
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Introduction

The Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (FLPMA) requires the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) to “develop, maintain, and when appropriate, revise land use plans” in order to guide management decisions for public lands within a specific Planning Area [43 United States Code (USC) 1712(a)]. A Resource Management Plan (RMP) is based upon an analysis of an area’s resources, existing management, and potential alternative management. RMPs are issue-oriented and developed by an Interdisciplinary (ID) Team with input from local, State, Native American tribal, and other Federal governments and agencies; interested groups and organizations, and the general public.

The National Environmental Policy Act of 1976 (NEPA) [Section 102(2)(C)] and Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) regulations for implementing the NEPA [40 CFR 1500-1508], require Federal agencies to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for major Federal actions that could significantly affect (impact) the environment. A tool for decision-making, an EIS identifies potential beneficial (positive) and adverse (negative) impacts (including short-term, long-term, direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts) that could occur as the result of the implementation of proposed management actions. RMPs, due to their broad nature and large scope, significantly affect the human environment; therefore, they are accompanied by EISs. The analysis conducted for an EIS considers a comprehensive range of potential management alternatives that provide for various levels of resource protection, as well as for recreational opportunities, potential leasing and development of mineral resources, range management (livestock grazing), and other land use activities. An EIS associated with an RMP identifies and analyzes the potential environmental consequences (impacts) of implementing each proposed management alternative and identifies appropriate measures designed to mitigate those impacts.

In fulfillment of these requirements, this Draft Resource Management Plan/Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DRMP/DEIS) documents the comprehensive analysis of alternatives and environmental impacts for the planning and management of public lands and resources administered by the BLM within the Planning Area managed by the Kremmling Field Office (KFO). The purpose, or goal, in developing this DRMP/DEIS is to ensure that public lands and mineral estate managed by the KFO are managed in accordance with all applicable laws, rules, regulations, policies, standards, and guidelines; as well as with the principles of multiple-use and sustained-yield management. The public lands within the Planning Area, although under the administrative care and management of the BLM, belong to the American people; therefore, it is the overriding goal of the BLM to actively seek out, engage, and include all interested parties in this planning process; a process that could shape how the public perceives, experiences, uses, and enjoys their public lands.

Planning Area

The KFO, headquartered in Kremmling, manages approximately 378,884 surface acres of public lands and approximately 2,240,775 subsurface acres of mineral estate administered by the KFO in Eagle, Grand, Routt, Jackson, Larimer, and Summit Counties, Colorado. Public lands managed by the KFO extend east to the Continental Divide, west to Steamboat Springs

and Vail, south to Interstate-70, and north to the Wyoming border. This combined acreage (surface acres and subsurface mineral estate) is being analyzed as the "Planning Area" for the purposes of this DRMP/DEIS.

The Planning Area is composed of lands managed by the BLM, the U.S. Forest Service (USFS), the National Park Service (NPS), the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), the State of Colorado; as well as of lands owned by private individuals. The combined total acreage for the Planning Area is approximately 3,116,272 acres. Approximately 378,884 of those acres are managed by the KFO. (See Chapter 1, Table 1-1, for a description of the land status within the Planning Area.)

PLAN FOUNDATION

This DRMP/DEIS was developed in order to guide and define Management Actions (Allowable Uses) for the BLM-managed public lands within the Planning Area, in accordance with all applicable laws, rules, regulations, policies, standards, and guidelines; and to provide an integrated Resource Management Plan that guides future land use decisions and project-specific analyses. This DRMP/DEIS addresses land use issues identified through BLM agency, interagency, and public scoping efforts; and establishes a range of alternatives that support management Goals and Objectives, via specific Management Actions, in accordance with land use planning guidelines.

This DRMP/DEIS revises the existing RMP for the KFO [the Kremmling RMP (BLM 1984b)]. Such RMP revisions are necessary if monitoring and evaluation findings, new data, new or revised policy, or changes in circumstances indicate that decisions for an entire RMP, or a major portion of an RMP, no longer serve as a useful guide for management. This DRMP/DEIS is needed in order to provide updated management direction to guide natural and cultural resource management activities within the Planning Area. There is a need to revise the KFO RMP (BLM 1984b) due to new issues and higher levels of controversy regarding issues that have arisen since the original plan was prepared in the 1980s. Major issues contributing to the necessity of revising the current RMP include several associated with the following resources and management areas:

Recreation -- in order to improve facilities, protect natural and cultural resources, provide a variety of opportunities, and to maximize socioeconomic benefits;

Special Management Areas/Special Designations -- in order to protect natural and cultural resources, and to maximize recreational opportunities and socioeconomic benefits;

Energy Development -- in order to protect cultural and natural resources, and to minimize user conflicts (especially with regard to oil and gas leasing);

Vegetation -- in order to reduce fuel loading, control and prevent noxious weeds, and to maintain a healthy forest ecosystem;

Wildlife -- in order to maintain and improve habitats while, at the same time, maintaining multiple-uses;

Sagebrush Habitat -- in order to reduce continued habitat loss and fragmentation; and

Surface Water and Groundwater Resources -- in order to maintain and improve habitat, improve water quality, protect drinking water sources, and to help meet and maintain local and regional water delivery compacts.

This DRMP/DEIS is also needed in order to allow for updated DOI- and BLM-management direction, guidance, and policy. New resource assessments and scientific information is available to help the KFO in updating and revising previous decisions. Specifically, there is a need to evaluate management prescriptions and resource allocations in order to address the increase in uses and demands within the Planning Area (such as increased recreation demand and use, and natural gas development); concerns over scenic quality and open spaces; as well as the increased interest in protecting natural and cultural resources. Routine amendments and maintenance actions are not adequate to address these changes. The DRMP/DEIS is needed in order to incorporate this new data and addresses land use issues, conflicts, and potential impacts; and to specify where, and under what circumstances, specific activities would be allowed on public lands under different management alternatives.

