

COLORADO RIVER VALLEY FIELD OFFICE

ROAN PLATEAU PLANNING AREA

Including Naval Oil Shale Reserves Numbers 1 & 3

**Draft Resource Management Plan Amendment and
Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement**

BLM/CO/PL-16/001



**United States Department of the Interior
Bureau of Land Management
Colorado State Office**



NOVEMBER 2015

DRAFT
Roan Plateau Planning Area
Resource Management Plan Amendment
and Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement

1. **Responsible Agency:** United States Department of the Interior,
Bureau of Land Management (BLM)
2. **Type of Action:** Administrative (X) Legislative ()
3. **Document Status:** Draft (X) Final ()
4. **Abstract:** This Draft Roan Plateau Planning Area Resource Management Plan Amendment (RMPA) and Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS) considers land use planning decisions for management of approximately 73,800 acres of Federal land in western Garfield County and a small portion of southern Rio Blanco County, Colorado. This includes 56,540 acres of the former Naval Oil Shale Reserves (NOSRs) Numbers 1 and 3. This new planning effort and supporting environmental analysis addresses information and alternatives analyzed in the BLM's earlier environmental analysis in the 2006 Proposed RMPA/FEIS, supplemented with additional analyses in response to issues identified by the U.S. District Court for the District of Colorado, as well as new issues raised in internal and external scoping for this supplement. The Draft RMPA/SEIS analyzes goals, objectives, allowable uses, and management actions for the Planning Area.

The Plan analyzes four alternatives, including: Alternative I, the No Action Alternative, which represents a continuation of the present management situation; Alternative II, the FEIS Proposed Plan Alternative, comprises the 2006 Proposed Plan; Alternative III, the Community Alternative, is constructed from public comments on the 2005 Draft RMPA/EIS and the 2015 scoping; Alternative IV, the Settlement Alternative, is the BLM Preferred Alternative and incorporates the terms of a settlement agreement signed between the BLM and the plaintiffs and interveners in a Federal lawsuit over the original Roan Plateau FEIS (<http://www.doi.gov/news/upload/Roan-Settlement-Agreement-SIGNED.pdf>). The plan amendment which is ultimately adopted may combine components from the four alternatives presented in this Draft.

Major issues addressed include air resources and air quality, management for greater sage-grouse, Wild and Scenic River eligibility, oil and gas leasing and development, socioeconomics, management of lands with wilderness characteristics, ecological resources, water resources, and riparian habitat and wetlands.

5. **Date Comments Must Be Received:** The BLM will accept written comments on this Draft RMP Amendment/ EIS which are post marked or received within 90 days following the notice of its availability in the Federal Register by the Environmental Protection Agency. The close of the comment period will be announced on the Roan Plateau RMPA website at <http://on.doi.gov/1P1Ax1h>, or may be obtained by contacting the BLM at the address or telephone number below. Additional information on how to comment, where to review documents, how to obtain additional information, and the time and location of public meetings can be found on the website, or by contacting the BLM.
6. **For Further Information Contact:**

Greg Larson, Project Manager	Telephone: (970) 876-9000
Bureau of Land Management	FAX: (970) 876-9090
Colorado River Valley Field Office	Email: roanplateau@blm.gov
2300 River Frontage Road	
Website: http://on.doi.gov/1P1Ax1h	

**United States Department of the Interior
Bureau of Land Management
Colorado State Office
Colorado River Valley Field Office**

DRAFT

**Roan Plateau Planning Area
Resource Management Plan Amendment
and
Supplemental
Environmental Impact Statement**

Volume I

November 2015

This page intentionally left blank.



United States Department of the Interior



BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT
Colorado River Valley Field Office
2300 River Frontage Road
Silt, Colorado 81652
(970) 876-9000

In Reply Refer To:
(CON040) 1610

NOV 13 2015

October 23, 2015

Dear Reader:

Enclosed for your review and comment is the Draft Roan Plateau Planning Area Resource Management Plan Amendment/Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (Draft RMPA/SEIS). The Bureau of Land Management (BLM) prepared this document in coordination with cooperating agencies, and in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, as amended, the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976, as amended, implementing regulations, the BLM's Land Use Planning Handbook (H-1601-1), and other applicable law and policy.

This Draft considers management for all BLM administered lands and resources in the Roan Plateau Planning Area, including Naval Oil Shale Reserves 1 and 3. The BLM Colorado River Valley Field Office administers the Planning Area, which includes approximately 73,603 acres of Federal land (Federal surface, Federal mineral estate, or both) in Garfield and Rio Blanco Counties. The Roan Plateau RMPA will amend two existing Resource Management Plans (RMP), the Glenwood Springs RMP and the White River RMP, as they pertain to the Roan Plateau Planning Area. The Roan Plateau Draft RMPA/SEIS and supporting information are available on the project web site at: <http://on.doi.gov/1P1Ax1h>.

The document evaluates a range of management decisions for resources, resource uses and special designations and responds to a June 22, 2012, ruling by the United States District Court for the District of Colorado remanding the 2007 and 2008 Roan Plateau Records of Decision.

Your review and comments on the content of this document are critical to the successes of this planning effort. If you wish to submit comments on the Draft RMPA/SEIS, please make your comments as specific as possible. Comments will be most helpful if they suggest changes to methodologies, include sources of information and focus on components of the four alternatives. Comments that contain only opinions or preferences will not receive a formal response in the Proposed RMPA/Final SEIS; however, BLM may consider them in the decision-making process. Comments will be accepted for ninety (90) calendar days following the Environmental Protection Agency's publication of its Notice of Availability in the *Federal Register*. The BLM can best utilize your comments and resource information submissions if received within the review period.

Please submit comments electronically to: roanplateau@blm.gov. Comments may also be submitted by mail to: Roan Plateau Comments – Attention: Greg Larson, BLM Colorado River Valley Field Office, 2300 River Frontage Road, Silt, CO 81652. To facilitate analysis of comments and information submitted, we strongly encourage you to submit comments in an electronic format.

Before including your address, phone number, email address or other personal identifying information in your comment, be advised that your entire comment - including your personal identifying information - may be made publicly available at any time. While you can ask us in your comment to withhold your personal identifying information from public review, we cannot guarantee that we will be able to do so.

The BLM will announce public meetings to provide an overview of the document, respond to questions and take public comments from local media, website and/or public mailings at least 15 days in advance.

Copies of the Draft RMPA/SEIS have been sent to affected Federal, state and local government agencies. Copies of the document and associated documents such as maps and supporting background information can be reviewed at several locations: the project web site, the BLM Colorado River Valley Field Office (2300 River Frontage Road, Silt, CO 81652) or White River Field Office (73544 Highway 64, Meeker, CO 81641) during normal working hours (7:45 a.m. to 4:30 p.m., except weekends and holidays), and the Garfield County (Colorado) Public Libraries.

Thank you for your continued interest in the Roan Plateau RMPA/SEIS. We appreciate the information and suggestions you contribute to the planning process. For additional information or clarification regarding this document or the planning process, please contact Greg Larson, Project Manager at the address shown above.

Sincerely,



Ruth Welch
State Director
BLM Colorado

Enclosure



United States Department of the Interior



BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT
Colorado River Valley Field Office
2300 River Frontage Road
Silt, Colorado 81652

IN REPLY REFER TO:

LLCON040(1610)

ERRATA SHEET

Notes Regarding the Roan Plateau Draft Resource Management Plan Amendment and Supplement Environmental Impact Statement

After preparation of the Roan Plateau Draft Resource Management Plan Amendment and Supplement Environmental Impact Statement, but prior to public release, the National Ambient Air Quality Standard (NAAQS) for ozone was changed from 75 parts per billion (ppb) to 70 ppb. This final rule was signed on October 1, 2015.

Due to the EIS preparation schedule, the following changes are not reflected in the draft document:

- In table 3.2.1, the primary and secondary NAAQS standard for ozone is now 0.070 ppm (or 70 ppb). The Federal Register announcement of this rule change is to be determined.
- Table 3.2-3 reflects that several monitors in northwest Colorado have recorded 8-hour average ozone concentrations above the concentration value of the new ozone 8-hour NAAQS (0.070 ppm).
- Chapter 4's analysis is conducted relative to the *former* 75 ppb standard. The maximum contributions to modeled exceedances used for this analysis are estimated / predicted with respect to cumulative modeled ozone 8-hour concentrations above the former ozone 8-hour Standard (75 ppb). It is reasonable to assume that CARMMS predicted RPPA future oil and gas maximum contributions above the new ozone 8-hour Standard (70 ppb) would be very similar in magnitude and maybe slightly higher than maximum ozone contributions with respect to the former ozone Standard. Regardless, the maximum RPPA contributions above the new ozone 8-hour Standard (70 ppb) would not exceed the overall maximum contributions for the RPPA future oil and gas development (see first column of numerical values in Table 4.2.15). It should be noted that there is currently not an acceptable ozone contribution significance threshold that has been established for Federal Land Managers and NEPA assessments for planning-level or project-level projected future oil and gas development. The EPA's Interstate Transport Rule one percent (of the ozone NAAQS) ozone impact significance threshold is applicable to an upwind state's ozone contributions to an actual monitored non-attainment area exceedance of the ozone Standard in a downwind state, and is not directly applicable for projected future oil and gas development NEPA assessments and ozone impacts in attainment areas.
- There are eight monitoring sites in the CARMMS 4-km domain with year 2008 DVCs above the former ozone NAAQS (75 ppb) and CARMMS predictions show that there would be 17 monitoring sites with DVF for future year 2021 ozone concentration above the new ozone Standard (70 ppb) for the CARMMS 2021 High and Medium scenarios, and 16 monitoring sites with DVF above new ozone Standard for CARMMS Low scenario (note that there would be ~ 19 monitoring sites with year 2008 DVCs above the new ozone Standard [75ppb] and

CARMMS predicts that there would only be two sites with year 2021 ozone concentration DVFs above the former ozone Standard [75 ppb] for all CARMMS scenarios). Even though there has recently been a new ozone Standard established since base year 2008, the cumulative ozone concentrations are predicted to decrease at air quality monitor locations throughout the Region. The CARMMS predicted average reductions in cumulative ozone concentrations (from base year 2008 to future year 2021) for all 37 Regional monitors in the CARMMS ozone analysis are 1.6 ppb, 1.6 ppb and 2.1 ppb for the CARMMS High, Medium and Low Scenarios, respectively. CARMMS predicts slight increases (< 1ppb) at only two Larimer County, Colorado based monitor locations for the CARMMS High and Medium Scenarios (no predicted increases at Regional monitors for the CARMMS Low Scenario).

