

Table 2-2 Summary Comparison of Alternatives

Table of Contents

Resources

Air Resources	69
Climate	69
Soil Resources	69
Water Resources	73
Vegetative Communities – Rangeland, Riparian, Forest and Woodlands	76
Noxious Weeds and Other Invasive Non-Native Species (Plant and Animal)	79
Invasive Plants	80
Invasive Terrestrial Animals and Insect Species	81
Invasive Aquatic Species	82
Wildlife	83
Special Status Species	90
Raptors	92
Greater Sage-Grouse	94
General Habitat	94
Protection Priority Areas	97
Grassland and Migratory Birds	101
Other Special Status Wildlife Species	102
Plants	103
Fish and Aquatics	104
Cultural Resources	105
Paleontological Resources	108
Visual Resources	110
Fire Management and Ecology	113

Resource Uses

Forest and Woodland Products	116
Livestock Grazing	119
Recreation	129
Travel Management and Transportation.....	135
Lands and Realty	139
Minerals	147
Oil and Gas	149
Other Minerals	152
Renewable Energy Resources	155
Special Designations	158
Fort Meade Recreation Area ACEC	160
Fossil Cycad ACEC	171
Greater Sage-Grouse Protection Priority Areas ACEC	172
Social and Economic	174
Public Safety	174

Table 2-2 Summary Comparison of Alternatives				
<i>Management Action</i>	<i>Alternative A (No Action)</i>	<i>Alternative B</i>	<i>Alternative C</i>	<i>Alternative D (Preferred Alternative)</i>
Natural, Biological and Cultural Resources				
Program: Air Resources				
<p>Goal 1: Ensure BLM authorizations and management activities protect the local quality of life and sustain economic benefits by complying with tribal, local, county, state, and federal air quality regulations, requirements, and implementation plans.</p> <p>Goal 2: Meet federal and state air quality standards.</p> <p>Management Common to All Alternatives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All resource uses would meet the Rangeland Health Standards for air quality • Management would minimize or prevent air quality degradation throughout the planning area by adapting current Best Management Practices and developing and applying mitigation measures, when necessary. • Coordinate with regulatory agencies to meet air quality standards. 				
Program: Climate				
<p>Goal 1: Evaluate the observed and anticipated long-term dynamic of climate change and minimize the impact of greenhouse gases from projects to the degree practicable and reasonably foreseeable.</p> <p>Goal 2: Provide for diverse, healthy ecosystems that are resilient to stresses such as climate change.</p> <p>Goal 3: Provide for flexible, adaptable management that allows for timely responses to changing climatic conditions.</p> <p>Goal 4: Maintain or improve the ability of BLM lands to reduce (sequester) atmospheric greenhouse gases.</p> <p>Management Actions Common to all Alternatives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BLM authorized actions would consider methods to decrease Greenhouse Gas (GHG) emissions. • Priority would be placed on actions that reduce or mitigate GHG emissions by actions such as: enhanced energy efficiency, use of lower GHG-emitting technologies, or renewable energy, planning for carbon capture and sequestration, and the capture or beneficial use of fugitive methane emissions. • Promote vegetative capture and storage of carbon, with consideration for resource objectives, by implementing Rangeland Health Standards and Guidelines and soil, monitoring, and vegetation BMPs at the project planning and implementation level (Appendix B). • Adjust the timing of BLM authorized activities as needed, to accommodate long-term changes in seasonal weather patterns while considering the impacts of adjustments to other resources and resource uses. 				
Program: Soil Resources				
<p>Goal 1: Manage uses to minimize soil erosion, sedimentation to water sources, and compaction; and to maintain surface soil water infiltration based on site-specific conditions.</p> <p>Goal 2: Maintain, improve, or restore soil health and productivity while supporting multiple use management.</p>				

**Table 2-2
Summary Comparison of Alternatives**

<i>Management Action</i>	<i>Alternative A (No Action)</i>	<i>Alternative B</i>	<i>Alternative C</i>	<i>Alternative D (Preferred Alternative)</i>
<p>Goal 3: Soils are stable and provide for capture, storage, and release of water, appropriate to soil type, climate, and land form.</p> <p>Goal 4: Soils are productive and support vegetation that provides forage, wildlife habitat, watershed protection, and esthetic characteristic based on soil type.</p> <p>Management Common to All Alternatives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Best management practices (BMPs) would be implemented at a site-specific project level to maintain or improve soil resources (Appendix B). • BLM would reclaim/reseed disturbed areas as needed to maintain or improve soil health and stability. • Rangeland Health Standards would be implemented to maintain and conserve soil resources and productivity. • Authorizations would be denied in areas where erosion could not be effectively controlled/mitigated; and reclamation to BLM program-specific standards would likely be unsuccessful. • The following guidelines would be adopted: South Dakota Field Office Reclamation Guidelines – Appendix D, South Dakota Field Office Soil Monitoring Guidelines – Appendix N, and South Dakota Field Office Mitigation Guidelines – Appendix C. • Mitigation of surface-disturbing or disruptive activities would be applied where needed to minimize impacts of human activities in sensitive soils (soils with low restoration potential/low fugitive dust resistance) and areas with steep slopes consistent with the stipulations outlined in this section. <p>Mitigation measures would be applied on a case-by-case basis during activity level planning if review of the project area indicates that sensitive soils and steep slopes are present or would be affected consistent with the management actions and restrictions found in this section and the Guidelines and BMPs listed in Appendix B. Exceptions to restriction requirements may be granted by the authorized officer if an environmental review demonstrates that effects could be mitigated to an acceptable level. Exceptions may also be granted where the short-term effects are mitigated by the long-term benefits (e.g., riparian restoration projects, prescribed fire, or vegetation treatments).</p>				
1	<p>Slopes over 30 percent would be managed as a Controlled Surface Use stipulation for oil and gas activities. Prior to surface disturbance on slopes over 30%, an engineering and reclamation plan must be approved by the authorized officer. The plan must demonstrate how the following will be accomplished:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • site productivity restored; • surface runoff adequately controlled; • off-site areas protected from accelerated erosion, such as 	<p>Controlled Surface Use. Surface use and occupancy would be controlled on slopes exceeding 25%. Prior to surface disturbance on slopes 25 percent or greater, an engineering and reclamation plan must be approved by the AO. The plan must demonstrate that no other practicable alternatives exist and how the following will be accomplished: (1) site productivity maintained or restored, (2) surface runoff and sedimentation adequately controlled, (3) on- and off-site areas protected from</p>	<p>Slopes over 25 percent would be managed as No Surface Occupancy and Use stipulation for oil and gas leasing. Applicable Waivers, Exceptions, and Modifications are described in Appendix E.3.</p> <p>Vegetation treatments and livestock grazing would be allowed in these areas provided that the goals for this resource are not compromised.</p>	<p>Same as Alternative B for slopes between 25-50%.</p> <p>Slopes over 50% would be managed as No Surface Occupancy and Use stipulation for oil and gas leasing. Applicable Waivers, Exceptions, and Modifications are described in Appendix E.4. Vegetation treatments and livestock grazing would be allowed in these areas provided that the goals for this resource are not compromised.</p>

Table 2-2, Summary Comparison of Alternatives

Table 2-2. Summary Comparison of Alternatives

Table 2-2 Summary Comparison of Alternatives				
<i>Management Action</i>	<i>Alternative A (No Action)</i>	<i>Alternative B</i>	<i>Alternative C</i>	<i>Alternative D (Preferred Alternative)</i>
	<p>rilling, gullyng, piping, and mass wasting;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • water quality and quantity in conformance with state and federal water quality laws; • surface-disturbing activities prohibited during extended wet periods; and • construction not allowed when soils are frozen. <p>(This stipulation would not apply to other resources uses).</p>	<p>accelerated erosion by wind or water, (4) surface-disturbing activities prohibited during extended wet periods, and (5) the activity located to reduce impacts to soil and water resources.</p> <p>Applicable Waivers, Exceptions, and Modifications are described in Appendix E.2.</p> <p>Vegetation treatments and livestock grazing would be allowed in these areas provided that the goals for this resource are not compromised.</p>		
2	<p>ROWs would not be restricted on slopes over 30 percent.</p>	<p>Slopes over 30% would be managed as ROWs avoidance areas for all types of ROWs including renewable energy development. Linear renewable energy ROWs may be allowed if no other feasible option is available. BLM would require off site mitigation prior to approving ROWs in these areas.</p>	<p>Slopes over 30% would be managed ROWs exclusion areas for renewable energy development. These areas would be managed as ROWs exclusion areas for other types of ROWs.</p>	<p>Same as Alternative B.</p>
3	<p>Sensitive soils reclamation requirements for oil and gas operations would be considered when an oil and gas drilling, production, or plugging and abandonment plan is submitted to the BLM. An environmental review would determine the</p>	<p>Controlled Surface Use. Prior to any surface disturbance on sensitive soils (refer to glossary) a reclamation plan must be approved by the Authorized Officer (AO). The plan must demonstrate that no other practicable alternatives exist for relocating the activity. The</p>	<p>Surface occupancy and use would be prohibited on sensitive soils for oil and gas leasing (soils with low restoration potential and low fugitive dust resistance).</p> <p>Sensitive soils would be managed as ROW exclusion areas for</p>	<p>Same as Alternative B.</p>

**Table 2-2
Summary Comparison of Alternatives**

<i>Management Action</i>	<i>Alternative A (No Action)</i>	<i>Alternative B</i>	<i>Alternative C</i>	<i>Alternative D (Preferred Alternative)</i>
	management of other resource uses on sensitive soils.	<p>plan must include a detailed description of how the activity would: (1) control wind and water erosion; (2) control surface runoff; (3) minimize sediment production; (4) maintain site productivity; and (5) complete reclamation. The plan will consider avoidance, size limitations, timing restrictions (e.g. limiting wet condition road usage), physical mitigation, and off-site mitigation.</p> <p>Vegetation treatments and livestock grazing would be allowed on sensitive soils provided that the goals for this resource are not compromised.</p>	<p>renewable energy development.</p> <p>Vegetation treatments and livestock grazing would be allowed on sensitive soils provided that the goals for this resource are not compromised.</p>	
4	No restrictions for ROWs.	Sensitive soils would be managed as ROWs avoidance areas for all types of ROWs including renewable energy development.	<p>Sensitive soils would be managed as ROW exclusion areas for renewable energy development.</p> <p>Sensitive soils would be managed as ROWs exclusion areas for other types of ROWs.</p>	Same as Alternative B.
5	No related management action exists.	Road and trail restrictions would be used on routes not necessary for management when soil health would be adversely impacted. Roads may be closed if necessary.	Roads and trails not necessary for management would be closed when soil health would be negatively or adversely impacted, and reclaimed to native vegetation.	<p>Road and trail restrictions would be used on routes not necessary for management when soil health would be adversely impacted. Roads may be closed if necessary.</p> <p>The authorized officer would consult with other users outside the BLM to determine which roads</p>

Table 2-2 Summary Comparison of Alternatives				
<i>Management Action</i>	<i>Alternative A (No Action)</i>	<i>Alternative B</i>	<i>Alternative C</i>	<i>Alternative D (Preferred Alternative)</i>
				and trails should remain open for their management and public safety.
Program: Water Resources				
<p>Goal 1: Maintain or improve the chemical, physical, and biological integrity of water resources to protect designated beneficial uses and achieve water quality standards and guidelines.</p> <p>Goal 2: Improve watershed function to minimize erosion and accelerated runoff to streams.</p> <p>Goal 3: Maintain or improve water quality for municipal, industrial, agricultural, biological, recreational and residential purposes.</p> <p>Goal 4: Maintain or improve stream channel shape, form, and function within the natural range of variability to allow for hydrological processes that can fully support beneficial uses.</p> <p>Goal 5: Maintain existing or acquire new water rights on BLM lands to ensure water availability for multiple use management while adhering to the State of South Dakota water rights, and other water quality related laws and regulations.</p> <p>Goal 6: Protect ground and surface water quantity and quality.</p> <p>Goal 7: Meet water quality standards without adversely affecting prior existing water rights and uses and protect beneficial uses of water.</p> <p>Management Common to All Alternatives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rangeland Health Standards and BMPs would be implemented to protect beneficial uses of water. • Projects (including mining plans) would be reviewed and current BMPs with mitigation measures adapted and applied to minimize impacts to water quality (see Appendix B). • BLM would continue working in coordination with local, county, state, tribal and federal agencies, private landowners, water companies and organizations to meet Total Maximum Daily Load goals. • Burned areas would be monitored for weed infestations, flow alterations, and accelerated soil erosion. Where sedimentation impacts to adjacent streams are likely, erosion would be mitigated. • Mitigation of surface-disturbing or disruptive activities would be applied where needed to minimize impacts of human activities in riparian areas, 100 year floodplains of rivers, areas with hydric soils, water bodies and streams consistent with the management actions and restrictions outlined in this section and the Guidelines and BMPs listed in Appendix B. Mitigation measures would be applied on a case-by-case basis during activity level planning review of the project area indicates that riparian areas, 100 year floodplains of major rivers, and water bodies and streams are present or would be affected. Exceptions to stipulation requirements may be granted by the authorized officer if an environmental review demonstrates that effects could be mitigated to an acceptable level. Exceptions may also be granted where the short-term effects are mitigated by the long-term benefits (e.g., riparian restoration projects, prescribed fire, or vegetation treatments). 				
Planning Area				
1	Riparian areas, 100 year floodplains of major rivers, and	Riparian areas, wetlands, 100 year floodplains of rivers and streams	Same as Alternative B.	Riparian areas, wetlands, 100 year floodplains of rivers and streams

<p align="center">Table 2-2 Summary Comparison of Alternatives</p>				
<p><i>Management Action</i></p>	<p><i>Alternative A (No Action)</i></p>	<p><i>Alternative B</i></p>	<p><i>Alternative C</i></p>	<p><i>Alternative D (Preferred Alternative)</i></p>
	<p>water bodies and streams would be managed as a No Surface Occupancy and Use for oil and gas leasing. Applicable Waivers, Exceptions, and Modifications are described in Appendix E.1.</p> <p>Grazing use would be restricted in portions of these areas through riparian exclosure fencing if other grazing management practices are inadequate to protect the health and function of riparian areas.</p> <p>Other uses would not be restricted in these areas.</p>	<p>and water bodies and areas within 300 feet of these features would be managed as No Surface Occupancy and Use for oil and gas leasing. At the implementation level any proposed projects that are located in areas identified as a 100 year floodplain (currently defined by “flooded soils” in the NRCS data set – see Glossary) would be evaluated for features that the stipulation is designed to protect and the stipulation applied when such features are present. Applicable Waivers, Exceptions, and Modifications are described in Appendix E.2.</p> <p>Vegetation treatments and livestock grazing would be allowed in these areas provided that the goals for this resource are not compromised.</p> <p>Other activities would be allowed if the project proponent demonstrates the impacts of the proposed project can be adequately mitigated and the water resource goals are not compromised or the project is designed to improve or maintain resource conditions or recreational opportunities.</p>		<p>and water bodies and areas within 300 feet of these features would be managed as No Surface Occupancy and Use for oil and gas leasing. At the implementation level any proposed projects that are located in areas identified as a 100 year floodplain (currently defined by “flooded soils” in the NRCS data set) would be evaluated for features that the stipulation is designed to protect and the stipulation applied when such features are present. Applicable Waivers, Exceptions, and Modifications are described in Appendix E.4.</p> <p>Other activities would be allowed if the project proponent demonstrates the impacts of the proposed project can be adequately mitigated and the water resource goals are not compromised or the project is designed to improve or maintain resource conditions or recreational opportunities.</p>

**Table 2-2
Summary Comparison of Alternatives**

<i>Management Action</i>	<i>Alternative A (No Action)</i>	<i>Alternative B</i>	<i>Alternative C</i>	<i>Alternative D (Preferred Alternative)</i>
2	No Restrictions on ROWs in Riparian areas, 100 year floodplains of major rivers, and water bodies and streams	Riparian areas, wetlands, 100 year floodplains of rivers and streams and water bodies and areas within 300 feet of these features would be managed as ROWs avoidance areas for all types of ROWs including renewable energy development. At the implementation level any proposed projects that are located in areas identified as a 100 year floodplain (currently defined by “flooded soils” in the NRCS data set) would be evaluated for features that the restriction is designed to protect and the restriction applied when such features are present. Linear ROWs may be allowed across these areas if no other feasible option is available. BLM would require off site mitigation prior to approving ROWs in these areas.	Riparian areas, wetlands, 100 year floodplains of rivers and streams and water bodies and areas within 300 feet of these features would be managed as ROWs exclusion areas for renewable energy development and other ROWs. At the implementation level any proposed projects that are located in areas identified as a 100 year floodplain (currently defined by “flooded soils” in the NRCS data set) would be evaluated for features that the restriction is designed to protect and the restriction applied when such features are present.	Same as Alternative B.
3	No related management action exists.	BLM would utilize road and trail restrictions on routes not necessary for management when water quality is likely to be impacted. Roads could be closed if necessary. The authorized officer would consult with the public, including other users and affected parties to determine which roads and trails	BLM would close and reclaim roads and trails not necessary for management when water quality is likely to be impacted. The authorized officer would consult with the public, including other users and affected parties to determine which roads and trails should remain open for their management and public safety	Same as Alternative B.

Table 2-2 Summary Comparison of Alternatives				
<i>Management Action</i>	<i>Alternative A (No Action)</i>	<i>Alternative B</i>	<i>Alternative C</i>	<i>Alternative D (Preferred Alternative)</i>
		should remain open for their management and public safety.		
Program: Vegetative Communities – Rangeland, Riparian, Forest and Woodlands				
<p>Goal 1: Manage public lands to provide plant communities that support the integrity of the ecological processes (water, energy, and nutrient cycles) and to provide forage, watershed protection, and a variety of wildlife habitat.</p> <p>Goal 2: Public lands meet the Dakotas Standards for Rangeland Health (Appendix A).</p> <p>Goal 3: A variety of habitat is present with a diverse assemblage of native plant communities indicative of the Northern Great Plains.</p> <p>Goal 4: Native plants dominate the planning area and are resistant to invasive plants, noxious weeds, and invasive pests.</p> <p>Goal 5: The abundance of woody vegetation is maintained or improved on those riparian sites that have the potential to support woody vegetation.</p> <p>Goal 6: Stands of oak, aspen, box elder, ash and other hardwoods are maintained and a variety of age classes are present.</p> <p>Management Common to All Alternatives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Management actions on BLM lands would be consistent with achieving the Dakotas Standards for Rangeland Health and Guidelines for Livestock Grazing Management (Appendix A). • BLM would complete assessments for rangeland health on a priority allotment basis with emphasis on allotments with significant acreage of public land, TES species, and resource problems or issues (e.g., I and M category allotments). • Allocation of forage would be based on benefits to livestock grazing, wildlife, watershed protection, and ecological processes. • Use of forest products, including firewood, posts, poles, sawtimber, Christmas trees, and other special forest products would be allowed by permit. • Gathering of plants and plant parts would be allowed for incidental use unless otherwise restricted. • Old growth forested stands would not be identified; however, characteristics such as large, old trees would be considered in treatments. The BLM would manage for multiple age classes of shrubs and trees. • Treatments would be designed to decrease the presence of or reduce the susceptibility to invasion by invasive plants and pests and noxious weeds. • Riparian and wetland communities, habitat, and associated uplands would be treated and restored through implementation of livestock grazing guidelines to meet Dakotas Standards for Rangeland Health (Appendix A). • Where riparian and wetland areas are already meeting standards they would be maintained in that condition or better. Where a sites capability is less than PFC BLM would manage to achieve or move towards capability. • Maintain and/or improve desired mix of seral stages within vegetation communities including forest and woodlands, grasslands, shrublands and riparian/wetlands. • BLM would consider the potential impacts of climate change on disturbed or degraded areas when determining the type of reclamation or the seed mix needed for reclamation. • The use of native plant species would be the preferred method used to revegetate or reclaim areas. If non-native species are used, the seed mix would be evaluated and approved by an IDT team prior to use to ensure that it has a low probability of displacing adjacent native vegetation. • Mitigation measures would be applied on a case-by-case basis during activity level planning to protect or maintain desired vegetation types including 				

Table 2-2. Summary Comparison of Alternatives

<p align="center">Table 2-2 Summary Comparison of Alternatives</p>				
<i>Management Action</i>	<i>Alternative A (No Action)</i>	<i>Alternative B</i>	<i>Alternative C</i>	<i>Alternative D (Preferred Alternative)</i>
<p>special status plant species consistent with the management actions and restrictions found in this section and the Guidelines and BMPs listed in Appendix B. Exceptions to restriction requirements may be granted by the authorized officer if an environmental review demonstrates that effects could be mitigated to an acceptable level. Exceptions may also be granted where the short-term effects are mitigated by the long-term benefits (e.g., riparian restoration projects, prescribed fire, or vegetation treatments).</p> <p>Vegetation is shown in Map 2-33.</p>				
<p align="center">Planning Area</p>				
1	<p>Mechanical vegetation treatments used to achieve desired plant communities could include scalping, chiseling, contour furrowing, ripping, interseeding, and chaining. Other treatments could include herbicides and prescribed fire.</p>	<p>Vegetation treatments used to achieve desired plant communities could include mechanical, prescribed fire, chemical treatments, grazing, seeding or planting. Contouring would be done on a limited basis.</p> <p>Any mechanical treatments within big sagebrush habitat crucial to sagebrush obligate species would be carried out to enhance that resource.</p>	<p>Same as Alternative B except mechanical and/or chemical treatments on herbaceous vegetation would be limited to seedbed preparation, drill seeding, and weed spraying.</p> <p>Any mechanical treatments within big sagebrush habitat crucial sagebrush obligate species would be evaluated at the project level to protect that resource.</p>	<p>Same as Alternative B.</p>
2	<p>Any mechanical treatment and tame pasture conversion proposed on big sagebrush habitat critical to antelope and Greater Sage-Grouse would be evaluated to protect that resource.</p>	<p>Conversion of vegetation types from introduced (non-native) tame pastures to native vegetation would be allowed.</p> <p>Conversion of native vegetation to tame pastures would only be allowed to improve, maintain, or protect habitat, sensitive soils, riparian vegetation or special status plants or animals during vulnerable periods and in cases where alternative forage sources</p>	<p>Same as Alternative B except conversion of vegetation type from native vegetation to tame pastures would not be allowed.</p>	<p>Conversion of vegetation types from introduced (non-native) tame pastures to native vegetation would be allowed.</p> <p>Conversion of native vegetation to tame pastures would only be allowed to improve, maintain, or protect habitat, sensitive soils, riparian vegetation or special status plants or animals during vulnerable periods and in cases where alternative forage sources</p>

**Table 2-2
Summary Comparison of Alternatives**

<i>Management Action</i>	<i>Alternative A (No Action)</i>	<i>Alternative B</i>	<i>Alternative C</i>	<i>Alternative D (Preferred Alternative)</i>
		<p>are needed to defer or change livestock grazing patterns to reduce disturbance to wildlife.</p> <p>Vegetation type conversion proposals would be evaluated at the project level. No more than 3% (8,220 acres) of the public land in the planning area could be converted to introduced species over the next 20 years.</p>		<p>are needed to defer or change livestock grazing patterns to reduce disturbance to wildlife.</p> <p>Vegetation type conversion proposals would be evaluated at the project level. No more than 1% (2,740 acres) of the public land in the planning area could be converted to non-invasive introduced species over the next 20 years.</p>
3	Range improvements would be used to protect and improve riparian areas.	Priority for funding and implementing range improvements would be given to projects that improve livestock management, provide stock water, or enhance forage production.	<p>Priority for funding and implementing range improvements would be given to projects that improve riparian areas, better manage wildlife habitat, and provide for watershed protection.</p> <p>Improved management of livestock would be a secondary benefit.</p>	Priority for funding and implementing range improvements would be given to projects that improve multiple resources.
4	The use of native seed species would be preferred for vegetation restoration.	<p>The use of native species would be the preferred method of revegetating disturbed sites. Non-invasive introduced species that pose little threat of displacing adjacent native vegetative communities could be used to restore vegetation including but not limited to the following circumstances:</p> <p>1) Emergency rehabilitation is</p>	Only native seed species would be used when seeding unless native seed is not available or the need for a non-native nurse crop is needed to establish native vegetation on a disturbed site.	Same as Alternative B.

