

BLM Colorado Solar Regional Mitigation Strategy – DRAFT Goals for the San Luis Valley/Taos Plateau Landscape

| Resource                 | BLM CO SRMS Goal - (Landscape or Resource Desired Outcome)   | BLM SRMS Objective (Mitigation Hierarchy) TO BE PROVIDED | BLM Taos RMP (2012)   | BLM SLV RMP (1991)   | NM SWAP - Comprehensive Wildlife Conservation Strategy for New Mexico - New Mexico Department of Game & Fish (2006) | CO-SWAP - State Wildlife Action Plan - Colorado Parks & Wildlife (2010)                                 | NPS Great Sand Dunes NP GMP (2007)  |
|--------------------------|--|--|---|--|---|---|---|
| Acoustics (noise, sound) | Low ambient landscape noise and characteristics of undisturbed soundscapes are retained to minimize nuisance or disturbance noise to nearby households, communities, and wildlife including sensitive species. |  | Page C-5. Fluid Minerals Management: Noise of explosives for geotechnical testing | Section 2.1.3.2. Wildlife: One mile buffer around Raptor nest. 0.25 mile buffer around occupied and unoccupied raptor nests/habitat. 300 yard buffer around developed livestock/wildlife waters. | Various noise references in terms of impacts - desired future outcome implied but not specified                     | Various noise-related references in terms of threats - desired future outcome implied but not specified | <p>Natural Sounds Chapter 1, Page 28 Natural Sounds</p> <p>The natural soundscape is preserved. Visitors have opportunities throughout most of the park to experience natural sounds. The sounds of civilization are generally confined to developed areas.</p> <p>Strategies ☐ Park managers will continue to work with the Federal Aviation Administration, commercial businesses, and general aviation entities to minimize noise and visual impacts of aviation to the park. Pilots will be discouraged from overflying the park. Actions taken to minimize aviation impacts could include identifying the park on aviation maps as a noise sensitive area, educating pilots about park values, and encouraging pilots to fly in compliance with Federal Aviation Administration regulations and advisory guidance, in a manner that minimizes noise and other impacts. If demand for commercial air tours develops, the National Park Service will develop a commercial air tour management plan to address tours and their effects on the park. ☐ The National Park Service will continue to work with Department of Defense entities (e.g., Colorado Air National Guard) to minimize impacts from military flights in the vicinity of the park. ☐ Park managers will follow several strategies to control existing and potential land-based noise sources: – Continue to require bus tour companies to comply with regulations that reduce noise levels (e.g., turning off engines when buses are parked). – Encourage visitors to avoid the use of noisy generators. – Maintain existing quiet hours in campgrounds. – Continue to enforce existing noise policies in the backcountry. ☐ Park managers will minimize noise generated by their own management activities by regulating National Park Service and concession use of noise-producing machinery such as aircraft and motorized equipment. Noise will be a consideration when procuring and using park equipment. In wilderness areas, the use of motorized equipment will conform to the requirements of the Wilderness Act “minimum requirements procedures” and related NPS policies (NPS Director’s Order – 41). ☐ The National Park Service will continue to collect baseline data on park soundscapes to understand characteristics and trends in natural soundscapes and to assist in management.</p> |

| Resource                   | BLM CO SRMS Goal - (Landscape or Resource Desired Outcome)   | BLM SRMS Objective (Mitigation Hierarchy) TO BE PROVIDED | BLM Taos RMP (2012)   | BLM SLV RMP (1991)  | NM SWAP - Comprehensive Wildlife Conservation Strategy for New Mexico - New Mexico Department of Game & Fish (2006) | CO-SWAP - State Wildlife Action Plan - Colorado Parks & Wildlife (2010) | NPS Great Sand Dunes NP GMP (2007)   |
|----------------------------|--|--|---|---|---|---|--|
| Air and Atmospheric Values | Air quality conditions near households and communities maintain EPA NAAQS and criteria pollutant standards, retain low contribution to ambient dust, promote Great Sand Dunes NP Class I Airshed Protected area visibility goals, and foster federal greenhouse gas (GHG) reduction goals. |  | <p><b>2.1.1 Air and Atmospheric Values Goals</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· To protect, maintain, or improve the quality of air resources associated with public lands managed by the BLM.</li> <li>· Prevent or minimize the threat to public health and safety, damages to natural resources or economic losses due to decreases in air quality.</li> </ul> <p><b>Objectives</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Minimize air quality impacts from BLM management actions such that compliance with all National Ambient Air Quality Standards established by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) are consistently achieved.</li> <li>· Identify potential greenhouse gas (GHG) sources for proposed actions.</li> <li>· Identify potential sinks for GHG emissions.</li> </ul> | <p><b>Page 3-1. Climate:</b> Climatic variability throughout the planning area, and over time, affects the management options for several resources. Climatic conditions will be monitored and analyzed when appropriate. For example, rangeland vegetation condition assessments will analyze both climatic and grazing management, and mineral development plans will analyze both climatic and mineral development reclamation.</p> <p><b>Page 3-1 Air Quality:</b> Air quality degradation will be minimized through strict compliance with Federal, state, and local regulations and implementation plans. For example, air quality impacts from prescribed burns are limited by BLM Manual 7723 (Air Quality Maintenance Requirements), which requires a state approved open burning permit prior to implementation. These impacts will be small in scale and dispersed throughout the planning area. Increasing off-highway vehicle (OHV) use in open areas might accelerate soil erosion and increase fugitive dust emissions; however, dust suppression control devices would not be practical. Additional management activities include monitoring, analysis, and impact mitigation on a project-specific basis, which will ensure compliance with applicable regulations and implementation plans.</p> | Not specifically referenced in terms of desired future conditions   | Not specifically referenced in terms of desired future conditions       | Air Quality Chapter 1, page 20. Great Sand Dunes' class I air quality is maintained or enhanced. Naturally dark night skies and scenic views are substantially unimpaired. Strategies ☐ The National Park Service will continue to work with appropriate state and federal agencies, industries, nearby communities, land managers, and the Western Regional Air Partnership to maintain park and regional air quality. ☐ Park staff and other scientists will continue to inventory and monitor the park's air quality and expand this program to detect and measure changes (improvement or deterioration) to the expanded park's airshed. ☐ Consistent with provisions of the Clean Air Act, the National Park Service will review, comment on, and recommend actions to minimize or reduce emissions from sources being proposed within 64 miles (103 kilometers) of Great Sand Dunes National Park and Preserve. ☐ Park managers will attempt to minimize the effects of in-park pollution sources on air quality. For example: if warranted by data demonstrating degradation, emissions from burning wood in campgrounds and employee residences may be reduced by establishing nonburn days or by banning wood burning altogether—continue to require bus tour companies to comply with regulations that reduce air pollution levels (e.g., turning off engines when buses are parked) |

| Resource           | BLM CO SRMS Goal - (Landscape or Resource Desired Outcome)  | BLM SRMS Objective (Mitigation Hierarchy) TO BE PROVIDED | BLM Taos RMP (2012)  | BLM SLV RMP (1991)  | NM SWAP - Comprehensive Wildlife Conservation Strategy for New Mexico - New Mexico Department of Game & Fish (2006) | CO-SWAP - State Wildlife Action Plan - Colorado Parks & Wildlife (2010) | NPS Great Sand Dunes NP GMP (2007)   |
|--------------------|---|--|--|---|---|---|--|
| Cultural Resources | <p><b>Significant cultural resources are identified, preserved, and protected, to ensure that they are available for appropriate uses by present and future generations.</b></p> <p><b>Imminent threats are reduced and potential conflicts from natural or human-caused deterioration or potential conflict with other resource uses are resolved by ensuring that all authorizations for land use and resource use comply with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.</b></p> <p><b>National historic trail routes and historic settings, remnants, and artifacts are identified and protected for public use and enjoyment .</b></p> |  | <p><b>2.1.2 Cultural: Goals</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Identify, preserve, and protect significant cultural resources and ensure that they are available for appropriate uses by present and future generations.</li> <li>Seek to reduce imminent threats and resolve potential conflicts from natural or human-caused deterioration or potential conflict with other resource uses by ensuring that all authorizations for land and resource use will comply with National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA), section 106.</li> <li>Identify and protect national historic trail routes and historic settings, remnants, and artifacts for public use and enjoyment.</li> </ul> <p><b>6 Chapter 2 Plan Decisions</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Promote stewardship, conservation, and appreciation of cultural resources through education and public outreach programs.</li> <li>Consult with Native American tribes to identify any cultural values or religious beliefs that may be affected by BLM authorizations or actions. Provisions will be made for Native American use of traditional cultural properties.</li> </ul> <p><b>Objectives</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Preserve and protect significant cultural resources through designation of areas of critical environmental concern (ACECs) with cultural management prescriptions.</li> <li>Support public awareness and interest in cultural resources through interpretive sites, archaeological tours, presentations, and literature.</li> <li>Encourage scientific research.</li> <li>Promote site stewardship.</li> <li>Identify traditional cultural properties and culturally significant resource sites through tribal consultation.</li> <li>National historic trails: Preserve the associated high-potential historic sites and high-potential historic route segments, physical remnants, and contributing features; interpret the historic aspects of the trails for the protection of the resource; and enhance understanding and enjoyment of these trails in cooperation with trail-administering agencies and nonprofit partners.</li> </ul> | <p><b>Page 4-3. Historical Resources</b><br/>All 18 identified historical significant sites will be protected.</p> <p>Those five sites eligible for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places will be enhanced and protected under a "scientific use," "public use," or "management use" category, as well as an NSO. The Cumbres and Toltec Scenic Railroad will receive additional protection through special management as a ACEC and NSO.</p> <p><b>Page 4-3. Archaeological Resources</b><br/>All significant sites will be protected. Eligible site/districts will be enhanced and protected under "management," "scientific," or "public use" categories. Sand Castle Area will receive additional protection through an ACEC designation and the 200-acre Folsom site has an NSO stipulation.</p> | N/A   | N/A   | <p>Cultural Resources Chapter 1, page 20. Great Sand Dunes' cultural resources, especially archeological and ethnographic resources, are identified, evaluated, managed, and protected within their broader context. Visitors and employees recognize and understand the value of the park's cultural resources. Management decisions about cultural resources are based on ongoing scholarly and scientific information and consultation with native peoples, the Colorado state historic preservation officer (SHPO), and others. Culturally modified trees are managed to preserve their integrity and vitality. The historic integrity of properties listed in the NRHP (or eligible for listing in the NRHP, or meeting the NRHP eligibility criteria) is protected. Human impacts on cultural resources are monitored and harmful effects are minimized or eliminated. Strategies: Park staff, researchers, and partners will continue to collect information to fill gaps in the knowledge and understanding of Great Sand Dunes cultural resources, to assess status and trends, and effectively protect and manage cultural resources.</p> <p>In accordance with the National Historic Preservation Act, as amended (NHPA), park managers will continue to locate, identify, and evaluate cultural resources throughout the park and preserve to determine if they are eligible for listing in the NRHP. In particular, the National Park Service will continue work to identify cultural landscapes and archeological sites within the expanded park and preserve.</p> |

| Resource                       | BLM CO SRMS Goal - (Landscape or Resource Desired Outcome) | BLM SRMS Objective (Mitigation Hierarchy) TO BE PROVIDED | BLM Taos RMP (2012) | BLM SLV RMP (1991) | NM SWAP - Comprehensive Wildlife Conservation Strategy for New Mexico - New Mexico Department of Game & Fish (2006) | CO-SWAP - State Wildlife Action Plan - Colorado Parks & Wildlife (2010) | NPS Great Sand Dunes NP GMP (2007)  |
|--------------------------------|--|--|---------------------|--------------------|---|---|---|
| Cultural Resources (Continued) | See above.   |  |                     |                    |   |   | <p>☑ The National Park Service will continue to work closely with and consult the Colorado SHPO and other interested parties to identify, evaluate, and determine appropriate treatment for sites, historic structures, cultural landscapes, and other historic properties throughout the park and preserve.</p> <p>☑ The National Park Service will use the best available scientific information and technology for making decisions about management of the park's cultural resources. Park managers will continue to use and expand its data management systems, including GIS and electronic databases, to analyze, model, predict, and test trends in resource conditions.</p> <p>☑ The National Park Service will continue long-term monitoring of archeological sites to measure deterioration from natural and human sources and to evaluate the effectiveness of management actions to protect resources and mitigate impacts. Park managers will rely on a variety of actions to minimize these impacts, including visitor education and interpretation, and use of patrols to enforce the Archeological Resource Protection Act. The park's archeological site disclosure policy will continue to be followed. Appropriate preservation actions for all cultural resources that are threatened or in danger of being lost will be developed, in consultation with the Colorado SHPO, American Indian tribes, and other consulting parties, in compliance with the NHPA. This could include measures such as removing the threat, stabilizing the resource, data recovery, documenting and researching, increasing ranger patrol and visitor education, or closure.</p> <p>☑ To provide the public and park staff with optimum interpretive and resource management opportunities, park personnel will continue to research, document, and catalog the museum collection. Museum objects and archival materials will be conserved to professional and NPS standards. The park's museum conservation program will continue to provide the proper preservation and protection of the museum collection.</p> <p>☑ Resource and maintenance staff will receive historic preservation training and will be made aware of and apply the most recent preservation technology and applications.</p> <p>☑ Park managers will continue to regularly update the park's Resource Stewardship Plan and prioritize actions needed to protect park resources.</p> |

| Resource            | BLM CO SRMS Goal - (Landscape or Resource Desired Outcome)  | BLM SRMS Objective (Mitigation Hierarchy) TO BE PROVIDED | BLM Taos RMP (2012)   | BLM SLV RMP (1991)   | NM SWAP - Comprehensive Wildlife Conservation Strategy for New Mexico - New Mexico Department of Game & Fish (2006)   | CO-SWAP - State Wildlife Action Plan - Colorado Parks & Wildlife (2010) | NPS Great Sand Dunes NP GMP (2007) |
|---------------------|---|--|---|--|---|---|------------------------------------|
| Ecology: Vegetation | Sufficient acreage of upland vegetation, riparian and wetland communities providing functioning ecological processes across the landscape to support healthy watersheds and viable and resilient populations of native species. |  | <p><b>2.1.7 Vegetative Communities</b></p> <p><b>2.1.7.1 Riparian Vegetation Goals</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· To provide for healthy watersheds and landscapes, sustained biological communities, and an improved understanding of ecosystems and resources through integrated interdisciplinary assessments (USDI 2007).</li> <li>· To provide for proper functioning condition (PFC) of vegetative communities by managing for viable and resilient native wildlife species and their associated habitats.</li> <li>· For riparian and wetland communities to move toward and/or remain in PFC such that riparian communities will be sustainable, provide physical stability and adequate habitat for a wide range of wildlife species, and support healthy, diverse, and abundant populations of fish and associated aquatic and riparian dependent species.</li> </ul> <p>Objectives</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Manage all riparian zones that have hydrophilic plant species as priority habitats.</li> <li>· Manage riparian areas with an emphasis on protection and restoration, and focus treatments on reestablishment of willows and cottonwoods, as well as other riparian vegetation, to stabilize stream banks and promote sinuosity and width/depth ratios appropriate to the site.</li> <li>· To give consideration to the restoration and protection of riparian areas as part of the BLM's decision making process for land use authorizations.</li> <li>· Monitor riparian areas and conduct rangeland health assessments to document progress toward achieving and maintaining PFC.</li> </ul> | <p><b>Page 3-3. Vegetation:</b></p> <p>Overall objectives will be to move toward good condition (late seral stage) based on site potential using grazing management. If necessary, vegetation manipulation practices or other techniques will also be used to aid in accomplishing this. Specific desired plant communities will be described in activity plans, if necessary, and in most cases will be a diverse community of grasses, shrubs, and forbs.</p> <p>Overall trend, condition, and forage production will be expected to improve. Soil-disturbing activities will be mitigated with standard operating practices for rehabilitation of disturbed sites and grazing allotment adjustments.</p> <p>Manipulation of vegetation, although not proposed, will involve mechanical, chemical, and fire practices. Site specific planning and any needed NEPA documentation will be accomplished if a proposal were made during the life of this land use plan. Ecological site determinations will be completed for the planning area, which will include site-specific vegetative resource measures for all resource actions.</p> <p>Maintenance, improvement, and/or replacement of the vegetation resource would continue to be a priority concern in all actions.</p> | <p>Desired Future Outcomes (Chapter 5. p. 180-181, 184-185) Desired future outcomes for the Intermountain Basins Big Sagebrush Shrubland include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>☑ Modified grazing management results in improved ecological conditions for Intermountain Basins Big Sagebrush Shrubland habitats and improved economic viability for the ranching community of northern New Mexico.</li> <li>☑ Protected areas have been established as wildlife corridors to reduce habitat fragmentation and provide SGCN access to necessary habitat.</li> <li>☑ Local communities are involved in and support decisions related to conserving to the SGCN and biodiversity of the Intermountain Basins Big Sagebrush Shrubland.</li> <li>☑ Consistent reclamation standards that ensure future habitat integrity and functionality for Intermountain Basins Big Sagebrush Shrubland are jointly established and adopted by private landowners, counties, municipalities, federal land management agencies and the State Land Office.</li> <li>☑ Working groups comprised of local, state, and federal government agencies, landowners and the public have been established to address conservation issues at the wildland urban interface. Desired future outcomes for the Rocky Mountain Alpine-Montane Wet Meadow include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>☑ The Rocky Mountain Alpine-Montane Wet Meadows persist in the condition, connectivity, and quantity necessary to sustain viable and resilient populations of SGCN and host a variety of land uses with reduced resource use conflicts.</li> <li>☑ Wetlands and meadows are restored to conditions approximating those that occurred before significant human impacts altered species composition, function, structure and morphology.</li> <li>☑ Existing grazing practices ensure the sustainability and integrity of Rocky Mountain Alpine-Montane Wet Meadows and preserve cost effectiveness for private interests.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> | see Fish and Wildlife goals   |                                    |