Initially, the KFO DRMP/DEIS was prepared in conjunction with the DRMP/DEIS for the neighboring Glenwood Springs Field Office (GSFO), which is now called the Colorado River Valley Field Office (CRVFO). This combined planning effort was an efficient way to complete the first stages of the planning process. However, given the complexity of the analysis, it was decided in December of 2010 that 2 separate documents, a DRMP/DEIS for the KFO and a DRMP/DEIS for the CRVFO, would be issued, and that the planning effort for the 2 Field Offices would continue as separate processes.

Scoping Process

As soon as the environmental analysis process begins, the scoping process begins. Regulations state that there “shall be an early and open process for determining the scope of issues to be addressed and for identifying the significant issues related to a Proposed Action” (40 CFR 1501.7). In the preparation of this DRMP/DEIS, the BLM engaged in internal scoping (with BLM staff and specialists) and external scoping (with local, State, Native American tribal, and other Federal agencies; public and private groups and organizations; and the general public).

The formal scoping period for the combined CRVFO/KFO DRMP/DEIS began on March 2, 2007 with the publication of the Notice of Intent (NOI) in the *Federal Register*. Under CEQ regulations, the public comment period must continue for at least 30 days; however, the BLM extended this public comment period to May 2, 2007, providing 60 days for submitting comments. Even though the scoping comment period has ended, the BLM has continued to consider all comments received during the planning process. The NOI was provided for public consideration at 7 scoping Open Houses and was posted on the project website. During this time, input was received from BLM staff, other resource and land management agencies, local governments, State government, Native American tribes, individual citizens, Resource Advisory Council (RACs), environmental groups, industry, and other interested parties. (See Chapter 5 for an extended discussion of the scoping, consultation, and collaboration efforts associated with this DRMP/DEIS.)

Development of Management Alternatives

Overview

The development of management alternatives is the heart of the DRMP/DEIS analysis process. BLM land use planning regulations, as well as the NEPA, require the BLM to develop a reasonable range of alternatives during the planning process. The NEPA directs the BLM to “study, develop, and describe appropriate alternatives to recommended courses of action in any proposal that involves unresolved conflicts concerning alternative uses of available resources...” [NEPA 102(2)(E)]. All proposed alternatives must be within the established planning criteria (Title 43 CFR, Section 1610) (See Chapter 1 for an extended discussion of the planning criteria for this DRMP/DEIS.)

Each of the 4 alternatives proposed for this DRMP/DEIS is a complete Resource Management Plan that would provide a framework for multiple-use and sustained-yield management of the full spectrum of resources, resource uses, and programs present within the Planning Area. Under all of the alternatives, the KFO would continue to manage the public lands, and their associated resources, in accordance with all applicable laws, rules, regulations, policies, standards, and guidelines. (Table ES-1 provides a summary of major management actions by alternative.)

The development of the 4 proposed management alternatives was guided by the Purpose and Need for the DRMP/DEIS; public scoping issues; agency goals and objectives; and all applicable regulatory requirements guiding on-the-ground management of public lands. The 4 proposed management alternatives were developed in order to address planning issues, concerns, and requirements; and to provide direction for resource programs influencing land management and resource use within the Planning Area. Each management alternative would represent a different combination of resource uses, management allocations, and environmental consequences; therefore, program goals would be met in varying degrees under the different alternatives.

The basic goal of developing alternatives is to prepare different combinations of management scenarios in order to:

- address all identified planning issues;
- resolve conflicts among resources and resource uses;
- meet the Purpose and Need for the DRMP/DEIS;
- provide a mix of resource protection, use, and development; and
- meet the established planning criteria.

Achieving these goals will help the BLM, and the public, understand the various ways of addressing conflicts concerning alternative uses of available resources, as well as provide the KFO with a reasonable range of alternatives with which to make an informed decision.

Planning Issues

As a result of agency and public scoping efforts, 12 planning issue categories were identified for analysis within this DRMP/DEIS. (See Chapter 2 for an extended discussion of the planning issues):

Travel Management and Transportation -- How will transportation be managed so that natural and cultural resources are protected; so that motorized and non-motorized recreational opportunities are provided; so that user conflicts are reduced; so that route designations and closures are enforced; and so that public access is improved?

Recreational Demand and Uses -- How will recreation be managed so that recreation sites and trails, especially those in close proximity to communities, are maintained and improved; so that user conflicts are reduced; so that natural and cultural resources are protected; so that a variety of recreational opportunities are provided; and so that socioeconomic benefits are maximized?

Lands and Realty -- What opportunities exist to make adjustments to public land ownership that would result in greater management efficiency, in appropriate and agreeable levels of public access, and in increased public and natural resource benefits?

Special Designations -- Where will special managed area designations be appropriate so that unique resources are protected; and how should existing special designations be managed so that natural and cultural resources are protected, and so that recreational opportunities and socioeconomic benefits are maximized?

Wildland-urban Interface -- How will BLM-managed public lands in wildland-urban interface (WUI) areas be managed so that benefits desired by the public are achieved, consistent with future resource and land use plans in neighboring communities?

Energy Development -- What areas should be open to energy development, especially to oil and gas leasing; and what restrictions/stipulations should be put in place so that cultural and natural resources are protected, and so that user conflicts are minimized?

Rangeland Health/Upland Management -- How will the BLM manage livestock grazing on public lands while, at the same time, protecting, managing, restoring, and using natural and cultural resources?