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>Section</u>	Volume I	<u>Page</u>
	EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	ES-1
1	PURPOSE AND NEED	1-1
1.1	OVERVIEW OF THE RMPA/SEIS.....	1-1
1.2	PURPOSE OF THE ACTION	1-3
1.3	NEED FOR THE ACTION	1-5
	1.3.1 Transfer of NOSRs 1 and 3 from DOE to BLM.....	1-5
	1.3.2 Demographic and Economic Changes in the Planning Area	1-6
	1.3.3 Oil and Gas Leasing.....	1-7
	1.3.4 Interim Travel Designations	1-7
	1.3.5 Wilderness Characteristics.....	1-7
	1.3.6 New Information from Land Health Assessments	1-8
	1.3.7 Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement.....	1-8
	1.3.7.1 New Information	1-8
	1.3.7.2 Regulatory Changes	1-10
	1.3.7.3 Management Actions Implemented Between the RODs and the Judicial Order	1-10
1.4	PLANNING AREA	1-11
1.5	AGENCY ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES.....	1-11
1.6	BLM LAND USE PLANNING PROCESS	1-12
1.7	SUMMARY OF SCOPING ISSUES	1-13
	1.7.1 Overview of Scoping and Issue Identification Process.....	1-13
	1.7.1.1 Original RMPA/EIS	1-14
	1.7.1.2 RMPA/SEIS	1-14
	1.7.2 Planning Issues Considered	1-14
2	ALTERNATIVES.....	2-1
2.1	INTRODUCTION	2-1
2.2	ALTERNATIVES DEVELOPMENT AND SELECTION PROCESS	2-1
2.3	ALTERNATIVES	2-6
	2.3.1 Alternative I - No Action Alternative	2-6
	2.3.2 Alternative II – 2006 Roan FEIS Proposed Plan Alternative	2-9
	2.3.3 Alternative III – Community Alternative	2-19
	2.3.4 Alternative IV – Settlement Alternative (Preferred Alternative).....	2-23
2.4	ALTERNATIVES NOT ANALYZED IN DETAIL	2-25

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>Section</u>	<u>Page</u>
3	AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT3-1
3.1	INTRODUCTION3-1
3.2	PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT3-1
3.2.1	Geological Resources3-1
3.2.1.1	Bedrock and Surficial Geology3-2
3.2.1.2	Anvil Points Claystone Cave.....3-2
3.2.1.3	Geologic Hazards3-3
3.2.2	Paleontological Resources3-3
3.2.3	Soil Resources.....3-6
3.2.3.1	General Soil Characteristics3-6
3.2.3.2	Soils Atop the Plateau3-6
3.2.3.3	Soils Below the Rim, Southern and Western Areas3-7
3.2.3.4	Soils Below the Rim, Eastern Area3-7
3.2.3.5	Soils Along Major Drainages3-8
3.2.3.6	Erodibility3-9
3.2.3.7	Compaction3-10
3.2.4	Water Resources3-10
3.2.4.1	Surface Water.....3-10
3.2.4.2	Groundwater.....3-31
3.2.4.3	Water Yield3-38
3.2.4.4	Water Rights.....3-38
3.2.5	Climate and Air Quality.....3-40
3.2.5.1	Introduction3-40
3.2.5.2	Regulatory Setting.....3-40
3.2.5.3	Existing Regional Air Quality.....3-44
3.2.5.4	Climate3-59
3.3	BIOLOGICAL ENVIRONMENT.....3-59
3.3.1	Upland Vegetation and Riparian/Wetland Areas.....3-59
3.3.1.1	Introduction3-60
3.3.1.2	Major Plant Community Types3-60
3.3.1.3	Current Condition and Trends.....3-62
3.3.1.4	Current Management and Desired Future Conditions.....3-66
3.3.2	Terrestrial and Aquatic Wildlife3-68
3.3.2.1	Introduction3-68
3.3.2.2	Major Habitat Types.....3-68
3.3.2.3	Current Use by Wildlife3-71
3.3.2.4	Current Condition and Trends.....3-81
3.3.2.5	Current Management and Desired Future Conditions.....3-85
3.3.3	Special Status Plants and Significant Plant Communities3-88
3.3.3.1	Introduction3-88
3.3.3.2	Current Condition and Trends.....3-89

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>Section</u>	<u>Page</u>
3.3.3.3	Current Management and Desired Future Conditions.....3-98
3.3.4	Special Status Fish and Wildlife3-98
3.3.4.1	Introduction3-98
3.3.4.2	Current Conditions and Trends3-99
3.3.5	Wild Horses and Burros.....3-113
3.4	HUMAN ENVIRONMENT3-113
3.4.1	Visual Resources.....3-113
3.4.1.1	Landscape Character and Scenic Quality3-113
3.4.1.2	Viewing Distance Zones and Visual Sensitivity3-114
3.4.1.3	Key Viewsheds.....3-115
3.4.1.4	Current VRM Classes and Visual Resource Management.....3-116
3.4.2	Cultural Resources3-118
3.4.2.1	Introduction3-118
3.4.2.2	Prehistoric and Historic Context3-118
3.4.2.3	Results of Previous Investigations3-121
3.4.2.4	Traditional Cultural Properties.....3-123
3.4.2.5	Sensitivity Zones3-123
3.4.2.6	Use Allocations3-123
3.4.2.7	Data Gaps3-125
3.4.3	Socioeconomics3-125
3.4.3.1	Area of Analysis.....3-125
3.4.3.2	Population3-126
3.4.3.3	Housing3-136
3.4.3.4	Facilities and Services.....3-139
3.4.3.5	Employment, Earnings, and Personal Income.....3-142
3.4.3.6	Labor Force and Unemployment.....3-154
3.4.3.7	Economic Models and the Contribution of BLM Management3-155
3.4.3.8	Public Finance3-161
3.4.3.9	Quality of Life.....3-173
3.4.3.10	Non-Market Values, Including Ecosystem Goods and Services3-177
3.4.3.11	Population Forecast for the Planning Area.....3-178
3.4.3.12	Environmental Justice3-178
3.4.4	Transportation.....3-180
3.4.4.1	Major Highways and Access Roads3-180
3.4.4.2	BLM Roads and Trails3-182
3.5	MANAGEMENT ENVIRONMENT3-183
3.5.1	Lands and Realty3-183
3.5.1.1	Introduction3-183
3.5.1.2	Withdrawals3-184
3.5.1.3	Land Tenure Categories3-185

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>Section</u>	<u>Page</u>
3.5.1.4 Land Use Authorizations.....	3-185
3.5.2 Travel Management	3-186
3.5.2.1 Current Management.....	3-186
3.5.2.2 Current Use	3-187
3.5.3 Recreation	3-188
3.5.3.1 Factors Creating Recreation Management Challenges.....	3-189
3.5.3.2 Resource Condition and Characteristics Atop the Plateau	3-189
3.5.3.3 Resource Condition and Characteristics Below the Rim	3-190
3.5.3.4 Current and Projected Recreational Use	3-191
3.5.3.5 Tourism	3-192
3.5.3.6 Recreational Shooting	3-192
3.5.4 Grazing and Rangeland Management.....	3-193
3.5.4.1 Current Management.....	3-193
3.5.4.2 Characteristics and Setting	3-193
3.5.4.3 Resource Condition and Capabilities Evaluation.....	3-194
3.5.5 Oil and Gas Leasing and Development	3-198
3.5.5.1 Drilling and Production.....	3-199
3.5.5.2 Recoverable Resources	3-200
3.5.5.3 Directional and New Technology Drilling Practices	3-200
3.5.5.4 Horizontal Drilling Practices.....	3-201
3.5.5.5 Leasing	3-201
3.5.5.6 Coalbed Natural Gas	3-202
3.5.5.7 Drilling and Development Approval Process.....	3-202
3.5.6 Other Minerals	3-203
3.5.6.1 Oil Shale.....	3-203
3.5.6.2 Coal	3-204
3.5.6.3 Other Leasable Minerals	3-204
3.5.6.4 Locatable Minerals.....	3-204
3.5.6.5 Mineral Materials	3-204
3.5.7 Areas of Critical Environmental Concern.....	3-205
3.5.7.1 Introduction	3-205
3.5.7.2 Anvil Points ACEC	3-206
3.5.7.3 Magpie Gulch ACEC	3-208
3.5.7.4 East Fork Parachute Creek ACEC	3-209
3.5.7.5 Trapper/Northwater Creek ACEC.....	3-211
3.5.8 Lands With Wilderness Characteristics	3-212
3.5.8.1 Plan Conformance	3-213
3.5.8.2 Wilderness Characteristics Inventory.....	3-213
3.5.9 Streams Eligible For Designation Under The Wild and Scenic Rivers Act ...	3-215
3.5.9.1 Introduction	3-216
3.5.9.2 Eligibility Process	3-216
3.5.9.3 Eligibility Findings.....	3-217

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>Section</u>	<u>Page</u>
3.5.9.4 Stream Classification.....	3-219
3.5.9.5 Water Quality	3-220
3.5.10 Forest Products	3-220
3.5.10.1 Management Plans and Documents	3-220
3.5.10.2 Current Management.....	3-220
3.5.10.3 Resource Condition and Capabilities Evaluation	3-221
3.5.11 Fire Management	3-221
3.5.11.1 Management Plans and Documents	3-221
3.5.11.2 Evaluation of Resource Condition and Capabilities.....	3-222
3.5.11.3 Current Fire Management	3-223
3.5.12 Public Health and Safety.....	3-224
3.5.12.1 Water Quality	3-225
3.5.12.2 Air Quality	3-226
3.5.12.3 Hazardous Wastes and Materials	3-231
3.5.12.4 Contaminated Sites.....	3-236
3.5.12.5 Worker Health and Safety	3-238
3.5.13 Renewable Energy	3-238
3.5.13.1 Wind Power.....	3-239
3.5.13.2 Solar Power	3-239
3.5.13.3 Geothermal	3-239
3.5.13.4 Biomass	3-239
4 ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES	4-1
4.1 INTRODUCTION	4-1
4.1.1 Impact Analysis Process	4-1
4.1.1.1 Direct and Indirect Onsite Impacts.....	4-1
4.1.1.2 Offsite and Cumulative Impacts.....	4-2
4.1.2 Protective Stipulations and Other Restrictions on Surface Use.....	4-3
4.1.3 General Levels of Impacts	4-6
4.2 PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT.....	4-9
4.2.1 Geological Resources	4-9
4.2.1.1 Introduction	4-9
4.2.1.2 Impacts of Alternative I.....	4-10
4.2.1.3 Impacts of Alternative II	4-11
4.2.1.4 Impacts of Alternative III.....	4-13
4.2.1.5 Impacts of Alternative IV.....	4-15
4.2.1.6 Overall Summary of Impacts to Geological Resources	4-16
4.2.2 Paleontological Resources	4-17
4.2.2.1 Introduction	4-17
4.2.2.2 Impacts of Alternative I.....	4-19
4.2.2.3 Impacts of Alternative II	4-21

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>Section</u>	<u>Page</u>
4.2.2.4	Impacts of Alternative III4-22
4.2.2.5	Impacts of Alternative IV4-23
4.2.2.6	Overall Summary of Impacts to Paleontological Resources4-24
4.2.3	Soil Resources4-25
4.2.3.1	Introduction4-25
4.2.3.2	Impacts of Alternative I4-27
4.2.3.3	Impacts of Alternative II4-29
4.2.3.4	Impacts of Alternative III4-31
4.2.3.5	Impacts of Alternative IV4-33
4.2.3.6	Overall Summary of Impacts to Soil Resources4-34
4.2.4	Water Resources4-35
4.2.4.1	Introduction4-35
4.2.4.2	Impacts of Alternative I4-40
4.2.4.3	Impacts of Alternative II4-44
4.2.4.4	Impacts of Alternative III4-46
4.2.4.5	Impacts of Alternative IV4-48
4.2.4.6	Overall Summary of Impacts to Water Resources4-50
4.2.5	Climate and Air Quality4-51
4.2.5.1	Introduction4-51
4.2.5.2	Overview of CARPP4-52
4.2.5.3	Overview of CARMMS4-53
4.2.5.4	Roan Plateau Planning Area Project Emission Inventory Development for Regional Analysis4-55
4.2.5.5	CARMMS Air Quality Impacts and Regional Analysis4-63
4.2.5.6	Project-Specific Near-Field Impacts Analysis4-97
4.2.5.7	Greenhouse Gases and Climate Change4-98
4.2.5.8	Protective/Mitigation Measures4-101
4.3	BIOLOGICAL ENVIRONMENT4-101
4.3.1	Upland Vegetation and Riparian/Wetland Areas4-101
4.3.1.1	Introduction4-101
4.3.1.2	Impacts of Alternative I4-104
4.3.1.3	Impacts of Alternative II4-106
4.3.1.4	Impacts of Alternative III4-111
4.3.1.5	Impacts of Alternative IV4-112
4.3.1.6	Overall Summary of Impacts to Upland Vegetation and Riparian/Wetland Areas4-114
4.3.2	Terrestrial and Aquatic Wildlife4-114
4.3.2.1	Introduction4-115
4.3.2.2	Impacts of Alternative I4-124
4.3.2.3	Impacts of Alternative II4-130
4.3.2.4	Impacts of Alternative III4-138
4.3.2.5	Impacts of Alternative IV4-141
4.3.2.6	Overall Summary of Impacts to Terrestrial and Aquatic Wildlife.4-144