| Resource                        | BLM CO SRMS Goal - (Landscape or Resource Desired Outcome) | BLM SRMS Objective (Mitigation Hierarchy) TO BE PROVIDED | BLM Taos RMP (2012)   | BLM SLV RMP (1991) | NM SWAP - Comprehensive Wildlife Conservation Strategy for New Mexico - New Mexico Department of Game & Fish (2006) | CO-SWAP - State Wildlife Action Plan - Colorado Parks & Wildlife (2010) | NPS Great Sand Dunes NP GMP (2007) |
|---------------------------------|--|--|---|--------------------|---|---|------------------------------------|
| Ecology: Vegetation (Continued) | See above.   |  | <p><b>General 2.1.7.2 Terrestrial Vegetation Goals</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Restore and/or maintain the health and productivity of public forests, including the support of watershed, wildlife, and other values, while providing for the use of forest and woodland resources.</li> <li>· Maintain and/or improve ecological site potential of woodland communities for sustainability and diversity.</li> <li>· Manage upland vegetation communities to move toward or remain in PFC, including a full range of herbaceous and shrub species.</li> <li>· Manage forest resources to provide a sustained flow of local economic benefits and protect nonmarket economic values.</li> </ul> <p><b>Objectives</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Manage forest types to contain healthy stands that combine for a diversity of age classes, densities, and structure (including dead and down material).</li> <li>· Inventory and manage old-growth structures in a sustainable manner.</li> <li>· Manage forest types to contain healthy stands of site-appropriate species.</li> <li>· Maintain or enhance communities of priority species or habitats to provide desired ecological functions and values.</li> </ul> |                    |   |   |                                    |

| Resource                                    | BLM CO SRMS Goal - (Landscape or Resource Desired Outcome)   | BLM SRMS Objective (Mitigation Hierarchy) TO BE PROVIDED | BLM Taos RMP (2012)   | BLM SLV RMP (1991)   | NM SWAP - Comprehensive Wildlife Conservation Strategy for New Mexico - New Mexico Department of Game & Fish (2006)  | CO-SWAP - State Wildlife Action Plan - Colorado Parks & Wildlife (2010) | NPS Great Sand Dunes NP GMP (2007) |
|---|--|--|---|--|--|---|------------------------------------|
| Ecology: Invasive Species and Noxious Weeds | Plant communities free of invasive species and noxious weeds are maintained, and infestations of weeds are controlled. |  | <p>2.1.12 Invasive Species/Noxious Weeds Goals</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Maintain plant communities free of noxious weeds and invasive species where possible.</li> <li>· Isolate and control populations by an appropriate method.</li> <li>· Immediately control and eliminate newly discovered outlier occurrences of noxious or invasive species.</li> </ul> <p>Chapter 2 Plan Decisions 31 Objectives</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Inventory and control weed populations through an integrated pest management (IPM) program implemented through integrated weed management (IWM) and cooperative weed management areas (CWMAs).</li> <li>· Reduce the area and density of existing populations to acceptable levels.</li> <li>· Monitor and reevaluate populations at suitable intervals through the use of surveys to identify new infestations.</li> </ul> <p>2.1.12 Invasive Species/Noxious Weeds Goals</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Maintain plant communities free of noxious weeds and invasive species where possible.</li> <li>· Isolate and control populations by an appropriate method.</li> <li>· Immediately control and eliminate newly discovered outlier occurrences of noxious or invasive species.</li> </ul> <p>Objectives</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Inventory and control weed populations through an integrated pest management (IPM) program implemented through integrated weed management (IWM) and cooperative weed management areas (CWMAs).</li> <li>· Reduce the area and density of existing populations to acceptable levels.</li> <li>· Monitor and reevaluate populations at suitable intervals through the use of surveys to identify new infestations.</li> </ul> | <p>Not directly discussed. Discussed under various resources and permitted uses.</p> <p>Not directly addressed but included in Resource Use categories such a mining, oil and gas.</p> | <p>Desired future outcomes for the Intermountain Basins Big Sagebrush Shrubland include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>☑ A fully funded, comprehensive, statewide noxious weed program is established and implemented. Colonization of noxious weed species is stopped and extant weed populations are controlled or eliminated.</li> </ul> |   |                                    |

| Resource                                    | BLM CO SRMS Goal - (Landscape or Resource Desired Outcome) | BLM SRMS Objective (Mitigation Hierarchy) TO BE PROVIDED | BLM Taos RMP (2012)   | BLM SLV RMP (1991)   | NM SWAP - Comprehensive Wildlife Conservation Strategy for New Mexico - New Mexico Department of Game & Fish (2006)  | CO-SWAP - State Wildlife Action Plan - Colorado Parks & Wildlife (2010) | NPS Great Sand Dunes NP GMP (2007) |
|---|--|--|---|--|--|---|------------------------------------|
| Ecology – Vegetation -Forestry and Woodland | No unavoidable impacts.                                    |  | <p><b>2.2.1 Forestry and Woodland Products Goals</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Restore forest and woodlands structure, composition, and processes on public lands to maximize the ecosystem’s resilience to the natural disturbance regimes, using the best available information as a basis for decisions on how much restoration is feasible.</li> <li>· Manage forest and woodland resources to provide a sustained flow of products to benefit local populations and support economic opportunities in the local communities.</li> </ul> <p><b>Objectives</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Reduce fuels around communities to lessen the potential for a catastrophic wildfire to impact these communities.</li> <li>· Salvage dead and dying timber to provide opportunities for fuelwood gathering, while focusing on areas with hazardous fuels and considering wildlife habitats, watershed health, and forest management concerns.</li> <li>· Improve forest health as measured by stand density index through management actions such as mechanical treatments, prescribed fire, and fuelwood gathering.</li> <li>· Preserve old and large trees, while maintaining the structural diversity and resilience of the forest and woodland stands.</li> <li>· Follow protocols to monitor forest health treatments (i.e., the Taos Field Office Monitoring Protocol for Prescribed Fire and Fuels Treatments 2005).</li> </ul> | <p><b>Page A-10. Forest and Woodland Management</b></p> <p>Managing 5,769 acres (98 percent) of commercial forest lands for a sustained yield, long rotation forest management program will result in offering for sale an annual harvest volume of 185 Mbf and replacement of 34 acres annually through regeneration harvest. A long rotation forest management program will allow for the development of a regulated forest with the older age classes possessing old growth characteristics. Natural components of the various habitat types will be maintained and visual quality objectives will be maintained more easily. Annual harvests of forest products will improve the existing age class distribution and increase growth rates by reducing impacts of forest pests and implementing intensive management practices. Species diversity will be maintained, and legal and physical access would be increased. Seasonal limitations on harvest in bighorn sheep lambing areas will reduce sale marketability on 335 acres of productive operable woodlands and 85 acres of commercial forest land. The requirement to maintain adequate thermal cover on 17,761 acres afforested land Will reduce the effectiveness of forest pest control projects. . Special harvesting techniques necessary to maintain .the existing values in six ACECs will not reduce total final harvest volume, but will increase costs for each sale. Management of wildlife habitat, ACECs, cultural resources, and visual resources will maintain the commercial forest or productive operable wpodland allowable harvest base acreage. Seasonal limitations on harvesting will reduce or preclude bidding on some tracts. Residual low quality and pest infested stands probably will not be treated nor placed into productive management without a successful sale program and will result in reduced harvest levels. Approximately 345 acres of commercial forest land (CFL) and 1,794 acres of productive operable woodlands (POW) are located in WSAs. Because of steep terrain, the 345 acres of CFL would not be included in the harvest base level even if the WSAs are not designated wilderness. Foi.tr hundred and ninety acres 'of productive operable woodlands are located in two WSAs, which have been recommended for wilderness designation. Withdrawing these acres will reduce the annual harvest' level by 27 cords' (3 acres). A total annual harvest of 477 cords of fuelwood could be produced from 11,992 acres (53 acres 'annually) of productive operable woodlands if the WSAs not recommended for wilderness designation are returned multiple use management.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>☑ Rocky Mountain Montane Mixed-Conifer Forest and Woodland habitats persist in the condition, connectivity, and quantity necessary to sustain viable and resilient populations of SGCN and host a variety of land uses with reduced resource use conflicts.</li> <li>☑ Partnerships have been established among state and federal government agencies, nongovernmental organizations and private landowners for the implementation of collaborative and coordinated initiatives to conserve SGCN and the functionality of the Rocky Mountain Montane Mixed-Conifer Forest and Woodland habitats upon which they depend.</li> <li>☑ Long-term conservation strategies to restore native species to viable populations within Rocky Mountain Montane Mixed-Conifer Forest and Woodlands garner wide public support.</li> <li>☑ Stand-replacing wildfires have become less common in the Rocky Mountain Montane Mixed-Conifer Forests and Woodlands and no longer alter existing habitats beyond the range of natural variability under which SGCN evolved.</li> <li>☑ Post-fire management activities that are detrimental to SGCN and/or ecosystem function and recovery are no longer practiced in Rocky Mountain Montane Mixed-Conifer Forest and Woodlands.</li> <li>☑ Prescriptions have been developed for the Rocky Mountain Montane Mixed-Conifer Forest and Woodlands that allow adequate and sustainable levels of human harvest of fuel wood and other wood products, are compatible with the tenets of ecological forestry, and replicate natural disturbance patterns.</li> <li>☑ Decisions to implement control measures for phytophagous insect outbreaks in Rocky Mountain Montane Mixed-Conifer Forest and Woodlands are informed and balanced by considerations of the role of these events</li> <li>Consistent development standards that ensure future habitat integrity and functionality for the wildland urban interface of Rocky Mountain Montane Mixed-Conifer Forest and Woodlands are jointly established and adopted by private landowners, counties, municipalities, federal land management agencies and the State Land Office.</li> <li>☑ Local zoning regulations are in place to help reduce wildfire threats to private residences at the wildland urban interface in Rocky Mountain Montane Mixed-Conifer Forest and Woodlands and funds that are currently directed toward these threats have been redirected to re-establishing naturally functioning ecosystems in forest interiors.</li> </ul> |   |                                    |

| Resource   | BLM CO SRMS Goal - (Landscape or Resource Desired Outcome) | BLM SRMS Objective (Mitigation Hierarchy) TO BE PROVIDED | BLM Taos RMP (2012) | BLM SLV RMP (1991) | NM SWAP - Comprehensive Wildlife Conservation Strategy for New Mexico - New Mexico Department of Game & Fish (2006)   | CO-SWAP - State Wildlife Action Plan - Colorado Parks & Wildlife (2010) | NPS Great Sand Dunes NP GMP (2007) |
|--|--|--|---------------------|--------------------|---|---|------------------------------------|
| Ecology – Vegetation (cont.) - Forestry and Woodland | See above  |  |                     |                    | <p>☑ Major migration/movement corridors of Rocky Mountain Montane Mixed-Conifer Forest and Woodlands are intact and maintain connectivity and availability of SGCN habitats.</p> <p>☑ Oil and gas extraction activities have not compromised the condition, connectivity, and quantity of Rocky Mountain Montane Mixed-Conifer Forest and Woodlands on the Valle Vidal or the capacity of this property to sustain viable and resilient populations of SGCN.</p> <p>☑ Livestock and large ungulate grazing levels are maintained at levels that sustain the full range of ecosystem functions and persistence of SGCN.</p> <p>☑ Aspen stands within Rocky Mountain Montane Mixed-Conifer Forest and Woodlands are maintained at a sufficient level to sustain obligate SGCN and associated plant and wildlife species.</p> <p>☑ Special habitats within the Rocky Mountain Montane Mixed-Conifer Forest and Woodlands such as cienegas, limestone outcrops, talus slopes, caves, and perennial streams are protected and are being monitored on a long-term basis to ensure conservation for SGCN that rely on these habitats.</p> <p>☑ Scientific ecosystem management has been established and implemented in the Rocky Mountain Montane Mixed-Conifer Forest and Woodlands and is evidenced in forest management plans.</p> <p>☑ Colonization by exotic species in Rocky Mountain Montane Mixed-Conifer Forest and Woodlands is stopped and existing populations of exotic species are controlled or eliminated.</p> <p>☑ Activities implemented in Rocky Mountain Montane Mixed-Conifer Forest and Woodlands under the Healthy Forest Initiative and Healthy Forest Restoration Act are focused on removing ladder fuels and smaller diameter thickets and protecting human structures and neighborhoods in the wildland urban interface and avoid unnecessary removal of large old-growth trees and snags important as wildlife habitat.</p> |   |                                    |

| Resource  | BLM CO SRMS Goal - (Landscape or Resource Desired Outcome)   | BLM SRMS Objective (Mitigation Hierarchy) TO BE PROVIDED | BLM Taos RMP (2012)  | BLM SLV RMP (1991)  | NM SWAP - Comprehensive Wildlife Conservation Strategy for New Mexico - New Mexico Department of Game & Fish (2006)   | CO-SWAP - State Wildlife Action Plan - Colorado Parks & Wildlife (2010)  | NPS Great Sand Dunes NP GMP (2007) |
|---|--|--|--|---|---|--|------------------------------------|
| Ecology: Terrestrial Wildlife and Aquatic Biota | Healthy watersheds and landscapes support ecological processes that maintain ecosystem resiliency and integrity to support natural abundance and diversity of terrestrial and aquatic populations and communities. |  | <p><b>2.1.3 Fish and Wildlife - Fish Goals</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Manage streams within the planning area to ensure that the natural diversity of aquatic biota is consistent with habitat.</li> <li>· Manage streams within the planning area to ensure that the natural integrity of aquatic ecosystems are protected, restored, and/or managed in an ecologically sound manner.</li> <li>· Expand recreational fisheries while protecting native fish populations and their habitat by developing and enhancing partnerships.</li> <li>· Protect aquatic habitats and manage BLM-affected streams to meet water quality standards established by the New Mexico Environment Department and from impairment or degradation.</li> <li>· Ensure aquatic habitats will support a diversity of self-sustaining biotic communities that are appropriate to the given environment.</li> </ul> <p><b>Objectives:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Manage all BLM perennial stream reaches to have at a minimum fish populations consisting of 50 percent native fish species as measured by catch per unit effort (e.g., number per minute).</li> <li>· Eliminate or control populations of undesirable non-native fish species in all waters managed by the BLM.</li> <li>· Continue to work with New Mexico Department of Game and Fish (NMDGF) to stock trout species in BLM-managed waters for recreational fishing opportunities.</li> <li>· Complete fish habitat quality and quantity surveys on all streams within the planning area on a 10 year rotating cycle.</li> <li>· Develop and/or implement one project per year to conserve, enhance, or restore fish populations and habitats, based on survey results.</li> </ul> <p><b>2.1.3.2 Wildlife Goals</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Manage public lands to achieve healthy watersheds and landscapes, sustained biological communities, and an improved understanding of ecosystems and resources through integrated, multi-party, and interdisciplinary assessment.</li> <li>· Ensure optimum populations and a natural abundance and diversity of wildlife resources on public lands by restoring, maintaining, and enhancing habitat conditions.</li> </ul> | <p><b>Page 4-9. Wildlife and Fish Habitat Management</b></p> <p>Significant habitat quality increases will occur on 9,147 acres as a result of intensive wetlands management on 1,600 acres and the restoration of 1,175 acres of historical wetlands within the Blanca ACEC. Numbers of water birds produced will increase significantly. Extensive management will improve conditions on 155 acres of wetlands in the Rio Grande River Corridor, Flat Top, Mishak Lakes, and Dry Lakes area. Interagency cooperation could restore 580 acres of historical wetlands in the previously mentioned areas contributing significantly in approaching the target numbers in the draft DOW water bird plan for the San Luis Valley.</p> <p>Allocation of 60 per-cent of the additional forage produced to nonlivestock use, if needed, will improve nongame habitats. Existing crucial big game wintering areas will be maintained or slightly improved. Minimized disturbance through restrictive use stipulations on big game crucial winter range and birthing areas, bald eagle roosting habitat, raptor nesting habitat, and water bird nesting habitat will decrease stress. Condition and health will improve and mortality and birthing losses will decrease for the affected species on approximately 342,000 acres. Other benefits include improved distribution and decreased big game utilization of adjacent private lands.</p> <p>Lambing range and 2,830 acres of raptor nesting areas along the Rio Grande River Corridor will be protected by no surface occupancy stipulations. Approximately 333,000 acres of crucial big game winter range and 9,147 acres of crucial water bird production areas will be protected with seasonal limitations. NSO and seasonal limitations on crucial winter range will reduce stress on big game populations, thereby reducing mortality and fetal losses and improving the overall condition and health of the herds.</p> <p>The withdrawal on the Blanca ACEC will protect 9,147 acres of wetland habitat. The withdrawal of 2,640 acres on the wild and scenic portion of the Rio Grande River Corridor ACEC will enhance wildlife values, particularly raptor habitat.</p> <p>The exclusion of mineral material sales in the Rio Grande River Corridor ACEC (2,640 acres), including the wild and scenic segment, defined riparian zones (3,285 acre~), part of the Flat Top portion (2,000 acres) of the San Luis Hills ACEC, and bighorn sheep lambing areas (6,260 acres) would protect the values on approximately 14,00~ acres.</p> <p>Seasonal limitations would be placed on approximately 333,000 acres of big game crucial winter range and 9,147 acres of wetlands. These limitations would reduce stress to big game populations during the critical period of use.</p> | <p>Desired Future Outcomes<br/><b>(Chapter 5 p 180-181)</b> Desired future outcomes for the Intermountain Basins Big Sagebrush Shrubland include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>☑ The Intermountain Basins Big Sagebrush Shrublands persist in the condition, connectivity, and quantity necessary to sustain viable and resilient populations of SGCN and host a variety of land uses with reduced resource use conflicts.</li> <li>☑ Modified grazing management results in improved ecological conditions for Intermountain Basins Big Sagebrush Shrubland habitats and improved economic viability for the ranching community of northern New Mexico.</li> <li>☑ A fully funded, comprehensive, statewide noxious weed program is established and implemented. Colonization of noxious weed species is stopped and extant weed populations are controlled or eliminated.</li> <li>☑ Protected areas have been established as wildlife corridors to reduce habitat fragmentation and provide SGCN access to necessary habitat.</li> <li>☑ Local communities are involved in and support decisions related to conserving to the SGCN and biodiversity of the Intermountain Basins Big Sagebrush Shrubland.</li> <li>☑ Consistent reclamation standards that ensure future habitat integrity and functionality for Intermountain Basins Big Sagebrush Shrubland are jointly established and adopted by private landowners, counties, municipalities, federal land management agencies and the State Land Office.</li> <li>☑ Working groups comprised of local, state, and federal government agencies, landowners and the public have been established to address conservation issues at the wildland urban interface.</li> </ul> | <p><b>See Sections 3.2-3.4, p. 63 -</b> Priorities, Threats, Conservation Action Overview: CDOW biologists prioritized conservation actions for species and key habitats on a scale of High, Medium, or Low, based on expert input, existing recovery/management plans, and staff experience/expertise. See Table 16 for prioritized conservation actions for species, and Table 17 for prioritized conservation actions for high priority; <b>Table 17 pp.155-192.</b> Key Habitats – Priorities, Threats, and Conservation Actions Sorted by Priority (High, Medium, Low), Habitat Type, and Habitat Name; BLM CO SRMS Related habitats. Little SEZ High Priority Habitat but ample species Overlap: Fair SEZ Medium &amp; Low priority overlap;</p> <p>Goals: <i>Maintain or restore habitat, compatible resource use, land protections, invasives species control, voluntary standards;</i> Sagebrush: Desert ScrubGreasewood Fans and flats, Saltbush fans and flats <b>Table 18 p193-197.</b> A sample of existing species-specific and multi-species conservation, recovery, and other action plans and agreements for Colorado wildlife. These and other plans that are in electronic format may be accessed via the CDOW website, <a href="http://wildlife.state.co.us/WildlifeSpecies/SpeciesOfConcern/">http://wildlife.state.co.us/WildlifeSpecies/SpeciesOfConcern/</a></p> |                                    |