Table 2-2. Summary Comparison of Alternatives

<p align="center">Table 2-2 Summary Comparison of Alternatives</p>				
<i>Management Action</i>	<i>Alternative A (No Action)</i>	<i>Alternative B</i>	<i>Alternative C</i>	<i>Alternative D (Preferred Alternative)</i>
		<p>needed to control erosion or weed invasion and native seed is not available</p> <p>2) A non-native nurse crop is needed to establish native vegetation</p> <p>3) The presence of a problematic soil (as defined in glossary) or severe loss of top soil on a disturbed site make re-establishment of native vegetation unlikely.</p>		
5	No related management action exists.	<p>BLM would consider designating indigenous plant gathering sites if specific proposals are brought forward in the future.</p> <p>The size of designated gathering sites would be determined during project level planning.</p> <p>Plant gathering for incidental use would be allowed, except that only above ground gathering would be allowed in the Fossil Cycad ACEC.</p>	<p>BLM would not consider designating indigenous plant gathering sites if specific proposals are brought forward in the future.</p> <p>Plant gathering for incidental use would be allowed, except that only above ground gathering would be allowed in the Fossil Cycad ACEC.</p>	<p>BLM would not consider designating indigenous plant gathering sites if specific proposals are brought forward in the future. Plant gathering for incidental use would be allowed, except that only above ground gathering would be allowed in the Fossil Cycad ACEC and Fort Meade ACEC. BLM could restrict gathering within areas if an Interdisciplinary Team determines through monitoring that gathering is causing negative impacts to resources within gathering areas.</p>
<p>Program: Noxious Weeds and Other Invasive Non-Native Species (Plant and Animal)</p>				
<p>Goal 1: Minimize infestation of noxious weeds.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduce existing acres infested by invasive plants and noxious weeds through IPM treatment methods including restoration and elimination of new infestations through early detection and rapid response. • New infestations are not common and existing infestations are declining across the landscape. • Invasive plants and noxious weeds are not leading to a decrease in acres that are meeting Standards for Rangeland Health. 				

**Table 2-2
Summary Comparison of Alternatives**

<i>Management Action</i>	<i>Alternative A (No Action)</i>	<i>Alternative B</i>	<i>Alternative C</i>	<i>Alternative D (Preferred Alternative)</i>
<p>Management Common to All Alternatives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Work cooperatively, and in coordination with federal, state, and county agencies, private landowners, and organizations to prevent and treat invasive plant species, including noxious weeds. • Use of a combination of Integrated Pest Management (IPM) methods and treatment practices for weed management. • Weed management Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs) and Best Management Practices (BMPs) will be included in all new treatment projects and incorporated, where possible, into existing contracts, agreements and land use authorizations which result in ground disturbing activities (Appendix B). • Certified weed seed free forage (hay and grains) straw and mulch would be required for all activities when used on BLM lands (exceptions could be made for emergencies when approved by the BLM authorized officer). • Reestablish perennial vegetation using native species in rehabilitation and reclamation unless site-specific evaluations indicate that non-native species are needed to ensure success or rapid vegetation reestablishment. • Monitoring will evaluate weed management activities at project and field office levels. • Provide information and educational material to the public. • The use of native plant species would be the preferred method used to revegetate or reclaim areas. If non-native species are used, the seed mix would be evaluated by an IDT team prior to use to ensure that it has a low probability of displacing adjacent native vegetation. • Mitigation measures would be applied on a case-by-case basis during activity level planning if review of the project indicates a potential to spread or introduce invasive species consistent with the management actions and restrictions found in this section and the Guidelines and BMPs listed in Appendix B. 				
Planning Area				
Invasive Plants				
1	No treatments would occur within suitable nesting habitat, within a 2 mile buffer zone, of known Greater Sage-Grouse leks from March 1-June 30.	Spot treatments only, using IPM methods within suitable nesting or brood rearing habitat, within a 3 mile buffer zone, of known sage-grouse leks from March 1-June 30.	Spot treatments only, using IPM methods within suitable nesting or brood rearing habitat, within a 4 mile buffer zone, of known sage-grouse leks from March 1-June 30.	Same as Alternative B.
2	No treatments would occur within suitable nesting habitat, within a 2 mile buffer zone, of known Greater Sage-Grouse leks from March 1 – June 30.	Spot treatments in Protection Priority Areas (PPAs) only, using IPM methods within suitable nesting or brood rearing habitat of known sage-grouse leks from March 1 – June 30. This does not apply to nesting habitat outside of PPAs.		
3	No related management action exists.	¼ mile weed treatment restriction zone around current year active raptor nesting site (including bald	¼ mile weed treatment restriction zone around raptor nesting sites (including bald eagles) active over	Same as Alternative B.

Table 2-2 Summary Comparison of Alternatives				
<i>Management Action</i>	<i>Alternative A (No Action)</i>	<i>Alternative B</i>	<i>Alternative C</i>	<i>Alternative D (Preferred Alternative)</i>
		eagles) from March 1-August 1. Exceptions for treatment are possible within the ¼ mile buffer zone from March 1 – August 1, following consultation with necessary specialists for timing of least impacts.	the previous 7 years from March 1-August 1. Exceptions for treatment are possible within the ¼ mile buffer zone from March 1 – August 1, following consultation with necessary specialists for timing of least impacts.	
4	Poisonous plants, unless designated as noxious, would not be treated.	Poisonous plants could be treated, where found, using IPM methods.	Poisonous plants could be treated only in developed recreation areas and along recreation trails.	Same as Alternative B.
5	In areas with identified T&E, special status plant, and sensitive plant species, wick or backpack sprayers and selective herbicides would be used to minimize risks to those species.		Listed T&E and sensitive plant species would have a 100 foot herbicide buffer zone. Any herbicides applied in this buffer would be applied by spot treatment only unless broadcast treatment would have beneficial impacts to such species.	Same as Alternative C.
6	No related action exists in the current plan regarding chemical use at plant gathering sites.	If plant gathering sites are designated, all methods of chemical weed treatments within these sites could be allowed given consideration to time of application and target species.	BLM would not consider designation of indigenous plant gathering areas.	Same as Alternative D.
Invasive Terrestrial Animals and Insect Species				
<p>Goal 2: Manage invasive terrestrial animal and insect species, and state and locally declared pests. Reduce acres and/or density of infestations by invasive species through prevention, early detection and rapid response, and provide education opportunities for public land users.</p> <p>Goal 3: Infestations are not common across the landscape.</p> <p>Management Common to All Alternatives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> All treatments would be designed to decrease the presence of, or reduce the susceptibility of invasion/outbreaks of invasive pests while minimizing adverse impacts to non-target species. 				

<p align="center">Table 2-2 Summary Comparison of Alternatives</p>				
<i>Management Action</i>	<i>Alternative A (No Action)</i>	<i>Alternative B</i>	<i>Alternative C</i>	<i>Alternative D (Preferred Alternative)</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Grasshopper/Mormon Cricket outbreaks would be managed in cooperation with the United States Dept. of Agriculture’s (USDA) Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service/Plant Protection and Quarantine (APHIS/PQQ). 				
1	No related action exists in the current plan for invasive animal or insect species.	Invasive terrestrial species, could be treated using IPM methods, as required by federal, state, and local laws, statutes and regulations, or if they are causing economic or environmental harm, or harm to human health.	Same as Alternative B.	
2	No related action exists in the current plan for state or locally declared pests. *Prairie dog towns on public land will be inventoried and examined on an as needed basis. Where prairie dogs are known to damage public and adjoining private rangelands, management would occur on a case-by-case basis.	State or locally declared pests could be treated using IPM methods, if consultation reveals that serious, economic or environmental harm, or harm to human health, may occur.	Same as Alternative B.	
<p>Invasive Aquatic Species</p> <p>Goal 4: Keep the aquatic environment free from invasive aquatic species. Prevent the introduction of invasive species into the aquatic environment through education of public land users on prevention, early detection, rapid response, control, management and restoration.</p> <p>Goal 5: All lentic (lakeshore/wetland) and lotic (river/stream) areas remain free from invasive aquatic species.</p> <p>Management Common to All Alternatives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide information and educational material to the public. Utilize Integrated Pest Management (IPM) concepts while working within federal, state laws, statutes, and regulations to minimize infestations of invasive aquatic species. Best Management Practices (BMP) would be included in all new treatment projects, and incorporated, where possible, into existing contracts, agreements, and land use authorizations that would potentially result in the introduction or spread of invasive aquatic species. 				

Table 2-2 Summary Comparison of Alternatives				
<i>Management Action</i>	<i>Alternative A (No Action)</i>	<i>Alternative B</i>	<i>Alternative C</i>	<i>Alternative D (Preferred Alternative)</i>
Planning Area				
1	No related action exists in the current plan for the treatment of invasive aquatic species.	Invasive aquatic species could be treated using IPM methods, as required by federal, state, and local laws, statutes and regulations, or if they are causing or have the potential to cause economic or environmental harm, or harm to human health.	Same as Alternative B.	
Program: Wildlife				
<p>Goal 1: Ensure that native wildlife species are provided habitat of sufficient quality and quantity to enhance biological diversity and sustain their economic, social and ecological values.</p> <p>Goal 2: Provide habitat and forage to support wildlife with consideration of South Dakota Wildlife Action Plan game management goals and the Northern Great Plains Joint Venture Program.</p> <p>Goal 3: Improve the resilience of wildlife habitats to protect wildlife communities from stressors and events such as severe wildfire and climate change</p> <p>Goal 4: Movement of big game species between habitats would be facilitated.</p> <p>Goal 5: A full spectrum of biological communities' habitats and their ecological processes are present.</p> <p>Goal 6: Populations of native plants and animals are well distributed across the landscape.</p> <p>Goal 7: Provide suitable habitat condition to allow for movement between blocks of habitat and seasonal and specialized habitats on a local and landscape scale.</p> <p>Goal 8: Maintain or improve specialized habitats on a local and landscape scale.</p> <p>Management Common to All Alternatives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New fences would follow BLM specifications (BLM Handbook 1741-1 and WO-IM-2010-022) to allow for wildlife passage and located or marked as feasible to minimize collisions and other wildlife issues, except for fences built specifically to keep wildlife out of an area. • Existing fences would be reviewed to identify areas where fence modification or removal could be implemented to improve wildlife movement problems. • BMPs (Appendix B) including oil and gas BMPs for wildlife would be used to reduce impacts to wildlife. • Functional wildlife escape ramps would be installed and maintained on all water tanks on BLM lands. • SDGFP Bat Management Plan would be implemented and mine openings inventoried for bat use prior to closing with public safety in mind. • Retain a minimum of 2 existing snags greater than 16 in DBH and 30 ft. tall per acre, unless a safety hazard exists. Salvage or felling of dead or dying trees would be acceptable. • Coordinate with other federal, state and private land management agencies in developing a habitat management plan. 				

<p align="center">Table 2-2 Summary Comparison of Alternatives</p>				
<p><i>Management Action</i></p>	<p><i>Alternative A (No Action)</i></p>	<p><i>Alternative B</i></p>	<p><i>Alternative C</i></p>	<p><i>Alternative D (Preferred Alternative)</i></p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> BLM authorized activities would actively manage for multiple ecosystems and a variety of habitat conditions for non-game mammals, migratory and grassland birds. Follow current “Reducing Avian Collisions with Power Lines” (APLIC) for all land use authorizations (summarized in Appendix B). Existing power lines identified for electrocution problems for wildlife on public lands would be modified to prevent wildlife electrocution. Fuels treatments would be designed to protect and/or improve wildlife habitat. Manage water developments to reduce the spread of West Nile virus. Predator control would be permitted subject to the stipulations outlined in the annual Animal Damage Control (ADC) MOU between BLM and USDA-Animal Plant Health Inspection Service. Identify distribution, key habitat areas, and special management needs for development of management plans and conservation measures. With emphasis on riparian/wetland areas, cottonwood galleries, native grasslands, sagebrush steppe, woody draws and seasonal ranges supporting life cycle requirements for wildlife. Mitigation of activities including surface-disturbing or disruptive activities would be applied where needed to avoid, minimize, rectify, reduce or compensate for impacts of human activities to wildlife or wildlife habitat consistent with the management actions and restrictions found in this section and the Guidelines and BMPs listed in Appendix B. Mitigation measures would be applied on a case-by-case basis during activity level planning if review of the project area indicates wildlife would be affected. Exceptions to stipulation requirements may be granted by the authorized officer if an environmental review demonstrates that effects could be mitigated to an acceptable level. Exceptions may also be granted where the short-term effects are mitigated by the long-term benefits (e.g., riparian restoration projects, prescribed fire, or vegetation treatments). The sequence of mitigation action would be: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Step 1. Avoid - Adverse impacts to resources are to be avoided and no action shall be permitted if there is a practicable alternative with less adverse impact. Step 2. Minimize - If impacts to resources cannot be avoided, appropriate and practicable steps to minimize adverse impacts must be taken. Step 3. Compensate - Appropriate and practicable compensatory mitigation is required for unavoidable adverse impacts which remain. The amount and quality of compensatory mitigation may not substitute for avoiding and minimizing impacts. <p>Additional details about mitigation can be found in Appendices C and V and in the Mitigation section of the Chapter 2 Summary.</p>				
<p align="center">Planning Area</p>				
<p>1</p>	<p>Mechanical and vegetation treatments in sagebrush areas would be done on a case-by-case basis</p>	<p>Any mechanical and vegetation treatments within big sagebrush habitat crucial to antelope and sage-grouse would be carried out to enhance that resource (see Map 2-6).</p>	<p>Any mechanical and vegetation treatments within big sagebrush habitat crucial to sage brush obligate species would be evaluated at the project level by an IDT to protect that resource (see Map 2-6).</p>	<p>Same as Alternative C.</p>

Table 2-2. Summary Comparison of Alternatives

<p align="center">Table 2-2 Summary Comparison of Alternatives</p>				
<i>Management Action</i>	<i>Alternative A (No Action)</i>	<i>Alternative B</i>	<i>Alternative C</i>	<i>Alternative D (Preferred Alternative)</i>
2	Surface occupancy and use would be prohibited within ¼ mile of grouse leks (O&G only).	Surface disturbing and disruptive activities would be avoided within ¼ mile of sharp-tailed grouse and greater prairie-chicken leks.	Surface disturbing and disruptive activities would be avoided within ½ mile of sharp-tailed grouse and greater prairie-chicken leks	Same as Alternative B.
3	No related management action exists.	Public lands within ¼ mile of sharp-tailed grouse and greater prairie-chicken leks would be an avoidance area for commercial renewable energy development and other ROWs.	Public lands within ½ mile of sharp-tailed grouse and greater prairie-chicken leks would be an exclusion area for commercial renewable energy development and other ROWs.	Public lands within ¼ mile of sharp-tailed grouse and greater prairie-chicken leks would be an exclusion area for commercial renewable energy development and an avoidance area for other ROWs.
4	Timing Restriction: Surface use would be prohibited from March 1 to June 15 in grouse nesting habitat within 2 miles of a lek. This stipulation does not apply to the operation and maintenance of production facilities (O&G only).	Timing Restriction: Surface disturbance and disruptive activities would be avoided from March 1 to June 30 in sharp-tailed grouse and greater prairie-chicken nesting habitat within 2 miles of a lek. This restriction does not apply to the operation and maintenance of production facilities.	Timing Restriction: Surface disturbance and disruptive activities would be avoided from March 1 to June 30 in sharp-tailed grouse and greater prairie-chicken nesting habitat within 3 miles of a lek. This restriction does apply to the operation and maintenance of production facilities.	Timing Restriction: Surface disturbance and disruptive activities would be avoided from March 1 to June 30 in sharp-tailed grouse and greater prairie-chicken nesting habitat within 2 miles of a lek.
5	No related management action exists.	Public lands within 2 miles of sharp-tailed grouse and greater prairie-chicken leks would be an avoidance area for commercial renewable energy development and other ROWs.	Public lands within 3 miles of sharp-tailed grouse and greater prairie-chicken leks would be an exclusion area for commercial renewable energy development and other ROWs.	Public lands within 2 miles of sharp-tailed grouse and greater prairie-chicken leks would be an avoidance area for commercial renewable energy development and other types of ROWs.

Table 2-2 Summary Comparison of Alternatives				
Management Action	Alternative A (No Action)	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D (Preferred Alternative)
6	No related management action exists.	No restrictions on authorizations for structures that provide raptor perches.	Controlled Surface Use (CSU): Structures over 10 feet that create raptor perches would not be authorized or would require anti-perch devices within the 2 mile buffer of sharp-tailed grouse and greater prairie-chicken nesting areas	Same as Alternative C.
7	No related management action.	Same as Alternative A.	New power lines would be sited in a manner which does not impact sharp-tailed grouse or greater prairie-chickens within two mile buffer of leks.	Same as Alternative C.
8	TL: Surface-disturbing and disruptive activities in big game winter range would be restricted from oil and gas development and production from December 1 to March 31 This stipulation would not apply to the operation and maintenance of production facilities. Other uses would not be restricted.	TL: Surface disturbance and disruptive activities would be prohibited from December 1 to March 31 within winter range for big game (Map 2-3).	TL: Surface disturbance and disruptive activities would be avoided from December 1 to March 31 within winter range for big game (Map 2-3). Surface disturbance and disruptive activities and livestock grazing on allotments not meeting Standards for Rangeland Health would be prohibited from December 1 to March 31 within crucial winter range for big game unless such use is needed to improve range condition or manage wildlife.	Same as Alternative C.
9	No related management action exists	Big game winter range would be an avoidance area for commercial renewable energy development and other ROWs.	Big game winter range would be an exclusion area for commercial renewable energy development and other ROWs.	Same as Alternative B.

Table 2-2, Summary Comparison of Alternatives

Table 2-2. Summary Comparison of Alternatives

<p align="center">Table 2-2 Summary Comparison of Alternatives</p>				
<i>Management Action</i>	<i>Alternative A (No Action)</i>	<i>Alternative B</i>	<i>Alternative C</i>	<i>Alternative D (Preferred Alternative)</i>
10	No related management action exists.	Surface occupancy and use is prohibited for oil and gas activities (NSO) within ¼ mile of raptor nest sites not defined as sensitive and special status that were active within the last 7 years. Refer to management action 6 in the special status species section of this table.	Surface occupancy and use is prohibited for oil and gas activities (NSO) within ½ mile of raptor nest sites not defined as sensitive and special status that were active within the last 7 years. Refer to management action 6 in the special status species section of this table.	Surface occupancy and use is prohibited for oil and gas activities (NSO) within ¼ mile of raptor nest sites not defined as sensitive and special status that were active within the last 7 years. Refer to management action 6 in the special status species section of this table.
11	No related management action exists.	Public lands within ¼ mile of raptor nests sites not defined as sensitive and special status that were active within the last 7 years would be an avoidance area for commercial renewable energy development and other ROWs. Refer to management action 7 in the special status species section of this table for actions associated with special status raptors.	Public lands within ¼ mile of raptor nests raptor nest sites not defined as sensitive and special status that were active within the last 7 years would be an exclusion area for commercial renewable energy development and other ROWs. Refer to management action 7 in the special status species section of this table for actions associated with special status raptors.	Public lands within ¼ mile of raptor nests raptor nest sites not defined as sensitive and special status that were active within the last 7 years would be an exclusion area for commercial renewable energy development and an avoidance area for other types of ROWs. Refer to management action 7 in the special status species section of this table for actions associated with special status raptors.
12	No related management action exists.	Surface disturbing and disruptive activities would be avoided in the designated bighorn sheep range (see Map 2-3).	Same as Alternative B.	
13	No related management action exists.	Snag and cavity bearing tree cutting, removal, and offer for sale or utilization would be allowed for public safety, salvage post fire, and/or in response to other resource needs.	Snag and cavity bearing tree cutting, removal, and offer for sale or utilization would be allowed where public safety has been identified as a potential concern and where no new permanent roads would be required for	Same as Alternative B.