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>Section</u>	<u>Page</u>
4.3.3	Special Status Plants and Significant Plant Communities4-144
4.3.3.1	Introduction4-145
4.3.3.2	Impacts of Alternative I.....4-147
4.3.3.3	Impacts of Alternative II4-149
4.3.3.4	Impacts of Alternative III.....4-152
4.3.3.5	Impacts of Alternative IV.....4-154
4.3.3.6	Overall Summary of Impacts to Special Status Plants and Significant Plant Communities.....4-155
4.3.4	Special Status Fish and Wildlife Species.....4-156
4.3.4.1	Introduction4-156
4.3.4.2	Impacts of Alternative I.....4-159
4.3.4.3	Impacts of Alternative II4-165
4.3.4.4	Impacts of Alternative III.....4-172
4.3.4.5	Impacts of Alternative IV.....4-174
4.3.4.6	Overall Summary of Impacts to Special Status Fish and Wildlife Species4-176
4.3.5	Wild Horses and Burros.....4-177
4.4	HUMAN ENVIRONMENT4-177
4.4.1	Visual Resources.....4-177
4.4.1.1	Introduction4-177
4.4.1.2	Impacts of Alternative I.....4-186
4.4.1.3	Impacts of Alternative II4-189
4.4.1.4	Impacts of Alternative III.....4-193
4.4.1.5	Impacts of Alternative IV.....4-196
4.4.1.6	Summary of Impacts to Visual Resources4-199
4.4.2	Cultural Resources.....4-199
4.4.2.1	Introduction4-200
4.4.2.2	Impacts of Alternative I.....4-206
4.4.2.3	Impacts of Alternative II4-208
4.4.2.4	Impacts of Alternative III.....4-210
4.4.2.5	Impacts of Alternative IV.....4-212
4.4.2.6	Overall Summary of Impacts to Cultural Resources.....4-213
4.4.3	Socioeconomics4-214
4.4.3.1	Introduction4-214
4.4.3.2	Impacts of the Alternatives4-215
4.4.3.3	Cumulative Effects4-237
4.4.3.4	Overall Summary of Impacts to Socioeconomics4-239
4.4.4	Transportation.....4-240
4.4.4.1	Introduction4-240
4.4.4.2	Impacts of Alternative I.....4-241
4.4.4.3	Impacts of Alternative II4-242
4.4.4.4	Impacts of Alternative III.....4-244
4.4.4.5	Impacts of Alternative IV.....4-245

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>Section</u>	<u>Page</u>
4.4.4.6 Overall Summary of Impacts to Transportation.....	4-246
4.5 MANAGEMENT ENVIRONMENT	4-246
4.5.1 Lands and Realty	4-246
4.5.1.1 Introduction	4-246
4.5.1.2 Impacts of Alternative I.....	4-246
4.5.1.3 Impacts of Alternative II	4-247
4.5.1.4 Impacts of Alternative III.....	4-248
4.5.1.5 Impacts of Alternative IV.....	4-249
4.5.1.6 Overall Summary of Impacts to Lands and Realty	4-249
4.5.2 Travel Management	4-249
4.5.2.1 Introduction	4-250
4.5.2.2 Impacts of Alternative I.....	4-251
4.5.2.3 Impacts of Alternative II	4-253
4.5.2.4 Impacts of Alternative III.....	4-255
4.5.2.5 Impacts of Alternative IV.....	4-257
4.5.2.6 Overall Summary of Impacts to Travel Management	4-259
4.5.3 Recreation.....	4-260
4.5.3.1 Introduction	4-260
4.5.3.2 Impacts of Alternative I.....	4-262
4.5.3.3 Impacts of Alternative II	4-264
4.5.3.4 Impacts of Alternative III.....	4-265
4.5.3.5 Impacts of Alternative IV.....	4-266
4.5.3.6 Overall Summary of Impacts to Recreation.....	4-267
4.5.4 Grazing and Rangeland Management.....	4-268
4.5.4.1 Introduction	4-268
4.5.4.2 Impacts of Alternative I.....	4-270
4.5.4.3 Impacts of Alternative II	4-272
4.5.4.4 Impacts of Alternative III.....	4-276
4.5.4.5 Impacts of Alternative IV.....	4-279
4.5.4.6 Overall Summary of Impacts to Grazing and Rangeland Management.....	4-281
4.5.5 Oil and Gas Leasing and Development	4-282
4.5.5.1 Introduction	4-283
4.5.5.2 Impacts of Alternative I.....	4-285
4.5.5.3 Impacts of Alternative II	4-286
4.5.5.4 Impacts of Alternative III.....	4-288
4.5.5.5 Impacts of Alternative IV.....	4-289
4.5.5.6 Overall Summary of Impacts to Oil and Gas Leasing and Development	4-291
4.5.6 Other Minerals	4-291
4.5.7 Areas of Critical Environmental Concern.....	4-292
4.5.7.1 Introduction	4-292
4.5.7.2 Impacts of Alternative I.....	4-293

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>Section</u>	<u>Page</u>
4.5.7.3	Impacts of Alternative II4-295
4.5.7.4	Impacts of Alternative III.....4-297
4.5.7.5	Impacts of Alternative IV.....4-299
4.5.7.6	Overall Summary of Impacts to ACECs4-300
4.5.8	Lands with Wilderness Characteristics4-301
4.5.8.1	Impacts of Alternative I.....4-302
4.5.8.2	Impacts of Alternative II4-304
4.5.8.3	Impacts of Alternative III.....4-306
4.5.8.4	Impacts of Alternative IV.....4-307
4.5.8.5	Overall Summary of Impacts to Land Managed for Wilderness Characteristics4-308
4.5.9	Streams Eligible for Designation under the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act.....4-309
4.5.9.1	Impacts of Alternative I.....4-310
4.5.9.2	Impacts of Alternative II4-318
4.5.9.3	Impacts of Alternative III.....4-327
4.5.9.4	Impacts of Alternative IV.....4-334
4.5.9.5	Overall Summary of Impacts to Streams Eligible for Designation under the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act4-336
4.5.10	Forest Products4-336
4.5.11	Fire Management4-337
4.5.11.1	Introduction4-337
4.5.11.2	Impacts of Alternative I.....4-338
4.5.11.3	Impacts of Alternative II4-339
4.5.11.4	Impacts of Alternative III.....4-340
4.5.11.5	Impacts of Alternative IV.....4-340
4.5.11.6	Overall Summary of Impacts to Fire Management4-340
4.5.12	Public Health and Safety.....4-341
4.5.12.1	Introduction4-341
4.5.12.2	Impacts of Alternative I.....4-342
4.5.12.3	Impacts of Alternative II4-344
4.5.12.4	Impacts of Alternative III.....4-346
4.5.12.5	Impacts of Alternative IV.....4-347
4.5.12.6	Overall Summary of Impacts to Public Health and Safety.....4-348
4.5.13	Renewable Energy4-348
4.6	IRREVERSIBLE AND IRRETRIEVABLE COMMITMENT OF RESOURCES.....4-348
5	REFERENCES.....5-1
6	CONSULTATION AND COORDINATION6-1
6.1	INTRODUCTION6-1
6.2	PUBLIC COLLABORATION AND OUTREACH6-1
6.2.1	Notice of Intent6-1
6.2.2	Scoping Process6-1

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>Section</u>	<u>Page</u>
6.2.3 Scoping Open Houses	6-1
6.2.4 Project Website	6-2
6.3 CONSULTATION AND COORDINATION.....	6-2
6.3.1 Cooperating Agencies	6-2
6.3.2 Tribal Consultation	6-4
6.3.3 Special Status Species Consultation.....	6-5
6.4 RMPA/SEIS DISTRIBUTION LIST	6-5
6.5 PUBLICATION OF THE DRAFT RMPA/SEIS	6-5
6.5.1 Document Release and Notice of Availability.....	6-5
6.5.2 Announcements and Advertisements.....	6-5
6.5.3 Public Meetings	6-5
6.6 LIST OF PREPARERS.....	6-6

Volume II

Appendix

A	MAPS
B	INFORMATION RELATED TO OIL AND GAS LEASING, PERMITTING, AND DEVELOPMENT, DESCRIPTION OF TYPICAL OIL AND GAS OPERATIONS, SAMPLE OIL AND GAS LEASE
C	STIPULATIONS
D	VISUAL RESOURCE MANAGEMENT (VRM) CLASSES AND OBJECTIVES
E	BLM RECREATION GUIDELINES TO MEET PUBLIC LAND HEALTH STANDARDS IN COLORADO
F	PROPOSED MANAGEMENT AND SETTING PRESCRIPTIONS FOR LANDS WITH WILDERNESS CHARACTERISTICS
G	REASONABLE FORESEEABLE DEVELOPMENT ROAN PLATEAU PLANNING AREA
H	BEST MANAGEMENT PRACTICES (BMPS)
I	DISTURBED SITE RECLAMATION STANDARDS AND IMPLEMENTATION, MONITORING, AND EVALUATION (FROM COLORADO RIVER VALLEY FIELD OFFICE PROPOSED RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PLAN (PRMP)/FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT (FEIS))
J	COMPREHENSIVE AIR RESOURCE PROTECTION PLAN
K	SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT

LIST OF TABLES

<u>Table</u>		<u>Page</u>
ES-1	Limitations and Resource/Management Designations Used in Impact Analysis	ES-7
ES-2	Anticipated Oil and Gas Development on BLM Lands During 20-Year Period	ES-8
ES-3	Potential Adverse Impacts to Resources	ES-9
1.1	Planning Issues Raised by Interested Parties and BLM Staff during Scoping	1-15
1.2	Planning Criteria Used by BLM in Developing and Implementing the RMPA/EIS	1-16
2.1	Summary of Management Components for the No Action Alternative and Action Alternatives	2-33
2.2	Proposed Management Prescriptions for Areas of Critical Environmental Concern (ACECs)	2-91
2.3	Management Goals, Objectives, and Actions for the Parachute Creek Watershed Management Area	2-101
2.4	Management Objectives for Major Plant Communities	2-109
3.2.1	Soil Erosion Classes, Areal Extent, and Location in the Planning Area	3-9
3.2.2	Water Resources Regulatory Requirements Applicable to the Planning Area	3-11
3.2.3	Historical Stream Discharge Data for Inactive U.S. Geological Survey Gaging Stations, Parachute Creek Basin	3-20
3.2.4	Historical Water Quality Data for U.S. Geological Gaging Stations, Parachute Creek Basin	3-21
3.2.5	U.S. Department of Energy Discharge and Water Quality Data for Naval Oil Shale Reserve 1 Streams	3-22
3.2.6	BLM Discharge and Water Quality Data for Some Streams Atop the Plateau	3-23
3.2.7	BLM Discharge and Water Quality Data for Some Streams Below the Cliffs	3-24
3.2.8	Water Quality Data for Streams within the Planning Area	3-25
3.2.9	Stream Classifications and Use Attainment for Stream Segments Located within the Planning Area	3-26
3.2.10	Water Quality Standards for Stream Segments Located within the Planning Area	3-29
3.2.11	Concentration Ranges of Major Ions in Groundwater Samples from Roan Plateau Planning Area	3-36
3.2.12	Major Ion Concentrations in Spring Samples from Roan Plateau Planning Area1	3-37
3.2.13	Colorado Water Conservation Board Instream Flow Water Rights	3-39
3.2.14	Ambient Air Quality Standards	3-41
3.2.15	PSD Class I Areas Near the Roan Plateau Planning Area	3-42
3.2.16	Ambient Air Quality Monitoring Data 2011 – 2014, Northwest Colorado	3-45
3.2.17	Year 2008 Eight-Hour Ozone Design Value Concentrations for Colorado	3-53