Vegetation -- What actions or restrictions will be needed so that dangerous fuel loading is reduced; so that the spread of noxious weeds and other undesirable plant species is controlled or prevented; and so that healthy forest ecosystems are maintained?

Fish and Wildlife -- How will uses and land management activities be managed so that terrestrial and aquatic habitats in a scattered land ownership pattern are maintained and improved under multiple-use land management requirements?

Water/Riparian Resources -- What measures will be implemented so that water resources, especially riparian areas and wetlands, are protected from the impacts of other uses?

Sagebrush Habitat and Sagebrush-dependent Species -- How will sagebrush habitat be managed so that continued habitat loss and fragmentation is reduced?

Cultural Resources -- How can the BLM protect and conserve cultural resources, and where do interpretation opportunities exist?

Management Alternatives

Four (4) management alternatives were analyzed in detail as part of this DRMP/DEIS process, including Alternative A (the No Action Alternative) and Alternative B (the Preferred Alternative). These alternatives were developed in order to analyze management goals and objectives within a reasonable range of management actions, and to assist decision-makers and the public in understanding the potential consequences and benefits of alternative scenarios. Under all of the alternatives, any action or development must be consistent with applicable local, State, and Federal laws, rules, regulations, policies, standards, and guidelines.

Each of the proposed alternatives represents a complete potential RMP, and describes a specific direction that would influence land management within the Planning Area, with an emphasis on different combinations of resource uses, allowable uses, and restoration measures designed to address issues and/or to resolve user conflicts. Resource program goals and desired outcomes would be met in varying degrees under the different alternatives.

The 4 alternatives differ from one another in the relative emphasis each one gives to particular resources or resource uses. Each alternative has been designed to respond to the planning issues differently, providing a range of possible management approaches that the BLM could implement. The distinction between the alternatives is expressed by varying allowable uses, management actions, and implementation actions. (See Chapter 2, Table 2-2, Descriptions of Alternative A, Alternative B, Alternative C, and Alternative D, for a complete description of all decisions proposed under each alternative.)

Alternative A (No Action Alternative)

Alternative A, the No Action Alternative, is the continuation of the present management situation. Desired Outcomes (Goals and Objectives) for BLM-managed public lands and resource uses would be based upon the existing KFO RMP (BLM 1984b), as amended, as well as upon applicable Activity Plans and Implementation Plans. Under this alternative, the emphasis would be on maintaining the existing land management direction for physical, biological, cultural, and historic resource values, along with recreational, social, and economic land uses. The KFO would implement the direction contained in laws, rules, regulations, policies, standards, and guidelines superseding provisions of the existing RMP and amendments.

Under this alternative, the appropriate development scenarios would stay the same for such allowable uses as mineral leasing, locatable mineral development, recreation use, timber harvesting, utility corridors, and livestock grazing. There would be no change in Desired Outcomes (Goals and Objectives), or Management Actions that are allowed, restricted, or prohibited on BLM-managed public lands or subsurface mineral estate. The KFO would not establish additional criteria, or change present criteria, in order to guide the identification of site-specific use levels for implementation activities.

Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)

Alternative B, the Preferred Alternatives, would allocate resources among competing human interests, land uses, and the conservation of natural and cultural resource values. Desired Outcomes (Goals and Objectives) would focus on environmental, economic, and social outcomes achieved by strategically addressing demands across the landscape. In general, management direction would be broad in order to accommodate a variety of values and uses.

Alternative C

Alternative C would emphasize protecting resource values and sustaining or restoring the ecological integrity of habitats for all priority plant, wildlife, and fish species. This would include a specific focus on the habitats necessary for conserving and recovering Listed, Proposed, or Candidate Threatened or Endangered plant and animal species. Desired Outcomes (Goals and Objectives) would focus on environmental and social outcomes achieved by sustaining relatively unmodified physical landscapes and natural and cultural resource values for current and future generations. The appropriate mix of uses on BLM-managed public lands and mineral estate would be based upon minimizing site-specific types and levels of human disturbances to natural and cultural resources. In general, management direction would be ecologically based. Existing uses would be recognized; however, they would likely be limited in order to ensure the protection of natural and cultural values, including intangible Native American landscape values encompassing plant communities, wildlife, viewsheds, air, and water. Development options for allowable uses (such as mineral leasing, locatable mineral development, recreation, and livestock grazing) would be contingent upon whether the KFO could meet the essential conditions of natural and heritage resources.

Alternative D

Under Alternative D, the appropriate mix of uses on BLM-managed public lands and mineral estate would be based upon making the most of resources that target social and economic outcomes while, at the same time, protecting land health. Management direction would recognize and expand existing uses, and would accommodate new uses to the greatest extent possible. The appropriate development scenarios for allowable uses (such as mineral leasing, locatable mineral development, recreation, communication sites, and livestock grazing) would emphasize maximizing resource production in an environmentally responsible manner while, at the same time, maintaining the basic protection needed in order to sustain resources.

