CHAPTER 1 - INTRODUCTION

1.1 OVERVIEW

The United States (US) Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management (BLM) has prepared this Draft Resource Management Plan (RMP) and environmental impact statement (EIS) to provide direction for managing public lands under the jurisdiction of the Coeur d'Alene District, Coeur d'Alene Field Office (CdA FO) in northern Idaho and to analyze the environmental effects that could result from implementing the alternatives presented in this plan. The affected lands are currently being managed under the Emerald Empire Management Framework Plan (MFP) (BLM 1981). Additional management direction is currently provided in 14 associated decision documents, including amendments and various resource guidance documents.

The land use planning process is the key tool used by the BLM to manage resources and to designate uses on public lands in coordination with Tribal, state, and local government, land users, and the interested public. Generally, an RMP does not result in a wholesale change of management direction. Accordingly, this RMP: 1) incorporates new information and regulatory guidance released since the previous plan and associated amendments, and 2) concentrates on providing management direction where it may be lacking or requiring clarification to resolve land use issues or conflicts. Current management direction that has proven effective and requires no change will be carried forward in this RMP and through the analysis process.

The RMP is being prepared using BLM planning regulations and guidance issued under the authority of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act (FLPMA) of 1976 (43 US Code [USC] 1701 et seq.) and BLM's Land Use Planning Handbook, H-1601-1 (BLM 2005a). An EIS is incorporated into this document to meet the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA), Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) regulations for implementing NEPA (40 Code of Federal Regulations [CFR] 1500-1508) (CEQ 1978), and requirements of BLM's NEPA Handbook, H-1790-1 (BLM 1988).

1.2 PURPOSE OF AND NEED FOR ACTION

The RMP is needed to respond to changing ecological, socioeconomic, institutional, and regulatory conditions that have occurred since the approval of the Emerald Empire MFP in 1981 and the various amendments and decisions that have been approved from 1982 to 2005. Many new laws, regulations, and policies have created additional public land management considerations. As a result, some of the decisions in the MFP and the associated amendments and decisions are no longer valid, or these decisions have been superseded by requirements that did not exist when they were prepared. Likewise, user demands and impacts have evolved requiring new management direction.

The purpose of the Coeur d'Alene RMP is to provide a single, comprehensive land use plan that will guide management of the public lands and interests administered by the CdA FO. The plan provides objectives, land use allocations, and management direction to maintain, improve, or restore resource conditions and to provide for the economic needs of local communities over the long term. The RMP incorporates new data, addresses land use issues and conflicts, specifies where and under what circumstances particular activities will be allowed on public lands, and incorporates the mandate of multiple uses in accordance with FLPMA. The RMP does not describe how particular programs or projects would be implemented or prioritized; rather, those decisions are deferred to more detailed implementation-level planning.

1.3 DESCRIPTION OF THE PLANNING AREA

The CdA planning area (planning area) is in the Panhandle Region of northern Idaho (see Figure 1-1 below and Map #1) and encompasses the five northernmost Idaho counties: Boundary, Bonner, Kootenai,

Benewah, and Shoshone. The planning area is bordered on the west by the Washington state line, on the north by the Canadian border, on the east by the Montana state line, and on the south by Latah and Clearwater Counties, Idaho.

The planning area includes all land within this region regardless of ownership, totaling approximately 5,077,776 acres. About 96,770 acres, or 1.9 percent of the planning area, are administered by the BLM. The decisions in the CdA RMP will only apply to the BLM-administered public lands within the planning area, which are referred to as the decision area. Table 1-1 identifies total and BLM-administered acreages and percentages of the planning area by county.

Table 1-1 BLM-Administered Public Lands Within the Planning Area

County	BLM Acres	Total Acres	BLM Percent of Total
Benewah	13,655	502,837	2.7
Bonner	11,975	1,227,920	1.0
Boundary	4,400	818,187	0.6
Kootenai	11,024	837,932	1.3
Shoshone	55,844	1,690,900	3.3
Planning Area Total	**96,898**	**5,077,776**	**1.9**

BLM-administered lands within the planning area consist of numerous tracts ranging in size from less than one acre to over 10,000 acres. BLM-administered lands are mixed among private, State of Idaho, US Forest Service-administered, and Tribal lands, each of which may be influenced or directly affected by BLM decisions.

