
2.0 CHAPTER 2 ALTERNATIVES

2.1 Introduction

This DRMP/DEIS provides direction for the management of approximately 378,884 surface acres and approximately 2,240,775 acres of subsurface mineral estate managed by the KFO in Eagle, Grand, Jackson, Routt, Larimer, and Summit Counties, Colorado. Public lands administered 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 BLM manages public lands and resource values according to the principles of multiple use and sustained yield. Given these principles, and the inherent conflicting nature of resource conservation and resource development, alternative development for this DRMP/DEIS occurred within the limits of planning criteria that address the needs of present and future generations while, at the same time, meeting the requirements of all applicable laws, rules, regulations, policies, standards, and guidelines (see 1.9 Planning Criteria for the specific planning criteria for this DRMP/DEIS). The analysis approach resulted in a reasonable range of alternatives that vary by their emphasis on allowable uses and management actions with regard to conservation and development. Chapter 2 describes 4 proposed alternatives (Alternatives A, Alternative B, Alternative C, and Alternative D), including the No Action Alternative (Alternative A) and the Preferred Alternative (Alternative B). This Chapter provides a narrative description of the management scenarios proposed under each alternative. The environmental impacts that would result from the implementation of the alternatives are presented in Chapter 4.

2.2 Development of Alternatives

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). 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.

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 development of the alternatives analyzed in this DRMP/DEIS included a public scoping process that allowed local, State, Native American tribal, and other Federal agencies and governments; public and private organizations and groups; and interested members of the public to comment on, and contribute input with regard to, the planning process.

Detailed analyses of conditions and trends for social, economic, and ecological elements related to the Planning Area were developed early in the process. These analyses included consideration of relevant new information, as well as legal, regulatory, and policy changes that have occurred since the last planning period.

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. The 4 alternatives, and the general management direction of each alternative, are discussed below.

2.3 Identification of Issues for Alternatives

During the planning process for this DRMP/DEIS, the identification of planning issues helped guide the development of the 4 proposed management alternatives (along with the development of planning criteria, the collection of data and information, and the analysis of the current management situation). Issue identification began in 2006, with an extensive review by the BLM's Interdisciplinary (ID) Team of current land management decisions and direction provided by the current Kremmling RMP, as amended (BLM 1984b), as well as:

Colorado Oil and Gas Leasing and Development Final Environmental Impact Statement (BLM 1991a);
Resource Management Plan Amendment and Environmental Impact Statement for Muddy Creek Reservoir (BLM 1991b);

Standards for Public Land Health and Guidelines for Livestock Grazing Management (BLM 1997a);

Decision Record and Finding of No Significant Impact and Environmental Assessment for Standards for Public Land Health and Guidelines for Livestock Grazing Management (BLM 1997b);

Recommended Recreation Management Guidelines to Meet Public Land Health Standards on Bureau of Land Management Lands in Colorado (BLM 2000a); and

Final Resource Management Plan Amendment and Environmental Assessment for Land Acquisition Land Use Priorities (BLM 2000b).

Resource Management Plan Amendment for Upper Colorado River Special Recreation Management Area (BLM 2000c)

Resource Management Plan Amendment for Designation of Energy Corridors on BLM-administered Lands in the 11 Western States (DOE and BLM 2008)

Based upon a thorough review of these documents, as well as other applicable documents, the ID Team identified preliminary planning issues that could be addressed in a new RMP. Generally, a planning issue is a point of conflict or dispute over resource management activities, allocations, and/or land use associated with the management of public lands. These issues are usually expressed in terms of the potential adverse (negative) consequences or impacts that a particular land or resource use may have upon other land or resources used or valued by another or for another purpose. Issues may reflect new data, new or revised policies, and/or changes in resource uses that may affect the Planning Area. (In contrast, management concerns are topics or points of dispute that involve a resource management activity and/or land use. Generally, management concerns are more important to individuals or small groups, as opposed to a planning issue that may have a more widespread point of conflict.)

A description of the planning issues identified by the ID Team were distributed during the scoping process for public comment, along with a request for the identification of additional issues. As a result of agency and public scoping efforts, 12 planning issue categories were identified:

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?

In order to better define the scope of the planning process for this DRMP/DEIS, as well as the development of the management alternatives, the planning issues were broken down into 2 groups. The first group is composed of 5 "Key Issues" (issues determined to have the greatest potential impact on the development of the proposed alternatives). The second group is composed of "Other Issues" (issues determined to have a smaller degree of impact on the development of the proposed alternatives).

2.3.1 Key Issues

For the purposes of this planning effort, Key Issues are issues specifically determined to have the greatest potential impact on the development (and direction) of the proposed alternatives. The 5 Key Issues creating variation within the proposed alternatives are:

- Recreational Demand and Uses;
- Special Designations;
- Energy Development;

- Wildlife (Habitat Management); and
- Sagebrush Habitat and Sagebrush-dependent Species.

2.3.1.1 Recreational Demand and Uses

Recreational demands and expectations related to public lands managed by the KFO have dramatically changed since the current KFO RMP (BLM 1984b) was developed. Public use and enjoyment of BLM-managed public lands have been affected by intense competition among increasing numbers of people for a finite amount of resources. Recreation visitation and use are expected to increase, especially in areas near growing communities. The public continues to demand a diverse range of recreational opportunities in a variety of natural resource settings.

Public scoping showed that some people want new or improved facilities for, and improved signage and information about, recreational opportunities; while others do not. Some people want more structured recreational opportunities for specific activities; while others want the BLM to manage for dispersed recreational activities. As the result of changing regional and local economies, rapid population growth, shifting demographics, and the expansion of residential areas, recreation is the center of both conflict and opportunity.

The current RMP (BLM 1984b) addresses only recreational opportunities within Special Recreational Management Areas (SRMAs) and Extensive Recreation Management Areas (ERMAs). [Revised BLM Manual 8320, Planning for Recreation and Visitor Services, defines an SRMA as an administrative unit where the existing or proposed recreational opportunities and recreation setting characteristics are recognized for their unique value, importance, and/or distinctiveness, especially as compared to other areas used for recreation" (BLM 2011c). An ERMA is defined as a public land unit identified in RMPs containing all acreage not identified as a SRMA. Recreation management actions within an ERMA are limited to only those of a custodial nature.] The revised BLM Land Use Planning Handbook, H-1601-1, requires the BLM to manage for structured outcomes within SRMAs. In order to meet this requirement, the BLM must address not only recreation, but must also identify visitor desires for experiences and benefits, the character of the recreation settings, and the necessary implementation framework (BLM 2005a). As part of the planning process, the KFO will review existing SRMAs and propose additional SRMAs in order to conform to the revised guidance.

2.3.1.2 Special Designations

Consistent with the goals, standards, and objectives for the Planning Area, the BLM can designate Special Management Areas. This includes identifying goals, standards, and objectives for each areas, as well as general management practices and uses (including necessary constraints and mitigation measures).

Some special management designations can only be designated by the U.S. Congress; however, they can be recommended through the RMP process. These include:

National Conservation Area (NCA) -- An area designated by Congress in order to provide for the conservation, use, enjoyment, and enhancement of certain natural recreational, paleontological, and other resources, including fish and wildlife habitat.

National Wilderness Area -- An area designated by Congress and defined by the Wilderness Act of 1964 as a place “where the Earth and its community of life are untrammelled by man, where man himself is a visitor who does not remain.” Designation is aimed at ensuring that these lands are preserved and protected in their natural condition. Wilderness Areas, which are generally at least 5,000 acres or more in size, offer outstanding opportunities for solitude or a primitive and unconfined type of recreation; such areas may also contain ecological, geological, or other features that have scientific, scenic, or historical value. Public lands designated by the BLM as Wilderness Study Areas (WSAs) may be subsequently considered by Congress for designation as a National Wilderness Area.

National Wild and/or Scenic Rivers (WSR) -- A river or river section designated by Congress or the Secretary of the Interior, under the authority of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act of 1968 (WSRA), in order to protect outstandingly remarkable scenic, recreational, geologic, fish and wildlife, historic, cultural, or other similar values; and to preserve the river or river section in its free-flowing condition.

National Scenic Trail -- Designated by Congress under the National Trails System Act of 1968 (NTSA), an extended trail that offers maximum outdoor recreation potential and provides enjoyment of the various qualities (scenic, historical, natural, and/or cultural) of the areas through which these trails pass.

National Historic Trail -- Designated by Congress under the NTSA, a type of extended trail that follows as closely as possible, on Federal land, the original trails or routes of travel with national historic significance. Designation identifies and protects historic routes and their historic remnants and artifacts for public use and enjoyment. A designated trail must meet certain criteria, including having a significant potential for public recreational use or interest based upon historic interpretation and appreciation.

Some special designations are considered “administrative” designations, and are within the scope of the RMP planning process, including:

Wilderness Study Area (WSA) -- An area designated by the BLM as having wilderness characteristics, thus making it worthy of consideration by Congress for designation as a National Wilderness Area. During the time Congress considers whether to designate a WSA as permanent Wilderness, the BLM is required to manage the WSA in a manner designed to prevent the impairment of the area’s suitability for Wilderness designation.

Area of Critical Environmental Concern (ACEC) -- An area of special concern where special management attention is required in order to protect and prevent irreparable damage to important historic, cultural or scenic values, fish and wildlife resources, or other natural systems or processes; or to protect life and safety from natural hazards.

Outstanding Natural Area (ONA) -- An area with high scenic values that has been little altered by human impact. Under current BLM policy, ONAs must meet the relevance and importance criteria of ACECs and are, therefore, designated as ACECs.

Research Natural Area (RNA) -- An area where natural processes are allowed to predominate, and that is preserved for the primary purposes of research and education. Under current BLM

policy, RNAs must meet the relevance and importance criteria of ACEC's and are, therefore, designated as ACECs.

Special Recreation Management Area (SRMA) -- Areas where recreation is one of the principal management objectives; where intensive recreation management is needed and that require more than minimal recreation-related investments. Generally, recreation activities in these areas are more concentrated, structured, and regulated than in ERMAs.

Extensive Recreation Management Area (ERMA) -- Areas where recreation is unstructured and dispersed, with minimal regulatory constraints and where minimal recreation-related investments are required.

Public scoping showed that many people want more BLM-managed public lands within the KFO allocated to Special Management Areas; however, others stated that they may oppose such allocation or may desire a reduction in the established quantities. Specifically, there has been high public interest in studying river segments for inclusion in the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System (NWSRS). Special designations addressed in this planning process include ACECs, WSR suitability, WSAs, and watchable wildlife viewing sites.

2.3.1.3 Energy Development

The Mineral Leasing Act of 1920 (MLA), as amended, and the Mineral Leasing Act for Acquired Lands of 1947 (MLAAL), as amended, give the BLM responsibility for oil and gas leasing on public lands. Currently, there is oil and gas development on BLM-managed public lands within the Planning Area. An oil and gas Operator is required to submit an Application for Permit to Drill (APD) for approval for every well. No drilling operations or surface-disturbance activities may be commenced prior to the BLM's approval of the permit [43 CFR 3162.3-1(c)].

Since 2000, the KFO's receipt of APDs has fluctuated, with 90 APDs submitted from 2000 through the first half of 2011 (with 2000 being a high year for the KFO, when 35 APDs were received). No APDs were received in 2003, 2006, 2007, 2010, or during the first half of 2011. Within the last 4 years, the KFO has received 4 applications for seismic surveys in Jackson County, indicating new interest in oil and gas development in that area (Hodgson 2008).

In relation to the planning process for this DRMP/DEIS, new issues and regulatory requirements are being addressed in the planning process for this DRMP/DEIS, such as enhanced protection of habitat for Greater sage-grouse (which is a BLM Sensitive Species and a Candidate for Federal listing as Threatened or Endangered). Another relevant issue is the advancements in the technologies used to access energy resources, such as directional drilling and the use of modern drilling rigs.

2.3.1.4 Fish and Wildlife

The USFWS and the CDOW are directly responsible for managing fish and wildlife species in Colorado; however, the BLM is directly responsible for managing fish and wildlife habitat on BLM-managed public lands. The BLM is also indirectly responsible for the health and well-being of fish and wildlife species whose habitats are on BLM-managed public lands. The BLM is mandated to ensure that Special Status Species are protected, by virtue of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (ESA); by agency policy, as described in the Special Status Species

Management Manual (Manual 6840) (BLM 2008o); and by the BLM Land Use Planning Handbook (H-1601-1) (BLM 2005a). The BLM also has a Memorandum of Agreement with the USFWS and the USFS regarding the protection of Special Status Species.

Management decisions related to fish and wildlife in the existing KFO RMP (BLM 1984b) include decisions related to:

- collecting additional data;
- cooperating with other agencies;
- providing new habitat, or protecting existing habitat, for specific species or populations; and
- improving habitats for particular species (BLM 1984b).

Wildlife protection and/or mitigation measures in use by the KFO have been effective in preventing impacts to wildlife and wildlife habitat; however, growing issues that warrant further examination in this planning process include fragmentation and reduced habitat quality resulting from oil and gas development, expanding subdivisions, and increased recreational use.

2.3.1.5 Sagebrush Habitat and Sagebrush-dependent Species

Sagebrush shrub lands are diverse and important habitats that support a variety of unique flora and fauna, including sage-grouse. Sagebrush shrub lands are also among the most important wintering and foraging areas for big game, especially mule deer. Generally, Wyoming Big sagebrush habitats within the Planning Area, as well as higher elevation communities of Mountain Big sagebrush and subalpine sagebrush, are in good condition, with good diversity and cover of herbaceous species. Throughout the region, sagebrush habitats continue to be threatened by a variety of influences associated with increased human presence and resource development, including conversion of the sagebrush steppe to agriculture; invasion by non-native plant species; energy extraction; rural residential expansion; and recreation. These, and other, factors have reduced, degraded, and/or fragmented sagebrush habitats. The bulk of these influences have occurred at lower elevations that contain a higher proportion of private lands that are especially critical areas for sage-grouse and wintering big game. The DRMP/DEIS addresses issues associated with sagebrush habitat fragmentation and big game winter range.

2.3.2 Other Issues

Seven (7) of the 12 planning issues identified through the initial planning and public scoping process were determined to have less impact on the development, and direction, of the proposed alternatives. These 7 issues are not considered “Key Issues;” however, they are considered in the environmental consequences analysis of the alternatives (see Chapter 4), and will have an impact on the management and use of BLM-managed public lands within the Planning Area. The 7 “Other Issues” addressed in this DRMP/DEIS are:

Vegetation;

Travel Management and Transportation;

Lands and Realty;

Wildland-urban Interface;

Rangeland Health/Upland Management;

Water/Riparian Resources; and

Cultural Resources.

2.3.2.1 Vegetation

Under all of the proposed alternatives, the desired outcomes for vegetation communities involve achieving a healthy cover of perennial vegetation that stabilizes the soil, increases infiltration of precipitation, slows surface run-off, prevents erosion, provides clean water to adjacent streams, and enhances the visual quality of BLM-managed public lands.

Rangelands within the Planning Area, which are composed primarily of sagebrush steppe and grassland communities, provide valuable cover, forage, and breeding sites for a variety of wildlife (including sage-grouse and wintering big game). These rangelands are the foundation for many resource uses, including livestock grazing. Some rangelands, especially at the lower and middle elevations, are threatened by the invasion and expansion of non-native annual cheatgrass and other noxious weeds. During public scoping, some people expressed concern that resource uses may be affecting the natural function and condition of these communities.

Coniferous forests, specifically lodgepole pine communities, are experiencing an outbreak of mountain pine beetle (MPB); approximately 85 percent to 95 percent of the lodgepole pine trees greater than 7 inches in diameter at breast height (dbh) are infected or already dead. The proposed alternatives provide varying management approaches designed to address vegetation and resource impacts from lodgepole pine mortality as a result of the MPB outbreak.

Under all of the proposed alternatives, BLM Colorado's Standards for Public Land Health and Guidelines for Livestock Grazing Management (BLM 1997a) would be met for vegetation resources. (See Section 2.3.2.5. for more information on Standards and Guidelines.)

2.3.2.2 Travel Management and Transportation

Travel and transportation are an integral part of virtually every activity that occurs on BLM-managed public lands. The DRMP/DEIS is required to comprehensively address all modes of travel and access within the Planning Area. Travel and transportation management supports, and facilitates, other uses of BLM-managed public lands; therefore, the management direction related to travel management and transportation is provided by other resources and program management objectives. In accordance with Colorado BLM guidance in Instruction Memorandum (IM) 2007-020 (BLM 2007i), areas open to cross-country travel or designated as "Open to Existing Routes" must change to areas that are designated as "Limited to Designated Routes."

2.3.2.3 Lands and Realty

Under all of the proposed alternatives, land tenure adjustments, ROW actions, land exchanges, sales and acquisition activities, as well as all other lands and realty actions, must support the goals and desired outcomes set for natural resources and resource uses. Lands and realty actions are subject to the various criteria developed from prescriptions designed to achieve the desired outcomes of other resource and resource use programs. The proposed lands and realty actions were adjusted, as necessary, in order to comply with the objectives and constraints proposed under each alternative.

2.3.2.4 Wildland-urban Interface

BLM land management issues are more complex in areas adjacent to, or near, BLM-managed public lands where population and development are rapidly expanding. The zone where public lands within the Planning Area and urban lands are contiguous or intermixed is called the wildland-urban interface (WUI). The Planning Area is faced with the challenge of sustaining BLM-managed public lands, and their associated resources, and meeting public demands in these areas.

2.3.2.5 Rangeland Health/Upland Management

Under all of the proposed alternatives, management actions would be designed in order to achieve the BLM Colorado's Standards for Public Land Health and Guidelines for Livestock Grazing Management (BLM 1997a), approved by the Secretary of the Interior on February 3, 1997. These include:

Standard 1 -- Upland soils exhibit infiltration and permeability rates that are appropriate to soil type, climate, land form, and geologic processes. Adequate soil infiltration and permeability allows for the accumulation of soil moisture necessary for optimal plant growth and vigor, and minimizes surface run-off.

Indicators:

Expression of rills, soil pedestals is minimal.

Evidence of actively-eroding gullies (incised channels) is minimal.

Canopy and ground cover are appropriate.

There is litter accumulating in place, and is not sorted by normal overland water flow.

There is appropriate organic matter in soil.

There is diversity of plant species with a variety of root depths.

Upland swales have vegetation cover or density greater than that of adjacent uplands.

There are vigorous, desirable plants.

Standard 2 -- Riparian systems associated with both running and standing water function properly, and have the ability to recover from major disturbance (such as fire, severe grazing, or 100-year floods). Riparian vegetation captures sediment, and provides forage, habitat and biodiversity. Water quality is improved or maintained. Stable soils store and release water slowly.

Indicators:

Vegetation is dominated by an appropriate mix of native or desirable introduced species.

Vigorous, desirable plants are present.

There is vegetation with diverse age class structure, appropriate vertical structure, and adequate composition, cover, and density.

Streambank vegetation is present, and is comprised of species and communities that have root systems capable of withstanding high streamflow events.

Plant species present indicate maintenance of riparian moisture characteristics.

Stream is in balance with the water and sediment being supplied by the watershed (there is no headcutting, no excessive erosion or deposition).

Vegetation and free water indicate high water tables.

Vegetation colonizes point bars with a range of age classes and successional stages.

An active floodplain is present.

Residual floodplain vegetation is available to capture and retain sediment and dissipate flood energies.

Stream channels with size and meander pattern appropriate for the stream's position in the landscape, and parent materials.

Woody debris contributes to the character of the stream channel morphology.

Standard 3 -- Healthy, productive plant and animal communities of native and other desirable species are maintained at viable population levels commensurate with the species and habitat's potential. Plants and animals at both the community and population level are productive, resilient, diverse, vigorous, and able to reproduce and sustain natural fluctuations, and ecological processes.

Indicators:

Noxious weeds and undesirable species are minimal in the overall plant community.

Native plant and animal communities are spatially distributed across the landscape with a density, composition, and frequency of species suitable to ensure reproductive capability and sustainability.

Plants and animals are present in mixed-age classes sufficient to sustain recruitment and mortality fluctuations.

Landscapes exhibit connectivity of habitat or presence of corridors to prevent habitat fragmentation.

Photosynthetic activity is evident throughout the growing season.

Diversity and density of plant and animal species are in balance with habitat/landscape potential and exhibit resilience to human activities.

Appropriate plant litter accumulates and is evenly distributed across the landscape.

Landscapes composed of several plant communities that may be in a variety of successional stages and patterns.

Standard 4 -- Special Status, Threatened and Endangered Species (Federal and State), and other plants and animals officially designated by the BLM, and their habitats, are maintained or enhanced by sustaining healthy, native plant and animal communities.

Indicators:

All the indicators associated with the plant and animal communities standard apply.

There are stable, and increasing, populations of endemic and protected species in suitable habitat.

Suitable habitat is available for recovery of endemic and protected species.

Standard 5 -- The water quality of all water bodies, including groundwater where applicable, located on, or influenced by, BLM-managed public lands will achieve or exceed the Water Quality Standards established by the State of Colorado. Water Quality Standards for surface water and groundwater include the designated beneficial uses, numeric criteria, narrative criteria, and anti-degradation requirements set forth under State law, as found in 5 CCR 1002-8, as required by Section 303(c) of the Clean Water Act (CWA).

Indicators:

Appropriate populations of macroinvertebrates, vertebrates, and algae are present.

Surface water and groundwater only contain substances (such as sediment, scum, floating debris, odor, heavy metal precipitates on channel substrate) attributable to humans within the amounts, concentrations, or combinations as directed by the Water Quality Standards established by the State of Colorado (5 CCR 1002-8).

Guidelines for Livestock Grazing Management

Guidelines are the management tools, methods, strategies, and techniques (such as BMPs) designed to maintain or achieve healthy public lands as defined by the Standards. Currently, the only guidelines for BLM Colorado that have been developed in concert with the RACs are Livestock Grazing Management Guidelines.

Guideline 1 -- Grazing management practices promote plant health by providing for 1 or more of the following:

periodic rest or deferment from grazing during critical growth periods;

adequate recovery and regrowth periods; and/or

opportunity for seed dissemination and seedling establishment.

Guideline 2 -- Grazing management practices address the kind, numbers, and class of livestock, season, duration, distribution, frequency and intensity of grazing use and livestock health.

Guideline 3 -- Grazing management practices maintain sufficient residual vegetation on both upland and riparian sites to protect the soil from wind and water erosion, to assist in maintaining appropriate soil infiltration and permeability, and to buffer temperature extremes. In riparian areas, vegetation dissipates energy, captures sediment, recharges groundwater, and contributes to stream stability.

Guideline 4 -- Native plant species and natural revegetation are emphasized in the support of sustaining ecological functions and site integrity. Where reseeding is required, on land treatment efforts, emphasis will be placed on using native plant species. Seeding of non-native plant species will be considered based upon local goals, native seed availability and cost, persistence of non-native plants and annuals and noxious weeds on the site, and composition of non-natives in the seed mix.

Guideline 5 -- Range improvement projects are designed consistent with overall ecological functions and processes with minimum adverse impacts to other resources or uses of riparian/wetland and upland sites.

Guideline 6 -- Grazing management will occur in a manner that does not encourage the establishment or spread of noxious weeds. In addition to mechanical, chemical, and biological methods of weed control, livestock may be used, where feasible, as a tool to inhibit or stop the spread of noxious weeds.

Guideline 7 -- Natural occurrences such as fire, drought, flooding, and prescribed land treatments should be combined with livestock management practices in order to move toward the sustainability of biological diversity across the landscape. This includes the maintenance, restoration, or enhancement of habitat to promote and assist the recovery and conservation of Threatened, Endangered, or other Special Status Species, by helping to provide natural vegetation patterns, a mosaic of successional stages, and vegetation corridors, and thus minimizing habitat fragmentation.

Guideline 8 -- Colorado BMPs, and other scientifically developed practices that enhance land and water quality, should be used in the development of Activity Plans prepared for land use.

In accordance with the BLM's Land Use Planning Handbook, H-1601-1 (BLM 2005a), standards for public land health must be expressed as goals in RMPs. The proposed planning criteria for this DRMP/DEIS include these standards and guidelines, and lay out a strategy for ensuring that proper grazing practices are followed. Under all of the proposed alternatives, grazing would be managed in order to maintain or improve the health of the BLM-managed public lands by incorporating conditions for permitted operations that are designed to enhance resource conditions.

2.3.2.6 Water/Riparian Resources

Under all of the proposed alternatives, the water quality of all water bodies on, or influenced by, BLM-managed public lands, including groundwater (where applicable), would be managed in a manner designed to achieve, or exceed, the water quality standards established by the State of Colorado. Water quality standards for surface water and groundwater include the designated beneficial uses, numeric criteria, narrative criteria, and anti-degradation requirements set forth under State law, as required by Section 303(c) of the Clean Water Act (CWA).

2.3.2.7 Cultural Resources

Under all of the alternatives, significant cultural resources would be protected in accordance with Section 110 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 (NHPA) and the Archaeological Resource and Protection Act of 1979 (ARPA), as well as with all other applicable laws, rules, regulations, policies, standards, and guidelines.

The NHPA, enacted in 1966 and amended in 1970 and 1980, is a Federal law that provides for a National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) that includes districts, sites, buildings, structures, and objects significant in American history, architecture, archaeology, and culture. Such places may have local, State, or national significance. Section 110 of the Act directs the heads of all Federal agencies to assume responsibility for the preservation of NRHP listed or eligible historic properties owned or controlled by their agency. Federal agencies are directed to locate, inventory, and nominate properties to the NRHP; to exercise caution in order to protect such properties; and to use such properties to the maximum extent feasible. Other major provisions of Section 110 include documentation of properties adversely affected (impacted) by Federal undertakings, the establishment of trained Federal Preservation Officers in each agency, and the inclusion of the costs of preservation activities as eligible agency project costs (16 USC 470 et seq., Section 110).

The ARPA was enacted "...to secure, for the present and future benefit of the American people, the protection of archaeological resources and sites which are on public lands and Indian lands, and to foster increased cooperation and exchange of information between governmental authorities, the professional archaeological community, and private individuals" [16 USC 470aa-470mm, Section 2(4)(b)].

Under all of the proposed alternatives, any undertaking that may affect cultural resources would take into account the potential impacts to historic properties. Field inventories and assessments, as well as record search inventories, would be conducted. Decisions would be made in

consultation with the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO), the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP), as well as Native American tribal agencies and governments, as applicable.

2.4 Description of Alternatives

This section summarizes the 4 alternatives 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.

Following the close of the public scoping period in June of 2007, the BLM began developing alternatives by assembling an ID Team of BLM resource specialists. In April of 2007, the BLM began coordinating planning efforts for this DRMP/DEIS with Cooperating Agencies. Between September of 2007 and June of 2008, the ID Team developed goals and the management actions necessary in order to meet those goals.

Four (4) management alternatives (Alternatives A, B, C, and D) were developed and analyzed in order to fulfill the Purpose and Need for this DRMP/DEIS (see Section 1.5, Purpose and Need for the DRMP/DEIS); to meet the multiple-use and sustained-yield mandates of the FLPMA; and to address the 12 planning issues developed during the scoping process. The 4 alternatives offer a reasonable range of management options that resolve the issues identified in the Community Assessment Report (BLM 2007n), the scoping process, and other outreach activities. The alternative development included input from Cooperating Agencies, the Northwest Colorado Resource Advisory Council (NWRAC) subgroups, visitor studies, focus groups, and informal interviews. Information was also gleaned from reports, including the ACEC Report on the Relevance and Importance Criteria (BLM 2007h) (see Appendix S for the portion of the evaluation applicable to the KFO); the NWSRS Eligibility Study (BLM 2007c) and the NWSRS Suitability Study (BLM 2008c); and the Visual Resource Management (VRM) Study (Otak 2007).

Each of the proposed alternatives represents a complete potential RMP, and provides management direction for resource programs based upon the development of specific goals, desired outcomes, and management actions. Each alternative 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 Key Issues and Other 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 (such as Travel Route designations). Each alternative's general direction is summarized in Sections 2.4.1 through

2.4.4, below. (See 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.)

Adaptive Management

The DOI defines Adaptive Management as "...a decision process that promotes flexible decision-making that can be adjusted in the face of uncertainties as outcomes from management actions and other events become better understood. Careful monitoring of these outcomes both advances scientific understanding and helps adjust policies or operations as part of an iterative learning process. Adaptive management also recognizes the importance of natural variability in contributing to ecological resilience and productivity. It is not a 'trial-and-error' process, but rather emphasizes learning while doing. Adaptive management does not represent an end in itself, but rather a means to more effective decisions and enhanced benefits. Its true measure is in how well it helps meet environmental, social, and economic goals; increases scientific knowledge; and reduces tensions among stakeholders." (Williams et al. 2009).

The systematic process of Adaptive Management (planning, implementation, monitoring, and evaluation) will be used by the KFO in order to determine the success of management actions in achieving the desired outcomes described under each of the proposed alternatives, and would be conducted within the framework of the Approved RMP. On-the-ground Adaptive Management implementation would be guided by the DOI's Technical Guide "Adaptive Management" (Williams et al. 2009). This DRMP/DEIS is based upon current scientific knowledge and best available data. In order to be successful, the implementation of the Approved Plan must have the flexibility to adapt and respond to new information. Under the concept of Adaptive Management, new information and/or changing conditions will be regularly evaluated, and decisions will be made as to whether to make implementation adjustments or changes. The Adaptive Management approach will enable resource managers to determine how well implementation actions achieve the desired outcomes, and what steps are needed in order to increase success or improve results.

Identification of the Preferred Alternative

This DRMP/DEIS presents 4 different alternatives, which take into consideration comments received by local, State, Native American tribal, and other Federal agencies and governments; public and private groups and organizations; and interested individuals. Public collaboration, garnered through the scoping process, shaped the focus on issues, including recreation, wildlife, minerals, cultural resources, rangeland health and grazing, land tenure, designation of special management areas (such as ACECs), access to public lands, and other topics. As part of the planning process, the alternatives evaluated in the DRMP/DEIS represent the range of management actions designed to address the issues identified during scoping, and that offer a distinct choice among potential management strategies.

The CEQ regulations for implementing the NEPA require the Lead Agency preparing an EIS to identify the agency's Preferred Alternative in the DRMP/DEIS (Sec 1502-14). The Preferred Alternative is the alternative that, at this stage, best represents the resolution of planning issues and promotes balanced multiple-use and sustained-yield objectives. During the public review of the DRMP/DEIS, the BLM will seek comments on the Preferred Alternative. After consideration of these comments, the BLM will develop a Proposed RMP/Final EIS (PRMP/FEIS), which may

present a different Preferred Alternative than the one presented in this DRMP/DEIS. The KFO Field Manager must recommend to the BLM's Colorado State Director which of the range of alternatives best represents the basis on which to develop the PRMP/FEIS.

As part of the KFO's ongoing consultation with the Cooperating Agencies, as well as coordination with the NWRAC subgroup, input was requested on the selection of the Preferred Alternative for the DRMP/DEIS. The selection of the Preferred Alternative was made while the document was being revised as a single document for the CRVFO (formerly the GJFO) and the KFO. The CRVFO selected Alternative B as the Preferred Alternative. In order to maintain consistency, Alternative B was recommended by the KFO Field Manager as the Preferred Alternative for the KFO DRMP/DEIS.

Management Actions Common to All Alternatives

Some of the allowable uses and management actions in this DRMP/DEIS are carried forward from the existing RMP (BLM 1984b) because there is no impending issue or concern associated with them, or because they were not identified during consultation or scoping as requiring change. These decisions are common to all 4 of the proposed alternatives. Other decisions are common to all action alternatives (Alternative B, Alternative C, and Alternative D) only. Each alternative emphasizes a slightly different mix of resources and resource uses, but many similarities exist. All alternatives must:

comply with applicable State and Federal laws, rules, regulations, policies, standards, and guidelines, including the multiple-use and sustained-yield mandates of the FLPMA;

conduct implementation actions (day-to-day management, monitoring, and administrative functions) that stem directly from law, rules, regulations, policies, standards, and guidelines that are considered to be in conformance with the alternatives, whether or not they are specifically addressed under the alternatives;

provide for human safety and property protection related to wildfire;

designate, in Limited travel areas, specific routes for motorized, mechanized, and non-motorized/non-mechanized use;

incorporate the Standards for Public Land Health and Guidelines for Livestock Management in Colorado (BLM 1997a) as goals in the alternatives;

authorize livestock grazing in a manner consistent with the Standards for Public Land Health and Guidelines for Livestock Management in Colorado (BLM 1997a);

sustain habitat in sufficient quantities and quality for viable plant, fish, and wildlife populations;

include protective measures that minimize air and water pollutants;

adhere to the Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment's (CDPHE's) Air Quality Control Commission Regulations (CDPHE 2008c), as required by law, in order to ensure that the CAA is not violated (special requirements to alleviate air quality impacts are included on a

case-by-case basis in use authorizations, including lease stipulations, within the scope of the BLM's authority);

facilitate orderly, economic, and environmentally sound energy development;

continue to manage WSAs in compliance with the BLM's Interim Management Policy for lands under wilderness review (BLM 1995);

offer a diversity of recreational opportunities that foster outdoor lifestyles, and that add to people's quality of life;

conserve key scenic vistas that communities and visitors value;

provide some sustainable forest and woodland products while, at the same time, maintaining landscape diversity and ecosystem integrity;

apply Conditions of Approval (COAs), BMPs, stipulations, and other site-specific mitigation measures (such as recreation guidelines) to all resource uses;

apply COAs BMPs, stipulations, and other site-specific mitigation measures designed to minimize erosion, encourage rapid reclamation, retain soils using stormwater mitigation practices, maintain soil stability, and support resources;

collaborate with adjacent landowners, State and other Federal agencies, Native American Tribes, communities, and other individuals and organizations, as needed, in order to attain and monitor water quality standards and to provide source water protection;

participate in partnerships and communicate with other agencies and interested parties (such as Habitat Partnership Program, Rocky Mountain Elk Foundation, Ducks Unlimited, Trout Unlimited, the CDOW, the USFWS, and the USFS); and

apply Suggested Practices for Raptor Protection on Power Lines: the State of the Art in 2006 (Avian Power Line Interaction Committee 2006) and Avian Protection Plan Guidelines (APLIC and USFWS 2005) for new power line construction (including upgrades and reconstruction) in order to prevent raptor electrocution.

In addition to these common elements, Table 2-2, Descriptions of Alternative A, Alternative B, Alternative C, and Alternative D, includes allowable uses and management actions common to all 4 of the proposed alternatives.

Oil and Gas Leasing Reform

The Master Leasing Plan (MLP) concept, which was introduced in the Washington Office Leasing Reform Instruction Memorandum (IM) 2010-117, promotes a proactive approach to planning for oil and gas development. The BLM uses RMPs in order to make oil and gas planning decisions [such as areas closed to leasing, open to leasing, or open to leasing with major or moderate constraints (lease stipulations)] based upon known resource values. The BLM issued IM 2010-117 so that the BLM can re-evaluate its leasing decisions in outdated RMPs in light of changing circumstances. The IM2010-117 lists criteria for the BLM to use when

determining whether circumstances warrant additional planning and analysis above and beyond the RMP. The BLM prepares an MLP when all 4 of the following criteria are met:

A substantial portion of the area to be analyzed in the MLP is not currently leased.

There is a majority Federal mineral interest.

The oil and gas industry has expressed a specific interest in leasing, and there is a moderate or high potential for oil and gas confirmed by the discovery of oil and gas in the general area.

Additional analysis or information is needed in order to address likely resource or cumulative impacts if oil and gas development were to occur where there are:

multiple-use or natural/cultural resource conflicts;

impacts to air quality;

impacts to the resources or values of any unit of the National Park System, National Wildlife Refuge, or National Forest Wilderness Area, as determined after consultation or coordination with the NPS, the USFWS, or the USFS; or

impacts on other specially designated areas.

After a thorough analysis, the BLM determined that the North Park proposed MLP did not meet all of the criteria established in the IM:

Criteria Number 1: A substantial portion of the area to be analyzed in the MLP is not currently leased -- The proposed MLP is 30 percent leased. In addition, a large portion (58.4 percent) of the unleased Federal minerals is under National Forest System Lands, and the IM does not apply to National Forest System Lands; therefore, Criteria Number 1 is not met.

Criteria Number 2: There is a majority Federal mineral interest -- The majority of Federal interest in the area is approximately 63.6 percent; therefore, Criteria Number 2 is met.

Criteria Number 3: The oil and gas industry has expressed a specific interest in leasing, and there is a moderate or high potential for oil and gas confirmed by the discovery of oil and gas in the general area -- The proposed MLP area has had expressions of interest by the oil and gas industry; however, these are primarily found in the low potential areas, therefore, Criteria Number 3 is not met.

Criteria Number 4: Additional analysis or information is needed in order to address likely resource or cumulative impacts if oil and gas development were to occur where there are:

multiple-use or natural/cultural resource conflicts -- Resource conflicts, based upon protests for recent lease sales in the area, include Greater sage-grouse, big game, raptors, fish, plants, and recreation; therefore, this criterion is met.

impacts to air quality -- Air emissions would be produced during all phases of oil and gas development, including exploration, well development, production, and well abandonment and road closures; therefore, this criterion is met.

impacts to the resources or values of any unit of the National Park System, a National Wildlife Refuge, or a USFS Wilderness Area, as determined after consultation or coordination with the NPS, the USFWS, or the USFS -- Leasing decisions in the North Park MLP area would not affect Rocky Mountain National Park, the Arapaho National Wildlife Refuge, or nearby by National Forest System lands; therefore, this criterion is not met.

impacts on other specially designated areas -- Oil and gas leasing reforms are built in as part of the alternatives proposed in the DRMP/DEIS; therefore, this criterion is not met.

The alternative development process associated with this DRMP/DEIS was well underway when the BLM issued IM 2010-117. Due to the stage of development, the KFO did not analyze the proposed North Park MLP as a separate alternative. The oil and gas impacts are analyzed within the established range of alternatives for the North Park MLP. (The specific analysis for the North Park MLP can be found in Appendix V.) The DRMP/DEIS incorporated an MLP-like management analysis in:

Chapter 3, which describes the existing condition relating to oil and gas development found within the Planning Area that could be affected by the implementation of the proposed alternatives described in Chapter 2.

Chapter 4, which analyzes the environmental impacts, including cumulative impacts that would result from the development of oil and gas resources (including the North Park area), under the different proposed alternatives.

Part of the BLM's implementation of the policy is to ensure oil and gas leasing stipulation consistency among the BLM Field Offices in each State, as well as among the various States. As this DRMP/DEIS was being prepared, leasing stipulations for the BLM in Colorado have been undergoing revisions. For the purposes of this DRMP/DEIS, the stipulations described under Alternative A (the No Action Alternative) are the existing leasing stipulations, which would continue to be applied to new leases until the Statewide stipulation Consistency Review and revision process is completed and the new stipulations are adopted. (See Appendix C for the current stipulations.) The stipulations described under Alternative B, Alternative C, and Alternative D below (and in Appendix B) are the current versions of the new leasing stipulations, which would be applied to new leases when the stipulations are adopted. The new stipulations are being used in this DRMP/DEIS in order to disclose the likely impacts resulting from their use. There may be changes, including editorial changes, and renumbering of the new stipulations by the time they are adopted, which will be reflected in the PRMP/FEIS. Oil and gas leasing stipulations are developed through land use planning; therefore, the new stipulations developed in the Consistency Review would be adopted in the Record of Decision (ROD) for the final Approved Plan, or by means of a Statewide RMP Amendment, whichever comes first. If the latter occurs first, the approved stipulations would become part of the Approved Plan for the KFO.

Oil and Gas Leasing Stipulations

Oil and gas leasing stipulations apply to surface-disturbing activities related to developing oil and gas leases on lands overlying Federal mineral estate, which include BLM-managed public lands, privately owned lands, and State-owned lands. As such, the Federal mineral estate acres are greater than BLM-managed surface acres. Within the Planning Area, Federal mineral estate totals approximately 2,240,775 surface and subsurface acres. Lands managed by the USFS will have leasing decisions made in the appropriate USFS Land and Resource Management Plans. The USFS land use plans analyze impacts from oil and gas leasing and development on National Forest System lands, and describe where the USFS will, and will not, consent to leasing. The BLM conducts leasing on National Forest System lands when the USFS consents. The BLM is also responsible for leasing and developing lands managed by the NPS, the USFWS, and other Federal agencies; however, within the Planning Area, the Arapaho National Wildlife Refuge, the Arapaho National Recreation Area, and the portion of Rocky Mountain National Park within the KFO Planning Area are not eligible for leasing.

2.4.1 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 Activity Plans or 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), allowable uses, 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. Key components of Alternative A are:

Recreational Demand and Uses -- Recreation would be managed for the continued availability of outdoor recreational opportunities, visitor resource interpretation, and visitor safety. Two (2) SRMAs, totaling approximately 13,650 acres, would be managed.

Energy Development -- The exploration of fluid and non-fluid energy resources would be managed using existing terms, conditions, and stipulations as currently applied to oil and gas leasing and development. Under this alternative, approximately 642,900 acres within the Planning Area would be open to oil and gas leasing and development. Currently, many of these areas are subject to major [no surface occupancy (NSO)] or moderate [controlled surface use (CSU)] stipulations or timing limitations (TLs).

Fish and Wildlife -- Conditions and trends of all aquatic habitats within perennial streams or lakes would be maintained and, where needed, improved at levels conducive to a healthy aquatic community. Habitat would be managed in a manner designed to support optimum terrestrial wildlife population levels (as determined cooperatively with the CDOW and the USFWS) commensurate with Public Land Health Standards and Guidelines (BLM 1997a).

Special Status Species and their habitats would be managed in a manner designed to provide for their continued presence, in accordance with applicable laws, rules, regulations, policies, standards, and guidelines. Current stipulations (such as seasonal protections) would continue in a manner designed to protect Sensitive Species habitat (such as Greater sage-grouse).

Sagebrush Habitat and Sagebrush-dependent Species -- Implementation measures designed to protect occupied and suitable habitat for sagebrush-dependent species would be continued. Habitat treatments designed to enhance sagebrush habitat for sagebrush-dependent species would be implemented.

Special Designations -- Existing ACECs and WSAs would be managed, including 2 ACECs (approximately 516 acres) and 3 WSAs (approximately 8,872 acres).

Wild and Scenic Rivers -- In addition, protective management of 15 waterway segments eligible for inclusion in the NWSRS would be implemented.

Wilderness Characteristics -- The KFO RMP (BLM 1984b) did not address managing for wilderness characteristics outside of WSAs.

2.4.2 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. (See Section 2.4 for a discussion of the selection of the Preferred Alternative.) Key components of Alternative B are:

Recreational Demand and Uses -- Alternative B would emphasize a variety of recreational activities, as well as the protection of natural resource recreation settings. Current recreational uses would be recognized and accommodated, where possible, when considering allowable uses. Alternative B would identify 2 SRMAs (approximately 15,550 acres) that offer a diversity of recreational opportunities, natural resource recreation settings, experiences, and beneficial outcomes. The 2 ERMAs (approximately 48,200 acres) would also offer dispersed recreational opportunities (recreation of various kinds that could occur in a scattered manner throughout a large area that would not be confined to a specific place or to developed facilities). The BLM-managed public lands not designated as either SRMAs or ERMAs would not be managed specifically for recreational opportunities.

Energy Development -- Under this alternative, approximately 625,200 acres within the Planning Area would be open to oil and gas leasing and development. The KFO would manage (in accordance with applicable laws, rules, regulations, policies, standards, guidelines, agreements, COAs, and BMPs) the exploration and development of oil and gas and mineral resources. Stipulations, such as NSOs and TLs, would be applied to oil and gas leases in order to ensure that development is performed in an environmentally responsible manner.

Fish and Wildlife -- Fish and wildlife species (including Special Status Species) would be strategically managed with an emphasis on protecting crucial habitat, stream flows, and riparian areas. Management actions would protect and improve priority habitat, winter range (quantity

and quality), and core wildlife areas. Development would be moderately limited in, and seasonal restrictions would be applied to, winter range.

Sagebrush Habitat and Sagebrush-dependent Species -- Alternative B would emphasize identifying and protecting sagebrush habitat for sagebrush-dependent species. Alternative B would also implement habitat treatments in order to enhance sagebrush habitat for sagebrush-dependent species.

Special Designations -- Alternative B would maintain the 3 existing WSAs (approximately 8,872 acres). It would protect natural and cultural values by administratively designating 6 ACECs (approximately 8,570 acres), and by applying proactive mitigation measures.

Wild and Scenic Rivers -- In relation to WSRs, Alternative B is divided into Alternative B1 and Alternative B2. Under Alternative B1, the KFO would find 2 segments (approximately 20.62 miles) of the Colorado River (Colorado River Segments 4 and 5; between the mouth of Gore Canyon and State Bridge) suitable for Congressional designation in the NWSRS. Under Alternative B2, the KFO would defer a determination of suitability, and would recommend adopting and implementing the Stakeholder Group's Management Plan in order to protect the free-flowing nature, outstanding remarkable values (ORVs), and tentative classifications on the Colorado River segments.

Wilderness Characteristics -- BLM-managed public lands within the Planning Area would not be managed in a manner specifically designed in order to maintain wilderness character.

2.4.3 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. Key components of Alternative C are:

Recreational Demand and Uses -- Current recreation uses would be recognized; however, such uses may not necessarily be accommodated when considering allowable uses. Alternative C would designate 3 SRMAs, totaling approximately 23,450 acres. One (1) ERMA (totaling approximately 800 acres) would be designated. Recreational opportunities would be offered that are in concert with sustaining the ecological integrity of habitats for priority plant, wildlife, and fish species. This would include a mix of recreation throughout the Planning Area. However, in more ecologically sensitive areas, recreation use may be more limited. BLM-managed public

lands not designated as either SRMAs or ERMAs would not be managed specifically for recreational opportunities.