LIST OF TABLES

<u>Table</u>	<u>Page</u>
3.2.18	HAP Air Quality Monitoring Data3-54
3.2.19	2011 Emission Inventory Data for Garfield County, Colorado (tons).....3-58
3.3.1	Vegetation Community Types and Condition in BLM Lands in Planning Area.....3-60
3.3.2	Proper Functioning Condition Assessments, Roan Plateau Planning Area3-64
3.3.3	Noxious Weeds and Other Invasive Non-Native Plants in the Planning Area3-65
3.3.4	Deer and Elk Winter Range in the Planning Area and Surrounding Region3-73
3.3.5	Special Status and Other Potentially Sensitive Plant Species in the Planning Area.....3-90
3.3.6	Significant Plant Communities in the Planning Area3-92
3.3.7	Special Status and Other Potentially Sensitive Animal Species within the Planning Area Vicinity 3-99
3.4.1	Visual Resource Inventory Classes, Sensitivity, Scenic Quality Rating Units and Distance Zones for the Roan Plateau Planning Area3-117
3.4.2	Northern Colorado River Basin Prehistory Chronology3-119
3.4.3	Survey Acreage and Cultural Resource Density by Location.....3-121
3.4.4	Cultural Resource Type by Location3-121
3.4.5	National Register Evaluations by Cultural Resource Type and Location.....3-122
3.4.6	Recommended BLM Use Categories by Cultural Resource Site Type3-123
3.4.7	Population Change in the Study Area from 2000 to 20103-126
3.4.8	Population Estimates and Population Change in Garfield, Mesa and Rio Blanco Counties and Selected Garfield County Communities from 2000 to 2013.....3-128
3.4.9	Demographics of the Three-County Region and Selected Communities in 20133-128
3.4.10	Household Income and Poverty in the Three-County Area and Selected Communities in Garfield County, 2013.....3-130
3.4.11	Occupational Profile in 2013 of the Three-County Area and of the Census County Divisions in Garfield County3-131
3.4.12	Profile of Housing and Households in 2013 for the Three-County Region and Selected Communities and Sub-Areas.....3-137
3.4.13	Employment of Workers in Garfield County by Industry, 2007-2013 (annual average jobs).....3-144
3.4.14	Earnings of Workers in Garfield County by Industry, 2007-2013 (millions of 2013 dollars)3-145
3.4.15	Personal Income of Residents in Garfield County, 2007-2013 (millions of 2013 dollars)3-146
3.4.16	Employment of Workers in Mesa County by Industry, 2007-2013 (annual average jobs).....3-147
3.4.17	Earnings of Workers in Mesa County by Industry, 2007-2013 (millions of 2013 dollars)3-149

LIST OF TABLES

<u>Table</u>	<u>Page</u>
3.4.18	Personal Income of Residents in Mesa County, 2007-2013 (millions of 2013 dollars) 3-150
3.4.19	Employment of Workers in Rio Blanco County by Industry, 2007-2013 (annual average jobs) 3-151
3.4.20	Earnings of Workers in Rio Blanco County by Industry, 2007-2013 (millions of 2013 dollars) 3-152
3.4.21	Personal Income of Residents in Rio Blanco County, 2007-2013 (millions of 2013 dollars) 3-153
3.4.22	Modeled Employment by Industry, County, and State, 2013 (annual average jobs) 3-158
3.4.23	Modeled Earnings by Industry, County, and State, 2013 (millions of dollars) 3-159
3.4.24	Employment Contributed by BLM Management of the Planning Area by Program by County, 2013 (annual average jobs)..... 3-162
3.4.25	Earnings Contributed by BLM Management of the Planning Area by Program by County, 2013 (millions of dollars)..... 3-162
3.4.26	Employment Contributed by BLM Management of the Planning Area by Industry and County, 2013 (annual average jobs)..... 3-163
3.4.27	Earnings Contributed by BLM Management of the Planning Area by Industry and County, 2013 (millions of dollars) 3-164
3.4.28	Distribution of Assessed Value and Oil and Gas Property Value in the Three-County Region, 2002, 2007, and 2013 3-165
3.4.29	State Sales Tax Collected at 2.9 Percent in All Jurisdictions within Garfield, Mesa, and Rio Blanco Counties, 2002 to 2013..... 3-166
3.4.30	Local Government Reliance on the Sales Tax for Selected Place in Garfield County, 2005 through 2012 3-166
3.4.31	Payments to Local Governments and School Districts in the Three-County Region Under the Colorado Federal Mineral Lease and State Severance Tax Direct Distribution Program, 2009 to 2014 3-167
3.4.32	Share of Cumulative Direct Distributions Received by Local Government in Garfield County Since 2009..... 3-168
3.4.33	Share of Cumulative Direct Distributions Received by School Districts in Garfield County Since 2009..... 3-169
3.4.34	Operating Expenditures for 2007, 2009, and 2013 in Garfield, Mesa, and Rio Blanco Counties 3-169
3.4.35	Operating Expenditures for 2007, 2009, and 2013 for Selected Local Governments in Garfield County 3-170
3.4.36	Cumulative Energy and Mineral Impact Assistance Program Awards and Matching Funds Committed to Facilities Construction and Improvements in the Three-County Region from 2005 to 2013..... 3-171
3.4.37	PILT Payments to Counties in the Three-County Region 3-172

LIST OF TABLES

<u>Table</u>	<u>Page</u>
3.4.38	Annual Average Rotary Drilling Rigs in the Three-County Region from 2011 to 20133-175
3.4.39	Population Forecast for Garfield, Mesa, and Rio Blanco Counties to 20403-178
3.4.40	Environmental Justice Screening of Census Block Groups in the Three-County Region for 2010 Minority and 2013 Low-Income Populations3-179
3.4.41	Average Annual Daily Traffic (AADT) on I-70 and Other Roads3-182
3.4.42	Roads and Trails in the Planning Area13-183
3.5.1	Land Ownership in the Planning Area.....3-184
3.5.2	Current Livestock Use on Grazing Allotments in the Planning Area.....3-194
3.5.3	Lease Status of Federal Mineral Estate in the Planning Area.....3-202
3.5.4	Results of Wilderness Characteristic and Roadless Inventory (acres).....3-213
3.5.5	Summary of Findings of WSR Eligibility Determination3-217
3.5.6	Fire Management Overview3-222
3.5.7	Constituents of Typical Hydraulic Fracturing Operation in Tight Gas Formations3-228
3.5.8	Chemistry (mg/L) of Produced/Disposed Waters at the Black Mountain Disposal Site Evaporation Pond, De Beque, Garfield County, Colorado3-233
3.5.9	CERCLA/RCRA/Hazardous Waste Notifiers Within One Mile of the Planning Area.....3-236
4.1.1	Acres (ac) and Percent (%) of Surface Use Restrictions in the Planning Area.....4-5
4.1.2	Surface Impacts of Oil and Gas Development on Federal Lands in 20 Years (ac=acres, mi= miles).....4-8
4.1.3	Cumulative Impacts of Oil and Gas Development on Federal plus Private Land in the Planning Area in 20 Years4-9
4.2.1	Summary of Impacts to Geological Resources by Alternative4-17
4.2.2	Summary of Impacts to Paleontological Resources by Alternative.....4-24
4.2.3	Summary of Impacts to Soil Resources by Alternative4-35
4.2.4	Potential Wastestream Outputs from Oil and Gas Extraction Processes4-36
4.2.5	Potentially Affected Water Resource Features by Alternative4-40
4.2.6	Summary of Estimated Fresh Water Depletions from Oil and Gas Development Activities, by Alternative4-41
4.2.7	Summary of Impacts to Water Resources by Alternative.....4-50
4.2.8	Well Development Rate for CARMMS High and Low Emissions Scenarios.....4-57
4.2.9	High Scenario - Annual Emissions from Federal Oil and Gas Activities within the Planning Area.....4-59
4.2.10	Medium Scenario - Annual Emissions from Federal Oil and Gas Activities within the Planning Area.....4-60

LIST OF TABLES

<u>Table</u>	<u>Page</u>
4.2.11	Low Scenario - Annual Emissions from Federal Oil and Gas Activities within the Planning Area4-60
4.2.12	High Scenario - Annual Emissions Percent Change from Base Year due to Federal Oil and Gas Activities within the Planning Area.....4-61
4.2.13	Medium Scenario - Annual Emissions Percent Change from Base Year due to Federal Oil and Gas Activities within the Planning Area.....4-61
4.2.14	Low Scenario - Annual Emissions Percent Change from Base Year due to Federal Oil and Gas Activities within the Planning Area.....4-62
4.2.15	CARMMS Future Oil and Gas Development/Projections Modeled – CRVFO (Inside Planning Area).....4-64
4.2.16	CARMMS Projected Year 2021 Annual Emissions4-65
4.2.17	CARMMS – 2021 Maximum Planning Area New Federal Oil and Gas Contributions to Modeled Ozone and PM _{2.5} Impacts at any Class I or Sensitive Class II Area4-66
4.2.18	CARMMS – 2021 Maximum Planning Area New Federal Oil and Gas Contributions to Modeled Visibility and Nitrogen Deposition Impacts4-67
4.2.19	CARMMS – 2021 Planning Area New Federal Oil and Gas Nitrogen Deposition Contributions to Class I/Sensitive Class II Areas4-67
4.2.20a	CARMMS – 2021 Planning Area New Federal Oil and Gas Lake Impacts - High Scenario4-67
4.2.20b	CARMMS – 2021 Planning Area New Federal Oil and Gas Lake Impacts - Medium Scenario4-68
4.2.20c	CARMMS – 2021 Planning Area New Federal Oil and Gas Lake Impacts - Low Scenario4-68
4.2.21a	CARMMS-Modeled AQRV Impacts - High 2021 Scenario - Full Cumulative Emissions Inventory4-79
4.2.21b	CARMMS-Modeled AQRV Impacts - Medium 2021 Scenario - Full Cumulative Emissions Inventory4-79
4.2.21c	CARMMS-Modeled AQRV Impacts - Low 2021 Scenario - Full Cumulative Emissions Inventory4-79
4.2.22a	CARMMS-Modeled Visibility Impacts – FLAG 2010 Methodology – Flat Tops Wilderness Area.....4-87
4.2.22b	CARMMS-Modeled Visibility Impacts – MATS Tool Cumulative – Flat Tops Wilderness Area.....4-87
4.2.22c	CARMMS-Modeled Visibility Impacts – FLAG 2010 Methodology – Maroon Bells - Snowmass Wilderness Area4-88
4.2.22d	CARMMS-Modeled Visibility Impacts – MATS Tool Cumulative – Maroon Bells-Snowmass Wilderness Area4-88
4.2.22e	CARMMS-Modeled Nitrogen Deposition – Flat Tops Wilderness Area.....4-89

LIST OF TABLES

<u>Table</u>	<u>Page</u>
4.2.22f	CARMMS-Modeled Nitrogen Deposition – Maroon Bells - Snowmass Wilderness Area.....4-89
4.3.1	Summary of Impacts to Upland Vegetation and Riparian/Wetland Areas by Alternative4-114
4.3.2	Estimated Direct and Effective Habitat Loss on BLM Surface, Alternative I.....4-126
4.3.3	Summary of Impacts of Alternative I to Terrestrial and Aquatic Wildlife4-129
4.3.4	Estimated Direct and Effective Habitat Loss on BLM Surface, Alternative II.....4-131
4.3.5	Summary of Impacts of Alternative II to Terrestrial and Aquatic Wildlife4-137
4.3.6	Estimated Direct and Effective Habitat Loss on BLM Surface, Alternative III4-139
4.3.7	Summary of Impacts of Alternative III to Terrestrial and Aquatic Wildlife4-140
4.3.8	Estimated Direct and Effective Habitat Loss on BLM Surface, Alternative IV4-142
4.3.9	Summary of Impacts of Alternative IV to Terrestrial and Aquatic Wildlife4-143
4.3.10	Summary of Impacts to Terrestrial and Aquatic Wildlife by Alternative.....4-144
4.3.11	Summary of Impacts to Special Status Plants and Significant Plant Communities, by Alternative4-156
4.3.12	Summary of Impacts to Special Status Fish and Wildlife by Alternative.....4-177
4.4.1	Visibility Characteristics for Areas (acres) Above and Below the Rim by Alternative4-180
4.4.2	Distance Zone Information for Roadway Viewsheds by Alternative (acres)4-181
4.4.3	Number of Well Pads Estimated Visible in each Viewshed by Alternative4-184
4.4.4	Visual Resource Inventory Values Impact Comparison (All Action Alternatives)....4-186
4.4.5	Summary of Impacts to Visual Resources by Alternative4-199
4.4.6	Cultural Resources in Areas Open to Oil and Gas Leasing and Development, Alternative I4-207
4.4.7	Cultural Resources in Areas Open to Oil and Gas Leasing and Development, Alternative II.....4-209
4.4.8	Cultural Resources in Areas Open to Oil and Gas Leasing and Development, Alternative III4-211
4.4.9	Cultural Resources in Areas Open to Oil and Gas Leasing and Development, Alternative IV4-213
4.4.10	Summary of Impacts to Cultural Resources by Alternative 14-214
4.4.11	Employment Effects in Garfield County by Program by Alternative, 2020 (annual average jobs).....4-217
4.4.12	Earnings Effects in Garfield County by Program by Alternative, 2020 (millions of 2013 dollars).....4-217
4.4.13	Employment Effects in Garfield County by Industry by Alternative, 2020 (annual average jobs).....4-217