Figure 1-1. CdA Planning Area

BLM lands lie partially within the ceded territory of the Coeur d'Alene Tribe. There are also about 180 acres of BLM-administered land within the current Coeur d'Alene reservation boundary. Other federally recognized tribes with aboriginal or historic ties to the area managed by the CdA FO include the Kootenai Tribe of Idaho, the Kalispel Tribe of Indians currently located in Washington, and the Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes in Montana.

Currently, the Idaho Panhandle National Forest (IPNF) is revising its forest plan for national forest lands, including those lands within the planning area. The BLM has coordinated, and will continue to coordinate, with the USDA Forest Service and other federal and state agencies during the development of the RMP.

The topography within the planning area is diverse, ranging from river valleys to mountain peaks over 7,000 feet elevation. The majority of BLM-administered land lies between 2,500 and 4,500 feet. Coniferous forest covers most of the planning area, with mountain shrubs and grasslands covering a very small area. Major rivers include the Coeur d'Alene, Kootenai, Pend Orielle, and St. Joe. Lakes are an important feature of the

planning area and include Coeur d'Alene, Pend Oreille, Priest, and the chain lakes bordering the Lower Coeur d'Alene River.

The Wallace area (Shoshone County) has mineral deposits of national importance. Two large silver mines (Lucky Friday and the Galena) continue to operate here, and a large portion of the working population is employed in some sort of mining activity. Similarly, the towns of St. Maries (Benewah County), Coeur d'Alene (Kootenai County), Bonners Ferry (Boundary County), and Sandpoint (Bonner County) support several sawmills.

1.4 SCOPING AND PLANNING ISSUES

1.4.1 Scoping Process

Early in the planning process, the public was invited to help the BLM identify planning issues and concerns relating to the management of BLM-administered public lands and resources/uses in the planning area. The formal scoping period began with publication of the Notice of Intent (NOI) in the Federal Register on September 3, 2004. The scoping period for receipt of public comments ended November 14, 2004, which provided 73 days for comment submittal.

BLM encouraged public participation during the scoping period through a newsletter, announcements in local news media, public meetings, and its project Web site. The newsletter described the planning process, solicited readers to submit comments, and announced public meeting dates and locations. It was mailed to more than 200 interested members of the public, local and Tribal governments, and federal and state agencies. Announcements in local news media also provided information on public meetings and solicited comments. BLM shared more detailed information about the RMP and planning process during five public meetings held at various locations throughout the planning area. The Web site at www.blm.gov/rmp/id/cda (previously www.cdarmp.com) provided background information, supporting documents, and directions for obtaining information and submitting comments. Detailed information about scoping, and the results can be found in the Scoping Report (BLM 2005b), which is available on the project Web site or at the CdA FO.

1.4.2 Planning Issues

The land use planning process is issue driven. Planning issues are disputes or controversies about existing and potential land and resource allocations, levels of resource use, production, and related management practices. Scoping is a collaborative public involvement process to identify planning issues to be addressed. BLM conducted scoping for the CdA RMP from September 3 to November 15, 2004. A scoping report is available from the CdA FO upon request, or on the Internet at www.blm.gov/rmp/id/cda. From analyses of the existing situation and comments received during public scoping, the BLM identified six major planning issues. A summary of these six issues follows:

Issue 1: ***What opportunities will BLM provide for motorized and nonmotorized recreation, while protecting natural and cultural resources?***

BLM received more scoping comments on recreation and public access than any other topic. This issue highlights a concern that many have about the damage that recreational activities often cause to other resources (e.g., riparian areas, wildlife habitat, water quality, cultural sites, etc.). It also refers to the public concern about access to their public lands and conflicts that occur among differing types of recreational uses.