Table 2-2 Summary Comparison of Alternatives				
<i>Management Action</i>	<i>Alternative A (No Action)</i>	<i>Alternative B</i>	<i>Alternative C</i>	<i>Alternative D (Preferred Alternative)</i>
			removal of wood products.	
14	No related management action exists.	Same as Alternative A.	Limit activities that would destroy or degrade traditional high value roost sites for wild turkeys.	Same as Alternative C.
15	No related management action exists.	Same as Alternative A.	Retain 10 inch or larger DBH trees in groups of 3 to 6 that have roost tree characteristics on slopes and ridges to provide roost sites for turkeys within ponderosa pine habitat.	Same as Alternative C.
16	BLM Instruction Memorandum 98-140 (1998) would be followed to protect bighorn sheep. Grazing of domestic sheep or goats near bighorn sheep range would be discouraged within 9 miles of bighorn sheep range (refer to livestock grazing section).	<p>a. No change in livestock conversions from cattle to domestic sheep or goats would be allowed in allotments within occupied bighorn sheep range. Transfer of grazing preference would only be allowed to livestock types other than domestic sheep and goats within occupied bighorn sheep range (Map 2-3).</p> <p>b. New domestic sheep and goat allotments or conversions from cattle to domestic sheep or goats would be permitted a minimum of 5 miles from known bighorn sheep range. This distance (buffer) would be greater if deemed necessary through site-specific analysis and</p>	<p>a. Same as Alternative B.</p> <p>b. Same as Alternative B except 15 miles instead of 5.</p> <p>c. Same as Alternative B except 10 mile buffer instead of 5.</p>	<p>a. Same as Alternative B.</p> <p>b. Same as Alternative B except a 15 mile distance (buffer) between domestic sheep/goats and bighorn sheep would be used instead of 5 mile buffer.</p> <p>c. Same as Alternative B except a 10 mile distance (buffer) between domestic goats used for weed control and bighorn sheep would be used instead of a 5 mile buffer.</p>

Table 2-2. Summary Comparison of Alternatives

<p align="center">Table 2-2 Summary Comparison of Alternatives</p>				
<i>Management Action</i>	<i>Alternative A (No Action)</i>	<i>Alternative B</i>	<i>Alternative C</i>	<i>Alternative D (Preferred Alternative)</i>
		<p>additional research findings.</p> <p>c. To minimize contact with bighorn sheep, domestic sheep and goats used for weed control within 5 miles of bighorn sheep range would only occur with coordination with SDGFP.</p>		
17	No related management action exists.	Occupied bighorn sheep range would be a ROW avoidance area for renewable energy and other types of ROWs.	Occupied bighorn sheep range would be a ROW exclusion area for renewable energy and other types of ROWs.	Same as Alternative B.
18	Any mechanical treatment and tame pasture conversion proposed on big sagebrush habitat critical to antelope and Greater Sage-Grouse would be evaluated to protect that resource.	<p>Any Conversion of vegetation type from tame pasture to native vegetation or from native vegetation to tame pasture (introduced species) would be allowed when needed to protect, maintain or improve wildlife habitat, sensitive soils, riparian vegetation and control weeds/invasive species.</p> <p>Vegetation type conversion proposals would be evaluated at the project level to protect wildlife habitat and watershed resources (e.g., sagebrush habitat critical to sagebrush obligate species). No more than 3% of public land in the planning area would be converted from native species to introduced species.</p>	Any Conversion of vegetation type from tame pasture to native vegetation would be allowed to protect wildlife habitat and watershed resources (e.g., sagebrush habitat critical to sagebrush obligate species). Conversion of vegetation type from native vegetation to tame pasture would not be allowed.	Same as Alternative B, except no more than 1% of public land (surface estate) in the planning area would be converted from native to non-native species.

**Table 2-2
Summary Comparison of Alternatives**

<i>Management Action</i>	<i>Alternative A (No Action)</i>	<i>Alternative B</i>	<i>Alternative C</i>	<i>Alternative D (Preferred Alternative)</i>
19	Any Range improvements would be used to protect and improve riparian areas.	Priority for funding and implementing range improvements would be given to projects that improve livestock management, provide stock water, or enhance forage production.	Priority for funding and implementing range improvements would be given to improve riparian areas, better manage wildlife habitat, and provide for watershed protection. Improved management of livestock would be a secondary benefit.	Priority for funding and implementing range improvements would be given to improve multiple resources.
20	No related management action exists.	¼ mile weed treatment restriction zone around current year active raptor nesting site from March 1-August 1.	¼ mile weed treatment restriction zone around raptor nesting sites active over the previous 2 years from March 1-August 1.	Same as Alternative B.
Program: Special Status Species				
<p>Goal 1: Ensure the long-term and self-sustaining persistence of special status species in South Dakota.</p> <p>Goal 2: Protect/maintain populations of special status species by minimizing direct mortality and impacts to habitat.</p> <p>Goal 3: Provide suitable habitat condition to allow for movement between large blocks of habitat and seasonal and specialized habitats on a local and landscape scale.</p> <p>Goal 4: Maintain or improve specialized habitats on a local and landscape scale.</p> <p>Goal 5: Maintain and/or increase Greater Sage-Grouse abundance and distribution by conserving, enhancing or restoring the sagebrush ecosystem upon which populations depend in cooperation with other conservation partners.</p> <p>Goal 6: Within Greater Sage-Grouse General Habitat, BLM will maintain habitat for viable sage-grouse populations.</p> <p>Goal 7: Manage for the biological integrity and habitat suitability to facilitate the conservation, recovery, and maintenance of populations of plants, fish and wildlife to avoid contributing to the listing of or jeopardizing the continued existence or recovery of special status species and their habitats.</p> <p>Goal 8: Maintain or enhance areas of ecological importance for special status wildlife species.</p> <p>Goal 9: Conserve and recover special status wildlife species by determining and implementing conservation strategies including restoration opportunities, use restrictions, and management actions.</p> <p>Goal 10: Manage specific environmental hazards, risks, and impacts in a manner compatible with special status wildlife species health.</p> <p>Goal 11: Identify habitat thresholds necessary to sustain well-distributed healthy populations of special status species to avoid future listings under the Endangered Species Act.</p> <p>Goal 12: Develop and implement the BMPs, activity plans, or use other mechanisms to protect high priority special status wildlife species.</p> <p>Goal 13: Manage special status species in consideration of the working landscape and the intermingled land ownership pattern that is present.</p>				

Table 2-2 Summary Comparison of Alternatives				
<i>Management Action</i>	<i>Alternative A (No Action)</i>	<i>Alternative B</i>	<i>Alternative C</i>	<i>Alternative D (Preferred Alternative)</i>
Goal 14: Across the planning area, maintain greater sage-brush cover at levels at or near the full potential for the each ecological site.				
Management Common to All Alternatives:				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Special Status Species and their habitat will be given special consideration before any actions are taken. • BMPs (Appendix B) including Oil and Gas BMPs for Wildlife would be used to reduce impacts to Special Status Species. • Inventory potential habitat used by BLM sensitive species. • If unoccupied habitat for TES species exists, BLM would work with other agencies, stakeholders, and partners to analyze proposals to reintroduce species while considering other resources and uses. • The mitigation and conservation measures for sage grouse (Appendix V) would be used to mitigate impacts from surface disturbance and disruptive activities in priority and general sage-grouse habitat in order to meet the goals and objectives set forth in this RMP and the BLM National Sage-grouse Conservation Strategy. • New fences would be located to avoid Greater Sage-Grouse leks and winter range and/or marked if these areas cannot be avoided. • Manage water developments to reduce the spread of West Nile virus within Greater Sage-Grouse habitat areas (especially for those water impoundments where water levels are artificially maintained). • Install reflectors on fences for Greater Sage-Grouse where appropriate. • Manage water developments to reduce the spread of West Nile virus within Greater Sage-Grouse habitat areas. • Follow current “Reducing Avian Collisions with Power Lines” (APLIC)” for all land use authorizations. • Existing overhead lines that are determined to be a major hazard to wildlife would be modified to reduce or eliminate the hazard. • Prairie dog control would consider impacts to wildlife species associated with prairie dog colonies. • Within Greater Sage-Grouse habitat, BLM would maintain habitat for sage-grouse subpopulations to promote movement and genetic diversity. Maintain, restore or enhance sage-grouse habitat and connectivity between sagebrush habitats, with emphasis on those habitats occupied by sage-grouse. • Within Greater Sage-Grouse habitat, BLM would evaluate areas for habitat restoration or enhancement potential. Specific restoration or enhancement actions would be determined at the project (implementation) level. • Applications for Special Recreation Permits in Greater Sage-Grouse priority habitat may be denied if approval of the permit would adversely impact sage-grouse or sage-grouse habitat. • Where suitable conservation actions cannot be achieved, seek to acquire state and private lands with intact subsurface mineral estate by donation, purchase or exchange in order to best conserve, enhance or restore sage-grouse habitat. • The RMP would incorporate existing recovery plans, management strategies, and guidelines for federally listed threatened and endangered species. State management plans would be considered for delisted species. • When Greater Sage-Grouse mitigation is necessary, BLM would prioritize mitigation in priority sage-grouse habitat areas (dependent upon the area-specific ability to increase sage-grouse populations). • Prior to authorizing Waivers, Exceptions or Modifications (WEMS) for oil and gas leasing, BLM would coordinate with the State of SD including the SD Game, Fish and Parks and other applicable State agencies or surface owner on any potential decision related to the use of WEMs that would affect resources or activities managed by the State or surface owner. 				

<p align="center">Table 2-2 Summary Comparison of Alternatives</p>				
<p><i>Management Action</i></p>	<p><i>Alternative A (No Action)</i></p>	<p><i>Alternative B</i></p>	<p><i>Alternative C</i></p>	<p><i>Alternative D (Preferred Alternative)</i></p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mitigation of activities including surface-disturbing or disruptive activities would be applied where needed to avoid, minimize, rectify, reduce or compensate for the impacts of human activities to special status species or special species habitat consistent with the management actions and restrictions found in this section and the Guidelines and BMPs listed in Appendix B. Mitigation measures would be applied on a case-by-case basis during activity level planning if review of the project area indicates special status species are present or would be affected. Exceptions to stipulation requirements may be granted by the authorized officer if an environmental review demonstrates that effects could be mitigated to an acceptable level. Exceptions may also be granted where the short-term effects are mitigated by the long-term benefits (e.g., riparian restoration projects, prescribed fire, or vegetation treatments). The sequence of mitigation action would be: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Step 1. Avoid</i> - Adverse impacts to resources are to be avoided and no action shall be permitted if there is a practicable alternative with less adverse impact. <i>Step 2. Minimize</i> - If impacts to resources cannot be avoided, appropriate and practicable steps to minimize adverse impacts must be taken. <i>Step 3. Compensate</i> - Appropriate and practicable compensatory mitigation is required for unavoidable adverse impacts which remain. The amount and quality of compensatory mitigation may not substitute for avoiding and minimizing impacts. <p>Additional details about mitigation including sage-grouse mitigation and conservation measures can be found in Appendices C and V and in the mitigation section of the Chapter 2 Summary.</p>				
<p align="center">Planning Area</p>				
<p>Raptors</p>				
<p>1</p>	<p>Surface occupancy and use would be prohibited within ½ mile of known bald eagle nest sites which have been active within the past 5 years and within bald eagle nesting habitat in riparian areas (O&G only).</p>	<p>Surface disturbing and disruptive activities would be avoided within ¼ mile of known bald eagle nest sites which have been active within the past 5 years and within bald eagle nesting habitat in riparian areas.</p> <p>Other surface occupancy and permitted uses could be limited at the project level.</p>	<p>Surface disturbing and disruptive activities would be avoided within ½ mile of known bald eagle nest sites which have been active within the preceding 5 breeding seasons. Other surface occupancy and permitted uses could be limited at the project level.</p>	<p>Same as Alternative C.</p>
<p>2</p>	<p>No related management action exists.</p>	<p>Public lands within ¼ mile of bald eagle nests would be an avoidance area for commercial renewable energy development and other ROWs.</p>	<p>Public lands within ½ mile of bald eagle nests would be an exclusion area for commercial renewable energy development and other ROWs.</p>	<p>Public lands within ½ mile of bald eagle nests would be an exclusion area for commercial renewable energy development and an avoidance area for other ROWs.</p>

**Table 2-2
Summary Comparison of Alternatives**

<i>Management Action</i>	<i>Alternative A (No Action)</i>	<i>Alternative B</i>	<i>Alternative C</i>	<i>Alternative D (Preferred Alternative)</i>
3	No related action exists in the current management plan for T&E/ sensitive and raptor species.	No weed treatments from 3/1- 8/1 within a ¼ mile buffer zone around active bald and golden eagle nesting sites. Exception: weed treatment may be possible within the ¼ mile buffer zone from March 1 – August 1, following consultation with necessary specialists for timing of least impacts.	No weed treatments from 3/1-8/1 within ¼ mile buffer zone around bald and golden eagle nesting sites active over the previous 7 years. Exception: weed treatment may be possible within the ¼ mile buffer zone from March 1 – August 1, following consultation with necessary specialists for timing of least impacts.	Same as Alternative C.
4	Surface occupancy and use would be prohibited within 1 mile of identified peregrine falcon nesting sites (O&G only).	Surface disturbing and disruptive activities would be avoided within ½ mile of identified peregrine falcon nesting sites. Other surface occupancy and permitted uses could be limited at the project level.	Surface disturbing and disruptive activities would be avoided within 1 mile of identified peregrine falcon nesting sites active within the preceding 7 breeding seasons. Other surface occupancy and permitted uses could be limited at the project level.	Same as Alternative C.
5	No related management action exists.	Public lands within ½ mile of peregrine falcon nests would be an avoidance area for commercial renewable energy development and other ROWs.	Public lands within 1 mile of peregrine falcon nests would be an exclusion area for commercial renewable energy development and other ROWs.	Public lands within ½ mile of peregrine falcon nests would be an exclusion area for commercial renewable energy development and an avoidance area for other ROWs.
6	Surface occupancy and use is prohibited within ½ mile of sensitive and special status raptor nest sites (peregrine falcons and bald eagles addressed in management actions 1 and 4). At the present time raptors that would be addressed by management	Surface disturbing and disruptive activities would be avoided within ¼ mile of sensitive and special status raptor nest sites that were active within the last 7 years (species addressed by this NSO would be the same as Alternative A).	Surface disturbing and disruptive activities would be avoided within ½ mile of sensitive and special status raptor nest sites that were active within the last 7 years (species addressed by this NSO would be the same as Alternative A).	Surface disturbing and disruptive activities would be avoided within ¼ mile of sensitive and special status raptor nest sites that were active within the preceding 7 breeding seasons. Additionally, surface occupancy and use is prohibited within ½ mile of active

**Table 2-2
Summary Comparison of Alternatives**

<i>Management Action</i>	<i>Alternative A (No Action)</i>	<i>Alternative B</i>	<i>Alternative C</i>	<i>Alternative D (Preferred Alternative)</i>
	action 6 include ferruginous hawk, northern goshawk, Swainson's hawk, golden eagle, and burrowing owls.			raptor nest sites from March 1 through July 31 (species addressed by this NSO would be the same as Alternative A).
7	No similar management action.	Public lands within ¼ mile of sensitive raptor nests would be an avoidance area for commercial renewable energy development and other ROWs. At the present time raptors that would be addressed by management action 7 include ferruginous hawk, northern goshawk, Swainson's hawk, golden eagle, and burrowing owls (peregrine falcons and bald eagles nests addressed in management actions 2 and 5).	Public lands within ½ mile of sensitive raptor nests would be an exclusion area for commercial renewable energy development and other ROWs. At the present time raptors that would be addressed by management action 7 include ferruginous hawk, northern goshawk, Swainson's hawk, golden eagle, and burrowing owls (peregrine falcons and bald eagles nests addressed in management actions 2 and 5).	Public lands within ¼ mile of sensitive raptor nests would be an exclusion area for commercial renewable energy development and an avoidance area for other ROWs. At the present time raptors that would be addressed by management action 7 include ferruginous hawk, northern goshawk, Swainson's hawk, golden eagle, and burrowing owls (peregrine falcons and bald eagles nests addressed in management actions 2 and 5).
8	No similar management action.	¼ mile weed treatment restriction zone around current year active raptor nesting site from March 1-July 31.	¼ mile weed treatment restriction zone around raptor nesting sites active over the previous 2 years from March 1-July 31.	¼ mile weed treatment restriction zone around current year active raptor nesting site from March 1-July 31. At the present time raptors that would be addressed by management action 8 include ferruginous hawk, northern goshawk, Swainson's hawk, golden eagle, and burrowing owls. ROWs near peregrine falcons and bald eagles nests addressed in management actions 2 and 5).
Greater Sage-Grouse General Habitat (Maps 2-4 and 2-5)				
9	Surface occupancy and use would be prohibited within ¼ mile of	Surface disturbing and disruptive activities would be avoided within	Surface disturbing and disruptive activities would be avoided within	Same as Alternative C.

Table 2-2. Summary Comparison of Alternatives

<p align="center">Table 2-2 Summary Comparison of Alternatives</p>				
<i>Management Action</i>	<i>Alternative A (No Action)</i>	<i>Alternative B</i>	<i>Alternative C</i>	<i>Alternative D (Preferred Alternative)</i>
	Greater Sage-Grouse leks (O&G only).	½ mile of sage-grouse leks.	1 mile of sage-grouse leks.	
10	No similar management action	Public lands within ½ mile of sage-grouse leks would be an avoidance area for commercial renewable energy development and other ROWs.	All public lands within 1 mile of sage-grouse leks in general habitat would be an exclusion area and all other areas in general habitat would be avoidance area for all types of ROWs.	Public lands within 1 mile of sage-grouse leks would be an exclusion area for commercial renewable energy development and an avoidance area for other ROWs.
11	Timing Restriction: Surface use would be prohibited from December 1 to March 31 within crucial winter range for Greater Sage-Grouse. See sagebrush cover Map 2-6.	Timing Restriction: Surface-disturbing or disruptive activities would be prohibited from December 1 to March 31 within winter range for sage-grouse. See sagebrush cover Map 2-6.	Timing Restriction: Surface-disturbing or disruptive activities would be prohibited from December 1 to March 31 within winter range for sage-grouse. See sagebrush cover Map 2-6. Other surface use and permitted uses could be limited at the project level.	Controlled surface use: Surface-disturbing or disruptive activities within sage-grouse winter range between December 1 and March 31 would require a plan approved by BLM to maintain suitability of habit and avoid or minimize habitat loss and disturbance. See sagebrush cover Map 2-6.
12	No related management action exists.	Sage-grouse winter range would be an avoidance area for commercial renewable energy development and other ROWs.	Sage-grouse winter range would be an exclusion area for commercial renewable energy development and other ROWs.	Sage-grouse winter range would be an exclusion area for commercial renewable energy development and an avoidance area for other ROWs. In cases where avoidance is not possible, BLM may require co-location of new ROWs with existing ROWs where possible.
13	Timing Restriction: Surface use would be prohibited from March 1 through June 30 in Greater Sage-Grouse nesting habitat within 2 miles of a lek. This stipulation does not apply to the operation	Timing Restriction: Surface disturbing and disruptive activities would be avoided from March 1 through July 15 in sage-grouse nesting habitat within 3 miles of a lek.	Timing Restriction: Surface disturbing and disruptive activities would be avoided from March 1 through July 15 in sage-grouse nesting habitat within 4 miles of a lek.	Same as Alternative C.

**Table 2-2
Summary Comparison of Alternatives**

<i>Management Action</i>	<i>Alternative A (No Action)</i>	<i>Alternative B</i>	<i>Alternative C</i>	<i>Alternative D (Preferred Alternative)</i>
	and maintenance of production facilities (Oil & Gas only).			
14	No related management action exists.	Sage-grouse nesting habitat within 3 miles of a lek would be an avoidance area for commercial renewable energy development and other ROWs.	Sage-grouse nesting habitat within 4 miles of a lek would be an exclusion area for commercial renewable energy development and other ROWs.	Sage-grouse nesting habitat within 4 miles of a lek would be an avoidance area for commercial renewable energy development and other ROWs.
15	No specific management action exists.	All new utility and powerlines (overhead lines) that can be safely buried would be buried within 1 mile of sage-grouse leks and within sage-grouse winter range.	<p>All new utility and powerlines (overhead lines) that can be safely buried would be buried within 2 miles of sage-grouse leks and within sage-grouse winter range.</p> <p>When burial of power lines is not possible, above ground lines will be located and designed to minimize impacts of predation, collision and other associated stressors to sage-grouse.</p> <p>Existing overhead lines within 2 miles of leks and within sage-grouse winter range would be evaluated for threats to sage-grouse and if necessary, modified to reduce the threat. If modification would not likely be effective, the overhead line may be relocated. Any requirements for modification or relocation of existing overhead lines would be subject to valid existing rights.</p>	Same as Alternative C.
16	TL: No weed treatments would	TL: Spot weed treatments only,	TL: Spot weed treatments only,	Same as Alternative B.

<p align="center">Table 2-2 Summary Comparison of Alternatives</p>				
<i>Management Action</i>	<i>Alternative A (No Action)</i>	<i>Alternative B</i>	<i>Alternative C</i>	<i>Alternative D (Preferred Alternative)</i>
	occur within suitable nesting habitat, within a 2 mile buffer zone, of known Greater Sage-Grouse leks from March 1-June 30.	using IPM methods within suitable nesting or brood rearing habitat, within a 3 mile buffer zone, of known sage-grouse leks from March 1-June 30.	using IPM methods within suitable nesting or brood rearing habitat, within a 4 mile buffer zone, of known sage-grouse leks from March 1-June 30.	
17	No similar action.	Where new ROWs are necessary in general habitat, ROWs would be co-located ROWs within existing ROWs where possible.	The entire General Habitat (Map 2-5) would be a ROW avoidance area for all types of ROWs. Where new ROWs are necessary in general habitat, ROWs would be co-located ROWs within existing ROWs where possible.	Where new ROWs are necessary in general habitat, ROWs would be co-located ROWs within existing ROWs where possible.
<p>Greater Sage-Grouse Protection Priority Areas (PPAs) Refer to Maps 2-4 and 2-5</p>				
18	No specific objective.	Objective: Manage Greater Sage-Grouse PPAs so that discrete anthropogenic (human-caused) disturbances do not adversely impact sage-grouse distribution or abundance.	Objective: Manage Greater Sage-Grouse PPAs/ACEC so that discrete anthropogenic (human-caused) disturbances cover less than 3% of the total sage-grouse habitat (considering disturbances across the landscape on all ownership types) to protect priority sage-grouse habitats from anthropogenic disturbances that will reduce distribution or abundance of sage-grouse.	Objective: Manage Greater Sage-Grouse PPAs so that discrete anthropogenic (human-caused) disturbances do not adversely impact sage-grouse distribution or abundance.
19	No similar action.	PPAs would include 83,744 surface and 253,357 subsurface oil and gas minerals acres. See Map 2-4.	Larger acres protected through Greater Sage-Grouse PPAs including 93,266 surface and 289,563 subsurface oil and gas minerals acres. See Map 2-5. Greater Sage-Grouse PPAs would be designated as an ACEC.	Same as Alternative B.
20	No similar action.	Greater Sage-Grouse PPAs would	Greater Sage-Grouse PPAs would	Same as Alternative B.