LIST OF TABLES

<u>Table</u>	<u>Page</u>
4.4.14 Earnings Effects in Garfield County by Industry by Alternative, 2020 (millions of 2013 dollars).....	4-218
4.4.15 Employment Effects in Mesa County by Program by Alternative, 2020 (annual average jobs).....	4-220
4.4.16 Earnings Effects in Mesa County by Program by Alternative, 2020 (millions of 2013 dollars).....	4-220
4.4.17 Employment Effects in Mesa County by Industry by Alternative, 2020 (annual average jobs).....	4-220
4.4.18 Earnings Effects in Mesa County by Industry by Alternative, 2020 (millions of 2013 dollars).....	4-221
4.4.19 Employment Effects in Rio Blanco County by Program by Alternative, 2020 (annual average jobs).....	4-223
4.4.20 Earnings Effects in Rio Blanco County by Program by Alternative, 2020 (millions of 2013 dollars).....	4-223
4.4.21 Employment Effects in Rio Blanco County by Industry by Alternative, 2020 (annual average jobs).....	4-223
4.4.22 Earnings Effects in Rio Blanco County by Industry by Alternative, 2020 (millions of 2013 dollars).....	4-224
4.4.23 Employment Effects in Three-County Area by Program by Alternative, 2020 (annual average jobs).....	4-226
4.4.24 Earnings Effects in Three-County Area by Program by Alternative, 2020 (millions of 2013 dollars).....	4-226
4.4.25 Employment Effects in Three-County Area by Industry by Alternative, 2020 (annual average jobs).....	4-226
4.4.26 Earnings Effects in Three-County Area by Industry by Alternative, 2020 (millions of 2013 dollars).....	4-227
4.4.27 Population Effect by County and by Alternative, 2020.....	4-229
4.4.28 Population Effect by Selected Community in Garfield County in 2020, by Alternative.....	4-230
4.4.29 Housing Effect by Selected Community in Garfield County in 2020, by Alternative, in Housing Units.....	4-231
4.4.30 One-Year Local and State Revenue Effect in 2020 Directly Related to Oil and Gas Production by Alternative (millions of 2013 dollars).....	4-234
4.4.31 One-Year Sales Tax Revenue Effect in 2020 for the State of Colorado and Selected Jurisdictions in Garfield County by Alternative (millions of 2013 dollars).....	4-235
4.4.32 Cumulative Employment Effects by County by Alternative, 2020 (annual average jobs).....	4-238
4.4.33 Summary of Impacts to Socioeconomics by Alternative.....	4-239
4.4.34 Vehicular Traffic Expected for Oil and Gas Drilling on BLM Lands.....	4-240

LIST OF TABLES

<u>Table</u>	<u>Page</u>
4.4.35	Summary of Impacts to Transportation by Alternative4-246
4.5.1	Summary of Impacts to Lands and Realty by Alternative4-249
4.5.2	Summary of Impacts to Travel Management by Alternative.....4-259
4.5.3	Summary of Impacts to Recreation by Alternative.....4-267
4.5.4	Summary of Impacts to Grazing and Rangeland by Alternative4-282
4.5.5	Anticipated Oil and Gas Development in BLM Portions of the Planning Area4-283
4.5.6	Planning Area Spacing.....4-284
4.5.7	Summary of Impacts to Oil and Gas Leasing and Development by Alternative4-291
4.5.8	Summary of Impacts to ACECs by Alternative.....4-300
4.5.9	Summary of Impacts to Land with Wilderness Characteristics by Alternative4-309
4.5.10	Summary of Impacts to Streams Eligible for Designation under the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act by Alternative.....4-336
4.5.11	Summary of Impacts to Fire Management by Alternative.....4-341
4.5.12	Summary of Impacts to Public Health and Safety by Alternative4-348
6.1	Agencies Invited to be Cooperators 6-3
6.2	Cooperating Agencies..... 6-3
6.3	Cooperating Agency Meeting Dates6-4
6.4	Notified Native American Tribes..... 6-4
6.5	Draft RMPA/SEIS Preparers 6-6

LIST OF FIGURES

<u>Figure</u>		<u>Page</u>
1-1	General Location Map	1-17
1-2	Land Status	1-19
1-3	General Planning Area View with Topography.....	1-21
2-1	Six Phased Development Areas for Oil and Gas Development atop the Plateau	2-31
3.2-1	Hydrogeologic Units of the Piceance Basin (CGS 2003).....	3-33
3.2-2	Diagrammatic Cross-Section of Groundwater Movement in Roan and Parachute Creek Drainage Basins.....	3-34
3.2-3	Ambient Air Quality Monitor Locations	3-47
3.2-4	2008 Ozone Design Value Concentration.....	3-48
3.2-5	8 th Highest 1 Hour Daily Max NO ₂ Concentration 2008	3-49
3.2-6	4 th Highest 8 Hour Average Daily Max O ₃ , 2008	3-50
3.2-7	Annual Average PM _{2.5} Concentration, 2008.....	3-51
3.2-8	8 th Highest Daily Average PM _{2.5} Concentration, 2008	3-52
3.2-9	Hazardous Air Pollutant Monitor Locations.....	3-55
3.2-10	AQRV Visibility Data for White River National Forest.....	3-56
3.2-11	Total Nitrogen (N) Deposition for the Gothic Site in Gunnison County	3-57
3.2-12	Total Sulfur (S) Deposition for the Gothic Site in Gunnison County	3-57
3.4-1	Year over Year Percentage Growth 2003 to 2010 of Total Population in the Three-County Region (Garfield, Mesa, and Rio Blanco Counties).....	3-127
3.4-2	Annual Population Change in Garfield County from 1985 to 2013	3-132
3.4-3	Natural Increase and Net Migration Components of Population Change in Garfield County from 1985 to 2013.....	3-132
3.4-4	Annual Population Change in Mesa County from 1985 to 2013	3-133
3.4-5	Natural Increase and Net Migration Components of Population Change in Mesa County from 1985 to 2013.....	3-133
3.4-6	Annual Population Change in Rio Blanco County from 1985 to 2013.....	3-134
3.4-7	Natural Increase and Net Migration Components of Population Change in Rio Blanco County from 1985 to 2013.....	3-134
3.4-8	Number of Private Primary Job Holders Working In and Near the Planning Area by County of Residence, 2002 to 2011	3-136
3.4-9	Percentage of Private Primary Job Holders Working In and Near the Planning Area by County of Residence, 2002 to 2011	3-137
3.4-10	Net Residential Building Permits in Three-County Region, 2003 to 2013.....	3-139

LIST OF FIGURES

<u>Figure</u>	<u>Page</u>
3.4-11	Unemployment Rate by County, 2007-2013 (percent).....3-154
3.4-12	Forecast Unemployment Rate by County, 2010-2040 (percent)3-155
3.4-13	Labor Force Participation Rate by County, 2007-2013 (percent).....3-156
3.4-14	Forecast Labor Participation Rate by County, 2010-2040 (percent)3-156
3.4-15	Forecast Employment by County, 2010-2040 (average annual jobs).....3-160
3.4-16	Index of Oil and Gas Well Drilling Activity ("Spuds," or Drilling Starts) in the Three-County Region from 2004 to 2013.....3-174
3.4-17	Index of Growth of the Active Oil and Gas Wells in Place in the Three-County Region from 2004 to 20133-174
4.2-1	CARMMS 4-kilometer Modeling Domain.....4-55
4.2-2	Planning Area contribution to the 8 th highest 1-hour daily maximum NO ₂ concentration for the 2021 high scenario.....4-69
4.2-3	Planning Area contribution to the annual average NO ₂ concentration for the 2021 high scenario4-69
4.2-4	Planning Area contribution to the 8 th highest 1 hour daily maximum NO ₂ concentration for the 2021 medium scenario.....4-70
4.2-5	Planning Area contribution to the annual average NO ₂ concentration for the 2021 medium scenario4-70
4.2-6	Planning Area contribution to the 8 th highest 1 hour daily maximum NO ₂ concentration for the 2021 low scenario.....4-71
4.2-7	Planning Area contribution to the annual average NO ₂ concentration for the 2021 low scenario4-71
4.2-8	Planning Area contribution to the 8 th highest daily average PM _{2.5} concentration for the 2021 high scenario4-72
4.2-9	Planning Area contribution to the annual average PM _{2.5} concentration for the 2021 high scenario4-72
4.2-10	Planning Area contribution to the 8 th highest daily average PM _{2.5} concentration for the 2021 medium scenario.....4-73
4.2-11	Planning Area contribution to the annual average PM _{2.5} concentration for the 2021 medium scenario4-73
4.2-12	Planning Area contribution to the 8 th highest daily average PM _{2.5} concentration for the 2021 low scenario.....4-74
4.2-13	Planning Area contribution to the annual average PM _{2.5} concentration for the 2021 low scenario4-74
4.2-14	Planning Area contribution to the 4 th highest 8-hour average daily maximum ozone concentration for the 2021 high scenario4-75
4.2-15	Planning Area contribution to the 4 th highest 8-hour average daily maximum ozone concentration for the 2021 medium scenario4-75

LIST OF FIGURES

<u>Figure</u>	<u>Page</u>
4.2-16	Planning Area contribution to the 4 th highest 8-hour average daily maximum ozone concentration for the 2021 low scenario4-76
4.2-17	CARMMS modeled ozone design value differences for the high development scenario4-81
4.2-18	CARMMS modeled ozone design value differences for the medium development scenario4-82
4.2-19	CARMMS modeled ozone design value differences for the low development scenario4-83
4.2-20	CARMMS modeled 2021 ozone design value for the high development scenario4-84
4.2-21	CARMMS modeled 2021 ozone design value for the medium development scenario4-85
4.2-22	CARMMS modeled 2021 ozone design value for the low development scenario4-86
4.2-23	Predicted differences in the 8 th highest daily average PM _{2.5} concentrations (2021 high scenario minus base year 2008 concentrations).....4-91
4.2-24	Predicted differences in annual average PM _{2.5} concentrations (2021 high scenario minus base year 2008 concentrations)4-91
4.2-25	Predicted differences in the 8 th highest daily average PM _{2.5} concentrations (2021 medium scenario minus base year 2008 concentrations).....4-92
4.2-26	Predicted differences in annual average PM _{2.5} concentrations (2021 medium scenario minus base year 2008 concentrations).....4-92
4.2-27	Predicted differences in the 8 th highest daily average PM _{2.5} concentrations (2021 low scenario minus base year 2008 concentrations).....4-93
4.2-28	Predicted differences in annual average PM _{2.5} concentration (2021 low scenario minus base year 2008 concentration).....4-93
4.2-29	Predicted differences in the 8 th highest 1-hour daily maximum NO ₂ concentration (2021 high scenario minus base year 2008 concentration)4-94
4.2-30	Predicted differences in the annual average NO ₂ concentration (2021 high scenario minus base year 2008 concentration)4-94
4.2-31	Predicted differences in the 8 th highest 1-hour daily maximum NO ₂ concentration (2021 medium scenario minus base year 2008 concentration)4-95
4.2-32	Predicted differences in the annual average NO ₂ concentration (2021 medium scenario minus base year 2008 concentration)4-95
4.2-33	Predicted differences in the 8 th highest 1-hour daily maximum NO ₂ concentration (2021 low scenario minus base year 2008 concentration)4-96
4.2-34	Predicted differences in the annual average NO ₂ concentration (2021 low scenario minus base year 2008 concentration)4-96

This page intentionally left blank.