Many respondents requested that the BLM maintain or improve public access for recreational use on public lands, while others expressed concern that many types of recreational use can cause damage to other

resources. Motorized and nonmotorized uses can damage wildlife habitat and can adversely affect water quality by damaging riparian plant communities and by causing soil erosion. Recreational use can also damage important cultural resources, including those of spiritual or traditional value to Native Americans. Some respondents suggested that the BLM limit types of access or use in sensitive areas. However, such restrictions may conflict with the public demand for more recreational access. To address these concerns, some have suggested that the BLM develop a looped trail system with existing routes, alleviating the need to backtrack or travel cross-country; provide maps and signs to delineate riding areas, which would discourage travel through environmental sensitive areas; provide interpretive areas and overlooks; and develop new routes to relocate existing routes causing resource damage.

A great number of comments agreed that maintaining or improving access to public lands, including access across them to lakes and waterways, should be a priority; however, user group conflicts were apparent, primarily demonstrated by the different levels of restrictions and access desired for motorized and nonmotorized recreation. Public comments indicate that there is a great demand for motorized (OHV) use on the public lands. One reason mentioned for keeping roads and trails open to motorized access included the need for equal access to the resource for people of all ages and abilities. OHVs include various four-wheel drive vehicles (jeeps, ATVs, etc.), two wheel vehicles (motorcycles), and snowmobiles. BLM recognizes that the types of roads or desired settings, and the impacts to the environment, differ among types of vehicles. This is especially true when comparing snowmobiles to other OHVs. Consideration of opportunities for nonmotorized recreational uses (i.e., mountain biking, horseback riding, hiking, cross-country and backcountry skiing, and snowshoeing) and potential conflicts among these types of uses, and with motorized use, make the situation more complex. There is also a difference of opinion among all types of recreational users regarding the setting. Some say that BLM should provide more developed facilities, while others desire more primitive settings. Some comments suggest that BLM should develop or maintain its existing road and trail system while allowing for segregation of users through route or area designations. Some also recommended that BLM attempt to link its roads and trails to other public trail systems to increase opportunities. Improving signage and availability of maps to reduce user conflicts was also a common suggestion.

Issue 2: ***How will the BLM manage vegetation treatments and provide forest products, while providing fish and wildlife habitat and protecting water quality, native plant communities, old growth forest, and cultural resources?***

The BLM manages the health of its lands, including fish and wildlife habitat, fisheries, and special status species habitat, and provides for sometimes conflicting uses, such as logging, grazing, and recreation. Certain public groups or individuals suggested that the BLM should emphasize conservation over extractive commodities, while others conversely advocated for the BLM to balance the needs of both uses.

Vegetation treatments include fuel reductions, stewardship projects, and commercial harvesting. There were also many concerns regarding habitat and wildlife protection and restoration, water quality degradation relevant to aquatic species and their habitats, the effects of exotic species on wildlife sustainability, and road impacts to neighboring habitats. Many of the comments received during the scoping period expressed concern about past and present forest and fire management actions. The public recognizes the need for fuel reduction and protection of the Wildland Urban Interface. Wildlife habitat includes those areas necessary to meet the life history requirements of terrestrial, aquatic, and special status species. Riparian areas are key components of wildlife habitat and are directly tied to water quality. It is important to the public to maintain

diverse and healthy vegetative components for fish, wildlife, and rare plant populations, riparian areas, water and air quality, and cultural and Tribal interests.

There were a few comments that identified forestry-related issues. The specific forestry-related issues were fire management, the need for forest management and forest inventory, restoration and sustainability of old-growth timber stands, and a desire to see commercial timber harvesting in the planning area. Those comments that mentioned forest management indicated that forested areas lacked natural fire regimes and that controlled burns should be examined as a management tool. Several comments indicated the need for a more complete forest management strategy, including old-growth inventory and management. Comments also pointed out the mandate for sustained yield, a need for cooperation between forest landholders, and the possibility of commercial timber harvests in the planning area. Forest management was also described as potentially beneficial to watershed, wildlife, and livestock management.