Energy Development -- Under this alternative, approximately 382,400 acres within the Planning Area would be open to oil and gas leasing and development. The KFO would manage (in accordance with all applicable laws, rules, regulations, policies, standards, guidelines, agreements, COAs, and BMPs) the exploration of oil and gas and mineral resources in high-potential areas. Extensive application of stipulations would be applied to oil and gas leases (such as NSOs and TLs) in order to ensure that energy development is performed in an environmentally responsible manner. Stipulations would be aimed at maximum conservation of the relatively unmodified physical landscapes, the essential conditions of natural and cultural resources, and compatibility with adjacent land uses. Under Alternative C, additional areas would be closed to energy development in order to emphasize resource conservation and protection (especially for wildlife, Special Status Species, vegetation, soils, air quality, and riparian areas) while, at the same time, providing opportunities for energy development.

Fish and Wildlife -- Fish and wildlife species, including Special Status Species, would be managed with an emphasis on proactively identifying, protecting, and improving habitats (such as sensitive and crucial wildlife habitat). Management actions would also protect and improve priority habitat, winter range (quantity and quality), and core wildlife areas. Sections of core wildlife areas would be closed, or major constraints (NSO stipulations) would be applied to oil and gas leasing. Protection of tributary watersheds, fish-bearing streams, stream flows, riparian areas, and habitat connections and migration corridors would be maximized. Development would be limited in, and seasonal restrictions would be applied to, winter range.

Sagebrush Habitat and Sagebrush-dependent Species -- The KFO would proactively identify, protect, and improve wildlife habitat, including treatments for the benefit of sagebrush-dependent species, especially in areas identified as historical habitats. Alternative C would include establishing reference areas that would be used as control groups for evaluating management activities in sagebrush habitat. In sage-grouse core areas within the Planning Area, BLM-managed public lands would be closed to oil and gas leasing.

Special Designations -- Alternative C would maintain the 3 existing WSAs (approximately 8, 872 acres). It would protect natural and cultural values by administratively designating 8 ACECs (approximately 9,250 acres), and by applying proactive mitigation measures.

Wild and Scenic Rivers -- Alternative C would provide protective management and make findings of suitability for the Congressional designation for all 15 segments eligible for inclusion in the NWSRS (approximately 87.38 miles).

Wilderness Characteristics -- BLM-managed public lands within the Planning Area that have wilderness characteristics would be managed for those characteristics, with specific prescriptions for protecting them.

2.4.4 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. Key components of Alternative D are:

Recreational Demand and Uses -- Alternative D would emphasize managing BLM-managed public lands in a manner designed to produce opportunities for recreation in combination with other BLM land uses. Alternative D would manage recreation settings for higher numbers of users. Alternative D would have 6 SRMAs, totaling approximately 84,850 acres.

Energy Development -- Under this alternative, approximately 625,300 acres within the Planning Area would be open to oil and gas leasing and development. Alternative D would manage (in accordance with applicable laws, rules, regulations, policies, standards, guidelines, agreements, COAs, and BMPs) the exploration of oil and gas and mineral resources in a manner designed to maximize exploration and development in moderate- to high-potential areas while, at the same time, meeting the basic needs for resource conservation and protection, as well as compatibility with multiple uses. More public land would be opened to leasing in specific geographic locations than under Alternative B or under Alternative C. Alternative D would include less-restrictive oil and gas leasing stipulations, such as CSUs and TLs, than would Alternatives B or Alternative C.

Fish and Wildlife -- Alternative D would continue to manage fish and wildlife (including Special Status Species) with an emphasis on protecting crucial habitat, including protecting stream flows and riparian areas.

Sagebrush Habitat and Sagebrush-dependent Species -- Fewer restrictions would be placed on uses in sagebrush habitat than would be placed under Alternatives B or under Alternative C.

Special Designations -- Alternative D would maintain 3 existing WSAs (approximately 8, 872 acres). It would include protecting natural and cultural resource values by administratively designating 2 ACECs (approximately 516 acres), and by applying proactive mitigation measures.

Wild and Scenic Rivers -- No segments eligible for inclusion in the NWSRS would be found suitable for Congressional designation under this Alternative.

Wilderness Characteristics -- BLM-managed public lands within the Planning Area would not be managed in a manner specifically designed to maintain wilderness character; however, other management actions under this alternative would help protect some wilderness characteristics.

2.5 Alternatives Considered but Eliminated from Detailed Analysis

The following alternatives were considered, but not carried forward for detailed analysis because: 1) they would not fulfill requirements of the FLPMA, or other applicable laws, rules, regulations, policies, standards, or guidelines; 2) they did not meet the Purpose and Need for this DRMP/DEIS; 3) they were already part of an existing plan, policy, or administrative function; or 4) they did not fall within the limits of the planning criteria (BLM Manual H-1790-a, BLM 2008a).

Alternatives that were considered, but eliminated from detailed analysis, are discussed below.

Implement Exclusive Use or Protection

Alternatives and general management options that proposed exclusive use or maximum development, production, or protection of one resource at the expense of other resources or resource uses were considered but eliminated from further analysis. The FLPMA mandates that the BLM manage the public lands for multiple use and sustained yield. This eliminates exclusive use or exclusive protection alternatives (such as closing all BLM-managed public lands to grazing, oil and gas leasing; or managing public lands only for fish, or wildlife, or wilderness values, to the exclusion of other resource considerations). In addition, resource conditions do not warrant the prohibition of any specific use throughout the Planning Area. Alternatives that would propose eliminating traditional uses, where resource conditions do not justify such measures, are not reasonable. Each alternative considered allows for some level of support, protection, or use of all resources within the Planning Area. In some instances, the alternatives analyzed in detail do include various considerations for eliminating or maximizing individual resource values or uses in specific areas where conflicts exist.

Designate Entire Planning Area as either Open or Closed to OHV Use

Alternatives proposed in order to designate the entire Planning Area as entirely Open to OHV use throughout the year, without regard to current travel restrictions, were considered but eliminated from further analysis. Alternatives proposed in order to close the entire Planning Area to OHV use was also considered but eliminated from further analysis. The management of public lands requires the implementation of restrictions in order to address travel concerns and recreation demands, as well as the protection of resource values. In addition, the KFO concluded that the current level of Open, Closed, or Limited OHV areas would be used as a baseline for comparing alternatives.

Conduct Partial Implementation of an Approved Plan

Alternatives that would focus on only a few issues, or that would otherwise result in only the partial implementation of the final Approved Plan, were considered but eliminated from detailed study. Preparation, and full implementation, of an RMP is a BLM requirement; therefore, these alternatives were dismissed as infeasible or impracticable, or they were excluded due to legal insufficiency under BLM requirements.

Place Moratorium on Land Exchanges

An alternative that would place a moratorium on land exchanges was considered but eliminated from further analysis. Congress has determined that land exchanges are an efficient land management tool for consolidating land ownership, as long as individual exchanges are determined to be in the public interest and are done within regulatory constraints.

Designate Additional Wilderness Study Areas

An alternative that would designate additional WSAs was considered but eliminated from further analysis because the BLM's authority to establish WSAs ended in 1993 (under Section 603 of

the FLPMA). The BLM has the authority under the FLPMA to determine if there are wilderness characteristics outside existing WSAs. (Appendix H, Wilderness Characteristics Assessments, includes results of the BLM's inventory of these non-WSA public lands in relation to wilderness character.) Areas having wilderness characteristics are identified in this DRMP/DEIS. Values associated with solitude, primitive recreation, and naturalness are considered along with all other resources and resource uses. Areas where wilderness character was not found were not brought forward for analysis. The proposed alternatives provide management options for managing public lands with wilderness characteristics, including allocations and actions that protect these values.

Close Entire Planning Area to Livestock Grazing

Consideration was given to an alternative that proposed eliminating livestock grazing from all BLM-managed public lands within the Planning Area; however, it was eliminated from further analysis. Any alternative that proposes to make the entire Planning Area unavailable for a specific use, such as grazing, would not meet the Purpose and Need for the DRMP/DEIS. The NEPA requires that agencies study, develop, and describe appropriate alternatives in order to recommended courses of action that involve unresolved conflicts concerning alternative uses of available resources. However, no issues or conflicts have been identified during the planning process that would require the complete elimination of grazing within the Planning Area for their resolution. Where appropriate, removal of livestock and adjustments to livestock use have been incorporated into the alternatives (on an allotment or area basis) in order to address planning issues that have been identified. The BLM has considerable discretion, through its grazing regulations, to determine and adjust stocking levels, seasons of use, and grazing management activities, and to allocate forage uses; therefore, the analysis of an alternative that would entirely eliminate grazing is not necessary.

In addition, an alternative that proposes to make the entire Planning Area unavailable for grazing would be inconsistent with the intent of the Taylor Grazing Act of 1934. The Act directs the BLM to provide for livestock use of BLM-managed public lands; to adequately safeguard grazing privileges; to provide for the orderly use, improvement, and development of the range; and to stabilize the livestock industry that depends upon the public range.

The FLPMA requires that public lands be managed on a multiple-use and sustained-yield basis [Sections 302(a) and 102(7)]. Livestock grazing is a principal or major use of public lands. Multiple use does not mean, or require, that all public lands be used for livestock grazing; however, complete removal of livestock grazing from the entire Planning Area would be arbitrary and would not meet the principle of multiple use and sustained yield.

In relation to grazing, potential conflicts may exist between resources and resource uses, and these conflicts were considered while developing the alternatives. The KFO has the discretion to adjust livestock use levels. Reduction, changes to, or elimination of, livestock grazing may be used on specific allotments where livestock grazing is resulting in, or contributing to, unacceptable conflicts with the protection or management, or both, of other resource values or uses. Livestock grazing has been a valid use within the Planning Area for many years, and is a continuing BLM management program. The CEQ's guidelines for implementing the NEPA require that agencies analyze the No Action Alternative; however, for the purposes of this analysis, the No Action Alternative (Alternative A) is to continue current management, which includes livestock grazing. For this reason, as well as those stated above, a No Grazing

Alternative for the entire Planning Area has been eliminated from further consideration in this DRMP/DEIS.

2.6 Summary Comparison of Alternatives and Environmental Consequences

Table 2-1 (Comparative Summary of Alternatives) describes the meaningful differences among alternatives relative to what they establish, and to where they occur. Table 2-2 (Descriptions of Alternative A, Alternative B, Alternative C, and Alternative D) provides detailed descriptions of the alternatives. Table 2-3 (Summary of Kremmling Field Office Wild and Scenic River Eligible Segment Lengths and Corridor Acreages) summarizes the KFO's WSR eligible segment lengths and corridor acreages. Table 2-4 (Summary of Environmental Consequences from Alternative A, Alternative B, Alternative C, and Alternative D) summarizes, by alternative, the environmental consequences of the actions proposed under the 4 alternatives.

Table 2-1 Comparative Summary of Alternatives						
Resource or Resource Use	Unit of Measure	Notes	Alt A	Alt B	Alt C	Alt D
Visual Resource Management (VRM)	Acres		Alt A	Alt B	Alt C	Alt D
VRM Class I			0	8,900	24,600	8,900
VRM Class II			185,300	136,500	155,400	62,700
VRM Class III			149,800	219,900	185,400	212,100
VRM Class IV			42,800	12,500	12,500	94,100
		Total Acres	377,900	377,800	377,900	377,800
Wildland Fire Management	Acres		Alt A	Alt B	Alt C	Alt D
Evaluate fuel conditions, fire danger, and hazards. Manage by mechanical, chemical, and prescribed fire treatments. Manage wildland fire for multiple objectives. Focus areas for fuels management and analysis:				•	•	•
Yarmony Mountain Management Focus Area	19,000			•	•	•
Troublesome Management Focus Area	8,100			•	•	•
Jensen and Kinney Creek Management Focus Area	16,900			•	•	•
Strawberry Management Focus Area	7,800			•	•	•
Independence Mountain/Pearl Management Focus Area	16,400			•	•	•
Non-WSA Lands Managed for Wilderness Characteristics	Acres		Alt A	Alt B	Alt C	Alt D
Troublesome	2,346				• ¹	
Drowsy Water	7,509				•	
Strawberry	5,834				•	
		Total Acres	0	0	15,689	0
Forestry	Acres or PSQ		Alt A	Alt B	Alt C	Alt D
Acres Commercial Forest/Intensive Management			40,000	28,100	24,000	28,100
Acres Forest and Woodland/Limited Management			60,000	65,800	69,900	65,800

Table 2-1 Comparative Summary of Alternatives						
Resource or Resource Use	Unit of Measure	Notes	Alt A	Alt B	Alt C	Alt D
Probable Sale Quantity (PSQ) (million board feet)			2.3	2.3	2.0	3.5
		Total Acres Commercial Forest/Intensive Management	40,000	28,100	24,000	28,100
		Total PSQ	2.3	2.3	2.0	3.5
Livestock Grazing	Acres or AUMs		Alt A	Alt B	Alt C	Alt D
Acres open to livestock grazing			336,900	329,100	322,300	329,300
Acres closed to livestock grazing			41,000	48,800	55,600	48,600
		Total Acres	377,900	377,900	377,900	377,900
Available AUMs		Total AUMs	39,400	38,909	38,865	39,037
SRMAs	Acres	Targeted Activities in SRMA	Alt A	Alt B	Alt C	Alt D
Headwaters	34,800	Hiking, horseback riding, hunting, camping, wildlife viewing, scenic viewing, snowshoeing, cross-country skiing, snowmobile riding, motorcycle riding				•
North Sand Hills	1,450	OHV riding on sand dunes, camping, hiking	•	•	•	•
Strawberry	7,900	Motorcycle riding, fishing, hiking, OHV riding			•	•
Upper Colorado River (West of State Highway 9)	12,200 (A) 14,100 (B, C,) 14,200 (D)	Floatboating, fishing, kayaking, rafting, camping	•	•	•	•
Upper Colorado River (East of State Highway 9)	800 (D)	Fishing				•
Wolford	25,700	OHV riding, extreme jeeping, hunting, fishing, hiking, bicycling				•
		Total Acres	13,650	15,500	23,450	84,850

Table 2-1 Comparative Summary of Alternatives						
Resource or Resource Use	Unit of Measure	Notes	Alt A	Alt B	Alt C	Alt D
ERMAs	Acres		Alt A	Alt B	Alt C	Alt D
Headwaters	13,800					
Strawberry	7,900					
Upper Colorado River (East)						
Wolford	25,700					
		Total Acres	0	48,200	800	0
Travel and Transportation Management	Acres or Miles		Alt A	Alt B	Alt C	Alt D
Acres Open (and, seasonally, Limited) to OHVs			307,300	200	50	200
Acres Limited to Existing Routes			7,300	0	0	0
Acres Limited to Designated Routes			54,500	369,300	353,800	369,300
Miles of routes designated for full-sized vehicles (vehicles 50 inches or greater in width)			1,739	872	710	870
Miles of routes designated for ATVs (vehicles less than 50 inches in width)			73	14	30	50
Miles of routes designated for motorcycles (1 front wheel and 1 rear wheel)			53	21	20	70
Miles of routes designated for mechanized vehicles (non-motorized with 1 front wheel and 1 rear wheel)			0	12	5	3
Miles of routes designated for foot/horse			99	72	110	80
Miles of routes designated for foot			33	6	5	6
Miles of routes designated for administrative use			22	626	1,040	950
Miles of routes designated for rehabilitation			0	433	520	370
Acres Closed to OHV use			8,700	8,400	24,100	8,400
		Total Acres	377,900	377,900	377,900	377,900
Lands and Realty	Acres		Alt A	Alt B	Alt C	Alt D
ROW Avoidance Areas			N/A	97,700	252,300	75,500
ROW Exclusion Areas			N/A	9,600	26,100	9,100
Retention Areas (land tenure)		Includes high value Federal mineral estate	N/A	457,700	474,200	336,500

Table 2-1 Comparative Summary of Alternatives						
Resource or Resource Use	Unit of Measure	Notes	Alt A	Alt B	Alt C	Alt D
		under all surface owners.				
Areas identified for disposal		Current acreage is 20,400 less than original Alt. A acreage due to previous land tenure adjustments.	398,300	N/A	N/A	N/A
Stipulations for Surface-disturbing Activities	Acres (Federal mineral estate²)		Alt A	Alt B	Alt C	Alt D
No Surface Occupancy (NSO) or surface-disturbing activities			24,700	232,200	224,000	209,000
Controlled Surface Use (CSU)			250,500	512,000	519,300	508,700
Timing Limitations (TLs)			562,900	520,200	520,200	520,200
Fluid Minerals	Acres (Federal mineral estate²)		Alt A	Alt B	Alt C	Alt D
Closed to fluid minerals leasing			10,600	28,300	271,100	28,200
High-potential areas closed to fluid minerals leasing			0	0	76,800	0
Moderate-potential areas closed to fluid minerals leasing			200	200	6,700	200
Open to fluid minerals leasing			642,900	625,200	382,400	625,300
High-potential areas open to fluid minerals leasing			114,000	114,000	37,200	114,000
Moderate-potential areas open to fluid minerals leasing			47,900	47,900	41,400	47,900
High Potential Areas						
With major constraints (NSO)			5,700	33,100	29,600	28,900
With minor constraints (CSU)			24,700	110,500	110,600	110,100
With minor constraints (TL)			104,300	112,500	112,500	112,500
Moderate Potential Areas						
With major constraints (NSO)			800	11,900	13,600	12,300

Table 2-1 Comparative Summary of Alternatives						
Resource or Resource Use	Unit of Measure	Notes	Alt A	Alt B	Alt C	Alt D
With minor constraints (CSU)			24,000	41,900	42,200	42,200
With minor constraints (TL)			45,700	46,000	46,000	46,000
Locatable Minerals	Surface Acres		Alt A	Alt B	Alt C	Alt D
Recommended for petition for withdrawal from operation under the General Mining Act of 1872			0	18,200	32,400	18,200
Open to location under the General Mining Act of 1872		Includes Federal mineral estate under all surface owners.	639,600	635,300	621,100	635,300
		Total Acres	653,500	653,500	653,500	653,500
Salable Minerals	Surface Acres		Alt A	Alt B	Alt C	Alt D
Closed to mineral material (salables) disposal			0	41,200	66,800	27,500
Open to mineral material (salables)			377,500	336,700	311,100	374,500
		Total Acres	377,900	377,900	377,900	377,900
Non-energy Solid Leasable Minerals	Surface Acres					
Closed to non-energy solid mineral leasing			0	41,200	66,800	5,300
Open to non-energy solid mineral leasing			377,900	336,700	311,100	372,600
		Total Acres	377,900	377,900	377,900	377,900
ACECs	Acres	ACEC Values	Alt A	Alt B	Alt C	Alt D
Barger Gulch Heritage Area	535	Heritage resources		•	•	
Kinney Creek	588	Colorado River cutthroat trout			•	
Kremmling Cretaceous Ammonite Research Natural Area (RNA)	198	Significant marine invertebrate fossils	•	•	•	•
Kremmling Potential Conservation Area	636	Osterhout milkvetch (<i>Astragalus osterhoutii</i>)		•	•	
Laramie River	1,783	North Park phacelia (<i>Phacelia formulosa</i>), dropleaf wild buckwheat		•	•	

Table 2-1 Comparative Summary of Alternatives						
Resource or Resource Use	Unit of Measure	Notes	Alt A	Alt B	Alt C	Alt D
		(<i>Eriogonum exilifolium</i>), larchleaf beardtongue (<i>Penstemon laricifolius</i> ssp. <i>exilifolius</i>), and Ward's goldenweed (<i>Oonopsis wardii</i>)				
North Park Natural Area	318 (A, D) 4,444 (B, C)	North Park phacelia (<i>Phacelia formulosa</i>)	•	•	•	•
North Sand Hills	92	Boat-shaped bugseed (<i>Corispermum navicula</i>)			•	
Troublesome Creek	974	Penland's beardtongue (<i>Penstemon penlandii</i>) and Osterhout milkvetch (<i>Astragalus osterhoutii</i>)		•	•	
		Total Acres	516	8,570	9,250	516
WSAs	Acres		Alt A	Alt B	Alt C	Alt D
North Sand Hills Natural Area	681		•	•	•	•
Platte River Contiguous	33		•	•	•	•
Troublesome	8,158		•	•	•	•
		Total Acres	8,872	8,872	8,872	8,872
WSRs Suitable	Total Miles	Classification	Alt A	Alt B	Alt C	Alt D
Blue River – segment 2	2.55	recreational			•	
Blue River – segment 3	2.05	recreational			•	
Colorado River – segment 1	7.32	recreational			•	
Colorado River – segment 2	2.44	recreational			•	
Colorado River – segment 3	24.36	recreational			•	
Colorado River – segment 4	5.36	recreational		• ⁴	•	
Colorado River – segment 5	15.26	recreational		• ⁴	•	
Kinney Creek	2.35	scenic			•	
Muddy Creek	8.93	recreational			•	

Table 2-1 Comparative Summary of Alternatives						
Resource or Resource Use	Unit of Measure	Notes	Alt A	Alt B	Alt C	Alt D
North Platte River	0.07	recreational			•	
Piney River	2.30	recreational			•	
Rabbits Ear Creek	4.24	wild			•	
Spruce Creek	0.97	recreational			•	
Sulphur Gulch	3.04	recreational			•	
Troublesome Creek	6.14	recreational			•	
		Total Miles	0	20.62	87.38	0

N/A = not available

¹ Wilderness characteristics would be protected with specific management prescriptions for protecting wilderness characteristics.

² Federal mineral estate includes mineral estate underlying BLM-managed public lands, privately owned lands, and State-owned lands. As such, Federal mineral estate acres are greater than BLM surface acres. Federal mineral estate affected by this DRMP/DEIS total 653,500 acres.

³ In Alternative C, several areas that are identified with CSU stipulations are also closed to fluid minerals leasing, including WSAs, WSR segments, parts of the riparian CSU, the key sage-grouse habitat CSU, soils CSU, hydrologic CSU, and VRM Class II.

⁴ There are 2 alternatives under Alternative B. Under Alternative B1, the BLM would find 2 segments (20.62 miles) suitable for congressional designation in the National Wild and Scenic Rivers Systems (2 segments of the Colorado River between the mouth of Gore Canyon and State Bridge). Under Alternative B2, the BLM would defer a determination of suitability and recommend adopting and implementing the Stakeholder Management Plan in order to protect the free-flowing nature, outstanding remarkable values (ORVs), and tentative classifications on the Colorado River segments.

Source: BLM 2008b (GIS)

Table 2-2
Descriptions of Alternative A, Alternative B, Alternative C, and Alternative D

Alternative A: No Action	Alternative B: Preferred	Alternative C	Alternative D
Theme: Current Management	Theme: Mixed Emphasis	Theme: Conservation	Theme: Resource Use
AIR			
<p>GOAL: No similar Goal in current RMP (BLM 1984b); however, by law, all BLM-activities must comply with all applicable Federal, State, and local air quality laws rules, regulations, policies, standards, and guidelines.</p>	<p>GOAL: Manage BLM-authorized activities in order to protect air quality and air quality related values (such as visibility), by complying with applicable Federal, State, and local air quality laws rules, regulations, policies, standards, and guidelines. Within the scope of the BLM’s authority, implement actions designed to minimize emissions that may cause, or contribute to, negative impacts to air quality or air quality-related values (AQRVs), and to protect Class I Airsheds affected by actions in the Planning Area.</p>		
<p>Desired Outcome: Limit air quality degradation in the Planning Area by ensuring that land use activities are in compliance with Federal, State, and local legislation.</p>	<p>Desired Outcome: Limit air quality degradation in the Planning Area by ensuring that land use activities are in compliance with Federal, State, and local legislation. Control the emissions and particulate-level impacts from authorized activities in order to help protect Class I Airsheds in, and adjacent to, the Planning Area.</p>		
<p>Action: No similar Action in current RMP.</p>	<p>Action: Work with State and local authorities to implement actions as Conditions of Approval (COA) to reduce emissions in order to meet Federal, State, and local air quality standards and regulations.</p>		
<p>Action: No similar Action in current RMP.</p>	<p>Action: Mitigate air quality violations or issues on BLM-managed public lands identified through monitoring sources.</p>		
<p>Action: Require drill-rig engines to meet EPA requirements.</p>	<p>Action: Within 1 year of the signing of the ROD, all new and existing drill-rig engines would meet EPA Tier 2 Non-road Diesel Engine Emission Standards, or meet equivalent emission standards. By 2015, all new and existing drill-rig engines would meet EPA Tier 4 or equivalent (or more stringent) emission standards.</p>		
<p>Action: Require Operators, as a COA, to implement dust-abatement measures, as needed, in order to prevent fugitive dust from vehicular traffic, equipment operations, or wind events. The Authorized Officer may direct the Operator to change the level, and type, of treatment (watering or application of various dust agents, surfactants, and road-surfacing material) if dust abatement measures are observed to be insufficient to prevent fugitive dust. In addition, require fugitive dust control plans.</p>			

Table 2-2
Descriptions of Alternatives A, B, C, and D

Alternative A: No Action Theme: Current Management	Alternative B Theme: Mixed Emphasis	Alternative C Theme: Conservation	Alternative D Theme: Resource Use
<p>Action: Require engines at field compression facilities to meet applicable Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment (CDPHE) Air Quality Control Commission (AQCC) regulations and EPA emission standards.</p>	<p>Action: Require, as a COA, new and existing natural gas fired reciprocating internal combustion engines at field compression facilities to meet CDPHE AQCC Regulation No. 7 emission standards for new and relocated engines, regardless of when the engines begin operation. Require compliance with applicable EPA emission standards for all types of engines.</p>		
<p>Action: Allow flaring and venting in accordance with Notice to Lessees (NTL-4A).</p>	<p>Action: As soon as the appropriate infrastructure is available (such as pipelines), require, as a COA, green completions, involving recovery and clean-up of natural gas, unless the need for an exemption can be documented. Require flaring of natural gas during well completions that do not use green completion technology. Prohibit venting of natural gas, except during emergency situations.</p>		
<p>Action: No similar Action in current RMP.</p>	<p>Action: No similar Action.</p>	<p>Action: Require, as a COA, emission controls for glycol dehydrators and condensate tanks, without regard to the quantity of uncontrolled volatile organic compound (VOC) emissions from the equipment. Reduce VOC emissions from new glycol dehydrators by achieving at least 95 percent control of VOC emissions from glycol dehydrator vents. Reduce VOC emissions from condensate tanks by at least 95 percent from uncontrolled emission levels.</p>	<p>Action: No similar Action.</p>
<p>Action: No similar Action in current RMP.</p>	<p>Action: Cooperate with the CDPHE in identifying monitoring needs, as well as monitoring installation and operation.</p>		

**Table 2-2
 Descriptions of Alternatives A, B, C, and D**

Alternative A: No Action Theme: Current Management	Alternative B Theme: Mixed Emphasis	Alternative C Theme: Conservation	Alternative D Theme: Resource Use
---	--	--------------------------------------	--------------------------------------

SOILS	
<p>▪ GOAL: Ensure that upland soils exhibit infiltration and permeability rates that are appropriate to soil type, climate, landform, and geologic processes. [Adequate soil infiltration and permeability allows for the accumulation of soil moisture necessary for optimal plant growth and vigor, minimizes surface run-off (Public Land Health Standard 1), and minimizes soil erosion.]</p>	
<p>Desired Outcome: No similar Desired Outcome in current RMP.</p>	<p>Desired Outcome: Ensure that surface disturbances do not cause accelerated erosion (such as rills, soil pedestals, and actively eroding gullies) on a watershed scale (e.g., 6th hydrologic unit code scale).</p>
<p>▪ ction: ▪ oordinate with other resources in order to ensure potential land uses in soil priority areas are consistent with that designation. Protect sensitive watersheds by placing restrictions on activities that could adversely affect them. Apply intensive management practices to sensitive watersheds in order to improve them. (Sensitive watersheds are areas with adverse geologic, soil, and/or vegetation conditions that cause a fragile situation. Small changes in land use intensity can result in large changes in erosion rates. Some of these areas are already experiencing accelerated erosion.)</p>	<p>Action: Require professional geotechnical engineering and reclamation plans meeting the following conditions in areas having soils with severe or very severe erosion hazard based upon the USDA, Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) soil survey or onsite inspection:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • restore site productivity; • adequately control surface run-off; • protect offsite areas from accelerated erosion (such as rilling, gullyng, piping, and mass wasting); • conduct no surface-disturbing activities during periods when soil is saturated; and • prohibit construction when soils are frozen.
<p>▪ restriction on Use: ▪ o similar Restriction on Use in current</p>	<p>Restriction on Use: STIPULATION: CO-NSO-1: Fragile Soils or Slopes Greater Than 40 Percent -- Prohibit surface occupancy or use in all areas of fragile soils, and on steep slopes, in order to protect soil productivity, and rare or sensitive biota; minimize risk to water bodies, fisheries, and aquatic species habitats; and</p>

**Table 2-2
 Descriptions of Alternatives A, B, C, and D**

Alternative A: No Action Theme: Current Management	Alternative B Theme: Mixed Emphasis	Alternative C Theme: Conservation	Alternative D Theme: Resource Use
<p>RMP.</p> <p>Restriction on Use: STIPULATION: Controlled Surface Use, CO-27: Slopes Greater than 40 Percent -- Before surface disturbance on slopes of, or greater than, 40 percent, an engineering/reclamation plan must be approved by the Authorized Officer. Such plans must demonstrate how the following will be accomplished:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • site productivity will be restored; • surface run-off will be adequately controlled; • offsite areas will be protected from accelerated erosion (such as drilling, gullyng, piping, and mass wasting); • surface-disturbing activities will not be conducted during extended wet periods; and • construction will be prohibited when soils are frozen. <p>(See Map 2-4, Appendix A.)</p>	<p>protect human health and safety (from landslides, mass wasting, etc.). (See Appendix B.)</p> <p>Restriction on Use: No similar Restriction on Use.</p>		
<p>▪ Restriction on Use: ▪ o similar Restriction on Use in current RMP. (Currently, Stipulation CO-27 under 1991 EIS applies to slopes greater than 40 percent.)</p>	<p>Restriction on Use: STIPULATION: CO-CSU-1: Soils (Slopes Between 25 and 40 percent) -- Apply CSU restrictions in order to improve reclamation potential; maintain soil stability and productivity of sensitive areas; and minimize contributions of salinity, selenium, and sediments likely to affect downstream water quality, fisheries, and other downstream aquatic habitats. (See Appendix B.)</p>		
<p>Desired Outcome:</p>			

**Table 2-2
 Descriptions of Alternatives A, B, C, and D**

Alternative A: No Action	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D
Theme: Current Management	Theme: Mixed Emphasis	Theme: Conservation	Theme: Resource Use

Ensure that on a landscape scale (as defined by Public Land Health Standard 1), canopy cover and ground cover are appropriate for the soil type, based upon current guidelines (such as NRCS reference sheets; soil surveys).

Action:
 Conduct site-specific monitoring (such as vegetation transect analysis) in areas identified as not meeting Public Land Health Standard 1. Where failure is due to unauthorized or undesirable levels of authorized land uses, take corrective actions (such as rehabilitation, management changes, and reclamation).

WATER

<p>▪ OAL: No similar Goal in current RMP.</p>	<p>GOAL: Protect watershed functions in the capture, retention, and release of water in quantity, quality, and timing in order to meet aquatic and terrestrial ecosystem needs.</p>
---	--

<p>Desired Outcome: Maintain streams on BLM-managed public lands that meet State water quality standards, and that have acceptable channel stability, in order to protect and enhance groundwater and sensitive watersheds in association with actions initiated by other resource programs. Apply management to streams not meeting standards in order to improve water quality.</p>	<p>Desired Outcome: Ensure that streams on BLM-managed public lands are in geomorphic balance (that stream-channel size, sinuosity, and substrate are appropriate for its landscape position and geology) with the water and sediment being supplied by the watershed (no accelerated erosion, deposition, or head-cutting).</p>
---	--

<p>Action: Apply intensive management to substandard or unstable stream channels and sensitive watersheds (which constitute only 3 miles, or 2 percent, of the total stream miles within the Planning Area).</p>	<p>Action: Improve dysfunctional streams caused by unnatural factors. Modify management practices (such as grazing systems, recreational uses) and/or stream restoration techniques (such as native plantings, fencing, energy dissipation structures, bank protection, culverts), as appropriate, in order to address causal factors.</p>
--	--

**Table 2-2
 Descriptions of Alternatives A, B, C, and D**

Alternative A: No Action	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D
Theme: Current Management	Theme: Mixed Emphasis	Theme: Conservation	Theme: Resource Use
<p>Desired Outcome:</p> <p>Protect surface water and groundwater in order to maintain their present good quality. All streams on public lands within the Planning Area that meet or exceed State water quality standards, and that have acceptable channel stability, will be maintained in the present condition through limited management. Streams not meeting State standards, or having unstable channels, will be improved in order to meet minimum standards through intensive management.</p>	<p>Desired Outcome: Ensure that the water quality of all surface water and groundwater located on, or influenced by, BLM-managed public lands contributes to achieving the water quality standards (numeric criteria, narrative criteria, and anti-degradation requirements) established by State of Colorado requirements under State law, as required by Section 303(c) of the Clean Water Act (CWA).</p>		
<p>Restriction on Use: No similar Restriction on Use in current RMP.</p>	<p>Restriction on Use: STIPULATION: CO-NSO-2: Major River Corridors -- Prohibit surface occupancy or use within stream channels, stream banks, and the area 2,500 horizontal feet either side of the ordinary high-water mark (bank-full stage) of the following rivers or streams in order to protect rivers and adjacent aquatic habitat: Colorado River, Piney Creek, Blue River, Fraser River, and North Platte River. (See Appendix B.)</p>		
<p>Restriction on Use: No similar Restriction on Use in current RMP.</p>	<p>Restriction on Use: STIPULATION: CO-NSO-4: Perennial Streams, Water Bodies, Fisheries, and Riparian Areas -- Prohibit surface occupancy or use within a minimum buffer distance of 325 horizontal feet for all perennial waters in order to maintain the proper functioning condition (PFC), including the vegetative, hydrologic, and geomorphic functionality of the perennial water body, in order to protect water quality, fish habitat, and aquatic habitat; and to provide a clean, reliable source of water for downstream users. (See Appendix B.)</p>		
<p>Restriction on Use: No similar Restriction on Use in current RMP.</p>	<p>Restriction on Use: No similar Restriction on Use.</p>	<p>Restriction on Use: STIPULATION: CO-NSO-5: Intermittent and Ephemeral</p>	<p>Restriction on Use: No similar Restriction on Use.</p>

**Table 2-2
 Descriptions of Alternatives A, B, C, and D**

Alternative A: No Action Theme: Current Management	Alternative B Theme: Mixed Emphasis	Alternative C Theme: Conservation	Alternative D Theme: Resource Use
		<p>Streams -- Prohibit surface occupancy or use within 50 horizontal feet (as measured from the top of the stream bank) for all intermittent or ephemeral streams in order to maintain and protect water quality, stream stability, aquatic health, seasonal use, downstream fisheries, and sediment processes downstream. [See Map 2-2 in Appendix A.]</p>	
<p>Restriction on Use: STIPULATION: Controlled Surface Use, CO-28: Riparian/Wetland Vegetation Zones -- Surface occupancy or use is subject to special operating constraints in order to protect perennial water impoundments and streams, and/or riparian/wetland vegetation by moving oil and gas exploration and development beyond the riparian vegetation zone. [See Map 2-4 in Appendix A.]</p>	<p>Restriction on Use: STIPULATION: CO-CSU-3 Perennial Streams, Water Bodies, Fisheries, and Riparian Areas -- Apply surface use restrictions from 325 horizontal feet to 500 horizontal feet from perennial water bodies in order to maintain the PFC, including the vegetative, hydrologic and geomorphic functionality of the perennial water body, in order to protect water quality, fish habitat, aquatic habitat; and to provide a clean, reliable source of water for downstream users. [See Maps 2-5 and 2-6 in Appendix A.]</p>		<p>Restriction on Use: No similar Restriction on Use.</p>
<p>Restriction on Use: No similar Restriction on Use in current RMP.</p>	<p>Restriction on Use: No similar Restriction on Use.</p>	<p>Restriction on Use: STIPULATION: CO-CSU-4 Intermittent and Ephemeral Streams -- Minimize locating roads, stream crossings, and facilities within 100 horizontal feet from the edge of the NSO buffer in order to minimize the risk of</p>	<p>Restriction on Use: No similar Restriction on Use.</p>

**Table 2-2
 Descriptions of Alternatives A, B, C, and D**

Alternative A: No Action Theme: Current Management	Alternative B Theme: Mixed Emphasis	Alternative C Theme: Conservation	Alternative D Theme: Resource Use
		sedimentation, spills, and other contaminants from reaching intermittent and/or ephemeral streams in order to protect water quality, stream function, and aquatic habitat. [See Map 2-6 in Appendix A.]	
Desired Outcome: No similar Desired Outcome in current RMP.	Desired Outcome: Provide sufficient water quantity on BLM-managed public lands for multiple-use and sustained-yield management and functioning, healthy riparian, wetland, aquatic, and upland systems.		
Action: No similar Action in current RMP.	Action: File for water rights and water use permits in order to protect all water uses on BLM-managed public lands, as allowed by State water law. Uses for which the BLM will apply for water rights include, but are not limited to, livestock, wildlife watering, wildlife habitat, recreation, and fire suppression. In addition, the BLM will make recommendations to the Colorado Water Conservation Board for protection or enlargement of in-streamflows on appropriate stream segments that cross BLM-managed public lands.		
Action: No similar Action in current RMP.	Action: Use tools (such as land and water acquisitions, realty actions, and Cooperative Agreements) in order to achieve water management objectives. These include improving streamflows, maintaining minimum pools in reservoirs, and providing public access to water bodies.		
Restriction on Use: o similar Restriction on Use in current RMP.	Restriction on Use : STIPULATION: CO-NSO-3: Municipal Watersheds and Public Water Supplies -- Prohibit surface occupancy or use on lands within 1,000 horizontal feet of either side of a classified surface water supply stream segment (as measured from the average high-water mark of a water body) for a distance of 5 miles upstream of a public water supply intake with the classification "Water Supply" by the State of Colorado used as a public (municipal) water supply in order to protect public water supplies, water quality, aquatic habitat, and human health. (See Appendix B.)		
Restriction on Use: o similar Restriction on Use in current	Restriction on Use : STIPULATION: CO-CSU-2: Municipal Watersheds and Public Water Supplies -- 1) Oil and Gas operations located greater than 1,000 horizontal feet, but less than 2,300 horizontal feet, from a		

**Table 2-2
 Descriptions of Alternatives A, B, C, and D**

Alternative A: No Action	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D
Theme: Current Management	Theme: Mixed Emphasis	Theme: Conservation	Theme: Resource Use

RMP.	classified surface water supply stream segment (as measured from the average high-water mark of a water body) for a distance of 5 miles upstream of a public water supply intake with the classification “Water Supply” by the State of Colorado shall require protective measures; and 2) NSO stipulations will be applied within this zone on slopes greater than 30 percent having fragile soils in order to protect public water supplies, water quality, aquatic habitat, and human health. (See Appendix B.)		
------	--	--	--

VEGETATION -- GENERAL

..... **GOAL:** Maintain healthy, productive plant communities of native and other desirable species at viable population levels commensurate with the potentials for the species and the habitats. Ensure that plants and animals at both the community and population level are productive, resilient, diverse, vigorous, and able to reproduce and sustain natural fluctuations and ecological processes (Public Land Health Standard 3).
 Ensure that riparian systems associated with both running water and standing water function properly, and have the ability to recover from major disturbances such as fire, severe grazing, or 100-year floods. Ensure that riparian vegetation captures sediment and provides forage, habitat, and biodiversity; that water quality is improved or maintained; and that stable soils store and release water slowly (Public Land Health Standard 2).

Vegetation – Forest and Woodlands

Desired Outcome: Provide intensive management on forestlands growing commercial species (lodgepole pine, Engelmann spruce, or Douglas-fir) on productive growing sites (producing 20 cubic feet of wood fiber per acre per year) on lands not withdrawn for other resource needs. Provide limited management on woodlands or non-commercial species (pinyon, juniper, ponderosa pine, subalpine fir, or aspen) or on sites producing less than 20 cubic feet of wood fiber per acre per year.	Desired Outcome: Manage forests and woodlands in order to maintain or enhance ecological resiliency by improving the vigor of trees within stands, and by creating a more diverse age and size class structure across the landscape.
Action: Implement silvicultural treatments (such	Action: Achieve diversity of age and size class, and improve vigor, by using treatments (mechanical, chemical,

Table 2-2
Descriptions of Alternatives A, B, C, and D

Alternative A: No Action	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D
Theme: Current Management	Theme: Mixed Emphasis	Theme: Conservation	Theme: Resource Use
<p>as clear-cuts, shelterwood and other partial cuts, thinning, wildland fire managed for multiple objectives, seeding and planting, mechanical treatments, and prescribed fire) appropriate to each forest and woodland species and to current stand conditions in order to create healthy and diverse forest and woodland communities, and to support other resources and resource use objectives.</p>	<p>biological, and fire). Apply silvicultural systems to stands appropriate to cover type (species silvicultural requirements, current stand conditions/structure), and capable of accomplishing management objectives. (Silvicultural systems are either even- or uneven-aged.)</p>		
<p>Desired Outcome:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪..... o similar Desired Outcome in current RMP. 	<p>Desired Outcome:</p> <p>Identify areas for current or potential old-growth conditions based upon structure and composition across the landscape. [Old-growth forest stands are composed of trees that are, generally, in the late successional stages of development. The desired attributes of old-growth stands are older, large trees for the species and site; signs of decadence (broken or deformed tops or boles and some root decay); multiple layers of canopy; standing-and-down dead trees; a variation in tree age, size, and spacing; and gaps or patchiness in the canopy and understory.]</p>		
<p>Action:</p> <p>Monitor general forest conditions through forest stand inventories, and monitor for insects and disease. Conduct periodic regeneration surveys in order to monitor for adequacy of regeneration of harvested areas.</p>	<p>Action:</p> <p>Same as Alternative A, with a focus on monitoring lodgepole pine affected by mountain pine beetle (MPB), and assessing areas affected by aspen decline. Inventory forest stands in order to identify and map areas with current or potential old-growth characteristics during periodic forest inventories.</p>		
<p>▪.....</p> <p>ction:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪..... o similar Action in current RMP. 	<p>Action:</p> <p>Maintain or contribute toward the restoration or development of old-growth structure and composition (primarily of spruce/fir, pinyon, juniper, and Douglas-fir stands) in areas where forest treatments utilizing the Healthy Forest Restoration Act of 2003 (HFRA) are proposed. Retain stands with old-growth characteristics such as, but not limited to, large trees, standing-and-down dead trees, and multiple canopy layers.</p>		

**Table 2-2
 Descriptions of Alternatives A, B, C, and D**

Alternative A: No Action	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D
Theme: Current Management	Theme: Mixed Emphasis	Theme: Conservation	Theme: Resource Use
Vegetation – Rangeland			
Desired Outcome: No similar Desired Outcome in current RMP.	Desired Outcome: Manage sagebrush steppe, where needed, to transition from homogeneous stands of old sagebrush in order to create a more diverse age-class structure across the landscape, and to improve diversity and cover of understory species.		
Action: No similar Action in current RMP.	Action: Achieve diversity of age class in sagebrush communities by using treatments (mechanical, chemical, biological treatments; and prescribed fire and wildland fire managed for multiple objectives).		
Action: No similar Action in current RMP.	Action: Reduce encroachment of pinyon, juniper, and other woody species in sagebrush steppe.		
Desired Outcome: No similar Desired Outcome in current RMP.	Desired Outcome: Manage mountain shrub communities in order to improve composition and structure, and to increase serviceberry, bitterbrush, and mountain mahogany.		
Action: No similar Action in current RMP.	Action: Use vegetation manipulation (mechanical, biological, and chemical treatments), fencing, seeding, prescribed fire and wildland fire managed for multiple objectives, and use restrictions in order to accomplish mountain shrub management objectives.		
Desired Outcome: No similar Desired Outcome in current RMP.	Desired Outcome: Manage native grasslands in order to maintain ecological functions.		
Action: No similar Action in current RMP.	Action: Use vegetation manipulation (mechanical, biological, and chemical treatments), fencing, seeding with native species, prescribed fire and wildland fire managed for multiple objectives, and use restrictions in order to accomplish native grassland management objectives.		
Action: No similar Action in current RMP.	Action: Use restoration techniques, including, but not limited to, revegetation, fertilization, and/or soil amendments (such as those identified in KFO interim or long-term restoration plans or BMPs) in order to rehabilitate disturbed or degraded rangeland plant communities.		
Action: Identify priority allotments (Improve, Maintain, or those not meeting Public Land Health Standards) in order to monitor for rangeland vegetation trend			

**Table 2-2
 Descriptions of Alternatives A, B, C, and D**

Alternative A: No Action	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D
Theme: Current Management	Theme: Mixed Emphasis	Theme: Conservation	Theme: Resource Use

and utilization.			
Vegetation – Riparian			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪..... Desired Outcome: ▪..... o similar Desired Outcome in current RMP. 	<p>Desired Outcome: Attain riparian area PFC.</p>		
<p>Action: No similar Action in current RMP.</p>	<p>Action: Manage for riparian/wetland values using management actions for improvement or protection. These actions may include, but are not limited to, implementing grazing management actions (such as adjusting livestock numbers, distribution, season of use, duration of use), plantings, recreation restrictions, structures (such as fencing), and upland water developments.</p>		
<p>Action: No similar Action in current RMP.</p>	<p>Action: Continue to monitor in order to meet Public Land Health Standard 2, and collect data on riparian areas/wetlands.</p>		
<p>Restriction on Use: No similar Restriction on Use in current RMP.</p>	<p>Restriction on Use: STIPULATION: CO-NSO-4: Perennial Streams, Water Bodies, Fisheries, and Riparian Areas -- Prohibit surface occupancy or use within a minimum buffer distance of 325 horizontal feet for all perennial waters in order to maintain the PFC, including the vegetative, hydrologic, and geomorphic functionality of the perennial water body, in order to protect water quality, fish habitat, and aquatic habitat; and to provide a clean, reliable source of water for downstream users. For unmapped wetlands, the vegetative boundary (from which the buffer originates) will be determined in the field. Where the riparian zone extends beyond 325 feet, the NSO would be extended to include the entire riparian zone. (See Appendix B.)</p>		
<p>Restriction on Use: STIPULATION: Controlled Surface Use, C0-28. Riparian/Wetland Vegetation Zones -- Apply CSU (site-specific relocation) restrictions to activities associated with oil and gas</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪..... <p>Restriction on Use: STIPULATION: CO-CSU-3: Perennial Streams, Water Bodies, Fisheries, and Riparian Areas -- Apply surface-use restrictions from 325 horizontal feet to 500 horizontal feet from perennial water bodies in order to maintain the PFC, including the vegetative,</p>	<p>Restriction on Use: No similar Restriction on Use.</p>	

**Table 2-2
 Descriptions of Alternatives A, B, C, and D**

Alternative A: No Action Theme: Current Management	Alternative B Theme: Mixed Emphasis	Alternative C Theme: Conservation	Alternative D Theme: Resource Use
exploration and development (including roads, transmission lines, and storage facilities) to an area beyond the riparian vegetation zone. (See Appendix C.)	hydrologic, and geomorphic functionality of the perennial water body, in order to protect water quality, fish habitat, and aquatic habitat; and provide a clean, reliable source of water for downstream users. (See Appendix B.)		
Vegetation – Weeds			
Desired Outcome: No similar Desired Outcome in current RMP.	Desired Outcome: Prevent the establishment of, treat existing, and reduce/slow the spread of, noxious and invasive weeds across landscape and ownership boundaries.		
Action: Promote weed awareness and preventative behavior through public contact, volunteer programs, and educational materials (such as Weed Identification Brochures and through the Tread Lightly Program).			
Action: No similar Action in current RMP.	Action: Focus on areas of new infestations and, where possible, extirpate existing populations within priority treatment areas, which include the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • disturbed areas (oil and gas and other mine development, burned areas, new road construction); • ACECs; • Special Status Species habitat; • riparian areas/wetlands; springs/seeps; • developed recreation sites, campgrounds, and campsites; • roads and trails; • WUI; and • big game winter ranges. 		
Action: No similar Action in current RMP.	Action: Use appropriate integrated vegetation treatments (chemical, mechanical, and biological treatments; prescribed fire; and natural fire managed for resource benefits) for the control of invasive/noxious weeds. (Use of herbicides would be consistent with local, State, and Federal laws, rules, regulations, policies, standards, and guidelines.)		