LIST OF ACRONYMS

°F	degrees Fahrenheit
µg/L	micrograms per liter
AADT	Average Annual Daily Traffic
ACEC	Area of Critical Environmental Concern
ACHP	Advisory Council on Historic Preservation
ADH	all designated habitat
AIRFA	American Indian Religious Freedom Act
AMP	Allotment Management Plan or Adaptive Management Plan
AMS	Analysis of the Management Situation
ANI	Analysis of New Information
APD	Application for Permit to Drill
APF	Anvil Points Facility
AQRV	air quality related value
ARPA	Archeological Resources Protection Act
ATV	all-terrain vehicle
AUM	animal unit month
BA	biological assessment
BCC	Birds of Conservation Concern
BCF	billion cubic feet
BEA	U.S. Bureau of Economic Analysis
BLM	Bureau of Land Management
BMPs	best management practices
BO	biological opinion
BTEX	benzene, toluene, ethylbenzene, and xylenes
CAA	Clean Air Act
CARMM	Colorado Air Resources Modeling Management Study
CARMMS	Colorado Air Resource Management Modeling Study
CARPP	Comprehensive Air Resource Protection Protocol
CCD	census county division
CCR	Colorado Code of Regulations
CDNR	Colorado Department of Natural Resources

LIST OF ACRONYMS

CDOT	Colorado Department of Transportation
CDOW	Colorado Division of Wildlife
CDPHE	Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment
CDPHE-APCD	Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment – Air Pollution Control Division
CEQ	Council on Environmental Quality
CERCLA	Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act
CERCLIS	Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act Information System
CFR	Code of Federal Regulations
cfs	cubic feet per second
CGS	Colorado Geological Survey
CGSGSC	Colorado Greater Sage-Grouse Steering Committee
CHD	congenital heart defect
CNHP	Colorado Natural Heritage Program
CO ₂	carbon dioxide
CO ₂ (e)	carbon dioxide equivalent
COA	condition of approval
COGCC	Colorado Oil and Gas Conservation Commission
CPW	Colorado Parks and Wildlife
CR	County Road
CRCT	Colorado River cutthroat trout
CRVFO	Colorado River Valley Field Office
CSU	Controlled Surface Use
CWA	Clean Water Act
CWCB	Colorado Water Conservation Board
CWP	commercial wood product
CWQCC	Colorado Water Quality Control Commission
DAU	data analysis unit
DLG	Division of Local Government
DM	Departmental Manual
DOE	U.S. Department of Energy
DPC	desired plant community
DPS	distinct population segment
DWR	Colorado Division of Water Resources

CHAPTER 3 ■ AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT

DWSPA	Drinking Water Supply Protection Area
<i>E. coli</i>	<i>Escherichia coli</i>
EA	Environmental Assessment
ECR	Ecological Condition Rating
EE/CA	Engineering Evaluation/Cost Analysis
EIS	Environmental Impact Statement
EPA	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
ERD	extended-reach drilling
ERMA	Extensive Recreation Management Area
ESA	Endangered Species Act
ESI	Ecological Site Inventory
FAR	Functioning At Risk
FCRPA	Federal Cave Resources Protection Act
FEIS	Final Environmental Impact Statement
FLPMA	Federal Land Policy and Management Act
FMP	Fire Management Plan
FMZ	Fire Management Zone
FONSI	Finding of No Significant Impact
FOOGLRA	Federal Onshore Oil and Gas Leasing Reform Act
FSEIS	Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement
GAP	Geographic Area Proposal
GHG	greenhouse gas
GHMA	General Habitat Management Area
GIS	Geographic Information System
GMU	Game Management Unit
GPT	gallons per ton
GSFO	Glenwood Springs Field Office
GSRA	Glenwood Springs Resource Area
HQ	hazard quotient
I-	Interstate
I&E	Inspection and Enforcement
IB	Information Bulletin
IR	Integrated Report
LN	Lease Notice

LIST OF ACRONYMS

LUPA	Land Use Plan Amendment
MBF	million board-feet
MBO	thousand barrels of oil
MBTA	Migratory Bird Treaty Act
MCF	thousand cubic feet
MCL	maximum contaminant level
MDP	Master Development Plan
mg/L	milligrams per liter
Micro	Micropolitan Statistical Area
mL	milliliters
MOA	Memorandum of Agreement
MOU	Memorandum of Understanding
MRL	method reporting limit
MSA	Metropolitan Statistical Area
MSL	mean sea level
NAGPRA	Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act
NASA	National Aeronautics and Space Administration
NCGSG DRMP/EIS	Northwest Colorado Greater Sage-Grouse Draft Resource Management Plan /Environmental Impact Statement
NCP	National Contingency Plan
NDIS	Natural Diversity Information Source
NDVI	Normalized Difference Vegetation Index
NED	National Elevation Dataset
NEPA	National Environmental Policy Act
NF	Non-Functional
NGD	No Ground Disturbance
NHPA	National Historic Preservation Act
NOA	Notice of Availability
NOI	Notice of Intent
NOSR	Naval Oil Shale Reserve
NOT	Not Meeting Standards
NRCS	Natural Resource Conservation Service
NREL	National Renewable Energy Laboratory
NRHP	National Register of Historic Places
NSO	No Surface Occupancy

CHAPTER 3 ■ AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT

NTD	neural tube defect
NWSRS	National Wild and Scenic Rivers System
OHV	off-highway vehicle
OMP	operational management plan
ORV	outstandingly remarkable value
OSTS	Oil Shale and Tar Sands
OW	Outstanding Waters
PA	participating area OR Programmatic Agreement
PAH	polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbon
PBA	Programmatic Biological Assessment
PBO	Programmatic Biological Opinion
PEIS	Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement
PFC	Proper Functioning Condition
PFYC	Potential Fossil Yield Classification
PHMA	Priority Habitat Management Area
PHMSA	Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration
PILT	Payments in Lieu of (Property) Taxes
Planning Area	Roan Plateau Planning Area
PNC	Potential Natural Community
ppm	parts per million
PRPA	Paleontological Resources Preservation Act
R&PPA	Recreation and Public Purposes Act
RCRA	Resource Conservation and Recovery Act
RCRIS	Resource Conservation and Recovery Act Information System
RFD	Reasonable Foreseeable Development
RMA	Recreation Management Area
RMP	Resource Management Plan
RMPA	Resource Management Plan Amendment
ROD	Record of Decision
ROS	Recreation Opportunity Spectrum
ROW	right-of-way
SDO	State Demography Office
SDWA	Safe Drinking Water Act
SEIS	Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement
SEZ	solar energy zone

LIST OF ACRONYMS

SH	State Highway
SHPO	State Historic Preservation Office
SI	Site Inspection
SPCC	Spill Prevention, Control, and Countermeasures
SRMA	Special Recreation Management Area
SRS	Secure Rural Schools and Community Self Determination Act
SSC	species of special concern
SSR	Site-Specific Relocation
SUPO	Surface Use Plan of Operations
SVIM	Soil and Vegetation Inventory Method
SWPCRP	Source Water Protection for the Colorado River Partnership
T&E	threatened and endangered
TCF	trillion cubic feet
TDS	total dissolved solids
TL	Timing Limitation
TMA	Travel Management Area
TMDL	total maximum daily load
U.S.C.	United States Code
USDA	U.S. Department of Agriculture
USDI	U.S. Department of the Interior
USDOT	U.S. Department of Transportation
USFS	U.S. Forest Service
USFWS	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
USGS	U.S. Geological Survey
VOC	volatile organic compound
VRI	Visual Resource Inventory
VRM	visual resource management
WMA	Watershed Management Area
WQCC	Water Quality Control Commission
WQS	water quality standards
WRFO	White River Field Office
WRRRA	White River Resource Area
WSA	Wilderness Study Area
WSR	Wild and Scenic River
WSRA	Wild and Scenic Rivers Act

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The U.S. Department of the Interior (DOI), Bureau of Land Management's (BLM) Colorado River Valley Field Office (CRVFO) is supplementing the 2006 Roan Plateau Planning Area Resource Management Plan Amendment (RMPA) and Final Environmental Impact Statement (Roan FEIS). This new planning effort and supporting environmental analysis addresses information and alternatives analyzed in the BLM's earlier environmental analysis in the FEIS, supplemented with additional analyses in response to issues identified by the U.S. District Court for the District of Colorado (Judicial Order) and through internal and external scoping for this supplemental EIS (SEIS). Major issues raised by the Judicial Order, agencies and the public include specific alternatives, air resources and air quality, management for greater sage-grouse, Wild and Scenic River eligibility, oil and gas leasing and development, socioeconomics, management of lands with wilderness characteristics, ecological resources, water resources, and riparian habitat and wetlands.

This Draft Roan Plateau RMPA and Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS) presents options for management of Bureau of Land Management (BLM) administered lands in the Roan Plateau Planning Area (Planning Area), primarily in the Colorado River Valley Field Office, with a far smaller portion in the White River Field Office. The Planning Area comprises approximately 73,800 acres of Federal land, including 56,540 acres of the former Naval Oil Shale Reserves (NOSRs) Numbers 1 and 3.

The Planning Area lies north of Interstate 70 between the towns of Rifle and Parachute and consists of three visually, geologically, and ecologically distinct areas: (1) xeric (dry) semi-desert habitats at lower elevations, (2) relatively mesic (moist) montane and subalpine habitats at higher elevations, and (3) a band of high and mostly unbroken cliffs separating these areas. Lands within the Planning Area drain westward to Parachute Creek, eastward to Government Creek, or southward to the Colorado River. Parachute Creek and Government Creek are both tributaries of the Colorado River.

Plan Foundation

The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998, Public Law 105-85 (Transfer Act) transferred jurisdiction for lands within NOSRs 1 and 3 from the U.S. Department of Energy to BLM. Since that time, the NOSRs have not been the subject of a coordinated planning process and are currently managed by direction provided by the 1984 Resource Management Plan (RMP) for the Glenwood Springs Resource Area (GSRA), revised in 1988 and amended in 1991, 1996, 1997, 1999, and 2002 and the 1997 White River Resource Area (WRRRA) RMP. The 1999 GSRA RMPA for Oil and Gas Leasing and Development allowed for the leasing of much of the former NOSR 3, including lands that already contained oil and gas production and facilities.

The development of the RMPA for the Planning Area began with a Notice of Intent (NOI) and public scoping in 2000. The Draft RMPA/EIS was published in November 2004 (BLM 2004). The Final RMPA/EIS (Roan FEIS) was published in August 2006 (BLM 2006). The BLM then issued two Records of Decision (RODs), the first in June 2007 (BLM 2007a) which include decisions for the majority of resources and the second, pertaining to Areas of Critical Environmental Concern (ACECs) only, in March 2008 (BLM 2008a).

The 2006 RMPA/FEIS analyzed options for implementing the Transfer Act, which directed BLM to enter into leases, as soon as practicable, with one or more private entities for the purpose of exploration, development and production of petroleum. In addition, the Transfer Act stipulated that the transferred lands be managed in accordance with the Federal Land Policy and Management Act (FLPMA) and other

Executive Summary

laws applicable to public lands. FLPMA requires the preparation of land use plans for public lands. The RMPA established management prescriptions, resource objectives, and land use allocations for the Roan Plateau Planning Area.