One of the issues addressed was the need to minimize conflict between fish and wildlife habitat and other resources. Many comments identified recreation, commercial forest production, and mineral development as uses that have potential wildlife conflicts. These comments suggested that the RMP identify ways to limit these impacts through closures or restrictions. The letters requested that the best available data and science be used to determine the nature and extent of wildlife conflict before management decisions are made. Other comments addressed the need to manage for and protect native species. Many individuals requested that all special status species in the planning area be given significant management attention in the RMP. Some comments focused on limiting the amount of management attention paid to nonnative species' habitat management, as well as avoiding the introduction of new nonnative species.

Comments specifically mentioned a need for management attention towards threatened and endangered (T&E) species, native fish species, groups of species, or types of habitats to be evaluated or designated. Many of the comments received during the scoping period expressed concern about fish and wildlife habitat, fisheries, and special status species protection and restoration, water quality degradation relevant to aquatic species, the effects of vegetation management on wildlife sustainability, and roadway and roadless area impacts on neighboring habitats. The public suggested specific management actions or management paradigms. Concerns were expressed over the quality of data to be used in the plan.

Commentors stated their concern about water quality being negatively impacted by resource uses in the area. Other comments stated that water quality might actually be improving and that activities permitted in the past should be allowed to continue. Specific activities mentioned in relation to water quality included water development, recreation, mining, roads, and timber harvest. Many of these comments stated that the impacts to water quality from these resource uses were minimal and easily managed, while other comments of this type explained that past impacts in the planning area have been substantial and should be kept to a minimum from the various resource uses.

Cultural resources include both prehistoric and historic archeological sites as well as Traditional Cultural Properties important to Native Americans. Management actions also need to protect municipal water supplies and protect Native American traditional uses. Comments included the request that BLM conduct inventories to determine the distribution, comparative importance, and relative sensitivity of cultural resources and to allocate their potential use in interpretation, education, scientific research, and maintenance of cultural traditions and religion. Respondents also asked that BLM adopt management actions necessary to protect and restore cultural sites or areas that are most vulnerable to current and future impacts and expressed concern about unauthorized collection and vandalism. Specific concerns were expressed regarding the potential for

direct effects and visual intrusions on a known traditional cultural property and the need to maintain confidentiality of resource locations.

Issue 3: ***How will BLM adjust land ownership to provide public benefits and improve access?***

Because of the scattered land ownership patterns found in northern Idaho, the issue of land tenure is a fundamental concern of the public and neighboring landowners. Land tenure includes retained and acquired lands and those available for exchange. Comments received supported the need to evaluate the scattered land ownership patterns; however, the comments expressed concern that access and commercial uses may be limited, restricted, or otherwise changed as a result of future land exchanges. Some comments asked that land exchanges be sought only when they supported resource conservation. In this regard, land tenure may be used as a mechanism or mitigation to isolate and protect certain watersheds, wildlife, plants, or other sensitive resources. Land tenure opportunities were otherwise interpreted as a tool to provide further access or public land use availability. For example, many isolated parcels provide valuable recreation access to water. The BLM will evaluate the potential effects of any land tenure decisions on public benefits, including access to lakes, waterways, and contiguous land parcels previously obstructed by private or alternate land ownership and recreational opportunities (especially the availability of trails). These resources will be considered for retention or swap with other public agencies. The BLM will work cooperatively with other relevant agencies to highlight some of these opportunities and to develop consistent plans for effective management of the lands. Many specific land areas were recommended for future land acquisition consideration, which may be considered under the implementation phase of the RMP.

Issue 4: ***How will the BLM manage invasive plant species?***

A large component of vegetation management is the control of invasive and exotic plant species. Management of noxious weeds and exotic species was a primary concern by the public. Specifically, the effects of other resources (e.g., water quality, fuels management, wilderness, and wildlife), as well as the contribution of other activities (e.g., recreational activities and vehicular access) on the spread of weeds and exotic species. Most comments focused on how, when, and where noxious weeds and other invasive species would be controlled in the planning area and what conditions would apply to other resource activities to prevent further invasions in the planning area.