Affected Environment

Chapter 3 describes the existing condition (affected environment) and trend of issue-related elements (resource areas) of the biological, physical, and socioeconomic characteristics found within the Planning Area, including human uses, that could be affected by the implementation of the 4 proposed alternatives. During the environmental analysis process, a description of the present condition of the affected public lands, and their associated resources, provided a basis for identifying and interpreting potential impacts of the alternatives proposed in this DRMP/DEIS. The analysis described in this DRMP/DEIS is based upon the following resource areas:

Air and Atmospheric Value (Air Quality, Climate and Meteorology, Climate Change);
Soil Resources;
Water Resources;
Vegetation Resources;
Fish and Wildlife Resources;
Special Status Species;
Cultural Resources;
Paleontological Resources;
Visual Resources;
Wildland Fire;
Lands with Wilderness Characteristics outside Existing WSAs;
Cave and Karst Resources;
Forestry Resources;
Range Management (Livestock Grazing);
Recreation and Visitor Services;
Comprehensive Travel and Transportation Management;
Lands and Realty;
Energy and Minerals;
Renewable Energy;
Areas of Critical Environmental Concern;
Wilderness and Wilderness Study Areas;
Wild and Scenic Rivers;
Watchable Wildlife Areas;
National Trails and Scenic Byways;
Transportation System;
Public Health and Safety;
Socioeconomics; and
Environmental Justice

Environmental Consequences (Impacts)

Chapter 4 describes, and compares, the environmental consequences that may result from the implementation of the 4 proposed alternatives presented in Chapter 2. In terms of complying with the NEPA, the specific purpose of Chapter 4 is to present the analyses of the alternative management actions, and to disclose the potential impacts of the Federal action on the human and natural environment. For this DRMP/DEIS, the Federal action is the BLM's selection of an alternative, which will serve as the framework for future land use planning direction and for the appropriate use of the BLM-managed public lands within the Planning Area. The human environment is considered to include both the natural environment (resources) and the BLM multiple-use and sustained-yield land management environment (resource uses).

The potential environmental consequences, or impacts, of each alternative are addressed in the same order of resource topics as was presented in Chapter 3. This parallel organization helps readers compare existing resource conditions (Chapter 3) to potential impacts (Chapter 4) for the same resource(s). The environmental impacts analysis emphasizes key planning issues (see Chapter 1) raised during the scoping process, rather than all possible consequences, in relation to the proposed alternatives (Chapter 2). The analysis of alternatives describes how each alternative could affect baseline conditions of individual resources within the Planning Area. Typically, impacts are described by Planning Area and resource uses.

Impact Analysis

When applicable, definitions of the following types of impacts are included in the evaluation of environmental consequences (all possible impacts are not described and, unless otherwise stated, impacts described in this chapter are assumed to be adverse), including:

Direct Impacts -- Direct impacts result from activities authorized by the BLM and, generally, occur at the same time and place as the management activity or action causing the impact.

Indirect Impacts -- Indirect impacts often occur at some distance, or time, from the action.

Short- or Long-term Impacts -- When applicable, the short-term or long-term aspects of impacts are described. (For the purposes of this DRMP/DEIS, short-term impacts occur during or after the activity or action, and may continue for up to 2 years. Long-term impacts occur beyond the first 2 years.)

Cumulative Impacts -- Cumulative impacts are impacts that result from the incremental impact of the action when it is added to other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions. Cumulative impacts can result from individually minor, but collectively significant, actions taking place over a period of time. For this DRMP/DEIS, potential cumulative impacts include those that could occur on other Federal and non-Federal lands.

All of the environmental impacts associated with the implementation of any of the alternatives would be in addition to ongoing existing impacts occurring on BLM-managed public lands within the Planning Area; lands managed by other land management agencies within the Planning Area; private lands within the Planning Area; and both public and private lands adjacent to, or near, the Planning Area. Even where an estimate of cumulative impacts resulting from offsite causes is available (such as the number of oil and gas wells in Jackson County in 20 years), it is not known how much long-term surface disturbance would result; to what degree adverse impacts would be avoided or mitigated; or how the impacts would affect other resource values and land uses (such as hunting, OHV travel, livestock grazing, and so forth). Therefore, the descriptions of cumulative impacts for the individual resources addressed in this chapter are primarily qualitative.

Beyond the 20-year planning horizon anticipated for an Approved RMP (Approved Plan), the BLM believes that quantitative impact assessments are speculative and unreliable, and hence, inappropriate. This is due to a large number of economic, geopolitical, environmental, regulatory, technological, and/or other factors that could affect conditions within, or adjacent to, the Planning Area beyond 20 years; factors which are, themselves, subject to change in unexpected ways or degrees. In general, however, it can reasonably be assumed that the Planning Area would continue to support existing multiple uses beyond the 20-year timeframe.

Table ES-1 Major Management Actions Addressing the 5 Key Issues			
Alternative A No Action	Alternative B Preferred	Alternative C	Alternative D
RECREATIONAL DEMAND AND USE			
<p>Within ERMAs and SRMAs, implement a 14-day camping limit on BLM-managed public lands year-round. Campers must relocate at least 30 miles away, and may not return within 30 days to a previous campsite.</p>	<p>In areas open to camping, implement a 14-day camping limit from September 1 to March 31, unless otherwise authorized. From April 1 to August 31, implement a 7-day camping limit, unless otherwise authorized. Campers must relocate at least a 30-mile radius away, and may not return within 30 days to a previous campsite.</p>		
	<p>Camping Closures -- Close the following to camping:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the open OHV area south and east of Wolford Mountain; • lands west of Grand County Road 224, south of Wolford Mountain, west of Wolford Reservoir, and east of U.S. Hwy 40; • Confluence Recreation Site, and adjacent BLM-managed public lands; • State Hwy 9 and Red Mountain Fishing Accesses; • Barger Gulch Fishing Access; • Reeder Creek Fishing Access, and adjacent BLM-managed public lands; • Powers Fishing Access; • Sunset Fishing Access, and adjacent BLM-managed public lands; • Windy Gap Fishing Access Parking Area; • Fraser River Fishing Access Parking Area; • Sidewinder Jeep Trail Parking Area; • Kremmling Cretaceous Ammonite Site; • Barger Gulch Paleo-Indian Site; • Yarmony Pit House Site; • Independence Mountain Tipi Site; • Junction Butte Wetlands; • Gore Ranch site; • Hurd Peak staging area; and, • North Sand Hills Instant Study Area. 		
<p>Allow the discharge of firearms for recreational target shooting on BLM-managed public lands outside of areas with firearm use restrictions.</p>			
<p>Prohibit the discharge of firearms for recreational target shooting in developed recreation sites.</p>	<p>Prohibit the discharge of firearms for recreational target shooting in the following areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • developed recreation sites (existing and future); • south of County Road 224, and south and west of Wolford Reservoir, east of County Road 22 and west of County Road 2; • adjacent to the Confluence Recreation Site; • adjacent to the Pumphouse Recreation Site; • adjacent to the Radium Recreation Site; • 0.25 mile on either side of the Colorado River from Parshall to State Bridge; • adjacent to the Reeder Creek Fishing Access; • adjacent to the Sunset Fishing Access; • between Jacquez Road and Sherriff Creek, north of Highway 40; • between County Road 219 and Highway 125, north of Highway 40; • in the southern portion of the Strawberry and Hurd Peak areas; 		