| Resource  | BLM CO SRMS Goal - (Landscape or Resource Desired Outcome) | BLM SRMS Objective (Mitigation Hierarchy) TO BE PROVIDED | BLM Taos RMP (2012)   | BLM SLV RMP (1991)  | NM SWAP - Comprehensive Wildlife Conservation Strategy for New Mexico - New Mexico Department of Game & Fish (2006) | CO-SWAP - State Wildlife Action Plan - Colorado Parks & Wildlife (2010) | NPS Great Sand Dunes NP GMP (2007) |
|---|--|--|---|---|---|---|------------------------------------|
| Ecology: Terrestrial Wildlife and Aquatic Biota (Continued) | See above.   |  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Determine the status and trends in selected indicators of the condition of BLM lands to allow managers to make informed decisions and to work more effectively with other agencies and individuals for the benefit of wildlife resources.</li> <li>· Provide early warning of abnormal conditions of selected resources to help develop effective mitigation measures and reduce costs of management.</li> <li>· Provide data to better understand the dynamic nature and condition of BLM lands and to provide reference points for comparisons with other altered environment.</li> <li>· Provide data to meet legal and congressional man-dates related to natural resource protect &amp; pub enjoyment.</li> <li>· Provide a means of measuring progress towards performance goals.</li> </ul> <p>Objectives</p> <p>Restore, protect, and enhance the resources necessary to support native wildlife species and their associated habitats, including mon and maintenance of wildlife water developments to improve design and/or retire/relocate to appropriate sites.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Management priorities focus on big game winter and summer ranges</li> <li>· by protecting and improving approximately 50,000 acres in the Taos Plateau and Chama planning units.</li> <li>· Manage sagebrush habitat, including mapping of current condition and extent of habitat for sagebrush-obligate species, to provide a range of self-sustaining sagebrush cover containing a variety of age classes and structures.</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Map and assess priority habitats for migratory birds in the Chama, Taos Plateau, Lower Gorge/Copper Hill, Ojo Caliente and West Santa Fe planning units, and develop habitat management recommendations and/or plans within seven years after approval of the RMP.</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Protect and improve big game winter range in the Taos Plateau, Chama and Ojo Caliente planning units by managing for low road density in transportation plans, implementing vegetation treatments to increase structural and compositional diversity, and construction of projects to improve water availability and wildlife movement inside migratory corridors.</li> </ul> | <p>Restoration and protection of 3,285 acres of riparian habitat would provide additional forage and cover for big game, waterfowl, and nongame species. The prey base for raptors and other predators would be improved. In-channel structures and improvements would provide food and habitat for waterfowl, big game, and nongame species.</p> <p>Forage conditions on big game crucial winter range would generally improve with continued development of grazing systems and improved management practices. Conflicts would also be reduced between livestock and wildlife on crucial big game Winter ranges. Both thermal and cover requirements for big game on 5,769 acres of commercial forest lands Will be maintained and in some areas present conditions will be improved within these stands . Seasonal limitations in bighorn sheep lambing areas should maintain present lambing levels. Limiting individual winter harvest timber operations to 80 acres or less of' crucial winter range between December 15 and March 31 should not cause major impacts to wintering big game.</p> <p>Designation and management. of Los Mogotes, Trickle Mountain, San Luis Hills, Rio Grande River Corridor, and Blanca as ACECs will have .a positive effect on wildlife values .. ACEC designation of other areas (e.g., La Jadero Canyon, Elephant Rocks, Sand Castle, and Cumbres and Toltec Scenic Railroad Corridor) will generally enhance wildlife values. Management under an SRMA designation on the Blanca ACEC and Rio Grande River Corridor ACEC will complement both recreation and wildlife. SRMA designation for the Rio Grande Corridor will enhance and protect 4,595 acres of unmanaged waterfowl and raptor habitat. Limited OHV designations (travel restricted to designated roads) will maintain existing habitat on 131,400 acres. A limited OHV designation will reduce stress to wildlife on 342,000 acres during critical periods. Stress will also be reduced on wildlife on 5,300 acres, which are closed to OHV travel. Habitat destruction and the disturbance and harassment of wildlife will occur on approximately ·173,400 acres of BLM land open to OHV use, which includes the remaining winter habitat for big game. The Rio Grande River Corridor SRMA includes the 2,640-acre segment recommended for wild and scenic designation. Placer- operations, which involve dredging, vegetation removal, and streambank disturbance, will have· adverse impacts on: aquatic habitat systems.</p> |   |   |                                    |

| Resource  | BLM CO SRMS Goal - (Landscape or Resource Desired Outcome) | BLM SRMS Objective (Mitigation Hierarchy) TO BE PROVIDED | BLM Taos RMP (2012)  | BLM SLV RMP (1991)   | NM SWAP - Comprehensive Wildlife Conservation Strategy for New Mexico - New Mexico Department of Game & Fish (2006) | CO-SWAP - State Wildlife Action Plan - Colorado Parks & Wildlife (2010) | NPS Great Sand Dunes NP GMP (2007) |
|---|--|--|--|--|---|---|------------------------------------|
| Ecology: Terrestrial Wildlife and Aquatic Biota (cont.) | See above  |  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Obtain scientifically sound biological information in order to properly assess potential impacts to wildlife and wildlife habitat in relation to wind or solar energy development, gathering both pre- and post-construction data according to current industry and scientific protocols, as it affects wildlife in general and birds and bats in particular. · Determine long-term trends in vegetation species composition, distribution, abundance, and community structure (e.g., cover and density by height class of woody species) of selected plant communities for focal wildlife species. Determine long-term trends in species composition and abundance of native and nonnative migratory birds.</li> <li>· Improve understanding of breeding bird-habitat relationships and the effects of management actions, such as invasive plant and animal control, by compiling existing data and/or researching the effects of these management actions on changes in bird species composition and abundance in relation to changes in specific habitat variables.</li> <li>· Determine long-term trends in the distribution and abundance of bats in the Chama, Taos Plateau, West Santa Fe, and Lower Gorge/Copper Hill planning units. · Determine long-term trends in the distribution and abundance of prairie dogs in the Chama and Taos Plateau planning units. · Determine long-term trends in the distribution and abundance of river otters in the Rio Grande or any other areas of relocation, as appropriate.</li> <li>· Use imagery or other techniques to estimate trends in the areal extent and configuration of landcover types in the planning area. · Determine annual nesting success of breeding raptors on BLM lands as measured by territories occupied, number of chicks produced, and number of chicks fledged. · Determine annual status and trends in prey base for raptor species in the Taos Plateau, as measured by abundance and species composition of small mammals and rodents.</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Water quality, water temperatures, bank and channel stability, and sedimentation will all be potentially adversely affected by these management actions: 4-10: Restoration and protection of 1,370 acres of riparian habitat will maintain the aquatic habitat in its present condition where the trend is stable. Structures placed in Ford Creek and La Garita Creek will improve pool:riffle ratios, stabilize streambanks, increase in-stream cover, and reduce channelization, streambank erosion, and sedimentation on 4.0 stream miles. Intensive grazing management on 22 miles of stream aquatic habitat will improve aquatic conditions as a result of improved riparian habitat along the Rio Grande River Corridor ACEC, including the 2,640 acres within the wild and scenic river corridor. Road construction across aquatic areas could increase sedimentation, streambank degradation, and water temperatures and decrease streambank cover. Acquisition of additional acres of aquatic habitat will occur. Disposal of aquatic habitat will not occur except for lands within the San Luis Lakes and Mishak Lakes area, which would go to NPS, DPOR, DOW, and/or USGS. Designation of Trickle Mountain, Blanca SRMA, and the Rio Grande River Corridor as ACECs will protect and enhance aquatic values. Closing areas along streams to OHV use will maintain or improve aquatic habitat. The net impact will be beneficial to aquatic habitat.</li> </ul> |   |   |                                    |

| Resource                        | BLM CO SRMS Goal - (Landscape or Resource Desired Outcome)   | BLM SRMS Objective (Mitigation Hierarchy) TO BE PROVIDED | BLM Taos RMP (2012)   | BLM SLV RMP (1991)  | NM SWAP - Comprehensive Wildlife Conservation Strategy for New Mexico - New Mexico Department of Game & Fish (2006)  | CO-SWAP - State Wildlife Action Plan - Colorado Parks & Wildlife (2010) | NPS Great Sand Dunes NP GMP (2007) |
|---------------------------------|--|--|---|---|--|---|------------------------------------|
| Ecology: Special Status Species | Sufficient acreage of high quality habitats are spatially distributed across the landscape providing all necessary habitat components to support life history requirements to maintain viable populations of special status species, avoiding the need for future listing. |  | <p><b>2.1.6 Special Status Species</b></p> <p><b>Goals</b> · Prevent the Federal listing of federally proposed and Bureau sensitive species, which include both Federal candidate species and delisted species within five years of delisting, through management prescriptions that will conserve, enhance, or restore habitat, and minimize adverse effects from actions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Facilitate the delisting of existing special status species so that their populations and the habitat on which they depend are restored to the point that the provisions of the Endangered Species Act are no longer necessary.</li> <li>· Minimize or eliminate threats affecting BLM Sensitive species and improve condition of the species habitat, including ecosystem management and conservation of native biodiversity to reduce the chance of native species requiring BLM sensitive species status.</li> </ul> <p><b>Objectives</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Achieve “no net loss” of special status species habitats.</li> <li>· Determine long-term trends in distribution, abundance, and threats or other limiting factors of selected special status species on BLM lands and evaluate the significance of those lands in the conservation of the species.</li> <li>· Ensure compliance with the statutory requirements of the Endangered Species Act.</li> <li>· Incorporate BMPs, standard operating procedures, conservation strategies and measures, and design criteria to mitigate specific threats during planning and implementation, including the use of Guidelines for Livestock Grazing Management until site-specific management plans or conservation strategies are developed.</li> <li>· Assist in the preparation and implementation of recovery or other special status species management plans.</li> <li>· Monitor populations and habitats to ensure that objectives for special status species habitat development and protection are being met, including additional surveys for Southwestern willow flycatcher.</li> </ul> | <p><b>Page 3-6. Special Status Plants and animal species:</b></p> <p>Threatened and endangered species and sensitive species and plant communities will be inventoried and monitored as necessary to provide information for proper management.</p> <p>Supplemental releases and reintroduction of Federal and state listed endangered, threatened, candidate, and sensitive species will be enacted following environmental analysis and consultation with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), the Colorado Division of Wildlife (DOW), Colorado Natural Areas Program (CNAP), and other affected parties.</p> | <p>Desired Future Outcomes (Chapter 5 p 180-181) Desired future outcomes for the Intermountain Basins Big Sagebrush Shrubland include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>☑ The Intermountain Basins Big Sagebrush Shrublands persist in the condition, connectivity, and quantity necessary to sustain viable and resilient populations of SGCN and host a variety of land uses with reduced resource use conflicts.</li> <li>☑ Modified grazing management results in improved ecological conditions for Intermountain Basins Big Sagebrush Shrubland habitats and improved economic viability for the ranching community of northern New Mexico..</li> <li>☑ Protected areas have been established as wildlife corridors to reduce habitat fragmentation and provide SGCN access to necessary habitat.</li> <li>☑ Local communities are involved in and support decisions related to conserving to the SGCN and biodiversity of the Intermountain Basins Big Sagebrush Shrubland.</li> <li>☑ Consistent reclamation standards that ensure future habitat integrity and functionality for Intermountain Basins Big Sagebrush Shrubland are jointly established and adopted by private landowners, counties, municipalities, federal land management agencies and the State Land Office.</li> <li>☑ Working groups comprised of local, state, and federal government agencies, landowners and the public have been established to address conservation issues at the wildland urban interface.</li> </ul> | See Fish and Wildlife goals   |                                    |

| Resource                                    | BLM CO SRMS Goal - (Landscape or Resource Desired Outcome) | BLM SRMS Objective (Mitigation Hierarchy) TO BE PROVIDED | BLM Taos RMP (2012)   | BLM SLV RMP (1991) | NM SWAP - Comprehensive Wildlife Conservation Strategy for New Mexico - New Mexico Department of Game & Fish (2006) | CO-SWAP - State Wildlife Action Plan - Colorado Parks & Wildlife (2010) | NPS Great Sand Dunes NP GMP (2007) |
|---|--|--|---|--------------------|---|---|------------------------------------|
| Ecology: Special Status Species (Continued) | See above  |  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Incorporate objectives and actions identified by the USFWS in authorized recovery plans into BLM plans and documents as appropriate.</li> <li>· Conduct special status species habitat inventories and studies to provide data for multiple-use planning, habitat management plans, and resolution of conflicts involving resource development and protection activities.</li> <li>· Prepare and implement habitat management plans to address special status species habitat development and protection needs, including riparian, giving priority to the Rio Grande corridor.</li> <li>· Monitor habitat management plans and/or cooperative agreements with other State, local or nongovernmental entities to determine if positive changes in trend for habitat development and protection are being met in such plans or agreements.</li> <li>· Where feasible, acquire lands containing habitat for special status species.</li> <li>· Cooperate with other Federal agencies to foster positive working relationships that promote the conservation of listed species.</li> <li>· Participate in regional and national working groups to help coordinate agency actions and create opportunities to overcome barriers to special status species and the ecosystems upon which they depend, and to develop species-specific or ecosystem-based conservation strategies. Cooperate with State and local agencies, including participation on watershed councils and weed management areas and coordination with State natural heritage programs and State wildlife agency strategic plans, providing technical assistance where possible.</li> <li>· Provide data to the BLM New Mexico State Office to assist with maintaining a current BLM Sensitive Species List.</li> </ul> |                    |   |   |                                    |