Issue 5: ***How will the BLM reduce the risk of harm or damage from fire to the public and their property?***

Comments regarding fire management focused on several issues, including restoration of the natural historical fire regime, restoration of lands from fire damage, prescribed burns, fire control and management in the WUI, air quality, and removal of dead and dying timber to reduce fuel loads. An updated fire management plan was requested (a temporary fire plan has been completed to meet the direction of the National Fire Plan, but this plan will be superseded by the Record of Decision that will implement the decisions contained in the Final CdA RMP). There was also a request from a representative of the US Environmental Protection Agency (US EPA) to integrate the National Fire Plan policies into the RMP.

Issue 6: ***What strategies and priorities will BLM use to protect healthy watersheds or restore damaged watersheds and riparian areas?***

The BLM must ensure a watershed approach to land and resource management that emphasizes assessing the function and condition of watersheds, incorporating watershed goals in planning, enhancing pollution

prevention, monitoring and restoring watersheds, recognizing waters of exceptional value, and expanding collaboration with other agencies, states, tribes, and communities. Specifically, the BLM is required to provide for enhanced watershed restoration efforts, including the integration of watershed restoration as a key part of land management planning and program strategies. Also, considering that CdA FO manages land adjacent to high quality waters, BLM is in the position to protect important watersheds. Several comments were received pertaining to water quality and watershed restoration, which resulted in designation of a new issue theme to be considered during the Resource Management Planning process. Watershed issues are further discussed in Section 3.2.4.

Riparian areas are directly tied to water quality and habitat sustainability. It is important to the public to maintain diverse and healthy vegetative components for fish, wildlife, and rare plant populations, riparian areas, water and air quality, and cultural and Tribal interests. Some comments requested fish and wildlife habitat and watershed restoration efforts to be incorporated into the planning process, especially for those areas determined to be critical habitats. A request was received for a listing of impaired water bodies that do not currently meet Idaho Water Quality Standards. One comment encouraged BLM to identify high quality watersheds needing protection and impaired watersheds needing restoration/remediation. The public also requested restrictions be placed on activities that may contribute to adverse impacts on water resources. Other comments suggested that the BLM consider incorporating riparian and wetland area protection as part of the protection of associated watersheds.

The mixed ownership of the planning area is interpreted to be a contributing factor to damaging watersheds. Water quality and watershed degradation from mixed land uses, roads, recreational activities, and commercial uses are major concerns.

1.4.3 Issues Considered Beyond the Scope of the RMP

During scoping, several concerns were raised that are beyond the scope of this planning effort or that represented questions on how the BLM would go about the planning process and implementation. The Scoping Report (BLM 2005b) provides a comprehensive list of these issues, which are summarized below:

Historical fisheries. The RMP will consider protection and restoration of fisheries currently federally listed under the Endangered Species Act and those with BLM special species status. Restoration of historical fisheries that are now functionally extinct is beyond the scope of this RMP. BLM manages habitat rather than populations and does not have the authority to determine what species will or should be reintroduced. The RMP may identify areas or parameters to be considered when other agencies propose fisheries management activities.

Implementation of cost analysis/cost recovery program to require special use permittees and commercial operators to pay for monitoring to prevent resource damage. This issue is beyond the scope of the RMP. Cost recovery for monitoring is required by regulation for some program areas such as ROWs.

Compensation of individuals or entities physically harmed by federal actions, including negative impacts on the local government tax base. This is issue is beyond the scope of the RMP.

Inventory roadless areas and examine areas as suitable for wilderness designation or for the protection of other special values. At this time the BLM cannot propose any additional Wilderness Study Areas (WSAs). Designations of proposed Areas of Critical Environmental Concern (ACEC) are evaluated in the RMP. The RMP will also examine 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.

1.5 PLANNING CRITERIA

In accordance with 43 CFR 1610.4-2, BLM prepared planning criteria to guide development of the resource management plan, to ensure that it is tailored to the issues, and to prevent unnecessary data collection and analysis. The NOI published in the Federal Register and the RMP newsletter distributed during the scoping period listed these criteria and solicited comments. BLM also discussed the criteria and asked for comments during the public scoping meetings. However, BLM received no comments on the criteria during the scoping period. Therefore the following criteria remain as originally published in the NOI:

1. The plan will comply with all applicable laws, regulations, and current policies. This includes local, state, Tribal, and federal air quality standards, as well as water quality standards from the Idaho Non-Point Source Management Program Plans.