Table 2-2
Descriptions of Alternatives A, B, C, and D

Alternative A: No Action	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D
Theme: Current Management	Theme: Mixed Emphasis	Theme: Conservation	Theme: Resource Use

Resources

Action: No similar Action in current RMP.	Action: Treat monocultures of cheatgrass and other exotic communities through prescribed grazing and chemical, biological, and mechanical treatment methods where eradication is possible. Establish desired vegetation by seeding.
Action: No similar Action in current RMP.	Action: Hold project proponents (including livestock operators, ROW holders, and other permittees deemed necessary by the Authorized Officer) responsible for monitoring and controlling noxious weeds that result from any new facilities, and/or improvements or other surface disturbances authorized on BLM-managed public lands (such as roads, communication sites, pipelines, stock ponds, fences, etc.).
Action: No similar Action in current RMP.	Action: Inventory/identify infested acres, beginning with the priority treatment areas. Focus on A-listed species, then B-listed species, and, finally, C-listed species.

FISH AND WILDLIFE

..... **GOAL:** Maintain healthy, productive plant and animal communities of native and other desirable species at viable population levels commensurate with the species' and habitats' potential. Ensure that plants and animals at both the community and population level are productive, resilient, diverse, vigorous, and able to reproduce and sustain natural fluctuations and ecological processes (Public Land Health Standard 3).

**Table 2-2
 Descriptions of Alternatives A, B, C, and D**

Alternative A: No Action	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D
Theme: Current Management	Theme: Mixed Emphasis	Theme: Conservation	Theme: Resource Use

Fisheries and Other Aquatic Wildlife			
<p>Desired Outcome: No similar Desired Outcome in current RMP.</p>	<p>Desired Outcome: In addition to providing for a wide variety of aquatic species, maintain and improve the portion on BLM-managed public lands of the priority habitat requirements for the following highly valued species (priority as recognized for at least 1 factor, such as density, diversity, size, public interest, remnant character, or age):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • coldwater sport fishes, including rainbow, brown, brook, and non-native cutthroat trout species [any species of cutthroat trout other than Colorado River or greenback cutthroat, which are addressed in the Special Status Species section (such as Yellowstone and Snake River cutthroat trout)]; and • Colorado River Basin native fishes, excluding Special Status Species, and including mountain whitefish, mountain sucker, speckled dace, mottled sculpin, and Paiute sculpin. <p>[NOTE: For Alternative B,</p>	<p>Desired Outcome: Same as under Alternative B.</p>	<p>Desired Outcome: In addition to providing for a wide variety of aquatic species, maintain the portion on BLM-managed public lands of the priority habitat requirements for the following highly valued species (priority as recognized for at least 1 factor, such as density, diversity, size, public interest, remnant character, or age):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • coldwater sport fishes, including rainbow, brown, brook, and non-native cutthroat trout species [any species of cutthroat trout other than Colorado River or greenback cutthroat, which are addressed in the Special Status Species section (such as Yellowstone and Snake River cutthroat trout)]. <p>[NOTE: For Alternative B, Alternative C, and Alternative D: habitat standards and desired wildlife population levels are determined, in some cases, by species-specific plans/strategies (such as BLM Strategic Plans,</p>

**Table 2-2
 Descriptions of Alternatives A, B, C, and D**

Alternative A: No Action	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D
Theme: Current Management	Theme: Mixed Emphasis	Theme: Conservation	Theme: Resource Use
	Alternative C, and alternative D: habitat standards and desired fisheries population levels are determined, in some cases, by species-specific plans/strategies (such as BLM Strategic Plans, CDOW Strategic Plans, or USFWS strategies), commensurate with Public Land Health Standards.]		CDOW Strategic Plans, or USFWS strategies), commensurate with Public Land Health Standards.]
Common to All Fisheries			
Action: No similar Action in current RMP.	Action: 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.		Action: Designate the following as priority habitats: perennial water sources (streams, rivers, lakes, ponds, springs, seeps, wetlands, wet meadows, bogs, and fens) and riparian areas.
Action: No similar Action in current RMP.	Action: Identify limiting habitat factors based upon site characteristics and habitat capabilities using channel type and geology classifications (such as Rosgen). 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 (such as changing livestock grazing season use) in order to achieve Desired Outcome.		
Action: No similar Action in current RMP.	Action: Identify in-channel features (such as culverts and water diversion structures) that block aquatic organism movement and/or impair stream connectivity; replace, modify, or remove these impediments as they are identified, and as opportunities allow.		
Restriction on Use: No similar Restriction on Use in current	Restriction on Use: STIPULATION: CO-NSO-4: Perennial Streams, Water Bodies, Fisheries, and Riparian Areas --		

Table 2-2
Descriptions of Alternatives A, B, C, and D

Alternative A: No Action	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D
Theme: Current Management	Theme: Mixed Emphasis	Theme: Conservation	Theme: Resource Use
RMP.	Prohibit surface occupancy or use within a minimum buffer distance of 325 horizontal feet for all perennial waters in order to protect water quality, fish habitat, aquatic habitat; and to provide a clean, reliable source of water for downstream users. For perennial streams, the buffer will be measured from ordinary high-water mark (bank-full stage). (See Appendix B.)		
Restriction on Use: No similar Restriction on Use in current RMP.	Restriction on Use: STIPULATION: CO-CSU-3: Perennial Streams, Water Bodies, Fisheries, and Riparian Areas -- Apply surface-use restrictions from 325 horizontal feet to 500 horizontal feet from the ordinary high-water mark (bank-full stage) of perennial water bodies in order to protect water quality, fish habitat, aquatic habitat; and to provide a clean, reliable source of water for downstream users. [See Maps 2-5 (Alternative B) and 2-6 (Alternative C) in Appendix A.]	Restriction on Use: No similar Restriction on Use.	
Coldwater Sport and Native Fish (such as Brown, Brook and Rainbow Trout; Non-native Cutthroat Trout, Mountain Whitefish, Mottled and Paiute Sculpin)			
Restriction on Use: No similar Restriction on Use in current RMP.	Restriction on Use: STIPULATION: CO-TL-1: Native Fish and Important Sport Fish -- Prohibit in-channel work in all occupied cutthroat trout (Colorado River, greenback, and Rio Grande) streams during spring spawning periods of April 1 to August 1, and fall spawning periods from October 1 to November 30, in order to protect redds (egg masses) in the gravel and emerging fry of native fish populations (Colorado River, greenback, and Rio Grande cutthroat trout, flannelmouth and bluehead sucker, and roundtail chub), and important sport fish populations (rainbow, brown, and brook trout). (See Appendix B.)		
WILDLIFE			
Desired Outcome: No similar Desired Outcome in current RMP.	Desired Outcome: In addition to providing habitat for a wide variety of species, maintain and improve the share on BLM-managed public lands of the priority habitat requirements of the following highly valued	Desired Outcome: In addition to providing habitat for a wide variety of species, maintain, improve, and conserve the share on BLM-managed public lands of the priority habitat requirements of the following	Desired Outcome: In addition to providing habitat for a wide variety of species, maintain the share on BLM-managed public lands of the priority habitat requirements of the following highly valued

**Table 2-2
 Descriptions of Alternatives A, B, C, and D**

Alternative A: No Action	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D
Theme: Current Management	Theme: Mixed Emphasis	Theme: Conservation	Theme: Resource Use
	<p>species (priority as recognized for at least 1 factor, such as density, diversity, size, public interest, remnant character, or age):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • severe winter range, winter concentration areas, production areas, big game migration corridors (such as mule deer, elk, moose, pronghorn, and bighorn sheep); • habitat for Greater sage-grouse; • habitat for Birds of Conservation Concern; • nesting and fledging habitat for raptors; and • riparian and wetlands habitat at PFC for all species. <p>Habitat standards and desired wildlife population levels are determined by species-specific plans/strategies (such as CDOW Data Analysis Unit management objectives, BLM Strategic Plans, CDOW Strategic Plans, or USFWS strategies), commensurate with Public Land Health Standards.</p>	<p>highly valued species (priority as recognized for at least 1 factor, such as density, diversity, size, public interest, remnant character, or age):</p> <p>Same areas as under Alternative B, plus:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • prairie dog habitat; and • wild turkey roost sites. <p>Habitat standards and desired wildlife population levels are determined by species-specific plans/strategies (such as CDOW Data Analysis Unit management objectives, BLM Strategic Plans, CDOW Strategic Plans, or USFWS strategies), commensurate with Public Land Health Standards.</p>	<p>species (priority as recognized for at least 1 factor, such as density, diversity, size, public interest, remnant character, or age):</p> <p>Same areas as under Alternative B, except not including Birds of Conservation Concern.</p> <p>Habitat standards and desired wildlife population levels are determined by species-specific plans/strategies (such as CDOW Data Analysis Unit management objectives, BLM Strategic Plans, CDOW Strategic Plans, or USFWS strategies), commensurate with Public Land Health Standards.</p>

**Table 2-2
 Descriptions of Alternatives A, B, C, and D**

Alternative A: No Action	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D
Theme: Current Management	Theme: Mixed Emphasis	Theme: Conservation	Theme: Resource Use

<p>Action: Allow introduction, translocation, transplantation, restocking, augmentation, and re-establishment of native and naturalized fish and wildlife species, in cooperation with the CDOW 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 Memorandums of Understanding (MOUs) with the CDOW.</p>	
<p>Action: LEASE NOTICE CO- 31. Biological Inventories -- In areas of known or suspected habitat of Special Status Species, or habitat of other species of interest (such as raptor nests, elk calving areas, or significant natural plant communities) require a biological inventory before approval of operations. (The inventory would be used to prepare mitigating measures designed to reduce or avoid the impacts of surface disturbance on the affected species or their habitats. These mitigating measures may include, but are not limited to, relocating roads, well pads, pipelines, and other facilities; and fencing operations.</p>	<p>Action: LEASE NOTICE CO-LN-3: Special Status Species Plants and Wildlife -- In areas of known or suspected habitat of Special Status Species (federally Listed, Proposed, Candidate, and BLM Sensitive Species), or significant plant communities, a biological inventory may be required prior to approval of operations. (The inventory will be used in environmental analysis, and mitigating measures may be required in order to reduce the impacts of surface disturbance on the affected species or their habitats.) Special design and construction measures designed to mitigate impacts may include, but are not limited to, relocation of roads, well pads, pipelines, and other facilities; and fencing operations. The lessee/Operator may be required to submit a Plan for avoidance or mitigation of impacts to the identified species to the Authorized Officer.</p>
<p>Action: No similar Action in current RMP.</p>	<p>Action: LEASE NOTICE K-LN-1: High-Value Wildlife Habitat -- The lease may in part, or in total, contain high-value wildlife habitat. (These areas include, but are not limited to, habitat for Special Status Species, big game severe winter range, big game migration corridors, and priority moose habitat.) The Operator may be required to implement specific measures through a COA in order to reduce impacts resulting from oil and gas or geothermal operations on wildlife and wildlife habitat. Special design and construction measures designed to mitigate impacts may include, but are not limited to, relocation of roads, well pads, pipelines, and other facilities, and fencing operations. The</p>

**Table 2-2
 Descriptions of Alternatives A, B, C, and D**

Alternative A: No Action Theme: Current Management	Alternative B Theme: Mixed Emphasis	Alternative C Theme: Conservation	Alternative D Theme: Resource Use
<p>lessee/Operator may be required to submit a plan for avoidance or mitigation of impacts to the identified species to the Authorized Officer.</p>			
<p>Restriction on Use: No similar Restriction on Use in current RMP.</p>	<p>Restriction on Use: STIPULATION: CO-TL-6 Wild Turkey Winter Habitat -- Prohibit surface use during the following time period in order to prevent disruption of Wild Turkey during the winter: • Mapped turkey winter habitat: December 1 to April 1. (See Appendix B.)</p>		
<p>Big Game Species</p>			
<p>Desired Outcome: Minimize big game stress and disturbance from surface occupancy and surface-disturbing activities on winter ranges, winter concentration areas, severe winter ranges, migration corridors, and birthing areas.</p>			
<p>Action: Protect wintering big game species by closing the following area to motorized travel from December 15 to April 15: • 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. Under severe winter conditions, the limitation period may be extended if requested by the CDOW. Severity of the winter will be determined on the basis of snow depth, snow crusting, daily mean temperatures, and whether animals are concentrated on the winter range during the winter months.</p>	<p>Action: Protect wintering big game species by closing the following areas to motorized and mechanized travel from December 15 to April 15: • 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. The CDOW will be consulted for seasonal closure adjustments regarding wildlife protection.</p>	<p>Action: Protect wintering big game species by closing the following areas to motorized and mechanized travel from December 15 to April 15: • Same areas as under Alternative A, plus the following: • North Sand Hills WSA; and • Strawberry SRMA. Limitation period exceptions, under mild and severe winter conditions, would be the same as under Alternative B.</p>	<p>Action: Protect wintering big game species by closing the following areas to motorized and mechanized travel from December 15 to April 15: • Same areas as Alternative A, plus the following: • North Sand Hills WSA. Limitation period exceptions, under mild and severe winter conditions, would be the same as under Alternative B.</p>

**Table 2-2
 Descriptions of Alternatives A, B, C, and D**

Alternative A: No Action Theme: Current Management	Alternative B Theme: Mixed Emphasis	Alternative C Theme: Conservation	Alternative D Theme: Resource Use
	Severity of the winter will be determined on the basis of snow depth, snow crusting, daily mean temperatures, and whether animals are concentrated on the winter range during the winter months.		
<p>Restriction on Use: STIPULATION: Timing Limitation, CO-9: Big Game Winter Habitat -- Prohibit surface occupancy and surface-disturbing activities from December 1 to April 30 in order to protect big game (mule deer, elk, pronghorn antelope, and bighorn sheep) winter range, including crucial winter habitat and other definable winter range as mapped by the CDOW. This may apply to Sundry Notices that require an environmental analysis. (See Map 2-11 in Appendix A.)</p>	<p>Restriction on Use: STIPULATION: CO-TL-3: Big Game Crucial Winter Range (Severe Winter Range and Winter Concentration Areas) -- Prohibit surface use during the following time period(s) in mapped crucial winter habitat in order to reduce behavioral disruption of big game during the winter season on crucial winter habitat as mapped by the Colorado CDOW. (NOTE: This stipulation would not apply to operation and maintenance of production facilities).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Antelope: December 1 to April 30; • Rocky Mountain/Desert Bighorn sheep: November 1 to April 30; • Mule deer/White-tailed deer: December 1 to April 30; • Elk: December 1 to April 30; and • Moose: December 1 to April 30. <p>[See Maps 2-8 (Alternative B), 2-9 (Alternative and C) and 2-10 (Alternative D) in Appendix A.]</p>		
<p>Restriction on Use: No similar Restriction on Use under current RMP.</p>	<p>Restriction on Use: STIPULATION: K-NSO-1 Core Wildlife Areas -- Prohibit surface occupancy or use on core wildlife areas (approximately 39,600 acres of the Federal mineral estate) in order to help reduce fragmentation of those areas. (Core wildlife areas are areas of high habitat value for multiple species,</p>	<p>Restriction on Use: Prohibit oil and gas leasing in the core wildlife areas (approximately 114,300 acres) listed below. (Core wildlife areas include areas of high habitat value for multiple species, including sage-grouse, elk, and mule deer.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 8 areas in Jackson County: 	<p>Restriction on Use: No similar Restriction on Use.</p>

**Table 2-2
 Descriptions of Alternatives A, B, C, and D**

Alternative A: No Action Theme: Current Management	Alternative B Theme: Mixed Emphasis	Alternative C Theme: Conservation	Alternative D Theme: Resource Use
	including sage-grouse, elk, and mule deer.) This stipulation would apply to the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 4 areas in Jackson County: California Gulch, Walden Reservoir, Spring Creek, and Cowdrey; and • 3 areas in Grand County: Wolford Mountain, Cedar Ridge, and Junction Butte. (See Appendix B Map 2-12 in Appendix A.)	California Gulch, Walden Reservoir, Spring Creek, Case Flats/Peterson, Cowdrey, Dunes, Independence, and Sentinel (all areas); and <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 6 areas in Grand County: Wolford Mountain, Cedar Ridge, Junction Butte, Radium Basin, Parshall Divide, and Sulphur Gulch. (See Appendix B and Map 2-12 in Appendix A.)	
Restriction on Use: STIPULATION: Timing Limitation, CO-10; CO-11; and CO-12: Big Game Birthing Areas -- Prohibit surface occupancy and surface-disturbing activities as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Elk Calving: April 16 to June 30; • Pronghorn Antelope Fawning: May 1 to July 15; and • Rocky Mountain Bighorn Sheep Lambing: May 1 to July 15. (See Map 2-11 in Appendix A.)	Restriction on Use: STIPULATION CO-TL-2 Big Game Production Areas -- Prohibit surface use during the following time period(s) in mapped big game production areas in order to reduce behavioral disruption during parturition and early young rearing period. (NOTE: This stipulation would not apply to operation and maintenance of production facilities.) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Antelope: April 15 to June 30; • Rocky Mountain Bighorn sheep: April 15 to June 30; • Mule deer/White-tailed deer: April 15 to June 30; • Elk: April 15 to June 30; and • Moose: April 15 to June 30. (See Appendix B.)		
Action: No similar Action in current RMP.	Action: Upon a request of the CDOW, and with concurrence by the Authorized Officer, close areas to human activity and to dogs on an area-specific basis during severe winter weather conditions, as defined by a combination of factors including snow depth, snow crusting, daily mean temperatures (long periods of cold temperatures), and concentrations of animals.		

Table 2-2
Descriptions of Alternatives A, B, C, and D

Alternative A: No Action	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D
Theme: Current Management	Theme: Mixed Emphasis	Theme: Conservation	Theme: Resource Use
Desired Outcome: Protect State Wildlife Areas from unnecessary surface occupancy and surface-disturbing activities.			
Restriction on Use: No similar Restriction on Use in current RMP.	Restriction on Use: Prohibit oil and gas leasing on all State-owned Wildlife Areas. (See Map 2-13 in Appendix A.)	Restriction on Use: No similar Restriction on Use.	
Desired Outcome: No similar Desired Outcome in current RMP.	Desired Outcome: Create optimum winter range and summer/transition habitat conditions for big game, targeting a ratio of 60 percent foraging habitat to 40 percent escape/hiding/thermal/birthing cover.		
Action: No similar Action in current RMP.	Action: Implement habitat improvement projects in the mountain shrub community (such as chemical, mechanical, and biological treatments; prescribed fire and natural fire managed for resource benefits; and seeding) in order to increase the amount of available, palatable, and nutritious forage by setting back succession and creating a diverse age structure of plants.		
Action: No similar Action in current RMP.	Action: Stimulate sprouting and regrowth in decadent aspen patches using treatments such as prescribed fire and natural fire managed for resource benefits and mechanical methods.		
Desired Outcome: No similar Desired Outcome in current RMP.	Desired Outcome: Increase the diversity and abundance of grasses and forbs in the understory of transition and winter range habitats for the critical period of late fall through early spring.		
Action: No similar Action in current RMP.	Action: Perform habitat treatments (such as chemical, mechanical, biological treatments; and prescribed fire and natural fire managed for resource benefits) in order to reduce the canopy cover in mature uniform-aged brush and mature pinyon, juniper, and other forest stands.		
Action: No similar Action in current RMP.	Action: Where a diverse understory is lacking, seed desirable species or fertilize in transition and winter range habitats.		
Action: No similar Action in current RMP.	Action: Where appropriate, reduce competition with livestock grazing for forage (for example, by changing season of use, adjusting AUMs, or by changing type of livestock).	Action: No similar Action.	

**Table 2-2
 Descriptions of Alternatives A, B, C, and D**

Alternative A: No Action Theme: Current Management	Alternative B Theme: Mixed Emphasis	Alternative C Theme: Conservation	Alternative D Theme: Resource Use
Desired Outcome: No similar Desired Outcome in current RMP.	Desired Outcome: Reduce habitat fragmentation and restore habitat connectivity on big game winter ranges, winter concentration areas, severe winter ranges, and movement corridors.		
Action: No similar Action in current RMP.	Action: Protect big game migration corridors by retaining parcels within migration corridors.	Action: No similar Action.	
Action: No similar Action in current RMP.	Action: 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-managed public lands where routes enter from private land, where there is no public access, and where administrative access is not needed; and • limiting construction of new routes. 		
Action: No similar Action in current RMP.	Action: Avoid developing permanent structures that are restrictive to wildlife migration and movement.		
Desired Outcome: No similar Desired Outcome in current RMP.	Desired Outcome: Help achieve CDOW big game population objectives.		
Action: No similar Action in current RMP.	Action: Identify and maintain designated travel routes in order to provide access for hunting opportunities into targeted big game units.		
Migratory Birds			
Desired Outcome: No similar Desired Outcome in current RMP.	Desired Outcome: Provide healthy and productive habitat for migratory bird species.		
Action: No similar Action in current RMP.	Action: 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:		

Table 2-2
Descriptions of Alternatives A, B, C, and D

Alternative A: No Action Theme: Current Management	Alternative B Theme: Mixed Emphasis	Alternative C Theme: Conservation	Alternative D Theme: Resource Use
	<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; • 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. The COA would consider the scale, type, and duration of the project; species potentially present; weather conditions; elevation and habitat types present; and type of motorized equipment to be used. An exception may be granted if nesting surveys indicate no nesting BCC species within 10 meters of the area to be disturbed. 		
<p>Action: No similar Action in current RMP.</p>	<p>Action: LEASE NOTICE CO-LN-1: Migratory Bird Nesting Habitat -- Avoid or minimize disruption of migratory bird nesting activity by siting or prioritizing vegetation clearing, facility construction, and concentrated operational activities (such as drilling, completion, utility installation) in order to avoid the involvement of higher value migratory bird habitats, especially during the core migratory bird nesting season (May 15 to July 15). (See Appendix B.)</p>		
Cavity-nesting Species			
<p>Desired Outcome: No similar Desired Outcome in current RMP.</p>	<p>Desired Outcome: Provide healthy and productive habitat for cavity-nesting species.</p>		
<p>Action: No similar Action in current RMP.</p>	<p>Action: Broadly manage all forest types in order to provide an average snag retention density of 3 snags per acre.</p>	<p>Action: No similar Action.</p>	
Raptors			
<p>Desired Outcome: No similar Desired Outcome in current RMP.</p>	<p>Desired Outcome: Provide healthy and productive habitat for raptors.</p>		
<p>Action: No similar Action in current RMP.</p>	<p>Action: Apply Suggested Practices for Raptor Protection on Power Lines: the State of the Art in 2006 (Avian Power Line Interaction Committee 2006) and Avian Protection Plan (APP) Guidelines (APLIC and</p>		

**Table 2-2
 Descriptions of Alternatives A, B, C, and D**

Alternative A: No Action Theme: Current Management	Alternative B Theme: Mixed Emphasis	Alternative C Theme: Conservation	Alternative D Theme: Resource Use
	USFWS 2005) to new power line construction (including upgrades and reconstruction) in order to prevent electrocution of raptors.		
Restriction on Use: STIPULATION: No Surface Occupancy, CO-3: Raptors -- Prohibit surface occupancy and surface-disturbing activities within a 0.125-mile radius of a nest site of golden eagles, ospreys, accipiters, buteos, falcons (except kestrels), and owls. (See Appendix C.)	Restriction on Use: STIPULATION CO-NSO-6 Raptor- Osprey, Red-tailed Hawk, Swainson’s Hawk, Cooper’s Hawk, Sharp-shinned Hawk, Northern Harrier, Burrowing Owl, Great horned Owl , and all owls and raptors, with the exception of American Kestrel -- Prohibit surface occupancy or use within a 0.25 mile radius of active and inactive nest sites of osprey, red-tailed hawk, Swainson’s hawk, Cooper’s hawk, Sharp-shinned hawk, Northern Harrier, Burrowing Owl, Great horned owl, and all owls (with the exception of Mexican spotted owl) in order to maintain the integrity of nest sites and surrounding habitat. (See Appendix B.)		
Restriction on Use: STIPULATION: Timing Limitation, CO-18: Raptors -- Prohibit surface occupancy and surface-disturbing activities from February 1 to August 15 within a 0.25-mile radius of a raptor nest site, including osprey, accipiters, falcons (except kestrels), buteos, and owls, in order to protect nesting and fledgling habitat during use. (See Appendix C.)	Restriction on Use: STIPULATION: CO-TL-5 Raptor- Osprey, Red-tailed Hawk, Swainson’s Hawk, Cooper’s Hawk, Sharp-shinned Hawk, Northern Harrier, Burrowing Owl, Great horned Owl, and all Owls and Raptors with the exception of American Kestrel Nest Sites -- Prohibit surface use within 0.25 mile radius of active nests during the following time period(s), or until fledgling and dispersal of young, in order to protect reproductive activity at nest sites. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Osprey: April 1 to August 31; • Red-tailed Hawk: February 15 to August 15; • Swainson’s Hawk: April 1 to August 15; • Cooper’s Hawk: April 1 to August 15; • Sharp-shinned Hawk: April 1 to August 15; • Northern Harrier: April 1 to August 15; • Burrowing Owls: March 15 to August 15; • Great horned Owl: February 1 to August 15; and • Other owls and raptors: March 1 to August 15. (See Appendix B.)		
Restriction on Use: STIPULATION: Timing Limitation, CO-20: Raptors -- Prohibit surface occupancy and surface-disturbing activities from April 1 to August 31 within a 0.5-mile radius of osprey nests in order to protect osprey nesting and fledgling habitat during use. (See Appendix C.)			
Waterfowl and Shorebirds			
Desired Outcome:	Desired Outcome:		

**Table 2-2
 Descriptions of Alternatives A, B, C, and D**

Alternative A: No Action Theme: Current Management	Alternative B Theme: Mixed Emphasis	Alternative C Theme: Conservation	Alternative D Theme: Resource Use
No similar Desired Outcome in current RMP.	Provide healthy and productive habitat for waterfowl and shorebirds.		
Restriction on Use: STIPULATION: No Surface Occupancy, CO-07: Waterfowl and Shorebird Habitat and Rookeries -- Prohibit surface occupancy and surface-disturbing activities in order to protect waterfowl and shorebird habitat and rookeries within significant production areas as mapped by the CDOW. (See Appendix C.)	Restriction on Use: No similar Restriction on Use.		
Restriction on Use: No similar Restriction on Use in current RMP.	Restriction on Use: STIPULATION CO-TL-4: Shorebirds, Waterbirds and Waterfowl -- Prohibit surface use in areas designated for waterfowl, shorebird, and waterbird production from March 1 to July 31 in order to prevent disruption of nesting activity. (NOTE: This stipulation would not apply to operation and maintenance of production facilities). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 0.25-mile radius around the nesting and production areas of the Hebron Waterfowl Area, Junction Butte Wetlands, and MacFarlane Reservoir. (See Appendix B.) 		
Special Status Species – Fish and Other Aquatic Wildlife			
■ GOAL: No similar Goal in current RMP.	GOAL: Prevent the need for listing of Proposed, Candidate, and Sensitive Species under the ESA; protect Special Status Species; and improve their habitats to a point where their special status recognition is no longer warranted (Public Land Health Standard 4). Take necessary actions in order to help to delist the 5 federally listed fish species found within the Planning Area by following pertinent Recovery Plans and implementing actions and protections that assist in their recovery.		
Desired Outcome: Protect occupied and suitable habitat for Federal Proposed, Candidate, and Threatened or Endangered Species, and protect occupied habitat for BLM Sensitive Species necessary for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • maintenance and recovery of Proposed, Candidate, and Threatened or Endangered Species; and • support of BLM Sensitive Species and significant plant communities, consistent with BLM policy on Special Status Species Management (BLM 			

**Table 2-2
 Descriptions of Alternatives A, B, C, and D**

Alternative A: No Action Theme: Current Management	Alternative B Theme: Mixed Emphasis	Alternative C Theme: Conservation	Alternative D Theme: Resource Use
Manual 6840, BLM 2008o).			
Common to All Special Status Fishes			
Action: No similar Action in current RMP.	Action: Identify limiting habitat factors based upon site characteristics and habitat capabilities using channel type and geology classifications (such as Rosgen). 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) or by changing management of other program activities (such as by changing livestock grazing season use) in order to achieve Desired Outcome.		
Action: No similar Action in current RMP.	Action: 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.		
Action: No similar Action in current RMP.	Action: Assist, as appropriate, 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.		
Action: No similar Action in current RMP.	Action: No similar Action.	Action: Designate the Kinney Creek ACEC in order to protect the Colorado River cutthroat trout, a Special Status Species.	Action: No similar Action.
Native Trout (Colorado River Cutthroat Trout and Greenback Cutthroat Trout)			
Restriction on Use: No similar Restriction on Use in current RMP.	Restriction on Use: STIPULATION: CO-NSO-4: Perennial Streams, Water Bodies, Fisheries, and Riparian Areas -- Prohibit surface occupancy or use within a minimum buffer distance of 325 horizontal feet for all perennial waters in order to protect water quality, fish habitat, aquatic habitat; and to provide a clean, reliable source of water for downstream users. For perennial streams, the buffer will be measured from the ordinary high-water mark (bank-full stage). (See Appendix B.)		
Restriction on Use:	Restriction on Use:		

**Table 2-2
 Descriptions of Alternatives A, B, C, and D**

Alternative A: No Action Theme: Current Management	Alternative B Theme: Mixed Emphasis	Alternative C Theme: Conservation	Alternative D Theme: Resource Use
No similar Restriction on Use in current RMP.	STIPULATION: CO-TL-1 : Native Fish and Important Sport Fish -- Prohibit in-channel work in all occupied cutthroat trout (Colorado River, greenback, and Rio Grande) streams during spring spawning periods of April 1 to August 1, and fall spawning periods from October 1 to November 30, in order to protect redds (egg masses) in the gravel and emerging fry of native fish populations (Colorado River, greenback, and Rio Grande cutthroat trout, flannelmouth and bluehead sucker, and roundtail chub), and important sport fish populations (rainbow, brown, and brook trout). (See Appendix B.)		
BLM Sensitive Amphibians (Great Basin Spadefoot, Boreal Toad, Northern Leopard Frog, and Wood Frog)			
Desired Outcome: Protect sensitive amphibian species and their habitats.			
Restriction on Use: No similar Restriction on Use in current RMP.	Restriction on Use: STIPULATION CO-CSU-7: BLM-Sensitive Amphibians -- Apply site-specific relocation restrictions within an 0.5 mile (800-meter) buffer around all known or identified breeding sites of boreal toad, northern leopard frog, Great Basin spade-foot toad, northern cricket frog, plains leopard frog, and canyon tree frog in order to protect breeding habitats and breeding activities; and to maintain the functionality of important breeding habitats and allow for breeding activities to occur uninterrupted. (See Appendix B.)		
Special Status Species – Plants and Terrestrial Wildlife			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ OAL: No similar Goal in current RMP.	GOAL: Prevent the need for listing of Proposed, Candidate, and Sensitive Species under the ESA; protect Special Status Species, and improve their habitats to a point where their special status recognition is no longer warranted (Public Land Health Standard 4).		
Desired Outcome: Protect occupied and suitable habitat for Listed, Proposed, or Candidate Species (including sage-grouse), and protect occupied habitat for other sensitive species necessary for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • maintenance and recovery of Proposed, Candidate, Threatened, and Endangered species; and • support of BLM Sensitive Species and 	Desired Outcome: Promote the maintenance and recovery of federally Listed, Proposed, and Candidate Species (including sage-grouse) by protecting occupied and adjacent suitable habitat. Protect occupied habitat for all BLM Sensitive Species.	Desired Outcome: Promote the maintenance and recovery of federally Listed, Proposed, Candidate, and BLM Sensitive Species (including sage-grouse) by protecting occupied and adjacent suitable habitat.	Desired Outcome: Promote the maintenance and recovery of federally Listed, Proposed, and Candidate Species (including sage-grouse) by protecting occupied habitat.

**Table 2-2
 Descriptions of Alternatives A, B, C, and D**

Alternative A: No Action Theme: Current Management	Alternative B Theme: Mixed Emphasis	Alternative C Theme: Conservation	Alternative D Theme: Resource Use
significant plant communities, consistent with BLM policy on Special Status Species Management (BLM Manual 6840, BLM2008o).			
Common to All Special Status Plants and Terrestrial Wildlife			
Action: No similar Action in current RMP.	Action: Designate ACECs in order to protect the following Special Status plant species: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Kremmling (Osterhout milkvetch); • Laramie River (North Park phacelia); • North Park Natural Area (North Park phacelia); and • Troublesome (Osterhout milkvetch and Penland beardtongue). 	Action: Designate ACECs in order to protect the following Special Status plant species: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same areas as under Alternative B, plus: • North Sandhills (boat-shaped bugseed). 	Action: Designate ACECs in order to protect the following Special Status plant species: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Kremmling (Osterhout milkvetch); • North Park Natural Area (North Park phacelia); and • Troublesome (Osterhout milkvetch and Penland beardtongue).
Action: No similar Action in current RMP.	Action: 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.		
Action: No similar Action in current RMP.	Action: Restore potential Special Status Species habitat to suitable habitat by applying treatments to historically occupied, degraded habitats.	Action: No similar Action.	
Action: No similar Action in current RMP.	Action: 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		

**Table 2-2
 Descriptions of Alternatives A, B, C, and D**

Alternative A: No Action	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D
Theme: Current Management	Theme: Mixed Emphasis	Theme: Conservation	Theme: Resource Use
<p>Action: No similar Action in current RMP.</p>	<p>with the CDOW.</p> <p>Action: LEASE NOTICE, CO-LN-3: Special Status Species Plants and Wildlife -- In areas of known or suspected habitat of Special Status Species (federally Listed, Proposed, Candidate, and BLM Sensitive Species), or significant plant communities, a biological inventory may be required prior to approval of operations. (The inventory will be used in environmental analysis, and mitigating measures may be required in order to reduce the impacts of surface disturbance on the affected species or their habitats.) Special design and construction measures designed to mitigate impacts, may include, but are not limited to, relocation of roads, well pads, pipelines, and other facilities; and fencing operations.</p>		
<p>Action: LEASE NOTICE, CO-34: Endangered Species Act -- The lease area may now, or hereafter, contain plants, animals, or their habitats determined to be Threatened, Endangered, or other Special Status Species. The BLM may recommend modifications to exploration and development proposals to further conservation and management objectives in order to avoid BLM-approved activity that will contribute to a need to list such a species or their habitat. The BLM may require modifications to (or disapprove) proposed activity that is likely to result in jeopardy to the continued existence of a Proposed or Listed Threatened or Endangered Species, or result in the destruction or adverse modification of a designated or proposed critical habitat. The BLM will not approve any ground-</p>	<p>Action: LEASE NOTICE, CO-LN-2: Endangered Species Act -- The lease area may now, or hereafter, contain plants, animals, or their habitats determined to be federally Threatened, Endangered, or Proposed for listing. The BLM may recommend modifications to exploration and development proposals to further conservation and management objectives in order to avoid BLM-approved activity that would adversely affect listed species or their habitat. The BLM may require modifications to (or disapprove) proposed activity that is likely to result in jeopardy to the continued existence of a Proposed or Listed Threatened or Endangered Species, or result in the destruction or adverse modification of a designated or proposed critical habitat. The BLM will not approve any ground-disturbing activity that may affect any such species or critical habitat until it obligations under applicable requirements of the ESA are completed, including completion of any required procedure for conference or consultation. (See Appendix B.)</p>		

**Table 2-2
 Descriptions of Alternatives A, B, C, and D**

Alternative A: No Action Theme: Current Management	Alternative B Theme: Mixed Emphasis	Alternative C Theme: Conservation	Alternative D Theme: Resource Use
disturbing activity that may affect any such species, or critical habitat, until obligations under applicable requirements of the ESA are completed, including completion of any required procedure for conference or consultation.			
Plants			
Action: Prohibit collection of rare plants or plant parts, except as permitted by the Authorized Officer for scientific research.			
Restriction on Use: No similar Restriction on Use in current RMP.	Restriction on Use: STIPULATION: CO-CSU-6: Significant Plant Communities and Relict Vegetation -- For those plant communities that meet the BLM's criteria for significant plant communities, special design, construction, and implementation measures, including relocation of operations by more than 656 feet (200 meters), may be required in order to conserve significant plant communities and relict communities (old growth forests and woodlands) that are not otherwise protected. (Habitat areas include occupied habitat and habitat necessary for the maintenance or viability of the species or communities.) (See Appendix B.)		
Action: No similar Action in current RMP.	Action: Require projects that remove topsoil areas of suitable habitat for Endangered or Threatened Species to set aside and replace the topsoil when groundwork is completed; to preserve the seedbank and associated mycorrhizal species; and to discourage invasive plant species.		
Restriction on Use: STIPULATION: No surface Occupancy, CO-08: Special Status Plant Species -- Prohibit surface occupancy and surface-disturbing activities on habitat areas in order to protect Special Status plant species (including federally Listed species, Proposed Species, and Candidate Species). (See Appendix C and Map 2-	Restriction on Use: STIPULATION: CO-NSO-7: Threatened, Endangered, Proposed and Candidate Plants -- Prohibit surface occupancy or use within a 656-foot (200-meter) buffer from the edge of occupied habitat for the following Special Status plant species: federally Listed, Proposed, and Candidate Species, in order to protect these plant species, and designated critical habitat, from direct and indirect impacts, including loss of habitat. In addition, prohibit surface occupancy within areas designated as critical habitat. (See Appendix B.)		

Table 2-2
Descriptions of Alternatives A, B, C, and D

Alternative A: No Action Theme: Current Management	Alternative B Theme: Mixed Emphasis	Alternative C Theme: Conservation	Alternative D Theme: Resource Use
14 in Appendix A.)			
Restriction on Use: No similar Restriction on Use in current RMP.	Restriction on Use: STIPULATION: CO-CSU-5 BLM-Sensitive Plant Species -- For plant species listed as Sensitive by the BLM, special design, construction, and implementation measures within a 328-foot (100-meter) buffer from the edge of occupied habitat may be required. In addition, relocation of operations by more than 656 feet (200 meters) may be required in order to protect BLM Sensitive plant species from direct and indirect impacts, including loss of habitat. (See Appendix B.)		
Restriction on Use: STIPULATION: No Surface Occupancy, KR-02: North Park Phacelia ACEC/RNA -- Prohibit surface occupancy and surface-disturbing activities in order to protect Endangered plant species habitat within the North Park Phacelia ACEC. (See Appendix C and Map 2-51 in Appendix A.)	Restriction on Use: STIPULATION CO-NSO-25: ACECs, RNAs, and ONAs -- Prohibit surface occupancy or use in ACECs, RNAs, and ONAs in order to protect and prevent irreparable damage to important historic, cultural, or scenic values, fish and wildlife resources, or other natural systems or processes; or to protect human life and safety from natural hazards. (See Appendix B.)		
American White Pelican			
Restriction on Use: STIPULATION: Timing Limitation, CO-17: American White Pelican -- Prohibit surface occupancy and surface-disturbing activities from March 16 to September 30 in order to protect nesting areas and feeding habitat. (See Appendix C.)	Restriction on Use: STIPULATION: CO-TL-4: Shorebirds, Waterbirds and Waterfowl -- Prohibit surface use during the period of March 1 to July 31 in areas designated for waterfowl, shorebird, and waterbird production in order to prevent disruption of nesting activity. (This stipulation would not apply to operation and maintenance of production facilities.). (See Appendix B.)		
Least Tern, Piping Plover, Mountain Plover			
Restriction on Use: No similar Restriction on Use in current RMP.	Restriction on Use: STIPULATION: CO-NSO-15: Least Tern , Snowy Plover, and Piping Plover Nesting Habitat -- Prohibit surface occupancy or use on the lands described below in order to protect the integrity of nesting habitat.		

**Table 2-2
 Descriptions of Alternatives A, B, C, and D**

Alternative A: No Action Theme: Current Management	Alternative B Theme: Mixed Emphasis	Alternative C Theme: Conservation	Alternative D Theme: Resource Use
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • production areas, as mapped by the BLM or by the CDOW. (See Appendix B.) 		
<p>Restriction on Use: No similar Restriction on Use in current RMP.</p>	<p>Restriction on Use: STIPULATION CO-TL-15: Mountain Plover Nesting Habitat -- Prohibit surface use during the following time period in order to prevent disruption of reproductive activity during the production period. (NOTE: This stipulation would not apply to operation and maintenance of production facilities.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • April 10 to July 31, in suitable nesting habitat, as mapped by the BLM or by the CDOW. (See Appendix B.) 		
Bald and Golden Eagles			
<p>Restriction on Use: STIPULATION: No Surface Occupancy, CO-04: Bald Eagle Roost or Nest Site -- Prohibit surface occupancy and surface-disturbing activities within a 0.25-mile radius of the roost or nest site. (See Appendix C.)</p>	<p>Restriction on Use: STIPULATION CO-NSO-11: Raptors – Bald Eagle and Golden Eagle -- Prohibit surface occupancy or use on the lands described below in order to maintain the integrity of nest sites and surrounding habitat:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bald Eagle: within 0.25 mile radius of active and inactive nest sites, or within 100 meters of abandoned nests (unoccupied for 5 consecutive years, but with all or part of the nest remaining); and • Golden Eagle: within 0.25 mile radius of active and inactive nest sites. (See Appendix B.) (NOTE: The Golden Eagle is not currently a Special Status Species; however, it is afforded special considerations under the Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act.)		
<p>Restriction on Use: No similar Restriction on Use in current RMP.</p>	<p>Restriction on Use: STIPULATION CO-CSU-11: Bald Eagle Habitat – Cottonwood Communities -- In order to maintain long-term availability of suitable bald eagle habitat, surface occupancy or use is subject to the following special operating constraints: The Field Manager may require the proponent/applicant to submit a Plan of Development that would demonstrate that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • involvement of cottonwood stands or cottonwood regeneration areas have been avoided, to the extent practicable; • special reclamation measures or design features are incorporated that would accelerate recovery 		

**Table 2-2
 Descriptions of Alternatives A, B, C, and D**

Alternative A: No Action Theme: Current Management	Alternative B Theme: Mixed Emphasis	Alternative C Theme: Conservation	Alternative D Theme: Resource Use
	and/or the re-establishment of affected cottonwood communities; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the pre-development potential of affected floodplains to develop or support riverine cottonwood communities has not been diminished; and the current/future utility of such cottonwood substrate for bald eagle use would not be impaired. (See Appendix B.)		
Restriction on Use: STIPULATION: Timing Limitation, CO-22: Bald Eagle Nest Site -- Prohibit surface occupancy and surface-disturbing activities within a 0.25-mile buffer around bald eagle nest sites from December 15 to June 15 in order to protect nesting habitat. (See Appendix C.)	Restriction on Use: STIPULATION: CO-TL-11: Bald Eagle and Golden Eagle Nest Sites -- Prohibit surface use in the areas and times described below, or until fledgling and dispersal of young, in order to protect reproductive activity at nest sites: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bald Eagle: November 15 to July 31, 0.5 mile radius around active nests; and Golden Eagle: December 15 to July 15, 0.5 mile radius around active nests. (See Appendix B.)		
Restriction on Use: STIPULATION: Timing Limitation, CO-23: Bald Eagle Winter Roost Site -- Prohibit surface occupancy and surface-disturbing activities within a 0.5-mile buffer around bald eagle winter roost sites from November 16 to April 15 in order to avoid relocation to less suitable areas. (See Appendix C.)	Restriction on Use: STIPULATION CO-TL-12: Bald Eagle Winter Roost Sites -- Prohibit surface use within the area described below during the following time period in order to prevent disruption of wintering bald eagles at communal roosts: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> November 15 to March 15, within 0.5 miles of an active winter roost. (See Appendix B.)		
Ferruginous Hawk, Peregrine Falcon, Prairie Falcon, and Northern Goshawk			
Restriction on Use: STIPULATION: No Surface Occupancy, CO-19: Ferruginous Hawk Nesting and Fledgling Habitat -- Prohibit surface occupancy and surface-disturbing activities within a 0.125-mile	Restriction on Use: STIPULATION: CO-NSO-13: Raptors- Ferruginous Hawk, Peregrine Falcon, Prairie Falcon, and Northern Goshawk -- Prohibit surface occupancy or use within 0.5 mile of active and inactive nest sites of Ferruginous Hawk, Peregrine Falcon, Prairie Falcon, and Northern Goshawk in order to maintain the integrity of nest sites and surrounding habitat. (See Appendix B.)		