A lawsuit was filed in July 2008 that challenged the BLM's oil and gas leasing and management decisions for the Roan Plateau. On June 22, 2012, the Colorado District Court issued a decision, (*Colorado Environmental Coalition v. Salazar*, 875 F. Supp. 2d 1233 (D. Colo. 2012), hereinafter called the Judicial Order), that upheld BLM's interpretation of Public Law 105.85: Department of Defense Authorization Act of 1998, the Transfer Act and its consideration of a No Leasing Alternative. However, the Judicial Order set aside the RODs, including provisions for issuing leases for oil and gas fluid minerals, and remanded the matter to the BLM for further action to address specific noted issues. Therefore, no RMP currently exists for the Planning Area.

In view of the Court's ruling, the BLM determined that a supplemental analysis under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and a new proposed RMPA were warranted. This document represents the development of a Draft RMPA/SEIS for the Planning Area. Because the goal of this process is to supplement the Roan FEIS, much of this Draft RMPA/SEIS integrates the language and analyses of the original RMPA/EIS process. This Draft RMPA/SEIS is updated to reflect supplemental analyses required by the Judicial Order, any new significant resource information, and revised maps and tables.

In view of the Court's ruling, the BLM determined that a supplemental analysis under NEPA and a new proposed RMPA were warranted. This document represents the development of a Draft RMPA/SEIS for the Planning Area. Because the goal of this process is to supplement the Roan FEIS, much of this Draft RMPA/SEIS integrates the language and analyses of the original RMPA/EIS process. This Draft RMPA/SEIS is updated to reflect supplemental analyses required by the Judicial Order, any new significant resource information, and revised maps and tables.

In 2014, during litigation subsequent to the Judicial Order, the BLM and other parties entered a Settlement Agreement ("*Conservation Colo. Ed. Fund. v. Jewell*, Nos. 12-1322, -1339" [10th Cir. Nov. 19, 2014]), available at: http://www.blm.gov/style/medialib/blm/co/information/newsroom/2014/roan_settlement_agreement.Par.45345.File.dat/Roan%20Settlement%20Agreement.SIGNED.pdf.

In the Settlement Agreement, BLM agreed to consider an alternative that included closing certain lands on top of the plateau to new oil and gas leasing while keeping other lands in the planning area open for leasing, exploration and development subject to certain conditions.

This Draft RMPA/SEIS was developed with input from the following Cooperating Agencies: U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service; Environmental Protection Agency; State of Colorado Department of Natural Resources, Colorado Parks and Wildlife; Garfield County, Colorado; Rio Blanco County, Colorado; Mesa County, Colorado; Town of Parachute, Colorado; and the City of Rifle, Colorado.

Purpose and Need

The purpose of amending the existing RMPs for the Roan Plateau Planning Area is to provide an integrated land use plan that guides future site-specific analysis and decisions in accordance with specific goals and objectives based on the direction provided by numerous laws, mandates, policies, and plans. The complete purpose and need for this RMPA/SEIS is described fully in Chapter 1, Purpose and Need.

The need for the SEIS was established by the Judicial Order, which set aside the Roan Plateau Planning Area RMPA and remanded the matter to the BLM to more fully address three issues:

Executive Summary

1. The “Community Alternative” that various local governments, environmental organizations, and individual members of the public recommended;
1. The cumulative air quality impacts of the RMPA decision in conjunction with anticipated oil and gas development on private lands outside the Planning Area; and
2. Potential ozone impacts from proposed oil and gas development.

This SEIS addresses the information and alternatives analyzed in the Roan Plateau Planning Area FEIS, supplemented with additional analyses in response to the Judicial Order and new issues raised in the scoping process for this supplemental EIS. In addition, BLM’s NEPA Handbook H-1790-1 directs addressing significant new circumstances or information relevant to environmental concerns and bearing on the proposed action or its effects. These new circumstances and information are integrated into this Draft RMPA/SEIS, including the following:

- Significant new data;
- Changed resource conditions;
- Changed regulatory status (e.g., threatened and endangered [T&E] species status) or other new regulations; and
- Changes in use of public land that occurred since the Roan FEIS and other associated management/activity plans were completed.

Management Alternatives

Management alternatives and associated environmental impacts in this document are analyzed as part of the requirements for an SEIS pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). The four alternatives represent possible amendments to the current management of the Planning Area.

The alternatives described and analyzed in this document represent possible management scenarios. They reflect a reasonable range of potential future land use and resource management scenarios based on information received as part of the public scoping process. Scoping input was received from BLM staff, other resource or land management agencies, local governments, individual citizens, environmental groups, industry, and other interested parties.

These alternatives may be refined as part of this RMPA/SEIS process. The final RMPA may include components from all of the alternatives. The following summarize each alternative. The four alternatives are described fully in Chapter 2, Alternatives.

- **Alternative I** is the No Action Alternative. Because this document supplements the RMPA/FEIS, the No Action Alternative presented here represents management of the Planning Area prior to the 2007/2008 Records of Decision (RODs) for the Roan Plateau RMPA/FEIS. Therefore, this is essentially the same No Action Alternative that was analyzed in the Roan Plateau Planning Area FEIS.

In general, current uses and trends would continue. The exceptions are resources for which BLM initiated implementation of the 2007 ROD before the Judicial Order was issued. For those resources, the No Action Alternative would require BLM to take certain actions to return to previous conditions. For example, that travel management of NOSRs 1 and 3 (viz., restricting motorized and mechanized

Executive Summary

travel to designated routes) would be vacated, and the entire Planning Area would be open to cross-country off-highway vehicle (OHV) use.

In Alternative I, 24,980 acres of the Planning Area would remain unavailable (closed) for further oil and gas leasing and development during the anticipated 20-year life of this RMPA. Therefore, the BLM likely would cancel oil and gas leases issued in 2008 for lands within the Planning Area to return to previous conditions.

Management actions and restrictions on surface use described in the 1999 Final Supplemental EIS (FSEIS) would continue to be applied. These include 14,090 acres with No Ground Disturbance/No Surface Occupancy (NGD/NSO) and 21,580 acres of Site-Specific Relocation/Controlled Surface Use (SSR/CSU) restrictions that would be applied to avoid, minimize, or mitigate impacts to sensitive resources. Timing Limitation (TL) restrictions on 21,440 acres limit seasonal activity in areas of deer and elk winter range, raptor and waterfowl habitat.

Under Alternative I no Areas of Environmental Concern (ACEC) or Watershed Management Areas would be designated. Areas would be managed to preserve Wild and Scenic River eligibility until a suitability determination would be made.

- **Alternative II** was the Roan FEIS Proposed Plan Alternative. Alternative II presents management for a full array of multiple-use activities as under the 2006 FEIS Proposed Plan. The overarching goal of Alternative II is to protect key ecological, visual, and recreational values while allowing for the leasing and subsequent development of oil and gas resources under strict and performance-based standards. No BLM surface would be closed to oil and gas leasing. Leasing decisions would allow for future phased and clustered oil and gas development under a unitization scenario with limits on unreclaimed surface disturbance.

Alternative II includes 45,790 acres with NGD/NSO and 68,900 acres of SSR/CSU restrictions that would be applied to avoid, minimize, or mitigate impacts to sensitive resources. TLs on 62,090 acres would seasonally limit activity in areas of deer and elk winter range, raptor and waterfowl habitat, greater sage-grouse habitats, migratory bird nesting areas, and elk production area.

Air quality would be managed within the scope of BLM's authority, and would ensure that air quality and air quality-related values are adequately protected by analyzing the effects of activities or resource uses authorized by the BLM and cumulative actions. Air resources would be protected in accordance with the methodology and provisions outlined in the BLM Comprehensive Air Resource Protection Protocol (CARPP).

Four ACECs (24,890 acres) would be designated and managed for important resources under Alternative II. The Parachute Creek Watershed Management Area would also be designated. All rivers eligible for management under the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act would be determined not suitable for designation and released from interim management protections.

- **Alternative III**, the Community Alternative, was constructed from public comments on the Draft RMPA/EIS in 2005, as well as public scoping comments for the RMPA/SEIS in 2013. Where public comments suggesting the Community Alternative and scoping were silent as to specific resource management, these management actions are the same as Alternative II. In accordance with public comment, no BLM surface in the Planning Area would be closed to oil and gas leasing, but surface disturbance on BLM lands above the rim would be limited.

Executive Summary

Alternative III includes 62,590 acres with NGD/NSO restrictions; including the entire BLM surface area above the rim, and 70,140 acres of SSR/CSU restrictions that would be applied to avoid, minimize, or mitigate impacts to sensitive resources. TL restrictions on 62,090 acres would seasonally limit activity in areas of deer and elk winter range, raptor and waterfowl habitat, greater sage-grouse habitats, migratory bird nesting areas, and elk production area.

As under Alternative II, air quality would be managed within the scope of BLM's authority, and would ensure that air quality and air quality-related values are adequately protected by analyzing the effects of activities or resource uses authorized by the BLM and cumulative actions. Air resources would be protected in accordance with the methodology and provisions outlined in the BLM Comprehensive Air Resource Protection Protocol (CARPP).

Four ACECs (24,890 acres) would be designated and managed for important resources under Alternative III. All eligible rivers in the Planning Area would be determined to be suitable for designation as Wild and Scenic Rivers. Restrictions on the discharge of firearms for recreational target shooting to protect visitor safety would comprise 610 acres.

- **Alternative IV** is the Settlement Alternative as well as BLM's Preferred Alternative. The basis of Alternative IV is to incorporate the terms of the Settlement Agreement for the Planning Area. Approximately 1,990 acres above the plateau rim and 28,470 acres below the rim would be open to oil and gas leasing and development (32,000 acres). Approximately 34,780 acres of BLM surface would be closed to oil and gas leasing. Leases on lands above the rim that would be made available to oil and gas leasing and development would be subject to the same stipulations as leases issued (per the remanded Record of Decision [ROD] and RMPA) in 2008, as modified by the terms and conditions detailed in the Settlement Agreement. These include specific limits as to the number of well pads to be allowed, maximum surface disturbance per well pad, timing/phasing of well pad construction, allowable access roads, collocation of associated infrastructure, and development of a Master Development Plan. On lands below the rim that would be made available to oil and gas leasing and development, leases would be subject to the same stipulations as leases issued (per the remanded ROD and RMPA) in 2008, as modified by the terms and conditions detailed in the Settlement Agreement.

Alternative IV includes 21,720 acres with NGD/NSO (no ground disturbance/No Surface Occupancy) and 36,990 acres of SSR/CSU (site-specific relocation/Controlled Surface Use) restrictions that would be applied to avoid, minimize, or mitigate impacts to sensitive resources. TL stipulations on 32,150 acres would seasonally limit activity in areas of deer and elk winter range, raptor and waterfowl habitat, greater sage-grouse habitats, migratory bird nesting areas, and elk production area.

As under Alternatives II and III, air quality would be managed within the scope of BLM's authority, and would ensure that air quality and air quality-related values are adequately protected by analyzing the effects of activities or resource uses authorized by the BLM and cumulative actions. Air resources would be protected in accordance with the methodology and provisions outlined in the BLM Comprehensive Air Resource Protection Protocol (CARPP).

Four ACECs (25,010 acres) would be designated and managed for important resources under Alternative III. The Parachute Creek Watershed Management Area would also be designated. Eligible rivers in the Planning Area would be determined to be not suitable for designation as Wild and Scenic Rivers.

Maps 1 through 35 (Appendix A) depict the resources and conditions within the Planning Area (fully described in Chapter 3, Affected Environment), as well as resource management, including the

Executive Summary

relative area of land available for oil and gas leasing and subject to different levels of surface-use restrictions, under Alternatives I through IV.

Table ES-1 summarizes the types and extent of land-use restrictions, stipulations, and protective designations incorporated into each of the four alternatives.