Table ES-1 Major Management Actions Addressing the 5 Key Issues			
Alternative A No Action	Alternative B Preferred	Alternative C	Alternative D
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • North Sand Hills SRMA; • Hebron Slough Waterfowl Area; and, • Junction Butte Wetlands. 		
Issue SRPs as a discretionary action.			
	Issue SRPs for a wide variety of uses that are consistent with resource and program objectives, and within budgetary and workload constraints. Prohibit vending permits outside special events on BLM-managed public lands (an exception would be to allow firewood sales at the Radium and the Pumphouse Recreation sites, and in the North Sand Hills SRMA.) Apply cost-recovery procedures for issuing SRPs, where appropriate.	Issue SRPs only if the proposed activity or event is consistent with the values associated with wilderness characteristics.	Maximize opportunities for commercial recreation by issuing SRPs, including vending permits outside of special events. Apply cost-recovery procedures for issuing SRPs where appropriate.
Implement recreation fees, as appropriate, in order to maintain visitor services and facilities by managing sites or areas as U.S. Fee Areas.			
	Complete trail construction and maintenance using the guidelines included the Criteria for Placement of Trails.		
	Manage the following ERMAs: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Headwaters: 13,800 acres; • Upper Colorado River (East): 800 acres; • Strawberry: 7,900 acres; and • Wolford: 25,700 acres. 	Manage the following ERMAs: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Upper Colorado River (East): 800 acres. 	
Manage the following SMRAs (approximately 13,650 acres): North Sand Hills (1,450 acres): Manage in order to protect the cultural resources and the dune environment while, at the same time, allowing OHV use to continue in a roaded natural setting. Upper Colorado River (West) (12,200 acres): Identify approximately 8,800 acres as a recreation priority; 2,500 acres as a wildlife priority; 830 acres as a soil priority; 35 acres as a protected area priority; and 40 acres with no priority. In addition,	Manage the following SMRAs (approximately 15,550 acres) SRMAs: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • North Sand Hills: 1,450 acres; and • Upper Colorado River (West): 14,100 acres. • Upper Colorado River (West) 	Manage the following SMRAs (approximately 23,450 acres): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • North Sand Hills: 1,450 acres; • Upper Colorado River (West): 14,100 acres; and • Strawberry: 7,900 acres. 	Manage the following SMRAs (approximately 84,850 acres): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • North Sand Hills: 1,450 acres; • Upper Colorado River (West): 14,200 acres; • Upper Colorado River (East): 800 acres; • Strawberry: 7,900 acres; • Headwaters: 34,800 acres; and • Wolford: 25,700 acres. • Same as under Alternative B for North Sand Hills and Upper

Table ES-1 Major Management Actions Addressing the 5 Key Issues			
Alternative A No Action	Alternative B Preferred	Alternative C	Alternative D
designate 20.8 miles of the Colorado River and associated tributaries as a water priority.			Colorado River (West).
SPECIAL DESIGNATIONS			
ACECs			
Designate the following areas as ACECs (516 acres): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Kremmling Cretaceous Ammonite RNA: 198 acres; and • North Park Natural Area: 318 acres. 			
	Designate the following areas as ACECs (9,250 acres): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Kinney Creek ACEC: 588 acres; and • North Sand Hills: 92 acres. 		Designate the following areas as ACECs (516 acres): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Kremmling Cretaceous Ammonite RNA: 198 acres; and • North Park Natural Area: 318 acres.
	Designate the following areas as ACECs (8,570 acres): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Barger Gulch Heritage Area ACEC: 535 acres; • Kremmling Potential Conservation Area: 636 acres; • Laramie River ACEC: 1,783 acres; • North Park Natural Area: 4,444 acres (including the 318 acres under Alternative A); and • Troublesome Creek ACEC: 974 acres. 		
Wilderness Study Areas			
Manage 3 WSAs (8,872 acres) under the Interim Management Policy: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • North Sand Hills Instant Study Area: 681 acres; • Platte River Contiguous WSA: 33 acres; and • Troublesome WSA: 8,158 acres. 			
	Designate WSAs and Wilderness (if designated by Congress) as VRM Class I.		
Prohibit motorized and mechanized travel in 2 WSAs: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Platte River Contiguous WSA; and • Troublesome WSA. 			
Allow, in the North Sand Hills ISA, cross-country motorized and mechanized travel on	Allow, in the North Sand Hills ISA, cross-country motorized and mechanized travel on 163 acres, and limit motorized and mechanized travel	Prohibit, in the North Sand Hills ISA, motorized and mechanized travel on 90	Allow, in the North Sand Hills ISA, cross-country motorized and mechanized travel on

