
Management Objective/Action	A	B	C	D	E
<b>RECREATION MANAGEMENT</b>					
<b>A. Off-Road Vehicle Designations</b>					
1) Open	198,350	75,115	198,350	22,676	198,350
2) Closed	320	3,537	320	47,972	320
3) Limited	65,811	185,829	65,811	193,833	65,811
<b>B. Special Designations</b>					
1) ACECs	0	4,506(3)	4,506(3)	4,506(3)	4,506(3)
2) RNAs	0	1,494(7)	1,494(7)	1,494(7)	1,494(7)
3) SRMAs	0	64,532(2)	64,532(2)	64,532(2)	64,532(2)
<b>C. Visual Resource Management Classes</b>					
1) Class I	11,338	11,338	11,338	11,338	11,338
2) Class II	99,055	99,055	27,800	115,055	27,800
3) Class III	141,266	141,266	51,960	125,266	51,960
4) Class IV	12,822	12,822	173,383	12,822	173,383
<b>D. Developed Recreation Sites</b>					
1) Number of Developed Recreation Sites	9	17	23	17	23
2) New Miles of Developed Multiple Use Trails	0	6	6	6	6
<b>CULTURAL RESOURCE MANAGEMENT</b>					
<b>A. No Surface Occupancy (Acres)</b>					
1) Historic R.R. Grade	5	10	5	20	5
2) Blackrock Canyon	10	40	10	640	10
3) Historic Trail Segments	40	2,000	40	11,600	40
<b>B. Sensitive Areas (Acres)</b>					
1) Prehistoric Area A	80	280	80	280	80
2) Indian Rocks	40	370	40	370	40
3) Prehistoric Area B	80	1,200	80	4,620	80
4) Upper Valley	120	520	120	1,600	120
5) Prehistoric Area C	40	280	40	280	40
6) Prehistoric Area D	10	40	10	280	10
7) Bear Lake Plateau	40	320	40	3,500	40
8) Prehistoric Area E	80	240	80	1,840	80
9) Prehistoric Area F	5	40	5	40	5
10) Prehistoric Area G	600	3,400	600	8,840	600
<b>FOREST MANAGEMENT (Acres)</b>					
<b>A. Commercial Forest Land (CFL)</b>					
1) TPCC Withdrawal	1,279	1,279	1,279	1,279	1,279
2) Deferred Lands (depending on Congress' decision)					
Petticoat Peak and Worm Creek WSAs	2,559	2,559	2,559	2,559	2,559
3) Available for Restricted Management	12,659	11,369	9,949	11,369	9,949
4) Available CFL Without Restrictions	808	808	808	808	808
5) CFL Managed to Enhance Other Uses	0	1,078	0	1,078	0
6) Proposed Harvest Levels (1000 Board feet/year)	350-400	350-400	250-300	350-400	250-300
B. Available Woodland	28,210	28,011	26,706	28,210	27,106
C. Withdrawn Woodlands (Petticoat Peak WSA)	5,069	5,069	5,069	5,069	5,069
<b>RIPARIAN AND WATER QUALITY</b>					
<b>A. Miles of stream managed primarily for improvement of stream condition and maintenance of water quality.</b>					
	3.15	20.15	0	34.15	6.75
<b>B. Miles of stream to be maintained in present condition</b>					
	87.97	70.89	64.04	59.64	83.84
<b>C. Miles of stream that would exhibit a downward trend</b>					
	2.75	2.75	29.75	0	3.20
<b>D. Miles of fencing needed to improve stream condition</b>					
	6.75	8.25	0	13.20	7.25
<b>E. Miles of inventoried stream disposed of as a result of Lands actions</b>					
	3.57	3.65	3.65	3.65	3.65
<b>WILDERNESS</b>					
Implement Congress' Decision on the Petticoat Peak and Worm Creek WSAs					
Petticoat Peak	11,298				
Worm Creek	40				
	11,338 Acres				
<b>SOILS AND WATERSHED MANAGEMENT</b>					
<b>A. Erosion Controls</b>					
1) Juniper Cutting Areas	0	500	1,000	300	600
2) Protect Oneida Narrows	948	948	948	948	948
3) Protect Ashy Soils	0	360	0	1,360	360
4) Woodall Mountain and Trail Creek (Reclamation)	52	224	314	224	600
<b>FIRE MANAGEMENT</b>					
1) Full Suppression	264,481	253,143	253,143	253,143	253,143
2) Limited Suppression		1/ 11,338	11,338	11,338	11,338
3) Prescribed Burning	0	11,240	17,600	0	11,240

1/ Petticoat Peak and Worm Creek WSAs will be managed under the Interim Management Policy.