Table ES-2 summarizes anticipated levels of oil and gas leasing and development for the four alternatives, based on the types and extents of lease stipulations and other surface use restrictions and assumptions used in BLM's Reasonable Foreseeable Development (RFD).

Environmental Consequences

Impacts of land use and resource management actions on the physical, biological, human, and management environments of the Planning Area for each of the four alternatives is discussed in detail in Chapter 4. The analysis of environmental consequences for an RMPA includes the impacts of specific alternative management scenarios for every resource or resource use; both on that specific resource or resource use, as well as on all other resources and resource uses. These impacts are categorized as direct and indirect onsite impacts, offsite, and cumulative impacts. Some types of impacts for resources or resource uses could be confined to BLM lands (such as specific disturbances to vegetation from rangeland improvement projects). Some actions may have offsite/indirect impacts on resources on Federal mineral estate (such as oil and gas, and requirements to protect such resources as special status species and cultural resources from such activity), or other land jurisdictions (e.g., private or State holdings).

In order for comparison with the Roan FEIS being supplemented, this impact analysis integrates a qualitative approach for summarizing impacts to specific resources and resource uses. Each category of potential impacts range in degrees of beneficial to adverse. These categories (negligible, minor, moderate, and major), applied to both beneficial and adverse impacts, allow for a relative comparison of impacts for each resource or resource use, by alternative. It is not possible to provide a single, meaningful summary of all the categorical impacts for a given resource or resource use, for each alternative. Therefore, Table ES-3 presents a comparison of general impact levels from management of specific resources under the four alternatives, as a range for each resource or resource use; from the most beneficial to the most adverse, under each alternative.

The impacts summarized in Table ES-3 incorporate positive effects of proposed special designations, management actions, mitigation measures, and best management practices to reduce or partially offset negative impacts, as integrated into each alternative. Under none of the alternatives would land uses, resource development activities, or management actions be allowed to violate Federal or State laws or exceed applicable Federal or State standards.

Executive Summary

Table ES-1 Limitations and Resource/Management Designations Used in Impact Analysis

<i>Limitation/Designation</i>	<i>Alternative</i>			
	<i>I</i>	<i>II</i>	<i>III</i>	<i>IV</i>
Areas with Surface Stipulations or Other Restrictions, Limitations, or Special Requirements¹				
No Lease for Oil and Gas ¹	44,180 ac	0 ac	0 ac	34,780 ac
Deferred Lease for Oil and Gas	0 ac	0 ac	0 ac	0 ac
No Ground Disturbance, No Surface Occupancy (NGD/NSO)	14,090ac	45,790 ac	62,590 ac	21,720 ac
Site-Specific Relocation, Controlled Surface Use (SSR/CSU)	21,580 ac	68,800 ac	70,140 ac	36,990 ac
Timing Limitation (TL) for Big Game Winter Range ²	20,230 ac (5 months)	38,430 ac (5 months)	38,430 ac (5 months)	31,410 ac (2 months)
Timing Limitations (TLs) for Raptor, Shorebird, and Waterfowl Nesting ²	640 ac	4,150 ac	4,250 ac	2,900 ac
Standard Restrictions, Limitations, and Oil and Gas Stipulations	7,570 ac	4,480 ac	3,080 ac	3,050 ac
Areas with Protective Designations or Management Actions¹				
Designated Areas of Critical Environmental Concern	0 ac	24,890 ac	24,890 ac	25,010 ac
Lands Managed to Protect Wilderness Characteristics	0 ac	0 ac	19,320 ac	0 ac
Streams Suitable for Management Under the Wild and Scenic River Act	0 ac	0 ac	7,750 ac	0 ac
Watershed Management Area	0 ac	33,010 ac	0 ac	4,450 ac
Routes				
Open to Motorized or Mechanized Travel	191 miles	191 miles	191 miles	191 miles
Closed to Motorized or Mechanized Travel	78 miles	24 miles	24miles	24 miles
Administrative Only	NA	54 miles	54 miles	54 miles
Visual Resource Management				
VRM Class I	0 ac	1,620 ac	1,620 ac	1,620 ac
VRM Class II	24,040 ac	30,400 ac	30,400 ac	30,400 ac
VRM Class III	37,120 ac	33,510 ac	33,510 ac	33,510 ac
VRM Class IV	10,340 ac	8,280 ac	8,280 ac	8,280 ac

¹ Includes overlap between stipulations and protective designations on which they are based. See text for definitions of NGD, NSO, SSR, CSU, TL, and COA. TLs include overlap with other stipulations, including no-lease area for oil and gas under Alternative I.

² Winter range TL applied as a lease stipulation under Alternatives I through II and a Condition of Approval under Alternative IV; raptor TL also includes bald eagle winter roosts.

Executive Summary

Table ES-2 Anticipated Oil and Gas Development on BLM Lands During 20-Year Period

<i>Component</i>	<i>Alternative</i>			
	<i>I</i>	<i>II</i>	<i>III</i>	<i>IV</i>
Area Available for Pads, Other Surface Facilities, and Roads ¹	13,210 ac	24,800 ac	9,070 ac	13,000 ac
Pads (Wells) atop the Plateau ^{2,3}	2 (43)	53 (1,067)	2 (40)	7 (149)
Pads (Wells) below the Cliffs ³	78 (1,567)	122 (2,445)	109 (2,190)	116 (2,326)
Total Pads (Wells) ³	80 (1,610)	175 (3,511)	111 (2,231)	123 (2,475)
Long-term Ground Disturbance for Pads and Associated Facilities ⁴	201 ac	439 ac	279 ac	309 ac
Length and Area of New or Widened Access Roads ⁴	36 miles (97 ac)	78 miles (211 ac)	49 miles (134 ac)	55 miles (148 ac)
Total Long-term Ground Disturbance	298 ac	650 ac	413 ac	456 ac
Total Gas Produced by New Wells on BLM Lands ³	2,111 BCF	4,618 BCF	1,919 BCF	3,246 BCF

¹ Leasable area minus areas with NSO stipulations.

² Pad impacts as follows: 2.5 acres for multi-well pads. Road impacts as follows: 0.4 mile of new or widened road per pad.

³ Natural gas produced over operational life of wells drilled on BLM lands in Planning Area during 20-year period of analysis. Based on RFD. Assumes 1.32 BCF per well.

Executive Summary

Table ES-3 Potential Adverse Impacts to Resources¹

Resource	Alternative			
	I	II	III	IV
Geological Resources	Moderate (+) to Negligible	Moderate (+) to Negligible	Moderate (+) to Negligible	Moderate (+) to Negligible
	Minor (-)	Minor (-)	Minor (-)	Minor (-)
Paleontological Resources	Minor (+) to Negligible	Moderate (+)	Moderate (+)	Moderate (+)
	Moderate (-)	Negligible (-)	Negligible (-)	Negligible (-)
Soil Resources	Minor (+)	Moderate to Major (+)	Moderate to Major (+)	Moderate to Major (+)
	Localized Minor to Moderate (-)	Negligible (-)	Negligible (-)	Negligible (-)
Water Resources	None	Minor to Moderate (+)	Minor to Moderate (+)	Minor to Moderate (+)
	Minor to Moderate (-)	Negligible (-)	Negligible (-)	Negligible (-)
Upland Vegetation and Riparian/Wetland Areas	Minor (+)	Moderate (+)	Moderate (+)	Moderate (+)
	Localized major (-)	Localized moderate (-)	Localized moderate (-)	Localized moderate (-)
Terrestrial and Aquatic Wildlife	Minor (+)	Moderate to Major (+)	Moderate to Major (+)	Moderate to Major (+)
	Minor to Moderate (-)	Moderate (-)	Minor (-)	Moderate (-)
Special Status Species Plants and Significant Plant Communities	Moderate (+)	Minor to Moderate (+)	Minor to Moderate (+)	Minor to Moderate (+)
	Moderate to Major (-)	Negligible to Minor (-)	Negligible (-)	Negligible (-)
Special Status Fish and Wildlife Species	Minor (+)	Moderate to Major (+)	Moderate to Major (+)	Moderate to Major (+)
	Negligible to Moderate (-), except localized Major (-) for CRCT	Negligible to Minor (-)	Negligible to Minor (-)	Negligible to Minor (-)
Visual Resources	Negligible (+)	Minor (+)	Major (+)	Minor (+)
	Minor (-)	Moderate (-)	Minor (-)	Moderate (-)
Cultural Resources	Negligible (+)	Localized moderate (+)	Localized moderate (+)	Localized moderate (+)
	Localized major (-)	Negligible (-)	Negligible (-)	Negligible (-)
Socioeconomics	Negligible	Negligible	Negligible	Negligible
	Negligible	Minor (-)	Negligible	Minor(-)
Transportation	Negligible (-)	Minor (-)	Minor (-)	Minor (-)
	Moderate (-)	Moderate (-)	Negligible (-) above the rim; Moderate (-) below the rim	Negligible (-) above the rim; Moderate (-) below the rim
Lands and Realty	none	none	none	none
Travel Management	None	None to negligible (+)	None to negligible (+)	None to negligible (+)
	Moderate to Major (-)	Minor to Moderate (-) in PHMA	Minor to Moderate (-) in PHMA and below the rim	Minor to Moderate (-) in PHMA and below the rim
Recreation	None	Negligible (-)	Minor (+)	Minor (+)
	Localized Minor (-)	Minor (-)	Negligible (-)	Negligible (-)

Executive Summary

Table ES-3 Potential Adverse Impacts to Resources¹

Resource	Alternative			
	I	II	III	IV
Grazing and Rangeland Management	<i>Resources: Negligible (-) to Minor (+) Minor: Permittees: None</i>	<i>Resources: Minor to Moderate (+) Permittees: None</i>	<i>Resources: Minor to Moderate (+) Permittees: Negligible to Minor (-)</i>	<i>Resources: Minor to Moderate (+) Permittees: Negligible to Minor (-)</i>
	<i>Resources: Minor (-) Permittees: Negligible to Minor (-)</i>	<i>Permittees: Minor (-) Resources: Negligible to Minor (-)</i>	<i>Permittees: Minor (-) Resources: Negligible to Minor (-)</i>	<i>Permittees: Minor (-) Resources: Negligible to Minor (-)</i>
Oil and Gas Leasing and Development	Moderate (-)	Negligible (-)	Negligible (-)	Negligible (-)
	Major (-)	Major (-)	Major (-)	Major (-)
Other Minerals	None	None	None	None
Areas of Critical Environmental Concern	Negligible to minor (+)	Minor to Moderate (+)	Minor to Moderate (+)	Minor to Moderate (+)
	Minor to Moderate (-)	Minor to Moderate (-)	Negligible (-)	Negligible to Minor (-)
Lands with Wilderness Characteristics	Minor (+)	Minor (+)	Minor (+)	Minor (+)
	Major (-)	Minor to Moderate (-)	Minor to Moderate (-)	Minor to Moderate (-)
Streams Eligible for Designation Under the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act	Moderate (+)	Moderate (+)	Moderate (+)	Moderate (+)
	Moderate (-)	Moderate (-)	Negligible to Moderate (-)	None to Minor (-)
Forest Products	NA	NA	NA	NA
Fire Management	Negligible (+)	Negligible (-)	Negligible (-)	Negligible (-)
	Negligible (-)	Negligible to Minor (-)	Minor (-)	Minor (-)
Public Health and Safety	Negligible (-)	Negligible to Minor (-)	Negligible to Minor (-)	Negligible to Minor (-)
	Minor to Moderate (-)	Minor to Moderate (-)	Minor to Moderate (-)	Minor to Moderate (-)
Renewable Energy	NA	NA	NA	NA

Note:

¹ Impacts presented as a summarized range for each resource. Limited to impacts on BLM lands during 20-year period of analysis. Overall impact level after combining adverse (-) and beneficial (+) effects of land uses and management actions and after incorporating BMPs. Assumes implementation of specified or legally required mitigation measures. Potential impacts to Climate and Air Quality not included, as not estimated with impact categories.

Key:

NA = not applicable