Table ES-1 Major Management Actions Addressing the 5 Key Issues				
Alternative A No Action	Alternative B Preferred	Alternative C	Alternative D	
163 acres, and limit motorized and mechanized travel to existing routes on 509 acres.	to designated routes on 509 acres.	acres (in the North Sand Hills ACEC), and limit motorized and mechanized travel to designated routes on 582 acres.	163 acres, and limit motorized and mechanized travel to designated routes on 509 acres.	
Close approximately 9,400 acres of Federal mineral estate in the WSAs to oil and gas leasing, which includes about 520 acres of a split-estate inholding in the Troublesome WSA.				
	If the North Sand Hills ISA is released from wilderness consideration, manage the lands under the prescriptions of the North Sand Hills SRMA.	If the North Sand Hills ISA is released from wilderness consideration, manage the lands under the prescriptions of the North Sand Hills SRMA and the North Sand Hills ACEC.	If the North Sand Hills ISA is released from wilderness consideration, manage the lands under prescriptions of the North Sand Hills SRMA.	
	If the Platte River Contiguous or the Troublesome WSA are released from wilderness consideration, manage to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • protect the non-motorized and non-mechanized recreation activity opportunities, primitive (undeveloped) physical recreation setting character, and scenic values; • close the areas to mechanized and motorized travel under Comprehensive Trails and Travel Management requirements; and close these areas to mineral leasing. 			
Wild and Scenic Rivers				
Identify 15 river segments as eligible, and manage to preserve the free-flowing nature and ORVs: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Blue River segment 2 (Recreational); • Blue River segment 3 (Recreational); • Colorado River segment 1 (Recreational); • Colorado River segment 2 (Recreational); • Colorado River segment 3 (Recreational); • Colorado River segment 4 (Recreational); • Colorado River segment 5 	B1 -- Determine the following 2 eligible river segments as suitable: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Colorado River (segment 4, Recreational); and • Colorado River (segment 5, Recreational) • Same as under Alternative D for the 13 eligible segments not determined to be suitable for inclusion in 	B2 -- Defer a WSR suitability determination, and adopt and implement the Stakeholder Group's Management Plan in order to protect the free-flowing nature, ORVs, and tentative classifications of Colorado River segments 4 (Recreational) and 5 (Recreational). If monitoring indicates the Stakeholder Management Plan is not	Determine the following 15 eligible river segments as suitable, and apply interim protective management: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Blue River segment 2 (Recreational); • Blue River segment 3 (Recreational); • Colorado River segment 1 (Recreational); • Colorado River segment 2 (Recreational); • Colorado River segment 3 (Recreational); • Colorado River segment 4 (Recreational); • Colorado River segment 5 	Identify 15 eligible river segments as not suitable, and release them from interim management protections afforded eligible segments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Blue River segment 2 (Recreational); • Blue River segment 3 (Recreational); • Colorado River segment 1 (Recreational); • Colorado River segment 2 (Recreational); • Colorado River segment 3 (Recreational); • Colorado River segment 4 (Recreational);

Table ES-1 Major Management Actions Addressing the 5 Key Issues				
Alternative A No Action	Alternative B Preferred		Alternative C	Alternative D
(Recreational); • Kinney Creek; • Muddy Creek; • North Platte River; • Piney River; • Rabbit Ears Creek; • Spruce Creek; • Sulphur Gulch; and • Troublesome Creek.	the NWSRS. Apply management prescriptions in order to protect the free-flowing nature, ORVs, and tentative classifications of the above river segments.	adequately protecting the free-flowing nature, ORVs, and tentative classification, the BLM would initiate a process to evaluate suitability and determine if river segment 4 and segment 5 are suitable for inclusion in the NWSRS. Apply management prescriptions in order to protect the free-flowing nature, ORVs, and tentative classifications of the above river segments.	(Recreational); • Kinney Creek (Scenic); • Muddy Creek (Recreational); • North Platte River (Recreational); • Piney River (Recreational); • Rabbit Ears Creek (Wild); • Spruce Creek (Recreational); • Sulphur Gulch (Recreational); and • Troublesome Creek (Recreational).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Colorado River segment 5 (Recreational); • Kinney Creek; • Muddy Creek; • North Platte River; • Piney River; • Rabbit Ears Creek; • Spruce Creek; • Sulphur Gulch; and • Troublesome Creek.
	Close 2 segments that are suitable for inclusion in the NWSRS to oil and gas leasing.		Close 15 segments that are suitable for inclusion in the NWSRS to oil and gas leasing.	
Establish the following interim protective management guidelines for all eligible segments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • approve no actions altering the free-flowing nature of the eligible stream segments through impoundments, channeling, or rip-rapping; • approve no actions that would measurably diminish a stream segment's identified ORV(s) affecting its potential suitability; and • approve no actions that would modify the setting or level of development of an eligible river segment to a degree that would change its tentative classification. 				
	Apply the interim protective management guidelines until designated or released to multiple use by Congress. In addition: apply land use authorization avoidance on suitable stream segments classified as Scenic or Recreational; and		Apply the interim protective management guidelines until designated or released to multiple use by Congress. In addition: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • apply land use authorization 	