Table 2-2
Descriptions of Alternatives A, B, C, and D

Alternative A: No Action Theme: Current Management	Alternative B Theme: Mixed Emphasis	Alternative C Theme: Conservation	Alternative D Theme: Resource Use
radius of a nest site in order to protect ferruginous hawk nesting and fledgling habitat during usage, and to avoid nest abandonment. (See Appendix C.)			
Restriction on Use: STIPULATION: Timing Limitation, CO-19: Ferruginous Hawk Nesting and Fledgling Habitat -- Prohibit surface occupancy and surface-disturbing activities from February 1 to August 15 within a 1-mile radius of a nest site in order to protect Ferruginous Hawk nesting and fledgling habitat during usage, and to avoid nest abandonment. (See Map 2-11 in Appendix A.)	Restriction on Use: STIPULATION: CO-TL-13: Ferruginous Hawk, Peregrine Falcon, Prairie Falcon, and Northern Goshawk Nest Sites -- Prohibit surface use in the areas and times described below, or until fledgling and dispersal of young, in order to protect reproductive activity at active nest sites. (NOTE: This stipulation would not apply to operation and maintenance of production facilities.) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ferruginous Hawk: February 1 to August 15, within 0.5 mile of active nest sites. (See Appendix B.) 		
Restriction on Use: STIPULATION: No Surface Occupancy, CO-05: Peregrine Falcon Cliff-Nesting Complex -- Prohibit surface occupancy and surface-disturbing activities within a 0.25 mile radius of a cliff-nesting complex in order to maintain the integrity of active nest sites and surrounding habitat. (See Appendix C.)	Restriction on Use: STIPULATION: CO-NSO-13: Raptors- Ferruginous Hawk, Peregrine Falcon, Prairie Falcon, and Northern Goshawk -- Prohibit surface occupancy or use within 0.5 mile of active and inactive nest sites of Ferruginous Hawk, Peregrine Falcon, Prairie Falcon, and Northern Goshawk in order to maintain the integrity of nest sites and surrounding habitat. (See Appendix B.)		
Restriction on Use: STIPULATION: Timing Limitation, CO-24: Peregrine Falcon Cliff-Nesting Complex -- Prohibit surface occupancy and surface-disturbing activities within a 0.5-mile buffer around peregrine falcon	Restriction on Use: STIPULATION: CO-TL-13: Ferruginous Hawk, Peregrine Falcon, Prairie Falcon, & Northern Goshawk Nest Sites. Prohibit surface use in the areas and times described below, or until fledgling and dispersal of young, in order to protect reproductive activity at active nest sites. (NOTE: This stipulation would not apply to operation and maintenance of production facilities.) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Peregrine and Prairie Falcon: March 15 to July 31, within 0.5 mile of active nest sites. 		

**Table 2-2
 Descriptions of Alternatives A, B, C, and D**

Alternative A: No Action Theme: Current Management	Alternative B Theme: Mixed Emphasis	Alternative C Theme: Conservation	Alternative D Theme: Resource Use
cliff-nesting complexes from March 15 to July 31. (See Appendix C.)	(See Appendix B.)		
Greater Sage-grouse and Sagebrush Biome			
Action: No similar Action in current RMP.	Action: 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.		
Restriction on Use: STIPULATION: No Surface Occupancy, CO-02: Grouse Leks -- Prohibit surface occupancy and surface-disturbing activities within a 0.25-mile radius of an active lek (courtship area). Grouse includes Greater sage-grouse, Columbian sharp-tailed grouse, and Lesser and Greater prairie chickens. (See Appendix C.)	Restriction on Use: STIPULATION: CO-NSO-9: Greater Sage-grouse -- Prohibit surface occupancy or use (approximately 47,700 acres of the Federal mineral estate) within 0.6 mile radius of Greater sage-grouse leks in order to maintain integrity of habitat surrounding leks that are used during the breeding period. (See Appendix B.)		
Restriction on Use: No similar Restriction on Use in current RMP.	Restriction on Use: STIPULATION: CO-CSU-8: Mapped Seasonal Habitats (non-lek breeding, late brood rearing, and winter habitat) or Suitable Sagebrush Habitat Within a 4-mile Radius of a Lek -- Apply CSU to approximately 437,500 acres of the Federal mineral estate. Surface occupancy or use is subject to the following special operating constraints: The Field Manager may require the proponent/applicant to submit a Plan of Development to maintain the integrity of important occupied Greater sage-grouse habitat in order to maintain sustainable local populations. The Plan of Development would demonstrate: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • reduction to acceptable levels, the direct or indirect loss of important Greater sage-grouse habitat necessary for sustainable local populations; • special reclamation measures or design features incorporated that would accelerate recovery and/or the re-establishment of affected sage-grouse habitat; and 		

**Table 2-2
 Descriptions of Alternatives A, B, C, and D**

Alternative A: No Action Theme: Current Management	Alternative B Theme: Mixed Emphasis	Alternative C Theme: Conservation	Alternative D Theme: Resource Use
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> that the current/future utility of such habitat for sage-grouse use would not be impaired. Additional conservation measures may be imposed, as necessary, in order to maintain high quality sage-grouse habitat; reduce fragmentation or loss of habitat within, or between, population areas; reduce cumulative impacts within population areas; and reduce disturbance to sage-grouse use in the Planning Area. Conservation measures may be identified in State or local Conservation Plans, or through appropriate science or research for the species. (See Appendix B.) 		
<p>Restriction on Use: STIPULATION Timing Limitation CO-15: Grouse Winter Habitat -- Prohibit surface occupancy and surface-disturbing activities during certain timeframes in grouse crucial winter habitat and nesting habitat (includes Greater sage-grouse). [Sage-grouse nesting habitat is described as sagebrush stands with sagebrush plants between 30 centimeters and 100 centimeters (approximately 12 inches and 40 inches) in height, and a mean canopy cover between 15 percent and 40 percent within a 2-mile radius of an active lek.]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sage-grouse crucial winter habitat: December 16 to March 15; and Sage-grouse nesting habitat: March 1 to June 30. <p>(See Appendix C.)</p>	<p>Restriction on Use: STIPULATION: CO-TL-7: Sage Grouse Nesting Habitat -- Prohibit surface use (approximately 437,500 acres of the Federal mineral estate) from March 1 to July 15 in suitable nesting habitat within a 4-mile radius of active leks or mapped nesting habitat in order to prevent disruption of reproductive activity during the production period. (NOTE: This stipulation is intended to apply to construction, drilling, fracing, and completion activities; however, it may apply to operation, maintenance, and production activities that may disrupt reproductive activities of sage-grouse as well).</p> <p>Restriction on Use: STIPULATION: CO-TL-8: Sage Grouse Winter Habitat -- Prohibit surface use (approximately 96,400 acres of the Federal mineral estate) from December 1 to March 15 in mapped important sage-grouse winter range, as defined by the BLM and the CDOW; prevent disruption of sage-grouse during the winter period. (See Appendix B.)</p>		

Table 2-2
Descriptions of Alternatives A, B, C, and D

Alternative A: No Action	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D
Theme: Current Management	Theme: Mixed Emphasis	Theme: Conservation	Theme: Resource Use
<p>..... ction: EASE NOTICE CO-30: Nesting Grouse Species -- Relocate surface-disturbing activities proposed between March 1 and June 30, consistent with lease rights granted and Section 6 of standard lease terms, out of grouse nesting habitat in order to protect nesting grouse species (including Greater sage-grouse and Columbian sharp-tailed grouse).</p>	<p>Action: LEASE NOTICE CO-LN-4: Important Sage-grouse Habitat -- The lease may in part, or in total, contain important Greater Sage-grouse habitats, as identified by the BLM, either currently or prospectively. The Operator may be required to implement specific measures through a COA in order to reduce impacts of oil and gas or geothermal operations on the Greater Sage-grouse population and habitat quality. Sage-grouse habitat conservation measures may include timing restrictions, distances or percentages of allowable surface-disturbing activities, noise-suppression actions, and desired density levels or other development constraints consistent with State or Range-wide Sage-grouse Conservation Planning for Colorado (including subsequent updates), current peer reviewed sage-grouse research, or as developed in conjunction with the CDOW, in order to meet local population objectives. Such measures shall be developed during the APD on-site and environmental review process, or during the environmental review process for Sundry Notices and associated ROWs, and will be consistent with lease rights granted.</p>		
<p>Desired Outcome: Sustain the integrity of the sagebrush biome in order to provide the amount, continuity, and quality of habitat that is necessary to maintain sustainable populations of Greater sage-grouse and other sagebrush-dependent species.</p>			
<p>Action: No similar Action in current RMP.</p>	<p>Action: Allow no more than 3 percent of the surface area within Greater sage-grouse core areas to be disturbed at any one time. 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</p>	<p>Action: Same as under Alternative B, except: Allow no more than 1 percent of the surface area within core areas to be disturbed at any one time.</p>	<p>Action: Same as Alternative B, except: Allow no more than 5 percent of the surface area within core areas to be disturbed at any one time.</p>

**Table 2-2
 Descriptions of Alternatives A, B, C, and D**

Alternative A: No Action Theme: Current Management	Alternative B Theme: Mixed Emphasis	Alternative C Theme: Conservation	Alternative D Theme: Resource Use
	already occur. Prohibit a net increase of acreage in roads. Close and rehabilitate roads that are fragmenting the sagebrush ecosystem.		
Action: No similar Action in current RMP.	Action: No similar Action.	Action: 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. (See Map 2-13 in Appendix A.)	Action: No similar Action.
Columbian Sharp-tailed Grouse			
Restriction on Use: STIPULATION: No Surface Occupancy, CO-02: Grouse Leks -- Prohibit surface occupancy and surface-disturbing activities within a 0.25-mile radius of an active lek (courtship area). Grouse includes Greater sage-grouse, Columbian sharp-tailed grouse, and Lesser and Greater prairie chickens. (See Appendix C.)	Restriction on Use: STIPULATION CO-NSO-10: Columbian Sharp-tailed and Plains Sharp-tailed Grouse -- Prohibit surface occupancy or use within a 0.4 mile radius of leks in order to maintain integrity of habitat surrounding leks that are used during the breeding period. (See Appendix B.)		

Table 2-2
Descriptions of Alternatives A, B, C, and D

Alternative A: No Action	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D
Theme: Current Management	Theme: Mixed Emphasis	Theme: Conservation	Theme: Resource Use

<p>Restriction on Use: STIPULATION: Timing Limitation, CO-15: Grouse Winter Habitat -- Prohibit surface occupancy and surface-disturbing activities during certain timeframes in grouse crucial winter habitat and nesting habitat (includes Columbian sharp-tailed grouse). [Sharp-tailed grouse nesting habitat is described as sagebrush stands with sagebrush plants between 30 centimeters and 100 centimeters (approximately 12 inches and 40 inches) in height, and a mean canopy cover between 15 percent and 40 percent within a 2-mile radius of an active lek.]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sharp-tailed grouse crucial winter habitat: December 16 to March 15; and • Sage-grouse nesting habitat: March 1 to June 30. <p>(See Appendix C.)</p>	<p>Restriction on Use: STIPULATION: CO-TL-9: Plains and Columbian Sharp-tailed Grouse Nesting Habitat -- Prohibit surface use from March 15 to July 30 in suitable nesting habitat within a 1.25 mile radius of active leks or mapped nesting habitat in order to prevent disruption of reproductive activity during the production period. (See Appendix B.)</p> <hr/> <p>Restriction on Use: STIPULATION CO-TL-10: Columbian Sharp-tailed Grouse Winter Habitat -- Prohibit surface use during the following time period in mapped important Columbian Sharp-tailed grouse winter range, as defined by the BLM and the CDOW during the planning process, in order to prevent disruption of Columbian Sharp-tailed grouse during the winter.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • December 1 to March 15. <p>[See Maps 2-8 (Alternative B), 2-9 (Alternative C), and 2-10 (Alternative D) in Appendix A.]</p>
---	---

**Table 2-2
 Descriptions of Alternatives A, B, C, and D**

Alternative A: No Action	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D
Theme: Current Management	Theme: Mixed Emphasis	Theme: Conservation	Theme: Resource Use
<p>▪ ction: ▪ EASE NOTICE, CO-30: Nesting Grouse Species -- Relocate surface-disturbing activities proposed between March 1 and June 30 out of grouse nesting habitat in order to protect nesting grouse species (including Greater sage-grouse and Columbian sharp-tailed grouse), consistent with lease rights granted and Section 6 of standard lease terms.</p>	<p>Action: LEASE NOTICE, CO-LN-4: Important Sage-grouse Habitat -- The lease may in part, or in total, contain important Greater Sage-grouse habitats, as identified by the BLM, either currently or prospectively. The Operator may be required to implement specific measures through a COA in order to reduce impacts of oil and gas or geothermal operations on the Greater Sage-grouse population and habitat quality. Sage-grouse habitat conservation measures may include timing restrictions, distances or percentages of allowable surface-disturbing activities, noise-suppression actions, and desired density levels or other development constraints consistent with State or Range-wide Sage-grouse Conservation Planning for Colorado (including subsequent updates), current peer reviewed sage-grouse research, or as developed in conjunction with the CDOW, in order to meet local population objectives. Such measures shall be developed during the APD on-site and environmental review process, or during the environmental review process for Sundry Notices and associated ROWs, and will be consistent with lease rights granted.</p>		
Greater Sandhill Crane			
<p>Restriction on Use: STIPULATION: Timing Limitation, CO-16: Greater Sandhill Crane -- Prohibit surface occupancy and surface-disturbing activities from March 1 to October 16 in order to protect Greater sandhill crane nesting and staging habitat during usage. (See Appendix C.)</p>	<p>Restriction on Use: STIPULATION: CO-TL-16: Greater Sandhill Crane Nesting, Roosting, Staging, and Migration Habitat -- Prohibit surface use from March 1 to October 16 in areas designated by the KFO for sandhill crane production or migration habitat use in order to prevent disruption of bird behavior during key seasonal habitat use periods. (See Appendix B.)</p>		
Western Yellow-billed Cuckoo			
<p>Action: No similar Action in current RMP.</p>	<p>Action: If suitable habitat for the Federal Candidate yellow-billed cuckoo is identified, conservation measures specified by the USFWS would be applied.</p>		
Mexican Spotted Owl			
<p>Action:</p>	<p>Action:</p>		

**Table 2-2
 Descriptions of Alternatives A, B, C, and D**

Alternative A: No Action Theme: Current Management	Alternative B Theme: Mixed Emphasis	Alternative C Theme: Conservation	Alternative D Theme: Resource Use
No similar Action in current RMP.	If suitable habitat for the Mexican spotted owl habitat is identified, conservation measures specified by the USFWS would be applied.		
Restriction on Use: STIPULATION: No Surface Occupancy, CO-06: Mexican Spotted Owl -- Prohibit surface occupancy and surface-disturbing activities within a 0.25-mile radius of a roost or nest site. (See Appendix C.)	Restriction on Use: STIPULATION: CO-NSO-14: Raptor -- Mexican Spotted Owl -- Prohibit surface occupancy or use on the lands identified as Protected Activity Centers (PACs) for Mexican spotted owls in order to maintain the integrity of the breeding and brood rearing complex. (See Appendix B.)		
Restriction on Use: No similar Restriction on Use in current RMP.	Restriction on Use: STIPULATION: CO-CSU-12: Mexican Spotted Owl – Suitable Breeding Habitat -- Surface occupancy or use is subject to the following special operating constraints designed to maintain the availability of suitable breeding and brood rearing habitat as defined in the Mexican Spotted Owl Recovery Plan in order to promote recovery: The Field Manager may require the proponent/applicant to submit a Plan of Development that would demonstrate that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impacts to Mexican spotted owl habitat have been avoided to the extent practicable. Constituent elements for Mexican spotted owl breeding habitat include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • high basal area of large diameter trees; • moderate-to-high canopy closure; • wide range of tree sizes, suggestive of uneven-age stands; • multi-layered canopy with large overstory trees of various species; • high snag basal area; • high volumes of fallen trees and other woody debris; • high plant species richness; and • adequate levels of residual plant cover to maintain fruits, seeds, and regeneration in order to provide for the needs of Mexican spotted owl prey species. For canyon habitat, the primary constituent elements include the following attributes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • cooler and often more humid conditions than the surrounding area; 		

**Table 2-2
 Descriptions of Alternatives A, B, C, and D**

Alternative A: No Action Theme: Current Management	Alternative B Theme: Mixed Emphasis	Alternative C Theme: Conservation	Alternative D Theme: Resource Use
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • clumps or stringers of trees and/or canyon wall containing crevices, ledges, or caves; • high percent of ground litter and woody debris; • riparian or woody vegetation (although not at all sites); • special reclamation measures or design features incorporated that would accelerate recovery and/or the re-establishment of affected Mexican spotted owl habitat; and • that the current/future utility of such habitat for Mexican spotted owl use would not be impaired. (See Appendix B.) 		
<p>Restriction on Use: STIPULATION: Timing Limitation, CO-21: Mexican Spotted Owl -- Prohibit surface occupancy and surface-disturbing activities from February 1 to July 31 in order to protect Mexican spotted owl core habitat areas (such as nesting and fledgling habitat) during usage. (See Appendix C.)</p>	<p>Restriction on Use: STIPULATION CO-TL-14: Mexican Spotted Owl Suitable Breeding Habitat -- Prohibit surface use from March 1 to August 31 in suitable breeding habitat in order to maintain the utility of suitable breeding and brood rearing habitat, as defined in the Mexican Spotted Owl Recovery Plan, in order to promote recovery. (See Appendix B.)</p>		
Burrowing Owl			
<p>Action: No similar Action in current RMP.</p>	<p>Action: Locate and map occupied burrowing owl habitat on BLM-managed public lands in Jackson County.</p>		
<p>Restriction on Use: No similar Restriction on Use in current RMP.</p>	<p>Restriction on Use: STIPULATION: CO-NSO-6: Raptor- Osprey, Red-tailed Hawk, Swainson’s Hawk, Cooper’s Hawk, Sharp-shinned Hawk, Northern Harrier, Burrowing Owl, Great horned Owl , and all Owls and raptors, with exception of American Kestrel -- Prohibit surface occupancy or use within 0.25 mile radius of active and inactive nest sites of Burrowing owl in order to maintain the integrity of nest sites and surrounding habitat. (See Appendix B.)</p>		
<p>Restriction on Use: No similar Restriction on Use in current RMP.</p>	<p>Restriction on Use: STIPULATION CO-TL-5 : Raptor- Osprey, Red-tailed Hawk, Swainson’s Hawk, Cooper’s Hawk, Sharp-shinned Hawk, Northern Harrier, Burrowing Owl, Great horned Owl, and all Owls and</p>		

**Table 2-2
 Descriptions of Alternatives A, B, C, and D**

Alternative A: No Action Theme: Current Management	Alternative B Theme: Mixed Emphasis	Alternative C Theme: Conservation	Alternative D Theme: Resource Use
Raptors with Exception of American Kestrel Nest Sites -- Prohibit surface use within a 0.25 mile radius of active nests from March 15 to August 15, or until fledgling and dispersal of young, in order to protect reproductive activity at nest sites. (See Appendix B.)			
Bats			
Restriction on Use: No similar Restriction on Use in current RMP.	Restriction on Use: STIPULATION CO-NSO-8: Sensitive or Federally Listed Bat Species -- Prohibit surface occupancy or use within a 0.25 mile radius of known maternity roosts or hibernacula of BLM Sensitive bat species in order to protect known Sensitive bat species' maternity roosts and hibernacula. (See Appendix B.)	Restriction on Use: No similar Restriction on Use.	
Action: No similar Action in current RMP.	Action: LEASE NOTICE CO-LN-3: Special Status Species Plants and Wildlife -- In areas of known or suspected habitat of Special Status Species (federally Listed, Proposed, Candidate, and BLM Sensitive Species), a biological inventory may be required prior to approval of operations. (The inventory will be used in environmental analysis, and mitigating measures designed to reduce the impacts of surface disturbance on the affected species or their habitats may be required.) Special design and construction measures designed to mitigate impacts may include, but are not limited to, relocation of roads, well pads, pipelines, and other facilities; and fencing operations. The lessee/operator may be required to submit a Plan for avoidance or mitigation of impacts to the Authorized Officer.		
White-tailed Prairie Dog			
Action: No similar Action in current RMP.	Action: Allow for the use of biological or chemical control, or both, of plague vectors at prairie dog colonies.		
Action: No similar Action in current RMP.	Action: Maintain at least 90 percent of the occupied prairie dog habitat acreage as undisturbed on BLM-managed public lands within the Management Focus Area. (See Map 3-15 in Appendix A.)	Action: Maintain at least 80 percent of the occupied prairie dog habitat acreage as undisturbed on BLM-managed public lands within the Management Focus Area.	

**Table 2-2
 Descriptions of Alternatives A, B, C, and D**

Alternative A: No Action	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D
Theme: Current Management	Theme: Mixed Emphasis	Theme: Conservation	Theme: Resource Use
<i>Resources</i>			
<p>Restriction on Use: No similar Restriction on Use in current RMP. .</p>	<p>(See Map 3-15, Appendix A).</p> <p>Restriction on Use: STIPULATION CO-CSU-9: Prairie Dog Town Complexes -- Development of lease parcels that include current or historically occupied prairie dog towns, as mapped by the CDOW or by the BLM, or by both, would require 1 or more of the following conservation measures prior to, and during, lease development in order to maintain the integrity and extent of prairie dog complexes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • development of a Surface Use Plan of Operations with the BLM that integrates and coordinates long-term lease development with measures necessary in order to minimize adverse impacts to prairie dog populations or their habitat; • special daily and seasonal activity restrictions on construction, drilling, product transport, and service activities during reproductive period (from March 1 to June 15); • special modifications to facility siting, design, construction, and operation in order to minimize involvement of prairie dog burrow systems; and • provide in-kind compensation for habitat loss and/or displacement (such as special on-site prairie dog habitat enhancement) when appropriate. <p>(See Appendix B and Map 3-15 in Appendix A.)</p>		
Canada Lynx			
<p>Action: No similar Action in current RMP.</p>	<p>Action: Implement applicable conservation and restoration measures identified in the Canada Lynx Conservation Assessment and Strategy (Ruediger et al. 2000). [Occupied lynx habitat is identified in the Lands and Realty section as a ROW Avoidance Area (including renewable energy sites, such as solar, wind, hydro, and biomass development).]</p>		
<p>Action: No similar Action in current RMP.</p>	<p>Action: 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 in Lynx Analysis Units (LAUs) in order to achieve desired conditions in accordance with Canada Lynx Conservation Assessment and Strategy (Ruediger et al. 2000).</p>		
<p>Action:</p>	<p>Action:</p>		

**Table 2-2
 Descriptions of Alternatives A, B, C, and D**

Alternative A: No Action	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D
Theme: Current Management	Theme: Mixed Emphasis	Theme: Conservation	Theme: Resource Use
No similar Action in current RMP.	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. (Where applicable, this would be coordinated between the KFO, the BLM Colorado State Office, the USFWS, and the USFS.)		
Action: No similar Action in current RMP.	Action: Protect key linkage areas both within, and between, LAUs or suitable lynx habitat, or both, from activities that would create barriers to movement.		
Restriction on Use: No similar Restriction on Use in current RMP.	Restriction on Use: STIPULATION: CO-CSU-10: Established Lynx Linkage Corridors and Lynx Habitat within LAUs -- Development of lease parcels within established Lynx Linkage Corridors and mapped LAUs would require appropriate application of the following conservation measures prior to, and during, lease development, as determined through Section 7 consultation with the USFWS, in order to maintain integrity and use of lynx habitat per LCAS guidelines: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • restrict newly constructed road use to activities associated directly with development and construction activities; • reduce the influence of snow compaction and removal activities as travel corridors for competitive predators [use of over-the-snow vehicles would be prohibited for use in LAU lynx habitat (such as for on-site reconnaissance, resource surveys)]; • surface use or disrupting activities would not be allowed in LAU denning habitat during the denning period, from March 15 to July 15; and • development or production facilities would be sited in order to avoid primary lynx habitat. Oil and gas development activities on BLM-managed public surface lands would not be allowed to contribute disproportionately to management thresholds applied to lynx habitat (no more than 30 percent of mapped habitat within a LAU in unsuitable condition, and less than 15 percent of habitat within an LAU converted to unsuitable condition within a 10-year period; also, maintenance of greater than 10 percent of habitat suitable for denning within an LAU). (See Appendix B and Map 3-17 in Appendix A.)		
Gray Wolf			
Action: No similar Action in current RMP.	Action: If applicable, coordinate with the CDOW and the USFWS for wolf management.		

**Table 2-2
 Descriptions of Alternatives A, B, C, and D**

Alternative A: No Action	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D
Theme: Current Management	Theme: Mixed Emphasis	Theme: Conservation	Theme: Resource Use

<p>Action: No similar Action in current RMP.</p>	<p>Action: LEASE NOTICE, CO-LN-2: Endangered Species Act -- The lease area may now, or hereafter, contain plants, animals, or their habitats determined to be federally Threatened, Endangered, or Proposed for Listing. The BLM may recommend modifications to exploration and development proposals to further conservation and management objectives in order to avoid BLM-approved activity that would adversely affect listed species or their habitat. The BLM may require modifications to (or disapprove) proposed activity that is likely to result in jeopardy to the continued existence of a Proposed or Listed Threatened or Endangered Species or result in the destruction or adverse modification of a designated or proposed critical habitat. The BLM will not approve any ground-disturbing activity that may affect any such species or critical habitat until obligations under applicable requirements of the ESA are completed, including completion of any required procedure for conference or consultation. (See Appendix B.)</p>
--	--

Cultural Resources

..... **GOAL 1:** Identify, preserve, and protect significant cultural resources in order to ensure appropriate uses by present and future generations (for research, education, and preservation of cultural heritage).

Desired Outcome:
 Preserve the nature and value of cultural resources.

<p>Action: No similar Action in current RMP.</p>	<p>Action: The BLM has allocated cultural resources currently recorded, or projected to occur on the basis of existing data synthesis, to the uses described below. These allocations are contained in the Class I Cultural Resource Overview of the BLM's Kremmling Field Office (Reed et al., 2008b), which contains privileged information not for distribution.</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td> <p>Use Allocation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Scientific use Conservation for future use Traditional use Public use Experimental use Discharge from management </td> <td> <p>Desired Outcome</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Preserved until research potential is realized Preserved until conditions for use are met Long-term preservation Long-term preservation, onsite interpretation Protected until used No use after recordation; not preserved </td> </tr> </table> <p>Sites will be added or removed from each allocation in response to changing conditions, or as additional</p>	<p>Use Allocation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Scientific use Conservation for future use Traditional use Public use Experimental use Discharge from management 	<p>Desired Outcome</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Preserved until research potential is realized Preserved until conditions for use are met Long-term preservation Long-term preservation, onsite interpretation Protected until used No use after recordation; not preserved
<p>Use Allocation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Scientific use Conservation for future use Traditional use Public use Experimental use Discharge from management 	<p>Desired Outcome</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Preserved until research potential is realized Preserved until conditions for use are met Long-term preservation Long-term preservation, onsite interpretation Protected until used No use after recordation; not preserved 		

**Table 2-2
 Descriptions of Alternatives A, B, C, and D**

Alternative A: No Action	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D
Theme: Current Management	Theme: Mixed Emphasis	Theme: Conservation	Theme: Resource Use
data and information are obtained.			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> GOAL 2: 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 uses comply with applicable laws, rules, regulations, policies, standards, and guidelines. 			
Desired Outcome: No similar Desired Outcome in current RMP.	Desired Outcome: Preserve the existing character of the historic and associated physical landscapes.		
Action: Inventory, evaluate, mitigate, and protect cultural resources, giving priority to those that are associated with Proposed Actions where surfaces will be disturbed.			
Action: Review all Proposed Actions and coordinate with proponents early in the implementation planning process in order to define an area of potential effect; conduct a literature review; and complete inventories, mitigation, and other related actions in consultation with Native American Tribes, the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), and other parties, as appropriate.			
Restriction on Use: Technical Guidance from the Colorado State Office requires a 100-meter buffer for historic properties.	Restriction on Use: STIPULATION CO-NSO-16: Cultural Resources -- Prohibit surface occupancy or use within 100 meters of all known eligible cultural resources, traditional cultural properties, and listed National Register Sites/Districts, outstanding cultural resources to be nominated to the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP), interpreted and/or public use sites, and experimental-use sites, in order to protect cultural resource sites that may be damaged from inadvertent, unauthorized, or authorized uses. (See Appendix B.)		
Action: No similar Action in current RMP.	Action: LEASE NOTICE CO-LN-5: Cultural Resources -- The lessee is hereby notified that a Class III Cultural Resource Inventory may be required prior to surface-disturbing activities. Mitigation measures may be required in order to reduce the impacts of surface disturbances on the affected cultural resources. These mitigating measures may include, but are not limited to, relocation of roads, well pads, and other facilities; evaluative testing; data recovery; and/or fencing. Mitigation measures may be required upon the discovery of any cultural resource. All cultural resource work must be performed by a BLM-permitted Archaeologist. The BLM may charge Federal licensees and permittees project costs of preservation activities conducted under the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) as a condition to the issuance		

**Table 2-2
 Descriptions of Alternatives A, B, C, and D**

Alternative A: No Action Theme: Current Management	Alternative B Theme: Mixed Emphasis	Alternative C Theme: Conservation	Alternative D Theme: Resource Use
<p>Action: No similar Action in current RMP.</p>	<p>of such license or permit.</p> <p>Action: LEASE NOTICE CO-LN-6: Buried Cultural Resources -- The lessee is hereby notified that a deep, subsurface survey may be required for subsurface-disturbing operations in areas that have a high potential for deeply buried cultural resources. All cultural resource work must be performed by a BLM-permitted Archaeologist. The BLM may charge Federal licensees and permittees project costs of preservation activities conducted under the NHPA as a condition to the issuance of such license or permit. (See Appendix B.)</p>		
<p>Desired Outcome: No similar Desired Outcome in current RMP.</p>	<p>Desired Outcome: Promote professional cultural resource research, public awareness, and education.</p>		
<p>Action: No similar Action in current RMP.</p>	<p>Action:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪..... Identify measures, such as the following, in order to proactively manage, protect, and use cultural resources, including traditional cultural properties: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • develop heritage tourism sites; • interpret sites; • identify priority areas in need of Class III Cultural Resource Inventories; • conduct Class III Cultural Resource Inventories in order to comply with Section 110 of the NHPA; • direct proactive inventory toward testing sensitivity predictions described in the Class I overview model (Reed et al. 2008a); • organize and conduct ongoing educational programs for the public, school groups, vocational archaeology groups, project proponents, permittees, contractors, and others, about cultural resource ethics; encourage their help in reporting incidents of vandalism; and • identify priority at-risk, significant sites for stabilization and rehabilitation. 		
<p>Action: Allow scientific research.</p>	<p>Action: Allow scientific research, traditional use by Native Americans, and public interpretation and education.</p>		
<p>Desired Outcome: Protect the Windy Gap Archaeological Sites.</p>			
<p>Restriction on Use:</p>			

Table 2-2
Descriptions of Alternatives A, B, C, and D

Alternative A: No Action	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D
Theme: Current Management	Theme: Mixed Emphasis	Theme: Conservation	Theme: Resource Use
<p>STIPULATION: No Surface Occupancy, KR-03: Windy Gap Cultural Resource Management Area -- Prohibit surface occupancy and surface-disturbing activities in the Windy Gap Cultural Resource Management Area. (See Appendix C.)</p>	<p>STIPULATION CO-NSO-16: Cultural Resources -- Prohibit surface occupancy or use within 100 meters of all known eligible cultural resources, traditional cultural properties, and listed National Register Sites/Districts, outstanding cultural resources to be nominated to the NRHP, interpreted and/or public use sites, and experimental-use sites, in order to protect cultural resource sites that may be damaged from inadvertent, unauthorized, or authorized uses. (See Appendix B.)</p>		
<p>Action: Continue to manage the Windy Gap Archaeological Sites under a Cultural Resource Management and Protection Plan and a Memorandum of Agreement with the Northern Colorado Water Conservancy District.</p>			
<p>Desired Outcome: Protect significant cultural sites within the North Sand Hills SRMA.</p>	<p>Desired Outcome: Protect, preserve, and mitigate significant cultural sites within, and near, the North Sand Hills SRMA. (See Appendix E.)</p>		
<p>Action: Protect the North Sand Hills cultural sites physically by fencing and by signing.</p>	<p>Action: Protect cultural sites within, and near, the North Sand Hills, in accordance with BMPs and SOPs.</p>		
<p>Restriction on Use: No similar Restriction on Use in current RMP.</p>	<p>Restriction on Use: STIPULATION: CO-NSO-16: Cultural Resources -- Prohibit surface occupancy or use within 100 meters of all known eligible cultural resources, traditional cultural properties, and listed National Register Sites/Districts, outstanding cultural resources to be nominated to the NRHP, interpreted and/or public use sites, and experimental-use sites, in order to protect cultural resource sites that may be damaged from inadvertent, unauthorized, or authorized uses. (See Appendix B.)</p>		
<p>Desired Outcome: No similar Desired Outcome in current RMP.</p>	<p>Desired Outcome: Uphold Native American trust responsibilities, and accommodate traditional uses.</p>		
<p>Action: No similar Action in current RMP.</p>	<p>Action: Develop a protocol, in consultation with Native American Tribes, to streamline, focus, and facilitate consultations, information exchange, participation, and incorporation of tribal interests into research interpretation and resource management actions.</p>		

**Table 2-2
 Descriptions of Alternatives A, B, C, and D**

Alternative A: No Action Theme: Current Management	Alternative B Theme: Mixed Emphasis	Alternative C Theme: Conservation	Alternative D Theme: Resource Use
Paleontology			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> OAL: No similar goal in current RMP. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> GOAL: Preserve and protect significant paleontological resources (generally, vertebrate or noteworthy occurrences of invertebrate or plant fossils). 		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Desired Outcome: protect fossils of scientific interest and give special consideration to those fossils of significant value. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Desired Outcome: Ensure that paleontological resources are available for appropriate scientific and educational uses. 		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Action: No similar Action in current RMP. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Action: Provide opportunities for education about, and interpretation of, paleontological resources. Target areas include, but are not limited to, the dinosaur track-way at Rancho del Rio, the Kremmling Cretaceous Ammonite Locality, and other sites deemed suitable for public use by virtue of their educational value, durability, and sustainability. 		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Restriction on Use: TIPULATION: No Surface Occupancy, KR-01: Kremmling Cretaceous Ammonite ACEC/RNA -- Prohibit surface occupancy and surface-disturbing activities within the Kremmling Cretaceous Ammonite ACEC/RNA. (See Appendix C and Maps 2-51 in Appendix A.) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Restriction on Use: STIPULATION CO-NSO-25: ACECs, RNAs, and ONAs -- Prohibit surface occupancy or use in ACECs, RNAs, and ONAs in order to protect and prevent irreparable damage to important historic, cultural, or scenic values, fish and wildlife resources, or other natural systems or processes; or to protect human life and safety from natural hazards. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Kremmling Cretaceous Ammonite Area of Critical Environmental Concern/Research Natural Area [(See Appendix B and Maps 2-52 (Alternative B), 2-53 (Alternative C), and 2-51 (Alternative D) in Appendix A.)] 		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Restriction on Use: o similar Restriction on Use in current 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Restriction on Use: STIPULATION CO-NSO-17: Paleontology Resources -- Prohibit surface occupancy or use within 100 meters of all known scientifically important paleontological resources in order to protect scientific 		

**Table 2-2
 Descriptions of Alternatives A, B, C, and D**

Alternative A: No Action Theme: Current Management	Alternative B Theme: Mixed Emphasis	Alternative C Theme: Conservation	Alternative D Theme: Resource Use
RMP.	information that may be damaged from inadvertent or authorized uses. [See Maps 2-1 (Alternative B), 2-2 (Alternative C), and 2-3 (Alternative D) in Appendix A.]		
<p>▪ ction: ▪ EASE NOTICE, CO-29: Class 1 and 2 Paleontological Areas -- Have an accredited Paleontologist approved by the Authorized Officer perform an inventory of surface-disturbing activities in Class 1 and Class 2 paleontological areas.</p>	<p>▪ Action: LEASE NOTICE, CO-LN-7: Paleontological (Fossil) Resources -- Prior to any surface-disturbing activities, an inventory of paleontological resources (fossils) in "Potential Fossil Yield Classification" (PFYC) Class 4 and Class 5 Areas shall be done in order to protect scientific information that may be damaged from inadvertent or authorized uses. Mitigation of scientifically important paleontological resources may include avoidance, monitoring, collection, excavation, or sampling. Mitigation of discovered scientifically important paleontological resources might require the relocation of disturbance over 100 meters. This, and any subsequent mitigation work, shall be conducted by a BLM-permitted Paleontologist. The lessee shall bear all costs for inventory and mitigation (WO IM-2009-011).</p>		
Visual Resources			
GOAL: Protect the open spaces, the natural aesthetics, and the scenic vistas that are considered a social, economic, and environmental benefit.			
<p>▪ esired Outcome: Protect visual quality through mitigating measures designed to reduce contrast with the surrounding landscape.</p>	<p>▪ Desired Outcome: Maintain visual quality and integrity in accordance with VRM classes.</p>		
<p>Action: Apply VRM Management Class criteria to VRI as follows: • VRM I = 0 acres • VRM II = 185,300 acres • VRM III = 149,800 acres • VRM IV = 42,800 acres Manage visual resources on BLM-managed public lands in accordance with the objectives for each class. (See Map 2-15 in Appendix A.)</p>	<p>Action: Designate VRM Management Classes as follows: • VRM I = 8,900 acres • VRM II = 136,500 acres • VRM III = 219,900 acres • VRM IV = 12,500 acres Manage visual resources on BLM-managed public lands in accordance with the objectives for each class. (See Map 2-16 in</p>	<p>Action: Designate VRM Management Classes as follows: • VRM I = 24,600 acres • VRM II = 155,400 acres • VRM III = 185,400 acres • VRM IV = 12,500 acres Manage visual resources on BLM-managed public lands in accordance with the objectives for each class. (See Map 2-17</p>	<p>Action: Designate VRM Management Classes as follows: • VRM I = 8,900 acres • VRM II = 62,700 acres • VRM III = 212,100 acres • VRM IV = 94,100 acres Manage visual resources on BLM-managed public lands in accordance with the objectives for each class. (See Map 2-18 in</p>

**Table 2-2
 Descriptions of Alternatives A, B, C, and D**

Alternative A: No Action	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D
Theme: Current Management	Theme: Mixed Emphasis	Theme: Conservation	Theme: Resource Use
<i>Resources</i>			
<p>Action: No similar Action in current RMP.</p>	<p>Appendix A.) Action: Recognize and make changes in VRM Management Classes that compliment adjacent local, State, and Federal entities' land use plans and objectives in order to maintain scenic values.</p>	<p>in Appendix A.)</p>	<p>Appendix A.) Action: No similar Action.</p>
<p>Action: Allow necessary road maintenance regardless of VRM Management Class.</p>			
<p>Action: No similar Action in current RMP.</p>	<p>Action: Within VRM Class II Areas, concentrate all new disturbances within existing ROWs or within 656 feet (200 meters) of existing disturbances in order to maintain overall scenic quality in utility corridors and in high-sensitivity transportation corridors identified and analyzed in the VRM Update (Otak 2007). (This recognizes existing disturbances, while not foregoing protections for high-sensitivity transportation corridors.)</p>		
<p>Action: No similar Action in current RMP.</p>	<p>Action: Co-locate communication towers, facilities, and associated structures with existing communication sites in order to minimize overall visual impacts.</p>		
<p>Action: No similar Action in current RMP.</p>	<p>Action: Manage all WSAs under VRM Class I objectives in order to support Interim Management policy guidelines to retain a natural landscape. If a WSA is designated as Wilderness, the area would continue to be managed as VRM Class I. Exceptions: 1) case-by-case exceptions for valid existing rights and grandfathered uses; and 2) if the WSA is released by Congress.</p>		
<p>Action: No similar Action in current RMP.</p>	<p>Action: No similar Action.</p>	<p>Action: Manage the following areas found to contain wilderness characteristics under VRM Class II objectives, unless otherwise managed as VRM Class I: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Troublesome Addition: 2,346 acres; </p>	<p>Action: No similar Action.</p>

**Table 2-2
 Descriptions of Alternatives A, B, C, and D**

Alternative A: No Action	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D
Theme: Current Management	Theme: Mixed Emphasis	Theme: Conservation	Theme: Resource Use
<i>Resources</i>			
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Drowsy Water: 7,509 acres; and • Strawberry: 5,834 acres (included in the Strawberry SRMA under this alternative). 	
<p>Action: No similar Action in current RMP.</p>	<p>Action: Manage the following SRMAs under the following VRM Management Class objectives in order to support setting prescriptions: <u>VRM Class II</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • North Sand Hills SRMA: 1,450 acres; and • Upper Colorado River SRMA: 14,100 acres. 	<p>Action: Manage the following SRMAs under the following VRM Management Class objectives in order to support setting prescriptions: <u>VRM Class II</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • North Sand Hills SRMA: 1,450 acres; • Strawberry SRMA: 7,900 acres; and • Upper Colorado River SRMA: 14,100 acres. 	<p>Action: Manage the following SRMAs under the following VRM Management Class objectives in order to support setting prescriptions: <u>VRM Class II</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • North Sand Hills SRMA: 1,450 acres; and • Upper Colorado River SRMA: 15,000 acres <p><u>VRM Class III</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Headwaters SRMA: 34,800 acres; • Strawberry SRMA: 7,900 acres; and • Wolford SRMA: 25,700 acres.
<p>Restriction on Use: No similar Restriction on Use in current RMP.</p>	<p>Restriction on Use: STIPULATION: CO-NSO-18: Visual Resources -- Prohibit surface occupancy or use in VRM Objective Class I Areas in order to maintain scenic quality, in accordance with documented public sensitivity to visual aesthetics and visibility. [See Appendix B and Maps 2-16 (Alternative B), 2-17 (Alternative C), and 2-18 (Alternative D) in Appendix A.]</p>		
<p>Restriction on Use:</p>	<p>Restriction on Use:</p>		

**Table 2-2
 Descriptions of Alternatives A, B, C, and D**

Alternative A: No Action	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D
Theme: Current Management	Theme: Mixed Emphasis	Theme: Conservation	Theme: Resource Use

Resources

<p>No similar Restriction on Use in current RMP.</p>	<p>STIPULATION: CO-CSU-15: VRM Objective Class Areas -- Oil and gas development and operations, and post-operation rehabilitation, must comply with VRM contrast limits by ensuring that project design does not exceed the following contrast ratings by VRM Objective Classes in order to maintain scenic quality, in accordance with documented public sensitivity to visual aesthetics and visibility.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Class II: weak/low • Class III: moderate • Class IV: strong/high <p>[See Appendix B and Maps 2-16 (Alternative B), 2-17 (Alternative C), and 2-18 (Alternative D) in Appendix A.]</p>
<p>Restriction on Use: No similar Restriction on Use in current RMP.</p>	<p>Restriction on Use: The following visual resource CSU stipulations would be applied to oil and gas leasing on a case-by case basis:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CO-CSU-16 Backcountry and Scenic Byway Viewsheds • CO-CSU-17 State and U.S. Highway Viewsheds • CO-CSU-18 Rehabilitation Within State and U.S. Highway and Interstate Viewsheds • CO-CSU-19 SRMAs • CO-CSU-20 Key Observation Points (KOPs) • CO-CSU-21 River Foreground and Middleground • CO-CSU-22 BLM Public Lands Near Residential Developments <p>(See Appendix B.)</p>
<p>Wildland Fire Management</p>	
<p>GOAL: Give first priority to public and firefighter safety and to protection of property. Integrate fire and fuels management in order to meet Public Land Health Standards; and natural and cultural resource objectives across landscapes, agencies, and political boundaries. Recognize the role of wildland fire as an essential ecological process, and allow fire to play a natural role in the ecosystem where, or when, resource objectives, or both, can be met.</p>	
<p>Desired Outcome: Allow for planned and unplanned ignitions in order to meet wildland fire and other resource management objectives.</p>	
<p>Desired Outcome: Apply a full range of wildland fire management options, including full suppression, to wildland fire managed for multiple objectives.</p>	

**Table 2-2
 Descriptions of Alternatives A, B, C, and D**

Alternative A: No Action	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D
Theme: Current Management	Theme: Mixed Emphasis	Theme: Conservation	Theme: Resource Use

Resources

<p>Action: No similar Action in current RMP.</p>	<p>Action: Evaluate fuel conditions, fire danger, and hazards associated with wildland fire and manage accordingly, using mechanical, chemical, and prescribed fire treatments, and wildland fire managed for multiple objectives. Examples of treatment evaluation criteria are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WUI; • areas of insect and disease; • treatment for resource benefit; • infrastructure; and, • impacts. <p>The following are some of the major evaluation criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • acres burned in 1 year; • acres burned in 10 years; • new residential and commercial development; • changes in wildlife and plant Special Status Species; • other vegetation treatments that may alter the fire regime and condition class; and, • social/political changes. <p>The following areas are the primary focus areas for fuels management and analysis:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yarmony Mountain Management Focus Area: 19,000 acres; • Troublesome Management Focus Area: 8,100 acres; • Jensen and Kinney Creek Management Focus Area: 16,900 acres; • Strawberry Management Focus Area: 7,800 acres; and, • Independence Mountain/Pearl Management Focus Area: 16,400 acres. <p>(See Map 2-19 in Appendix A.)</p>
<p>Lands with Wilderness Characteristics Outside Existing WSAs</p>	
<p>■ OAL: No similar Goal in current RMP.</p>	<p>GOAL: Provide appropriate levels of protection in areas that will be managed for wilderness characteristics (naturalness, outstanding opportunities for solitude, and outstanding opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation) outside existing WSAs.</p>

**Table 2-2
 Descriptions of Alternatives A, B, C, and D**

Alternative A: No Action	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D
Theme: Current Management	Theme: Mixed Emphasis	Theme: Conservation	Theme: Resource Use
<i>Resources</i>			
<p>Desired Outcome: No similar Desired Outcome in current RMP.</p>	<p>Desired Outcome: Maintain wilderness characteristics.</p>	<p>Desired Outcome: Protect wilderness characteristics through specific actions.</p>	<p>Desired Outcome: Maintain wilderness characteristics.</p>
<p>Action: No similar Action in current RMP.</p>	<p>Action: Specific prescriptions would not be applied in order to protect lands with wilderness characteristics. In those assessment areas, management actions, such as travel management, oil and gas leasing stipulations, COAs, and BMPs, would be applied to activities, especially surface-disturbing activities, which would help maintain wilderness characteristics.</p>	<p>Action: Protect wilderness characteristics on about 15,700 acres using specific Management and Setting Prescriptions for BLM-managed public lands managed for wilderness characteristics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Troublesome Addition: 2,346 acres; • Drowsy Water: 7,509 acres; and • Strawberry: 5,834 acres (included in the Strawberry SRMA under this alternative) (See Map 2-20 in Appendix A.)	<p>Action: Same as under Alternative B, except that the Drowsy Water and Strawberry assessment areas would be open to additional motorized use, because they are included in SRMAs that emphasize motorized recreation.</p>
<p>Restriction on Use: No similar Restriction on Use in current RMP.</p>	<p>Restriction on Use: No similar Restriction on Use.</p>	<p>Restriction on Use: Close approximately 15,700 acres of the Federal mineral estate under lands managed for wilderness characteristics to fluid mineral leasing and preclude geophysical exploration on those lands. [See Appendix B and Map 2-20</p>	<p>Restriction on Use: No similar Restriction on Use.</p>

**Table 2-2
 Descriptions of Alternatives A, B, C, and D**

Alternative A: No Action	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D
Theme: Current Management	Theme: Mixed Emphasis	Theme: Conservation	Theme: Resource Use

Resources

	(Alternative B) in Appendix A.]
Cave Resources and Abandoned Mines	
GOAL: No similar Goal in current RMP.	GOAL: Preserve the biotic, mineralogical, paleontological, hydrologic, and cultural values in caves.
Desired Outcome: Protect cave values, especially those defined as significant under the Federal Cave Resources Protection Act of 1988 (FCRPA) in order to provide opportunities for people to engage in caving, research, and scientific exploration.	
Action: Manage any existing, or newly identified caves, in order to retain their physical, social, and operational settings. (See Appendix I, Management and Setting Prescriptions for Cave Resources and Abandoned Mines.)	
Restriction on Use: No similar Restriction on Use in current RMP.	Restriction on Use: STIPULATION: CO-NSO-24: Karst (Cave) Resources -- Prohibit surface occupancy or use above recreationally significant karst (cave) resources, and their associated surface and subterranean hydrologic features, in order to protect sensitive karst recreation-tourism attractions, associated recreation opportunities, and maintain their social and economic productivity. [See Maps 2-1 (Alternative B), 2-2 (Alternative C), and 2-3 (Alternative D) in Appendix A.]
Action: No similar Action in current RMP.	Action: Recommend withdrawal for significant caves.
Desired Outcome: No similar Desired Outcome in current RMP.	Desired Outcome: Provide opportunities for people to engage in caving, research, and scientific exploration in caves, while, at the same time, preventing the introduction of White-nose Syndrome (WNS).
Action: No similar action in current RMP.	Action: Apply measures established in BLM laws, rules, regulations, policies, standards, and guidelines in order to prevent the introduction of WNS in caves where bat populations reside. BLM would protect bats while, at the same time, avoiding unacceptable risks to other biota and natural systems in caves.
Action: No similar action in current RMP.	Action: Discourage or prevent entry into abandoned mines in order to protect bat populations, and to provide for public health and safety. Apply measures established in BLM policies to prevent the introduction of WNS in abandoned mines.