Table 2-2 Summary Comparison of Alternatives				
<i>Management Action</i>	<i>Alternative A (No Action)</i>	<i>Alternative B</i>	<i>Alternative C</i>	<i>Alternative D (Preferred Alternative)</i>
		be managed as No Surface Occupancy and Use (83,744 surface and 253,357 oil and gas subsurface minerals acres as shown in Map 2-4). These areas would be open to oil and gas leasing with a no surface occupancy stipulation. All sage-grouse habitat that is not part of a PPA would be managed as General Habitat as noted in Map 2-4.	be closed to oil and gas development, recommended for withdrawal from locatable mineral development and closed to salable and other leasable minerals. PPAs/ACEC would include 93,266 surface acres and 289,563 oil and gas subsurface mineral acres (refer to Map 2-5). All sage-grouse habitat that is not part of a PPA would be managed as General Habitat as noted in Map 2-5.	
21	No similar action	All grazing allotments wholly located in Greater Sage-Grouse PPAs would be considered for retirement where the base property owner relinquishes their preference.		
22	No similar action	Other resource uses within the Greater Sage-Grouse PPAs shown in Map 2-4 would be allowed pending project level environmental review provided the goals for sage-grouse and sage-grouse habitat are not compromised.	Other resource uses within the Greater Sage-Grouse PPAs/ACEC would be allowed pending project level environmental review provided the goals for sage-grouse and sage-grouse habitat are not compromised.	Greater Sage-Grouse PPAs would include the same areas and management of other resource uses as described in Alternative B.
23	No similar action.	Greater Sage-Grouse PPAs would be avoidance areas for all types of ROWs. Where new ROWs associated with valid existing rights are required, co-locate new ROWs within existing ROWs or where it best minimizes sage-grouse impacts. Use existing roads, or realignments as described above, to access valid	The Greater Sage-Grouse PPAs/ ACEC would be exclusion areas for all types of ROWs. The following exceptions would apply: Within designated ROW corridors encumbered by existing ROW authorizations: new ROWs may be co-located only if the entire footprint of the proposed project (including construction and	The Greater Sage-Grouse PPAs would be exclusion areas for renewable energy ROWs and avoidance areas for other ROWs. Where new ROWs associated with valid existing rights are required, co-locate new ROWs within existing ROWs or where it best minimizes sage-grouse impacts. Use existing roads, or

Table 2-2. Summary Comparison of Alternatives

**Table 2-2
Summary Comparison of Alternatives**

<i>Management Action</i>	<i>Alternative A (No Action)</i>	<i>Alternative B</i>	<i>Alternative C</i>	<i>Alternative D (Preferred Alternative)</i>
		<p>existing rights that are not yet developed. If valid existing rights cannot be accessed via existing roads, then build any new road constructed to the absolute minimum standard necessary.</p>	<p>staging) can be completed within the existing disturbance associated with the authorized ROWs.</p> <p>Subject to valid existing rights: where new ROWs associated with valid existing rights are required, co-locate new ROWs within existing ROWs or where it best minimizes sage-grouse impacts. BLM would use existing roads, or realignments as described above, to access valid existing rights that are not yet developed. If valid existing rights cannot be accessed via existing roads, then build any new road constructed to the absolute minimum standard necessary, and add the surface disturbance to the total disturbance in the priority area. If that disturbance exceeds 3% for that area, then make additional effective mitigation necessary to offset the resulting loss of sage-grouse.</p>	<p>realignments as described above to access valid existing rights that are not yet developed. If valid existing rights cannot be accessed via existing roads, then build any new road constructed to the absolute minimum standard necessary.</p>
24	No similar action.	<p>Within PPAs new power and utility lines (overhead lines) would be buried, eliminated, designed or sited in a manner which would not impact sage-grouse on public lands.</p>	<p>Within PPAs all new power and utility lines (overhead lines) that can be safely buried would be buried.</p> <p>When burial of power lines is not possible, above ground lines will be located and designed to</p>	Same as Alternative C.

**Table 2-2
Summary Comparison of Alternatives**

<i>Management Action</i>	<i>Alternative A (No Action)</i>	<i>Alternative B</i>	<i>Alternative C</i>	<i>Alternative D (Preferred Alternative)</i>
			<p>minimize impacts of predation, collision and other associated stressors to sage-grouse.</p> <p>Existing overhead lines within PPAs and within sage-grouse winter range would be evaluated for threats to sage-grouse and if necessary, modified to reduce the threat. If modification would not likely be effective, the overhead line may be relocated.</p> <p>Any requirements for modification or relocation of existing overhead lines would be subject to valid existing rights.</p>	
25	No similar action	<p>Retain public ownership of priority sage-grouse habitat. BLM would consider exceptions where there is mixed ownership, and land exchanges would allow for additional or more contiguous federal ownership patterns within the priority sage-grouse habitat area.</p> <p>Under priority sage-grouse habitat areas with minority federal ownership, BLM would develop an additional, effective mitigation agreement for any disposal of federal land. As a final preservation measure, consideration would be given to pursuing a permanent conservation easement.</p>		
26	Timing Limit: No weed treatments would occur within suitable nesting habitat, within a 2 mile buffer zone, of known Greater Sage-Grouse leks from March 1-June 30.	Timing Limit: Spot weed treatments only, using IPM methods within suitable nesting or brood rearing habitat of known sage-grouse leks from March 1-June 30.		
27	No specific management action	Categorical Exclusions (CXs) including those under the Energy Policy Act of 2005, Section 390 would not be used in priority sage-grouse habitats due to resource conflicts.		

<p align="center">Table 2-2 Summary Comparison of Alternatives</p>				
<i>Management Action</i>	<i>Alternative A (No Action)</i>	<i>Alternative B</i>	<i>Alternative C</i>	<i>Alternative D (Preferred Alternative)</i>
Grassland and Migratory Birds				
28	<p>Prescribed burning could be used as an alternative to mechanical treatment. Prescribed fire would be used to enhance vegetation and habitat and reduce hazardous fuels.</p>	<p>Prescribed burning would be allowed to achieve measurable landscape level objectives from:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • other resources, including, but not limited to forestry, wildlife, range, vegetation, and watershed - the reduction of hazardous fuels (public safety) • the introduction of fire into fire adapted ecosystems <p>Prescribed fire may be allowed in Greater Sage-Grouse PPAs if the activity would benefit sagebrush communities (e.g., achieve a diversity of age class or increase forbs, etc.).</p> <p>See Map 2-4 for Greater Sage-Grouse PPAs under Alternatives B and D.</p>	<p>Same as Alternative B, except prescribed fire would not be allowed in the Greater Sage-Grouse PPAs/ACEC.</p> <p>See Map 2-5 for Greater Sage-Grouse PPAs under Alternative C.</p>	<p>Same as Alternative B. See Map 2-4 for Greater Sage-Grouse PPAs under Alternatives B and D.</p>
29	<p>Surface occupancy and use would be prohibited within ¼ mile of wetlands identified as piping plover habitat. (O&G only).</p>	<p>Surface disturbing and disruptive activities would be avoided within ¼ mile of piping plover habitat.</p> <p>Other surface occupancy and permitted uses could be limited at the project level.</p>	<p>Same as Alternative B.</p>	
30	<p>No similar action.</p>	<p>Public lands within ¼ mile of wetlands or associated habitats identified as piping plover habitat</p>	<p>Public lands within ¼ mile of wetlands or associated habitats identified as piping plover habitat</p>	<p>Same as Alternative B.</p>

Table 2-2 Summary Comparison of Alternatives				
Management Action	Alternative A (No Action)	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D (Preferred Alternative)
		would be an avoidance area for commercial renewable energy development and other ROWs.	would be an exclusion area for commercial renewable energy development and other ROWs.	
31	Surface occupancy and use would be prohibited within ¼ mile of wetlands identified as interior least tern habitat (O&G only).	Surface disturbing and disruptive activities would be avoided within ¼ mile of interior least tern habitat. Other surface occupancy and permitted uses could be limited at the project level.	Same as Alternative B.	
32	No specific management action identified.	Public lands within ¼ mile of wetlands or associated habitats identified as least tern habitat would be an avoidance area for commercial renewable energy development and other ROWs.	Public lands within ¼ mile of wetlands or associated habitats identified as least tern habitat would be an exclusion area for commercial renewable energy development and other ROWs.	Same as Alternative B.
Other Special Status Wildlife Species				
33	Prairie Dog colonies that occur entirely on public land and are not causing significant adverse impacts to soil and vegetative resources would be managed for their wildlife and recreational values.	Prairie Dog colonies that occur entirely on public land would be managed for their wildlife, recreational and other values. Treatment would be considered if prairie dogs are determined by an IDT to be causing adverse impacts to soil and vegetative resources, or other resources and/or threats to public health and safety.	Prairie dog colonies that occur entirely on public land will be managed for their wildlife, recreational and other values. Treatment would only be considered for public health and safety.	Prairie Dog colonies that occur entirely on public land would be managed for their wildlife, recreational and other values. Treatment would be considered if prairie dogs are determined by an IDT to be causing adverse impacts to soil and vegetative resources, or other resources and/or threats to public health and safety.
34	In cases where prairie dog colonies originate on public land and spread onto private land, treatment would only be considered if the adjoining landowner is willing to enter into an agreement to control the prairie	Treatment of any prairie dog colony that exists on both public and private land would be considered through project level planning when the adjoining landowner is controlling the prairie dogs on their land.	Same as Alternative B.	

Table 2-2. Summary Comparison of Alternatives

<p align="center">Table 2-2 Summary Comparison of Alternatives</p>				
<i>Management Action</i>	<i>Alternative A (No Action)</i>	<i>Alternative B</i>	<i>Alternative C</i>	<i>Alternative D (Preferred Alternative)</i>
	dogs on his land at the same time they are being controlled on public land.			
35	No similar action.	Prairie dogs would not be considered for reintroduction on public land.	Prairie dogs could be considered for reintroduction on historic colonies or large unfragmented blocks of public land with a minimum of 10,000 or more acres of public land, if acquired, and while considering other resources and uses.	Prairie dogs could be considered for reintroduction on historic colonies or large unfragmented blocks of public and cooperating adjoining land owners with a minimum of 10,000 or more acres of public land, if acquired, with a 1 mile buffer from adjoining private land, and while considering other resources and uses.
36	No similar action.	No more than 15% of the total acreage of prairie dogs would be treated on public land each year. At current levels 15% amounts to approximately 296 acres.	No more than 10% of the total acreage of prairie dogs on public land would be treated each year. At current levels, 10% amounts to approximately 198 acres.	Same as Alternative B.
37	No similar action.	Bat gates or other suitable measures would be used to protect bats and bat habitat unless public health and safety would be sacrificed.	Same as Alternative B.	
Special Status Plants				
38	No similar action.	Livestock grazing in areas with high concentration of special status plants would not be allowed unless beneficial or negligible impacts would occur as determined through site-specific review by interdisciplinary team.	Same as Alternative B.	

Table 2-2 Summary Comparison of Alternatives				
<i>Management Action</i>	<i>Alternative A (No Action)</i>	<i>Alternative B</i>	<i>Alternative C</i>	<i>Alternative D (Preferred Alternative)</i>
Exemption Area Same as rest of planning area except:				
39	No similar action.	Evaluate all actions along Whitewood Creek and limit any actions that could decrease water flows and quality to maintain American dipper habitat.	Same as Alternative B.	
Program: Fish and Aquatics				
<p>Goal 1: Ensure that aquatic habitat is of suitable quality to support a diversity of plant and animal communities.</p> <p>Goal 2: Promote public awareness, appreciation, and fisheries conservation, management and ecology.</p> <p>Management Common to All Alternatives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evaluate all projects for aquatic habitat potential. • Aquatic stream/river surveys and monitoring would occur to collect baseline and trend data to evaluate the existing condition. This information is needed for determining the effects from other management on aquatic resources, mitigation and protection measures and identifying habitat restoration needs. • Survey and monitoring would include (1) fish (2) Macro-invertebrates (3) water quality (4) instream habitat (5) riparian habitat. • Fishing reservoirs would be surveyed/monitored as needed for fish, riparian, emergent vegetation, reservoir condition, water quality, water depth, and condition of access. • BLM roads/trail crossings and ROW on fish bearing streams would be made fish and aquatic species passable. • All fishing reservoirs would be maintained as a fishery as long as BLM and SDGFP determine that it is a viable fishery. • Coordinate with SDGFP, other agencies and general public on the educational public fishing days and other aquatic educational opportunities. • Develop habitat structures in reservoirs that are lacking structure or need restoration for aquatic species. • Coordinate with SDGFP prior to fisheries improvements. • Utilize Integrated Pest Management (IPM) concepts while working within federal, state laws, statutes, and regulations to minimize infestations of invasive aquatic species. 				
Planning Area				
1	No specific management action developed.	Increase fishing opportunities by development of ponds or reservoirs dependent upon water availability and dam constraints.		
2	Fish would be periodically stocked in 2 impoundments, Fort Meade Reservoir and Cottle Creek Reservoir.	Maintain aquatic habitat and fishing opportunities. Periodic stocking would be allowed by SDGFP or BLM.	No stocking would be allowed in water sources that have adequate natural reproduction of game fish.	Same as Alternative B.

Table 2-2 Summary Comparison of Alternatives				
<i>Management Action</i>	<i>Alternative A (No Action)</i>	<i>Alternative B</i>	<i>Alternative C</i>	<i>Alternative D (Preferred Alternative)</i>
3	The fisheries habitat in Bear Butte Creek would be improved by narrowing and deepening the channel during low water periods and using structures to create riffles, overhangs, and other improvements.	The fisheries habitat in Bear Butte Creek would be improved where feasible.		
4	NSO – Surface occupancy and use would be prohibited within ¼ mile of designated reservoirs with fisheries (oil & gas only).	Surface disturbing and disruptive activities would be avoided within ¼ mile of reservoirs with fisheries. Other surface occupancy and permitted uses could be limited at the project level.		
5	No specific management action developed.	Public lands within ¼ mile of reservoirs with fisheries would be an avoidance area for renewable energy development and other ROWs.	Public lands within ¼ mile of reservoirs with fisheries would be an exclusion area for renewable energy development and other ROWs.	Public lands within ¼ mile of reservoirs with fisheries would be an avoidance area for renewable energy development and other ROWs except that proposals would be considered for implementing individual ROW linear crossings if no other feasible crossing location can be found. If BLM allows a ROW crossing of the avoidance area, off site mitigation may be required.
6	Additional water sources that benefit wildlife would be developed.	Additional water sources and opportunities to maintain or increase water levels would be developed to benefit wildlife, fisheries other aquatic species and livestock.		
Program: Cultural Resources				
<p>Goal 1: Identify, preserve, and protect significant cultural resources and ensure that they are available for appropriate uses by present and future generations.</p> <p>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 identifying priority geographic areas for new field inventory, based on a probability for unrecorded significant resources.</p> <p>Management Common to All Alternatives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BLM would inventory and evaluate cultural resources pursuant to Section 106 and Section 110 of the National Historic Preservation Act to consider the 				

<p align="center">Table 2-2 Summary Comparison of Alternatives</p>				
<p><i>Management Action</i></p>	<p><i>Alternative A (No Action)</i></p>	<p><i>Alternative B</i></p>	<p><i>Alternative C</i></p>	<p><i>Alternative D (Preferred Alternative)</i></p>
	<p>effects of proposed BLM actions on cultural properties which may be eligible for the National Register of Historic Places including Traditional Cultural Properties.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Should National Register eligible cultural resources be found during an inventory, impacts to them would be mitigated, generally through avoidance. Should it be determined the cultural resources cannot be avoided; consultation with the State Historic Preservation Officer would be initiated. A program on mitigation would be developed via consultation between the South Dakota Field Office, the SHPO, the THPOs, and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation. • The BLM would continue to consult with Native American Tribes to identify areas that are important to the tribes. Consultation may result in identifying areas for cultural resource field inventories. • BLM would consult with Native American tribes to discuss view shed and the potential effects on Traditional Cultural Properties. • The BLM would limit surface-disturbing activities within selected Native American traditional cultural and religious sites for continued use by tribes. Traditional cultural sites would be identified in consultation with affiliated Native American tribes. • BLM would evaluate cultural resources according to the National Register criteria (36 CFR Part 60.4) and assign cultural resources to appropriate use categories (BLM Handbook 8110.41 and .42) as the basis for management decisions. • All sites determined eligible to the National Register of Historic Places would be allocated and managed for Scientific, Public, Traditional, Experimental, and/or Conservation for future use. If another use becomes evident or proposed after use allocation has occurred, the use allocation may be changed without a plan amendment. • The BLM would conduct regular monitoring of at-risk cultural sites to protect sites from conflicts with other resources uses and to document natural and human caused deterioration • Where feasible, the BLM would acquire properties adjacent to public lands through donation, exchange, or purchase that contain significant cultural resources including, but not limited to, those properties eligible for inclusion on the NRHP. • The BLM would continue management of Fort Meade according to the goals and objectives of the 1987 Cultural Resource Management Plan (CRMP) and the 1996 Fort Meade Recreation Area ACEC Management Plan. This includes Management Objectives such as: (1) Inventory and evaluate sites/features on public lands to determine their best use. (2) Protect significant sites/features and 3. Insure their proper use by allocating and managing cultural resource sites to Conservation, Scientific, Traditional, and /or Public Use. Interpretive sites would be developed as appropriate. • For Oil and Gas Leasing, to ensure that leased lands are examined to determine if cultural resources are present and to specify protective mitigation measures, the BLM would restrict surface-disturbing activities by attaching a lease notice for Cultural Resource Survey and a Cultural Resource Lease Stipulation for avoidance and protection of cultural resources (Appendix E), to all oil and gas lease parcels sold. • BLM would continue to attach the Cultural Resource Protection condition to all Range Grazing Leases (Appendix P). • Allocate and manage all National Register eligible Rock Art sites for Conservation, Scientific, Traditional, and /or Public Use. Interpretative sites would be developed as appropriate. • Allocate and manage all National Register eligible Aboriginal sites such as Occupation (camp sites), and Use Sites (quarries, game kills, lithic procurement sites) to Scientific, Traditional, and/or Conservation Use. No interpretative sites would be developed. • Allocate and manage all Prehistoric Earthworks sites (Aboriginal earthen mounds) to Conservation Use and Traditional Use. No interpretative sites would be developed. 			

Table 2-2 Summary Comparison of Alternatives				
Management Action	Alternative A (No Action)	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D (Preferred Alternative)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Allocate and manage all National Register eligible Rock alignments, (effigy figures, drive-lines, cairns, stone circles) to Conservation Use, Scientific, and Traditional Use. No interpretative sites would be developed. Allocate and manage all National Register eligible Historic Sites--non-mining, (homesteads, farmsteads, cabins, historic roads, trails, and rail roads) for scientific use and public use. Interpretative sites would be developed as appropriate. Allocate and manage all National Register eligible Historic Mining Complex sites to Public and Scientific Use. Interpretative site would be developed at the Belle Eldridge Mine Site. Allocate and manage National Register eligible Homestake Gold Historic Powder House Structures and related Caretakers House Foundation to Public Use. Interpretative site would be developed. Allocate and manage all Vision Quest Sites/Sacred Sites/TCPs/Ethnohistoric as well as burial sites to Conservation Use and Traditional Use. Allocate and manage site that have been determined Not Eligible for consideration to the NRHP, such as Prehistoric sites with low diversity and limited quantity (.,50 artifacts), isolated finds; low or limited complexity; and small size with exhausted potential after initial recordation, or have been destroyed. Historic sites that contain little or no scientific or historical value (isolated trash dumps and artifact scatters, isolated features such as mine prospects pits or claim markers, and structural remains with no integrity) to Experimental Use or Discharge from Use. No interpretive sites would be developed. 			
Planning Area				
1	Identify priority geographic areas for Section 110 cultural inventories based on a probability for unrecorded significant resources and/or resource need.	Conduct at least 100 acres of Section 110 cultural inventories per year.		Conduct at least 400 acres of Section 110 cultural inventories per year.
2	Bear Butte National Historic Landmark (410 acres federal minerals) would be available for mineral entry.	Bear Butte National Historic Landmark (410 Acres federal minerals) would not be recommended for withdrawal. Leasable federal minerals would be closed (no lease) except for oil and gas which would be open to leasing with an NSO-stipulation. Salable federal minerals (410 Acres) would be closed (no lease).		Bear Butte National Historic Landmark (410 Acres federal minerals) would be recommended for withdrawal, while leasable federal minerals and salable federal minerals would be closed (no lease).
3	Standard lease stipulations would protect areas directly within cultural sites, Native American traditional use areas/Traditional	Standard lease conditions (Appendix E.6) would protect areas within <u>and around</u> cultural sites, Native American traditional use areas/Traditional Cultural Properties, and Archaeological/Historic Districts that are eligible or potentially eligible for the National Register of Historic Places.		

<p align="center">Table 2-2 Summary Comparison of Alternatives</p>				
<p><i>Management Action</i></p>	<p><i>Alternative A (No Action)</i></p>	<p><i>Alternative B</i></p>	<p><i>Alternative C</i></p>	<p><i>Alternative D (Preferred Alternative)</i></p>
	<p>Cultural Properties, and Archaeological/Historic Districts that are eligible or potentially eligible for the National Register of Historic Places.</p> <p>Refer to Appendix E.6.</p>	<p>Protective buffers would include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Surface-disturbing activities would not be allowed within and for a distance of 300 feet from the boundaries of from the boundaries of cultural properties and archaeological/historic districts determined to be eligible or potentially eligible for the National Register of Historic Places. • Standard lease conditions would not allow Surface Occupancy and Use within, and for a distance of ½ mile from the boundaries of cultural properties determined to be of importance to Native American Tribal groups, sites determined to be Traditional Cultural Properties, and/or designated for traditional use. Such properties include (but are not limited to) burial locations, pictograph/petroglyph, vision quest locations, certain stone alignments, buttes or other uplift type landforms, plant gathering locations, and areas considered sacred or used for religious purposes. <p>Refer to Appendix E.2-E.4 for specific details including exceptions, modifications, and waivers.</p>		
4	No Specific Management Action.	NSO (No Surface Occupancy) within the boundary of the Black Hills Ordnance Depot and townsite of Igloo (Igloo Historic District map). The Igloo Historic District is a National Register of Historic Places Eligible Site. This applies to all minerals.		
<p>Program: Paleontological Resources</p> <p>Goal 1: Preserve and enhance paleontological resources on public land. Goal 2: Provide opportunities for scientific and recreational uses of paleontological resources within the planning area. Goal 3: Significant paleontological resources will be identified and preserved for their scientific values. Goal 4: Educational and recreational opportunities will be enhanced for the enjoyment of the public.</p> <p>Management Common to All Alternatives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Significant fossil localities will be identified, recorded, protected, and retained in Federal ownership as much as possible. • Projects would be designed to avoid disturbance to significant paleontological resources, or proper mitigation procedures applied if avoidance is not possible. • The Potential Fossil Yield Classification (PFYC) system will be developed and applied to afford proper mitigation actions for all surface-disturbing activities and land disposal actions. See Map 2-7. Surface occupancy and use is prohibited within designated paleontological sites/localities. • BLM would cooperate with permitted institutions or parties to map and record fossil localities • The requirements of Public Law 111-11 Subtitle D - Paleontological Resources Preservation will be followed for all management practices. 				
<p align="center">Planning Area</p>				
1	Paleontological resources would be protected by clearance or	Prior to approval of surface-disturbing activities, BLM would	Prior to approval of surface-disturbing activities field surveys	Prior to approval of surface-disturbing activities, field surveys

<p align="center">Table 2-2 Summary Comparison of Alternatives</p>				
<i>Management Action</i>	<i>Alternative A (No Action)</i>	<i>Alternative B</i>	<i>Alternative C</i>	<i>Alternative D (Preferred Alternative)</i>
	review action on a case-by-case basis.	review proposed project and if needed, require field surveys to be completed for bedrock exposures of PFYC 4 and 5 geologic formations (Class 4a and 5a). See Map 2-7. BLM would review proposed project plans for activities that result in surface disturbance potential impacts to paleontological resources and if needed require On-site monitoring or spot-checks at key times would be done if significant fossils are located during the survey.	would be completed for all PFYC 3, 4, and 5 geologic formations, and on-site monitoring would be performed for all Class 4 and 5 formations. See Map 2-7.	would be considered for all PFYC Class 4 and 5 formations in accordance with BLM guidance. A sampling of Class 3 formations would be surveyed based on known or likely paleontological occurrences. See Map 2-7. On-site or spot-check monitoring requirements during disturbance activities would be determined based on results of the survey (Appendix E.4).
2	Collection of common invertebrate and plant fossils by the public would be allowed in reasonable quantities using only hand tools.	Portions of the planning area would remain open for hobby collection of common invertebrate and plant fossils. Hobby collecting areas would be designated using only hand tools.	Same as Alternative A except collecting would be limited to surface collection for personal, noncommercial use using only hand tools.	Hobby collecting areas for common invertebrate and plant fossils would be designated when possible using only hand tools. Areas containing significant invertebrate or plant fossils would be identified and closed to hobby collecting if warranted. Other surface use authorizations would be assessed for adverse impacts to paleontological resources in these localities, and appropriate management restrictions applied.
3	Lands of paleontological interest would be considered for retention during land sales or exchanges. Lands that would help meet resource needs would be considered for acquisition by land exchange actions.	Retain public lands with significant paleontological values.	Retain public lands with significant paleontological values. Identify and proactively work toward acquiring non-BLM parcels within the planning area that contain significant paleontological resources.	Retain public lands with significant paleontological values. Identify non-BLM parcels that contain significant paleontological values. Include these parcels in acquisition efforts prompted by other resources, as applicable.