Table ES-1 Major Management Actions Addressing the 5 Key Issues			
Alternative A No Action	Alternative B Preferred	Alternative C	Alternative D
	apply COAs, BMPs, and SOPs.	exclusions (including solar and wind development) on suitable stream segments classified as Wild; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • apply land use authorization avoidance on suitable stream segments classified as Scenic or Recreational; and • apply COAs, BMPs, and SOPs. 	
Interim protective management would be subject to valid existing rights.			
ENERGY AND MINERALS			
RENEWABLE ENERGY			
	Wind and solar energy applications would be reviewed when consistent with resource goals and objectives. Avoidance and Exclusion Areas would apply. Renewable energy projects could result in impacts to nearly all renewable and non-renewable resources administered by the KFO, which would be mitigated or avoided during project design, if projects were approved.		
COAL			
Approximately 45,000 acres of Federal mineral estate would be open to consideration for coal leasing. Approximately 7,190 acres would be unsuitable for surface mining. Stipulations would be applied to oil and gas leases within areas of federally leased coal in order to prevent conflicts of development.	Approximately 123,700 acres of Federal mineral estate would be open to consideration for coal leasing within the McCallum KRCRA. Within the KRCRA, approximately 106,000 acres would be unsuitable for surface mining.	Less than 123,700 acres of Federal mineral estate would be open to consideration for coal leasing. Lands managed for wilderness characteristics outside of WSAs would be considered unsuitable for coal leasing: VRM Class I protections (approximately 24,600 acres); and, Greater sage-grouse protections.	Approximately 45,000 acres of Federal mineral estate would be open to consideration for coal leasing. Approximately 7,190 acres would be unsuitable for surface mining.
FLUID MINERALS			
Approximately 642,900 acres of Federal mineral estate would be open to oil and gas leasing and	Approximately 625,200 acres would be open to oil and gas leasing and development.	Approximately 382,400 acres would be open to oil and gas leasing and development	Approximately 625,200 acres would be open to oil and gas leasing and development.

Table ES-1 Major Management Actions Addressing the 5 Key Issues			
Alternative A No Action	Alternative B Preferred	Alternative C	Alternative D
development.			
LOCATABLE MINERALS			
Approximately 13,900 acres are withdrawn from mineral location: the Upper Colorado River SRMA and the North Sand Hills ISA. The remainder of the public lands administered by the KFO would be open for mining claim location and possible subsequent mining. Activities other than casual use require a Notice or a Plan of Operations and are subject to performance standards designed to protect other resource values. Management of eligible WSR segments and WSAs under performance standards, and Interim Management guidelines for WSAs, would essentially prevent locatable-mineral-related surface occupancy and surface-disturbing activities.			
	Approximately 18,200 additional acres recommended for withdrawal from mineral entry.	Approximately 32,400 additional acres recommended for withdrawal from mineral entry.	Approximately 18,200 additional acres recommended for withdrawal from mineral entry.
SALABLE AND NON-ENERGY SOLID LEASABLE MINERALS			
All BLM-managed surface estate would continue to be opened to mineral material disposal and non-energy solid leasable minerals. WSAs remain open, provided that activities meet non-impairment criteria and that those activities began before the passage of the FLPMA.	Approximately 41,200 acres of BLM administered surface estate would be closed to disposal and leasing.	Approximately 66,800 acres of BLM-managed surface estate would be closed to disposal and leasing.	Approximately 41,200 acres of BLM administered surface estate would be closed to disposal and leasing.
WILDLIFE			
	Designate the following as priority habitats: perennial water sources (streams, rivers, lakes, ponds, springs, seeps, wetlands, wet meadows, bogs, and fens), riparian areas, intermittent streams and ponds, and ephemeral/seasonal waters.		Designate the following as priority habitats: perennial water sources (streams, rivers, lakes, ponds, springs, seeps, wetlands, wet meadows, bogs, and fens) and riparian areas.
	Identify limiting habitat factors based upon site characteristics and habitat capabilities using channel type and geology classifications. Upon identification of limiting factors, prioritize and fix those that can be fixed using proven river, stream, lake, and riparian methodologies (such as in-channel habitat structures designed to create pools, riparian plantings, tamarisk removal), or by changing management of other program activities in order to achieve Desired Outcome.		
	Identify in-channel features that block aquatic organism movement and/or impair stream connectivity; replace, modify, or remove these impediments as they are identified, and as opportunities allow.		
Allow introduction, translocation, transplantation, restocking, augmentation, and re-establishment of native and naturalized fish and wildlife species.			
Protect wintering big game species by closing	Protect wintering big game species by closing the following areas to	Protect wintering big game species by closing the	Protect wintering big game species by closing

Table ES-1 Major Management Actions Addressing the 5 Key Issues			
Alternative A No Action	Alternative B Preferred	Alternative C	Alternative D
the following area to motorized travel from December 15 to April 15: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wolford Travel Management Area. • Restrict snowmobiles to designated routes. • Under mild winter conditions, the last 60 days of the seasonal limitation period may be suspended after consultation with the CDOW. 	motorized and mechanized travel from December 15 to April 15: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same areas as under Alternative A, plus the following: • North Sand Hills SRMA and WSA. • The Authorized Officer may adjust the start or end date of a seasonal area closure, depending upon ground conditions, resource concerns, or public health and safety. 	following areas to motorized and mechanized travel from December 15 to April 15: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same areas as under Alternative A, plus the following: • North Sand Hills WSA; and • Strawberry SRMA. 	the following areas to motorized and mechanized travel from December 15 to April 15: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same areas as Alternative A, plus the following: • North Sand Hills WSA.
	Close areas to human activity and to dogs on an area-specific basis during severe winter weather conditions.		
	Implement habitat improvement projects in the mountain shrub community in order to increase the amount of available, palatable, and nutritious forage by setting back succession and creating a diverse age structure of plants.		
	Stimulate sprouting and regrowth in decadent aspen patches using treatments such as prescribed fire and natural fire managed for resource benefits and mechanical methods.		
	Perform habitat treatments in order to reduce the canopy cover in mature uniform-aged brush and mature pinyon, juniper, and other forest stands.		
	Where a diverse understory is lacking, seed desirable species or fertilize in transition and winter range habitats.		
	Where appropriate, reduce competition with livestock grazing for forage		
	Protect big game migration corridors by retaining parcels within migration corridors.		
	Reduce the density of roads and trails in priority big game habitats by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • closing and revegetating duplicate roads or trails; • closing and revegetating routes on BLM 		
	Avoid developing permanent structures that are restrictive to wildlife migration and movement.		
	Identify and maintain designated travel routes in order to provide access for hunting opportunities into targeted big game units.		
	Provide healthy and productive habitat as determined by habitat and population standards from sources such as Birds of Conservation Concern (BCC) Region Plans, State Partners-in-Flight Plans, and State Wildlife Action Plans for migratory birds; and avoid or minimize impacts to migratory birds by incorporating the following measures: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • manage plant communities for a variety of seral stages, structural diversities, and (habitat) patch-sizes capable of supporting diverse and viable migratory bird populations; • restore, enhance, and maintain riparian and upland habitats; 		