**Table 2-2
 Descriptions of Alternatives A, B, C, and D**

Alternative A: No Action	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D
Theme: Current Management	Theme: Mixed Emphasis	Theme: Conservation	Theme: Resource Use

Resources

Forestry			
<p>■ OAL: No similar Goal in current RMP.</p>	<p>GOAL: Use a variety of silvicultural techniques and harvest systems in order to manage for healthy forests and woodlands while, at the same time, offering a variety of forest products on a sustainable basis.</p>		
<p>Desired Outcome: Manage all productive (producing at least 20 cubic feet of wood fiber per acre per year) forestland that is suitable (stands not withdrawn for other resource needs) for producing a variety of forest products on a sustained-yield basis.</p>	<p>Desired Outcome: On suitable productive forest land that is available for intensive management, produce a variety of forest products in order to meet commercial and private demands on a sustained-yield basis. [See Map 2-21 (Alternatives B and D) and 2-22 (Alternative C) in Appendix A.]</p>		
<p>Action: Intensively manage approximately 40,000 acres of commercial forest acreage. Maintain and protect the remaining forested lands, composed of approximately 60,000 acres, through limited management practices. Determine the estimated annual allowable cut using the new timber production and operations inventories within the 40,000 acres of intensively managed forest acreage. Intensive management activities could include timber-harvesting techniques, artificial regeneration, stand conversion, stand improvement, pre-commercial thinning, and commercial thinning. Limited management activities will primarily involve custodial practices, such as fire</p>	<p>Action: Provide forest products, including but not limited to, sawlogs, firewood, Christmas trees, posts and poles, transplants, specialty wood products, and biomass by implementing the following actions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • intensively manage 28,100 acres of commercial forest land to target an average annual PSQ of 2.3 million board feet; and • apply limited management to the remaining forests and woodlands: 65,800 acres. (See Map 2-21 in Appendix A.) 	<p>Action: Provide forest products, including but not limited to, sawlogs, firewood, Christmas trees, posts and poles, transplants, specialty wood products, and biomass by implementing the following actions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • intensively manage 24,000 acres of commercial forest land to target an average annual PSQ 2.0 million board feet; and • apply limited management to the remaining forests and woodlands: 69,900 acres. (See Map 2-22 in Appendix A.) 	<p>Action: Provide forest products, including, but not limited to, sawlogs, firewood, Christmas trees, post and poles, transplants, specialty wood products, and biomass by implementing the following actions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • intensively manage 28,100 acres of commercial forest land to target an average annual PSQ of 3.5 million board feet; and • apply limited management to the remaining forests and woodlands: 65,800 acres. (See Map 2-21 in Appendix

**Table 2-2
 Descriptions of Alternatives A, B, C, and D**

Alternative A: No Action	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D
Theme: Current Management	Theme: Mixed Emphasis	Theme: Conservation	Theme: Resource Use
<i>Resources</i>			
protection and salvage. (The allowable cut was recalculated in 1992 and adjusted to approximately 2.3 million board-feet per year.)			A.)
<p>Action: Intensively manage forestlands growing commercial species (lodgepole pine, Engelmann spruce, subalpine fir, or Douglas-fir) on productive growing sites (producing 20 cubic feet of wood fiber per acre per year) on lands not withdrawn for other resource needs. Limited management on woodlands or non-commercial species (pinyon, juniper, ponderosa pine, limber pine, or aspen) or on sites producing less than 20 cubic feet of wood fiber per acre per year.</p>	<p>Action: Conduct intensive management using the following actions: clear-cuts, shelterwood, partial cuts, and other harvest cuts; pre-commercial and commercial thinning; seeding and planting; timber stand improvement; site preparation; sanitation treatments; mechanical treatments, and prescribed fire and wildland fire managed for multiple objectives, for stand improvement, replacement, or conversion. Maintain or improve existing access routes and construct permanent or temporary routes for access to productive forestlands. Pursue temporary or permanent access agreements or easements in order to provide public or administrative access to productive forest areas that are currently inaccessible.</p>		
<p>Action: Implement immediate salvage or accelerated harvests after catastrophic events, such as fire, windstorm, or insect epidemics. Give a high priority to intensive management areas for fire protection and insect and disease control.</p>	<p>Action: Implement immediate salvage or accelerated harvests following adverse events (MPB and spruce beetle infestations, other insect outbreaks, disease, blow down, wildfire) in order to regenerate stands and to capture the economic value of forest products before that value is lost. Accelerate harvest of lodgepole pine killed or threatened by MPB for the next 10 years to 15 years</p>	<p>Action: Following catastrophic events, conduct salvage operations in order to capture some commercial value, and to reduce the large scale severe wildfire potential. Accelerate harvest of lodgepole pine killed or threatened by MPB for the next 10 years to 15 years in order to salvage commercial value, and to reduce the large scale severe wildfire potential. As markets develop, increase aspen</p>	<p>Action: Same as under Alternative B.</p>

**Table 2-2
 Descriptions of Alternatives A, B, C, and D**

Alternative A: No Action	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D
Theme: Current Management	Theme: Mixed Emphasis	Theme: Conservation	Theme: Resource Use
<i>Resources</i>			
	in order to salvage commercial value, and to reduce the large scale severe wildfire potential. As markets develop, increase aspen harvest in order to regenerate stands affected by aspen decline and other pathogens.	harvest in order to regenerate stands affected by aspen decline and other pathogens	
Action: Conduct periodic regeneration surveys in order to monitor for adequacy of regeneration of all reproduction method treatment areas. If adequate regeneration is not present or anticipated within 5 years, then artificially regenerate the area.	Action: Conduct periodic regeneration surveys in order to monitor for adequacy of regeneration of all reproduction-method-treatment areas. If adequate regeneration is not present or anticipated within 15 years, then artificially regenerate the area.		
Action: Conduct periodic stand examinations and forest inventories in order to monitor forest stand conditions. Thinning or other timber stand improvement projects may be monitored by periodic re-measurement of permanently marked plots that compare treated plots with untreated control plots.			
Action: No similar Action in current RMP.	Action: Limit ground-based harvesting systems to slopes of 40 percent or less on suitable soils. Do not constrain aerial or cable systems by slope.		
Desired Outcome: Do not intensively manage forested lands growing woodland or non-commercial species (pinyon, juniper, Ponderosa pine, or aspen), non-productive growing sites (producing less than 20 cubic feet of wood fiber per acre per year), or sites withdrawn from planned harvest for other resource needs or because they are	Desired Outcome: Provide supplemental forest products by managing low-productivity forestland (woodlands and forest stands producing less than 20 cubic feet per acre per year), or sites withdrawn from planned harvest for other resource needs or because they are economically inaccessible, commensurate with meeting resource goals and objectives.		

**Table 2-2
 Descriptions of Alternatives A, B, C, and D**

Alternative A: No Action	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D
Theme: Current Management	Theme: Mixed Emphasis	Theme: Conservation	Theme: Resource Use
Resources			
economically inaccessible. These lands receive custodial management, primarily for other resource values.			
Action: Conduct harvesting (primarily salvage for posts, firewood, etc.). Control fires, insects, and diseases, but at a lower priority than for intensively managed areas. Plan no intensive forest management practices (such as thinning or artificial regeneration).	Action: Conduct limited management, including harvesting for wood products, through the following actions: clear-cuts, shelterwood, partial cuts, and other harvest cuts; commercial thinnings; sanitation treatments; and mechanical treatments; and prescribed fire and wildland fire managed for multiple objectives for stand improvement, replacement or conversion. Conduct no intensive practices (such as artificial regeneration or pre-commercial thinning) unless necessary in order to achieve management objectives or benefit other resources.		
Action: Apply forest management practices in order to improve other resource values (such as range or wildlife habitat improvement and treatment of insect- or disease-infested trees in recreation sites) on BLM-managed public lands intermingled with private lands.	Action: Apply forest management practices and harvesting in order to improve other resource values, and reduce hazardous fuels in cooperation with forest management activities on adjacent private lands.		
Livestock Grazing			
■ OAL: No similar Goal in current RMP.	GOAL: Apply flexible and sustainable livestock grazing, in accordance with Standards for Public Land Health and Guidelines for Livestock Grazing Management (BLM 1997a) in order to contribute to local economies, ranching livelihoods, and to the rural western character integral to many communities.		
Desired Outcome: Increase sustained forage production in 20 years by 37 percent to an estimated level of 54,300 AUMs, and intensify management on 76 large allotments representing 51 percent of the BLM-	Desired Outcome: Meet the forage demands of livestock operations based upon current active preference (AUMs) while, at the same time, improving the quantity and	Desired Outcome: Meet the forage demands of wildlife first, based upon CDOW objectives. Meet the forage demands of livestock operations second, based upon current	Desired Outcome: Meet the forage demands of livestock operations first, based upon current active preference (AUMs). Meet the forage demands of wildlife second,

**Table 2-2
 Descriptions of Alternatives A, B, C, and D**

Alternative A: No Action Theme: Current Management	Alternative B Theme: Mixed Emphasis	Alternative C Theme: Conservation	Alternative D Theme: Resource Use
managed public lands, commensurate with Standards for Public Land Health and Guidelines for Livestock Grazing Management (BLM 1997a).	quality of forage available for livestock and wildlife.	active preference. If conflicts for forage arise, give preference to wildlife.	based upon CDOW objectives. If conflicts for forage arise, give preference to livestock.
Action: Provide 336,900 acres for livestock grazing, and approximately 39,400 AUMs of livestock forage, commensurate with meeting Standards for Public Land Health and Guidelines for Livestock Grazing Management showing lands available for grazing. (See Map 2-23 in Appendix A.)	Action: Provide approximately 329,100 acres for livestock grazing, and approximately 38,909 AUMs of livestock forage.	Action: Provide approximately 322,300 acres for livestock grazing, and provide approximately 38,865 AUMs of livestock forage.	Action: Provide approximately 329,300 acres for livestock grazing, and approximately 39,037 AUMs of livestock forage.
Action: No similar Action in current RMP.	Action: Close 4 allotments that are unsuitable for livestock grazing, totaling 6,829 acres, with a corresponding reduction of 323 AUMs: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 07041(Pinkham): 239 acres, 10 AUMs; • 07522 (Selak): 5,106 acres, 225 AUMs; • 07524 (Fraser River): 1,396 acres, 0 AUMs; and • 07755 (Selak East): 534 acres, 88 AUMs. 	Action: Close 6 allotments that are unsuitable for livestock grazing, totaling 8,268 acres, with a corresponding reduction of 438 AUMs: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 07041 (Pinkham): 239 acres, 10 AUMs; • 07522 (Selak): 5,106 acres, 225 AUMs; • 07524 (Fraser River): 1,396 acres, 0 AUMs; • 07755 (Selak East): 534 acres, 88 AUMs; • 07050 (Lower Sand Hills): 539 acres 59 AUMs; and 	Action: Close 3 allotments that are unsuitable for livestock grazing, totaling 7,036 acres, with a corresponding reduction of 313 AUMs: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 07522 (Selak): 5,106 acres, 225 AUMs; • 07524 (Fraser River): 1,396 acres, 0 AUMs; and • 07755 (Selak East): 534 acres, 88 AUMs.

**Table 2-2
 Descriptions of Alternatives A, B, C, and D**

Alternative A: No Action Theme: Current Management	Alternative B Theme: Mixed Emphasis	Alternative C Theme: Conservation	Alternative D Theme: Resource Use
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 07163 (Sand Hills): 454 acres 56 AUMs. 	
<p>Action: No similar Action in current RMP.</p>	<p>Action: Create 1 new allotment of approximately 480 acres in T. 2 N., R. 79, W. Sections 19 and 20, authorizing 40 AUMs.</p>		
<p>Action: No similar Action in current RMP.</p>	<p>Action: Allow temporary, non-renewable livestock grazing on BLM-managed public lands not currently authorized for grazing (except on closed allotments), including future land acquisitions, in accordance with applicable regulations, policies, and land management objectives, when livestock grazing is determined to be an appropriate use. This would result in an undetermined increase in acres available for grazing and AUMs.</p>	<p>Action: Do not allow grazing on lands not currently authorized for livestock grazing, or on future land acquisitions.</p>	<p>Action: Same as under Alternative B.</p>
<p>Action: No similar Action in current RMP.</p>	<p>Action: Create 4 reserve allotments that may be used for temporary, non-renewable livestock grazing in emergencies, or in order to manage vegetation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 07505 (Sulphur Gulch): 4,738 acres, 192 AUMs; • 07573 (Blue Valley): 951 acres, 90 AUMs; 	<p>Action: Same as under Alternative B.</p>	<p>Action: Create 2 reserve allotments that may be used for temporary livestock grazing in emergencies, or in order to manage vegetation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 07505 (Sulphur Gulch): 4,616 acres, 598 AUMs; and • 07561 (Spruce Creek): 4,616 acres, 598 AUMs .

Table 2-2
Descriptions of Alternatives A, B, C, and D

Alternative A: No Action Theme: Current Management	Alternative B Theme: Mixed Emphasis	Alternative C Theme: Conservation	Alternative D Theme: Resource Use
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 07561 (Spruce Creek): 4,616 acres, 598 AUMs; and • 07107 (Sentinel Mountain): 1,640 acres, 192 AUMs. 		
<p>Action: Prioritize 311 grazing allotments for management according to 1 of the following 3 levels: Maintain, Improve, and Custodial, as follows: 20 Maintain (satisfactory condition); 76 Improve (unsatisfactory condition); and 215 Custodial (small unconsolidated allotments or allotments/give priority for other land uses). Rank allotments and make adjustments as monitoring data become available.</p>	<p>Action: Categorize 257 grazing allotments for management according to 1 of the following 3 levels (Maintain, Improve, Custodial): 171 Maintain (allotment in satisfactory condition); 85 Improve (allotment in unsatisfactory condition); and 36 Custodial (small, unconsolidated allotments). Rank allotments for priority attention and make adjustments as monitoring data become available. (See Appendix K.)</p>		
<p>Action: Invest in cost-effective range improvements (primarily through public investment) to implement grazing systems in order to meet specific objectives of allotment management plans, including 45,200 acres of land treatment (brush control and reseeding).</p>	<p>Action: Conduct vegetation manipulation and other range improvement projects, including grazing management practices, in order to improve the quantity and quality of forage available for livestock and wildlife.</p>	<p>Action: Conduct vegetation manipulation and other range improvement projects, including grazing management practices, in order to improve the quantity and quality of forage available for wildlife (first) and for livestock (second).</p>	<p>Action: Conduct vegetation manipulation and other range improvement projects, including grazing management practices, in order to improve the quantity and quality of forage available for livestock (first) and for wildlife (second).</p>
<p>Action: No similar Action in current RMP.</p>	<p>Action: Assess vegetation attributes in grazing allotments in order to ensure that the BLM Colorado Standards for Public Land Health and Guidelines for Livestock Grazing Management (BLM 1997a) are met in accordance with established protocols and technical references.</p>		

**Table 2-2
 Descriptions of Alternatives A, B, C, and D**

Alternative A: No Action	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D
Theme: Current Management	Theme: Mixed Emphasis	Theme: Conservation	Theme: Resource Use
<p>Action: No similar Action in current RMP.</p>	<p>Action: When deemed necessary by the Authorized Officer, defer or exclude livestock grazing use for 2 growing seasons on disturbed areas (after a fire event, reclamation of disturbed lands, seedings, surface-disturbing vegetation treatment), or until site-specific analysis or monitoring data, or both, indicate that vegetation cover, species composition, and litter accumulation are adequate to support and protect watershed values, meet vegetation objectives, and sustain grazing use.</p>		
<p>Recreation and Visitor Services</p>			
<p>..... OAL: No similar Goal in current RMP.</p>	<p>GOAL: Produce a diversity of quality recreational opportunities that support outdoor-oriented lifestyles and add to participants' quality of life while, at the same time, contributing to the local economies.</p>		
<p>Desired Outcome: Ensure the continued availability of outdoor recreational opportunities that the public seeks, and that are not readily available from other sources, in order to reduce the impacts of recreational use on fragile and unique resource values and to provide for visitor safety and resource interpretation.</p>	<p>Desired Outcome: Resource Protection -- Increase awareness, understanding, and a sense of stewardship in recreational activity participants so that their conduct safeguards cultural and natural resources as defined by Standards for Public Land Health and Guidelines for Livestock Grazing Management or area-specific outcomes (such as in relation to ACECs, WSRs, etc.). Visitor Health and Safety -- Ensure that visitors are not exposed to unhealthy or unsafe human-created conditions (defined by a repeat incident in the same year, of the same type, in the same location, due to the same cause). Use/User Conflict -- Achieve a minimum level of conflict between recreation participants in order to: 1) allow other resources and programs to achieve their RMP objectives; 2) curb illegal trespass and property damage; and 3) maintain a diversity of recreational activity participation. Community Growth Area -- Increase collaboration with community partners in order to maintain appropriate activity-based recreational opportunities in community growth areas (BLM-managed public lands adjacent to, between, and surrounding communities; also referred to as WUI areas).</p>		
<p>Restriction on Use: No similar Restriction on Use in current RMP.</p>	<p>Restriction on Use: STIPULATION CO-NSO-23: Recreation and Visitor Resources -- Prohibit surface occupancy or use within the boundaries of BLM developed recreation sites in order to protect capital facility investments, protect recreational opportunities, maintain desirable recreation setting characteristics, and maintain the social and economic productivity of BLM recreation sites. (See Appendix B.)</p>		
<p>Restriction on Use: No similar Restriction on Use in current</p>	<p>Restriction on Use: The following recreation resource NSO stipulations would be applied to oil and gas leasing on a case-</p>		

**Table 2-2
 Descriptions of Alternatives A, B, C, and D**

Alternative A: No Action Theme: Current Management	Alternative B Theme: Mixed Emphasis	Alternative C Theme: Conservation	Alternative D Theme: Resource Use
RMP.	by-case basis: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CO-NSO-19: High Value Recreation and Wildlife Habitat Resources; • CO-NSO-20: Recreation and Visitor Resources (parks); and • CO-NSO-21: Recreation and Visitor Resources (wildlife areas). (See Appendix B.)		
Restriction on Use: No similar Restriction on Use in current RMP.	Restriction on Use: STIPULATION CO-CSU-24: Developed Recreation Sites -- Surface occupancy is restricted within one-half mile of the boundaries of BLM developed recreation sites, except where sights and sounds may be topographically screened, in order to protect capital facility investments, protect recreation opportunities, maintain desirable recreation setting characteristics, and maintain the social and economic productivity of BLM recreation sites. (See Appendix B.)		
Restriction on Use: No similar Restriction on Use in current RMP.	Restriction on Use: The following recreation resource CSU stipulations would be applied to oil and gas leasing on a case-by-case basis: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CO-CSU-25: Recreation Travel Routes and Corridors; and • CO-CSU-26: Recreation Access Zones. (See Appendix B.)		
Action: Camping Limits -- Within ERMA's and SRMA's, 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.	Action: Camping Limits -- In areas open to camping, implement a 14-day camping limit on BLM-managed public lands 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.	Action: Same as under Alternative A.	
Action: No similar Action in current RMP.	Action: Camping Closures -- Close the following BLM-managed public lands to camping: <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; 		

**Table 2-2
 Descriptions of Alternatives A, B, C, and D**

Alternative A: No Action	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D
Theme: Current Management	Theme: Mixed Emphasis	Theme: Conservation	Theme: Resource Use
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. (See Map 2-24 in Appendix A.) 		
<p>Action Allow the discharge of firearms for recreational target shooting on BLM-managed public lands outside of areas with firearm use restrictions (see below), provided that the firearm is discharged toward a proper backstop sufficient to stop the projectile's forward progress beyond the intended target. Targets shall be constructed of wood, cardboard and paper, or similar non-breakable materials. All targets, clays, and shells are considered litter after use, and must be removed and properly discarded.</p>			
<p>Action: Firearm Use Restriction -- Prohibit the discharge of firearms for recreational target shooting on the following BLM-managed public lands:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • developed recreation sites. 	<p>Action: Firearm Use Restriction -- Prohibit the discharge of firearms for recreational target shooting on the following BLM-managed public lands. [The purpose of the restriction is to protect visitor safety by minimizing potential for accidental shootings (43 CFR 8364.1).] Continue to permit hunting in accordance with CDOW regulations:</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; 		

**Table 2-2
 Descriptions of Alternatives A, B, C, and D**

Alternative A: No Action	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D
Theme: Current Management	Theme: Mixed Emphasis	Theme: Conservation	Theme: Resource Use
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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; • North Sand Hills SRMA; • Hebron Slough Waterfowl Area; and, • Junction Butte Wetlands. (See Map 2-25 in Appendix A.)		
<p>Action: Special Recreation Permits (SRPs) -- Issue SRPs as a discretionary action.</p>	<p>Action: Special Recreation Permits -- 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,</p>	<p>Action: Special Recreation Permits -- Same areas as under Alternative B, except in areas managed for wilderness characteristics outside WSAs. Issue SRPs only if the proposed activity or event is consistent with the values associated with wilderness characteristics. (See Appendix M, Special Recreation Permit Evaluation Criteria.)</p>	<p>Action: Special Recreation Permits -- Issue SRPs as a discretionary action. Unless otherwise specified, maximize opportunities for commercial recreation by issuing SRPs, including vending permits outside of special events. Apply cost-recovery procedures for issuing SRPs where appropriate. (See Appendix M, Special Recreation Permit Evaluation Criteria.)</p>

**Table 2-2
 Descriptions of Alternatives A, B, C, and D**

Alternative A: No Action	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D
Theme: Current Management	Theme: Mixed Emphasis	Theme: Conservation	Theme: Resource Use
	where appropriate. (See Appendix M, Special Recreation Permit Evaluation Criteria.)		
Action: Fees -- As provided by the guidelines in the Federal Lands Recreation Enhancement Act of 2004 (FLREA; PL 108-447), implement recreation fees, as appropriate, in order to maintain visitor services and facilities by managing sites or areas as U.S. Fee Areas.			
Action: No similar Action in current RMP.	Action: Trail Construction and Maintenance -- Complete trail construction and maintenance using the guidelines included the Criteria for Placement of Trails. (See Appendix N, Description of Recreation Resources).		
Extensive Recreation Management Areas (ERMAs)			
Action: BLM-managed public lands not included in SRMAs (about 364,300 acres) would not be managed for specific recreation opportunities. (See Appendix N, Description of Recreation Resources.) [NOTE: The Kremmling RMP (BLM 1984b) determined that ERMAs would be managed in order to “provide visitor information, minimal facility development and site maintenance, and public land access.” In the context of that guidance, all acreage not within an SRMA would be managed as an ERMA under this alternative. Current guidance, however, requires public lands not designated as Special Recreation Management Areas (SRMAs) be managed in order to meet	Action: Establish the following areas as separate ERMAs in order to specifically address local recreation issues: <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. Lands not in SRMAs or in ERMAs (approximately 314,200 acres) would not be managed for specific recreation opportunities. (See Appendix N, Description of Recreation Resources.)	Action: Establish the following area as a separate ERMA in order to specifically address local recreation issues: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Upper Colorado (East): 800 acres. Lands not in SRMAs or in ERMAs (about 353,700 acres) would not be managed for specific recreation opportunities. (See Appendix N, Description of Recreation Resources.)	Action: Lands not in SRMAs (approximately 293,100 acres) would not be managed for specific recreation opportunities. (See Appendix N, Description of Recreation Resources.)

**Table 2-2
 Descriptions of Alternatives A, B, C, and D**

Alternative A: No Action	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D
Theme: Current Management	Theme: Mixed Emphasis	Theme: Conservation	Theme: Resource Use
basic recreation and visitor services and resource stewardship needs. These areas would not be managed for specific recreational opportunities.			
Restriction on Use: No similar Restriction on Use in current RMP.	Restriction on Use: STIPULATION K-CSU-1: ERMA and Other Lands Outside of SRMAs -- Apply CSU (site-specific relocation) restrictions in the following ERMA and to lands that would not be managed for specific recreational opportunities: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Upper Colorado River (East): 800 acres; • Headwaters: 13,800 acres; • Strawberry :7,900 acres; and, • Wolford: 25,700 acres. [NOTE: Intensive forest management areas in the Headwaters and Strawberry ERMA would be exempt from this restriction (see Map 2-21 and Map 2-42 in Appendix A).]	Restriction on Use: STIPULATION K-CSU-1: ERMA and Other Lands Outside of SRMAs -- Apply CSU (site-specific relocation) restrictions in the following ERMA and to lands that would not be managed for specific recreational opportunities. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Upper Colorado River (East): 808 acres (See Map 32 in Appendix A.)	Restriction on Use: No similar restriction on use.
Special Recreation Management Areas (SRMAs)			
Desired Outcome: Ensure the continued availability of outdoor recreational opportunities that the public seeks, and that are not readily	Desired Outcome: Specific Outcome-focused Objectives, Recreation Setting Character Conditions, and the Administrative, Management, Information, and Monitoring Framework can be found in Appendix N (Description of Recreation Resources).		

**Table 2-2
 Descriptions of Alternatives A, B, C, and D**

Alternative A: No Action	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D
Theme: Current Management	Theme: Mixed Emphasis	Theme: Conservation	Theme: Resource Use
<p>available from other sources, in order to reduce the impacts of recreational use on fragile and unique resource values and to provide for visitor safety and resource interpretation.</p>			
<p>Action: Administratively designate 2 SRMAs (approximately 13,650 acres total):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. Manage area for its unique recreational opportunities and activities, primarily off-road vehicle use and open sand dunes. Acquire public access through privately owned land, write and implement a Recreation Area Management Plan (RAMP), monitor visitor use, provide visitor services, reduce resource damage, and mitigate conflicts. • 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, designate 20.8 miles of the Colorado River and associated tributaries as a water 	<p>Action: Administratively designate 2 SRMAs for the protection of the recreation outcomes and setting prescriptions (approximately 15,550 acres total):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • North Sand Hills: 1,450 acres; and • Upper Colorado River (West): 14,100 acres. <p>North Sand Hills --</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • close to oil and gas leasing; • close to non-energy solid mineral leasing; • close to saleable mineral disposal; • petition for withdrawal; • ROW Avoidance Area; and • Retention Area <p>Upper Colorado River (West) --</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • close to oil and gas leasing; • close to solid non-energy mineral leasing; • close to saleable mineral disposal; 	<p>Action: Administratively designate 3 SRMAs for the protection of the recreation outcomes and setting prescriptions (approximately 23,450) acres total):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • North Sand Hills: 1,450 acres; • Upper Colorado River (West): 14,100 acres; and • Strawberry: 7,900 acres. <p>Same as under Alternative B for North Sand Hills and Upper Colorado River (West).</p> <p>Strawberry --</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • close to oil and gas leasing; • close to non-energy solid mineral leasing; • close to saleable mineral disposal; • petition for withdrawal; • ROW Avoidance Area; and • Retention Area. <p>(See Map 2-32 in Appendix A.)</p>	<p>Action: Administratively designate 6 SRMAs for the protection of the recreation outcomes and setting prescriptions in combination with other BLM land uses (approximately 84,850 acres total):</p> <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. <p>Same as under Alternative B for North Sand Hills and Upper Colorado River (West).</p> <p>Upper Colorado River (East) --</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • close to oil and gas leasing; • close to solid non-energy mineral leasing; • close to saleable mineral disposal;

**Table 2-2
 Descriptions of Alternatives A, B, C, and D**

Alternative A: No Action	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D
Theme: Current Management	Theme: Mixed Emphasis	Theme: Conservation	Theme: Resource Use
<p>priority. (See Map 3-30 in Appendix A.)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • petition for withdrawal; • ROW Avoidance Area; and • Retention Area. <p>(See Map 2-31 in Appendix A.)</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • petition for withdrawal; and • Retention Area. <p>Strawberry --</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CSU for fluid minerals; • Open for other minerals; and • Retention Area. <p>Headwaters --</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CSU for fluid minerals; • Open for other minerals; and • Retention Area. <p>Wolford --</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CSU for fluid minerals; • Open for other minerals; and • Retention Area. <p>(See Map 3-33 in Appendix A.)</p>
<p>Restriction on Use: STIPULATION: No Surface Occupancy, KR-04 and KR-05: Upper Colorado River SRMA; North Sand Hills SRMA -- Prohibit surface occupancy and surface-disturbing activities in the following SRMAs (approximately 13,650 acres total):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • North Sand Hill: 1,450 acres; and • Upper Colorado River: 12,200 acres. <p>(See Map 2-14 in Appendix A.)</p>	<p>Restriction on Use: No similar restriction on use:</p>	<p>Restriction on Use: No similar restriction on use:</p>	<p>Restriction on Use: STIPULATION CO-CSU-19: SRMAs -- Restrict surface occupancy or use in SRMAs in order to protect major BLM recreation investments; distinctive character of settings and service-delivery systems essential to the production of specified recreation benefits, and associated activity opportunities; and the individual, social, economic, and environmental benefits thereby realized:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strawberry: 7,900 acres;

Table 2-2
Descriptions of Alternatives A, B, C, and D

Alternative A: No Action Theme: Current Management	Alternative B Theme: Mixed Emphasis	Alternative C Theme: Conservation	Alternative D Theme: Resource Use
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Headwaters: 34,800 acres; and • Wolford: 25,700 acres. (See Map 2-7 in Appendix A.)
Comprehensive Trails and Travel Management			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ OAL: No similar Goal in current RMP. 	GOAL: The Travel Management System supports the BLM’s mission, achieves resource management goals and desired outcomes, and provides for appropriate public and administrative access.		
Desired Outcome: Manage BLM-managed public lands in the KFO for ORV use by providing for public needs or demands, protecting natural resources and the safety of BLM-land users, and minimizing conflicts among various users.	Desired Outcome: Maintain a comprehensive Travel Management System that best meets the full range of public, resource management, and administrative access needs.		
Over-Land Travel			
Action: No similar Action in current RMP.	Action: In areas and routes subject to the application of seasonal closures, the closure may be waived for administrative or BLM-authorized uses, after consideration, on a case-by-case basis.		
Action: Designate OHV-area travel as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Open: 307,300 acres; • Limited to Existing Routes: 7,300 acres; Limited to Designated Routes: 54,500 acres, and, • Closed: 8,700 acres. (See Map 2-26 in Appendix A.)	Action: Designate OHV-area travel as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Open: 200 acres; • Limited to Existing Routes: 0 acres; • Limited to Designated Routes: 369,300 acres; and, • Closed: 8,400 acres . (See Map 2-27 in Appendix A.)	Action: Designate OHV-area travel as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Open: 50 acres; • Limited to Existing Routes: 0 acres; • Limited to Designated Routes: 353,800 acres;, and, • Closed: 24,100 acres. (See Map 2-28 in, Appendix A.)	Action: Designate OHV-area as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Open: 200 acres; • Limited to Existing Routes: 0 acres; • Limited to Designated Routes: 369,300 acres; and, • Closed: 8,400 acres. (See Map 2-29 in Appendix A.)

**Table 2-2
 Descriptions of Alternatives A, B, C, and D**

Alternative A: No Action Theme: Current Management	Alternative B Theme: Mixed Emphasis	Alternative C Theme: Conservation	Alternative D Theme: Resource Use
<p>Action: In areas classified as Limited to Designated Routes, allow travel on 1,980 miles:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • routes designated for full-sized vehicles (vehicles 50 inches or greater in width): 1,739 miles; • routes designated for ATVs (vehicles less than 50 inches in width, routes maintained to a maximum of 50 inches in width): 73 miles; • routes designated for motorcycles (vehicles with 1 front wheel and 1 rear wheel, routes maintained to a maximum of 24 inches in width): 53 miles; • routes designated for mechanized vehicles (non-motorized vehicles with 1 front wheel and 1 rear wheel, routes maintained to a maximum of 24 inches in width): 0 miles; • routes designated for foot/horse: 99 miles; • routes designated for foot: 33 miles; • routes designated for administrative use: 22; and • routes designated for rehabilitation: 0 miles; and • Other/unknown: 89 miles. (See Map 2-70 in Appendix A.) 	<p>Action: Routes designated as Limited total 1,637 miles, classified as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • routes designated for full-sized vehicles (vehicles 50 inches or greater in width): 872 miles; • routes designated for ATVs (vehicles less than 50 inches in width, routes maintained to a maximum of 50 inches in width): 14 miles; • routes designated for motorcycles: (vehicles with 1 front wheel and 1 rear wheel, routes maintained to a maximum of 24 inches in width): 21 miles; • routes designated for mechanized vehicles (non-motorized vehicles with 1 front wheel and 1 rear wheel, routes maintained to a maximum of 24 inches in width): 12 miles; • routes designated for foot/horse: 72 miles; • routes designated for foot: 6 miles; and • routes designated for • • administrative use: 626 miles; and, • Routes to be decommissioned: 433 miles. 	<p>Action: Routes designated as Limited total 1,563 miles, classified as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • routes designated for full-sized vehicles (vehicles 50 inches or greater in width): 754 miles; • routes designated for ATVs vehicles less than 50 inches in width, routes maintained to a maximum of 50 inches in width): 11 miles; • routes designated for motorcycles (vehicles with 1 front wheel and 1 rear wheel, routes maintained to a maximum of 24 inches in width): 14 miles • routes designated for mechanized vehicles (non-motorized vehicles with 1 front wheel and 1 rear wheel, routes maintained to a maximum of 24 inches in width): 6 miles; • routes designated for foot/horse: 86 miles; • routes designated for foot: 6 miles; • routes designated for administrative use: 692 miles; and, • Routes to be decommissioned: 507 miles. 	<p>Action: Routes designated as Limited total 1,717 miles, classified as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • routes designated for full-sized vehicles (vehicles 50 inches or greater in width): 971 miles; • routes designated for ATVs (vehicles less than 50 inches in width, routes maintained to a maximum of 50 inches in width): 27 miles; • routes designated for motorcycles (vehicles with 1 front wheel and 1 rear wheel, routes maintained to a maximum of 24 inches in width): 62 miles; • routes designated for mechanized vehicles (non-motorized vehicles with 1 front wheel and 1 rear wheel, routes maintained to a maximum of 24 inches in width): 7 miles; • routes designated for foot/horse: 60 miles; • routes designated for foot: 6 miles; • routes designated for administrative use: 590 miles; and, • Routes to be decommissioned: 353 miles.

**Table 2-2
 Descriptions of Alternatives A, B, C, and D**

Alternative A: No Action	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D
Theme: Current Management	Theme: Mixed Emphasis	Theme: Conservation	Theme: Resource Use

	[NOTE: For these alternatives, administrative routes are limited to authorized users (typically, motorized access). These are existing routes that lead to developments that have an administrative purpose, where the BLM or a permitted user must have access for regular maintenance or operation. These authorized developments could include such items as power lines, cabins, weather stations, communication sites, spring developments, corrals, or water troughs.]		
<p>Action: Implement the following seasonal travel closures:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prohibit motorized travel from April 1 to June 1: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Grouse Mountain Road No. 2758. • Prohibit motorized travel from April 15 to June 1: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dice Hill Road No. 2750; • Black Mountain Access Road No. 2757; • Smith Mesa Road No. 2759; • Kinney Creek Road No. 2755; • Strawberry Road No. 2751; • Hurd Peak Road No. 2765; • Buffalo Peak Access Road No. 2507 and No. 2508; • Independence Mountain Access Roads No. 2503 and No. 2504; • Bull Mountain Road No. 2505; and • Owl Mountain Road No. 2502 and No. 2506. • Prohibit motorized travel from Labor Day to June 1: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Smith Mesa Lower Mainline Road 	<p>Action: Implement the following seasonal travel closures:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prohibit motorized and mechanized travel from December 1 to June 1: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dice Hill Road No. 2750; • Black Mountain Access Road No. 2757; • Fox Loop (Grouse Mountain Road) No. 2758; • Smith Mesa Road No. 2759; • Strawberry Road No. 2751; • Hurd Peak Road No. 2765; • Parson’s Draw Road No. 2513; • Three Mile Creek Road No. 2510 ; • Owl Mountain Road No. 2502 and No. 2506; • Hogback Road No. 2760; • Spruce Creek Road No. 2767; and • Spruce Creek Spur Road No. 2770 and 2771. 	<p>Action: Implement the following seasonal travel closures:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prohibit motorized and mechanized travel from December 1 to June 1: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same as under Alternative B. • Prohibit motorized and mechanized travel from December 15 to June 1: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same as under Alternative B. • Prohibit motorized and mechanized travel from March 1 to June 1: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same as under Alternative B. • Prohibit motorized and mechanized travel from Labor Day to June 1: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same as under Alternative B. 	<p>Action: Implement the following seasonal travel closures:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prohibit motorized and mechanized travel from December 1 to June 1: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same as under Alternative B. • Prohibit motorized and mechanized travel from December 15 to June 1: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same as under Alternative B. • Prohibit motorized and mechanized travel from March 1 to June 1: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same as under Alternative B. • Prohibit motorized and mechanized travel from Labor Day to June 1: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same as under Alternative B. • Prohibit motorized and mechanized travel from December 15 to April 15: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wolford Mountain Travel Management Area (in order to protect big game wintering

Table 2-2
Descriptions of Alternatives A, B, C, and D

Alternative A: No Action	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D
Theme: Current Management	Theme: Mixed Emphasis	Theme: Conservation	Theme: Resource Use
<p>No. 2762;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • McQueary Creek Road No. 2756; and, • Kinney Creek Spur Roads. • Prohibit motorized travel from June 1 to August 1: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hebron Slough: Closed to all motorized vehicles (in order to protect nesting waterfowl). • Prohibit motorized travel from June 1 to Labor Day: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Radium Hot Springs Access Road. • Prohibit motorized travel from August 1 to July 1: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hebron Slough: motorized vehicles Limited to Designated Roads and Trails. (Exception: Snowmobiles operating on snow.) • Prohibit motorized travel from October 1 to June 1: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Three Mile Creek Road No. 2510 (Exception: Snowmobiles operating on snow). • Prohibit motorized travel from December 1 to April 1: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inspiration Point Flats Road and Jeep Trail; and • Pumphouse Recreation Site Access Road. • Prohibit motorized travel year-long: 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prohibit motorized and mechanized travel from December 15 to June 1: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sheriff Creek Road No. 2764; • McQueary Loop No. 2768; and • Kinney Creek Road No. 2755. • Prohibit motorized and mechanized travel from March 1 to June 1: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Buffalo Peak Access Roads No. 2507 and No. 2508; and, • Independence Mountain Access Roads No. 2503 and No. 2504. • Prohibit motorized and mechanized travel from Labor Day to June 1: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same as under Alternative A, plus: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Kinney Creek Spur Roads – 3 roads east of Kinney Creek Road; • Behler Creek Road No. 2769; and • Smith Mesa lower main line road No. 2762. • Prohibit motorized and mechanized travel from 	<p>December 15 to April 15:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wolford Mountain Travel Management Area (in order to protect big game wintering habitat); • North Sand Hills SRMA and WSA; and • Strawberry SRMA. • Prohibit motorized and mechanized travel from September 15 to June 1: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same as Alternative B. • Prohibit motorized and mechanized travel year-long: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same as under Alternative B. 	<p>habitat); and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • North Sand Hills WSA. • Prohibit motorized and mechanized travel from September 15 to June 1: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same as under Alternative B. • Prohibit motorized and mechanized travel from October 1 to June 1: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same as under Alternative B. • Prohibit motorized and mechanized travel year-long: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same as under Alternative B.