| Resource              | BLM CO SRMS Goal - (Landscape or Resource Desired Outcome)  | BLM SRMS Objective (Mitigation Hierarchy) TO BE PROVIDED | BLM Taos RMP (2012) | BLM SLV RMP (1991)   | NM SWAP - Comprehensive Wildlife Conservation Strategy for New Mexico - New Mexico Department of Game & Fish (2006) | CO-SWAP - State Wildlife Action Plan - Colorado Parks & Wildlife (2010) | NPS Great Sand Dunes NP GMP (2007) |
|-----------------------|---|--|---------------------|--|---|---|------------------------------------|
| Environmental Justice | <b>Disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects on minority and low-income populations are avoided in the landscape.</b> |  | Not addressed       | <p><b>Page 4-4. Economic Conditions and Social Environment Assumptions</b></p> <p>The socio-economic analysis is adequate to analyze local/regional social and economic effects; effects on the BLM San Luis Resource Area management costs; and effects on national values for recreation activities. Currently there are no up-to-date models specific to the economic study area (ESA) that could be used to measure total employment and income changes for this plan. The Bureau of Economic Analysis Regional Input-Output Modeling System (RIMS II), now has multipliers for Colorado, which are used in this analysis. The expenditure data was developed from studies by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and other studies for Colorado (Table 14-f, and Table 4:2). Management will affect employment, population, and income in the area. Most of the effects occur because of impact to the ranching sector, forestry sector, and retail and service sectors. These economic sectors will be affected by changes in grazing, forestry, and recreation opportunities occurring from the land uses in the plan. The potential economic impacts are insignificant as they relate to local and regional impact. Contributions to the ESA from recreation activities occurring on BLM land will be as follows: expenditure \$2,177,870; output \$4,608,373; earnings \$1,498,157; and employment 119.</p> <p>Recreation activity employment (119) in the ESA will be less than 1 percent change. The expenditures for recreation (e.g., transportation, lodging, entertainment, eating, and drinking) are changes in final demand. The expenditure data is used to measure economic effects on the ESA and national values are defined as the net economic gain from an activity. Expenditures are important to local and state economies, but they do not reflect the total recreation values of the resource, which include the personal benefits one receives from participation in that activity. Thus, 'national' values measure 'these additional benefits. For example, the net gain or national values from a recreation activity are what the recreator is willing to pay over their' actual cost~ to participate in the activity. Net gains. Are portrayed on ??? basis for this analysis.</p> |   |   |                                    |

| Resource                      | BLM CO SRMS Goal - (Landscape or Resource Desired Outcome) | BLM SRMS Objective (Mitigation Hierarchy) TO BE PROVIDED | BLM Taos RMP (2012) | BLM SLV RMP (1991)  | NM SWAP - Comprehensive Wildlife Conservation Strategy for New Mexico - New Mexico Department of Game & Fish (2006) | CO-SWAP - State Wildlife Action Plan - Colorado Parks & Wildlife (2010) | NPS Great Sand Dunes NP GMP (2007) |
|-------------------------------|--|--|---------------------|---|---|---|------------------------------------|
| Environmental Justice (cont.) | See above  |  |                     | <p>These national; values are estimates of "willingness to pay" (wtp). Wtp values are 'easy to determine when goods and services are bought and sold in well-defined markets. Recreation wtp values, however, usually have to be estimated from secondary sources (Table 4-1). No significant population change will result from land use allocation. The impacts tend to be site-specific and confirmed to a particular type of user group. Any decision will usually produce trade-offs with social advantages for some persons or groups and social disadvantages for others. Some resource products on BLM land can be valued; others cannot. Dollar values can be assigned to timber and other resources (Tables 4-2 and 4-3).</p> <p>All of these values were estimated as willingness to pay values. Some of the values were determined by observation of goods and services bought and sold in well-defined markets. For example markets exist for grazing; However, other resources such as recreation do not have established markets. These values were based on various willingness to pay studies. . . . Examples of other benefits not assigned monetary values include the value to future generations of protection and preserving cultural resources, the benefits of maximizing viable populations of wildlife species, and the satisfaction derived by those who do not have any intention of seeing these populations. . . .</p> <p>Consequences of Proposed Plan<br/> Mineral values are also not considered. Mineral activity on BLM lands respond mostly to changes in market prices over time, rather than to changes in land management plans. Price changes in minerals or the amount of minerals that can be produced in the future on BLM lands cannot be predicted. Thus minerals are not valued for the trade-off analysis, but are considered during the decision making process. The BLM San Luis Resource Area management costs of \$650,000 per year are not expected to change. The actual dollar amount may change because of inflation. In terms of 1987 dollars, however, the \$650,000 is not expected to increase</p> |   |   |                                    |

| Resource  | BLM CO SRMS Goal - (Landscape or Resource Desired Outcome)  | BLM SRMS Objective (Mitigation Hierarchy) TO BE PROVIDED | BLM Taos RMP (2012)   | BLM SLV RMP (1991)   | NM SWAP - Comprehensive Wildlife Conservation Strategy for New Mexico - New Mexico Department of Game & Fish (2006)  | CO-SWAP - State Wildlife Action Plan - Colorado Parks & Wildlife (2010) | NPS Great Sand Dunes NP GMP (2007) |
|---|---|--|---|--|--|---|------------------------------------|
| Hydrology – Surface Water, Water Quality, and Ground-water Availability | Surface water and groundwater quantity and quality, and watershed functions, result in compliance with Clean Water Act, other applicable water quality requirements, which maintain or improve sufficient water to support people, economies, wildlife, and ecological systems. |  | <p><b>2.1.9 Water Goals</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· For water resources to be highly functioning and in good condition, as measured by physical, chemical, and biological parameters in the planning area.</li> <li>· To provide for the physical and legal availability of water to facilitate authorized use on public lands, including potable water at recreation facilities.</li> <li>· Restore, maintain, and preserve the natural functions of floodplains to reduce the risk of flood loss or damage to property, and minimize the impact of floods on human health and safety.</li> <li>· Restore, maintain, and preserve water quality in surface waters that flow through BLM-administered lands.</li> <li>· Develop and maintain partnerships with other agencies, organizations, and individual stakeholders to develop and implement watershed restoration projects and pursue funding opportunities to complete projects.</li> </ul> <p><b>Objectives</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Assess water quality and establish management objectives for perennial streams using the Standards for Public Land Health.</li> <li>· Over the life of the plan, reduce channel instability across the planning area by 50 percent in ephemeral, intermittent, and perennial stream channels through a combination of resource management and active restoration or rehabilitation.</li> <li>· Manage projects and activities to reduce water runoff and soil loss.</li> <li>· Update water resource inventories and maintain water quality monitoring data necessary to make management decisions.</li> <li>· Submit documentation to support Federal water rights to the New Mexico State Engineer for all waters on BLM lands that have not been previously claimed.</li> </ul> | <p><b>Page 3-2. Water Resources</b></p> <p>Legal rights through the state water court system will be acquired .to use water in support of BLM programs, including the water needs of BLM recreation areas and sites, commercial and concession facilities, special plant and animal habitat areas, state and local government recreation and public purposes lease areas, livestock management allotments, and wildlife habitat areas. Water quality will continue to be maintained or improved in accordance with state and Federal standards. BLM will consult the appropriate state agencies on proposed projects that could significantly affect water quality. Management actions on BLM - administered land within municipal watersheds will continue to be designed to protect water quality and quantity. The Bureau water use inventory and water rights program within the planning area will continue to be implemented. As new projects are completed and old ones are maintained, re-evaluating and updating will be required. Monitoring selected ground water and surface water stations will be continued in cooperation with USGS. Potential impacts to surface water resources are not as critical nor probable as to ground water resources. In the event that reaches of the lower Rio Grande River are designated for special management under the National Wild and Scenic Rivers Act no Federal claims for instream flows are anticipated; however, an implicit Federal reserved water right is in the Act. Existing stream conditions are sufficient to satisfy the needs of any special management designation. 3-2 Pending future designation, BLM may have to quantify needs and file in state water court. Watershed activity plans will be developed and implemented on areas where livestock grazing plan adjustments will not fully correct any determined water quality problem. Cooperative management within the range program and the watershed program in the development, implementation, evaluation, and modification of AMPs as affected by watershed values will continue as a top priority. Monitoring and evaluation of water quality and quantity, as well as control of erosion and sediment production, will remain high priority management goals. Emphasis will be to continue all watershed activities that provide protection, maintenance, and enhancement of the watershed resources, including the support provided to other resource programs and activities.</p> | Watershed condition, groundwater depletion, water withdrawals, water loss, de-watering impacts to wildlife and species referenced but desired future outcome implied |   |                                    |

| Resource  | BLM CO SRMS Goal - (Landscape or Resource Desired Outcome) | BLM SRMS Objective (Mitigation Hierarchy) TO BE PROVIDED | BLM Taos RMP (2012)   | BLM SLV RMP (1991)   | NM SWAP - Comprehensive Wildlife Conservation Strategy for New Mexico - New Mexico Department of Game & Fish (2006) | CO-SWAP - State Wildlife Action Plan - Colorado Parks & Wildlife (2010) | NPS Great Sand Dunes NP GMP (2007) |
|---|--|--|---|--|---|---|------------------------------------|
| Hydrology – Surface Water, Water Quality, and Ground-water Availability (cont.) | See above  |  | <p><b>2.1.9 Water Goals</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· For water resources to be highly functioning and in good condition, as measured by physical, chemical, and biological parameters in the planning area.</li> <li>· To provide for the physical and legal availability of water to facilitate authorized use on public lands, including potable water at recreation facilities.</li> <li>· Restore, maintain, and preserve the natural functions of floodplains to reduce the risk of flood loss or damage to property, and minimize the impact of floods on human health and safety.</li> <li>· Restore, maintain, and preserve water quality in surface waters that flow through BLM-administered lands.</li> <li>· Develop and maintain partnerships with other agencies, organizations, and individual stakeholders to develop and implement watershed restoration projects and pursue funding opportunities to complete projects.</li> </ul> <p><b>Objectives</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Assess water quality and establish management objectives for perennial streams using the Standards for Public Land Health.</li> <li>· Over the life of the plan, reduce channel instability across the planning area by 50 percent in ephemeral, intermittent, and perennial stream channels through a combination of resource management and active restoration or rehabilitation.</li> <li>· Manage projects and activities to reduce water runoff and soil loss.</li> <li>· Update water resource inventories and maintain water quality monitoring data necessary to make management decisions.</li> <li>· Submit documentation to support Federal water rights to the New Mexico State Engineer for all waters on BLM lands that have not been previously claimed. The Taos Field Office will continue to participate in local watershed planning efforts for streams that cross BLM jurisdiction.</li> <li>· Manage all projects and authorized activities so that they will not contribute to surface or ground water quality degradation.</li> </ul> | <p>The BLM in Colorado will continue to take an active role in the control of nonpoint source pollution on public lands. BLM is an active participant on the state of Colorado Nonpoint Source Taskforce and Agriculture/Silviculture Subcommittee. Through these organizations, BLM will identify nonpoint source pollution areas for the updating of the Colorado Nonpoint Assessment Report. It is the policy of BLM to protect, maintain, restore, and/or enhance the quality of waters on public lands. The implementation of best management practices will be utilized to help achieve this goal. Funds will be requested for planning and project implementation for nonpoint source control with emphasis placed on the priority watersheds identified in the Colorado Nonpoint Source Management Program report. Nonpoint source control projects will be implemented as funding and manpower allow.</p> <p><b>Waterpower/Storage</b><br/>Management actions to maintain the physical potential for the development of waterpower/storage sites on BLM-administered lands within the planning area will continue. One exception to this will be the recommendation to terminate the withdrawals for the Rio Grande River Corridor. An evaluation of all potential sites will be accomplished, and recommendations for new withdrawals be proposed as needed.</p> <p><b>Appendix A, Page A-9. Water Rights</b><br/>The Rio Grande River Interstate Compact became effective on March 18, 1938, and applies to this river segment. A major purpose of this interstate water agreement was to establish the quantity of water Colorado is to deliver into New Mexico. Section 13(e) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act address interstate compacts:<br/>“Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed to alter, amend, repeal, interpret, modify, or be in conflict with any interstate compact made by any States which contain any portion of the national wild and scenic rivers system.”<br/>The future administration of this compact, therefore, would not be affected by the addition of the 41-mile stretch of this river to the National Wild and Scenic River System.<br/>Several water user groups expressed concern that even though the river corridor may qualify under the criteria, there is an over allocation of water within the San Luis Valley for domestic, municipal, industrial, and agricultural purposes. The water users believe designation would cause them some unspecified problems regarding their operations.</p> |   |   |                                    |

| Resource  | BLM CO SRMS Goal - (Landscape or Resource Desired Outcome) | BLM SRMS Objective (Mitigation Hierarchy) TO BE PROVIDED | BLM Taos RMP (2012) | BLM SLV RMP (1991)  | NM SWAP - Comprehensive Wildlife Conservation Strategy for New Mexico - New Mexico Department of Game & Fish (2006) | CO-SWAP - State Wildlife Action Plan - Colorado Parks & Wildlife (2010) | NPS Great Sand Dunes NP GMP (2007) |
|---|--|--|---------------------|---|---|---|------------------------------------|
| Hydrology – Surface Water, Water Quality, and Ground-water Availability (cont.) | See Above  |  |                     | <p>The major concerns of the users are focused on the reserved water right that would be created by the designation, Section 13(c) of the Act states that wild and scenic designation reserves water in the quantity necessary to accomplish the purpose of the Act, preservation of rivers in a free-flowing condition, and preservation of the outstandingly remarkable values for the benefit and enjoyment of future generations. Water users are uneasy because of the strategic location of the prospective Federal water right, even though this possible right would be junior to approximately 16,000 other senior adjudicated water rights. Their concern also is that if BLM obtained a reserved water right it would be based on the conditions in the stream at the time of national designation. Any changes in water rights upstream, which could alter these conditions in the river, could be protested by BLM, since BLM as a junior water right holder would have a right to expect conditions to remain the same as at the time of wild and scenic designation by Congress.</p> <p>There are 16,000 + senior adjudicated water rights existing in the San Luis Valley presently, which are as follows: Rio Grande River and tributaries Alamo &amp; La Jara Creeks and tributaries Conejos River and tributaries Costilla Kulebra Creeks and tributaries Old Water District 27 Old Water District 35 Augmentation Plans TOTAL 2,400 8,250 1,050 1,800 450 1,250 1,200 16,451. SOURCE: "Tabulated Water Rights in Water Division 3" dated December 31, 1989.</p> <p>Since there are a very large number of senior rights already in place on the Rio Grande River, the placement of an additional very junior Federal water right should have a very negligible, if any, effect on existing upstream water operations, future changes, or modifications to diversions. Many of the 16,000 senior water right holders would have problems with: 1) major upstream diversion of water (i.e., selling water to cities outside the S.an Luis Valley) and 2) minor operational changes upstream (i.e., changing point-of diversion 'or modifications of diversion structures) and would object to such changes. A junior reserved water right could be, at the worst case, a nuisance transactional factor for water users. There appears to be widespread interest in continuing the agricultural lifestyle in the San Luis Valley. A sizable number of the water users and non-water users in the valley have publicly expressed opposition to diverting water from the valley to out-of-basin users.</p> |   |   |                                    |

| Resource  | BLM CO SRMS Goal - (Landscape or Resource Desired Outcome) | BLM SRMS Objective (Mitigation Hierarchy) TO BE PROVIDED | BLM Taos RMP (2012) | BLM SLV RMP (1991)  | NM SWAP - Comprehensive Wildlife Conservation Strategy for New Mexico - New Mexico Department of Game & Fish (2006) | CO-SWAP - State Wildlife Action Plan - Colorado Parks & Wildlife (2010) | NPS Great Sand Dunes NP GMP (2007) |
|---|--|--|---------------------|---|---|---|------------------------------------|
| Hydrology – Surface Water, Water Quality, and Ground-water Availability (cont.) | See above  |  |                     | <p>This interest, expressed by many commenters, may well be better served by conserving this river environment through wild and scenic designation. The proposal to designate the Rio Grande River as wild and scenic may be of assistance in continuing the existing conditions on the river and preserving a portion of that river environment; i.e., maintaining some minimum flows in the river with agriculture return flows. This may, in fact, have a very strong psychological effect of keeping water in the valley for conservation and agriculture uses instead of diverting it to other areas for municipal use. There is a concern that the Federal government, if this river is placed in the national wild and scenic system, would want a low-flow limitation or require a minimum flow without going through the Colorado State Water Law system. Any reserved right for this river would be adjudicated in the Colorado courts. The environmental groups, including reputable wildlife biologists, have stated that a minimum flow of from 40 to 60 cfs would be needed to perpetuate the biological riverine environment and related values.</p> <p>The BLM recommendation for designation in the proposed RMP would in no way change the valid existing water rights situation and would state that any inadvertent water flow present, specifically the “existing conditions,” are sufficient for the perpetuation of the significant river values. This basically would mean continuing the existing situation on this 41-mile stretch of river; i.e., average 10-year (1980-1989) flows of 654 cfs, short duration low flows of 43 cfs, and short duration high flows around 3,400 cfs. There were other concerns expressed that there would not be any flows within this particular 41-mile stretch of river because of changes in water operations upstream. In discussing these concerns with the water users, they have no specific examples of actual proposals for changes in operations at this time and could not offer any ideas for likely future proposals.</p> |   |   |                                    |