**Table 2-2
Summary Comparison of Alternatives**

Management Action	Alternative A (No Action)	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D (Preferred Alternative)																																																						
Program: Visual Resources																																																										
Goal 1: Public lands provide natural appearing landscapes for recreational opportunities.																																																										
Management Common to All Alternatives:																																																										
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide appealing landscapes and enhance opportunities to enjoy attractive settings. Manage scenic values in accordance with the objectives established for Visual Resource Management Classification as described in Appendix I, and in coordination with other resource uses and values. • Surface occupancy and use for energy development would be prohibited in Class I Visual Management designations. • Where current development degrades potential inventory class and as opportunities arise, review options to improve visual inventory class. • Require interim reclamation for surface disturbances that are not necessary for production and maintenance activities, to reduce visual contrasts. 																																																										
Planning Area																																																										
1	<p>Visual Resource Management Classification approximate (total) acres would be:</p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th>VRI Acres</th> <th>VRM Class</th> <th>VRM Acres</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">313</td> <td style="text-align: center;">I</td> <td style="text-align: center;">0</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">6,060</td> <td style="text-align: center;">II</td> <td style="text-align: center;">1,231</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">5,284</td> <td style="text-align: center;">III</td> <td style="text-align: center;">4,993</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">260,095</td> <td style="text-align: center;">IV</td> <td style="text-align: center;">531</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td style="text-align: center;">0 (No Designation)</td> <td style="text-align: center;">264,997</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Fossil Cycad ACEC is a Class IV VRM designation, and Fort Meade has a mix of designation, including some undesignated. All undesignated areas would be managed as VRM Class IV and</p>	VRI Acres	VRM Class	VRM Acres	313	I	0	6,060	II	1,231	5,284	III	4,993	260,095	IV	531		0 (No Designation)	264,997	<p>Visual Resource Management Classification approximate (total) acres would be:</p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th>VRM Class</th> <th>VRM Acres</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">I</td> <td style="text-align: center;">0</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">II</td> <td style="text-align: center;">1,544</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">III</td> <td style="text-align: center;">5,284</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">IV</td> <td style="text-align: center;">264,924</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">0 (No Designation)</td> <td style="text-align: center;">0</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Designates Fossil Cycad ACEC as Class II, and completes designation in Fort Meade ACEC to match adjacent class.</p>	VRM Class	VRM Acres	I	0	II	1,544	III	5,284	IV	264,924	0 (No Designation)	0	<p>Visual Resource Management Classification approximate (total) acres would be:</p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th>VRM Class</th> <th>VRM Acres</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">I</td> <td style="text-align: center;">0</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">II</td> <td style="text-align: center;">11,657</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">III</td> <td style="text-align: center;">179,212</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">IV</td> <td style="text-align: center;">80,883</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">0 (No Designation)</td> <td style="text-align: center;">0</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Designates Fossil Cycad ACEC as VRM Class II, designates all of Fort Meade ACEC to VRM Class II (Except Recreation development zones which would be retained as Class IV), designates Inventory</p>	VRM Class	VRM Acres	I	0	II	11,657	III	179,212	IV	80,883	0 (No Designation)	0	<p>Visual Resource Management Classification approximate (total) acres would be:</p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th>VRM Class</th> <th>VRM Acres</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">I</td> <td style="text-align: center;">0</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">II</td> <td style="text-align: center;">1,544</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">III</td> <td style="text-align: center;">10,367</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">IV</td> <td style="text-align: center;">259,841</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">0 (No Designation)</td> <td style="text-align: center;">0</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Designates Fossil Cycad ACEC as VRM Class II, retains Fort Meade Byway as VRM Class II; Class III designation is assigned to Fort Meade ACEC portions, and to the Exemption Area SRMA; Class IV</p>	VRM Class	VRM Acres	I	0	II	1,544	III	10,367	IV	259,841	0 (No Designation)	0
VRI Acres	VRM Class	VRM Acres																																																								
313	I	0																																																								
6,060	II	1,231																																																								
5,284	III	4,993																																																								
260,095	IV	531																																																								
	0 (No Designation)	264,997																																																								
VRM Class	VRM Acres																																																									
I	0																																																									
II	1,544																																																									
III	5,284																																																									
IV	264,924																																																									
0 (No Designation)	0																																																									
VRM Class	VRM Acres																																																									
I	0																																																									
II	11,657																																																									
III	179,212																																																									
IV	80,883																																																									
0 (No Designation)	0																																																									
VRM Class	VRM Acres																																																									
I	0																																																									
II	1,544																																																									
III	10,367																																																									
IV	259,841																																																									
0 (No Designation)	0																																																									

Table 2-2, Summary Comparison of Alternatives

**Table 2-2
Summary Comparison of Alternatives**

<i>Management Action</i>	<i>Alternative A (No Action)</i>	<i>Alternative B</i>	<i>Alternative C</i>	<i>Alternative D (Preferred Alternative)</i>
	evaluated on a case-by-case basis through project/activity plans. Refer to the Fort Meade and Fossil Cycad sections below in this table for additional details about the ACECs.		Class II as VRM Class II, designates BLM identified areas as VRM Class III. The Greater Sage-Grouse PPAs/ACEC would be classified as VRM Class IV (same as Alternatives B and D).	includes Recreation Development Zones in Fort Meade ACEC and other planning area acres.
2	CSU – surface-disturbing activities. Semi-permanent or permanent facilities in VRM Class II, areas may require special design including location, size, and camouflage painting to blend with the natural surroundings and meet the visual quality objectives for the area (applied to all activities)	CSU –All surface-disturbing activities. Semi-permanent or permanent facilities may require special design including location, size, and camouflage or earth tone paint to blend with the natural surroundings and meet the visual quality objectives in VRM Classes II, III and IV.	Same as Alternative B.	<p>CSU - Semi-permanent or permanent facilities that are not specifically prohibited in VRM Class II areas may require special design including location, size, and camouflage painting to blend with the natural surroundings and meet the visual quality objectives for the area (applies to all activities; CSU for oil and gas).</p> <p>Surface-disturbing activities in VRM Class III and IV may also require designs to reduce VRM impacts (applies to all activities; lease notice for oil and gas).</p> <p>Exceptions: The field manager may allow temporary projects to exceed VRM standards in Class II-IV areas if the project will terminate within 2 years of initiation. Rehabilitation will begin at least by the end of the two year period. During the temporary project, the field manager may require phased mitigation to better conform with prescribed VRM.</p>

Table 2-2 Summary Comparison of Alternatives																																																										
Management Action	Alternative A (No Action)	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D (Preferred Alternative)																																																						
3	Surface occupancy and use would be prohibited within developed recreation areas and undeveloped recreation areas receiving concentrated public use to protect visual resources (Oil & Gas only).	Surface occupancy and use would be prohibited in and within ½ mile buffer of Exemption Area SRMA. Surface occupancy and use would be prohibited within ½ mile buffer around Fort Meade SRMA/ACEC. (Minerals would be withdrawn within the Fort Meade SRMA/ACEC as noted in Minerals section of this table).	Surface occupancy and use would be prohibited within 1 mile of Fort Meade and other developed recreation sites.	Same as Alternative B.																																																						
4	No specific management action.	Public lands would be an avoidance area for commercial wind energy development in VRM Class I and II designations.	Public lands would be excluded from commercial wind energy development in VRM Class I and II designations.	Public lands would be an excluded from commercial wind energy development and would be a ROW avoidance area for other types of ROWs in VRM Class I and II designations.																																																						
5	<p>Exemption Area: Visual Resource Management Classification (included in planning area totals above) approximate acres would be:</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>VRI Acres</th> <th>VRM Class</th> <th>Acres</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>0</td> <td>1</td> <td>0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3,438</td> <td>2</td> <td>0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>0</td> <td>3</td> <td>0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1,645</td> <td>4</td> <td>0</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>0 (No Designation)</td> <td>5,083</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	VRI Acres	VRM Class	Acres	0	1	0	3,438	2	0	0	3	0	1,645	4	0		0 (No Designation)	5,083	<p>Exemption Area: Visual Resource Management Classification (included in planning area totals above) approximate acres would be:</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>VRM Class</th> <th>Acres</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>I</td> <td>0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>II</td> <td>0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>III</td> <td>0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>IV</td> <td>5,083</td> </tr> <tr> <td>0 (No Designation)</td> <td>0</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>All Exemption Area acres would be designated as VRM Class IV.</p>	VRM Class	Acres	I	0	II	0	III	0	IV	5,083	0 (No Designation)	0	<p>Exemption Area: Visual Resource Management Classification (included in planning area totals above) approximate acres would be:</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>VRM Class</th> <th>Acres</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>I</td> <td>0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>II</td> <td>3,438</td> </tr> <tr> <td>III</td> <td>1,645</td> </tr> <tr> <td>IV</td> <td>0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>0 (No Designation)</td> <td>0</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Acres with VRI Class II would be designated as VRM class II and</p>	VRM Class	Acres	I	0	II	3,438	III	1,645	IV	0	0 (No Designation)	0	<p>Exemption Area: Visual Resource Management Classification (included in planning area totals above) approximate acres would be:</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>VRM Class</th> <th>Acres</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>I</td> <td>0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>II</td> <td>0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>III</td> <td>5,083</td> </tr> <tr> <td>IV</td> <td>0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>0 (No Designation)</td> <td>0</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>All Exemption Area acres would be designated as VRM Class III.</p>	VRM Class	Acres	I	0	II	0	III	5,083	IV	0	0 (No Designation)	0
VRI Acres	VRM Class	Acres																																																								
0	1	0																																																								
3,438	2	0																																																								
0	3	0																																																								
1,645	4	0																																																								
	0 (No Designation)	5,083																																																								
VRM Class	Acres																																																									
I	0																																																									
II	0																																																									
III	0																																																									
IV	5,083																																																									
0 (No Designation)	0																																																									
VRM Class	Acres																																																									
I	0																																																									
II	3,438																																																									
III	1,645																																																									
IV	0																																																									
0 (No Designation)	0																																																									
VRM Class	Acres																																																									
I	0																																																									
II	0																																																									
III	5,083																																																									
IV	0																																																									
0 (No Designation)	0																																																									

Table 2-2. Summary Comparison of Alternatives

Table 2-2 Summary Comparison of Alternatives				
<i>Management Action</i>	<i>Alternative A (No Action)</i>	<i>Alternative B</i>	<i>Alternative C</i>	<i>Alternative D (Preferred Alternative)</i>
			VRI Class IV would be designated as VRM Class III.	
Program: Fire Management and Ecology				
<p>Goal 1: Manage wildfire and fuels for the protection of public health, safety, property, and resource values, emphasizing firefighter and public safety as the single overriding priority.</p> <p>Goal 2: Manage hazardous fuels in areas of urban and industrial interface to reduce potential loss due to severe wildfire.</p> <p>Goal 3: Maintain and/or improve desired mix of seral stages within vegetation communities including forest and woodlands, grasslands, shrublands, and riparian/wetlands.</p> <p>Goal 4: Manage vegetation communities through cooperative efforts by restoring and maintaining natural fire regimes and frequency to the landscape, where appropriate.</p> <p>Goal 5: Maintain and promote partnerships with the public and interagency cooperators to develop and strengthen coordination of all fire management activities across jurisdictional boundaries.</p> <p>Goal 6: Utilize integrated management techniques unless otherwise restricted (defined as prescribed fire, mechanical, chemical, or biological, followed by desired seeding) to reduce fuels and to protect high priority areas or resource values.</p> <p>Goal 7: Burned areas pose minimal threat to public safety, property, cultural resources, and/or ecological function.</p> <p>Goal 8: Continued ecological improvements in the conifer, grassland, shrubland, and riparian strata. This is reflected in moving Fire Regime Condition Class (FRCC) 3 to 2, Class 2 to 1, and maintaining Class 1; with emphasis in wildland urban interface (WUI) areas.</p> <p>Management Common to All Alternatives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All 274,000 acres of BLM-administered lands including the Exemption Area, Fort Meade ACEC, and Remainder of South Dakota Fire Management Units would be designated as Category B – where fire may be desirable for resource benefit, but wildfire would cause negative impacts because of developments and sensitive resources. Suppression is required. Prescribed fire and mechanical treatments would be used to reduce hazardous fuels and to enhance resources. • National fire suppression guidelines and the current Fire Management Plan would be utilized to guide fire suppression techniques on public lands. • In Greater Sage-Grouse Protection Priority Areas (PPAs) and within 3 miles of leks in general habitat, use of aggressive suppression techniques and heavy equipment would only be used when lesser techniques would not adequately protect habitat. • In the course of fire suppression, a resource advisor would be consulted or assigned to wildfires that involve or threaten public lands. • State of South Dakota Division of Wildland Fire Suppression (SDDWFS) would provide suppression responsibilities for wildfires on BLM-administered lands in cooperation with local rural and volunteer fire departments through Interagency Cooperative Agreements and approved Annual Operating Plans. Eastern Montana/Dakotas District Office in Miles City would provide suppression responsibilities for BLM-administered lands within Harding County. • The aerial application of fire retardant would be restricted over areas that contain petroglyphs and pictographs. • BLM would follow the most recent policy for delivery of wildfire chemicals near waterways. • Incident base camps, staging areas, helibases, and other incident management activities would be placed outside of and sufficiently distant from known or 				

**Table 2-2
Summary Comparison of Alternatives**

<i>Management Action</i>	<i>Alternative A (No Action)</i>	<i>Alternative B</i>	<i>Alternative C</i>	<i>Alternative D (Preferred Alternative)</i>
<p>identified cultural resources and riparian areas.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Priority of fire management activities would be placed on fuels reduction in WUI areas in conjunction with completed Community Wildfire Protection Plans (CWPPs). • Fire management activities outside of WUI areas would use FRCC to determine level of fuels treatment. • Treatments would be designed to protect and/or improve wildlife habitat and reduce the severity of wildfires. • BLM would protect sensitive status species habitat during suppression and prescribed fire activities as described in the National Fire Suppression Guidelines and the current fire management plan. • BLM would provide assistance to communities in developing, implementing, and maintaining CWPPs. • Treat burned areas that pose an unacceptable risk to public safety, property, cultural resources, and/or ecological function. Treatments would be in accordance with the National BLM Emergency Stabilization and Burned Area Rehabilitation policy. • Mitigation measures would be applied on a case-by-case basis during activity level planning consistent with the management actions and restrictions found in this section and the Guidelines and BMPs listed in Appendix B. 				
Planning Area				
1	<p>Use of earth moving/tillage equipment would be avoided for wildfire suppression in areas with special designations to protect cultural resources and values, archeological districts, and other areas known to possess cultural resources.</p> <p>The use of heavy equipment and off road vehicles would be limited to existing roads and trails within these areas during rehabilitation.</p> <p>Use of heavy equipment would be restricted in riparian areas, streamside zones, Belle Eldridge repository, or other hazardous and environmentally sensitive sites and identified cultural properties in order to reduce impacts to</p>	<p>Use and movement of heavy equipment (earth moving/tillage equipment) for fire suppression would be allowed in all areas unless otherwise restricted (ex: known archeological sites, hazardous and environmentally sensitive sites, ACECs).</p> <p>Precautions would be applied to protect cultural resources and values, archeological districts, reduce impacts to sensitive soils and plants, and to minimize soil erosion.</p> <p>In areas where heavy equipment is restricted, Cultural Resource Specialists or Resource Advisors would be consulted for locations of identified areas before use of or anticipated use of heavy</p>	Same as Alternative B.	<p>Use and movement of heavy equipment (earth moving/tillage equipment) for fire suppression would be allowed in all areas unless otherwise restricted (ex: known archeological sites, hazardous and environmentally sensitive sites, ACECs).</p> <p>Precautions would be applied to protect cultural resources and values, archeological districts, reduce impacts to sensitive soils and plants, and to minimize soil erosion.</p> <p>In areas where heavy equipment is restricted, Cultural Resource Specialists or Resource Advisors would be consulted for locations of identified areas before use of or anticipated use of heavy</p>

**Table 2-2
Summary Comparison of Alternatives**

<i>Management Action</i>	<i>Alternative A (No Action)</i>	<i>Alternative B</i>	<i>Alternative C</i>	<i>Alternative D (Preferred Alternative)</i>
	sensitive soils and plants and to minimize soil erosion.	equipment. Heavy equipment would be allowed off roads and trails except where prohibited.		equipment. Heavy equipment would be allowed off roads and trails except where prohibited.
2	Prescribed burning could be used as an alternative to mechanical treatment. Prescribed fire would be used to enhance vegetation and habitat and reduce hazardous fuels.	Prescribed burning would be allowed to achieve measurable landscape level objectives from: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • other resources, including, but not limited to forestry, wildlife, range, vegetation, and watershed - the reduction of hazardous fuels (public safety); • the introduction of fire into fire adapted ecosystems. Prescribed fire may be allowed in Greater Sage-Grouse PPAs if the activity would benefit sagebrush communities (ex: achieve a diversity of age class). See Map 2-4 for Greater Sage-Grouse PPAs.	Same as Alternative B, except prescribed fire would not be allowed in the Greater Sage-Grouse PPAs/ACEC. See Map 2-5 for Greater Sage-Grouse PPAs.	Same as Alternative B. See Map 2-4 for Greater Sage-Grouse PPAs.
3	No similar action.	Areas identified for prescribed burning could be rested from livestock grazing up to one year prior to treatment if necessary to produce fine fuels to carry the burn, and for a minimum of one growing season following treatment to promote recovery of vegetation.	Areas identified for prescribed burning could be rested from livestock grazing up to one year prior to treatment if necessary to produce fine fuels to carry the burn, and for a minimum of two growing seasons following treatment to promote recovery of vegetation.	Same as Alternative B.

Table 2-2 Summary Comparison of Alternatives				
Management Action	Alternative A (No Action)	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D (Preferred Alternative)
		<p>Adaptive Management: Prescribed livestock grazing following fire may be implemented prior to the minimum rest period.</p> <p>Threshold: When an interdisciplinary team has determined that plant communities would move away from those plant communities that support the integrity of the ecological processes (water, energy, and nutrient cycles) without prescribed livestock grazing, prescribed livestock grazing would be used for special management purposes such as reducing annual plant invasion where site-specific interdisciplinary planning and the NEPA process has determined it to be a viable management option.</p>	<p>Adaptive Management would be the same as Alternative B.</p>	
Resource Uses				
Program: Forest and Woodland Products				
<p>Goal 1: Manage public forest and woodlands to provide plant communities that support the integrity of the ecological processes (water cycle, energy cycle, and nutrient cycle) and improve or maintain wildlife habitat considering economically efficient methods.</p> <p>Goal 2:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Forests and woodlands support diverse vegetative communities as indicated by wildlife habitat goals. • Forests and woodlands would be managed for ecological resiliency, as indicated by fuels and fire management goals. • Forest and woodland treatments may result in vegetative products being available for public or other use depending on local market demands <p>Goal 3: Manage forest resources to improve resilience to severe events and maintain and enhance their ability for the long-term sequestration of carbon.</p>				

Table 2-2 Summary Comparison of Alternatives				
<i>Management Action</i>	<i>Alternative A (No Action)</i>	<i>Alternative B</i>	<i>Alternative C</i>	<i>Alternative D (Preferred Alternative)</i>
<p>Management Common to All Alternatives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A range of forested conditions (open savannah to dense canopy, newly regenerated to mature stands) would be maintained in the forest and woodland types • All appropriate silvicultural systems (Even-aged, Two-aged, Uneven-aged) would be available for management • All silvicultural tools would be available (mechanical thinning, hand thinning, horse logging, planting, prescribed burning, cable logging, chemical treatments, pheromone application, etc.) to provide the desired results • Forestry Best Management Practices for South Dakota would be followed for forest and woodland projects (Appendix B). • Retain, where existing, a minimum of 2 existing snags per acre greater than 16 in DBH and 30 ft. tall, unless a safety hazard. Salvage or felling of dead or dying trees would be acceptable • Forest treatments would retain or improve turkey roost sites • Cross-country travel would be allowed for forest management practices under the terms of a permit. • Mitigation measures would be applied on a case-by-case basis during activity level planning consistent with the management actions and restrictions found in this section and the Guidelines and BMPs listed in Appendix B. 				
Planning Area				
1	All lands would be available for the sale, use, and treatment of forest and woodland products, except sale would not be allowed on the Fossil Cycad ACEC.	Same as Alternative A.	All lands would be available for the sale, use, and treatment of forest and woodland products, unless otherwise restricted.	Same as Alternative A.
2	Forest and woodland products, such as firewood, posts, poles, biomass, and timber would be managed to benefit other resources and offered for sale when they have an economic value. Probable Sale Quantity (PSQ) would be 7000 Tons/year for all forest and woodland products.	Forest and woodland products, such as firewood, posts, poles, biomass, timber, and other special forest products would be managed to benefit other resources and offered for sale when they have an economic value and utilized or treated if there is no economic value. Probable Sale Quantity (PSQ) would be 7000 Tons/year for all forest and woodland products.	Treatment methods would favor natural processes applied by management (prescribed burning, pheromone application, patience) to work towards desired conditions. Removal off-site (through sale offering or other utilization) of forest products with economic value would be allowed where no new permanent roads would be required. Probable Sale Quantity (PSQ) would be 6000 Tons/year for all	Same as Alternative B.