**Table 2-2
 Descriptions of Alternatives A, B, C, and D**

Alternative A: No Action	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D
Theme: Current Management	Theme: Mixed Emphasis	Theme: Conservation	Theme: Resource Use

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sheriff Creek Road No. 2764; • Parson's Draw Road No. 2513; • Mitchell Placer Road No. 2511; and • Owl Mountain Spur Roads. <p>Other:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Spruce Creek Road No. 2767 -- Prohibit motorized travel from Labor Day to June 1. • Spruce Creek Spur Roads No. 2770 and 2771 -- Prohibit motorized travel from Labor Day to June 1. • Wolford Mountain Single Track -- Prohibit motorized travel from September 15 to June 1 • Wolford Mountain Travel Management Area -- Prohibit motorized travel from December 16 to April 14. 	<p>December 15 to April 15:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wolford Mountain Travel Management Area (in order to protect big game wintering habitat); and • North Sand Hills SRMA and WSA. <p>Prohibit motorized and mechanized travel from September 15 to June 1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wolford Mountain Single Track. <p>Prohibit motorized and mechanized travel from October 1 to June 1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strawberry motorized single-track trail system (except Strawberry, Hurd Peak, and Behler Creek primary access roads). <p>Prohibit motorized and mechanized travel year-long:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mitchell Placer Road No. 2511. 		
--	---	--	--

(NOTE: For all alternatives, exceptions to seasonal closures would be considered for over-the-snow travel when the average snow depth is 12 inches or more, except in the Wolford Mountain Travel Management Area, where over-the-snow travel is restricted to designated routes. 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. The CDOW will be consulted for seasonal closure adjustments regarding wildlife protection.

Action:

Table 2-2
Descriptions of Alternatives A, B, C, and D

Alternative A: No Action	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D
Theme: Current Management	Theme: Mixed Emphasis	Theme: Conservation	Theme: Resource Use
<p>Motorized/Mechanized Use -- Prohibit motorized/mechanized travel off designated routes in Limited and Closed areas, with the following exceptions and supplementary stipulations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BLM authorization for administrative use (such as accessing private land; accessing minerals/energy sites; administering grazing allotments; or conducting maintenance or installation of range improvements, habitat treatments, trail construction, communication sites, and reservoirs). • BLM authorization to exercise valid existing rights. • For emergency and other purposes, as authorized under 43 CFR 8340.0-5(a)(2), (3), (4) and (5): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • any non-amphibious registered motorboat; • any military, fire, emergency, or law enforcement vehicle while being used for emergency purposes; • any vehicle whose use is expressly authorized by the Authorized Officer, or otherwise officially approved; • vehicles in official use; and • any combat or combat support vehicle when used in times of national defense emergencies. 			
<p>Action: Administrative Use -- Grant administrative use authorizations on a case-by-case basis with approval from the Authorized Officer. For all authorizations that allow off-route motorized or mechanized travel, or both, specify the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • what type of use is allowed, and for what purpose; • times; • dates or seasons of access; and • where motorized or mechanized vehicle travel off designated routes is allowed. 			
<p>Action: Access to Campsites -- In areas with Limited travel designations, allow motorized or mechanized travel, or both, up to 300 feet from designated motorized or mechanized routes for direct access to dispersed campsites provided that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • no resource damage occurs; • no new routes are created; and • such access is not otherwise prohibited by the BLM Field Manager. 			
<p>Action: Game Retrieval -- No similar Action in current RMP. (Game retrieval was defined by specific Open, Closed, or Limited travel regulations.)</p>	<p>Action: Game Retrieval -- Prohibit motorized cross-country travel for big game retrieval on BLM-managed public lands, excluding direct access for mechanized game retrieval carts provided that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • no resource damage occurs; • no new routes are created; and • such access is not otherwise prohibited by the BLM Field Manager. 		

**Table 2-2
 Descriptions of Alternatives A, B, C, and D**

Alternative A: No Action Theme: Current Management	Alternative B Theme: Mixed Emphasis	Alternative C Theme: Conservation	Alternative D Theme: Resource Use
<p>Action: Non-motorized Modes of Travel -- Non-motorized modes of travel (such as foot and equestrian, including pack stock) are allowed on BLM-managed public lands unless otherwise specified.</p>			
<p>Over-the-Snow Travel</p>			
<p>Action: ▪ o similar Action in current RMP.</p>	<p>Action: Define an over-the-snow vehicle as a motor vehicle that is designed for use over snow that runs on a track or tracks and/or a ski or skis. An over-the-snow vehicle does not include machinery used strictly for the grooming of non-motorized trails.</p>		
<p>Action: ▪ o similar Action in current RMP.</p>	<p>Action: Areas and routes open to over-the-snow travel must have a minimum average of 12 inches of snow in order to be considered open for public use. The 12-inch rule may be waived for administrative or BLM-authorized uses, after consideration on a case-by-case basis.</p>		
<p>Action: ▪ o similar Action in current RMP.</p>	<p>Action: On groomed, non-motorized winter trails, restrict travel to non-motorized and non-mechanized uses only, unless otherwise authorized by the BLM Field Manager.</p>		
<p>Action: Designate all BLM-managed public lands open to over-the-snow vehicles, except in areas where over-the-snow travel is Limited to Designated Routes, as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wolford Mountain Travel Management Area, restricted to snowmobiles on designated routes from December 15 to April 15 in order to protect big-game wintering habitat. 			
<p>Action: Prohibit over-the-snow vehicles on BLM-managed public lands in the following areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Kremmling Cretaceous Ammonite ACEC; • Platte River Contiguous WSA; and, • Troublesome WSA. 	<p>Action: Prohibit over-the-snow vehicles on BLM-managed public lands in the following areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • all winter wildlife closures; • Kremmling Cretaceous Ammonite ACEC; • North Sand Hills SRMA and WSA (from December 15 to April 15); 	<p>Action: Prohibit over-the-snow vehicles on BLM-managed public lands in the following areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • all winter wildlife closures; • Kremmling Cretaceous Ammonite ACEC; • North Sand Hills SRMA and WSA (from December 15 to April 15); 	<p>Action: Prohibit over-the-snow vehicles on BLM-managed public lands in the following areas: Same areas as under Alternative A, plus the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • all winter wildlife closures; and • North Sand Hills WSA (from December 15 to April 15.)

**Table 2-2
 Descriptions of Alternatives A, B, C, and D**

Alternative A: No Action Theme: Current Management	Alternative B Theme: Mixed Emphasis	Alternative C Theme: Conservation	Alternative D Theme: Resource Use
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Platte River Contiguous WSA; • Troublesome WSA and adjacent BLM-managed public lands, which are those lands included in the Troublesome Temporary Road and Area Closure of September 2006; and, • Barger Gulch ACEC. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Platte River Contiguous WSA; • Strawberry SRMA; • Troublesome WSA and adjacent BLM-managed public lands, which are those lands included in the Troublesome Temporary Road and Area Closure of September 2006; • Barger Gulch ACEC; and, • Drowsy Water area, on lands having wilderness characteristics. 	
Water and Air Travel			
Action: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ o similar Action in current RMP. 	Action: Water -- Close all BLM-managed public waters (lakes, ponds, and reservoirs) to motorized use unless use is consistent with the area's management objectives, and is authorized by the BLM Field Manager. Exception: Wolford Reservoir.		
Action: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ o similar Action in current RMP. 	Action: Air -- Require all motorized aircraft including, but not limited to, airplanes, helicopters, and ultralights, to have a use authorization for take-off and landing locations on BLM-managed public lands or waters.		
Lands and Realty			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ OAL 1: No similar goal in current RMP. 	GOAL 1: Meet public needs for realty authorizations (such as ROWs, renewable energy sources, permits, and leases) when such needs are consistent with other resource values.		
Desired Outcome: Provide the opportunity to use BLM-managed public lands for development of facilities that benefit the public, while at the same time, considering	Desired Outcome: Provide for the development of transportation systems, utilities, communication sites, and renewable energy resources when development is consistent with management of other resource values.		

**Table 2-2
 Descriptions of Alternatives A, B, C, and D**

Alternative A: No Action	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D
Theme: Current Management	Theme: Mixed Emphasis	Theme: Conservation	Theme: Resource Use
environmental and agency concerns.			
<p>Action:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ o similar Action in current RMP. 	<p>Action:</p> <p>Designate as ROW corridors the alignments delineated in the 1992 (updated in 2003) Western Regional Corridor Study (Western Utility Group 1992, 2003), and the Designation of Energy Corridors on Federal Land in the 11 Western States EIS (DOE and BLM 2008). Locate new utility facilities in designated or existing corridors, unless an evaluation shows that to be impracticable.</p>		
<p>Action:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ ite major linear realty actions in order to meet the following location criteria: • concentrate linear facilities within, or contiguous to, existing corridors where possible; • avoid locations that would take intensively managed forestland out of production; • avoid locations that would harass livestock or wildlife; • avoid steep topography, poor soils, or other fragile areas (such as Threatened and Endangered habitats); and, • avoid cultural sites that are listed on, or eligible for listing on, the NRHP. 	<p>Action:</p> <p>Designate 97,700 acres as land use authorization Avoidance Areas (including renewable energy sites, such as solar, wind, hydro, and biomass development):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Heritage Areas identified in the future; • ACECs not included in land-use authorization Exclusion Areas; • NSO steep slopes (greater than or equal to 50 percent); • developed recreation sites; • SRMAs; • wetlands; • structural range improvements; • occupied habitat for Threatened or Endangered species; • active Greater sage-grouse leks with 0.6-mile buffer; • VRM Class II Areas with slopes 	<p>Action:</p> <p>Designate 252,300 acres as land use authorization Avoidance Areas (including renewable energy sites, such as solar, wind, hydro, and biomass development):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same areas as under Alternative B, plus the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WSR segments suitable for inclusion in the NWSRS that are not included in land use authorization Exclusion Areas; and • Sage-grouse core areas. <p>(See Map 2-35 in Appendix A.)</p>	<p>Action:</p> <p>Designate 75,500 acres as land use authorization Avoidance Areas (including renewable energy sites, such as solar, wind, hydro, and biomass development):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Heritage Areas identified in the future; • ACECs not included in land-use authorization Exclusion Areas (North Park Natural Area); • NSO steep slopes (greater than or equal to 50 percent) • developed recreation sites; • wetlands; • structural range improvements; • occupied habitat for Threatened or Endangered species; • active Greater sage-grouse leks with 0.6-mile buffer; • Watchable Wildlife Areas

**Table 2-2
 Descriptions of Alternatives A, B, C, and D**

Alternative A: No Action	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D
Theme: Current Management	Theme: Mixed Emphasis	Theme: Conservation	Theme: Resource Use
	over 30 percent and high visual sensitivity; • Watchable Wildlife Areas (Junction Butte Wetland and Hebron Waterfowl Area); and • 2 segments suitable for inclusion in the NWSRS (Recreational and Scenic classifications). (See Map 2-34 in Appendix A.)		(Hebron Waterfowl Area); and • VRM Class II Areas with slopes over 30 percent and high visual sensitivity (See Map 2-36 in Appendix A.)
(NOTE: Avoidance Area is defined as an area within which land use authorizations, such as ROW grants, would be avoided to the extent possible due to some sensitive resource value that may be damaged or diminished if development were allowed.			
Action: No similar Action in current RMP.	Action: Designate 9,600 acres as land use authorization Exclusion Areas (including renewable energy sites, such as solar, wind, hydro, and biomass development): • WSAs; • ACECs (Barger Gulch Heritage Area and Kremmling Cretaceous Ammonite RNA); and, • VRM Class I Areas (See Map 2-34 in Appendix A.)	Action: Designate 26,100 acres as land use authorization Exclusion Areas (including renewable energy sites, such as solar, wind, hydro, and biomass development): • Same areas as under Alternative B, plus the following: • 2 segments suitable for inclusion in the NWSRS (Wild classification); and, • areas determined to contain wilderness characteristics outside existing WSAs. (See Map 2-35 in Appendix A.)	Action: Designate 9,100 acres as land use authorization Exclusion Areas (including renewable energy sites, such as solar, wind, hydro, and biomass development): • WSAs; • Kremmling Cretaceous Ammonite ACEC/RNA; and, • VRM Class I Areas. (See Map 2-36 in Appendix A.)

**Table 2-2
 Descriptions of Alternatives A, B, C, and D**

Alternative A: No Action Theme: Current Management	Alternative B Theme: Mixed Emphasis	Alternative C Theme: Conservation	Alternative D Theme: Resource Use
	(NOTE: Exclusion Area is defined as an area within which a land-use authorization, such as a ROW grant, would not be considered due to some sensitive resource value that would be irreversibly damaged or diminished if development activities were allowed.)		
Action: No similar Action in current RMP.	Action: Installing memorials or monuments on BLM-managed public lands would require approval by a ROW or other authorization. Installing memorials (such as park benches or trees) in order to enhance a recreation site or wildlife habitat would be encouraged.		
Action: No similar Action in current RMP.	Action: Emphasize the co-location of communication site facilities and use of existing sites in order to minimize the number of total sites. Require communication site plans for new communication site locations. New communication sites may be considered if the new use cannot be accommodated on an existing site or on non-BLM-managed public lands.		
Action: No similar Action in current RMP.	Action: Renewable Energy -- Encourage wind energy development in acceptable areas, in accordance with current policy and when consistent with Goals and Desired Outcomes. ROW Avoidance and Exclusion Areas (as stated above) apply. (See Map 3-21 in Appendix A.)		
Action: No similar Action in current RMP.	Action: Renewable Energy -- Consider ROW applications for solar energy development projects (per IM 2007-97). ROW Avoidance and Exclusion Areas (as stated above) apply.		
■ OAL 2: No similar Goal in current RMP.	GOAL 2: Provide for public ownership of lands (or interests in lands) with high-value resources or public values, or both, that facilitate effective BLM land management.		
Desired Outcome: Improve the efficiency and effectiveness of BLM land management by identifying BLM-managed public lands suitable for a variety of disposal actions, including land sales, exchanges, State selection, interagency boundary adjustments, Recreation and Public Purpose Act of 1926 (RPPA) leases or purchases, and	Desired Outcome: Apply the following criteria when considering land tenure adjustments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • retain all public lands or interests in land (such as easements) that enhance multiple-use and sustained-yield management; • acquire lands or interests in land that complement important resource values and further management objectives; and • dispose of lands or interests in lands that are difficult or uneconomical to manage or no longer needed for Federal purposes. 		

**Table 2-2
 Descriptions of Alternatives A, B, C, and D**

Alternative A: No Action	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D
Theme: Current Management	Theme: Mixed Emphasis	Theme: Conservation	Theme: Resource Use
<p>Section 302 leases. Provide a more compact and manageable land base, via ownership consolidation, that would promote plan-driven, efficient, and effective management of the BLM-managed public lands within the Planning Area.</p>			
<p>Action: No similar Action in current RMP.</p>	<p>Action: Retain the following BLM-managed public lands for long-term management, totaling 457,700 acres:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SRMAs; • developed recreational sites; • developed administrative sites; • ACECs; • WSAs; • 2 suitable WSR segments; • Heritage Areas identified in the future; • high-potential Federal mineral estate under private and State-owned surface, and high- and medium-potential Federal mineral estate under Federal surface; • occupied habitat for Threatened and Endangered Species; • Greater sage-grouse core areas; • big game critical winter range; 	<p>Action: Retain the following BLM-managed public lands for long-term management, totaling 474,200 acres:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same areas as under Alternative B, plus the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • an additional 13 suitable WSR river segments; • occupied habitat for Sensitive Species; • big game migration corridors ; • wetlands and riparian areas; and, • lands managed for wilderness characteristics outside of WSAs. <p>(See Map 2-38 in Appendix A.)</p>	<p>Action: Retain the following BLM-managed public lands for long-term management, totaling 336,500 acres:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same areas as under Alternative B, except for no suitable WSR segments. <p>(See Map 2-39 in Appendix A.)</p>

**Table 2-2
 Descriptions of Alternatives A, B, C, and D**

Alternative A: No Action	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D
Theme: Current Management	Theme: Mixed Emphasis	Theme: Conservation	Theme: Resource Use
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • access points to BLM-managed public lands; • major river corridors [0.50-mile on either side of the following rivers: Colorado, Blue (Grand County), Fraser (Grand County), and North Platte (Jackson County)]; and, • perennial stream corridors with a width of a minimum of the floodplain; • Federal reserved water right withdrawals. (If the exception criteria listed below apply, Federal reserved water right withdrawals must be revoked prior to land tenure adjustments); and • Power Site Reserves and Power Site Classifications within, or adjacent to, a Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) power project. <p>(See Map 2-37 in Appendix A.)</p>		
<p>Exception Criteria for Retention Areas -- Retain the areas above for long-term management unless: 1) the resource values and the public objectives that the Federal lands or interests to be conveyed may serve if retained in Federal ownership are not more than the resource values of the non-Federal lands or interests and the public objectives they could serve if acquired (43 CFR 2200.0-6[1]); 2) the resource values of lands leaving public ownership are guaranteed protection under other ownership (transferred lands included in a long-term Conservation Easement that become part of a wildlife management area);</p>			

**Table 2-2
 Descriptions of Alternatives A, B, C, and D**

Alternative A: No Action	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D
Theme: Current Management	Theme: Mixed Emphasis	Theme: Conservation	Theme: Resource Use

	3) lands on the list of Retention Areas included in a proposed land exchange for which an agreement to initiate an exchange was approved before the date of the Notice of Intent to prepare this DRMP/DEIS; or 4) lands in trespass, where it would be in the public interest to allow for a sale.		
<p>Action:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ acquire lands for public ownership that would benefit overall BLM management. (Site-specific environmental analysis would consider acquisition needs.) Land that would be considered for acquisition includes the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • inholdings of private, State, or other Federal land within large blocks of BLM-managed public lands; • land adjacent to intensively managed tracts of BLM-managed public lands where overall program management would be enhanced (such as lands adjacent to SRMAs, intensively managed forest sites, grazing allotments, and important mineral areas); and • lands of mineral importance where the Federal minerals are overlain by State or private surface ownerships. 	<p>Action:</p> <p>Consider acquisitions for BLM-managed public lands inside, and outside, of Retention Areas through exchanges, boundary adjustments, donations, or purchases that meet any of the following criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • provide public access; • consolidate existing BLM-managed public lands, including parcels that make management easier or reduce trespass occurrences; • are suitable for public purposes adjacent to, or of special importance to, local communities and to State and/or Federal agencies for purposes including, but not limited to, community expansion, extended community services, or economic development; • areas near communities that provide open spaces and preserve agriculture; protect wildlife and critical habitat; enhance recreation opportunities; and, generally, serve the public good; • could improve water quality or increase water quantity; • facilitate the conservation or recovery of Special Status Species; and • meet the intent of the Land and Water Conservation Fund or Federal Land Transaction Facilitation Act. [See Maps 2-37 (Alternative B), 2-38 (Alternative C), and 2-39 (Alternative D) in Appendix A.] <p>Actively pursue easements through specific parcels in order to improve access to BLM-managed public lands for administrative and public needs.</p> <p>Land use priorities and management prescriptions for future land acquisitions will be identified and established in site-specific environmental documents prepared for each individual land acquisition.</p>		
<p>Action:</p> <p>Manage 15,500 acres as Category I lands suitable for disposal through exchange, State selections, and RPPA purchases.</p>	<p>Action:</p> <p>Consider disposals through exchanges, State selections, boundary adjustments, RPPA leases and patents, leases under Section 302 of the FLPMA, sales under Sections 203 and 209 of the FLPMA, and sales under the Federal Land Transaction Facilitation Act (FLTFA)</p>	<p>Action:</p> <p>Same as under Alternatives B and Alternative C, plus the following additional criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • lands that have facilities in 	

**Table 2-2
 Descriptions of Alternatives A, B, C, and D**

Alternative A: No Action Theme: Current Management	Alternative B Theme: Mixed Emphasis	Alternative C Theme: Conservation	Alternative D Theme: Resource Use
<p>Consider all 398,300 acres for disposal on a case-by-case basis, provided that disposal serves the national interest. All lands may be available for disposal through exchanges, State selections, boundary adjustments, RPPA leases and patents, and leases under Section 302 of the FLPMA. However, only those BLM-managed public lands identified as Category II would be considered for disposal by sale under the provisions of Section 203 of the FLPMA. Approximately 1,000 acres have been selected by the Colorado State Board of Land Commissioners under Section 7 of the Statehood Act of March 3, 1875. Approximately 1,450 acres have been identified primarily for exchanges, and approximately 2,500 acres have been identified primarily for special disposals that would be in the public interest and benefit Federal and other governmental agencies' management programs. Approximately 14,000 acres have been primarily identified for disposal through land sales. Disposals would require site-specific environmental analysis. BLM-managed public lands considered suitable for disposal are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • tracts in the Grand Lake, Granby, and Fraser areas that would support or 	<p>for BLM-managed public lands outside of Retention Areas. Apply the following criteria to disposals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • lands that contain important wetland or riparian wildlife habitat, other water resources, significant cultural resources, recreational values, or are essential to Candidate, Listed, or Proposed Threatened or Endangered Species would be evaluated on a case-by-case basis; • disposal of the land will not adversely impact the manageability of remaining BLM-managed public lands or minerals; • disposal of the land will not adversely impact the public's access to remaining BLM-managed public lands; • disposal of the land is deemed to be in the local public's interest; and • existing public access at the time of disposal would be reserved, as needed, if the lands are transferred out of public ownership. <p>[See Maps 2-37 (Alternative B) and 2-38 (Alternative C) in Appendix A.]</p>		<p>trespass; and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • lands of any configuration that are difficult to manage and increase the occurrence of trespass. <p>(See Map 2-39 in Appendix A.)</p>

Table 2-2
Descriptions of Alternatives A, B, C, and D

Alternative A: No Action	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D
Theme: Current Management	Theme: Mixed Emphasis	Theme: Conservation	Theme: Resource Use
<p>enhance the areas' recreational and tourism-based economies;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • inholdings within large blocks of State or other Federal lands; • BLM-managed public lands adjacent to large blocks of State or other Federal lands that would be best managed by that agency; • BLM-managed public lands overlying other mineral estates; • isolated tracts that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • have no important wildlife habitat values (such as winter range, nesting areas, and mating areas); • are not within a sensitive watershed or riparian area; • are in areas where BLM-initiated range management opportunities are limited due to size, isolation, and site potential; • are lands where BLM-initiated forest management opportunities are limited due to tract size, stand size, access difficulties, or adverse sites; and that • have no resource values of major significance. 			
<p>Action: No similar Action in current RMP.</p>	<p>Action: Reserved Federal interests in split-estate lands anywhere within the Planning Area may be considered for conveyance out of Federal ownership.</p>		

Table 2-2
Descriptions of Alternatives A, B, C, and D

Alternative A: No Action Theme: Current Management	Alternative B Theme: Mixed Emphasis	Alternative C Theme: Conservation	Alternative D Theme: Resource Use
---	--	--------------------------------------	--------------------------------------

<p>Desired Outcome: No similar Desired Outcome in current RMP.</p>	<p>Desired Outcome: Meet resource management needs by withdrawing lands from operation of the General Mining Law of 1872.</p>		
<p>Action: The following areas have been withdrawn from settlement, sale, location, or entry under the general land laws, including the mining laws: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Upper Colorado River SRMA: 13,257 acres; and • North Sand Hills Instant Study Area (ISA): 681 acres. [See Maps 2-30 (for the Upper Colorado River SRMA) and 2-51 (for the North Sand Hills ISA) in Appendix A.] (NOTE: Upper Colorado River acres include mineral estate under other surface ownership inholdings.)</p>	<p>Action: Petition the Secretary of the Interior for withdrawal of the following areas (in priority order for action) from settlement, sale, location, or entry under the general land laws, including the mining laws, totaling approximately 18,200 acres: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • YMCA/Sheep Mountain Conservation Easement: 3,400 acres; • ACECs: 8,800 acres; • developed recreation sites: 34 acres; • SRMAs: 6,000 acres (Upper Colorado River [West] acres not already withdrawn); and • 2 segments suitable for inclusion in the NWSRS: 24 acres. (See Map 2-40 in Appendix A.) [NOTE: 1) Due to overlapping acreages, the total acreage proposed for withdrawal will not equal the sum of the acreages of the individual areas proposed for</p>	<p>Action: Petition the Secretary of the Interior for withdrawal of the following areas (in priority order for action) from settlement, sale, location, or entry under the general land laws, including the mining laws, totaling approximately 32,400 acres: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • YMCA/Sheep Mountain Conservation Easement: 3,400 acres; • ACECs: (Same as under Alternative B, plus Alternative C additions): 9,400 acres; • developed recreation sites: 34 acres; • SRMAs: (Same as under Alternative B, plus Strawberry SRMA: 13,900 acres; and • 15 segments suitable for inclusion in the NWSRS: 10,200 acres. (See Map 2-41 in Appendix A.) [NOTE: 1) Due to overlapping acreages, the total acreage proposed for withdrawal will not</p>	<p>Action: Petition the Secretary of the Interior for withdrawal of the following areas (in priority order for action) from settlement, sale, location, or entry under the general land laws, including the mining laws, totaling approximately 18,200 acres: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • YMCA/Sheep Mountain Conservation Easement: 3,400 acres; • ACECs: 8,800 acres; • developed recreation sites: 34 acres; • SRMAs: 6,000 acres (Upper Colorado River [West and East] acres not already withdrawn). (See Map 2-40 in Appendix A.) [NOTE: 1) Due to overlapping acreages, the total acreage proposed for withdrawal will not equal the sum of the acreages of the individual areas proposed for withdrawal; and 2) acreage proposed for withdrawal are under BLM-managed surface</p>

**Table 2-2
 Descriptions of Alternatives A, B, C, and D**

Alternative A: No Action Theme: Current Management	Alternative B Theme: Mixed Emphasis	Alternative C Theme: Conservation	Alternative D Theme: Resource Use
	withdrawal; and 2) acreage proposed for withdrawal are under BLM-managed surface and other surface ownerships.]	equal the sum of the acreages of the individual areas; and 2) acreage proposed for withdrawal are under BLM-managed surface and other surface ownerships.]	and other surface ownerships.]
Action: No similar Action in current RMP.	Action: Review withdrawals, as needed, and recommend their renewal, continuation, revocation, or termination.		
Coal			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ OAL: ▪ o similar Goal in current RMP. 	GOAL: Provide opportunities for the leasing, exploration, and development of coal in order to meet local and national energy needs.		
Desired Outcome: Maximize the availability of Federal mineral exploration and development in order to allow the best mechanism for meeting BLM management objectives. Maximize the number of acres of Federal mineral estate open for development while, at the same time, protecting other resources and allowing for resource recovery and impacts mitigation.	Desired Outcome: Facilitate environmentally sound exploration and development of coal resources, using the best available technology.		
Action: Manage approximately 45,000 acres of the Federal mineral estate as open to consideration for coal leasing. [Within areas open to coal leasing, a preliminary application of 20 unsuitability criteria revealed that 7,190 acres are	Action: Manage approximately 123,700 acres of Federal mineral estate within the McCallum Known Recoverable Coal Resource Area (KRCRA) as open to consideration for coal leasing. [Within the McCallum KRCRA, a preliminary application of 20 unsuitability criteria revealed that 106,000 acres are unsuitable for surface mining (see Appendix L).] Additional applications of unsuitability criteria will not be made on future or existing, non-producing coal leases until the mine plan review stage. All lands determined suitable, unsuitable, or unacceptable for further consideration for leasing may be reviewed,		

**Table 2-2
 Descriptions of Alternatives A, B, C, and D**

Alternative A: No Action	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D
Theme: Current Management	Theme: Mixed Emphasis	Theme: Conservation	Theme: Resource Use

Resources

<p>unsuitable for surface mining (BLM 1984b.) A final decision on other applications of unsuitability criteria will not be made on existing, non-producing coal leases until the mine plan review stage.</p>	<p>and suitability determinations may be modified based upon new data during activity planning efforts. If lands outside the McCallum KRCRA are proposed for consideration for coal leasing, determinations about leasing will be made on a case-by-case basis, including identifying lands that are acceptable for consideration for coal leasing and development. Before a decision is made to lease specific tracts, site-specific activity planning, environmental analysis, and a determination of development potential, may be required. Lands with special designations (such as ACECs or SRMAs) are considered to be not acceptable for consideration for coal leasing and surface development. In situations where development potential of an area is unknown, exploratory drilling may be allowed in order to obtain sufficient data for resource management decisions, and to make fair market value determinations. (See Map 2-42 in Appendix A.)</p>
<p>Action: No similar Action in current RMP.</p>	<p>Action: Apply special conditions that must be met during more detailed planning, lease sale, or post-lease activities, including measures required to protect other resource values, as outlined in Appendix D (Conditions of Approval Applicable Surface-Disturbing Activities Other Than Oil and Gas Leasing) and Appendix E (Best Management Practices and Standard Operating Procedures).</p>
<p>Restriction on Use: STIPULATION: No Surface Occupancy, CO-01: Federally Leased Coal Lands -- No surface occupancy or use is allowed on leases within the area of federally leased coal lands in order to protect surface and longwall coal mines where oil and gas development is incompatible with planned coal extraction. (See Appendix C.)</p>	<p>Restriction on Use: STIPULATION: K-NSO-2: Federally Leased Coal Lands -- No surface occupancy or use is allowed on leases within the area of federally leased coal lands in order to protect surface and longwall coal mines where oil and gas development is incompatible with planned coal extraction. (See Appendix B and Map 2-42 in Appendix A.)</p>
<p>Restriction on Use: STIPULATION: Controlled Surface Use, CO-25. Federally Leased Coal Lands -- Operations proposed within the</p>	<p>Restriction on Use: STIPULATION: K-CSU-2: Federally Leased Coal Lands -- Operations proposed within the area of an approved surface or underground coal mine will be relocated outside the area to be mined or to accommodate room-and-pillar mining operations, in order to protect surface or underground coal mines.</p>

**Table 2-2
 Descriptions of Alternatives A, B, C, and D**

Alternative A: No Action	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D
Theme: Current Management	Theme: Mixed Emphasis	Theme: Conservation	Theme: Resource Use

Resources

area of an approved surface or underground coal mine will be relocated outside the area to be mined or to accommodate room-and-pillar mining operations, in order to protect surface or underground coal mines. (See Appendix C.)	(See Appendix B and Map 2-42 in Appendix A.)		
Fluid Minerals (Oil and Gas, Oil Shale, and Geothermal Resources)			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> OAL: No similar Goal in current RMP.	GOAL: Provide opportunities for leasing, exploration, and development of fluid minerals (oil and gas, including coalbed methane) using balanced, multiple-use and sustained-yield management in order to meet local and national energy needs.		
Oil and Gas			
Desired Outcome: Facilitate the orderly, economic, and environmentally sound exploration and development of oil and gas resources using balanced multiple-use and sustained-yield management.	Desired Outcome: Facilitate orderly, economic, and environmentally sound exploration and development of oil and gas resources, emphasizing high- and moderate- potential areas, using the best available technology.	Desired Outcome: Facilitate orderly, economic, and environmentally sound exploration and development of oil and gas resources, emphasizing high-potential areas, using the best available technology.	Desired Outcome: Facilitate orderly, economic, and environmentally sound exploration and development of oil and gas resources in conjunction with other resource uses and objectives, using the best available technology.
Action: Manage approximately 642,900 acres of Federal mineral estate as open to oil and gas leasing and development. Standard lease terms and leasing stipulations would be applied to leases. COAs, BMPs, and SOPs (see Appendices D and E), design features, and mitigation measures would be applied to development proposals. (The BLM has	Action: Manage approximately 625,200 acres of Federal mineral estate as open to oil and gas leasing and development. Standard lease terms and leasing stipulations would be applied to leases. COAs, BMPs, and SOPs (see Appendices D and E), design features, and mitigation	Action: Manage approximately 382,400 acres of Federal mineral estate as open to oil and gas leasing and development. Standard lease terms and leasing stipulations would be applied to leases. COAs, BMPs, and SOPs (see Appendices D and E), design features, and mitigation	Action: Manage approximately 625,300 acres of the Federal mineral estate as open to oil and gas leasing and development. Standard lease terms and leasing stipulations would be applied to leases. COAs, BMPs, and SOPs (see Appendices D and E), design features, and

**Table 2-2
 Descriptions of Alternatives A, B, C, and D**

Alternative A: No Action Theme: Current Management	Alternative B Theme: Mixed Emphasis	Alternative C Theme: Conservation	Alternative D Theme: Resource Use
<p>the discretion to modify surface operations in order to change or to add specific mitigation measures when supported by scientific analysis.) All mitigation and conservation measures not already required as stipulations will be analyzed in a site-specific environmental analysis document, and be incorporated, as appropriate, into COAs of Permits, Plans of Development, or other use authorizations.</p>	<p>measures would be applied to development proposals. (The BLM has the discretion to modify surface operations in order to change or to add specific mitigation measures when supported by scientific analysis.) All mitigation and conservation measures not already required as stipulations will be analyzed in a site-specific environmental analysis document, and be incorporated, as appropriate, into COAs of the Permits, Plans of Development, or other use authorizations.</p>	<p>measures would be applied to development proposals. (The BLM has the discretion to modify surface operations in order to change or to add specific mitigation measures when supported by scientific analysis.) All mitigation and conservation measures not already required as stipulations will be analyzed in a site-specific environmental analysis document, and be incorporated, as appropriate, into COAs of the Permits, Plans of Development, or other use authorizations.</p>	<p>mitigation measures would be applied to development proposals. (The BLM has the discretion to modify surface operations in order to change or to add specific mitigation measures when supported by scientific analysis.) All mitigation and conservation measures not already required as stipulations will be analyzed in a site-specific environmental analysis document, and be incorporated, as appropriate, into COAs of the Permits, Plans of Development, or other use authorizations.</p>
<p>▪ [NOTE: The acreages in the following leasing stipulation summaries are not additive. Under each alternative, leasing stipulations (NSO, CSU, and TLs) would be applied in a variety of overlapping combinations on Federal mineral estate open to leasing in order to accomplish specific management outcomes.</p>			
<p>▪ Restriction on Use: NO LEASING SUMMARY -- Close approximately 10,600 acres of the Federal mineral estate to oil and gas leasing and geophysical exploration:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • municipal boundaries; • Troublesome and Platte River Contiguous WSAs (including about 516 acres of a split-estate inholding in the Troublesome WSA); and 	<p>▪ Restriction on Use: NO LEASING SUMMARY -- Close approximately 28,300 acres of the Federal mineral estate to oil and gas leasing and geophysical exploration:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same areas as under Alternative A, plus the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Upper Colorado River SRMA; 	<p>▪ Restriction on Use: NO LEASING SUMMARY -- Close approximately 271,100 acres of the Federal mineral estate to oil and gas leasing and geophysical exploration.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same areas as under Alternative B, plus the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • core wildlife areas; 	<p>▪ Restriction on Use: NO LEASING SUMMARY -- Close approximately 28,200 acres of the Federal mineral estate to oil and gas leasing and geophysical exploration.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same areas as under Alternative A, plus the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Upper Colorado River SRMA;

**Table 2-2
 Descriptions of Alternatives A, B, C, and D**

Alternative A: No Action Theme: Current Management	Alternative B Theme: Mixed Emphasis	Alternative C Theme: Conservation	Alternative D Theme: Resource Use
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • North Sand Hills ISA. (See Map 2-43 in Appendix A.) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • YMCA/Sheep Mountain Conservation Easement; • 2 segments suitable for inclusion in the NWSRS; and • North Sand Hills SRMA. (See Map 2-44 in Appendix A.) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Greater sage-grouse core areas; • lands managed for wilderness characteristics outside of WSAs; • an additional 13 segments suitable for inclusion in the NWSRS; • Strawberry SRMA; and • State-owned Wildlife Areas. (See Map 2-13 in Appendix A.) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • YMCA/Sheep Mountain Conservation Easement; and • North Sand Hills SRMA. (See Map 2-45 in Appendix A.)
<p>Restriction on Use: NO SURFACE OCCUPANCY SUMMARY -- Apply major constraints (NSO) to 24,700 acres that are open to oil and gas leasing. Lease areas with fluid minerals NSO stipulations in order to protect resources. (See Map 2-14 in Appendix A.)</p>	<p>Restriction on Use: NO SURFACE OCCUPANCY SUMMARY -- Apply major constraints (NSO) to 232,200 acres that are open to fluid minerals leasing. Lease areas with fluid minerals NSO stipulations in order to protect resources. (See Map 2-1 in Appendix A.)</p>	<p>Restrictions on Use: NO SURFACE OCCUPANCY SUMMARY -- Apply major constraints (NSO) to 224,000 acres that are open to fluid minerals leasing. Lease areas with fluid minerals NSO stipulations in order to protect resources. (See Map 2-2 in Appendix A.)</p>	<p>Restrictions on Use: NO SURFACE OCCUPANCY -- Apply major constraints (NSO) to 209,000 acres that are open to fluid minerals leasing. Lease areas with fluid minerals NSO stipulations in order to protect resources. (See Map 2-3 in Appendix A.)</p>
<p>Restriction on Use: CONTROLLED SURFACE USE SUMMARY -- Apply moderate constraints (CSU) to 250,300 acres that are open to oil and gas leasing. Lease areas with CSU stipulations in order to protect resources. (See Map 2-4 in Appendix A.)</p>	<p>Restriction on Use: CONTROLLED SURFACE USE SUMMARY -- Apply moderate constraints (CSU) to 512,000 acres that are open to fluid minerals leasing. Lease areas with CSU stipulations in order to protect resources. (See Map 2-5 in Appendix A.)</p>	<p>Restriction on Use: CONTROLLED SURFACE USE SUMMARY -- Apply moderate constraints (CSU) to 519,300 acres that are open to fluid minerals leasing. Lease areas with CSU stipulations in order to protect resources. (See Map 2-6 in Appendix A.)</p>	<p>Restriction on Use: CONTROLLED SURFACE USE SUMMARY -- Apply moderate constraints (CSU) to 508,700 acres that are open to fluid minerals leasing. Lease areas with CSU stipulations in order to protect resources. (See Map 2-7 in Appendix A.)</p>

**Table 2-2
 Descriptions of Alternatives A, B, C, and D**

Alternative A: No Action Theme: Current Management	Alternative B Theme: Mixed Emphasis	Alternative C Theme: Conservation	Alternative D Theme: Resource Use
<p>Restriction on Use: TIMING LIMITATION SUMMARY -- Apply moderate constraints (TLs) to 562,900 acres that are open to oil and gas leasing. Lease areas with timing limitation stipulations in order to protect resources. (See Map 2-11 in Appendix A.)</p>	<p>Restriction on Use: TIMING LIMITATION SUMMARY -- Apply moderate constraints (TLs) to 520,200 acres that are open to fluid minerals leasing. Lease areas with timing limitation stipulations in order to protect resources. [See Maps 2-8 (Alternative B), 2-9 (Alternative C), and 2-10 in Appendix A.]</p>		
Geothermal			
<p>Desired Outcome: No similar Desired Outcome in current RMP.</p>	<p>Desired Outcome: Facilitate environmentally sound exploration and development of geothermal resources using the best available technology.</p>		
<p>▪ Action: The Planning Area has geothermal development potential. Most geothermal resources are likely to be of a lower temperature; therefore, no nominations for commercial electrical generation leases (indirect use) are expected. However, the BLM could receive future applications for onsite electrical generation from geothermal resources for oil and gas facilities (direct use). Leasing of geothermal resources would be in conformance with the surface-disturbing stipulations identified in Appendix B, Stipulations Applicable to Oil and Gas Leasing and Other Surface-Disturbing Activities. Desired Outcomes for resource conditions identified in this DRMP/DEIS will guide development of reclamation requirements prior to abandonments of areas developed for geothermal energy production.</p>			
Locatable Minerals, Salable Minerals (Mineral Materials), and Non-Energy Leasable Minerals			
<p>▪ OAL: No similar Goal in current RMP.</p>	<p>GOAL: Provide opportunities for development of locatable minerals, mineral materials, and non-energy leasable minerals while, at the same time, preventing unnecessary and undue degradation.</p>		
<p>Desired Outcome: Provide mineral materials from Federal lands in order to meet local demands. Provide materials by Free Use Permit to government agencies. Fill demands not provided by private sources by use of mineral materials from BLM-managed public lands.</p>	<p>Desired Outcome: Facilitate environmentally sound exploration and development of locatable minerals, mineral materials, and non-energy leasable minerals.</p>		

**Table 2-2
 Descriptions of Alternatives A, B, C, and D**

Alternative A: No Action	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D
Theme: Current Management	Theme: Mixed Emphasis	Theme: Conservation	Theme: Resource Use

<p>Action: Locatable Minerals -- All BLM-managed public lands are open to mineral entry and development (locatable minerals) under the General Mining Law of 1872 unless already withdrawn, proposed for administrative withdrawal, or designated as Wilderness. Locatable mineral exploration and development on BLM-managed public lands would be regulated under 43 CFR 3800. All surface estate would be open to location of mining claims for locatable minerals. In WSAs (8,872 acres), restrictions on mineral development would become effective only if Congress designates them as Wilderness. Pending this determination, WSAs remain open provided that activities meet non-impairment criteria, and that those activities began before the passage of the FLPMA. [See Maps 2-46 (Alternatives B and D), 2-47 (Alternative C), Map 2-30 (Alternative A, Upper Colorado River SRMA) and Map 2-51 (Alternative A, North Sand Hills ISA), in Appendix A.]</p>			
<p>Action: Salable Minerals (mineral materials such as moss rock, top soil, sand and gravel, scoria, fill dirt) -- Open all surface estate to mineral material disposal, except for those identified below, which would be closed to mineral material disposal. Open areas total approximately 377,900 acres. • In WSAs, restrictions on mineral development would become effective only if Congress designates the area as Wilderness. Pending this determination, WSAs remain open provided that activities meet non-impairment criteria, and that those activities began before the passage of the FLPMA. (See Map 2-48 in Appendix A.)</p>	<p>Action: Salable Minerals (mineral materials such as moss rock, top soil, sand and gravel, scoria, fill dirt) -- Open all surface estate to mineral material disposal, except for those identified below, which would be closed to mineral material disposal. Open areas total approximately 336,700 acres. • WSAs; • ACECs; • SRMAs; • developed recreation sites; • YMCA/Sheep Mountain Conservation Easement; and • 2 segments suitable for inclusion in the NWSRS. (See Map 2-49 in Appendix A.)</p>	<p>Action: Salable Minerals (mineral materials such as moss rock, top soil, sand and gravel, scoria, fill dirt) -- Open all surface estate to mineral material disposal, except for those identified below, which would be closed to mineral material disposal. Open areas total approximately 311,100 acres. • Same as under Alternative B, plus the following: • areas managed for wilderness characteristics outside of WSAs; and • an additional 13 segments suitable for inclusion in the NWSRS. (See Map 2-50 in Appendix A.)</p>	<p>Action: Salable Minerals (mineral materials such as moss rock, top soil, sand and gravel, scoria, fill dirt) -- Open all surface estate to mineral material disposal, except for those identified below, which would be closed to mineral material disposal. Open areas total approximately 350,400 acres. • Same as under Alternative A, plus the following: • YMCA/Sheep Mountain Conservation Easement.) (See Map 2-49 in Appendix A.)</p>

**Table 2-2
 Descriptions of Alternatives A, B, C, and D**

Alternative A: No Action Theme: Current Management	Alternative B Theme: Mixed Emphasis	Alternative C Theme: Conservation	Alternative D Theme: Resource Use
<p>Action: Salable Minerals (mineral materials such as moss rock, top soil, sand and gravel, scoria, fill dirt) -- Dispose of salable minerals primarily from established common use areas.</p>			
<p>Action: Salable Minerals (mineral materials such as moss rock, topsoil, sand and gravel, scoria, and fill dirt) -- Apply COAs and BMPs, and SOPs to the disposal of saleable minerals (mineral materials). Saleable materials on BLM-managed public lands would be regulated under 43 CFR 3600.</p>			
<p>Action: Non-energy Solid Leasable Minerals (solid minerals such as sylvite and halite) -- Open all surface estate to solid minerals leasing, except for those areas identified below, which would be closed to leasing. Open areas total approximately 377,900 acres.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In WSAs, restrictions on mineral development will become effective only if Congress designates the area as Wilderness. Pending this determination, WSAs remain open provided that activities meet non-impairment criteria, and that those activities began before the passage of the FLPMA. <p>(See Map 2-51 in Appendix A.)</p>	<p>Action: Non-energy Solid Leasable Minerals (solid minerals such as sylvite and halite) -- Open all surface estate to solid minerals leasing, except for those areas identified below, which would be closed to leasing. Open areas total approximately 336,700 acres.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WSAs; • ACECs; • SRMAs; • developed recreation sites; • YMCA/Sheep Mountain Conservation Easement; and • 2 segments (suitable for inclusion in the NWSRS. <p>(See Maps 2-40, 2-52, and 2-54 in Appendix A.)</p>	<p>Action: Non-energy Solid Leasable Minerals (solid minerals such as sylvite and halite) -- Open all surface estate to solid minerals leasing, except for those areas identified below, which would be closed to leasing. Open areas total approximately 311,100 acres.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same areas as under Alternative B, plus: • areas managed for wilderness characteristics outside of WSAs; and • an additional 13 segments suitable for inclusion in the NWSRS. <p>(See Maps 2-20, 2-41, 2-53, and 2-55 in Appendix A.)</p>	<p>Action: Non-energy Solid Leasable Minerals (solid minerals such as sylvite and halite) -- Same areas as under Alternative B, except for no suitable WSR segments. Open areas total approximately 372,600 acres.</p>
<p>Action: No similar Action in current RMP.</p>	<p>Action: Non-energy Solid Leasable Minerals -- Apply COAs, BMPs, and SOPs to the leasing, exploration, and development of non-energy leasable minerals.</p>		