| Resource  | BLM CO SRMS Goal - (Landscape or Resource Desired Outcome) | BLM SRMS Objective (Mitigation Hierarchy) TO BE PROVIDED | BLM Taos RMP (2012)  | BLM SLV RMP (1991)   | NM SWAP - Comprehensive Wildlife Conservation Strategy for New Mexico - New Mexico Department of Game & Fish (2006) | CO-SWAP - State Wildlife Action Plan - Colorado Parks & Wildlife (2010) | NPS Great Sand Dunes NP GMP (2007) |
|---|--|--|--|--|---|---|------------------------------------|
| Hydrology – Surface Water, Water Quality, and Ground-water Availability (cont.) | See above  |  |  | BLM is directed, by regulation, to look at reasonable, foreseeable impacts. It is apparent that with 25 return flows within this stretch, there would always be some minimum water flows in the river. The obligatory flows downriver to the New Ditch Diversion Dam provide for at least this level of flows to the very beginning point of this 41-mile stretch of river. It is apparent that if the water users on any of the return flow waterways below the New Ditch Dam (e.g., La Jara Creek, Alamosa River, Tenfoot, Ditch, Trinchera Creek, Conejos River, Alamosa Lateral Ditch, Empire Lateral Ditch, etc.) were to sell their water rights to a transmountain diversion company (e.g., cities outside the San Luis Valley, etc.) they would only be allowed by present state water law to sell an amount equal to that which they consumptively use. This use is normally between 50 and 60 percent, therefore, a substantial amount of water will continue to flow into the river and be available for conservation of the river environment in this lower stretch of the river.  |   |   |                                    |
| Lands and Realty (Land Tenure Management)                                       | No unavoidable impacts                                     |  | <p>2.2.2 Land Tenure Goals</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Develop a deliberate and well-considered combination of public and private land ownership patterns to provide for more efficient and effective resource management actions.</li> <li>· To provide for reasonable access to public lands, resources, and facilities for the use and enjoyment of the public, as well as for administrative purposes.</li> </ul> <p>Objectives</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Retain public lands with high resource values in public ownership.</li> <li>· Adjust land ownership to consolidate public land holdings, acquire lands with high public resource values, and meet public and community needs.</li> <li>· Facilitate the acquisition, exchange, or disposal of public lands to provide the most efficient management of public resources.</li> <li>· Acquire and maintain access to public lands where needed to improve management efficiency and facilitate multiple use and the public's enjoyment of these lands in coordination with other Federal agencies, State and local governments, and private landowners.</li> </ul> | <p><b>Page 4-11. Lands Ownership Adjustment Management Lands and Realty Management</b></p> <p>Emphasis will be placed on acquisition of lands with significance for special plant and animal species, wildlife habitat, cultural values, riparian areas, public access, and recreation areas (especially along the Rio Grande River Corridor ACEC/SRMA). Acquisition could enhance forest and woodland management, livestock management, and minerals management.</p> <p>Lands with special plants and animals, cultural values, riparian areas, public access, significant wildlife habitat, and recreation areas will not be available for disposal unless the benefits acquired will equal or exceed the benefits lost.</p> <p>Disposal of isolated tracts will improve manageability and perhaps enhance one or more other resources if disposal of an isolated tract will result in acquisition of a desired resource value. Exchanges will be used to consolidate large blocks of ELM-administered land. " Existence of a few mining claims and the foreseeable level of fluid mineral operations may be an insignificant impact to land disposal and rights-of-way routing. Eliminating mineral activities through Withdrawals on the six cultural sites of 560 acres, will have an insignificant effect on mining because the six site</p> <p><b>Utility Corridors.</b> All utility corridors will be designated per the Western Utilities Group (WUG) plan, except areas of critical environmental concern (ACECs) and exclusion areas. All other BLM -administered lands will be open for consideration for development of major utility facilities with stipulations on a case-by-case basis. (See Realty Action Decisions Map in the back of this document.)</p> |   |   |                                    |

| Resource  | BLM CO SRMS Goal - (Landscape or Resource Desired Outcome) | BLM SRMS Objective (Mitigation Hierarchy) TO BE PROVIDED | BLM Taos RMP (2012)   | BLM SLV RMP (1991)   | NM SWAP - Comprehensive Wildlife Conservation Strategy for New Mexico - New Mexico Department of Game & Fish (2006) | CO-SWAP - State Wildlife Action Plan - Colorado Parks & Wildlife (2010) | NPS Great Sand Dunes NP GMP (2007) |
|---|--|--|---|----------------------|---|---|------------------------------------|
| Lands and Realty (Land Use Authorizations, Utility Corridors, Communications Sites) | No unavoidable impacts                                     |  | <p><b>2.2.3 Land Use Authorizations, Utility Corridors, Communication Sites</b></p> <p><b>Goals</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Provide land use authorizations in support of public needs, to be done in consideration of and in compliance with the various management decisions, goals, objectives, and resource restrictions required to protect or maintain multiple uses and resource values.</li> </ul> <p>Chapter 2 Plan Decisions 41</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Establish an efficient system of utility corridors and communication sites to meet the energy and communication needs of the public with minimum negative impacts on visual, biological, cultural, and physical resources.</li> </ul> <p><b>Objectives</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Identify areas that are suitable and available to meet public needs for use authorizations such as rights-of-way, leases, and permits, while minimizing adverse impacts to other resource values.</li> <li>· Process rights-of-way applications in a timely manner, applying appropriate mitigation to protect resource values.</li> <li>· Issue land-use authorizations based on RMP decisions, BLM policy, and other Federal mandates to support the public need for uses such as utilities, renewable energy, and telecommunications.</li> </ul> | See Previous Section |   |   |                                    |

| Resource                       | BLM CO SRMS Goal - (Landscape or Resource Desired Outcome) | BLM SRMS Objective (Mitigation Hierarchy) TO BE PROVIDED | BLM Taos RMP (2012)  | BLM SLV RMP (1991)   | NM SWAP - Comprehensive Wildlife Conservation Strategy for New Mexico - New Mexico Department of Game & Fish (2006) | CO-SWAP - State Wildlife Action Plan - Colorado Parks & Wildlife (2010) | NPS Great Sand Dunes NP GMP (2007) |
|--------------------------------|--|--|--|--|---|---|------------------------------------|
| Lands and Realty (Withdrawals) | No unavoidable impacts                                     |  | <p><b>2.2.9 Withdrawals Goals</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Utilize withdrawal actions with the least restrictive measures and minimum size necessary to accomplish the required purposes.</li> <li>Identify areas requiring protection from mineral entry through withdrawal, including the minimum area necessary to protect the sensitive lands or resources.</li> </ul> <p><b>Objectives</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Review existing withdrawals on a case-by-case basis prior to the end of the withdrawal period or as otherwise required by law to determine whether they should be extended, revoked, or modified.</li> <li>Consider requests for new withdrawals and withdrawal relinquishments, extension or modifications on a case-by-case basis.</li> <li>Lands with particularly sensitive resources will be protected from mineral entry through the use of withdrawals.</li> </ul> | <p>Page S-2 and Lands and Realty section above: <b>Lands Withdrawal Management</b></p> <p>Existing withdrawals will be retained except for the waterpower/storage withdrawals in the 2,640 acres on the 22-mile Rio Grande River Corridor determined suitable for wild and scenic river designation. A new withdrawal will be recommended to protect the river corridor values, whether or not designation as a wild and scenic river occurs. The existing withdrawal for the Blanca area will be expanded to include all 9,147 acres within this special wildlife and recreation area. New withdrawals will be recommended for six eligible national register historic place (NRHP) sites, and retention of the existing withdrawal on Cumbres Toltec Scenic Railroad site will also recommended.</p> |   |   |                                    |

| Resource   | BLM CO SRMS Goal - (Landscape or Resource Desired Outcome)   | BLM SRMS Objective (Mitigation Hierarchy) TO BE PROVIDED | BLM Taos RMP (2012)  | BLM SLV RMP (1991)   | NM SWAP - Comprehensive Wildlife Conservation Strategy for New Mexico - New Mexico Department of Game & Fish (2006) | CO-SWAP - State Wildlife Action Plan - Colorado Parks & Wildlife (2010) | NPS Great Sand Dunes NP GMP (2007) |
|--|--|--|--|--|---|---|------------------------------------|
| Livestock Grazing                                    | Public rangeland meets BLM land health standards and provides a sustainable level of livestock grazing consistent with the principles of multiple use and sustained yield. |  | <p><b>2.2.4 Livestock Grazing Goals</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Manage the public rangelands to provide for a sustainable level of livestock grazing consistent with the principles of multiple use and sustained yield.</li> <li>· Manage livestock grazing on the public rangelands to provide maintenance or enhancement of the natural resources.</li> </ul> <p><b>Objectives</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Maintain existing desirable rangeland conditions and improve rangeland health utilizing best grazing management practices, meeting or exceeding New Mexico Standards for Public Land Health and Guidelines for Livestock Grazing Management (2001).</li> <li>· Avoid net loss of animal unit months (AUMs) within the planning area where practical.</li> <li>· Identify and implement vegetation improvements on a landscape scale to increase forage quality and quantity for both livestock and wildlife and to support and sustain local communities.</li> <li>· Establish reserve common allotments to provide forage reserves for conservation benefits and management flexibility.</li> </ul> | <p><b>Page 4-9 and appendix D. Livestock Grazing Management</b></p> <p>Forage production will potentially increase by an estimated 10 000 AUMs on the allotted lands based on expected grazing management improvements during the 20-year life of the plan. These increases would be divided between livestock (4,000 AUMs) and nonlivestock uses (6,000 AUMs for wildlife, soils, watershed, etc.), if needed. The net effect will likely benefit livestock grazing management as well as the nonlivestock uses within the resource area.</p> <p>During the life of the plan, there also could be an estimated 30,000 more acres (of the approximate 42,000 acres of unallotted lands) that very likely will become suitable production acres. This potentially will provide for an approximate additional 1,500 AUMs that will be allocated between livestock (600 AUMs) and nonlivestock use (900 AUMs) with a net beneficial effect to livestock. This will occur after thorough vegetation resource base monitoring. Incorporating riparian objectives into AMPs could potentially result in additional limitations on livestock operators, increases in operational costs, and temporary loss m AUMs authorized.</p> <p>Seasonal limitations to OHV use on approximately 390,000 acres (76 percent) and closures on 11,584 acres (2 percent) will reduce damage to vegetation and management problems created by use of roads in the spring. The overall net effect to livestock grazing management in the resource area could be an increase of available forage by about 4,600 AUMs over the span of this land use plan.</p> |   |   |                                    |
| Military and Civilian Aviation (added from Dry Lake) | No unavoidable impacts   |  | None   | <p><b>Page 2-55 Comment 1-1 Military needs</b></p> <p>Mission requirements, fuel costs, and environmental constraints all contribute to decisions made in locating a military training activity. Because of general aviation and population pressures, low altitude, high speed flights are relegated to those areas least accessible and sparsely inhabited.</p> <p>Therefore, we request that you give full consideration to how planning and management decisions might adversely affect the use of low altitude airspace by the Air Force. We believe unrestricted military use of these routes is essential for training and combat effectiveness.</p> <p><b>Response</b></p> <p>The bulk of BLM-administered lands will not be affected by flight maneuvers; however, lands that lie adjacent to USPS lands recommended for wilderness will be. Flights should avoid these areas, which are on the western slope of the Sangre de Cristo Mountains.</p>  |   |   |                                    |

| Resource | BLM CO SRMS Goal - (Landscape or Resource Desired Outcome) | BLM SRMS Objective (Mitigation Hierarchy) TO BE PROVIDED | BLM Taos RMP (2012)   | BLM SLV RMP (1991)  | NM SWAP - Comprehensive Wildlife Conservation Strategy for New Mexico - New Mexico Department of Game & Fish (2006) | CO-SWAP - State Wildlife Action Plan - Colorado Parks & Wildlife (2010) | NPS Great Sand Dunes NP GMP (2007) |
|----------|--|--|---|---|---|---|------------------------------------|
| Minerals | No unavoidable impacts                                     |  | <p>2.2.5 Mineral Resources (Leasable, Locatable, and Saleable)<br/>The Taos Field Office is responsible for administering approximately 1.5 million acres of Federal mineral estate in the planning area. The leasable minerals are carbon dioxide, coal, geothermal, and oil and gas. Locatable minerals that occur or may occur on or adjacent to BLM land include mica, diatomite, perlite, gold, silver, copper, lead, zinc, molybdenum, turquoise, silica sand, and uranium. Salable minerals, or mineral materials, include common varieties of sand, gravel, stone, pumice, pumicite, clay, rock, and petrified wood.</p> <p><b>2.2.5.1 Leasable Minerals Goals</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Make mineral resources available in order to provide stable, abundant, and affordable sources of energy while maintaining, restoring, and promoting a healthy, sustainable ecosystem.</li> </ul> <p><b>Objectives</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Ensure that all energy exploration, operations, and reclamation are conducted in an environmentally responsible manner through the application of improved protection practices referred to as best management practices (BMPs).</li> <li>· Provide leasing opportunities for oil, natural gas, geothermal energy, and solid mineral resource development.</li> <li>· Mitigate resource impacts caused by the exploration and development of leasable minerals in a manner which provides for the rehabilitation of the affected lands. Provide guidance and standards for ensuring compliance with agency policies and operating requirements governing oil and gas in the Code of Federal Regulations, Onshore Oil and Gas Orders, and Notice to Lessees.</li> </ul> | <p><b>Page 4-7. Minerals Management</b><br/>In this plan, 617,180 acres (99.5 percent) of Federal fluid mineral estate will be open for leasing and 3,620 acres (0.5 percent) will be closed to leasing. Appendix C identifies proposed lease stipulations for resource-specific requirements for stipulation waivers, exemptions, and modifications. As a matter of policy, fluid mineral operations will not be allowed within the 3,285 acres of riparian resources unless such activity could be fully mitigated to the satisfaction of the authorized officer. The implementation of this policy should not result in a significant impact to fluid mineral resources as all such areas are 300 feet or less in width. Some inconvenience may occur as a result of this requirement; however, no fluid resources will be lost.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Managing 6,260 acres of bighorn sheep lambing range under a no surface occupancy requirement will result in substantially higher (30 to 100 percent) drilling and development costs because directional drilling, if feasible, will be required. If for technological and/or economical reasons directional drilling could not be conducted, the potential fluid resources within these areas will be foregone. The seasonal use restriction on 17,034 acres of crucial antelope winter and fawning range will place a severe restriction on these lands as occupancy will be restrained from December 15 to July 15 of each year. This combination of seasonal use restrictions will only provide for occupancy from July 16 to December 14. The management of approximately 342,000 acres of crucial big game winter range and crucial waterfowl areas under a seasonal use restriction could result in higher exploration, drilling, and development costs in addition to potential scheduling problems. The management of 2,640 acres of fluid mineral estate within the Rio Grande River Corridor ACEC including the wild and scenic segment, 2,000 acres within the Flat Top semiprimitive nonmotorized area, 760 acres of NRHP sites, 40 acres within the town of South Fork, 3,824 acres, in the Cumbres Toltec ACEC, and 1,200 acres within the Pike Stockade/Monte Vista park R&amp;PP sites will be under a no surface occupancy (NSO) stipulation. These management actions will result in substantial increases. (50 to 100 percent). Tables 4-4 and 4-5 list this acreage by leasing category for oil and gas and geothermal resources. 4-6 for exploration and development because of the requirement to use directional drilling, if possible, to access the fluid mineral potential of these areas. If directional drilling were not feasible, the potential fluid resource of these lands will be lost.</li> </ul> <p>All Federal fluid mineral estate will be available for leasing with the exception of the 320 acres within the incorporated town of Del Norte and the 3,300 acres of WSAs recommended for wilderness designation.</p> |   |   |                                    |

| Resource             | BLM CO SRMS Goal - (Landscape or Resource Desired Outcome) | BLM SRMS Objective (Mitigation Hierarchy) TO BE PROVIDED | BLM Taos RMP (2012)  | BLM SLV RMP (1991)  | NM SWAP - Comprehensive Wildlife Conservation Strategy for New Mexico - New Mexico Department of Game & Fish (2006) | CO-SWAP - State Wildlife Action Plan - Colorado Parks & Wildlife (2010) | NPS Great Sand Dunes NP GMP (2007) |
|----------------------|--|--|--|---|---|---|------------------------------------|
| Minerals (Continued) | No unavoidable impacts                                     |  | <p>· Manage mineral resources in the public interest by maximizing the recovery of those resources, wherever appropriate, while minimizing their waste and protecting correlative rights (rights of various mineral interest owners).</p> <p><b>2.2.5.2 Locatable Minerals Goals</b></p> <p>· Allow for exploration and production of locatable minerals to contribute to a stable local and domestic mineral supply while minimizing effects to other resources and resource uses.</p> <p>Objectives</p> <p>· Ensure that all locatable minerals exploration and development is conducted in an environmentally responsible manner through the application of BMPs</p> <p><b>2.2.5.3 Saleable Minerals Goals</b></p> <p>· Allow for exploration and production of saleable minerals to contribute to a stable local and domestic mineral supply while minimizing effects to other resources and resource uses.</p> <p>Objectives</p> <p>· Ensure that all saleable minerals exploration and development is conducted in an environmentally responsible manner through the application of BMPs</p> | <p>Management of 258,536 acres under standard lease terms will ensure the exploration for and potential development of fluid minerals from these lands. The management of about 342,000 acres under a seasonal use stipulation will result in higher exploration and development costs and scheduling problems for the operator/lessee. Any increase in exploration and/or Consequences of Proposed Plan development costs could result in a potential loss of fluid mineral production in the planning area.</p> <p>A no surface occupancy requirement on 16,844 acres for recreation and wildlife will result in substantially higher drilling and development costs or possible loss of fluid resource from these lands. The adverse impact of this leasing stipulation will be especially significant in this planning area because of the limited fluid resource information currently available and the inability to obtain such information because of the exclusion of surface operations from these lands.</p> <p>In this plan 601,443 acres (97 percent) of Federal minerals will be identified as open to entry and location and available for exploration and development under the general mining laws. The continuation of existing and new withdrawals of the Blanca Wildlife Habitat/Special Recreation Management Area (9,147 acres) and the Pike Stockade and Monte Vista R&amp;PP sites (1,200 acres), as well as the U.S. Forest Service administrative sites (200 acres), the Rio Grande Wild and Scenic River segment (2,640 acres), six eligible NRHP sites (760 acres), and WSAs recommended for wilderness designation (3,300 acres) should not result in a significant impact because of the low potential of the areas for locatable minerals. Total acres closed to mineral entry and location will be 17,247 (3 percent). The closure of 2,000 acres of OHV use and the designation of ACECs encompassing a total of 131,380 acres of Federal lands will result in increased cost and inconvenience for mining claimants/operators because of the requirement for filing and approving a plan of operations.</p> <p>In this plan 599,371 acres-(97 percent) of the planning area are open to the disposal of mineral materials with a minimum of timing restrictions. Mineral material resources from these lands will be available to private and governmental agencies through sale or free use.</p> |   |   |                                    |