Table 2-2 Summary Comparison of Alternatives				
<i>Management Action</i>	<i>Alternative A (No Action)</i>	<i>Alternative B</i>	<i>Alternative C</i>	<i>Alternative D (Preferred Alternative)</i>
			forest and woodland products.	
3	No related management action exists.	Incidental use of plant materials would be allowed, except that only above ground plant gathering would be allowed in the Fossil Cycad ACEC (Figure 2-1).	Same as Alternative B.	Incidental use of plant materials would be allowed, except that only above ground plant gathering would be allowed in the Fossil Cycad ACEC and Fort Meade ACEC (Figure 2-1).
4	No related management action exists.	Snag and cavity bearing tree cutting, removal, and offer for sale or utilization would be allowed for public safety, salvage post fire, and/or in response to other resource needs.	Snag and cavity bearing tree cutting, removal, and offer for sale or utilization would be allowed where public safety has been identified as a potential concern and where no new permanent roads would be required. Removal off-site would be unacceptable where additional permanent roads would be necessary for product removal.	Snag and cavity bearing tree cutting, removal, and offer for sale or utilization would be allowed for public safety, salvage post fire, and/or in response to other resource needs.
5	Roads would be constructed to the minimum standard necessary to remove forest and woodland products, unless the roads would be needed for other purposes requiring a higher standard.	New permanent roads may be built for long-term management of areas where multiple entries would be necessary to meet objectives. New road construction would be kept to the minimum (construction standard, number and length) necessary for multiple use management. Rerouting and maintenance of existing authorized roads would be allowed to reduce impacts to resources. Temporary road construction would also be kept to a minimum and decommissioned as part of the	No new permanent roads would be constructed for forest management. Maintenance of existing roads would be allowed. Rerouting of existing roads would not be allowed. Temporary road construction would be kept to a minimum (construction standard, number and length) necessary for the project, and decommissioned as part of the project.	Same as Alternative B.

Table 2-2 Summary Comparison of Alternatives				
<i>Management Action</i>	<i>Alternative A (No Action)</i>	<i>Alternative B</i>	<i>Alternative C</i>	<i>Alternative D (Preferred Alternative)</i>
		project.		
6	No related management action exists.	If goshawk nest areas occur within ½ mile of project area and a protected area has not been identified, the project analysis would determine whether some of the acreage should be protected.	Same as Alternative B.	Same as Alternative B.
Program: Livestock Grazing				
<p>Goal 1: Manage for a sustainable level of livestock grazing while meeting or progressing toward the Dakotas Standards for Rangeland Health (Appendix A) recognizing the ecological benefits of moderate levels of large animal grazing in the Great Plains.</p> <p>Goal 2: Manage livestock grazing to provide economic opportunities in the planning area.</p> <p>Locations of Grazing Allotments are shown in Maps 2-8.</p> <p>Management Common to All Alternatives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Livestock grazing would be managed through implementation of the Dakotas Standards for Rangeland Health and Guidelines for Livestock Grazing Management (Appendix A). • Implementation of existing Allotment Management Plans (AMPs) and development of new AMPs for priority allotments (I and M Allotments) would continue. • BLM would complete assessments for rangeland health on a priority allotment basis with emphasis on allotments with significant acreage of public land, TES species, and resource problems or issues (e.g., I and M category allotments). • BLM would work cooperatively on integrated ranch planning so that ranch operations with a combination of BLM/deeded/other leased lands can be properly planned and coordinated. • Prioritize allotments for AMP development, habitat improvement projects, rangeland health assessments and other range-related activities within sage-grouse protection priority habitat, riparian areas, and other high priority locations. • Prioritize completion of rangeland health assessments and processing grazing permits/leases within priority greater sage-grouse habitat areas. BLM would focus this process on allotments that have the best opportunities for conserving, enhancing or restoring habitat for greater sage-grouse. • New fences would follow BLM specifications (BLM Handbook 1741-1 and WO IM-2010-022) to allow for wildlife passage and located or marked as feasible to minimize collisions and other wildlife issues, except for fences built specifically to keep wildlife out of an area. • Existing fences would be reviewed to identify areas where fence modification or removal could be implemented to improve wildlife movement. • Functional wildlife escape ramps would be installed and maintained on all water tanks on BLM lands. • Temporary stocking rate adjustments would be done in response to changing conditions (drought, fire, etc.) and desired vegetative response (e.g., livestock 				

<p align="center">Table 2-2 Summary Comparison of Alternatives</p>				
<p><i>Management Action</i></p>	<p><i>Alternative A (No Action)</i></p>	<p><i>Alternative B</i></p>	<p><i>Alternative C</i></p>	<p><i>Alternative D (Preferred Alternative)</i></p>
	<p>use to modify vegetation).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Certified weed seed free forage (hay and grains) straw and mulch would be required for all activities when used on BLM lands (exceptions could be made for emergencies when approved by the BLM authorized officer). • Joint cooperative monitoring with grazing lessees would be highly encouraged as outlined in IM No. 2006-100 and IB No. 2010-015. • Requests to divide or combine grazing allotments would be denied when it does not result in proper and efficient management of public rangelands (43 CFR 4110.2-4). • Unless specifically precluded on the lease or permit, administrative use motorized cross-country travel (including aircraft) would be allowed to maintain or repair range improvements, treat or move livestock, spray weeds, monitor animal and range conditions, and complete other management tasks directly associated with livestock and range management. BLM may restrict or prohibit administrative cross-country motorized travel in specific areas to protect resources, address safety issues or limit other conflicts associated with cross-country travel. • Adjustments to livestock management practices or livestock numbers would be made based on results of monitoring studies, rangeland health assessments, allotment evaluations, interdisciplinary review and consultation, cooperation and coordination with the affected lessee. Guidelines for Grazing Management include practices which mitigate livestock grazing (Appendix A). Additional site-specific mitigation would be identified and implemented through environmental review that is completed at the implementation phase (project level) when AMPs or grazing lease renewals occur. Applicable BMPs as described in Appendix B would also be used to mitigate impacts. 			
	<p>Objective 1: For allotments without approved specific management objectives and established grazing strategies, the utilization level as measured at the end of the grazing season would not exceed 50% on herbaceous forage plants on a pasture-wide basis or on selected key areas. Utilization would be monitored (within staffing capabilities and budget) to gauge effectiveness of management. Allotments with approved management plans would establish allowable use levels for grazing allotments through specific management objectives during the management planning process.</p> <p>Objective 2: Across the planning area, BLM would allow approximately 50% of the annual vegetation production to be used by livestock with approximately 25% ingested by livestock and the other 25% trampled or soiled. Fifty percent of the annual vegetation production would remain to meet wildlife forage/cover requirements and watershed needs (soil and hydrologic conditions). The additional 25% of the annual vegetation production that would not be consumed by livestock would meet wildlife forage/cover requirements and watershed needs as well. See the Animal Unit Month Allocations portion of the Livestock Grazing section of Chapter 3 for detailed example of livestock forage allocations.</p>			
<p align="center">Planning Area</p>				
<p>1</p>	<p>Allocation of forage would be based on Missouri River Basin (MRB) surveys with consideration for needs of wildlife and watershed.</p>	<p>Allocation of forage would be based on MRB surveys with consideration for needs of wildlife and watershed.</p> <p>Adjustments to AUMs would be</p>	<p>Same as Alternative A except no increase in AUMs would be allowed.</p>	<p>Same as Alternative B.</p>

**Table 2-2
Summary Comparison of Alternatives**

<i>Management Action</i>	<i>Alternative A (No Action)</i>	<i>Alternative B</i>	<i>Alternative C</i>	<i>Alternative D (Preferred Alternative)</i>
	Adjustments in livestock apportionment would be made if monitoring showed a significant change in the allotment grazing capacity as a result of management actions applied. Vegetation use adjustments would be based on site-specific monitoring as reflected by trend in plant species composition and soil erosion condition. Adjustments would be made when adequate monitoring data was acquired to support an adjustment and after coordination and consultation with the operator.	based on monitoring. Adaptive Management: An increase in AUMs may be allowed (up to 5% within Decision Area). Threshold: Allotment Management Plans (AMPs) are implemented and management practices in the AMPs to increase AUMs include improved grazing systems, range improvements, changes in season of use and/or stocking rates etc. An allotment would be monitored for three years following an adjustment. If increased AUM harvest is found to cause a decrease in range condition, then AUMs would be reverted to the number of AUMs prior to the increase. Decreases in original AUMs would occur only after other methods to better distribute and manage livestock have been tried and failed.		
2	Livestock grazing would be allowed on about 271,000 acres. The amount of forage available for permitted use on these lands would be about 73,400 Animal Unit Months (AUMs).	Livestock grazing would be allowed on about 272,000 acres. The amount of forage that could be available for permitted use on these lands would be about 77,300 (AUMs).	Same as Alternative A (No Action).	Same as Alternative B.
3	Allowable utilization by livestock would not exceed 50% by weight.	On allotments found to exceed 50% utilization at the end of the grazing season, utilization would	Adjustments in livestock grazing management (livestock numbers and kind, seasons of use, rest, etc.)	Same as Alternative B.

<p align="center">Table 2-2 Summary Comparison of Alternatives</p>				
<p><i>Management Action</i></p>	<p><i>Alternative A (No Action)</i></p>	<p><i>Alternative B</i></p>	<p><i>Alternative C</i></p>	<p><i>Alternative D (Preferred Alternative)</i></p>
		<p>be measured in every pasture of the allotment at the end of the following grazing season.</p> <p>Adaptive Management: Adjustments in livestock grazing management (livestock numbers and kind, seasons of use, rest etc.) may occur with additional monitoring* of livestock grazing effects.</p> <p>Threshold: Two consecutive years of exceeding 50% utilization on a pasture-wide basis. Adjustments would be based on monitoring.</p> <p>*Additional monitoring includes vegetation attributes such as frequency, cover, density, production, structure and composition. Other non-vegetative attributes that could be monitored are hydrologic function and soil and site stability.</p>	<p>would be made if utilization levels were found to exceed 50% utilization on a pasture-wide basis or on selected key areas for three consecutive years on any given allotment.</p>	
4	<p>Supplemental feeding could be authorized for improved livestock and rangeland management on public lands.</p>	<p>Salt, minerals and protein supplements would be used to better distribute livestock grazing use and meet nutritional needs of livestock. Livestock supplements would not be allowed within ¼ mile of riparian areas. Adjustments to supplement</p>	<p>Same as Alternative B.</p>	

Table 2-2. Summary Comparison of Alternatives

<p align="center">Table 2-2 Summary Comparison of Alternatives</p>				
<i>Management Action</i>	<i>Alternative A (No Action)</i>	<i>Alternative B</i>	<i>Alternative C</i>	<i>Alternative D (Preferred Alternative)</i>
		locations would be made if found to create excessive disturbance to other resources.		
5	Allotments where grazing preference is relinquished during the life of the plan would remain available for livestock grazing leases or permits.	Same as Alternative A (No Action).	Allotments where grazing preference is relinquished, a reduction, suspension or elimination of livestock grazing leases could become necessary in specific situations where livestock grazing causes or contributes to conflicts with the protection and/or management of other resource values or uses. Such determinations would be made during site-specific activity planning and associated environmental analysis. These determinations would be based on several factors, including monitoring studies, reviewing current science, obtaining input from livestock operators and the interested public, and assessing the ability to meet the Dakotas Standards for Rangeland Health.	Same as Alternative C:
6	There would be no yearlong leases on M or I allotments.	Yearlong leases on M and I allotments would only be allowed where no resource concerns exist, or when an Allotment Management Plan (AMP) or terms and conditions on the grazing lease have been developed to address those concerns.	There would be no yearlong leases on M or I allotments.	Same as Alternative B:

<p align="center">Table 2-2 Summary Comparison of Alternatives</p>				
<i>Management Action</i>	<i>Alternative A (No Action)</i>	<i>Alternative B</i>	<i>Alternative C</i>	<i>Alternative D (Preferred Alternative)</i>
7	<p>All grazing permits/leases requested to be transferred or renewed for grazing allotments would be subject to a site-specific interdisciplinary environmental review.</p>	<p>Livestock grazing permits/leases would be transferred or renewed for Improve (I), Maintain (M) and Custodial (C) category grazing allotments where the AUMs and kind of livestock are the same as the previous permit/lease.</p> <p>A screening criteria checklist (see Appendix K) would be reviewed and documented prior to transfer or renewal. Any subsequent updates or modifications to the direction in the screening checklist would be used.</p> <p>In cases where the use would substantially differ from that authorized in the previous grazing permit/lease, other factors have developed to change the management circumstances, or land health standards are not being met because of livestock grazing, a site-specific interdisciplinary environmental review would be undertaken.</p>	<p>Same as Alternative B, except that only category M and C allotments would be considered for grazing permit/lease transfers through this process.</p> <p>Livestock grazing permits/leases requested to be transferred or renewed for category I grazing allotments would be subject to a site-specific interdisciplinary environmental review.</p>	<p>Same as Alternative B.</p>
8	<p>Yearling cattle factors would be considered through individual AMPs. The animal unit equivalent would be 0.7 for yearling cattle. Yearling factors would only apply to stocking rates and carrying capacities.</p>	<p>Same as Alternative A (No Action).</p>	<p>Yearling cattle factors would not be considered. The animal unit equivalent would be 1.0 for yearling cattle.</p>	<p>Yearling cattle factors would be considered through individual AMPs. The animal unit equivalent would be 0.7 for yearling cattle. Yearling factors would only apply to stocking rates and carrying capacities.</p>

**Table 2-2
Summary Comparison of Alternatives**

<i>Management Action</i>	<i>Alternative A (No Action)</i>	<i>Alternative B</i>	<i>Alternative C</i>	<i>Alternative D (Preferred Alternative)</i>
9	<p>BLM Instruction Memorandum 98-140 (1998) would be followed to protect bighorn sheep. To limit the potential for disease transmission to bighorn sheep, the IM provides guidelines for domestic livestock management as summarized below: Domestic sheep and goat grazing and trailing should be discouraged in the vicinity of native wild sheep ranges; review of grazing permit applications for new domestic sheep or goat grazing permits should consider buffer strips up to 9 miles or as developed through a cooperative agreement to minimize contact between domestic sheep and goats and native wild sheep; domestic sheep and goats should be closely managed and carefully herded where necessary to prevent them from straying into native wild sheep areas.</p>	<p>To limit the potential for disease transmission to bighorn sheep, no change in livestock conversions from cattle, horses, or bison to domestic sheep or goats would be allowed in allotments within current occupied bighorn sheep range. Bighorn sheep range is shown in Map 2-3. Transfer of grazing preference would only be allowed to livestock types other than domestic sheep and goats within current occupied bighorn sheep range.</p> <p>New domestic sheep and goat allotments or conversions from cattle, horses, or bison to domestic sheep or goats would not be permitted within a minimum of 5 miles from known bighorn sheep range. This distance would be greater if deemed necessary through site-specific analysis and additional research findings.</p> <p>To minimize contact with bighorn sheep, domestic sheep and goats used for weed control within 5 miles of bighorn sheep range would only occur with coordination with SDGFP.</p> <p>If new bighorn sheep introductions</p>	<p>Same as Alternative B.</p> <p>Same as Alternative B except 15 mile buffer instead of 5.</p> <p>Same as Alternative B except 10 mile buffer instead of 5.</p>	<p>To limit the potential for disease transmission to bighorn sheep, no change in livestock conversions from cattle, horses, or bison to domestic sheep or goats would be allowed in allotments within current occupied bighorn sheep range. Bighorn sheep range is shown in Map 2-3. Transfer of grazing preference would only be allowed to livestock types other than domestic sheep and goats within current occupied bighorn sheep range.</p> <p>New domestic sheep and goat allotments or conversions from cattle, horses, or bison to domestic sheep or goats would not be permitted within a minimum of 15 miles from known bighorn sheep range. This distance would be greater if deemed necessary through site-specific analysis and additional research findings.</p> <p>To minimize contact with bighorn sheep, domestic sheep and goats used for weed control within 10 miles of bighorn sheep range would only occur with coordination with SDGFP.</p> <p>If new bighorn sheep introductions</p>

<p align="center">Table 2-2 Summary Comparison of Alternatives</p>				
<p><i>Management Action</i></p>	<p><i>Alternative A (No Action)</i></p>	<p><i>Alternative B</i></p>	<p><i>Alternative C</i></p>	<p><i>Alternative D (Preferred Alternative)</i></p>
		<p>are proposed in areas that are currently not occupied by bighorn sheep, BLM would take this information into consideration and analyze the impacts at the project level utilizing the same buffer distances listed above.</p>		<p>are proposed in areas that are currently not occupied by bighorn sheep, BLM would take this information into consideration and analyze the impacts at the project level utilizing the same buffer distances listed above.</p>
10	<p>An interdisciplinary inspection would evaluate the feasibility and impacts of proposed range improvements before approving projects.</p> <p>Mitigation measures for resource protection would be developed for each project.</p>	<p>Range improvements would be allowed to improve livestock husbandry or to improve land health.</p> <p>Mitigation measures for resource protection would be developed for each project.</p>	<p>Range improvements (such as improving or increasing water sources) would be allowed as part of an overall grazing strategy to benefit watershed and wildlife habitat resources and not solely for animal husbandry.</p> <p>Mitigation measures for resource protection would be developed for each project.</p>	<p>Range improvements (such as improving or increasing water sources) would be allowed as part of an overall grazing strategy to benefit multiple resources.</p> <p>Mitigation measures for resource protection would be developed for each project.</p>
11	<p>No specific management action.</p>	<p>Areas identified for prescribed burning could be rested from livestock grazing up to one year prior to treatment if necessary to produce fine fuels to carry the burn, and for a minimum of one growing season following treatment to promote recovery of vegetation.</p> <p>Adaptive Management: Prescribed livestock grazing following fire could be implemented prior to the minimum rest period. The prescribed livestock grazing would</p>	<p>Areas identified for prescribed burning could be rested from livestock grazing up to one year prior to treatment if necessary to produce fine fuels to carry the burn, and for a minimum of two growing seasons following treatment to promote recovery of vegetation.</p> <p>Adaptive Management: Same as Alternative B.</p>	<p>Same as Alternative B.</p>

Table 2-2. Summary Comparison of Alternatives

Table 2-2. Summary Comparison of Alternatives

<p align="center">Table 2-2 Summary Comparison of Alternatives</p>				
<i>Management Action</i>	<i>Alternative A (No Action)</i>	<i>Alternative B</i>	<i>Alternative C</i>	<i>Alternative D (Preferred Alternative)</i>
		<p>be used for special management purposes such as reducing annual plant invasion where site-specific interdisciplinary planning and the NEPA process have determined it to be a viable management option.</p> <p>Threshold: When an interdisciplinary review has determined that plant communities would move away from those plant communities that support the integrity of the ecological processes (water, energy, and nutrient cycles) without prescribed livestock grazing.</p>		
12	No specific management action.	Grazing in areas with high concentration of TES plants would not be allowed unless beneficial or negligible impacts would occur as determined through a review by an interdisciplinary team.	Same as Alternative B.	Same as Alternative B.
<p align="center">Exemption Area Same as rest of planning area except:</p>				
13	Livestock grazing would only be allowed where tree regeneration is not of importance.	<p>To protect other resource values, no new grazing allotments would be authorized in the Exemption Area unless capability criteria are met for 50% of the proposed allotment acres.</p> <p>The grazing lessee would be</p>	<p>New livestock grazing allotments would not be authorized within the Exemption Area.</p> <p>Transfer of grazing preferences on existing allotments would be allowed based on project level planning.</p>	Same as Alternative B.

<p align="center">Table 2-2 Summary Comparison of Alternatives</p>				
<p><i>Management Action</i></p>	<p><i>Alternative A (No Action)</i></p>	<p><i>Alternative B</i></p>	<p><i>Alternative C</i></p>	<p><i>Alternative D (Preferred Alternative)</i></p>
		<p>required to fence new allotments. Grazing would also be allowed throughout the Exemption Area for beneficial resource uses such as fuels treatments, weed control etc. Any such treatments would be completed following a site-specific interdisciplinary team analysis.</p> <p>Capability criteria are as follows: Capable for cattle grazing; slope less than or equal to 30%, range production above or at 200 lbs/acre, wind/water erodibility at slight to moderate. Sheep grazing capability is the same as cattle except the slope cutoff is 45%. Areas not meeting these criteria are shown in Map 2-24.</p> <p>There would be approximately 1,294 acres capable for cattle grazing outside of existing allotments and approximately 2,435 acres non-capable for cattle grazing. There would be approximately 1,608 acres capable for sheep grazing outside of existing allotments and approximately 2,121 acres non-capable for sheep grazing</p>	<p>Grazing would be allowed throughout the Exemption Area for beneficial resource uses such as fuels treatments, weed control etc. Grazing would be completed on a treatment basis and not set up as an allotment. Any such treatments would be completed following a site-specific interdisciplinary team analysis.</p>	

Table 2-2 Summary Comparison of Alternatives				
<i>Management Action</i>	<i>Alternative A (No Action)</i>	<i>Alternative B</i>	<i>Alternative C</i>	<i>Alternative D (Preferred Alternative)</i>
Program: Recreation				
<p>Goal 1: Provide for a range of recreational opportunities while minimizing adverse impacts to other resources.</p> <p>Goal 2: Encourage community partnerships with BLM for the purpose of improving the recreational opportunities in response to the needs of visitors and local communities.</p> <p>Management Common to All Alternatives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maintain existing recreation facilities and areas in a safe condition. • Emphasize recreation opportunities not provided by the private sector or other public lands. • Forage brought onto BLM-administered public land would be required to be certified weed free forage. • Firearm shooting would be allowed except where specifically restricted or prohibited. Areas may be closed or restricted to firearm shooting if safety issues arise, littering occurs, or conflicts with other resources or resource uses occur. • Notify adjacent local governments of events requiring Special Recreation Use Permits or authorized use. • Fishing would be allowed under state fishing regulations. • Issue Special Recreation Use Permits based on evaluation of criteria including but not limited to analyzing natural and cultural resource conditions, visitor safety, conflicting resource uses, and other current conditions or needs. • Applications for Special Recreation Permits in sage-grouse priority habitat areas may be denied if approval of the permit would adversely impact sage-grouse or sage-grouse habitat. • Outfitter/guide hunting activities on public lands within grazing allotments under agreement with the State of South Dakota for wildlife or public access purposes would not be allowed and therefore would be excluded from the issuance of Outfitter/Guide Special Recreation Permits. Exceptions may be allowed in cases where only a portion of the allotment is under agreement with the State. • Areas designated as Extensive Recreation Management Areas will offer recreation opportunities in a relatively unchanged physical recreation setting, that facilitate the visitors' freedom to participate in a variety of dispersed recreation activities. • Guidelines and BMPs would be used to mitigate impacts of recreational activities (Appendix B). 				
Planning Area				
1	No specific management action.	Approximately 259,936 acres would be designated as Extensive Recreation Management Area (ERMA), where recreation management is commensurate and considered in context with the management of other resources and resource uses. Camping limits, recreation permit/fees,	Approximately 265,019 acres would be designated as Extensive Recreation Management Area (ERMA), where recreation management is commensurate and considered in context with the management of other resources and resource uses. Camping limits, recreation permit/fees, conditions	Same as Alternative B.