**Table 2-2
 Descriptions of Alternatives A, B, C, and D**

Alternative A: No Action	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D
Theme: Current Management	Theme: Mixed Emphasis	Theme: Conservation	Theme: Resource Use

Special Designations	
GOAL: Use special management area designations to recognize the unique values on BLM-managed public lands that require special management in order to protect those resource values.	
Areas of Critical Environmental Concern (ACECs)	
<p>Desired Outcome: Designate areas where special management is needed in order to protect important geologic, botanic, historic, cultural, and scenic values, fish and wildlife resources, other natural systems (rare or exemplary), and human life and property from natural hazards.</p>	<p>Desired Outcome: Designate ACECs, and provide the special management necessary in order to protect the relevant and important geologic, botanic, historic, cultural, and scenic values, fish and wildlife resources, other natural systems (rare or exemplary), and human life and property from natural hazards.</p>

**Table 2-2
 Descriptions of Alternatives A, B, C, and D**

Alternative A: No Action Theme: Current Management	Alternative B Theme: Mixed Emphasis	Alternative C Theme: Conservation	Alternative D Theme: Resource Use
<p>Action:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Designate the following areas as ACECs (516 acres): • Kremmling Cretaceous Ammonite RNA: 198 acres; and • North Park Natural Area: 318 acres. (See Appendix S and Map 2-51 in Appendix A.) 	<p>Action:</p> <p>Designate the following areas as ACECs (8,570 acres):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same areas as under Alternative A, plus the following: • 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. <p>(See Appendix S and Map 2-52 in Appendix A.)</p>	<p>Action:</p> <p>Designate the following areas as ACECs (9,250 acres):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same areas as under Alternative B, plus the following: • Kinney Creek ACEC: 588 acres; and • North Sand Hills: 92 acres. <p>(See Appendix S and Map 2-53 in Appendix A.)</p>	<p>Action:</p> <p>Same as under Alternative A.</p>
<p>Restriction on Use: STIPULATION: No Surface Occupancy, KR-01: Kremmling Cretaceous Ammonite Site -- No surface occupancy or use is allowed in order to protect ammonite fossils in the Kremmling ammonite site. (See Appendix C and Map 2-51 in Appendix A.)</p>	<p>Action:</p> <p>Apply the following management to all ACECs, in addition to ACEC-specific restrictions on use:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Restriction on Use: STIPULATION CO-NSO-25: ACECs, RNAs and ONAs -- Prohibit surface occupancy or use in ACECs, RNAs, and ONAs in order to protect and prevent irreparable damage to important historic, cultural, or scenic values, fish and wildlife resources, or other natural systems or processes; or to protect human life and safety from natural hazards. • Apply COAs, BMPs, and SOPs. • Aggressively control noxious weeds using Integrated Weed Management (IWM) methods consistent 		

**Table 2-2
 Descriptions of Alternatives A, B, C, and D**

Alternative A: No Action Theme: Current Management	Alternative B Theme: Mixed Emphasis	Alternative C Theme: Conservation	Alternative D Theme: Resource Use
<p>Restriction on Use: STIPULATION: No Surface Occupancy, KR-02: North Park Phacelia ACEC -- No surface occupancy or use is allowed, in order to protect Endangered plant species habitat within the ACEC. (See Appendix C and Map 2-51 in Appendix A.)</p>	<p>with protection and promotion of relevant and important values. Methods may include, for example, biological control, site-specific spraying, and grubbing by hand. Any weed control measures proposed in WSAs within ACECs (such as the North Sand Hills ISA) will be consistent with WSA Interim Management Policy direction. Weed-control measures proposed within Wilderness or WSRs will be consistent with the legislation covering those areas.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommend ACECs for withdrawal from mineral location. • Close ACECs to solid mineral leasing, mineral material sales, and coal leasing. • Consider the use of retardant and heavy equipment in wildfire suppression, except in the Barger Gulch Heritage Area and the Kremmling Cretaceous Ammonite ACECs, after determining the resource values at risk and identifying potential impacts to those resource values. Any use of retardant or heavy equipment must be approved in advance by a line officer. Use prescribed fire and wildland fire managed for multiple objectives when desired characteristics of the ACEC will be preserved and management objectives will be met. • Prohibit new motorized routes, with the exception of new administrative routes. • Evaluate vegetation treatments on a case-by-case basis, and permit them as long as ACEC values are maintained. <p>[See Appendix B and Maps 2-52 (Alternative B), 2-53 (Alternative C), and 2-51 (Alternative D) in Appendix A.]</p>		
Barger Gulch ACEC			
<p>Action: No similar Action in current RMP.</p>	<p>Action: Designate the Barger Gulch Heritage Area (535 acres) as an ACEC in order to protect heritage resources. Management actions designed to protect the cultural resources are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • exclude use of heavy equipment; • prohibit motorized or mechanized travel, with the exception of administrative access; • manage as a land use authorization Exclusion Area (including renewable energy sites, such as solar, wind, hydro, and biomass development). 	<p>Action: No similar Action.</p>	
Kremmling Cretaceous Ammonite ACEC			

**Table 2-2
 Descriptions of Alternatives A, B, C, and D**

Alternative A: No Action Theme: Current Management	Alternative B Theme: Mixed Emphasis	Alternative C Theme: Conservation	Alternative D Theme: Resource Use
<p>Action: Manage the Kremmling Cretaceous Ammonite ACEC/RNA (198 acres) as an ACEC in order to protect significant marine invertebrate fossils. Management actions designed to protect the important ammonite fossils are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Restriction on Use. <p>STIPULATION: No Surface Occupancy, KR-01: Kremmling Cretaceous Ammonite Site -- No surface occupancy or use is allowed in order to protect ammonite fossils in the Kremmling ammonite site. (See Appendix C and Map 2-51 in Appendix A.)</p>	<p>Action: In the Kremmling Cretaceous Ammonite ACEC/RNA, apply the following management actions in order to protect the important ammonite fossils:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • exclude use of heavy equipment; • prohibit motorized or mechanized travel, with the exception of administrative access; and • manage as a land use authorization Exclusion Area (including renewable energy sites, such as solar, wind, hydro, and biomass development). <p>[See Maps 2-34 and 2-51 (Alternatives B and D), 2-35 and 2-52 (Alternative C), and 2-36 (Alternative D) in Appendix A.]</p>		
North Park Natural Area ACEC			
<p>Action: Designate the North Park Natural Area (318 acres) as an ACEC in order to protect the North Park Phacelia (<i>Phacelia formulosa</i>), a federally listed Endangered plant species. Management action designed to protect the important plant values is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Restriction on Use. <p>STIPULATION: No Surface Occupancy, KR-01: Kremmling Cretaceous Ammonite Site -- No surface occupancy or use is allowed in order to protect ammonite fossils in the</p>	<p>Action: Designate the North Park Natural Area (4,444 acres, including the 318 acres from the existing North Park Natural Area ACEC) an ACEC in order to protect North Park Phacelia (<i>Phacelia formulosa</i>), a federally listed Endangered plant species. Management action designed to protect the plant is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • manage as a land use authorization Avoidance Area. <p>[See Maps 2-34 and 2-52 (Alternative B), and 2-35 and 2-53 (Alternative C) in Appendix A.]</p>	<p>Action: Same as under Alternative A, except apply:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Restriction on Use: STIPULATION CO-NSO-25: ACECs, RNAs and ONAs -- Prohibit surface occupancy or use in ACECs, RNAs, and ONAs in order to protect and prevent irreparable damage to important historic, cultural, or scenic values, fish and wildlife resources, or other natural 	

**Table 2-2
 Descriptions of Alternatives A, B, C, and D**

Alternative A: No Action	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D
Theme: Current Management	Theme: Mixed Emphasis	Theme: Conservation	Theme: Resource Use
Kremmling ammonite site. (See Appendix C and Map 2-51 in Appendix A.)			systems or processes; or to protect human life and safety from natural hazards. (See Map 2-51 in Appendix A.)
Troublesome Creek ACEC			
Action: No similar Action in current RMP.	Action: Designate the Troublesome Creek ACEC (974 acres) in order to protect Penland's beardtongue (<i>Penstemon penlandii</i>) and Osterhout milkvetch (<i>Astragalus osterhoutii</i>), 2 federally listed endangered plant species: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • manage as a land use authorization Avoidance Area. [See Maps 2-34 and 2-52 (Alternative B), and 2-35 and 2-53 (Alternative C) in Appendix A.]		Action: No similar Action.
Kinney Creek ACEC			
Action: No similar Action in current RMP.	Action: No similar Action.	Action: Designate the Kinney Creek ACEC (588 acres) in order to protect the Colorado River cutthroat trout core conservation population. Management actions designed to protect the fish are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • manage as a land use authorization Avoidance Area; • consider stream/riparian improvements on a case-by-case basis; • allow camping in designated dispersed areas; and • prohibit the use of wildland fire managed for multiple 	Action: No similar Action.

Table 2-2
Descriptions of Alternatives A, B, C, and D

Alternative A: No Action	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D
Theme: Current Management	Theme: Mixed Emphasis	Theme: Conservation	Theme: Resource Use
		objectives. (See Maps 2-35 and 2-53 in Appendix A.)	
North Sand Hills ACEC			
Action: No similar Action in current RMP.	Action: No similar Action.	Action: Designate the North Sand Hills (92 acres) as an ACEC in order to protect the boat-shaped bugseed (<i>Corispermum navicula</i>), a rare plant. Management actions designed to protect the plant are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • manage as a land use authorization Avoidance Area; and • prohibit motorized or mechanized travel. (See Maps 2-35 and 2-53 in Appendix A.)	Action: No similar Action.
Wilderness Study Areas			
GOAL: No similar Goal in current RMP.	GOAL: Preserve the wilderness character of WSAs.		
Desired Outcome: Preserve wilderness characteristics in WSAs in accordance with non-impairment standards as defined under the Interim Management Policy for Lands Under Wilderness Review (BLM Manual H-8550-1 [BLM 1995]) until Congress either designates these lands as Wilderness or releases them for other purposes.			
Action: 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 			

Table 2-2
Descriptions of Alternatives A, B, C, and D

Alternative A: No Action Theme: Current Management	Alternative B Theme: Mixed Emphasis	Alternative C Theme: Conservation	Alternative D Theme: Resource Use
<p>• Troublesome WSA: 8,158 acres. [See Maps 2-51 (Alternatives A and D), 2-52 (Alternative B), and 2-53 (Alternative C) in Appendix A.]</p>			
<p>Action: No similar Action in current RMP.</p>	<p>Action: Designate WSAs and Wilderness (if designated by Congress) as VRM Class I.</p>		
<p>Action: Prohibit motorized and mechanized travel in 2 WSAs: • Platte River Contiguous WSA; and • Troublesome WSA. [See Maps 2-51 (Alternative A), 2-52 (Alternative B), 2-53 (Alternative C), 2-51 (Alternative D) in Appendix A.]</p>			
<p>Action: Allow, in the North Sand Hills ISA, cross-country motorized and mechanized travel on 163 acres, and limit motorized and mechanized travel to existing routes on 509 acres.</p>	<p>Action: Allow, in the North Sand Hills ISA, cross-country motorized and mechanized travel on 163 acres, and limit motorized and mechanized travel to designated routes on 509 acres.</p>	<p>Action: Prohibit, in the North Sand Hills ISA, motorized and mechanized travel on 90 acres (in the North Sand Hills ACEC), and limit motorized and mechanized travel to designated routes on 582 acres.</p>	<p>Action: Same as under Alternative B.</p>
<p>Action: 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. [See Maps 2-43 and 2-51 (Alternative A), 2-44 and 2-52 (Alternative B), 2-13 and 2-53 (Alternative C), and 2-45 and 2-51 (Alternative D) in Appendix A.]</p>			
<p>Action: No similar Action in current RMP.</p>	<p>Action: Apply COAs, BMPs, and SOPs in WSAs. [See Maps 2-52 (Alternative B), 2-53 (Alternative C), and 2-51 (Alternative D) in Appendix A.]</p>		
<p>Action: No similar Action in current RMP.</p>	<p>Action: If Congress releases the North Sand Hills ISA from wilderness consideration, manage the lands under the prescriptions of the North Sand Hills SRMA.</p>	<p>Action: If Congress releases the North Sand Hills ISA from wilderness consideration, manage the lands under the prescriptions of the North Sand Hills SRMA and the</p>	<p>Action: If Congress releases the North Sand Hills ISA from wilderness consideration, manage the lands under prescriptions of the North</p>

**Table 2-2
 Descriptions of Alternatives A, B, C, and D**

Alternative A: No Action	Alternative B		Alternative C	Alternative D
Theme: Current Management	Theme: Mixed Emphasis		Theme: Conservation	Theme: Resource Use
<p>Action: No similar Action in current RMP.</p>	<p>Action: If Congress releases the Platte River Contiguous WSA or the Troublesome WSA from wilderness consideration, manage the lands under the following prescriptions:</p> <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. 		<p>North Sand Hills ACEC.</p>	<p>Sand Hills SRMA. (</p>
Wild and Scenic Rivers				
<p>GOAL: No similar Goal in current RMP.</p>	<p>GOAL: Manage suitable river segments and identify suitable segments for inclusion in the NWSRS, protecting outstandingly remarkable resource values (ORVs) in accordance with the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act of 1968 (WSRA), and with applicable laws, rules, regulations, policies, standards, and guidelines. .</p>		<p>..... GOAL: No similar Goal.</p>	
<p>Desired Outcome: No similar Desired Outcome in current RMP.</p>	<p>Desired Outcome: Manage all eligible segments to protect the free-flowing nature, ORVs, and tentative classification, pending congressional action or for the duration of the Approved RMP.</p>		<p>Desired Outcome: No similar Desired Outcome.</p>	
<p>Action: Identify the following 15 river segments as eligible, and manage them under interim protection in order to preserve the free-flowing nature, ORVs, and tentative classification:</p> <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 	<p>Action: Alternative B1 -- Determine the following 2 eligible river segments as suitable:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Colorado River (segment 4, 	<p>Action: Alternative B2 -- Defer a WSR suitability determination, and adopt and implement the Stakeholder Management Plan in order to</p>	<p>Action: Determine the following 15 eligible river segments as suitable, and apply interim protective management:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Blue River segment 2 (Recreational); • Blue River segment 3 (Recreational); • Colorado River segment 1 (Recreational); 	<p>Action: Determine the following 15 eligible river segments as not suitable, and release them from interim management protections afforded eligible segments. This concludes the suitability study phase for these segments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Blue River segment 2 (Recreational); • Blue River segment 3

**Table 2-2
 Descriptions of Alternatives A, B, C, and D**

Alternative A: No Action Theme: Current Management	Alternative B Theme: Mixed Emphasis	Alternative C Theme: Conservation	Alternative D Theme: Resource Use
<p>(Recreational);</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Colorado River segment 3 (Recreational); • Colorado River segment 4 (Recreational); • Colorado River segment 5 (Recreational); • Kinney Creek; • Muddy Creek; • North Platte River; • Piney River; • Rabbit Ears Creek; • Spruce Creek; • Sulphur Gulch; and • Troublesome Creek. <p>[See Maps 1-2 through 1-7). (See Table 2-3, Summary of Wild and Scenic River Eligible Segment Lengths and Corridor Acreages, for total segment lengths and segment study corridor acreages, as well as segment lengths on BLM-managed public lands, and segment study corridor acreages on BLM-managed public lands.) (See Appendix T.)</p>	<p>Recreational); and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Colorado River (segment 5, Recreational) <p>Same as under Alternative D for the 13 eligible segments not determined to be 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. (See Appendix T and Map 2-54 in Appendix A.)</p>	<p>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 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</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Colorado River segment 2 (Recreational); • Colorado River segment 3 (Recreational); • Colorado River segment 4 (Recreational); • Colorado River segment 5 (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). <p>(See Appendix T and Map 2-55 in Appendix A.)</p>	<p>(Recreational);</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Colorado River segment 1 (Recreational); • Colorado River segment 2 (Recreational); • Colorado River segment 3 (Recreational); • Colorado River segment 4 (Recreational); • Colorado River segment 5 (Recreational); • Kinney Creek; • Muddy Creek; • North Platte River; • Piney River; • Rabbit Ears Creek; • Spruce Creek; • Sulphur Gulch; and • Troublesome Creek. <p>(See Appendix T.)</p>

**Table 2-2
 Descriptions of Alternatives A, B, C, and D**

Alternative A: No Action	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D
Theme: Current Management	Theme: Mixed Emphasis	Theme: Conservation	Theme: Resource Use
	<p>NWSRS. Apply management prescriptions in order to protect the free-flowing nature, ORVs, and tentative classifications of the above river segments. (See Appendix T and Map 2-54 in Appendix A.)</p>		
<p>(NOTE: Blue River segment 1 is on National Forest System lands and, due to mapping inconsistencies, was inadvertently analyzed for eligibility by the BLM. As a result, segment 1 is not being further considered in the BLM's suitability analysis.</p>			
<p>Action: No similar Action in current RMP.</p>	<p>Action: Close 2 segments that are suitable for inclusion in the NWSRS to oil and gas leasing. (See Maps 2-44 and 2-54 in Appendix A.)</p>	<p>Action: Close 15 segments that are suitable for inclusion in the NWSRS to oil and gas leasing. (See Maps 2-13 and 2-55 in Appendix A.)</p>	<p>Action: No similar Action.</p>
<p>Action: Establish the following interim protective management guidelines for all eligible segments:</p> <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; 	<p>Action: Apply the interim protective management guidelines identified under Alternative A until designated or released to multiple use by Congress. In addition:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • apply land use authorization avoidance on suitable stream segments classified as Scenic or 	<p>Action: Apply the interim protective management guidelines identified under Alternative A until designated or released to multiple use by Congress. In addition:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • apply land use authorization exclusions (including solar 	<p>Action: No similar Action.</p>

**Table 2-2
 Descriptions of Alternatives A, B, C, and D**

Alternative A: No Action	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D
Theme: Current Management	Theme: Mixed Emphasis	Theme: Conservation	Theme: Resource Use
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. 	Recreational; and <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • apply COAs, BMPs, and SOPs. (See Appendix D and Appendix E.) 	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. (See Appendix D and Appendix E.) 	
Action: Interim protective management would be subject to valid existing rights.			Action: No similar Action
Restriction on Use: STIPULATION CO-CSU-28: Wild and Scenic River Segments -- Restrict surface occupancy or use within one-quarter mile of all rivers that are eligible or suitable for WSR designation in order to preserve their ORVs, free-flowing nature, and water quality; and their consequent recreational, social, economic, and environmental significance. [See Maps 2-4 (Alternative A), 2-5 and 2-54 (Alternative B), 2-6 and 2-55 (Alternative C), and 2-7 (Alternative D) in Appendix A.]			
Continental Divide National Scenic Trail			
GOAL: No similar Goal in current RMP.	GOAL: Establish a trail alignment in the Muddy Pass area, and identify resources to enhance the Continental Divide National Scenic Trail (CDNST).		
Desired Outcome: No similar Desired Outcome in current RMP.	Desired Outcome: Protect resources associated with potential trail alignments in order to support current and future efforts to establish a connecting trail segment in the Muddy Pass area.		
Action: No similar Action in current RMP.	Action: Manage public lands in the Muddy Pass area in order to retain their natural settings for the establishment of a one-quarter-mile-wide trail alignment for the CDNST, and a viewshed corridor of up to 5 miles wide along the trail alignment. The width of the viewshed corridor could be reduced by topographic or vegetation features that provide screening.		

**Table 2-2
 Descriptions of Alternatives A, B, C, and D**

Alternative A: No Action Theme: Current Management	Alternative B Theme: Mixed Emphasis	Alternative C Theme: Conservation	Alternative D Theme: Resource Use
Action: No similar Action in current RMP.	Action: Pursue agreements with the Continental Divide National Scenic Trails Alliance, private landowners, and other land management agencies, in order to facilitate routing of the CDNST, and provide appropriate recreational experiences along the trail corridor.		
Action: No similar Action in current RMP.	Action: Implement the CDNST Comprehensive Plan if an approved route or portion of a route crosses BLM-managed public lands or lands over-lying Federal mineral estate.		
Action: No similar Action in current RMP.	Action: Consider land exchanges and easement acquisitions, where opportunities arise, in order to improve the continuity of the trail.		
Action: No similar Action in current RMP.	Action: Recommend withdrawal for newly identified or proposed trail corridors.	Action: No similar Action.	
Restriction on Use: No similar Restriction on Use in current RMP.	Restriction on Use: STIPULATION K-NSO-3: National Trail Corridors -- Prohibit surface occupancy or use in national trail alignments, and in viewshed corridors up to 5 miles in width, in order to conserve, protect, and restore National Scenic and Historic Trail resources, qualities, and values. [See Maps 2-1 (Alternative B), 2-2 (Alternative C), and 2-3 (Alternative D) in Appendix A.]		
Action: No similar Action in current RMP.	Apply COAs (Appendix D) and BMPs and SOPs (Appendix E) to actions proposed in the one-quarter-mile trail corridor.		
State or National Trails and Byways			
GOAL: No similar Goal in current RMP.	GOAL: Cooperatively identify, plan, implement and manage with other agencies or interest groups potential or proposed State or national trails and byways that may occur within the Planning Area.		
Desired Outcome: No similar Desired Outcome in current RMP.	Desired Outcome: Use BLM-managed public lands in the Planning Area for alignments of State or national trail corridors and byways, where appropriate.		
Action: No similar Action in current RMP.	Action: If BLM-managed public lands are included, or are considered for inclusion, in State or national trails corridors, manage those lands to retain their physical, social, and operational settings; and to support the conservation, protection, restoration, enjoyment, and appreciation of the resources, qualities and		

**Table 2-2
 Descriptions of Alternatives A, B, C, and D**

Alternative A: No Action Theme: Current Management	Alternative B Theme: Mixed Emphasis	Alternative C Theme: Conservation	Alternative D Theme: Resource Use
<p>Action: No similar Action in current RMP.</p>	<p>values of those corridors.</p> <p>Action: BLM-managed public lands in corridors along BLM Byways and Back Country Byways, All-American Roads, and National Scenic Byways would be managed in order to retain their physical, social, and operational settings; and to support the conservation, protection, restoration, enjoyment, and appreciation of the resources, qualities, and values of those corridors.</p>		
<p>Restriction on Use: No similar Restriction on Use in current RMP.</p>	<p>Restriction on Use: STIPULATION: CO-CSU-16: Backcountry and Scenic Byway Viewsheds -- Surface occupancy is restricted within viewsheds of designated Backcountry, Scenic and Historic Byways, at foreground and middleground distances (within 5 miles), unless topographically screened from view, in order to protect the scenic integrity of Colorado's Scenic and Historic Byways and their social and economic significance to nearby communities and Colorado's statewide economy. [See Maps 2-5 (Alternative B), 2-6 (Alternative C), and 2-7 (Alternative D) in Appendix A.]</p>		
<p>Action: No similar Action in current RMP.</p>	<p>Action: Apply COAs, BMPs, and SOPs to actions proposed in State or National Trails and Byways corridors. (See Appendix D and Appendix E.)</p>		
<p>Watchable Wildlife Areas</p>			
<p>GOAL: Use special designations to recognize the unique values on BLM-managed public lands that require special management in order to protect resource values.</p>			
<p>Desired Outcome: Designate Watchable Wildlife Areas (WWAs), and provide the special management necessary in order to protect the area's wildlife resources and values so that those areas will not be disqualified from designation.</p>			
<p>Action: No similar Action in current RMP.</p>	<p>Action: Designate the following areas (totaling approximately 4,400 acres) as WWAs: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Junction Butte Wetland: 100 acres; and • Hebron Waterfowl Area: 4,300 acres. </p>	<p>Action: Same as under Alternative B.</p>	<p>Action: Designate the following area as a WWA: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hebron Waterfowl Area: 4,300 acres. </p>

**Table 2-2
 Descriptions of Alternatives A, B, C, and D**

Alternative A: No Action	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D
Theme: Current Management	Theme: Mixed Emphasis	Theme: Conservation	Theme: Resource Use

Resources

Action: No similar Action in current RMP.	Action: Coordinate with the CDOW regarding the need for seasonal and emergency closures in order to resolve conflicts with hunting and other uses at WWAs, and for interpretation of watchable wildlife resources.
Action: No similar Action in current RMP.	Action: Issue Class I SRPs that are consistent with WWA objectives. (See Appendix M, Special Recreation Permit Evaluation Criteria.)
Action: No similar Action in current RMP.	Action: Identify and construct the necessary facilities (such as parking areas, toilets, trailheads) at WWAs in order to ensure public health and safety, and to protect other resources.
Action: No similar Action in current RMP.	Action: Close WWAs to recreational target shooting.
Restriction on Use: No similar Restriction on Use in current RMP.	Restriction on Use: STIPULATION K-NSO-4: Watchable Wildlife -- Prohibit surface occupancy or use in designated WWAs in order to protect high value wildlife habitat and recreation values associated with those areas. [See Maps 2-1 (Alternative B), 2-2 (Alternative C), and 2-3 (Alternative D) in Appendix A.]
Desired Outcome: No similar Desired Outcome in current RMP.	Desired Outcome: Manage vegetation produced in WWAs in order to provide optimum habitat for waterfowl and upland bird species; and to provide optimum winter forage for big game animals, including mule deer and Rocky Mountain elk.
Action: No similar Action in current RMP.	Action: Implement the appropriate management activities (such as those associated with grazing, manual or mechanical techniques, prescribed fire and wildland fire managed for multiple objectives, herbicide treatments) in order to enhance vegetation for wildlife at WWAs.
Action: No similar Action in current RMP.	Action: Coordinate with project partners, the CDOW, Ducks Unlimited, and other interested parties, in order to ensure habitat objectives are met.
Action: No similar Action in current RMP.	Action: Increase willow habitat at the periphery of the ponds at the Junction Butte Wetlands in order to provide nesting habitat for migratory birds.

**Table 2-2
 Descriptions of Alternatives A, B, C, and D**

Alternative A: No Action Theme: Current Management	Alternative B Theme: Mixed Emphasis	Alternative C Theme: Conservation	Alternative D Theme: Resource Use
---	--	--------------------------------------	--------------------------------------

Resources

Desired Outcome: No similar Desired Outcome in current RMP.	Desired Outcome: Provide educational opportunities for the general public.		
Action: No similar Action in current RMP.	Action: Design and construct the necessary access trails, interpretive displays, and brochures.		
Support			
Transportation Facilities			
GOAL: No similar Goal in current RMP.	GOAL: Provide a Transportation System that is manageable, maintainable, and that meets the need for managing resources and resource uses.		
Desired Outcome: Provide access in order to allow multiple-use and sustained-yield management of BLM-managed public lands.	Desired Outcome: Maintain BLM roads to identified maintenance intensity levels (appropriate intensity, frequency, and type of maintenance) consistent with public safety and Resource Management Plan objectives.		
Action: Prepare a Transportation Plan identifying road closures, maintenance needs, and access needs. Acquire access to the following BLM-managed public lands: Troublesome East and West, Canyon Creek, Drowsy Water Creek, Smith Creek, Willow Creek, Muddy Pass/Bear Mountain/Diamond Mountain/Iron Clad Mountain/Spicer Peak, Sheep Mountain, Bradfield Ditch, North Sand Hills, Upper Colorado River, McFarlane Reservoir, Colorado River (Middle Park), Pitchpine Mountain, Battleship Oil Field, and San Toy Mountain. This includes approximately:	Action: Maintain 0 miles of road at Maintenance Intensity Level 0 : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> existing routes that will no longer be maintained and no longer be declared a route. (Routes identified as Level 0 are identified for removal from the Transportation System entirely.) Maintain 17 miles of road at Maintenance Intensity Level 1 : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> routes where minimum (low intensity) maintenance is required in order to protect adjacent lands and resource 	Action: Maintain 0 miles of road at Maintenance Intensity Level 0 : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> existing routes that will no longer be maintained and no longer be declared a route. (Routes identified as Level 0 are identified for removal from the Transportation System entirely.) Maintain 17 miles of road at Maintenance Intensity Level 1 : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> routes where minimum (low intensity) maintenance is required in order to protect adjacent lands and resource 	Action: Maintain 0 miles of road at Maintenance Intensity Level 0 : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> existing routes that will no longer be maintained and no longer be declared a route. (Routes identified as Level 0 are identified for removal from the Transportation System entirely.) Maintain 16 miles of road at Level 1 . <ul style="list-style-type: none"> routes where minimum (low-intensity) maintenance

**Table 2-2
 Descriptions of Alternatives A, B, C, and D**

Alternative A: No Action	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D
Theme: Current Management	Theme: Mixed Emphasis	Theme: Conservation	Theme: Resource Use

Resources

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 0 miles of road at Maintenance Level 1; • 22 miles of road at Maintenance Level 2; • 115 miles of road at Maintenance Level 3; and • 2 miles of road at Maintenance Level 4. 	<p>values. These roads may be impassable for extended periods of time.</p> <p>Maintain 119 miles of road at Maintenance Intensity Level 3:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • routes requiring moderate maintenance due to low-volume use (seasonally or year-round for commercial, recreation, or administrative access). Maintenance intensities may not provide year-round access; however, they are intended to, generally, provide resources appropriate in order to keep the route in use for most of the year. <p>Maintain 2 miles of road at Maintenance Intensity Level 5:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • routes for high (maximum) maintenance due to year-round needs, high-volume traffic, or significant use. Also may include routes identified through management objectives as requiring high intensities of maintenance or to be maintained open on a year-round basis. 	<p>values. These roads may be impassable for extended periods of time.</p> <p>Maintain 119 miles of road at Maintenance Intensity Level 3:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • routes requiring moderate maintenance due to low-volume use (seasonally or year-round for commercial, recreation, or administrative access). Maintenance intensities may not provide year-round access; however, they are intended to, generally, provide resources appropriate in order to keep the route in use for most of the year. <p>Maintain 2 miles of road at Maintenance Intensity Level 5:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • routes for high (maximum) maintenance due to year-round needs, high-volume traffic, or significant use. Also may include routes identified through management objectives as requiring high intensities of maintenance or to be maintained open on a year-round basis. 	<p>is required in order to protect adjacent lands and resource values. These roads may be impassable for extended periods of time.</p> <p>Maintain 121 miles of road at Maintenance Intensity Level 3:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • routes requiring moderate maintenance due to low-volume use (such as seasonally or year-round for commercial, recreation, or administrative access). Maintenance intensities may not provide year-round access; however, they are intended to, generally, provide resources appropriate in order to keep the route in use for most of the year. <p>Maintain 2 miles of road at Maintenance Intensity Level 5:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • routes for high (maximum) maintenance due to year-round needs, high-volume traffic, or significant use.
---	--	--	--

**Table 2-2
 Descriptions of Alternatives A, B, C, and D**

Alternative A: No Action	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D
Theme: Current Management	Theme: Mixed Emphasis	Theme: Conservation	Theme: Resource Use

Resources

			Also may include routes identified through management objectives as requiring high intensities of maintenance or to be maintained open on a year-round basis.
Health and Safety			
GOAL: No similar Goal in current RMP.	GOAL: Protect lives, resources, and property in order to improve the quality of life in local communities.		
Desired Outcome: No similar Desired Outcome in current RMP.	Desired Outcome: Ensure that BLM-managed public lands provide safe facilities and conditions for visitors, users, and employees, with minimum conflict among users and minimum damage to BLM-managed public lands and resources.		
Action: No similar Action in current RMP.	Action: Investigate all reported incidents and injuries in order to ensure that all contributing factors are identified and, where appropriate, plans are formulated to take corrective action.		
Action: See the Recreation and Visitor Services section for camping, parking, and firearm use restrictions.			
Action: No similar Action in current RMP.	Action: Close motorized vehicle access routes that lead to illegal dumpsites.		

**Table 2-1
 Summary of Kremmling Field Office Wild and Scenic River Eligible Segment Lengths and Corridor Acreages**

River or Creek	Segment	Total Segment Length (miles)	Length on Public Lands (miles)	Total WSR Study Corridor (acres)	Area on Public Lands (acres)
Blue River	Total of 2 segments				
	Segment 2	2.55	0.96	890	289
	Segment 3	2.05	0.52	761	270
Colorado River	Total of 5 eligible segments				
	Segment 1	7.32	0.80	2,360	366
	Segment 2	2.44	0.31	742	126
	Segment 3	24.36	3.24	7,411	1,272
	Segment 4	5.36	4.73	1,703	1,405
	Segment 5	15.26	12.28	4,806	3,860
Kinney Creek	1 segment	2.35	2.35	865	802
Muddy Creek	1 segment	8.93	3.43	2,004	950
North Platte River	1 segment	0.07	0.07	149	41
Piney River	1 segment	2.30	2.11	840	732
Rabbit Ears Creek	1 segment	4.24	4.24	1,410	1,297
Spruce Creek	1 segment	0.97	0.97	433	364
Sulphur Gulch	1 segment	3.04	3.04	1,063	997
Troublesome Creek	1 segment	6.14	3.71	1,883	1,179

NOTE: Blue River Segment 1 is on National Forest System lands and, due to mapping inconsistencies, was inadvertently analyzed for eligibility by the BLM. As such, Segment 1 is not being further considered in the BLM's suitability analysis.

**Table 2-2
 Summary of Environmental Consequences from Alternative A, Alternative B, Alternative C, and Alternative D**

Summary Comparison of Impacts			
Alternative A Current Management (No Action Alternative)	Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)	Alternative C	Alternative D
AIR QUALITY			

Table 2-2 Summary of Environmental Consequences from Alternative A, Alternative B, Alternative C, and Alternative D			
Summary Comparison of Impacts			
Alternative A Current Management (No Action Alternative)	Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)	Alternative C	Alternative D
Under all of the alternatives, the BLM will adhere to local, State, and Federal regulations designed to protect air quality. This alternative has few specific restrictions or management actions that address air quality. Under this alternative, the number of acres available for oil and gas development, other mineral development, livestock grazing, other surface-disturbing activities, and open cross-country travel is the highest, which would result in the greatest impact to air quality.	Indirect benefits to air quality would be achieved due to the increased acreage closed to leasing, and to the travel management restrictions prescribed under this alternative. Alternative B also requires oil and gas operations to begin to reduce emissions and move toward “green completions,” which will reduce impacts to air quality.	Alternative C would indirectly benefit air quality the most, due to the largest amount of acreage covered by no leasing or NSO stipulations/restrictions, the smallest number of AUMs, and the emphasis on non-motorized travel.	Alternative D would be similar to Alternative B, but with somewhat greater indirect impacts to air quality, due to fewer acres withdrawn from surface occupancy and fewer restrictions on use.
CLIMATE			
Scientific assessments of future climate change are more global and regional in scale, and there are no precise scientific assessments of future climate change impacts and projections for specific localized sites within the Planning Area. Estimating quantitative changes in the local environment is not feasible at this time; however, several scientific organizations are working on downscaling models that should be useful in the near future. Management activities that can contribute to the phenomena of climate change include those that emit green house gases (GHGs) (especially CO ₂ and methane), such as fossil fuel use, prescribed fires, and livestock grazing. Energy development, vegetation manipulation projects, motorized recreation, livestock grazing, and wildfire are the main management actions that could contribute to climate change in the Planning Area.			
Alternative A would be expected to result in the highest potential impacts to climate of the 4 alternatives. This would be due to the acreage available for energy development, livestock	Alternative B would have fewer acres available for motorized recreation, energy development, and livestock grazing than would Alternative A.	Alternative C would have the fewest acres open to activities that emit GHGs.	Alternative D would be similar to Alternative B, with more acres open to uses that emit GHGs.

Table 2-2 Summary of Environmental Consequences from Alternative A, Alternative B, Alternative C, and Alternative D			
Summary Comparison of Impacts			
Alternative A Current Management (No Action Alternative)	Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)	Alternative C	Alternative D
grazing, and motorized recreation.			
SOILS			
Alternative A would rely more on mitigation measures and design features to protect soil resources, especially on steep slopes, than actually restricting other resource uses to less erosive areas. This could result in the most direct and indirect soil impacts of all of the alternatives. Cross-country travel is allowed on the majority of the BLM-managed acres under this alternative, which has led to many user-created trails on erosive soils, and miles of unmaintained trails. This alternative also allows for the most acres open to oil and gas development.	Alternative B would result in fewer direct soil impacts than would Alternative A, due to the prevalence of travel management restrictions limiting cross-country travel. NSO stipulations applied to oil and gas development would protect soils on BLM-managed public lands. More acres would be indirectly protected, due to oil and gas stipulations that remove wildlife habitat or recreation areas from leasing, or prohibit surface occupancy. Alternative B, Alternative C, and Alternative D would not require wildland fire suppression on all acres, and would allow for increased fuel treatment acres within the Planning Area. This greater use of fire management options (such as fuels treatments and the use of wildfire in order to achieve multiple objectives), could	Alternative C would be similar to Alternative B, but would have the greatest protections for soil resources by emphasizing non-motorized recreation and removing core wildlife and Greater sage-grouse areas from oil and gas leasing and development.	Alternative D would have more protection than would Alternative A, due to the restrictions on cross-country travel and on oil and gas development. Indirectly, fewer acres of fragile soils would be avoided during other resource management activities. Fewer roads would be decommissioned than the under Alternative B and Alternative C; and SRMAs would be designated that allow motorized recreation. Impacts to soils would be reduced more through mitigation measures, reclamation, and project design rather than through avoidance.

Table 2-2 Summary of Environmental Consequences from Alternative A, Alternative B, Alternative C, and Alternative D			
Summary Comparison of Impacts			
Alternative A Current Management (No Action Alternative)	Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)	Alternative C	Alternative D
	reduce soil impacts resulting from fire suppression tactics and from larger, more catastrophic wildfires.		
WATER RESOURCES			
Under all of the alternatives, the BLM must comply with local, State, and Federal water quantity and quality regulations. Mineral development, recreation use (especially OHV use), livestock grazing, and timber harvesting activities are the primary land uses that could impact water quality and quantity. Land use restrictions designed to protect water quality and quantity are relatively limited, and are, generally, handled at the project level, with design features and mitigation measures.	Alternative B would dictate major restrictions on oil and gas development in order to protect water resources. NSO stipulations for perennial waters and public water supplies would help to reduce impacts to water quality, channel stability, and watershed health. Cross-country travel would be restricted to only a few open areas, helping reduce multiple stream crossings and closing user-created trails that impact streams and wetlands. Increased use of NSO stipulations, and other restrictions in other resource management areas, would reduce user-caused impacts to stream segments and wetlands that occur within those areas.	Alternative C would have the most restrictions on land uses that impact water resources. Non-motorized recreation would be emphasized in the SRMAs, increasing the acres closed to motorized travel that otherwise can increase sediment loading in streams and degrade water quality. Intermittent and ephemeral channels would be buffered with occupancy restrictions, further reducing potential water resource impacts. Removing wildlife areas from oil and gas leasing would protect water resources that occur within those closures.	Alternative D would result in fewer direct water resource impacts than would Alternative A, due to the reduction in cross-country travel and the increased numbers of acres protected by various occupancy restrictions (especially around perennial streams and water supplies). Under this Alternative, the BLM could expend more on enforcement, design features, and mitigation measures in order to reduce travel management impacts to water resources than under Alternative A; but less than under Alternative B and Alternative C. Alternative D would designate SRMAs that allow motorized recreation in areas with water resource concerns.
VEGETATION			
FORESTS AND WOODLANDS			

Table 2-2 Summary of Environmental Consequences from Alternative A, Alternative B, Alternative C, and Alternative D			
Summary Comparison of Impacts			
Alternative A Current Management (No Action Alternative)	Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)	Alternative C	Alternative D
<p>Adverse impacts to forest and woodland vegetation would be less under Alternative A than under Alternative C, but more than under Alternative B and Alternative D. This alternative identifies more forest acres as suitable for intensive management, when compared to Alternative B and Alternative D, and, especially, Alternative C; however, VRM objectives would be the most restrictive. VRM objectives could prohibit vegetative treatments or place restrictions on their size or intensity, limiting opportunities to manage for healthy and diverse forest and woodland communities.</p> <p>In addition, cross-country travel, allowed on most public lands within the Planning Area, would result in damage to vegetation.</p>	<p>Alternative B would allow for the greatest flexibility in designing and implementing silvicultural systems designed to maintain or enhance ecological resiliency in forest stands and woodlands. Alternative B and Alternative D identify approximately 2,400 acres less than does Alternative A as suitable for intensive management; however, VRM objectives would be much less restrictive than under Alternative A. As with Alternative C and Alternative D, cross-country travel would be restricted on most public lands within the Planning Area, substantially reducing damage to vegetation when compared to Alternative A. There would be more forest and woodland acres potentially affected by SRMA and ERMA designations under Alternative B than there would be under Alternative A; but less than there would be under Alternative D. The application</p>	<p>Alternative C would have the least number of forested acres identified as suitable for intensive management. Protecting wilderness characteristics of forest and woodland acres within the Troublesome, Drowsy Water, and Strawberry areas would reduce opportunities to enhance species and age-class diversity, and improve stand health across the landscape. SRMA designations on additional forest and woodlands in the Strawberry area would result in further restrictions. Limitations on cross-country travel would be similar to those found under Alternative B and Alternative D.</p>	<p>Adverse impacts to forestry would be greater under Alternative D than under Alternative B, but less than under Alternative A or Alternative C. Alternative B and Alternative D are similar with regard to forested acres suitable for intensive management and VRM objectives. However, more forest and woodland acres would be potentially affected by SRMA and ERMA designations under Alternative D than under any other alternative. The application of COAs designed to minimize impacts to recreation setting characteristics within SRMAs could result in reduced opportunities to maintain or enhance age-class and species diversity, and thereby improve stand health, across the landscape.</p>

Table 2-2 Summary of Environmental Consequences from Alternative A, Alternative B, Alternative C, and Alternative D			
Summary Comparison of Impacts			
Alternative A Current Management (No Action Alternative)	Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)	Alternative C	Alternative D
	of COAs designed to minimize impacts to recreation setting characteristics within ERMAs could result in reduced opportunities to maintain or enhance age-class and species diversity, and thereby improve stand health, across the landscape.		
RANGELANDS			
Alternative A, which is least restrictive to recreation, lands and realty authorizations, road development, and minerals development, would result in a greater incremental impact to rangeland vegetation than would Alternative B or Alternative C. BMPs and SOPs would help to mitigate development-related impacts and ensure that, overall, the impacts to rangeland vegetation would remain relatively minor.	Alternative B would provide for higher levels of restrictions on those uses that could result in vegetation damage on public lands within the Planning Area. These restrictions on use, especially as they relate to motorized recreation use, would help reduce the incremental impact from other human actions or natural processes. The overall impact to rangeland vegetation would be minor, and less than it would be under Alternative A.	Alternative C, which is the most restrictive of all of the alternatives, would result in the least amount of surface-disturbing activity. The actions under this alternative, when combined with other human actions, would result in the least incremental impact to rangeland vegetation of any of the alternatives. As under Alternative B, the overall impact would be comparatively minor.	Alternative D, which would have fewer restrictions on surface-disturbing activities than would Alternative B or Alternative C, would have a greater impact on rangeland vegetation when considering the incremental effects of actions under this alternative. However, the overall impact would be less than that under Alternative A.
RIPARIAN			
Alternative A has few actions addressing wetland vegetation or riparian resources. Alternative A tries to avoid disturbances and improve land	Alternative B would result in fewer direct impacts to riparian vegetation than would Alternative A. Cross-country travel closures would minimize	Alternative C would result in the fewest direct impacts to riparian areas. The closure of core wildlife areas and sage-grouse core areas to leasing would	Alternative D would result in fewer impacts to riparian areas than would Alternative A, but more than Alternative B and Alternative C. Surface

Table 2-2 Summary of Environmental Consequences from Alternative A, Alternative B, Alternative C, and Alternative D			
Summary Comparison of Impacts			
Alternative A Current Management (No Action Alternative)	Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)	Alternative C	Alternative D
use practices in order to reduce vegetation removal and promote productivity in the riparian area. Impacts from surface-disturbing activities are mitigated, somewhat, by relocating oil and gas activities and by applying COAs and BMPs to all surface-disturbing activities that require an authorization. Livestock grazing and cross-country vehicle travel produce impacts that are the hardest to control. Under this alternative, losses of riparian vegetation would be the greatest.	travel in wetland vegetation and would protect riparian resource values. Oil and gas operations affecting riparian areas would be restricted by stipulations and COAs, reducing the impact of those activities on riparian areas. Impacts from other surface-disturbing activities would be lessened by avoidance or by other mitigation measures.	eliminate oil and gas impacts in those areas. Travel management restrictions would reduce impacts in riparian areas. Under this alternative, SRMAs would not emphasize motorized recreation; however, there could still be resource impacts due to recreation uses that could require mitigation or design features in order to reduce vegetation impacts.	occupancy restrictions and travel management designations would reduce impacts when compared with Alternative A, but would be less protective than under Alternative B or Alternative C.
WEEDS			