2. The RMP planning effort will be collaborative and multi-jurisdictional in nature. The BLM will strive to ensure that its management decisions are complementary to other planning jurisdictions and adjoining properties, within the boundaries described by law and Federal Regulations.

3. All previously established Wilderness Study Areas will continue to be managed for wilderness values and character until Congress designates them as wilderness areas or releases them for multiple use management.

4. The RMP will recognize all valid existing rights.

5. As part of this RMP process, BLM will analyze areas for potential designation as Areas of Critical Environmental Concern (ACEC) in accordance with 43 CFR 1610.7-2 and river corridors for suitability for designation under the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act.

1.6 PLANNING PROCESS

In accordance with 43 CFR 1610.4, preparation of an RMP involves interrelated steps as described in Table 1-2 below.

Table 1-2 BLM Planning Process

BLM Planning Process Step	Description	Timeframe
Step 1 – Planning Issues Identification	Issues and concerns are identified through a scoping process that includes the public, Indian tribes, other federal agencies, and state and local governments.	September 2004 – January 2005
Step 2 – Planning Criteria Development	Planning criteria are created to ensure decisions are made to address the issues pertinent to the planning effort. Planning criteria are derived from a variety of sources including applicable laws and regulations, existing management plans, coordination of other agencies' programs, and the results of public and agency scoping. The planning criteria may be updated and changed as planning proceeds.	September 2004
Step 3 – Data and Information Collection	Data and information for the resources in the planning area are collected based on the planning criteria.	Ongoing
Step 4 – Management Situation Analysis	The current management of resources in the planning area is assessed.	January 2005
Step 5 – Alternatives Formulation	A range of reasonable management alternatives that address issues identified during scoping is developed.	August 2005
Step 6 – Alternatives Assessment	The effects of each alternative are estimated.	October 2005
Step 7 – Preferred Alternative Selection	The alternative that best resolves planning issues is identified as the preferred alternative.	October 2005
Step 8 – Resource Management Selection	First, a draft RMP/EIS is issued and is made available to the public for a review period of 90 calendar days. After comments to the draft document have been received and analyzed, the RMP/EIS is modified as necessary, and the proposed RMP/Final EIS is published and made available for public review for 30 calendar days. A ROD is signed to approve the RMP/EIS.	Draft RMP/EIS: January 2006 Proposed RMP/Final EIS: October 2006 ROD: Estimated May 2007
Step 9 – Implementation Monitoring	Management measures outlined in the approved plan are implemented on the ground, and future monitoring is conducted to test their effectiveness. Changes are made as necessary to achieve desired results.	Ongoing after RMP approval

1.7 RELATIONSHIP TO BLM POLICIES, PLANS, AND PROGRAMS

Since the development and approval of the 1981 Emerald Empire MFP, it has been necessary to amend the plan to provide additional broad land management direction. As the land use plan guidance is put into practice on the ground, implementation-level planning is directed by BLM policy and program-specific guidance. Table 1-3 identifies a number of plans, and decision and analytical documents have been developed by the BLM that relate to or otherwise govern management within the planning area. Some of these plans and documents amended the MFP, while others, though they have not been formally adopted through the land use planning process, are considered by BLM when conducting implementation-level planning or when analyzing other specific actions. These documents and other major management guidance are listed below by category.

Table 1-3 Identification of Coeur d'Alene Plan Amendments and Other Documents Considered for Implementation-Level Planning