| Resource                            | BLM CO SRMS Goal - (Landscape or Resource Desired Outcome) | BLM SRMS Objective (Mitigation Hierarchy) TO BE PROVIDED | BLM Taos RMP (2012)   | BLM SLV RMP (1991)  | NM SWAP - Comprehensive Wildlife Conservation Strategy for New Mexico - New Mexico Department of Game & Fish (2006) | CO-SWAP - State Wildlife Action Plan - Colorado Parks & Wildlife (2010) | NPS Great Sand Dunes NP GMP (2007) |
|-------------------------------------|--|--|-----------------------|---|---|---|------------------------------------|
| Minerals (cont.) - (Fluid Minerals) | No unavoidable impacts                                     |  | 2.2.5 and Appendix B. | <p>The management of about 342,000 acres (55 percent) of the planning area under a season of use limitation could result in scheduling inconvenience and loss of mineral material resources. The cost of capital improvements, which cannot be utilized throughout the year, could result in the cost of production becoming too high and resource use uneconomical. Impacts from seasonal use limitations could be significant in the Los Mogotes and San Luis Hills area because of the moderate to high potential of these areas for cinders and the limited resource of this type available in the planning area. The following areas, WSAs (3,300 acres), town of Del Norte (320 acres), Rio Grande River Corridor ACEC (2,640 acres), Cumbres Toltec Corridor ACEC (3,824 acres), Flat Top Mountain (2,000 acres), bighorn sheep lambing area (6,260 acres), and riparian areas (3,285 acres) are unavailable for mineral materials disposal. A total of 21,629 acres will be precluded from development.</p> <p><b>Page 4-2. Minerals Management</b> The reasonably foreseeable level of fluid mineral operations per year within the planning area will involve 3 to 10 applications for permit to drill (APDs) and 3 to 7 notices of intent (NOIs) to conduct geophysical operations. This level of fluid mineral activity represents an estimated maximum disturbance of about 40 acres per year. Geophysical exploration operations will be subject to relatively the same management decisions and subsequent effects as identified for fluid mineral leasing and development. Although existing fluid mineral leases will not be modified by the decisions of this plan during the term of each lease, lessees and operators will be encouraged to voluntarily comply with such requirements if and when operations are conducted. Retention or disposal of mineral rights on ELM-administered lands identified for land ownership adjustment will be determined on a case-by-case basis. Disposal of these lands with low-value minerals could potentially create a split-estate situation; i.e., surface estate separated from the subsurface minerals. Exploration and development in these areas could cause some additional operational requirements; however, because of the assumed low-mineral values. The effect will be insignificant.</p> |   |   |                                    |

| Resource                                       | BLM CO SRMS Goal - (Landscape or Resource Desired Outcome)  | BLM SRMS Objective (Mitigation Hierarchy) TO BE PROVIDED | BLM Taos RMP (2012)                                 | BLM SLV RMP (1991)  | NM SWAP - Comprehensive Wildlife Conservation Strategy for New Mexico - New Mexico Department of Game & Fish (2006) | CO-SWAP - State Wildlife Action Plan - Colorado Parks & Wildlife (2010) | NPS Great Sand Dunes NP GMP (2007) |
|--|---|--|---|---|---|---|------------------------------------|
| Native American Concerns (added from Dry Lake) | <p>Regular and meaningful consultation and collaboration with tribal officials to strengthen the United States government-to-government relationships with Indian tribes are established.</p> <p>See cultural, ecological, hydrology, specially designated areas, and visual goals to address resources of concern to Native Americans.</p> |  | Not directly address, see cultural section (2.2.2.) | Not addressed directly see historical and cultural resources section on page 4-3. |   |   |                                    |

DRAFT

| Resource     | BLM CO SRMS Goal - (Landscape or Resource Desired Outcome) | BLM SRMS Objective (Mitigation Hierarchy) TO BE PROVIDED | BLM Taos RMP (2012)   | BLM SLV RMP (1991)  | NM SWAP - Comprehensive Wildlife Conservation Strategy for New Mexico - New Mexico Department of Game & Fish (2006) | CO-SWAP - State Wildlife Action Plan - Colorado Parks & Wildlife (2010) | NPS Great Sand Dunes NP GMP (2007) |
|--------------|--|--|---|---|---|---|------------------------------------|
| Paleontology | No unavoidable impacts                                     |  | <p><b>2.1.4 Paleontology Goals</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Preserve and protect paleontological resources to ensure their availability for appropriate uses by present and future generations in accordance with existing laws, regulations, and Executive orders.</li> <li>· Manage paleontological resources for their scientific, education, and recreational values, and mitigate any potential adverse impacts to them.</li> </ul> <p><b>Objectives</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Evaluate and identify potential areas that contain vertebrate fossils or noteworthy occurrences of invertebrate and plant fossils.</li> <li>· Develop strategies to monitor public lands where important paleontological localities have been identified.</li> <li>· Develop volunteer or cooperative management agreements with associations, professional paleontologists, local organizations, universities, museums, and governmental entities to facilitate the management and protection of paleontological resources.</li> <li>· Promote awareness among users of the BLM public lands of the importance of paleontological resources.</li> </ul> | <p>4-8. Paleontological Resources:</p> <p>All the significant resources, vertebrate and invertebrate, will be protected and developed for public education opportunities and research. These significant locations will be retained in public ownership and closed to OHV, surface occupancy, and other physical disturbance. Offering a selected site (i.e., the Clayton Cone area) to the interested public as special educational and collecting areas will enhance the overall understanding and protection of these resources.</p> | N/A   | N/A   |                                    |

| Resource                 | BLM CO SRMS Goal - (Landscape or Resource Desired Outcome) | BLM SRMS Objective (Mitigation Hierarchy) TO BE PROVIDED | BLM Taos RMP (2012)   | BLM SLV RMP (1991) | NM SWAP - Comprehensive Wildlife Conservation Strategy for New Mexico - New Mexico Department of Game & Fish (2006) | CO-SWAP - State Wildlife Action Plan - Colorado Parks & Wildlife (2010) | NPS Great Sand Dunes NP GMP (2007) |
|--------------------------|--|--|---|--------------------|---|---|------------------------------------|
| Paleontology (Continued) |  |  | <p><b>General Management Guidance</b><br/>It is the policy of the BLM to manage and protect paleontological resources according to existing BLM handbook guidance (BLM Manual 8270, Paleontological Resource Management and H- 8270-1) and under the provisions of the Paleontological Resources Preservation Subtitle of the Omnibus Public Land Management Act of 2009 (16 USC 470aaa). BLM New Mexico has an assistance agreement with the New Mexico Museum of Natural History and Science and the New Mexico Museum of Natural History Foundation to ensure the care, protection, and storage of paleontological resources collected from public lands in New Mexico. The BLM will continue to use existing partnerships and information collected from paleontological collection permits to evaluate the importance of specific areas on public lands within the planning area. In the BLM's management of paleontological resources, it will continue to apply mitigation measures in specific locations where these resources could occur based on the potential fossil yield and paleo-sensitivity map developed for the Taos Field Office.</p> <p><b>Allocations and Management Actions</b><br/>The Sombrillo ACEC will be managed for the protection of relevant and important paleontological resources (see Appendix A).</p> <p>In addition, a qualified paleontologist will be required to conduct a survey for paleontological resources prior to any surface-disturbing activities within areas where significant resources are known to occur (e.g., the Sombrillo area) and may be required to monitor during such activities.</p> |                    |   |   |                                    |

| Resource   | BLM CO SRMS Goal - (Landscape or Resource Desired Outcome)  | BLM SRMS Objective (Mitigation Hierarchy) TO BE PROVIDED | BLM Taos RMP (2012)  | BLM SLV RMP (1991)  | NM SWAP - Comprehensive Wildlife Conservation Strategy for New Mexico - New Mexico Department of Game & Fish (2006) | CO-SWAP - State Wildlife Action Plan - Colorado Parks & Wildlife (2010) | NPS Great Sand Dunes NP GMP (2007) |
|------------|---|--|--|---|---|---|------------------------------------|
| Recreation | High quality recreation opportunities, experiences, and diverse settings are retained or improved across the landscape. |  | <p><b>2.2.6 Recreation Goals</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Provide a diversity of settings where visitors may have the opportunity to realize their personal expectations or goals while engaging in a variety of activities in the outdoors.</li> <li>· Provide high quality recreation opportunities and experiences.</li> <li>· Manage for appropriate levels of use, facilities, management and services, and administrative controls in each recreation area. Balance public demand, protection of resources, setting objectives, and fiscal responsibility.</li> <li>· Issue special recreation permits in an equitable manner for specific recreational uses of public lands and related waters as a means to minimize user conflicts, control visitor use, protect recreation resources, and provide for private and commercial recreation use according to the management objectives and implementing actions of each SRMA and ERMA.</li> <li>· Develop and maintain cooperative relationships with national, State, and local recreation providers, tourism entities, and local recreational groups.</li> <li>· Improve and expand collaboration with the State of New Mexico on boating safety.</li> </ul> <p><b>Objectives</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Strive to achieve the objectives of each Special Recreation Management Area (SRMA) or Extensive Recreation Management Area (ERMA).</li> <li>· Enhance recreation access, opportunities, and experiences by increasing the level of management presence through signs and basic onsite controls.</li> <li>· Increase the BLM's identity, enhance visitor services, and promote appropriate behavior by providing clear and consistent signing, information, maps, interpretation, and environmental education at recreation sites and facilities.</li> <li>· Collaborate with communities to provide trail links and access to public land.</li> <li>· Manage and maintain recreation sites and facilities for quality experiences and enjoyment. Design for function and aesthetics, with design standards that are appropriate for the setting and enjoyment by the public.</li> </ul> | <p>Page 4-12. Recreation Management: Recreation Management</p> <p>An NSO stipulation on the Rio Grande River Corridor ACEC and the SPNM portion of Flat Top in the San Luis Hills ACEC will protect 4,640 acres from surface-disturbing activities. Mineral withdrawals on the Blanca and Rio Grande River Corridor ACECs and the Pike Stockade/Monte Vista R&amp;PP sites will protect 12,987 acres from mineral entry. Mineral materials will be unavailable for disposal on the 2,640 acres in the Rio Grande River Corridor ACEC, the 3,824 acres in the Cumbres and Toltec Scenic Railroad Corridor ACEC, and a 2,000-acre portion of SPNM on Flat Top (8,464 acres total). A nondiscretionary closure on the WSAs recommended for wilderness designation will protect 3,300 acres of wilderness values from mineral leasing. These acres will also be closed to disposal of mineral materials. Intensive recreation management of Blanca, Penitente Canyon, Zapata Falls, and the Rio Grande River Corridor SRMAs will enhance recreation opportunities on 27,573 acres (5 percent). Extensive recreation management will maintain recreation opportunities on the remaining 493,104 acres (95 percent).</p> <p>Management of a portion of Segment A and all of Segments B and C of the Rio Grand River Corridor as an SRMA will enhance recreational opportunities on 2,760 acres. Table 4-6 shows OHV designations by acreage and percent of planning area. 22-mile segment of the Rio Grande River Corridor ACEC will reduce boating use, but will preserve the primitive setting.</p> <p>Additional public land gained through access acquisition and road development and improvement will increase camping, hunting, sightseeing, four-wheeling, snowmobiling, and cross-country skiing opportunities. Temporary disruption of dispersed types of recreation activities could occur on 150 acres annually.</p> <p>Management of the Sand Castle Area, San Luis Hills, Ra Jadero · Canyon, Los Mogotes, Elephant Rocks Area, Cumbres and Toltec Scenic Railroad Corridor, Blanca Area, Rio Grande River Corridor, and Trickle Mountain ACECs will enhance and improve recreation opportunities on 131,380 acres. A primitive and wilderness type experience will be potentially available on 2,640 acres of the Rio Grande River Corridor ACEC if designated as wild and scenic by Congress.</p> |   |   |                                    |

| Resource           | BLM CO SRMS Goal - (Landscape or Resource Desired Outcome) | BLM SRMS Objective (Mitigation Hierarchy) TO BE PROVIDED | BLM Taos RMP (2012) | BLM SLV RMP (1991)   | NM SWAP - Comprehensive Wildlife Conservation Strategy for New Mexico - New Mexico Department of Game & Fish (2006) | CO-SWAP - State Wildlife Action Plan - Colorado Parks & Wildlife (2010) | NPS Great Sand Dunes NP GMP (2007) |
|--------------------|--|--|---------------------|--|---|---|------------------------------------|
| Recreation (cont.) | See above  |  |                     | <p>Some minor effects on public land recreationists may occur from limiting OHV travel to designated roads and trails on BLM-administered lands within ACECs. Cultural and OHV conflicts will be addressed in detail in the site-specific CRMAP for Sand Castle With emphasis on protection of cultural and ecological values. Significant recreational opportunities will be enhanced on Blanca, Penitente Canyon, Zapata Falls, and the Rio Grande River Corridor SRMAs. Wildlife related recreation activities in these SRMAs will be maintained.</p> <p>River-based Enhancement and maintenance of vegetation condition within of 1,735 acres (54 percent) of riparian zones will benefit recreationists seeking scenic and educational opportunities. Management of the Blanca and Trickle Mountain ACECs, crucial winter ranges, birthing areas, and riparian habitat through seasonal OHV limitations will improve opportunities for hunting, fishing, and wildlife observation.</p> <p>Protection of nesting waterfowl and birds of prey in the recreation activities will be encouraged on 29 miles of the Rio Grande River Corridor SRMA. Protection of the semiprimitive character of Flat Top (2,000 acres) and the wilderness characteristics on 3,300 acres will occur. Dispersed recreational opportunities in the San Luis Extensive Recreation Area will be enhanced.</p> |   |   |                                    |

| Resource       | BLM CO SRMS Goal - (Landscape or Resource Desired Outcome) | BLM SRMS Objective (Mitigation Hierarchy) TO BE PROVIDED | BLM Taos RMP (2012)   | BLM SLV RMP (1991)   | NM SWAP - Comprehensive Wildlife Conservation Strategy for New Mexico - New Mexico Department of Game & Fish (2006) | CO-SWAP - State Wildlife Action Plan - Colorado Parks & Wildlife (2010) | NPS Great Sand Dunes NP GMP (2007) |
|----------------|--|--|---|--|---|---|------------------------------------|
| Socioeconomics | To be provided   |  | Not discussed as a separate topic but in various resource and resource use section. | <p><b>Page 4-14. Economic Conditions and Social Environment</b><br/> Local and regional social and economic impacts, national economic values analysis, and impacts on the BLM San Luis Resource' Area management costs are addressed in this analysis.</p> <p>Stipulations placed on fluid mineral leasing will not have measurable economic or social impacts. Any increased operating costs resulting from the stipulations will lower the potential for economic production. In addition, economic benefits associated with the unknown oil and gas potential will not be achieved.</p> <p>Closing 17,247 acres to mineral entry will not likely have an impact on the local economy since these withdrawn lands have a very low potential for locatable minerals. The unavailability of 21,629 acres for disposal of mineral materials will not have an economic or social impact because of low resource potential in the planning area. Current trend and condition associated with management of 32,400 AUMs will be maintained. No net increases nor decreases will occur.</p> <p>Increases in forage supply will result in increased game populations in crucial areas and associated recreational activities and could increase area income and employment.</p> <p>An increase of one job will be expected. Slight improvement of aquatic habitat and increase in angler days will. Be expected; however, the impact on economic and social conditions in the planning area will be less than 1 percent.</p> <p>Sale of 185 Mbf of raw timber represents no increase. The sale of 477 cords of fuelwood will help offset residential energy costs and produce about \$4,293 in Federal revenue. Local employment and income will benefit to the extent purchases will be made by commercial fuelwood cutters.</p> <p>.Land ownership adjustments will occur on a case-by-case basis; therefore, it is not possible to predict any impacts on economic or social conditions. Social and economic benefits for any given proposal will be addressed in appropriate NEPA documentation. Economic benefits from recreation will be less than 1 percent and will be concentrated on those businesses providing tourist and recreation sales and service. Available jobs will increase from 118 to 119. The cumulative impacts on the local economy will likely be beneficial, but not large.</p> |   |   |                                    |

| Resource               | BLM CO SRMS Goal - (Landscape or Resource Desired Outcome) | BLM SRMS Objective (Mitigation Hierarchy) TO BE PROVIDED | BLM Taos RMP (2012) | BLM SLV RMP (1991)  | NM SWAP - Comprehensive Wildlife Conservation Strategy for New Mexico - New Mexico Department of Game & Fish (2006) | CO-SWAP - State Wildlife Action Plan - Colorado Parks & Wildlife (2010) | NPS Great Sand Dunes NP GMP (2007) |
|------------------------|--|--|---------------------|---|---|---|------------------------------------|
| Socioeconomics (cont.) |  |  |                     | <p>The BLM SLRA costs can be compared to the benefits over time using 8-7/8 percent discount rate. The ratio of national value compared to the cost is 3.42. Benefits were only those measured in the national income tables.</p> <p>BLM SLRA management costs are \$650,000 per year compared to benefits of \$2,402,715.</p> <p>Table 4-3 (Assumptions for Analysis in this proposed RMP) shows impacts to national values from activities in the planning area. The national values for these activities will be expected to have a cumulative increase of about 14 percent over the base. The total impact to national values from recreation, range, and forestry will be about \$2.4 million.</p> |   |   |                                    |