Table 2-2 Summary of Environmental Consequences from Alternative A, Alternative B, Alternative C, and Alternative D			
Summary Comparison of Impacts			
Alternative A Current Management (No Action Alternative)	Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)	Alternative C	Alternative D
Alternative A would allow for the greatest use of resources; would apply the fewest restrictions; and would, therefore, result in the greatest amount of disturbance. The overall impact, however, of Alternative A would be comparatively minor. All alternatives would place an equal emphasis on weed control, and all alternatives would result in continued cooperation between the KFO and the Counties for controlling weeds.	Actions proposed under Alternative B would limit the opportunities for establishing and spreading weeds due to the restrictions placed on land uses. Reduced cross-county vehicle travel and COAs applied to surface-disturbing activities are examples of management actions that would affect the spread of weeds. Weed management activities (such as chemical treatments) would limit the spread of weeds at roughly the same levels as Alternative C and Alternative D.	Alternative C would have the greatest effect on reducing the spread of weeds, due to the restrictions placed on land uses. Under this alternative, more lands would be closed to oil and gas leasing and development, and closed to cross-country travel. Weed management activities (chemical treatments) would limit the spread of weeds at roughly the same levels as Alternative B and Alternative D.	Alternative D would allow for greater use of resources than would Alternative B and Alternative C. Restrictions on surface uses, especially cross-county travel and oil and gas leasing and development, would be applied, but not to the levels of Alternative B and Alternative C. Weed management activities (chemical treatments) would limit the spread of weeds at roughly the same levels as Alternative B and Alternative C.
FISH AND WILDLIFE			
Alternative A would have more potential for direct and indirect impacts to fish and wildlife species and their habitats than would the other alternatives. Recreation and fluid minerals management would result in the most impacts under Alternative A, because OHV use would continue to be allowed largely unabated across large portions of the Planning Area. Oil and gas development, and the	Alternative B would result in fewer impacts than would Alternative A. Motorized recreation use on the KFO's public lands would be subject to a much higher degree of route designation, resulting in fewer conflicts with fish and wildlife. Alternative B includes a number of protective stipulations for fish and wildlife, which would enhance conditions and reduce direct	Alternative C would result in the fewest impacts to fish and wildlife. Motorized recreation use on the KFO's public lands would be subject to a slightly higher degree of route designation than they would be under Alternative B, resulting in fewer conflicts with fish and wildlife. Alternative C includes the most protective stipulations for fish and wildlife, which would enhance conditions and reduce direct and indirect	Under Alternative D, impacts to fish and wildlife would be less than under Alternative A, but greater than under Alternative C and Alternative D. Motorized recreation use on the KFO's public lands would be subject to a much higher degree of route designation under Alternative D than under Alternative A, resulting in fewer conflicts with fish and wildlife. Alternative D includes more protective

Table 2-2 Summary of Environmental Consequences from Alternative A, Alternative B, Alternative C, and Alternative D			
Summary Comparison of Impacts			
Alternative A Current Management (No Action Alternative)	Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)	Alternative C	Alternative D
associated road construction, would continue to occur on private, State, and BLM-managed public lands. (Roads are one of the single biggest issues with regard to fish and wildlife habitat quality).	and indirect impacts from surface-disturbing activities. Healthier vegetation for fish and wildlife would be more resistant to invasive weeds and drought conditions.	impacts resulting from surface-disturbing activities.	stipulations than does Alternative A for fish and wildlife, which would enhance conditions and reduce direct and indirect impacts resulting from surface-disturbing activities.
SPECIAL STATUS SPECIES			
Alternative A would have more potential for direct and indirect impacts to Special Status Species and their habitats. Recreation and fluid minerals management would result in the most impacts under Alternative A. OHV use would continue to be allowed largely unabated across large portions of the Planning Area, and oil and gas development, and the associated road construction, would continue to occur on private, State, and BLM-managed public lands. (Roads are one of the single biggest issues with regard to Special Status Species habitat quality.)	Alternative B would result in fewer impacts than would Alternative A. Motorized recreation use on the KFO's public lands would be subject to a much higher degree of route designation, resulting in fewer conflicts with Special Status Species. Alternative B includes a number of protective stipulations for Special Status Species, which would enhance conditions and reduce direct and indirect impacts resulting from surface-disturbing activities. Healthier vegetation for Special Status Species would be more resistant to invasive weeds and to drought conditions.	Alternative C would result in the fewest impacts to Special Status Species. Motorized recreation use on the KFO's public lands would be subject to a slightly higher degree of route designation than under Alternative B, resulting in fewer conflicts with Special Status Species. Alternative C includes the most protective stipulations for Special Status Species, which would enhance conditions and reduce direct and indirect impacts resulting from surface-disturbing activities.	Impacts to Special Status Species under Alternative D would be less than under Alternative A, but greater than under Alternative C and Alternative D. Motorized recreation use on the KFO's public lands would be subject to a much higher degree of route designation under Alternative D they would be under Alternative A, resulting in fewer conflicts with Special Status Species. Alternative D includes more protective stipulations than Alternative A for Special Status Species, which would enhance conditions and reduce direct and indirect impacts resulting from surface-disturbing activities.
CULTURAL RESOURCES			
Adverse direct or indirect	Impacts to cultural resources	Impacts to cultural resources	Alternative D would result in

Table 2-2 Summary of Environmental Consequences from Alternative A, Alternative B, Alternative C, and Alternative D			
Summary Comparison of Impacts			
Alternative A Current Management (No Action Alternative)	Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)	Alternative C	Alternative D
<p>impacts to cultural resources could occur from any surface-disturbing activities, as well as from natural events (such as soil erosion), all of which could affect the integrity of cultural sites. Actual impacts to cultural resources from permitted surface disturbances rarely occur, due to the requirements of inventory in advance of any surface disturbance, followed by avoidance or site mitigation measures designed to protect the integrity of cultural resources. Authorized surface-disturbing activities could result in the discovery of previously unknown cultural resources, which would lead to the expansion of local knowledge about the history or prehistory of and area. Natural events and unregulated activities (such as from illegal artifact collection, trespass, largely uncontrolled OHV use, and livestock concentrations in sensitive areas) would create impacts to cultural resources that likely</p>	<p>under Alternative B would vary little from Alternative A; however, more restrictions on surface-disturbances (especially OHV use), emphasis on travel management, and greater use of BMPs and COAs for permitted activities would reduce impacts. More attention to protecting soils and vegetation would result in fewer naturally caused impacts to cultural resources. Uncontrolled impacts (such as from illegal artifact collection), would still occur, much the same as under Alternative A; however, restrictions on access may reduce opportunities for activities that would impact cultural resources.</p>	<p>would be much the same as under Alternative B; however, this alternative would result in fewer impacts to cultural resources than would any of the other alternatives. Adverse direct or indirect impacts are expected to be less because this alternative is the most restrictive regarding surface disturbances. Uncontrollable impacts would be similar to Alternative B, but with fewer impacts from OHV use and more restrictions on access.</p>	<p>impacts similar to those of Alternative A. Restrictions in this alternative, however, while less stringent than under Alternative B and Alternative C, would provide greater protection for cultural resources than is provided under Alternative A. Uncontrolled impacts (such as from illegal artifact collection), would still occur, much the same as under Alternative A; however, restrictions on OHV use and access may reduce opportunities for activities that would impact cultural resources.</p>

Table 2-2 Summary of Environmental Consequences from Alternative A, Alternative B, Alternative C, and Alternative D			
Summary Comparison of Impacts			
Alternative A Current Management (No Action Alternative)	Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)	Alternative C	Alternative D
would not be mitigated.			
PALEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCES			
Adverse direct or indirect impacts to paleontological resources could result from any surface-disturbing activities in areas where sediments are prominent. Impact could also result from natural events (such as soil erosion), which could affect the integrity of paleontological sites, and damage fossils. Actual impacts to paleontological resources from permitted surface disturbances rarely occur, due to the requirements of inventory in advance of any surface disturbance, followed by avoidance or site mitigation measures designed to protect the integrity of those resources. Authorized surface-disturbing activities could result in discovery of previously unknown fossil resources, which would lead to expanding local knowledge about the prehistory of an area. Natural events and unregulated activities (such as	Under Alternative B, impacts to paleontological resources would vary little from Alternative A; however, more restrictions on surface disturbances,(especially OHV use), emphasis on travel management, and greater use of BMPs and COAs for permitted activities would reduce impacts. More attention to protecting soils and vegetation would result in fewer naturally caused impacts to fossil resources. Uncontrolled impacts (such as from illegal fossil collection), would still occur, much the same as under Alternative A; however, restrictions on access may reduce opportunities for activities that would impact paleontological resources.	Impacts to paleontological resources would be much the same as under Alternative B; however this alternative would result in fewer impacts to fossil resources than would any of the other alternatives. Adverse direct or indirect impacts are expected to be less because this alternative is the most restrictive regarding surface disturbances. Uncontrollable impacts would be similar to those under Alternative B, but with fewer impacts from OHV use, and more restrictions on access.	Alternative D would result in impacts similar to those under Alternative A. Restrictions in this alternative, however, while less stringent than under Alternative B and Alternative C, would provide greater protection for paleontological resources than would be provided by Alternative A. Uncontrolled impacts (such as from illegal fossil collection), would still occur, much the same as under Alternative A; however, restrictions on OHV use and access may reduce opportunities for activities that would impact paleontological resources.

Table 2-2 Summary of Environmental Consequences from Alternative A, Alternative B, Alternative C, and Alternative D			
Summary Comparison of Impacts			
Alternative A Current Management (No Action Alternative)	Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)	Alternative C	Alternative D
from illegal fossil collection, trespass, largely uncontrolled OHV use, and livestock concentrations in sensitive areas) would result in impacts to paleontological resources that likely would not be mitigated.			
VISUAL RESOURCES			
Activities that involve surface disturbance, including vegetation treatments, would be affected by Visual Resource Management (VRM) requirements. Depending upon the locations of Proposed Actions, and the requirements of related VRM classes, substantial modifications to the proposal could be required in order to ensure conformance with those requirements. Modifications could include such things as painting, providing vegetation barriers, relocation, and changing the design of structures in order to reduce visibility, which could increase the cost of a project. Activities that are not controlled by a use authorization (such as cross-	Impacts to visual resources would be the same as under Alternative A, but there would be more flexibility in developing projects that affect visual quality, due to a larger number of acres are in VRM Classes III and Class IV. As a result, the requirements of project proponents to protect visual resources could be less stringent than under Alternative A, depending upon the location of a project.	Under this alternative, impacts to visual resources would be the same as under Alternative A, but the intensity and extent of those impacts would be somewhat lessened, due to increased acreage in VRM Class I and Class II, when compared with Alternative A. A large number of acres remain in VRM Class III, providing flexibility in designing projects to meet visual resource protection requirements.	Under this alternative, impacts to visual resources would be the same as under Alternative A, but would be greater in intensity and extent, since most of the public land acreage would be under VRM Class III and Class IV. The requirements for mitigations of impacts to visual resources are less stringent in those classes. Given the amount of acreage in these 2 VRM classes, visual impacts could be greatest under this alternative, when compared with the other alternatives.

Table 2-2 Summary of Environmental Consequences from Alternative A, Alternative B, Alternative C, and Alternative D			
Summary Comparison of Impacts			
Alternative A Current Management (No Action Alternative)	Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)	Alternative C	Alternative D
country travel), could result in unmitigated impacts to the visual character of an area or to a landscape. Under this alternative, The majority of BLM-managed public lands are in VRM Classes II and Class III.			
WILDLAND FIRE MANAGEMENT			
Wildland fire management activities would continue to be guided by national policies and regulations. Fire Management Units (FMUs) identified in the Fire Management Plan (FMP) call for aggressive fire suppression, with constraints related to resources and values (such as steep slopes, unique vegetation, soils, and cultural sites), and with limited treatment acres allowed. Usually, these are high value areas where an uncontrolled fire would do extensive damage to the resources. Under Alternative A, nearly the entire Planning Area would be in FMUs that would be fairly restrictive in terms of using fire as a management tool. These areas will require	Impacts under this alternative would be similar to those under Alternative A; however, constraints on suppression activities imposed by other resource management programs could result in limitations on suppression activities. Greater emphasis would be placed on evaluating components of wildland fire management, and using various treatments designed to reduce the likelihood of wildfire, including greater use of fire managed for multiple objectives. Damage to resources from wildfire would be reduced, when compared with Alternative A.	Impacts under this alternative would be similar to Alternative B.	Impacts under this alternative would be similar to Alternative B.

Table 2-2 Summary of Environmental Consequences from Alternative A, Alternative B, Alternative C, and Alternative D			
Summary Comparison of Impacts			
Alternative A Current Management (No Action Alternative)	Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)	Alternative C	Alternative D
intensive suppression, accompanied by a limited allowance for treatment size. The long-term absence of fire, due to aggressive suppression, would increase fuel loads, resulting in less frequent but larger-scale fires. Impacts to vegetation, soils, visual and cultural resources, water quality, and other resources, would be more intense from large-scale fires, than from small-scale fires or those managed for resource benefit.			
LANDS WITH WILDERNESS CHARACTERISTICS OUTSIDE EXISTING WSAs			
Under this alternative, lands with wilderness characteristics outside of existing WSAs would not be managed for those characteristics. Values of naturalness, and opportunities for solitude and primitive and unconfined recreation that may exist in some areas could be affected by surface-disturbing activities. Impacts from other resource uses could include loss of vegetation, reduced visual quality, and impacts to other	Under this alternative, the impacts would be the same as under Alternative A, with the exception that there would be fewer impacts from cross-country travel in areas that may have wilderness characteristics, since almost all travel would be limited to designated routes.	Under Alternative C, the Drowsy Water, Troublesome Additions, and Strawberry areas would have lands managed as lands with wilderness characteristics. There would be a direct beneficial impact to these areas, since they would be managed for naturalness and to provide opportunities for solitude and primitive and unconfined recreation. Comprehensive Travel Management designations, oil and gas stipulations, and COAs	Under this alternative, the impacts would be the same as under Alternative A, with the exception that there would be greater impacts to lands with wilderness characteristics due to SRMA designations in the Drowsy Water and Strawberry areas (which would allow for motorized recreational opportunities). Comprehensive Travel Management designations under this alternative would allow new

Table 2-2 Summary of Environmental Consequences from Alternative A, Alternative B, Alternative C, and Alternative D			
Summary Comparison of Impacts			
Alternative A Current Management (No Action Alternative)	Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)	Alternative C	Alternative D
resources (such as wildlife or soils). Cross-country travel and the creation of new, unsustainable routes would continue. Areas could also have mineral development. Some COAs and oil and gas stipulations could provide limited protection of lands with wilderness characteristics.		would protect lands with wilderness characteristics by limiting the effects of other resource uses on those values.	routes to be developed in these 2 areas, affecting naturalness and opportunities for solitude and primitive and unconfined recreation. Other resource uses under this alternative could affect lands with wilderness characteristics.
CAVE RESOURCES and ABANDONED MINES			
Under Alternative A, there are no specific protections for cave and karst resources. Human contact with caves through exploration, recreation, or vandalism can alter the resources directly as a result of physical damage to cave features and formations, or can result in disturbance-related impacts to bats or other cave biota. Indirect impacts to cave resources can result from the disruption of cave hydrology, especially for active ("wet" or still growing) caves. Management activities on the overlying surface that affect the hydrology of caves, or that compromise	Under Alternative B, Alternative C, and Alternative D, restrictions would be applied to activities that could damage cave resources or disturb bats and other cave biota. The most stringent restrictions would apply to oil and gas exploration and development. The possible introduction of White Nose Syndrome (WNS) into caves or abandoned mines housing bat populations would be addressed by applying protective measures derived from BLM policies. Abandoned mines would continue to pose a hazard to public health and safety.		

Table 2-2 Summary of Environmental Consequences from Alternative A, Alternative B, Alternative C, and Alternative D			
Summary Comparison of Impacts			
Alternative A Current Management (No Action Alternative)	Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)	Alternative C	Alternative D
<p>their isolation and integrity, can have essentially permanent adverse impacts. Abandoned mines may house bats and other biota, which would be affected in a manner similar to that of caves. Additionally, abandoned mines may pose a hazard to human health and safety .</p>			
FORESTRY			
<p>Adverse impacts to forestry would be less under Alternative A than under Alternative C, but more than under Alternative B and Alternative D. The least number of forest and woodland acres are impacted by land use designations (such as ERMA, and SRMA). However, VRM restrictions are greatest under Alternative A, when compared to Alternative B, Alternative C, or Alternative D.</p>	<p>Under this alternative, adverse impacts to forestry would be less than under any other alternative. Impacts from VRM restrictions would be similar to those under Alternative D, and less than those under Alternative C and Alternative A. There would be substantially more forest and woodland acres potentially affected by SRMA and ERMA designations under Alternative B than under Alternative A, but substantially less than under Alternative D. The application of COAs designed to minimize impacts to recreation setting characteristics within ERMA</p>	<p>Alternative C would have more potential for adverse impacts to forestry than would Alternative A, Alternative B, or Alternative D. Land use designations would result in a 4,100-acre decrease in the number of forested lands identified for intensive management when compared to Alternative B and Alternative D; and a 6,500-acre decrease when compared to Alternative A. VRM objectives would be more restrictive than under Alternative B or Alternative D, and would be only slightly less restrictive than under Alternative A.</p>	<p>Adverse impacts to forestry would be greater under Alternative D than under Alternative B, but less than under Alternative A or Alternative C. Impacts from VRM restrictions would be similar to those under Alternative B, and less than those under Alternative C and Alternative A. More forest and woodland acres would be potentially affected by SRMA and ERMA designations under Alternative D than under any other alternative. The application of COAs designed to minimize impacts to recreation setting characteristics within SRMA</p>

Table 2-2 Summary of Environmental Consequences from Alternative A, Alternative B, Alternative C, and Alternative D			
Summary Comparison of Impacts			
Alternative A Current Management (No Action Alternative)	Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)	Alternative C	Alternative D
	could constrain forestry actions.		could constrain forestry actions.
LIVESTOCK GRAZING			
Currently, invasive weed infestations affecting livestock grazing operations are being identified and treated through partnerships with local Counties and landowners. Recreation use would result in more conflicts with livestock grazing under Alternative A than under Alternative B or Alternative C, given the large expanse of undesignated routes, the increased residential development, and the increasing numbers of recreational users.	Motorized recreation use would be subject to a higher degree of control under Alternative B, resulting in fewer conflicts with livestock grazing operations. Alternative B includes a number of protective stipulations for plants and wildlife that would enhance forage conditions for wildlife and livestock, and reduce impacts resulting from actions and processes occurring on adjacent or nearby private and State lands. Healthier rangeland vegetation would be more resistant to invasive weeds and to drought conditions.	Motorized recreation use would have the most restrictions under Alternative C, thus the incremental impact of increased residential development and the associated increase of use on public lands, and damage to vegetation, would be less. Alternative C includes more protective stipulations for plants and wildlife that would enhance forage conditions for livestock, but would also increase wildlife numbers and species, and potentially increase conflicts between livestock and wildlife.	Alternative D would impose fewer use restrictions than would Alternative B or Alternative C. Conflicts with recreationists would likely be greater than under Alternative B or Alternative C, but somewhat less than under Alternative A. Alternative D, with more emphasis on energy and mineral development and more recreation user-friendly emphasis (resulting in more surface disturbance), when considered together with the current invasive weed problem throughout the Planning Area, would reduce rangeland health and provide less available forage for livestock grazing operators.
RECREATION AND VISITOR SERVICES			
Alternative A would have the least number of protections for specific recreational opportunities or recreation setting characteristics, which	Under Alternative B, management of SRMAs for specific recreational opportunities and recreation setting characteristics would	Alternative C would have more protections for recreation outcomes and settings throughout the Planning Area than would the other alternatives. Restrictive	Alternative D would have more protections for recreation outcomes and settings than would Alternative A, but fewer than would Alternative B and

Table 2-2 Summary of Environmental Consequences from Alternative A, Alternative B, Alternative C, and Alternative D			
Summary Comparison of Impacts			
Alternative A Current Management (No Action Alternative)	Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)	Alternative C	Alternative D
could result in adverse impacts to recreation. Recreation setting character within the SRMAs would be indirectly protected by other resource decisions (such as NSOs for oil and gas and withdrawal from the general mining laws). Alternative A has the fewest restrictions on target shooting, and would not place restrictions on overnight camping.	result in more beneficial impacts to targeted recreation opportunities in those areas than under Alternative A and Alternative D, but fewer than under Alternative C. Alternative B has fewer protections than Alternative C, but more than Alternative A and Alternative D. Restrictive management actions from other resource programs would help protect recreational values throughout the Planning Area. Restrictions on cross-country travel and designations of travel routes would reduce opportunities for unregulated, unconstrained outdoor recreation. Limitations on target shooting and overnight camping would be imposed under this Alternative, eliminating unrestricted participation in those activities.	management actions from other resource programs would help to protect recreation values. Restrictions on cross-country travel and designations of travel routes would reduce opportunities for unregulated, unconstrained outdoor recreation to a greater extent than under Alternative B. Limitations on target shooting and overnight camping would be imposed under this Alternative in the same areas as under Alternative B, eliminating unrestricted participation in those activities.	Alternative C. There are fewer surface disturbance and occupancy restrictions under Alternative D than there are under Alternative C, but more than under Alternative A. Alternative D has constraints that would protect the recreational outcomes and settings in Headwaters, Strawberry, and Wolford SRMAs. Restrictions on cross-country travel and designations of travel routes would reduce opportunities for unregulated, unconstrained outdoor recreation, but less than under Alternative B and Alternative C. Limitations on target shooting and overnight camping would be imposed under this Alternative in the same areas as under Alternative B and Alternative C, eliminating unrestricted participation in those activities.
COMPREHENSIVE TRAILS AND TRAVEL MANAGEMENT			
Alternative A would result in fewer direct impacts to travel management than would Alternative B, Alternative C, and	Alternative B would result in fewer vehicle-caused impacts than would Alternative A, since all travel would be limited to	Alternative C would result in the greatest impacts to vehicle uses, because travel would be limited to designated routes, with increased	Alternative D would result in the same impacts associated with vehicle use as Alternative B. More acres would be designated

Table 2-2 Summary of Environmental Consequences from Alternative A, Alternative B, Alternative C, and Alternative D			
Summary Comparison of Impacts			
Alternative A Current Management (No Action Alternative)	Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)	Alternative C	Alternative D
<p>Alternative D. This alternative identifies more acres as Open, allowing for extensive cross-country travel, which would be less restrictive for public access. Largely unregulated cross-country travel would create other concerns for resource management concerns and impacts throughout the Planning Area. This Alternative would have the least amount of restrictions limiting travel to designated routes. Protective measures proposed by other resource uses through COAs would have direct impacts across all alternatives to the creation of new access routes or to the development of new transportation system.</p>	<p>designated routes and to a few Open areas, which are limited in size that can be realistically managed. Acreage in closed areas is similar to that under Alternative A. There would be more miles of roads and trails designated as Open to the public under Alternative B than under Alternative C, but the same as under Alternative D. Travel restrictions would affect public access, especially unregulated recreation use, but would improve management of the Transportation System, and reduce impacts to resources.</p>	<p>acreage closed to vehicle use and fewer Open areas than under the other alternatives. Under this alternative, the North Sand Hills SRMA would be managed for non-motorized and non-mechanized recreational opportunities. Travel would be restricted on lands with wilderness characteristics in the Drowsy Water, Troublesome Additions, and Strawberry areas. Travel restrictions would affect public access, especially unregulated recreation use, but would improve management of the Transportation System, and reduce impacts to resources.</p>	<p>Open for vehicle use under this Alternative than under Alternative C, but fewer than under Alternative A. As under Alternative B, this alternative has the greatest number of miles of roads and trails designated as Open to the public. The Wolford Mountain SRMA, Headwaters SRMA, and a portion of the Strawberry SRMA, would enhance access and recreational motorized opportunities. Travel restrictions would affect public access, especially unregulated recreation use, but would improve management of the Transportation System, and reduce impacts to resources.</p>
LANDS AND REALTY			
<p>Under this alternative, construction of major linear realty projects would be constrained by topography, other land uses, and vegetation and cultural resources. Additionally, NSOs and TLs</p>	<p>Under this alternative, there would be more impacts to land use authorizations than under Alternative A, with the creation of Avoidance and Exclusion Areas. COAs could impact realty actions under Alternative</p>	<p>Under this alternative, the impacts to land use authorizations would be the same as under Alternative B, except for additional areas being included in Avoidance Area and Exclusion Area categories. COAs would</p>	<p>Under this alternative, impacts would be slightly less than under Alternative B and Alternative C. There would be fewer areas in Avoidance Area and Exclusion Area categories. VRM would least affect ROWs under this</p>

Table 2-2 Summary of Environmental Consequences from Alternative A, Alternative B, Alternative C, and Alternative D			
Summary Comparison of Impacts			
Alternative A Current Management (No Action Alternative)	Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)	Alternative C	Alternative D
could impact realty-related construction project design and timeframes. Current stipulations would be applied to land use authorizations in order to protect affected resources. The majority of public lands within the Planning Area could be disposed by a variety of means other than sale. Approximately 14,400 acres would be considered for disposal by sale and by other means.	B more than under Alternative A. Disposal of all public lands would be available by exchange or sale under this Alternative, but the creation of Retention Areas would exclude certain lands from land tenure actions. More public land would be petitioned for withdrawal from mineral entry than has previously been withdrawn under Alternative A., making those lands unavailable for entry under mining and operation of other land laws.	continue to be applied to land use authorizations. VRM would affect land use authorizations more under this Alternative, as more public land would be classified as VRM Class II. Land tenure actions would be the same as under Alternative B, except for additional acreage in the Retention Area category. Additional public land would be petitioned for withdrawal from mineral entry and operation of other land laws.	alternative. There would be fewer areas in the Retention Area category; therefore, more land would be available for disposal. There would be the same amount of public land petitioned for withdrawal from mineral entry as under Alternative B.
ENERGY AND MINERALS			
RENEWABLE ENERGY			
No policy.	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. Within open areas, approximately 7,190 acres would be unsuitable for surface mining. Stipulations would be applied to oil and gas leases	Under this alternative, 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	Under this alternative, acreages open to consideration for coal leasing would be similar, but less than, under Alternative B. Lands with special management area designations (ACECs, SRMAs, WSRs) would increase in acreage from those under	Under this alternative, approximately 45,000 acres of Federal mineral estate would be open to consideration for coal leasing. Within open areas, 7,190 acres would be unsuitable for surface mining. NSO and CSU stipulations would be

Table 2-2 Summary of Environmental Consequences from Alternative A, Alternative B, Alternative C, and Alternative D			
Summary Comparison of Impacts			
Alternative A Current Management (No Action Alternative)	Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)	Alternative C	Alternative D
<p>within areas of federally leased coal in order to prevent conflicts of development. Currently, there is no coal mining, and the potential for mining is low. However, surface mining of coal could affect most of the renewable and non-renewable resources in proximity to mining, and would have to be mitigated.</p>	<p>mining. Determinations on suitability of lands for coal leasing outside of the KRCRA would be considered on a case-by-case basis. Lands with special management area designations (ACECs or SRMAs) and VRM Class I Areas would be considered unsuitable for coal leasing. Stipulations would be applied to oil and gas leases, as they would be under Alternative A. Greater sage-grouse protections (COAs) could have a moderate impact on the development of coal resources.</p>	<p>Alternative B, by adding other designations or by increasing the size of areas with special designations. NSO stipulations on oil and gas would be applied to leases, as they would be under Alternative B. Lands managed for wilderness characteristics outside of WSAs would be considered unsuitable for coal leasing. VRM Class I areas would be greatest under Alternative C (24,600 acres), almost triple the acreage, when compared to Alternative B. VRM Class II Areas would also increase; coal operation and development activities would not likely be permitted in VRM Class II locations. Greater sage-grouse protections (NL and COAs) would have a major impact on coal resources under this Alternative. Overall, designations of lands and resource protections under Alternative C would have the greatest impact on coal resources of all the alternatives.</p>	<p>applied to oil and gas leases within areas of federally leased coal in order to prevent conflicts of development.</p>
FLUID MINERALS			

Table 2-2 Summary of Environmental Consequences from Alternative A, Alternative B, Alternative C, and Alternative D			
Summary Comparison of Impacts			
Alternative A Current Management (No Action Alternative)	Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)	Alternative C	Alternative D
Under this alternative, approximately 642,900 acres of Federal mineral estate would be open to oil and gas leasing and development, approximately 3 percent more than under Alternative B or Alternative D, and 39 percent more than under Alternative C. Fewer areas would be subject to major stipulations (NSOs) or moderate stipulations (CSUs) than under the other alternatives. Moderate to minor constraints in the form of TLs would impact slightly more acres (approximately 562,900) under this alternative.	Under this alternative, approximately 625,200 acres would be open to oil and gas leasing and development, about the same as under Alternative D; 3 percent less than under Alternative A; and almost 40 percent more than under Alternative C. The number of acres subject to major stipulations (NSOs) would increase by approximately 10 times when compared to Alternative A, but would be about the same when compared with Alternative C and Alternative D. Acres subject to moderate CSU constraints would double when compared to Alternative A, but would be about the same when compared with Alternative C and Alternative D. TLs would be similar across all alternatives.	Under this alternative, impacts to fluid mineral resources would be greatest, by vastly reducing the number of acres available for exploration and development. Approximately 382,400 acres would be open to oil and gas leasing and development, about 37 percent to 40 percent less than under Alternative A, Alternative C, and Alternative D. Of the areas open, NSO stipulations would apply to almost 60 percent of the total open area, further restricting the ability of a lessee to explore and develop an oil and gas lease. CSU and TL stipulations would apply to approximately the same number of acres as under Alternative B and Alternative D.	Under this alternative, impacts would be similar to Alternative B, but approximately 10 percent fewer acres of Federal mineral estate would be constrained by NSO stipulations. Approximately the same number of acres of Federal mineral estate would be open to leasing, closed to leasing, and constrained by CSU and TL stipulations as under Alternative B.
LOCATABLE MINERALS			
Under Alternative A, approximately 13,900 acres are withdrawn from mineral location: the Upper Colorado River	Under this alternative, the impacts would be similar to Alternative A, with 18,200 additional acres recommended	Under this alternative, impacts would be similar to Alternative B. Approximately 13,900 acres would remain withdrawn, and an	Under this alternative, impacts would be similar to Alternative B. Approximately 13,900 acres would remain withdrawn, and an

Table 2-2 Summary of Environmental Consequences from Alternative A, Alternative B, Alternative C, and Alternative D			
Summary Comparison of Impacts			
Alternative A Current Management (No Action Alternative)	Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)	Alternative C	Alternative D
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.	for withdrawal from mineral entry. Other resource values, such as water quality, wildlife habitat, VRM, WSAs, and WSRs, would be protected by performance standards, including COAs, to a greater extent than under Alternative A.	additional 32,400 acres would be recommended for withdrawal from mineral entry. Performance standards, including COAs, would apply to more acreage under this alternative than under the other alternatives, restricting locatable-mineral-related surface occupancy and surface-disturbing activities to a greater extent than under the other alternatives. As a result, impacts resulting from mining could be less than under the other alternatives.	additional 18,200 acres would be recommended for withdrawal from mineral entry. Performance standards, including COAs, would be applied to fewer acres than under Alternative B and Alternative C. More acres would have restrictions under this alternative than under Alternative A.
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. Surface occupancy and surface-disturbing activities may be re-located or restricted to protect	Salable minerals and non-energy solid leasable minerals would be regulated the same as, and subject to similar restrictions, as under Alternative A. Under Alternative B, 41,200 acres of BLM administered surface estate	Salable minerals and non-energy solid leasable minerals would be regulated the same as, and subject to similar restrictions, as under Alternative B. Under Alternative C, 66,800 acres of BLM-managed surface estate would be closed to disposal and	Same as under Alternative B.

Table 2-2 Summary of Environmental Consequences from Alternative A, Alternative B, Alternative C, and Alternative D			
Summary Comparison of Impacts			
Alternative A Current Management (No Action Alternative)	Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)	Alternative C	Alternative D
<p>other resource values (such as wildlife, soils, VRM). Salable minerals would be disposed of primarily from common-use areas and would be regulated under 43 CFR 3600. In WSAs, restrictions on mineral development would become effective only if Congress designates the area as Wilderness. Pending this determination, WSAs remain open, provided that activities meet non-impairment criteria and that those activities began before the passage of the FLPMA.</p>	<p>would be closed to disposal and leasing. Overall impacts would be similar to Alternative A, and would be minor.</p>	<p>leasing. Overall impacts would be similar to Alternative B, and would be minor.</p>	
AREAS OF CRITICAL ENVIRONMENTAL CONCERN			
<p>The actions proposed under Alternative A would result in relatively minor impacts to existing ACECs. A NSO stipulation would be applied to energy and mineral development in order to protect the values within each ACEC. For ACECs not designated, Alternative A would have the greatest potential for direct and indirect impacts resulting from</p>	<p>Under this alternative, impacts to ACECs would be less than under Alternative A, because more areas would be designated. This would result in more areas protected and increased beneficial impacts. For ACECs not designated under this alternative, motorized recreation use on BLM-managed public lands would be subject to a much</p>	<p>The actions proposed in Alternative C would result in relatively minor impacts to existing and proposed ACECs. NSOs would be applied to energy and mineral development in order to protect the values within each ACEC. Since all areas are proposed for designation, this alternative would result in the most areas protected and the greatest beneficial impacts.</p>	<p>Under this alternative, impacts to ACECs would be the same as under Alternative A. For ACECs not designated, motorized recreation use on BLM-managed public lands would be subject to a much higher degree of route designation under Alternative D, when compared to Alternative A, resulting in fewer conflicts to areas with values not proposed for designation.</p>

Table 2-2 Summary of Environmental Consequences from Alternative A, Alternative B, Alternative C, and Alternative D			
Summary Comparison of Impacts			
Alternative A Current Management (No Action Alternative)	Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)	Alternative C	Alternative D
surface-disturbing activities that could result in adverse impacts to relevant and important values. Recreation and Fluid Minerals Management would allow for substantial impacts under Alternative A, given that OHV use would continue to be allowed unabated across large portions of the Planning Area, and that natural gas development, and the associated road construction, would continue to occur on large expanses of private and BLM-managed public lands.	higher degree of route designation under Alternative B, resulting in fewer conflicts to areas with values not proposed for designation. Alternative B also includes a number of protective stipulations and COAs for plants, fish, and wildlife that would enhance conditions for these areas, and reduce direct and indirect impacts resulting from surface-disturbing activities.	Alternative C would provide the most protections to ACECs, which would result in reduced direct and indirect impacts resulting from surface-disturbing activities. No impacts would result from not designating ACECs under this alternative.	Alternative D includes more protective stipulations and COAs for plants, fish, and wildlife, which would enhance conditions for these areas, and reduce direct and indirect impacts resulting from surface-disturbing activities.
WILDERNESS AND WILDERNESS STUDY AREAS			
Under Alternative A, the Troublesome WSA, the North Platte Contiguous WSA, and the North Sand Hills ISA would be managed under the Interim Policy for Lands Under Wilderness Review (IMP). Resource uses would be limited to those meeting the non-impairment standards of the IMP. Impacts could occur to lands in the WSAs and in the ISA from adjacent lands that are	Under this Alternative, the impacts would be the same as under Alternative A, with the exception that Comprehensive Travel Management decisions would provide additional protections to the WSAs and to the ISA by limiting motorized and mechanized travel to designated routes, thereby reducing the likelihood of encroachment into the protected areas.	Under this alternative, the impacts would be the same as under Alternative A, with the exception that the North Sand Hills ISA would be managed for non-motorized and non-mechanized recreational opportunities, providing greater protection for the resources found there. The Troublesome Additions would be managed for their existing naturalness and opportunities for solitude and	Under this alternative, the impacts would be the same as under Alternative A, with the exception that there would be more miles designated as Open for motorized and mechanized travel near the North Sand Hills ISA than under Alternative B and Alternative C, resulting in a greater potential for encroachment.

Table 2-2 Summary of Environmental Consequences from Alternative A, Alternative B, Alternative C, and Alternative D				
Summary Comparison of Impacts				
Alternative A Current Management (No Action Alternative)	Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)		Alternative C	Alternative D
Open to OHV use, since there is greater possibility that there could be motorized or mechanized use in the protected areas. The exception would be the open sand areas of the North Sand Hills ISA, where motorized and mechanized use is permitted.			primitive recreation, serving as a buffer for the Troublesome WSA. Under this alternative, fewer miles of routes would be designated as Open to motorized and mechanized travel in the area, reducing the opportunities for encroachment in the WSA.	
WILD AND SCENIC RIVERS				
Under this alternative, all 15 river segments are eligible for inclusion in the NWSRS, and managed for free-flowing nature, ORVs, and tentative classifications. No actions would be approved that would alter the free-flowing nature, diminish the ORVs, or modify the setting or level or development of a segment that would change its tentative classification. There are no restrictions on oil and gas leasing.	Alternative B1 -- Under this alternative, there would be more protections for the Colorado River segments (segments 4 and 5) than under Alternative A, because these segments will be suitable.	Alternative B2 -- Under this alternative, impacts would be similar to those identified under Alternative B1. However, the WSR suitability determination would be deferred, and the Stakeholder Management Plan would be adopted and implemented in order to protect	Under this alternative, the Colorado River would have the most protection than under any of the other alternatives. All 15 river segments would be managed as suitable and closed to leasing of oil and gas; they would have NSO stipulations (on Wild segments); CSU stipulations (on Scenic and Recreational segments); and land use exclusions (including solar and wind development on wild segments).	Alternative D has the least amount of protection for the 15 segments. All segments would be determined not suitable, and would be released from Interim Management protections.

Table 2-2 Summary of Environmental Consequences from Alternative A, Alternative B, Alternative C, and Alternative D				
Summary Comparison of Impacts				
Alternative A Current Management (No Action Alternative)	Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)		Alternative C	Alternative D
	There would be no leasing for oil and gas; there would be CSU stipulations (on Scenic and Recreational segments), and land use avoidance on these 2 segments.	the free-flowing nature, ORVs, and tentative classification of Colorado River segments (segments 4 and 5, both Recreational).		
WATCHABLE WILDLIFE AREAS				
Watchable Wildlife Areas (WWAs) are not designated under this alternative; therefore, surface-disturbing activities could result in adverse impacts to relevant and important values for potential WWAs. Impacts could include loss of vegetation, resulting in impacts to wildlife habitat and visual resources. Recreation and Fluid Minerals Management would allow for substantial impacts, given that	The actions and processes proposed under Alternative B would result in relatively minor impacts to proposed WWAs. NSOs would be applied to energy and mineral development in order to protect the values within each WWA. Since 2 areas are proposed for designation, when compared to Alternative A, this alternative would result in more areas protected and greater		Under this alternative, the impacts would be the same as under Alternative B.	The actions and processes proposed under Alternative D are similar to that of Alternative A and Alternative B, except that only the Hebron Waterfowl Area would be designated. For WWAs not designated (Junction Butte Wetland), motorized recreation use on BLM-managed public lands would be subject to a higher degree of route designation, when compared to Alternative A,

Table 2-2 Summary of Environmental Consequences from Alternative A, Alternative B, Alternative C, and Alternative D			
Summary Comparison of Impacts			
Alternative A Current Management (No Action Alternative)	Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)	Alternative C	Alternative D
OHV use would continue to be allowed largely unabated across large portions of the Planning Area, and that natural gas development, and the associated road construction, would continue to occur on large expanses of private and BLM-managed public lands.	beneficial impacts. All WWAs are proposed for designation under Alternative B and Alternative C; therefore, no impacts would result from not designating WWAs under these alternatives. Alternative B and Alternative C would provide the most protections to WWAs, which would result in reduced direct and indirect impacts resulting from surface-disturbing activities.		resulting in fewer conflicts to areas with values not proposed for designation. Alternative D includes more protective stipulations and COAs for plants, fish, and wildlife, when compared to Alternative A, which would enhance conditions for these areas and result in reduced direct and indirect impacts resulting from surface-disturbing activities.
STATE OR NATIONAL TRAILS AND BYWAYS			
There are no specific protections under Alternative A for State or national trails and byways. Impacts from resource uses and actions, especially from energy and mineral development, lands and realty actions, and forestry, could affect existing or potential future alignments or designations of national trails or scenic byways. Surface disturbances in alignments and in the broader visual corridors could degrade the visual, natural and cultural values of trails and byways.	Under Alternative B, specific actions would be implemented if BLM-managed public lands are included in, or are considered for inclusion in, alignments and corridors of State or national trails and byways. Applying oil and gas leasing stipulations, COAs and BMPs to surface-disturbing activities in existing or potential alignments of trails and byways, and their associated corridors, would limit non-conforming activities. Where there are not existing or	Same as under Alternative B.	Same as under Alternative B.

Table 2-2 Summary of Environmental Consequences from Alternative A, Alternative B, Alternative C, and Alternative D			
Summary Comparison of Impacts			
Alternative A Current Management (No Action Alternative)	Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)	Alternative C	Alternative D
	currently proposed alignments for trails or byways, impacts resulting from other resource uses could preclude opportunities for identifying and designating new trail and byway alignments and corridors.		
TRANSPORTATION FACILITIES			
Under this alternative, roads on the Transportation Maintenance Plan would be maintained at current levels until more maintenance is required, due to increased use. Authorizations associated with resource management (especially ROWs, oil and gas development, and timber harvesting) would result in the greatest impact to roads, as use would be heavier than under normal conditions, and would be concentrated on specific sections of roads. Increased maintenance of roads used for these activities would be required as part of a use authorization. Maintenance of roads, coupled with use restrictions (such as limits on	Under this Alternative, impacts would be the same, or similar to, those under Alternative A, including those considered to be beneficial. Use restrictions applied to other activities (such as TLs on oil and gas development or specified seasons for timber harvesting) could limit the use of roads for permitted activities.	Under this Alternative, impacts would be the same, or similar to, those under Alternative A, except that restrictions on use (especially ROWs, oil and gas development, and timber harvesting) would be more stringent than under Alternative A and Alternative B, which would affect road use for permitted activities.	Under this alternative, the impacts would be the same as under Alternative B.

Table 2-2 Summary of Environmental Consequences from Alternative A, Alternative B, Alternative C, and Alternative D			
Summary Comparison of Impacts			
Alternative A Current Management (No Action Alternative)	Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)	Alternative C	Alternative D
use of roads when wet) lessens impacts to other resources, by reducing the impacts of soil erosion and dust, protecting water quality from run-off, and treating weed infestations.			
SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC CONDITIONS			
None of the alternatives would be expected to reduce economic diversity (the number of economic sectors) or increase economic dependency, which occurs when the local economy is dominated by a limited number of industries. Shifts in emphasis could occur; however, these would not result as a consequence of planning actions in this DRMP/DEIS. The alternatives have the potential to affect local businesses and individuals; however, the relative contribution of BLM-related activities to the local economy under Alternative A, and the relative differences between the alternatives, would not be large enough to have any measurable impact on economic diversity or dependency. (For example, the dependency of the local economy on the livestock industry, forest products, mining, and recreation activities would not be affected by BLM resource management proposed under this DRMP/DEIS.) Under all the alternatives, all BLM-related contributions (such as jobs and labor income), would continue to support less than 1 percent of totals within the impact area economy, but could be more important for smaller communities within the Planning Area.			
PUBLIC HEALTH AND SAFETY			
Due to the remoteness of the BLM-managed public lands administered by the KFO, dumping on public grounds is a major problem. The influx of recreationists has added to this	Under this alternative, wildland fire may be used for multiple resource objectives, as it would be under Alternative B, Alternative C, and Alternative D; however, public health and	Under this alternative, the impacts would be the same as under Alternative B, except fewer acres would be available for oil and gas production; thereby reducing the chance of	Under this alternative, the impacts would be the same as under Alternative B, except more acres would be available for oil and gas production; thereby increasing the chance of

Table 2-2 Summary of Environmental Consequences from Alternative A, Alternative B, Alternative C, and Alternative D			
Summary Comparison of Impacts			
Alternative A Current Management (No Action Alternative)	Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)	Alternative C	Alternative D
<p>problem. Target shooting is allowed on all public lands except for developed recreation sites. The debris from this activity adds to the waste on public lands. Oil and gas development always runs the risk of a hazardous material spill. Wildland fire is a safety issue for the public and for firefighters, and can involve property losses. The KFO policy is essentially full suppression of wildfires. The existing hazard of beetle killed forests is increasing in intensity, as more trees die and weaken. Some logging and hazard-tree removal is occurring.</p>	<p>safety still would be at risk from wildfires. Employees and public-land users are at risk from falling trees killed by the MPB epidemic. Impacts from target shooting would be reduced, since more areas would have firearm use restrictions.</p>	<p>hazardous spills.</p>	<p>hazardous spills.</p>
ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE			

Table 2-2 Summary of Environmental Consequences from Alternative A, Alternative B, Alternative C, and Alternative D			
Summary Comparison of Impacts			
Alternative A Current Management (No Action Alternative)	Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)	Alternative C	Alternative D
Under this alternative, there are no proposed management actions that would <i>directly</i> impact minority and low-income populations. However, the management actions in this alternative could <i>indirectly</i> impact minority or low-income populations' quality of life by potentially affecting local housing markets or increasing health and safety risks to children or other environmental justice populations. There is no evidence, however, to suggest that minority or low-income populations would be disproportionately affected by these indirect impacts. If these impacts occur, they would more likely affect all segments of the area's population. Indirect impacts that would result from the management actions under this alternative could also benefit minority and low-income populations, such as secondary employment that could be generated by increased recreation, recreation	Impacts to environmental justice populations would be similar to those under Alternative A.		

Table 2-2 Summary of Environmental Consequences from Alternative A, Alternative B, Alternative C, and Alternative D			
Summary Comparison of Impacts			
Alternative A Current Management (No Action Alternative)	Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)	Alternative C	Alternative D
<p>expenditures in the regional economy, and increased oil and gas and energy development. In general, this type of employment occurs in services and retailing industries, areas that, typically, would employ lower income households.</p>			