Land Use Plans and Amendments	Other National, Statewide, District, or Field Office Decision and Analytical Documents
Emerald Empire Planning Unit Management Framework Plan, Step 3 - Decisions (BLM 1981)	North Idaho Timber Management Program Record of Decision (BLM 1982a)
Land Tenure Adjustment (LTA) MFP Amendment (BLM 1984)	North Idaho Range Management Program Summary Report (BLM 1982b)
Designation Order (Order No. ID060-4 - Designation of Hideaway Islands RNA) (BLM 1985)	North Idaho Draft MFP Amendment and Environmental Impact Statement (Wilderness Study Areas) (BLM 1982c)
Land Tenure Adjustment (LTA) Plan Amendment for the Emerald Empire and Chief Joseph MFPs (BLM 1989a)	Record of Decision (ROD), Vegetation Treatment on the BLM Lands in Thirteen Western States, BLM Idaho (BLM 1991)
Plan Amendment for the Emerald Empire and Chief Joseph MFPs to Designate 12 Areas as Research Natural Areas (RNA) and/or Areas of Critical Environmental Concern (ACECs) (BLM 1989b)	Update to MFPs to include Land Acquisition Management Guidelines (BLM 1993)
Coeur d'Alene District, Idaho, Emerald Empire Resource Area Off-highway Vehicle (OHV) Designations (1990)	Decision Record and Finding of No Significant Impacts (DR/FONSI), Coeur d'Alene District Programmatic Noxious Weed Control, EA No. ID060-94-05 (BLM 1994)
Record of Decision, Secretary of the Interior (Recommendations for WSAs in the State of Idaho) (OSOI 1991)	Idaho Standards for Rangeland Health and Guidelines fro Livestock Grazing Management (BLM 1997)
	Northern Rockies Lynx Amendment Draft Environmental Impact Statement (BLM 2004a)
	Coeur d'Alene Field Office Fire Management Plan (BLM 2004b)

RELATED PLANS

BLM planning regulations require that BLM plans be consistent with officially approved or adopted resource related plans of other federal, state, local, and Tribal governments to the extent those plans are consistent with federal laws and regulations applicable to public lands. Plans formulated by federal, state, local, and Tribal governments that relate to management of lands and resources have been reviewed and considered as the RMP/EIS has been developed. These plans include the following:

- Interior Columbia Basin Ecosystem Management Project: Project Data (Forest Service and BLM 2001);
- Interior Columbia Basin Final EIS (Forest Service and BLM 2000);
- Canada Lynx Conservation Assessment and Strategy (Forest Service and USFWS 2000);
- Summary of the Draft EIS, Northern Rockies Lynx Amendment (BLM and Forest Service 2004);
- Inland Native Fish Strategy Environmental Assessment Decision Notice and Finding of No Significant Impact (Forest Service 1995b);
- Idaho Department of Environmental Quality's Final Area Wide Risk Management Plan (IDEQ 2004b);
- A View to the Future: A Comprehensive Historic Preservation Plan for Idaho (SHPO 2002);
- Proposed Plan Amendments and EIS for Small Wilderness Study Areas, Statewide (BLM 1988d);
- Idaho's 2003 – 2007 Statewide Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation and Tourism Plan (Idaho State Parks and Recreation 2003);
- Proposed Land Management Plan, Idaho Panhandle National Forests (Forest Service 2006);
- The Coeur d'Alene Tribe, Draft Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement for the Integrated Resource Management Plan (Coeur d'Alene Tribe 2005); and
- Section 368 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (designation of West-wide energy corridors) is being implemented through the current development of an interagency Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS). The Final PEIS will provide plan amendment decisions that will address numerous energy corridor related issues, including the utilization of existing corridors (enhancements and upgrades), identification of new corridors, supply and demand considerations, and compatibility with other corridor and project planning efforts. Identification of corridors in the PEIS may affect the CdA FO Planning Area, and the approved PEIS would subsequently amend the CdA RMP.

1.8 CHANGES FROM THE DRAFT RMP TO THE PROPOSED RMP

As a result of public comment and the internal review of the Draft RMP/EIS, Alternative D (the Preferred Alternative in the draft) has been adjusted and now represents the BLM's Proposed Action in the Proposed RMP/Final EIS. Changes regarding alternatives focused on adjustments to Alternative D in order to address public concerns, while continuing to meet the BLM's legal and regulatory mandates. Additional information has been inserted as needed and changes have been made throughout Chapters 1 through 5. Changes include the following:

- Adjustments to Alternative D;
- Clarifications to better explain the management proposed in the Draft RMP/EIS;
- Changes to information based on inventory updates after August 2004;
- Updates to maps;

- Description of the public comment process; and
- Minor corrections, such as typographical errors.