DRAFT

| Resource | BLM CO SRMS Goal - (Landscape or Resource Desired Outcome)  | BLM SRMS Objective (Mitigation Hierarchy) TO BE PROVIDED | BLM Taos RMP (2012)  | BLM SLV RMP (1991)  | NM SWAP - Comprehensive Wildlife Conservation Strategy for New Mexico - New Mexico Department of Game & Fish (2006)  | CO-SWAP - State Wildlife Action Plan - Colorado Parks & Wildlife (2010) | NPS Great Sand Dunes NP GMP (2007) |
|----------|---|--|--|---|--|---|------------------------------------|
| Soils    | Soil health exhibits functional biological physical characteristics that are appropriate to soil type. climate, and landform and retain soil conditions including soil stability, land cover, and characteristics that meet BLM's lands health standards, contribute to public health and safety, avoid damages to natural site characteristics, and contribute to economic productivity and ecological sustainability. |  | <p><b>2.1.5 Soils Goals</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Maintain or improve soil health by preventing or minimizing soil erosion and compaction.</li> <li>· Prevent or minimize threats to public health and safety, damages to natural site characteristics, or economic losses due to accelerated runoff and erosion.</li> <li>· Prevent impairment of soil productivity due to accelerated loss or physical/chemical degradation.</li> </ul> <p><b>Objectives</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Over the life of the plan, begin restoration of all areas identified as having impaired soils within five years of assessment.</li> <li>· Over the life of the plan, prevent any increases in acreage of impaired soils due to management activities.</li> <li>· Manage all projects and authorized activities to maintain or improve soil condition.</li> </ul> <p><b>Management Guidance</b></p> <p>Many Federal laws and Executive Orders impact soil management because soil resources are fundamental to all other resources and resource uses. Guidance for management of soil resources is published in BLM Manuals 7000-7100. Primary authority for management includes the Taylor Grazing Act and the Public Rangelands Improvement Act, both of which address use of Federal rangelands including assessment, conservation, and improvement of soil resources.</p> <p>The Clean Water Act indirectly affects soil management by controlling the release of nonpoint sources of pollution such as sedimentation caused by erosion. The U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) is responsible for development of soil surveys, which are used by the BLM to determine soil types and characteristics when assessing management actions.</p> <p>The Taos Field Office monitors and assesses soil resource condition primarily through the range program during reauthorization of livestock grazing permits. Project-level impacts to soils are assessed during the development of EISs or EAs for proposed projects and use authorizations.</p> <p>The soils program works to reduce impacts to soil and associated vegetation resources through allocation of uses such as transportation and grazing and mitigation of project impacts. The soils program also works with other programs to implement restoration projects.</p> <p>In addition, under the existing Riparian and Aquatic HMP and standards and guidelines for grazing, soils will be provided protection through vegetation management.</p> | <p><b>Page 3-2. Soils:</b></p> <p>Surface-disturbing activities, including grazing, mineral development, forest and woodland harvest, and OHV use, might cause a very slight loss of watershed values throughout the planning area during the life of the plan. Allotment grazing adjustments and standards with stipulations for other resource actions will decrease erosion and potentially enhance watershed characteristics for a net watershed value increase construction of transmission and communication facilities in designated utility corridors and communication sites might adversely affect soil on a shortterm basis with very insignificant effects overall.</p> | Soil characterization and conditions in relation to habitat characterized, land use impacts to soils (ie off-road), bioaccumulation of heavy metals in soils referenced and desired future conditions implied. |   |                                    |

| Resource                   | BLM CO SRMS Goal - (Landscape or Resource Desired Outcome)   | BLM SRMS Objective (Mitigation Hierarchy) TO BE PROVIDED | BLM Taos RMP (2012)  | BLM SLV RMP (1991)  | NM SWAP - Comprehensive Wildlife Conservation Strategy for New Mexico - New Mexico Department of Game & Fish (2006) | CO-SWAP - State Wildlife Action Plan - Colorado Parks & Wildlife (2010) | NPS Great Sand Dunes NP GMP (2007) |
|----------------------------|--|--|--|---|---|---|------------------------------------|
| Specially Designated Areas | Values for which specially designated areas were designated are preserved, protected, and/or enhanced. |  | <p><b>2.2.10 Special Designations.</b></p> <p><b>2.2.10.1 Areas of Critical Environmental Concern</b></p> <p>Goals</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Provide special management attention to areas with relevant and important values to ensure such values are protected and preserved from irreparable harm.</li> </ul> <p><b>Objectives</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Inventory, protect, and monitor ACECs consistent with special management prescriptions to ensure their relevant and important values may be preserved.</li> </ul> <p><b>2.2.10.2 Byways Goals</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Provide for the promotion and enhancement of designated scenic and backcountry byways.</li> </ul> <p><b>Objectives</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Partner with interested governments and special interest groups to provide for interpretation and marketing of the byways.</li> <li>· Expose visitors to the byway's recreational resources, and interpret natural, cultural, geological, and scenic features.</li> <li>· Provide interconnectivity between local communities and a working partnership for regional development of eco- and recreational tourism.</li> </ul> <p><b>2.2.10.3 National Historic or Scenic Trails Goals</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Provide for effective and accessible orientation, interpretation, and education programs and activities on the trails, enabling visitors of all abilities to understand and appreciate their history, significance, and enduring legacy.</li> </ul> | <p><b>ACEC Page 4-11. Areas of Critical Environmental Concern</b></p> <p>Wildlife, recreation, scenic, cultural, wild and scenic river, and other unique values will be given special attention on 131,380 acres (93 percent) of the total 141,681 acres identified for special management. These areas are Sand Castle, San Luis Hills, Blanca, Trickle Mountain, Cumbres and Toltec Scenic Railroad Corridor, Elephant Rocks, Ra Jadero Canyon, Los Mogotes, and the Rio Grande River Corridor ACECs. Special management to protect wildlife; recreation/scenic, cultural, and other unique values on the remaining 10,301 acres (7 percent) will not occur. The proposed ACECs that currently have other designations, such as the Cumbres and Toltec Scenic Railroad (a National Register property), will be designated ACECs in addition to their present designations. Slightly increased costs. Impacts from land disposal will addition to their present designations. The use of the ACEC designation, however, will not affect prior status.</p> <p><b>SRMA, see Recreation Management; WSA, Wilderness Management</b></p> <p>The WSAs will be managed under BLM Interim Management Policy and Guidelines for Lands Under Wilderness Review (IMP) until Congress makes a decision on wilderness recommendations in the Canon City District. In accordance with Section 603 of FLPMA, BLM is required to manage all identified wilderness study areas under the nonimpairment mandate. This mandate restricts any uses/development of the WSAs, which would make them unsuitable for wilderness designation. Valid existing rights must be recognized and are an exception to the nonimpairment mandate. Those grazing, mining, and mineral leasing uses existing when FLPMA was approved on October 21, 1976, may continue in the same manner and degree as on that date, even if the use will impair wilderness suitability.</p> <p>Mining operations occurring as of October 21, 1976, may continue in the same manner and degree as long as they do not cause unnecessary or undue degradation. Mining operations proposed after this date, however, are subject to the nonimpairment requirements for all operations proposed. An interagency agreement between the U.S. Forest Service (USFS) and BLM dated February 20, 1981, provided for the joint study of adjoining areas and designated the USFS as the lead agency in the study. A proposal has been made to Congress recommending 3,300 acres of contiguous BLM wilderness study areas (Black Canyon, South Piney Creek, Pap~, Ke.al, and Zapata Creek WSAs) suitable for wilderness designation. In the event that Congress releases any of these areas from further wilderness consideration, management prescriptions identified in this plan Will be followed.</p> |   |   |                                    |

| Resource                           | BLM CO SRMS Goal - (Landscape or Resource Desired Outcome) | BLM SRMS Objective (Mitigation Hierarchy) TO BE PROVIDED | BLM Taos RMP (2012)  | BLM SLV RMP (1991)  | NM SWAP - Comprehensive Wildlife Conservation Strategy for New Mexico - New Mexico Department of Game & Fish (2006) | CO-SWAP - State Wildlife Action Plan - Colorado Parks & Wildlife (2010) | NPS Great Sand Dunes NP GMP (2007) |
|------------------------------------|--|--|--|---|---|---|------------------------------------|
| Specially Designated Areas (cont.) | See above  |  | <p><b>Objectives</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Provide for the safe enjoyment of cultural resource and recreational opportunities related to the trails' history and resources.</li> <li>· Establish and support partnerships to provide visitor experiences and to conserve and preserve resources related to the historic trails' period of use.</li> <li>· Use current management practices and technologies to implement the National Trails System Act, and administer the national historic trails to protect their setting, visual integrity, archaeological resources, and physical traces.</li> </ul> <p><b>2.2.10.4 Watchable Wildlife Areas Objectives</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Provide wildlife viewing opportunities at sites which are accessible by vehicle and have a high likelihood that species of interest can be seen.</li> </ul> <p><b>2.2.10.5 Wild and Scenic Rivers Goals</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Continue to manage designated wild and scenic river segments consistent with the intent of their designations.</li> <li>· To the extent of the BLM's authority, maintain the free-flowing character, preserve or enhance the outstandingly remarkable values, and allow no activities within the river corridor that will alter the tentative classification of those segments determined suitable for congressional designation in the National Wild and Scenic River System.</li> </ul> | <p><b>3-5 Proposed Resource Management Plan</b></p> <p>Other designated BLM WSAs (Sand Castle and San Luis Hills) will be managed in accordance with BLM and congressional directives. These WSAs, which are not recommended by BLM for wilderness designation in the Final Canon City District Wilderness Environmental Impact Statement dated December 1987, would be returned to other multiple use management, as ACECs, if released by Congress from further wilderness consideration.</p> <p><b>Page 4-13. Wild and Scenic River.</b> Wild and Scenic River Designation of Segments B and C of the river (2,640 acres/22 miles), by Congress as an element of the National Wild and Scenic River System, could have an overall positive effect on the San Luis Valley. If this designation were to take place, the corridor, with its significant outstandingly remarkable wildlife and other related values, would be maintained, and potentially enhanced, in perpetuity for the use and enjoyment of future generations.</p> <p>Designation of Segment B (scenic) and C (wild) would close 2,640 acres to surface mineral development. Since the area is low in mineral potential and the physical configuration of the unit is narrow, adverse impacts of designation on mineral development will be minimal. The Rio Grande River Study Report, Appendix A, page 7 has additional analysis on mineral resources. Funding for management of the corridor will potentially increase through designation. Additional funds will allow enhancement of riparian resource through protection and improvement of the riverine environment (especially in Segment B). Wild and scenic designation will require increased livestock management attention to the corridor. Control of unauthorized livestock use in the corridor will be needed to protect and enhance the riverine environment.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Opportunities for additional protection and enhancement of the outstandingly remarkable wildlife values will occur as a result of wild and scenic designation and anticipated funding increases. Designation may also increase funding for some fishery improvement work, which may minimally enhance sport fishery habitat.</li> </ul> <p>Acquisition of land through exchanges or through the Land and Water Conservation Fund will receive increased attention if the area is designated as wild and scenic. Administrative designations of the corridor as an area of critical environmental concern (ACEC) and special recreation management area (SRMA) will provide special management emphasis. These designations, however, will not protect and maintain the free-flowing conditions nor preserve the outstandingly remarkable qualities to the degree of a wild and scenic river designation.</p> |   |   |                                    |

| Resource                           | BLM CO SRMS Goal - (Landscape or Resource Desired Outcome) | BLM SRMS Objective (Mitigation Hierarchy) TO BE PROVIDED | BLM Taos RMP (2012) | BLM SLV RMP (1991)  | NM SWAP - Comprehensive Wildlife Conservation Strategy for New Mexico - New Mexico Department of Game & Fish (2006) | CO-SWAP - State Wildlife Action Plan - Colorado Parks & Wildlife (2010) | NPS Great Sand Dunes NP GMP (2007) |
|------------------------------------|--|--|---------------------|---|---|---|------------------------------------|
| Specially Designated Areas (cont.) | See above  |  |                     | <p>Designation will preserve and enhance primitive recreation values by directing management emphasis and funding to the area and by ensuring long-term protection to the river environment. Designation, however, will also slightly increase recreation visitation to the area, creating addition visitor management problems. Some insignificant adverse impacts to the physical environment will occur. From increased recreational use. Because Segment C is so critical for wildlife, even minor increases in recreational use, if not properly regulated, could result in moderate impacts to wildlife.</p> <p><b>Consequences of Proposed Plan</b><br/> A detailed analysis of the effects of wild and scenic designation will have on water rights is contained in Appendix A.<br/> The following effects will occur: 1) The Rio Grande River Compact will not be affected. 2) The Federal government will acquire a Water right junior to approximately 16,000 other senior adjudicated water rights in an extremely over-appropriated drainage. 3) Water users/developers will continue to be uneasy because the Federal government will have a right to expect conditions to remain the same as at the time of wild and scenic designation by Congress. Because the Federal government right will be very junior, any proposed change of existing use that would affect existing flows would also receive objections from many of the 16,000 senior water right holders. At most, therefore, the Federal reserved right will: be a nuisance transactional factor for water users. 4) BLM states that "existing conditions" are sufficient for the perpetuation of significant river values. BLM also states that any additional water needs will be adjudicated according to Colorado State Water Law. Valid existing rights, therefore, will not be affected by designation. 5) Wild and scenic designation may serve to help perpetuate an agrarian lifestyle in the San Luis Valley by helping to prevent diversion of water from the valley to mit -of-basin users. Appendix A, pages 9. and 18; have more detailed analysis on effects to water rights by wild and scenic designation. Wild and scenic designation of the Rio Grande River will have a positive effect on the economy of the San Luis Valley. Designation could also slightly increase recreation visitation to the area, creating additional visitor management problems and minor adverse impacts to the physical environment. Tourism boards, towns, and counties could market the congressionally designated area along with the other natural attractions in the San Luis Valley. Land values for properties adjacent to the corridor will likely rise slightly. An unquantifiable economic gain could occur as a result of potential positive effects from residual tourism.</p> |   |   |                                    |

| Resource  | BLM CO SRMS Goal - (Landscape or Resource Desired Outcome) | BLM SRMS Objective (Mitigation Hierarchy) TO BE PROVIDED | BLM Taos RMP (2012)   | BLM SLV RMP (1991)   | NM SWAP - Comprehensive Wildlife Conservation Strategy for New Mexico - New Mexico Department of Game & Fish (2006)          | CO-SWAP - State Wildlife Action Plan - Colorado Parks & Wildlife (2010) | NPS Great Sand Dunes NP GMP (2007) |
|---|--|--|---|--|--|---|------------------------------------|
| Specially Designated Areas (cont.): Lands With Wilderness Characteristics | See above  |  | <p><b>2.1.10 Lands with Wilderness Characteristics</b></p> <p><b>Goals</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Manage lands with wilderness characteristics identified for protection to maintain those characteristics.</li> </ul> <p><b>Objectives</b></p> <p>Where wilderness characteristics are managed for protection:</p> <p>28 Chapter 2 Plan Decisions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Minimize surface disturbing activities such that the natural quality of the area is maintained.</li> <li>· Maintain opportunities for solitude and primitive recreation where they occur in these areas.</li> </ul> | <p><b>Page 3-5. Wilderness Management</b></p> <p>The WSAs will be managed under BLM Interim Management Policy and Guidelines for Lands Under Wilderness Review (IMP) until Congress makes a decision on wilderness recommendations in the Canon City District. In accordance with Section 603 of FLPMA, BLM is required to manage all identified wilderness study areas under the nonimpairment mandate. This mandate restricts any uses/ development of the WSAs, which would make them unsuitable for wilderness designation. Valid existing rights must be recognized and are an exception to the nonimpairment mandate. Those grazing, mining, and mineral leasing uses existing when FLPMA was approved on October 21, 1976, may continue in the same manner and degree as on that date, even if the use will impair wilderness suitability. Mining operations occurring as of October 21, 1976, may continue in the same manner and degree as long as they do not cause unnecessary or undue degradation. Mining operations proposed after this date, however, are subject to the nonimpairment requirements for all operations proposed.</p> <p>An interagency agreement between the U.S. Forest Service (USFS) and BLM dated February 20, 1981, provided for the joint study of adjoining areas and designated the USFS as the lead agency in the study. A proposal has been made to Congress recommending 3,300 acres of contiguous BLM wilderness study areas (Black Canyon, South Piney Creek, Papa Keal, and Zapata Creek WSAs) suitable for wilderness designation. In the event that Congress releases any of these areas from further wilderness consideration, management prescriptions identified in this plan will be followed.</p> <p>Proposed Resource Management Plan</p> <p>Two other designated BLM WSAs (Sand Castle and San Luis Hills) will be managed in accordance with BLM and congressional directives. These WSAs, which are not recommended by BLM for wilderness designation in the Final Canon City District Wilderness Environmental Impact Statement dated December 1987, would be returned to other multiple use management, as ACECs, if released by Congress from further wilderness consideration.</p> | Wilderness referenced and implied desired future conditions for habitat protections or impacts to forest management included |   |                                    |