Table 2-2 Summary Comparison of Alternatives				
<i>Management Action</i>	<i>Alternative A (No Action)</i>	<i>Alternative B</i>	<i>Alternative C</i>	<i>Alternative D (Preferred Alternative)</i>
		conditions of use, travel types and modes may be regulated to achieve or maintain setting characteristics.	of use, travel types and modes may be regulated to achieve or maintain setting characteristics.	
2	No specific management action.	Approximately 11,652 acres (Fort Meade ACEC; 6,574 acres and the Exemption Area; 5,078 acres) would be designated Special Recreation Management Areas (SRMA), indicating a commitment to intensive recreation management. Fort Meade ACEC and the Exemption Area are shown in Figures 2-2 and 2-3.	Approximately 6,574 acres (Fort Meade ACEC) would be designated as Special Recreation Management Area, indicating a commitment to intensive recreation management. Fort Meade ACEC is shown in Figure 2-2.	Same as Alternative B.
3	No specific management action.	Objective: The planning area would be managed for approximately 11,652 acres (Fort Meade ACEC and the Exemption Area) of Front Country Recreation Setting Characteristics; 261,325 acres of Middle Country Characteristics; and 320 acres (Fossil Cycad) of Back Country Characteristics.	Objective: The planning area would be managed for approximately 6,574 acres (Fort Meade ACEC) of Front Country Recreation Setting Characteristics; 88,539 acres of Middle Country Characteristics; and up to 178,163 acres of Back Country Characteristics.	Same as Alternative B.
4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Camping would be allowed on BLM surface administered lands, with a 16 day stay limit and a minimum ½ mile move on dispersed camping areas (ERMAs). b) Motorized travel cross country for camping purposes would be limited to within 300 feet of 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Same as Alternative A. b) Same as Alternative A. c) Same as Alternative A. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Same as Alternative A. b) Motorized travel cross country for camping purposes would be limited to within 100 feet of existing roads after locating the campsite in a non-motorized fashion. c) Same as Alternative A. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Same as Alternative A. b) Motorized travel cross country for camping purposes would be limited to within 100 feet of existing roads after locating the campsite in a non-motorized fashion. c) Same as Alternative A.

**Table 2-2
Summary Comparison of Alternatives**

<i>Management Action</i>	<i>Alternative A (No Action)</i>	<i>Alternative B</i>	<i>Alternative C</i>	<i>Alternative D (Preferred Alternative)</i>
	<p>existing roads and trails after locating the campsite in a non-motorized fashion.</p> <p>c) Campfires would be allowed unless restricted by fire closure.</p>			
5	<p>Area would be designated as LIMITED for transportation purposes. Motorized travel would be allowed on existing roads and trails.</p>	<p>Area would be designated as LIMITED for transportation purposes. Motorized travel would be allowed on existing roads and trails, or designated roads and trails in TMAs. Designation of roads and trails would be determined in future travel/transportation planning process in accordance with the chosen alternative. Roads and trails may be closed to protect resources. New roads and trails may be developed.</p>	<p>Area would be designated as LIMITED for transportation purposes. Motorized travel would be allowed on designated roads and trails. Designation of roads and trails would be determined in future TMA planning process and follow goals and objectives of the chosen alternative Roads and trails may be closed to protect resources. No new roads or trails would be developed; exceptions would be made where required by law, regulation, or policy. Approval for construction of new roads would be assessed at the project level</p>	<p>Same as Alternative B:</p>
6	<p>a) Hunting would be allowed according to state regulation. Outfitter/guide permits would be issued when consistent with management objectives.</p> <p>b) Trapping would be allowed according to state regulation. Traps may be no closer than 100 yards from any road, trail, or trailhead.</p>	<p>a) Hunting would be allowed according to state regulation and Outfitter/guide types of Special Recreation Permits may be issued. Priority for these permits where there is a conflict would be based on a first come basis.</p> <p>b) Trapping would be allowed according to state regulation and traps may not be within 50</p>	<p>a) Same as Alternative B except no commercial Special Recreation Permits would be issued.</p> <p>b) Same as Alternative B.</p>	<p>a) Same as Alternative B.</p> <p>b) Same as Alternative B.</p>

**Table 2-2
Summary Comparison of Alternatives**

<i>Management Action</i>	<i>Alternative A (No Action)</i>	<i>Alternative B</i>	<i>Alternative C</i>	<i>Alternative D (Preferred Alternative)</i>
		feet of any road or trail, and 1000 feet of campsites, trailheads or dwellings.		
7	Fish stocking would be allowed.	Game fish stocking would not be allowed in waters with adequate natural reproduction.	Same as Alternative A: Fish stocking would be allowed.	
8	Special Recreation Use Permits would be issued when consistent with management objectives and would be required for any commercial, competitive, group use and/or vending activities.	Special Recreation Use Permits would be issued when consistent with management objectives; evaluated on a case by case basis, analyzing natural and cultural resource conditions, visitor safety, conflicting resource uses, and other current conditions or needs. SRPs would be required for any commercial, competitive, group use, and/or vending activities. Conflicts between permit applications that are otherwise acceptable will be resolved on a first come priority basis.	No commercial Special Recreation Use Permits would be issued. Other types of SRPs may be issued when consistent with management objectives; evaluated on a case-by-case basis, analyzing natural and cultural resource conditions, visitor safety, conflicting resource uses, and other current conditions or needs. Conflicts between permit applications that are otherwise acceptable will be resolved on a first come priority basis.	Same as Alternative B: Special Recreation Use Permits would be issued when consistent with management objectives; evaluated on a case-by-case basis, analyzing natural and cultural resource conditions, visitor safety, conflicting resource uses, and other current conditions or needs. SRPs would be required for any commercial, competitive, group use, and/or vending activities. Conflicts between permit applications that are otherwise acceptable will be resolved on a first come priority basis.
9	No similar action.	Geocaching would be allowed.	Geocaching would be allowed if it does not create ground disturbance, is not placed in or on historic features, artifacts or structures, and is not commercial in nature.	Same as Alternative C.
10	Recreational gold panning would be allowed on all streams except at Fort Meade and in the Fossil Cycad Area.	Recreational gold panning would be allowed except at Fort Meade ACEC, Fossil Cycad ACEC. Recreational gold panning could be restricted if monitoring	Recreational gold panning would be allowed except at Fort Meade ACEC, Fossil Cycad ACEC. Recreational gold panning could be restricted if monitoring	Same as Alternative B.

Table 2-2. Summary Comparison of Alternatives

<p align="center">Table 2-2 Summary Comparison of Alternatives</p>				
<i>Management Action</i>	<i>Alternative A (No Action)</i>	<i>Alternative B</i>	<i>Alternative C</i>	<i>Alternative D (Preferred Alternative)</i>
		determined negative effects to resources. Streams may be identified and up to 20 acres could be recommended for withdrawal from mineral entry to provide a recreational gold panning opportunity.	determined negative effects to resources.	
11	BLM-administered lands would be available for other non-consumptive recreational pursuits such as bird watching, sledding, walking, cross-country skiing (ungroomed), meditation etc. Gathering of plant materials for incidental use, other than forest products, is allowed.	BLM-administered lands would be available for other non-consumptive recreational pursuits such as bird watching, sledding, walking, cross-country skiing (ungroomed), meditation etc. Special Recreation Permits would be required when activities involve groups. Gathering of plant materials for incidental use would be allowed, except only above ground gathering would be allowed in the Fossil Cycad ACEC.		
12	Surface occupancy and use would be prohibited within developed recreation areas and undeveloped recreation areas receiving concentrated public use (O&G only).	Surface occupancy and use would be prohibited within ½ mile of the SRMAs Fort Meade ACEC and Exemption Area.	Surface occupancy and use would be prohibited within 1 mile of the SRMAs Fort Meade ACEC and other developed recreation sites.	Same as Alternative B.
13	No similar action.	ROWs associated with renewable energy and other uses would be avoided area within ½ mile of SRMAs Fort Meade ACEC and Exemption Area.	ROWs associated with renewable energy and other uses would be excluded within 1 mile of the Fort Meade SRMA, other developed recreation sites and the Exemption Area.	ROWs for renewable energy would be excluded. ROWs for other uses would be avoided within ½ mile of SRMAs (Fort Meade ACEC, Exemption Area and other developed recreation sites).
14	No restrictions on snowmobile use.	Snowmobiles and vehicles specifically equipped to travel over snow would be unrestricted	Snowmobiles and vehicles specifically equipped to travel on snow would be restricted to	Same as Alternative B.

**Table 2-2
Summary Comparison of Alternatives**

<i>Management Action</i>	<i>Alternative A (No Action)</i>	<i>Alternative B</i>	<i>Alternative C</i>	<i>Alternative D (Preferred Alternative)</i>
		unless adverse impacts to resources or infrastructure occurs, safety issues become evident or snowmobile use in important wildlife use areas increases to the point that it becomes disruptive (refer to glossary) to wildlife. Note that additional snowmobile restrictions in the Fort Meade ACEC and the Exemption Area may apply as shown under the Exemption Area or the Special Designation section (Fort Meade ACEC portion) of this table.	designated roads and trails.	
Exemption Area Same as the rest of the planning area except:				
15	No identified Recreation Opportunity Spectrum classification.	Objective: Exemption Area would be managed for Roaded Natural recreation opportunities.	Objective: Exemption Area would be managed for Semi-primitive non-motorized recreation opportunities.	Objective: Exemption Area would be managed for Roaded Natural recreation opportunities.
16	The Exemption Area would be designated as Extensive Recreation Management Area (ERMA), same as the rest of the planning area.	The Exemption Area would be designated as a Special Recreation Management Area (SRMA). Specific planning document would be developed.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative B.
17	Same as the rest of the planning area.	Designated camping areas and associated regulations may be developed.	Same as Alternative A.	Designated camping areas and associated regulations may be developed. Black Hills Fire Protection District rules shall apply to campfires on BLM land.
18	The Mickelson Trail and State Snowmobile trail system would be the only maintained trails.	The Mickelson Trail and State Snowmobile trail system would continue to be managed by the	Same as A, except motorized travel would be limited to designated roads, which may be	The Mickelson Trail and State Snowmobile trail system would continue to be managed by the

<p align="center">Table 2-2 Summary Comparison of Alternatives</p>				
<i>Management Action</i>	<i>Alternative A (No Action)</i>	<i>Alternative B</i>	<i>Alternative C</i>	<i>Alternative D (Preferred Alternative)</i>
	Snowmobiling would be restricted to these designated trails. Other motorized travel would be limited to existing roads and trails.	State of South Dakota and use on these trails would be regulated by that agency. Snowmobiling would be restricted to these designated trails. Hiking trails around Deadwood and potential OHV trail connecting Deadwood to other trails may be developed. Other motorized travel would be limited to existing trails until the Travel Management Plan designates roads and trails for motorized travel. Roads and trails may be closed to protect resources. New roads would be allowed.	closed to protect resources. New roads would not be allowed unless required by law or policy.	State of South Dakota and use on these trails would be regulated by that agency. Snowmobiling would be restricted to designated trails. Hiking trails around Deadwood and potential OHV trail connecting Deadwood to other trails may be developed. Other motorized travel would be limited to existing trails until the Travel Management Plan designates roads and trails for motorized travel. Roads and trails may be closed to protect resources. New permanent and temporary road construction, maintenance, rerouting, and decommissioning would be allowed.
19	Same as the rest of the planning area.	Fish stocking would be allowed. Increase fishing opportunities by development of ponds, such as a pond near the Homestake Powderhouses, dependent upon water availability and dam constraints.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative B.
20	Same as the rest of the planning area.	Recreation Use Permits would be required at developed, designated campgrounds.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative B.
<p>Program: Travel Management and Transportation</p> <p>Goal 1: Manage transportation and access to provide for use and enjoyment of the public lands while protecting resource values and providing for user safety. Goal 2: Access is available to larger blocks of BLM-administered surface lands. Goal 3: Manage transportation network to enhance a variety of uses of public lands.</p>				

**Table 2-2
Summary Comparison of Alternatives**

<i>Management Action</i>	<i>Alternative A (No Action)</i>	<i>Alternative B</i>	<i>Alternative C</i>	<i>Alternative D (Preferred Alternative)</i>
<p>Management Common to All Alternatives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fort Meade (Figure 2-2), the Exemption Area (Figure 2-3) and the Center of the Nation (Map 2-1) would be designated as Travel Management Areas (TMAs). Areas are designated as open, closed, or limited to various modes of transportation • Acquire or retain access to public lands to improve management efficiency. • Existing mode of travel for accessing private lands through BLM will be continued unless adverse resource impacts are occurring. • Coordinate with SD Game, Fish, and Parks, the Commissioner of School and Public Lands, lessee(s), and adjacent landowners concerning designation of access including routes on BLM-administered public land that is adjacent or within hunting management areas such as Walk-In areas, etc. (SD Hunting Atlas (printed annually). • Travel routes through cultural resource sites would be rerouted or mitigated. • Motorized wheeled cross-country travel would be prohibited except for administrative, authorized and emergency uses. BLM may restrict or prohibit administrative or authorized cross-country motorized travel in specific areas to protect resources, address safety issues or limit other conflicts associated with cross-country travel. • Temporary travel restrictions would be implemented in emergency situations to comply with fire restrictions or protect the soil and water quality. • Work in coordination with federal, tribal, state, and county agencies, private landowners, and organizations for road maintenance issues for existing and new roads. • As opportunities arise BLM would establish or maintain access easements for administrative and/or for public use. • Authorization of cross-country motorized travel for disabled hunter/angler access and game retrieval may be allowed in cooperation with SDGFP by special authorization. • Authorization of cross-country motorized travel for other types of disabled user access would be addressed on a case-by-case basis and would require special authorization. • Back Country Byway designation and management would continue as detailed in the 1996 Fort Meade ACEC Management Plan. • Future National Scenic and Historic Trails may be designated as a Special Designation and management plans developed. • Designated transportation /utility corridors would be located along I-90, State Highway 34 and the Bear Butte Road as described in the 1996 Fort Meade ACEC Plan (Figure 2-2). • Roads would be constructed at the minimum standard necessary. An environmental review would be completed if an upgrade is proposed for other purposes that require a higher standard. • Guidelines and BMPs would be used to mitigate impacts of transportation (Appendix B). • Allow no upgrading of existing routes that would change route category (road, primitive road, or trail) or capacity unless the upgrading would have minimal impact on sage-grouse habitat, is necessary for motorist safety, or eliminates the need to construct a new road. <p>Aircraft Use on BLM-Administered Public Land:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Approval of permanent or temporary air strips would be determined through project level planning. • Aircraft landings and take-offs would be allowed for the purposes of search and rescue, law enforcement activities, wildfire suppression, military training 				

<p align="center">Table 2-2 Summary Comparison of Alternatives</p>				
<i>Management Action</i>	<i>Alternative A (No Action)</i>	<i>Alternative B</i>	<i>Alternative C</i>	<i>Alternative D (Preferred Alternative)</i>
<p>and operations, or emergency activities and other authorized uses.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prior written authorization for aircraft landings and take-offs would be required and would be considered on a case-by-case basis. • A vender would need a Special Recreation Permit to become an air taxi service. 				
<p align="center">Planning Area</p>				
1	Travel would be restricted to existing roads and trails in accordance with the 2003 OHV ROD.	Three Travel Management Areas (TMAs) would be developed: Fort Meade Recreation ACEC, Exemption Area, and Center of the Nation (the large blocks of public lands in Northern Butte and Southern Harding counties). These areas would be considered focus areas when implementation planning for transportation (OHV, including snowmobile use, aerial, and non-motorized travel) is initiated.		
2	Motorized wheeled cross-country travel to retrieve big game animals would be prohibited.	Motorized wheeled cross-country travel would be limited to 300 feet from nearest road to retrieve big game animals. This action may be revised or changed during travel management planning and this type of cross-country travel could be prohibited in specific areas pending site-specific environmental review.	Same as Alternative A. This action may be revised or changed during travel management planning and this type of cross-country travel could be allowed in specific areas pending site-specific environmental review.	
3	Travel would be allowed within 300 feet of roads to access campsite.	Motorized wheeled travel would be allowed within 300 feet of roads to access campsite by direct route unless prevented by terrain features. This action may be revised or changed during travel management planning and this type of cross-country travel could be prohibited in specific areas pending site-specific environmental review.	Motorized wheeled travel would be allowed within 100 feet of roads to access campsite by direct route unless prevented by terrain features. This action may be revised or changed during travel management planning and this type of cross-country travel could be prohibited in specific areas pending site-specific environmental review.	Same as Alternative C.
4	No restrictions on snowmobile use.	Snowmobiles and vehicles specifically equipped to travel on snow would be unrestricted unless monitoring indicates degradation	Snowmobiles and vehicles specifically equipped to travel on snow would be restricted to designated roads and trails.	Same as Alternative B.

Table 2-2 Summary Comparison of Alternatives				
<i>Management Action</i>	<i>Alternative A (No Action)</i>	<i>Alternative B</i>	<i>Alternative C</i>	<i>Alternative D (Preferred Alternative)</i>
		to natural resources, disturbance to wildlife, or safety problems.		
5	Roads would be constructed at the minimum standard necessary unless an upgrade is needed for other purposes that require a higher standard.	New permanent roads may be built for long-term management of areas where multiple entries would be necessary to meet objectives. New road construction would be kept to the minimum (construction standard, number and length) necessary for multiple use management. Rerouting and maintenance of existing authorized roads would be allowed to reduce impacts to resources. Construction of temporary roads could be authorized through project level planning and would be kept to a minimum, decommissioned and reclaimed as part of the project.	No new permanent roads would be constructed except as required by law, regulation or policy. Maintenance of existing roads would be allowed. Rerouting of existing roads would not be allowed. Temporary road construction would be kept to a minimum (construction standard, number and length) necessary for the project, and decommissioned and reclaimed as part of the project.	Same as Alternative B.
6	The planning area would be designated as LIMITED for transportation purposes. Motorized travel would be allowed on existing roads and trails.	Unless otherwise designated through travel management planning, the planning area would be designated as LIMITED to <u>existing roads and trails</u> for transportation purposes except for the Fort Meade and Fossil Cycads ACECs which would be LIMITED to <u>designated roads and trails</u> . Motorized travel would be allowed on existing roads and trails, or designated roads and trails in TMAs. Roads and trails may be closed to protect	Unless otherwise designated through, travel management planning, the planning area would be designated as LIMITED to <u>existing roads and trails</u> for transportation purposes except for the Fort Meade and Fossil Cycads ACECs which would be LIMITED to <u>designated roads and trails</u> . No new roads or trails would be developed; exceptions would be made where required by law, regulation, or policy. Approval for construction of new	Same as Alternative B.

Table 2-2 Summary Comparison of Alternatives				
<i>Management Action</i>	<i>Alternative A (No Action)</i>	<i>Alternative B</i>	<i>Alternative C</i>	<i>Alternative D (Preferred Alternative)</i>
		resources. New roads and trails may be developed.	roads and trails would be assessed at the project level.	
Exemption Area Same as the rest of the planning area except:				
7	Mickelson Trail and State Snowmobile Trail. Snowmobiles would be allowed on the Mickelson Trail between the Deadwood and Dumont Trailheads, on portions that cross BLM-administered lands. The state snowmobile trail system has additional routes across BLM land. Cross-country travel with snowmobiles would be permitted.	Same as Alternative A.	Mickelson Trail and State Snowmobile trail. Snowmobiles would be allowed on the Mickelson Trail between the Deadwood and Dumont Trailheads, on portions that cross BLM-administered lands. The state snowmobile trail system has additional routes across BLM land. Snowmobiling is restricted to these designated trails.	Snowmobile and other vehicles modified for snow travel use would be limited to designated routes. Cross-country travel by over snow vehicles would not be permitted.
8	Other vehicle travel (motorized wheeled vehicles) would be limited to existing roads and trails	Other vehicle travel (motorized wheeled vehicles) would be limited to existing roads and trails until such time that a Travel Management Plan is developed. Travel by the motorized wheeled vehicles would be limited to designated roads and trails after the Travel Management Plan is developed.		
9	No specific management action.	Non-motorized trails would be developed in coordination with partners and user groups and included in the Travel Management Plan.	No new trails would be authorized.	Same as Alternative B.
Program: Lands and Realty				
Land Use Authorizations				
Goal 1: Address needs of industry, utilities, the public, or government entities for land use authorizations (rights-of-way (ROWs), leases and permits) while minimizing adverse impacts to other resource values.				
Goal 2: Locate new ROW facilities adjacent to existing ROWs to the extent practical.				
Management Common to All Alternatives:				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requests for land use authorizations (ROWs, leases, permits) would be authorized and mitigation applied on a case-by-case basis • No authorizations would be issued for activities that could result in the contamination of the public lands. 				