Some public comments suggested that alternatives to maximize particular uses or to maximize protection of certain resources should be analyzed in detail. While these types of alternatives were considered, they were not analyzed in detail because they did not meet the BLM's multiple use and sustained yield mandate established in the FLPMA or the planning criteria set out in the Draft RMP/EIS. Other comments suggested consideration of items outside the scope of the BLM's decision authority. These items were not considered in this plan. All other suggested modifications were within the range of alternatives analyzed by the BLM.

Adjustments to Alternative D

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

- The amount of public land managed by BLM within the planning area changed by about 230 acres due to land exchanges that occurred after preparation of the Draft RMP/EIS. The current acreage was shown earlier in Table 1-1. However, since this minor acreage difference is not significant, BLM did not update the description of the alternatives, effected environment, or environmental consequences.
- Various changes have been made to further explain the BLM's forest management actions. Language has been added to clarify the types of resources that various actions refer to;
- The Proposed Action will not allow for aerial spraying of weeds;
- Action LR-D2.1.2 clarifies the priorities for exchange or disposal of federal lands;
- Action SS-D-1.1.6 now contains all the lynx management measures specified in Alternative F of the Northern Rockies Lynx Amendment;
- A measure proposing an eagle viewing area and interpretive station has been added to the Proposed Action under Action SS-D1.1.5. An additional measure has been added to the same action to regulate controlled burns that may affect bald eagle nests;
- Other special status species actions have been expanded or modified as a result of consultation with USFWS;
- Recreation and Lands and Realty Actions (RC-D1.8.2 and LR-D1.1.5, respectively) have been modified to ensure consistent management of BLM lands adjacent to USFS Inventoried Roadless Areas;
- Cultural resources Action CR-B2.1.6 now specifies coordination with fire management activities;
- Wildland Fire Management now includes Action WF-D1.6.6 specifying collaboration with local partners concerning wildfire protection plans;
- Air Quality section now contains an objective and an action (AQ-1.4 and AQ-1.4.1) specifying direct coordination with affected Native American Tribes when BLM conducts prescribed fire and wildland fire use within Tribal reservation boundaries;
- Cultural Resources, and Social and Economic sections now say that BLM will coordinate with the Coeur d'Alene Tribe to establish a formal agreement regarding consultation (see actions CRD-1.1.3 and SE-D1.1.4); and
- No backcountry byways are designated.

Adjustments to Appendices

- Appendix D (CNFISH) has been revised to give greater specificity to allowable actions and BLM priorities within RMOs. It now allows for adaptive management based on observations of actual conditions and broadens the definition of areas where sidecast of excavated road materials is prohibited; and
- Appendix A now includes additional BMPs from the BLM Wind Energy Record of Decision and EPA recommendations for source water protection. The BLM will adopt programmatic policies and BMPs in the Wind Energy Development Program.

Map Changes

Only maps that have been revised are included with this document (attached at the end of Volume II). For all other maps, see the Draft Coeur d'Alene RMP/EIS, Volume III. Copies of the Draft Volume III maps are available on the project website at http://www.blm.gov/rmp/id/cda/, or upon request from BLM (call 208-769-5000 or email information@cdarmp.com).

- Map 1: BLM Ownership Updated
- Map 5: Wildland urban interface area has been corrected
- Map 37: Atlas Mine Road has been changed to a "green" designated route;
- Map 44: Right-of-way avoidance areas added adjacent to National Forest Inventoried Roadless Areas
- Maps 66-68: Back country by-ways removed. No back country byways are proposed.
- Maps 20-23: Recreation Opportunity Spectrum has been added; and
- Tribal Reservation Boundaries have been added to applicable maps.

Alternatives Considered but Eliminated from Detailed Analysis

Alternatives to change existing OHV designations from "limited" to "closed" within existing wilderness study areas were considered but not carried forward for detailed analysis. This process is described in Section 2.4.5.

1.9 OVERALL VISION

The overall vision for the planning process is derived from the BLM mission statement: Sustain the health, diversity and productivity of the public lands for the use and enjoyment of present and future generations.