Table ES-1 Major Management Actions Addressing the 5 Key Issues			
Alternative A No Action	Alternative B Preferred	Alternative C	Alternative D
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> conduct habitat-improvement projects; apply COAs to all activities that alter vegetation, and to the broad use of pesticides in migratory bird habitat during the nesting season. The COA would apply to activities between May 15 and July 15. 		
	Provide healthy and productive habitat for cavity-nesting species.		
	Apply the Avian Power Line Interaction Committee 2006 and Avian Protection Plan (APP) Guidelines (APLIC and USFWS 2005) to new power line construction (including upgrades and reconstruction) in order to prevent electrocution of raptors.		
	Identify limiting habitat factors based upon site characteristics and habitat capabilities using channel type and geology classifications. Upon identification of limiting factors, prioritize and fix those that can be fixed using proven river, stream, lake, and riparian methodologies, or by changing management of other program activities.		
	Protect BLM fish-bearing streams or stream segments by actively seeking minimum in-stream flow protection and, for lakes, minimum pool depths, where opportunities arise.		
	Assist with the introduction, translocation, transplantation, restocking, augmentation, and re-establishment of Special Status fishes, in cooperation with the CDOW and/or with the USFWS, or with both, subject to the guidance provided by BLM Manual 1745 (Introduction, Transplant, Augmentation and Reestablishment of Fish, Wildlife and Plants), and by existing or future MOUs with the CDOW.		
	In occupied Special Status Species habitat, prioritize treatments in order to protect against invasion and establishment of noxious weeds or other aggressive exotic plants. Close or relocate selected travel routes in order to protect Special Status Species and significant plant communities. Pursue land tenure adjustments in order to facilitate the conservation or recovery of Special Status Species.		
	Restore potential Special Status Species habitat to suitable habitat by applying treatments to historically occupied, degraded habitats.		
	Allow introduction, translocation, transplantation, restocking, augmentation, and re-establishment of native and naturalized fish and wildlife species, in cooperation with the CDOW and/or with the USFWS, or with both, subject to the guidance provided by BLM Manual 1745, and by existing or future MOUs with the CDOW.		
	If suitable habitat for the Federal Candidate yellow-billed cuckoo is identified, conservation measures specified by the USFWS would be applied.		
	If suitable habitat for the Mexican spotted owl habitat is identified, conservation measures specified by the USFWS would be applied.		
	Locate and map occupied burrowing owl habitat on BLM-managed public lands in Jackson County.		
	Allow for the use of biological or chemical control, or both, of plague vectors at prairie dog colonies.		
	Maintain at least 90 percent of the occupied prairie dog habitat acreage as undisturbed within the Management Focus Area.	Maintain at least 80 percent of the occupied prairie dog habitat acreage as undisturbed within the Management Focus Area.	
	Implement applicable conservation and restoration measures identified in the Canada Lynx Conservation Assessment and Strategy.		
	Use timber management, where applicable, in conjunction with, or in place of, fire as a disturbance process to create and maintain snowshoe hare habitat in lynx habitats occurring		

Table ES-1 Major Management Actions Addressing the 5 Key Issues			
Alternative A No Action	Alternative B Preferred	Alternative C	Alternative D
	in Lynx Analysis Units (LAUs) in order to achieve desired conditions in accordance with Canada Lynx Conservation Assessment and Strategy.		
	Update LAU maps and lynx habitat with new information or specific habitat surveys within LAUs that are associated with BLM-managed public lands within the Planning Area. Do not change LAU boundaries unless such modification is supported by providing rationale.		
	Protect key linkage areas both within, and between, LAUs or suitable lynx habitat, or both, from activities that would create barriers to movement.		
	If applicable, coordinate with the CDOW and the USFWS for wolf management.		
Sagebrush Habitat and Sagebrush-dependent Species			
	Allow no more than 3 percent of the surface area within Greater sage-grouse core areas to be disturbed at any one time	Allow no more than 1 percent of the surface area within core areas to be disturbed at any one time.	Allow no more than 5 percent of the surface area within core areas to be disturbed at any one time.
		Prohibit oil and gas leasing on, or within, Greater Sage-grouse Core Areas in unleased areas in order to offset impacts of gas development in leased areas.	
	Apply conservation measures and guidance from the Colorado Greater Sage-grouse Conservation Plan, local work group plans (Middle Park and North Park, North Eagle, South Routt), Connelly Guidelines, the BLM National Sage-grouse Habitat Conservation Strategy (BLM 2004a), and Western Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies, when appropriate.		
	Require a maximum lease size (2,560 acres per lease) for new leases. Require development and approval of a Master Development Plan. Encourage clustered development. Avoid ROWs. Where ROWs cannot be avoided, encourage them in areas where disturbances already occur. Prohibit a net increase of acreage in roads. Close and rehabilitate roads that are fragmenting the sagebrush ecosystem.		