| Resource                                       | BLM CO SRMS Goal - (Landscape or Resource Desired Outcome) | BLM SRMS Objective (Mitigation Hierarchy) TO BE PROVIDED | BLM Taos RMP (2012)  | BLM SLV RMP (1991)   | NM SWAP - Comprehensive Wildlife Conservation Strategy for New Mexico - New Mexico Department of Game & Fish (2006) | CO-SWAP - State Wildlife Action Plan - Colorado Parks & Wildlife (2010) | NPS Great Sand Dunes NP GMP (2007) |
|--|--|--|--|--|---|---|------------------------------------|
| Specially Designated Areas (cont.): Wilderness | See above  |  | <p><b>2.1.10 Lands with Wilderness Characteristics</b></p> <p><b>Goals</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Manage lands with wilderness characteristics identified for protection to maintain those characteristics.</li> </ul> <p><b>Objectives</b></p> <p>Where wilderness characteristics are managed for protection:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Minimize surface disturbing activities such that the natural quality of the area is maintained.</li> <li>· Maintain opportunities for solitude and primitive recreation where they occur in these areas.</li> </ul> | <p>Wilderness Management</p> <p>The WSAs will be managed under BLM Interim Management Policy and Guidelines for Lands Under Wilderness Review (IMP) until Congress makes a decision on wilderness recommendations in the Canon City District. In accordance with Section 603 of FLPMA, BLM is required to manage all identified wilderness study areas under the nonimpairment mandate. This mandate restricts any uses/development of the WSAs, which would make them unsuitable for wilderness designation. Valid existing rights must be recognized and are an exception to the nonimpairment mandate.</p> <p>Those grazing, mining, and mineral leasing uses existing when FLPMA was approved on October 21, 1976, may continue in the same manner and degree as on that date, even if the use will impair wilderness suitability. Mining operations occurring as of October 21, 1976, may continue in the same manner and degree as long as they do not cause unnecessary or undue degradation. Mining operations proposed after this date, however, are subject to the nonimpairment requirements for all operations proposed. An interagency agreement between the U.S. Forest Service (USFS) and BLM dated February 20, 1981, provided for the joint study of adjoining areas and designated the USFS as the lead agency in the study. A proposal has been made to Congress recommending 3,300 acres of contiguous BLM wilderness study areas (Black Canyon, South Piney Creek, Papa Keal, and Zapata Creek WSAs) suitable for wilderness designation. In the event that Congress releases any of these areas from further wilderness consideration, management prescriptions identified in this plan Will be followed for other designated BLM WSAs. (Sand Castle and San Luis Hills) will be managed in accordance with BLM and congressional directives. These WSAs, which are not recommended by BLM for wilderness designation in the Final Canon City District Wilderness Environmental Impact Statement dated December 1987, would be returned to other multiple use management, as ACECs, if released by Congress from further wilderness consideration.</p> |   |   |                                    |

| Resource | BLM CO SRMS Goal - (Landscape or Resource Desired Outcome) | BLM SRMS Objective (Mitigation Hierarchy) TO BE PROVIDED | BLM Taos RMP (2012)  | BLM SLV RMP (1991)   | NM SWAP - Comprehensive Wildlife Conservation Strategy for New Mexico - New Mexico Department of Game & Fish (2006) | CO-SWAP - State Wildlife Action Plan - Colorado Parks & Wildlife (2010) | NPS Great Sand Dunes NP GMP (2007) |
|----------|--|--|--|--|---|---|------------------------------------|
|          | No unavoidable impacts                                     |  | <p><b>2.2.8 Transportation and Access Goals</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Provide reasonable access to public lands for multiple uses in a manner consistent with the goals and objectives of all resources, uses, and other opportunities.</li> <li>· Work collaboratively with the public, including tribal, State and local governments, special interest groups, and individuals to develop an appropriate transportation system on public lands, including motorized and non-motorized recreational trails.</li> </ul> <p><b>Objectives</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Establish nine transportation areas to facilitate travel management.</li> <li>· Inventory all transportation areas within three years following completion of the RMP in preparation for area-specific travel management plans, to be finalized within five years of the RMP's completion.</li> <li>· Use criteria to guide the designation of routes in areas limited to designated roads, or use of roads in areas limited to existing roads, which will consider:               <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The desired future condition for access (if different from the planning unit as a whole).</li> <li>2. Whether or not the road provides access to an important destination, to private, State or other Federal lands, or is critical for particular activities.</li> <li>3. Road and trail density to support goals related to conservation of scenic quality or sensitive habitat management; or to accommodate certain uses. For sensitive habitat, limit roads and trails to an average of 0.5 mile of road per square mile. In areas identified for motorized recreation use, a high density might exceed 2 miles of road per square mile.</li> </ol> </li> </ul> | <p><b>Page 4-3. Access and Transportation Management</b></p> <p>Access and Transportation Management Assumptions</p> <p>Acquisition of all identified access proposals will improve administration of resource programs. Also BLM collector and local roads will continue to be maintained, and BLM: resource roads will not be routinely maintained. An active signing/barricading program will also be implemented on road closures and problem areas.</p> |   |   |                                    |

| Resource                              | BLM CO SRMS Goal - (Landscape or Resource Desired Outcome) | BLM SRMS Objective (Mitigation Hierarchy) TO BE PROVIDED | BLM Taos RMP (2012)   | BLM SLV RMP (1991) | NM SWAP - Comprehensive Wildlife Conservation Strategy for New Mexico - New Mexico Department of Game & Fish (2006) | CO-SWAP - State Wildlife Action Plan - Colorado Parks & Wildlife (2010) | NPS Great Sand Dunes NP GMP (2007) |
|---------------------------------------|--|--|---|--------------------|---|---|------------------------------------|
| Transportation and Access (Continued) |  |  | <p>4. Reclamation of redundant roads or roads that no longer serve their intended purpose to achieve road density objectives and reduce habitat fragmentation, while maintaining road network connectivity.</p> <p>5. Conditions to be identified in the road inventory process that will require mitigation such as routes that are alongside or within riparian areas or routes in areas with cultural or paleontological resources. Mitigation might include rerouting, redesign of routes (e.g., riparian area crossings to minimize downstream sedimentation), or fencing of resources</p> <p>6. Maintenance standards to determine where work is needed to reduce damage to the land, such as installing culverts where flood damage recurs or filling in low lying areas to eliminate the need for users to create new routes to avoid the area.</p> <p>· Monitor use to determine if the road network requires modification to improve access or protect resources.</p> |                    |   |   |                                    |

DRAFT

| Resource         | BLM CO SRMS Goal - (Landscape or Resource Desired Outcome)  | BLM SRMS Objective (Mitigation Hierarchy) TO BE PROVIDED | BLM Taos RMP (2012)   | BLM SLV RMP (1991)   | NM SWAP - Comprehensive Wildlife Conservation Strategy for New Mexico - New Mexico Department of Game & Fish (2006) | CO-SWAP - State Wildlife Action Plan - Colorado Parks & Wildlife (2010) | NPS Great Sand Dunes NP GMP (2007) |
|------------------|---|--|---|--|---|---|------------------------------------|
| Visual Resources | Visual quality in the region is maintained through preservation of open-space landscapes and undisturbed views, or through compensation for visual resources impaired by development. |  | <p><b>2.1.8 Visual Resources Goals</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Manage public lands in a manner that will maintain the overall visual quality of the region, certain open-space landscapes, undisturbed views, and other high-quality visual resources.</li> </ul> <p>Objectives</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Visual resources will be managed according to the following objectives per visual resource management (VRM) class (Visual Resource Inventory Handbook H-8410-1):</li> </ul> <p>Class I: Preserve the existing character of the landscape. The level of change should be very low and must not attract attention.</p> <p>Class II: Retain the existing character of the landscape. The level of change should be low. Management activities may be seen, but should not attract the attention of the casual observer.</p> <p>Class III: Partially retain the existing character of the landscape. The level of change should be moderate. Management activities may attract attention, but should not dominate the view of the casual observer.</p> <p>Class IV: Allow management activities requiring major modifications to the existing character of the landscape. The level of change may be high. Management activities may dominate the view. However, every attempt will be made to minimize the impact and aim to repeat the basic elements in the landscape.</p> | <p><b>Page 4-14. Visual Resource Management</b></p> <p>Proposed surface-disturbing activities will meet the allowable class objectives in existing class II, III, and IV areas.</p> <p>Existing objectives will be changed as follows: (1) The foreground area of that portion of the Rio Grande River corridor designated as an ACEC (22 miles) will be changed from VRM Class III to II, which will result in improvement of VRM resources in class III areas; (2) all public land west of U.S. Highway 285 will be changed from VRM Class II to III, which will result in degradation of visual resources in class II areas.</p> <p>Strict application of VRM Class II objectives will protect and enhance visual resources in the Cumbres and Toltec Scenic Railroad ACEC (3,824 acres) and the Rio Grande River Corridor ACEC (22 miles/2,640 acres). Chapter 4: A restoration project, designed to correct and improve the visually contrasting class IV Blanca Chaining area to VRM Class III objectives, will be implemented on 2,375 acres during the life of the plan. Over the long term, the chaining area will be improved to class II. For more detail refer to Appendix F of the draft RMP EIS.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Conformance to VRM class objectives will protect visual resources. Mineral development could be expected to alter landscapes in a few localized viewsheds.</li> <li>Forest harvest on 1,660 acres of VRM Class II land in scattered localized viewsheds would result in minimal impact over a period of 120 years. Woodland harvest in a dispersed pattern on 7,685 acres of VRM Class II land will result in minimal impact over a period of 175 years. The effect from this harvest will be much less during the 15- to 20-year life of the plan. Annual harvests of approximately 477 cords of fuelwood from 53 acres of productive, operational woodland will be concentrated in the Blanca. Chaining area. This proposed project will reduce the contrast of the chaining in the short term to class III and in the long term to class II.</li> </ul> |   | N/A   |                                    |

| Resource                     | BLM CO SRMS Goal - (Landscape or Resource Desired Outcome) | BLM SRMS Objective (Mitigation Hierarchy) TO BE PROVIDED | BLM Taos RMP (2012) | BLM SLV RMP (1991)   | NM SWAP - Comprehensive Wildlife Conservation Strategy for New Mexico - New Mexico Department of Game & Fish (2006) | CO-SWAP - State Wildlife Action Plan - Colorado Parks & Wildlife (2010) | NPS Great Sand Dunes NP GMP (2007) |
|------------------------------|--|--|---------------------|--|---|---|------------------------------------|
| Visual Resources (Continued) | See above  |  |                     | <p>Development of a major utility corridor west of U.S. Highway 285 will result in managing some VRM Class II land as VRM Class III, and degradation of visual resources will occur. ACEC designation will protect the scenic values on 18,410 acres of VRM Class II land and 77,255 acres of VRM Class III land.</p> <p>Visual resources on 95,000 acres ( 65 percent) of VRM Class II land and 5,300 acres (23 percent) of SPNM will be protected by OHV closures and limitations. Scenic quality will be altered on approximately 173,000 acres (34 percent) that is open to OHV use, and the potential for irreversible adverse impacts will increase. Managing 24 percent of the planning area (125,948 acres) as VRM Class II will protect outstanding visual resources. These lands include the areas of scenery that provide significant recreational opportunities. Managing the remainder of the area as VRM Class III or VRM Class IV will maintain the overall visual character of the planning area, but will allow for visually contrasting projects or disturbances within scattered localized viewsheds. The Blanca Chaining project could restore 2,375 acres of class IV to VRM Class III. Wilderness designation will protect the scenic values on 3,300 acres.</p> <p>Scenic values will be protected on 2,640 acres in the 22-mile portion of the Rio Grande River Corridor designated as an ACEC. More intense recreational use will be encouraged on Segment B (14 miles) of the river corridor. The semiprimitive nonmotorized setting will be protected on approximately 2,000 acres of Flat Top.</p> |   |   |                                    |
| Wild horse and burro         | No unavoidable impacts                                     |  | NA                  | NA   |   |   |                                    |

| Resource | BLM CO SRMS Goal - (Landscape or Resource Desired Outcome)                     | BLM SRMS Objective (Mitigation Hierarchy) TO BE PROVIDED | BLM Taos RMP (2012)  | BLM SLV RMP (1991)  | NM SWAP - Comprehensive Wildlife Conservation Strategy for New Mexico - New Mexico Department of Game & Fish (2006) | CO-SWAP - State Wildlife Action Plan - Colorado Parks & Wildlife (2010) | NPS Great Sand Dunes NP GMP (2007) |
|----------|--|--|--|---|---|---|------------------------------------|
| Fire     | Design features included in Solar PEIS – not evaluated as a separate resource. |  | <p><b>2.1.11 Wildland Fire Goals</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Suppress wildland fires where they threaten human health and safety, natural resource values, and private property.</li> <li>· Restore fire frequency and intensity regimes to pre-European settlement levels by reducing fuel loads.</li> <li>· Reestablish appropriate vegetation communities to maintain natural fire regimes.</li> <li>· Reduce the need for wildfire suppression through restoration activities.</li> </ul> <p><b>Objectives</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Prevent the loss of life or property from wildland fire.</li> <li>· Manage wildfire with minimal damage to other resources.</li> <li>· Use prescribed fire and mechanical fuels treatments to reduce hazardous fuels while achieving the objectives of the wildlife habitat, livestock grazing, visual quality, vegetation, watershed quality, and weed control programs.</li> <li>· Follow fire management actions delineated for each fire management unit throughout the planning area while employing multiple strategies to meet resource objectives.</li> <li>· When possible, allow for wildland fire to be managed for resource objectives or limited suppression tactics, enabling fire to act in its natural role as a disturbance.</li> <li>· Maintain a landscape of diverse plant communities and successional stages similar to those created by historic fire regimes.</li> <li>· Implement wildfire rehabilitation efforts to protect and sustain ecosystems, protect public health and safety, and help communities protect infrastructure.</li> <li>· Cooperate with adjacent landowners (Federal, State, tribal, and private) in fire management activities across jurisdictional boundaries.</li> </ul> | <p><b>Amended by the 2004 San Luis Valley Fire Management Plan</b><br/>Page 13 III Wildland Fire Management Strategies</p> <p><b>A. General Management Considerations</b><br/>In order to comply with direction provided in current National Fire Plan guidance, the LUPs, the Watershed Plan, the ACEC Plan, and the Wilderness Plan, all agency (ies) will implement the following fire management guidance across the FPU.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Use fire to restore and/or sustain ecosystem health.</li> <li>• Identify appropriate management response (AMR) goals, objectives, and constraints by specific Fire Management Units (FMU) within the FPU. All wildland fire management activities will be managed as described in the FMU guidance outlined in Chapter III, section D.</li> <li>• Work collaboratively with communities at risk within the (Wildland Urban Interface) WUI to develop plans for risk reduction.</li> <li>• Work collaboratively with regional partners in fire and resource management across agency(ies) boundaries.</li> <li>• Allow wildland fire to protect, maintain, and enhance resources. Allow fire to function in its ecological role when appropriate for the site and situation.</li> <li>• Employ fire prevention strategies that reduce human ignition with special emphasis in campgrounds and transportation corridors.</li> <li>• Use fire as a management tool to improve the ecological condition of range ecosystems and maintain natural plant community diversity.</li> </ul> <p><b>B. Wildland Fire Management Goals</b><br/>Fire Management Goals</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Achieve a program where firefighter and public safety are the highest priority in every fire management activity.</li> <li>• Be consistent with land uses and estimates of historic fire regimes,</li> <li>• Utilize wildland and prescribed fire as tools to meet land management objectives.</li> <li>• Maintain a safe, efficient, and effective organization for the suppression of wildfires at a minimum cost consistent with the values at risk.</li> </ul> <p>These goals contribute to the accomplishment of regional and national strategic plans including the 10-year Comprehensive Strategy, National Fire Plan, the cohesive strategies, as well as wildland fire policy. These Fire program goals reflect the core principles and goals of the Comprehensive Strategy that is supported by the San Luis Resource Area Resource Management Plan. The actions associated with each goal are derived from the Rocky Mountain Region National Fire Plan Business Plan (2003). We consider this strategy to be dynamic and subject to annual review as national and regional direction evolve. Also, as we gain more experience with fire and fuels management, there may be a need for additional or revised actions.</p> |   |   |                                    |

| Resource         | BLM CO SRMS Goal - (Landscape or Resource Desired Outcome)                     | BLM SRMS Objective (Mitigation Hierarchy) TO BE PROVIDED | BLM Taos RMP (2012)  | BLM SLV RMP (1991)                                | NM SWAP - Comprehensive Wildlife Conservation Strategy for New Mexico - New Mexico Department of Game & Fish (2006) | CO-SWAP - State Wildlife Action Plan - Colorado Parks & Wildlife (2010) | NPS Great Sand Dunes NP GMP (2007) |
|------------------|--|--|--|---|---|---|------------------------------------|
| Renewable Energy |  |  | <p><b>2.2.7 Renewable Energy Goals</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Facilitate environmentally responsible commercial development of renewable energy projects on public lands.</li> <li>· Use renewable energy systems on BLM facilities where feasible.</li> <li>· Issue rights-of-way for development of solar and wind energy facilities where consistent with resource management objectives.</li> </ul> <p>Objectives</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Reduce the analysis time for solar and wind project authorizations by identifying appropriate use areas.</li> <li>· Promote the development of small, local solar and wind projects that benefit adjacent communities.</li> </ul> | See Minerals Management for Geothermal Discussion |   |   |                                    |
| Hazardous Waste  | Design features included in Solar PEIS – not evaluated as a separate resource. |  | See section 2.2.3  | Not included                                      |   |   |                                    |

Colorado's State Wildlife Action Plan (SWAP) is available here: <http://cpw.state.co.us/aboutus/Pages/StateWildlifeActionPlan.aspx>. CPW is in the process of updating the Colorado SWAP in 2015, but the original 2006 plan is available at the website. The 2006 New Mexico SWAP is here: <http://www.teaming.com/sites/default/files/New%20Mexico%20Wildlife%20Action%20Plan.pdf>