**Table 2-2
Summary Comparison of Alternatives**

<i>Management Action</i>	<i>Alternative A (No Action)</i>	<i>Alternative B</i>	<i>Alternative C</i>	<i>Alternative D (Preferred Alternative)</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Issues in connection with RS 2477 roads would be subject to current guidance. • Follow “Suggested Practices for Avian Protection on Power Lines (APLIC 2006) for all applicable land use authorizations. • ROW avoidance and exclusion areas would be subject to valid existing rights. • No communications site areas will be designated but should any communications sites facilities be authorized, BLM would encourage co-location where possible. • Retain and renew existing Recreation and Public Purposes (R&PP) leases as long as they are compatible with the objectives in this management plan. • All underground ROWs that are terminated will remain buried unless there is a threat to life and degradation of resources. • R&PP and other classifications would be allowed as needed, but no lands would be suitable for DLE or Indian allotment classification and application. • No new ROW corridors will be designated but applicants will be encouraged to use routes with other ROWs. • Utility and transmission line ROWs may be authorized in the Fort Meade ACEC ROW corridor pending environmental review (Figure 2-2) <p>Acres presented below do not include BLM surface estate in eastern South Dakota as BLM surface estate in eastern South Dakota is extremely limited and most lands are under the reservoirs or on islands of the Missouri River.</p> <p>The acres listed below account for the overlap of ROW restrictions. When overlaps of various ROW restrictions were encountered, the acres within the most stringent restriction were tallied first in a trumping order.</p>				
Planning Area				
1	<p>Most areas would be open for ROW actions except for the Fort Meade ACEC. Utility and transmission line ROWs would be allowed in the Fort Meade ROW utility areas (Figure 2-2).</p> <p>Surface Acres affected would be as follows (includes renewable energy ROW restrictions):</p> <p>Open: 267,768 acres Avoidance: 0 acres Exclusion: 5,522 acres</p> <p>Refer to Map 2-15.</p>	<p>There would be no ROWs exclusion areas. ACECs, VRM Class II areas, important wildlife and special status species habitat, floodplains (, and soils that are vulnerable to impacts would be ROWs avoidance areas except for the Fort Meade utility corridors which would be open (Figure 2-2). VRM Class III and IV would be open. Refer to summary below.</p> <p>Surface Acres affected would be as follows (includes renewable energy ROW restrictions):</p> <p>Open: 107,187 acres</p>	<p>In the Fort Meade and Fossil Cycad ACECs and Greater Sage-Grouse PPAs/ ACEC, VRM Class II areas, important wildlife and special species habitat, floodplains, and soils that are vulnerable to impacts would be ROWs exclusion areas except for the Fort Meade utility corridors which would be open (Figure 2-2). The Exemption area would be a ROWs avoidance area. VRM Class III and IV would be open. Refer to summary below.</p> <p>Surface Acres affected would be as follows (includes renewable</p>	<p>ACECs would be ROWs exclusion areas except for the Fort Meade utility corridors which would be open (Figure 2-2). Important wildlife, VRM Class II areas and special status species habitat, floodplains, and soils that are vulnerable to impacts would be ROWs avoidance areas. VRM Class III and IV would be open. In many cases Renewable Energy ROWs for Alternative D would vary from restrictions for other types of ROWs.</p> <p>*Surface Acres affected would be as follows (does not include</p>

Table 2-2. Summary Comparison of Alternatives

Table 2-2 Summary Comparison of Alternatives																																																																																														
Management Action	Alternative A (No Action)	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D (Preferred Alternative)																																																																																										
		Avoidance: 166,130 acres Exclusion: 0 acres Refer to Map 2-16.	energy ROW restrictions): Open: 98,159 acres Avoidance: 0 acres Exclusion: 175,158 acres Refer to Map 2-17.	renewable energy ROW restrictions): Open: 99,310 acres Avoidance: 168,171 acres Exclusion: 5,836 acres *The acres presented above represent ROWs not associated with Renewable Energy ROWs. Refer to the Renewable Energy section of this table for a summary of these acres. Appendix R contains a summary of specific Renewable Energy ROW actions. Refer to Map 2-18.																																																																																										
Summary of ROW Restrictions (does not include Renewable Energy ROW restrictions)																																																																																														
	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Resource</th> <th>Restriction</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr><td>Fort Meade ACEC</td><td>Exclusion</td></tr> <tr><td>Fossil Cycad ACEC</td><td>Open</td></tr> <tr><td>Exemption Area</td><td>Open</td></tr> <tr><td>SRMA buffers</td><td>Open</td></tr> <tr><td>Greater Sage-Grouse PPA/lek buffers</td><td>Open</td></tr> <tr><td>Greater Sage-Grouse nesting & brood rearing areas</td><td>Open</td></tr> <tr><td>Big game/sage-grouse wintering areas</td><td>Open</td></tr> <tr><td>Sharp-tailed grouse/greater prairie-chicken lek buffers/ nesting/ brood rearing areas</td><td>Open</td></tr> <tr><td>Spec. Status Species (SSS) raptor nests</td><td>Open</td></tr> </tbody> </table>	Resource	Restriction	Fort Meade ACEC	Exclusion	Fossil Cycad ACEC	Open	Exemption Area	Open	SRMA buffers	Open	Greater Sage-Grouse PPA/lek buffers	Open	Greater Sage-Grouse nesting & brood rearing areas	Open	Big game/sage-grouse wintering areas	Open	Sharp-tailed grouse/greater prairie-chicken lek buffers/ nesting/ brood rearing areas	Open	Spec. Status Species (SSS) raptor nests	Open	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Resource</th> <th>Restriction</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr><td>Fort Meade ACEC</td><td>Avoidance</td></tr> <tr><td>Fossil Cycad ACEC</td><td>Avoidance</td></tr> <tr><td>Exemption Area</td><td>Avoidance</td></tr> <tr><td>SRMA buffers</td><td>Avoidance</td></tr> <tr><td>Greater Sage-Grouse PPA/lek buffers</td><td>Avoidance</td></tr> <tr><td>Greater Sage-Grouse nesting & brood rearing areas</td><td>Avoidance</td></tr> <tr><td>Big game/sage-grouse wintering areas</td><td>Avoidance</td></tr> <tr><td>Sharp-tailed/greater prairie-chicken leks/nesting/ brood rearing areas</td><td>Avoidance</td></tr> <tr><td>SSS Raptor Nests</td><td>Avoidance</td></tr> <tr><td>Raptors nests</td><td>Avoidance</td></tr> <tr><td>Bighorn sheep range</td><td>Avoidance</td></tr> </tbody> </table>	Resource	Restriction	Fort Meade ACEC	Avoidance	Fossil Cycad ACEC	Avoidance	Exemption Area	Avoidance	SRMA buffers	Avoidance	Greater Sage-Grouse PPA/lek buffers	Avoidance	Greater Sage-Grouse nesting & brood rearing areas	Avoidance	Big game/sage-grouse wintering areas	Avoidance	Sharp-tailed/greater prairie-chicken leks/nesting/ brood rearing areas	Avoidance	SSS Raptor Nests	Avoidance	Raptors nests	Avoidance	Bighorn sheep range	Avoidance	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Resource</th> <th>Restriction</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr><td>Fort Meade ACEC</td><td>Exclusion</td></tr> <tr><td>Fossil Cycad ACEC</td><td>Exclusion</td></tr> <tr><td>Exemption Area</td><td>Avoidance</td></tr> <tr><td>SRMA buffers</td><td>Exclusion</td></tr> <tr><td>Greater Sage-Grouse PPA/ACEC/lek buffers</td><td>Exclusion</td></tr> <tr><td>Greater Sage-Grouse nesting & brood rearing areas</td><td>Exclusion</td></tr> <tr><td>Big game/sage-grouse wintering areas</td><td>Exclusion</td></tr> <tr><td>Sharp-tailed/greater prairie-chicken lek buffers/ nesting/ brood rearing areas</td><td>Exclusion</td></tr> <tr><td>SSS raptor nests</td><td>Exclusion</td></tr> <tr><td>Raptor nests</td><td>Exclusion</td></tr> </tbody> </table>	Resource	Restriction	Fort Meade ACEC	Exclusion	Fossil Cycad ACEC	Exclusion	Exemption Area	Avoidance	SRMA buffers	Exclusion	Greater Sage-Grouse PPA/ACEC/lek buffers	Exclusion	Greater Sage-Grouse nesting & brood rearing areas	Exclusion	Big game/sage-grouse wintering areas	Exclusion	Sharp-tailed/greater prairie-chicken lek buffers/ nesting/ brood rearing areas	Exclusion	SSS raptor nests	Exclusion	Raptor nests	Exclusion	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Resource</th> <th>Restriction</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr><td>Fort Meade ACEC</td><td>Exclusion</td></tr> <tr><td>Fossil Cycad ACEC</td><td>Exclusion</td></tr> <tr><td>Exemption Area</td><td>Avoidance</td></tr> <tr><td>SRMA buffers</td><td>Avoidance</td></tr> <tr><td>Greater Sage-Grouse PPA/lek buffers</td><td>Avoidance</td></tr> <tr><td>Greater Sage-Grouse nesting & brood rearing areas</td><td>Avoidance</td></tr> <tr><td>Big game/sage-grouse wintering areas</td><td>Avoidance</td></tr> <tr><td>Sharp-tailed/greater prairie-chicken lek buffers/ nesting/ brood rearing areas</td><td>Avoidance</td></tr> <tr><td>SSS raptor nests</td><td>Avoidance</td></tr> <tr><td>raptor nests</td><td>Avoidance</td></tr> <tr><td>Bighorn sheep range</td><td>Avoidance</td></tr> </tbody> </table>	Resource	Restriction	Fort Meade ACEC	Exclusion	Fossil Cycad ACEC	Exclusion	Exemption Area	Avoidance	SRMA buffers	Avoidance	Greater Sage-Grouse PPA/lek buffers	Avoidance	Greater Sage-Grouse nesting & brood rearing areas	Avoidance	Big game/sage-grouse wintering areas	Avoidance	Sharp-tailed/greater prairie-chicken lek buffers/ nesting/ brood rearing areas	Avoidance	SSS raptor nests	Avoidance	raptor nests	Avoidance	Bighorn sheep range	Avoidance
Resource	Restriction																																																																																													
Fort Meade ACEC	Exclusion																																																																																													
Fossil Cycad ACEC	Open																																																																																													
Exemption Area	Open																																																																																													
SRMA buffers	Open																																																																																													
Greater Sage-Grouse PPA/lek buffers	Open																																																																																													
Greater Sage-Grouse nesting & brood rearing areas	Open																																																																																													
Big game/sage-grouse wintering areas	Open																																																																																													
Sharp-tailed grouse/greater prairie-chicken lek buffers/ nesting/ brood rearing areas	Open																																																																																													
Spec. Status Species (SSS) raptor nests	Open																																																																																													
Resource	Restriction																																																																																													
Fort Meade ACEC	Avoidance																																																																																													
Fossil Cycad ACEC	Avoidance																																																																																													
Exemption Area	Avoidance																																																																																													
SRMA buffers	Avoidance																																																																																													
Greater Sage-Grouse PPA/lek buffers	Avoidance																																																																																													
Greater Sage-Grouse nesting & brood rearing areas	Avoidance																																																																																													
Big game/sage-grouse wintering areas	Avoidance																																																																																													
Sharp-tailed/greater prairie-chicken leks/nesting/ brood rearing areas	Avoidance																																																																																													
SSS Raptor Nests	Avoidance																																																																																													
Raptors nests	Avoidance																																																																																													
Bighorn sheep range	Avoidance																																																																																													
Resource	Restriction																																																																																													
Fort Meade ACEC	Exclusion																																																																																													
Fossil Cycad ACEC	Exclusion																																																																																													
Exemption Area	Avoidance																																																																																													
SRMA buffers	Exclusion																																																																																													
Greater Sage-Grouse PPA/ACEC/lek buffers	Exclusion																																																																																													
Greater Sage-Grouse nesting & brood rearing areas	Exclusion																																																																																													
Big game/sage-grouse wintering areas	Exclusion																																																																																													
Sharp-tailed/greater prairie-chicken lek buffers/ nesting/ brood rearing areas	Exclusion																																																																																													
SSS raptor nests	Exclusion																																																																																													
Raptor nests	Exclusion																																																																																													
Resource	Restriction																																																																																													
Fort Meade ACEC	Exclusion																																																																																													
Fossil Cycad ACEC	Exclusion																																																																																													
Exemption Area	Avoidance																																																																																													
SRMA buffers	Avoidance																																																																																													
Greater Sage-Grouse PPA/lek buffers	Avoidance																																																																																													
Greater Sage-Grouse nesting & brood rearing areas	Avoidance																																																																																													
Big game/sage-grouse wintering areas	Avoidance																																																																																													
Sharp-tailed/greater prairie-chicken lek buffers/ nesting/ brood rearing areas	Avoidance																																																																																													
SSS raptor nests	Avoidance																																																																																													
raptor nests	Avoidance																																																																																													
Bighorn sheep range	Avoidance																																																																																													

**Table 2-2
Summary Comparison of Alternatives**

<i>Management Action</i>	<i>Alternative A (No Action)</i>	<i>Alternative B</i>	<i>Alternative C</i>	<i>Alternative D (Preferred Alternative)</i>																																																														
	<table border="1"> <tr><td>Raptor nests</td><td>Open</td></tr> <tr><td>Bighorn sheep range</td><td>Open</td></tr> <tr><td>Least terns/piping plover habitat</td><td>Open</td></tr> <tr><td>Fisheries</td><td>Open</td></tr> <tr><td>VRM Class II</td><td>Open</td></tr> <tr><td>VRM Class III & IV</td><td>Open</td></tr> <tr><td>Floodplains</td><td>Open</td></tr> <tr><td>Sensitive soils</td><td>Open</td></tr> <tr><td>Slopes over 25%</td><td>Open</td></tr> </table>	Raptor nests	Open	Bighorn sheep range	Open	Least terns/piping plover habitat	Open	Fisheries	Open	VRM Class II	Open	VRM Class III & IV	Open	Floodplains	Open	Sensitive soils	Open	Slopes over 25%	Open	<table border="1"> <tr><td>Least terns/piping plover habitat</td><td>Avoidance</td></tr> <tr><td>Fisheries</td><td>Avoidance</td></tr> <tr><td>VRM Class II</td><td>Avoidance</td></tr> <tr><td>VRM Class III & IV</td><td>Open</td></tr> <tr><td>Floodplains</td><td>Avoidance</td></tr> <tr><td>Sensitive soils</td><td>Avoidance</td></tr> <tr><td>Slopes over 25%</td><td>Avoidance</td></tr> </table>	Least terns/piping plover habitat	Avoidance	Fisheries	Avoidance	VRM Class II	Avoidance	VRM Class III & IV	Open	Floodplains	Avoidance	Sensitive soils	Avoidance	Slopes over 25%	Avoidance	<table border="1"> <tr><td>Bighorn sheep range</td><td>Exclusion</td></tr> <tr><td>Least terns/piping plover habitat</td><td>Exclusion</td></tr> <tr><td>Fisheries</td><td>Exclusion</td></tr> <tr><td>VRM Class II</td><td>Exclusion</td></tr> <tr><td>VRM Class III & IV</td><td>Open</td></tr> <tr><td>Floodplains</td><td>Exclusion</td></tr> <tr><td>Sensitive soils</td><td>Exclusion</td></tr> <tr><td>Slopes over 25%</td><td>Exclusion</td></tr> </table>	Bighorn sheep range	Exclusion	Least terns/piping plover habitat	Exclusion	Fisheries	Exclusion	VRM Class II	Exclusion	VRM Class III & IV	Open	Floodplains	Exclusion	Sensitive soils	Exclusion	Slopes over 25%	Exclusion	<table border="1"> <tr><td>Least terns/piping plover habitat</td><td>Avoidance</td></tr> <tr><td>Fisheries</td><td>Avoidance</td></tr> <tr><td>VRM Class II</td><td>Avoidance</td></tr> <tr><td>VRM Class III & IV</td><td>Open</td></tr> <tr><td>Floodplains</td><td>Avoidance</td></tr> <tr><td>Sensitive soils</td><td>Avoidance</td></tr> <tr><td>Slopes over 25%</td><td>Avoidance</td></tr> </table>	Least terns/piping plover habitat	Avoidance	Fisheries	Avoidance	VRM Class II	Avoidance	VRM Class III & IV	Open	Floodplains	Avoidance	Sensitive soils	Avoidance	Slopes over 25%	Avoidance
Raptor nests	Open																																																																	
Bighorn sheep range	Open																																																																	
Least terns/piping plover habitat	Open																																																																	
Fisheries	Open																																																																	
VRM Class II	Open																																																																	
VRM Class III & IV	Open																																																																	
Floodplains	Open																																																																	
Sensitive soils	Open																																																																	
Slopes over 25%	Open																																																																	
Least terns/piping plover habitat	Avoidance																																																																	
Fisheries	Avoidance																																																																	
VRM Class II	Avoidance																																																																	
VRM Class III & IV	Open																																																																	
Floodplains	Avoidance																																																																	
Sensitive soils	Avoidance																																																																	
Slopes over 25%	Avoidance																																																																	
Bighorn sheep range	Exclusion																																																																	
Least terns/piping plover habitat	Exclusion																																																																	
Fisheries	Exclusion																																																																	
VRM Class II	Exclusion																																																																	
VRM Class III & IV	Open																																																																	
Floodplains	Exclusion																																																																	
Sensitive soils	Exclusion																																																																	
Slopes over 25%	Exclusion																																																																	
Least terns/piping plover habitat	Avoidance																																																																	
Fisheries	Avoidance																																																																	
VRM Class II	Avoidance																																																																	
VRM Class III & IV	Open																																																																	
Floodplains	Avoidance																																																																	
Sensitive soils	Avoidance																																																																	
Slopes over 25%	Avoidance																																																																	
2	No specific management action.	<p>All fiber-optic, telephone and power lines that can be safely buried would be buried or sited to have least impact on resources.</p> <p>All other utility lines would be evaluated at the project level.</p>	All fiber-optic, telephone, power and other lines would be buried.	Same as Alternative B.																																																														
3	No specific management action.	Unauthorized use, occupancy and development of public lands would be investigated and resolved either through termination and removal of facilities or issuance of an authorization.																																																																
<p>Withdrawals</p> <p>Goal 1: Utilize withdrawal actions with the least restrictive measures and minimum size necessary to accomplish the required purpose.</p> <p>Goal 2: Protect significant resources or significant government investments.</p> <p>Management Common to All Alternatives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> All withdrawals would be reviewed prior to termination or as otherwise required by law to extend, modify, or retain Modification or revocation would be recommended when the purpose for which the lands are withdrawn is no longer applicable to a portion or the entire withdrawal. BLM would consider other agency requests for withdrawal relinquishment, revocation, extensions, or modifications. New withdrawals would be considered on a case-by-case basis where resource values, protection of agency investments, or management could transfer to another agency. New withdrawal proposals would be considered on a case-by-case basis where management would transfer to another federal agency or when resource values or agency investment are best protected by withdrawal. New withdrawal proposals would include the minimum area required to meet the purpose of the withdrawal Those lands having withdrawals revoked would be placed in the appropriate category based on Land Ownership Adjustment criteria found in Appendix I. Withdrawn lands returned to BLM management, would be managed the same as adjacent public lands; or, if isolated the same as comparable, nearby lands. 																																																																		

Table 2-2 Summary Comparison of Alternatives				
<i>Management Action</i>	<i>Alternative A (No Action)</i>	<i>Alternative B</i>	<i>Alternative C</i>	<i>Alternative D (Preferred Alternative)</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Fort Meade Recreational Area ACEC would remain withdrawn from locatable mineral entry, would remain closed to leasable mineral entry and would be closed to salable mineral entry. 				
Planning Area				
1	Locatable federal within the Fort Meade and Fossil Cycad ACECs would remain withdrawn from mineral entry.	Locatable federal minerals under Fort Meade ACEC (6,574 Acres), Fossil Cycad ACEC (320 Acres), and Bear Butte National Historic Landmark (410 Acres) would be recommended for withdrawal.	Locatable federal minerals under Fort Meade ACEC (6,574 Acres), Fossil Cycad ACEC (320 Acres), and Bear Butte National Historic Landmark (410 Acres) would be recommended for withdrawal. Locatable minerals in the Greater Sage-Grouse PPAs would be withdrawn from mineral entry (refer to Map 2-5). Greater Sage-Grouse PPAs/ACEC acres would be 93,267 surface acres and 289,288 acres of mineral estate.	Locatable federal minerals under Fort Meade ACEC (6,574 Acres), Fossil Cycad ACEC (320 Acres), and Bear Butte National Historic Landmark (410 Acres) would be recommended for withdrawal.
<p>Land Tenure</p> <p>Goal 1: Retain public lands with high resource values in public ownership.</p> <p>Goal 2: Adjust land ownership to improve public land pattern and management efficiency.</p> <p>Goal 3: Acquire lands that enhance public access, high resource values and meets public and community needs.</p> <p>Goal 4: Access is available to larger blocks of the BLM-administered surface lands at locations identified internally or from the public and users</p> <p>Goal 5: Achieve a more management efficient and consolidated public land pattern.</p> <p>Management Common to All Alternatives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Exchange would be the preferred method of land adjustment; all exchanges must be within South Dakota. Lands or interest in lands could be acquired by purchase, exchange, revocation of another agency’s withdrawals, administrative transfer from another agency, cooperative agreement, or donation, where they complement existing resource values. All land or mineral ownership adjustments would be with willing sellers or exchange proponents and the acquired lands would be managed as similar lands are under the approved RMP. Evaluate the proposed disposal tracts using the land tenure criteria (refer to Appendix I). Acquired lands would be managed under the same management prescription as adjacent public lands: or, if isolated, the same as comparable, nearby public lands. Parcels of land administered by BLM and discovered through land status updates and corrections would be managed as similar lands are managed under the approved RMP. 				

<p align="center">Table 2-2 Summary Comparison of Alternatives</p>				
<p><i>Management Action</i></p>	<p><i>Alternative A (No Action)</i></p>	<p><i>Alternative B</i></p>	<p><i>Alternative C</i></p>	<p><i>Alternative D (Preferred Alternative)</i></p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lands acquired within or adjacent to administratively designated special management areas, such as ACECs which have valuable resources, would be managed the same as the special management area. Access would be acquired from willing landowners using all acquisition methods. Road and trail easements and land exchanges would be the preferred access acquisition method. Retain existing access to BLM-administered lands in conveyance documents. Pursue reciprocal rights for public access when granting a BLM ROW, as appropriate. Management actions needed to protect newly acquired lands would be considered as part of the analysis prior to acquisition. All proposed land ownership adjustment actions would be evaluated under project level planning. All entitlement selections have been completed by the state of South Dakota. The BLM will work with partners and willing landowners to proactively secure access to the public lands for the use and enjoyment of the public with consideration of the working landscape and the intermingled landownership pattern that is present. Acquire or retain public access to public lands within the retention areas. 				
<p align="center">Planning Area</p>				
<p>1</p>	<p>Consider land ownership adjustments on a case-by-case basis based on the criteria for retention, acquisition and disposal.</p>	<p>Land Ownership Adjustment would be considered on a case-by-case basis based on retention, acquisition, and disposal criteria found in Appendix I.</p> <p>Public lands would fall into three categories:</p> <p><i>Category 1 – Retention area with no disposal (6,900 acres):</i> Lands managed in Category I – Retention would include all ACECs, National Register-eligible archeological sites/historic districts, and lands acquired through LWCF. Category I lands would not be transferred from BLM management by any method for the life of the plan.</p>	<p>Same as Alternative B.</p>	

Table 2-2. Summary Comparison of Alternatives

<p align="center">Table 2-2 Summary Comparison of Alternatives</p>				
<p>Management Action</p>	<p>Alternative A (No Action)</p>	<p>Alternative B</p>	<p>Alternative C</p>	<p>Alternative D (Preferred Alternative)</p>
		<p><i>Category 2 - Retention with Limited disposal potential based on specialist review (186,424 acres):</i> Public lands within Category II would be considered for limited land ownership adjustments; however, lands in Category II would not be available for sale under section 203 of FLPMA. Some public lands in Category II may contain resource values protected by law or policy. If actions cannot be taken to adequately mitigate impacts from disposal of those lands, those parcels would be retained.</p> <p><i>Category 3 – Disposal contingent on specialist review (86,578 acres):</i> These lands generally are isolated or fragmented from other public land ownerships making them difficult to manage. Public land parcels in this category are relatively smaller in size (typically 160 acres or less). A map of these disposal parcels can be found by alternative in Map 2-2. These parcels have been found to potentially meet the sale criteria of section 203(a)(1) of FLPMA and could be made available for sale or disposal through any method.</p>		

Table 2-2 Summary Comparison of Alternatives				
Management Action	Alternative A (No Action)	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D (Preferred Alternative)
2	<p>Jurisdictional transfers with other federal or state agencies would be considered.</p> <p>Types –consolidated for increased management efficiency or no longer needed by the other agency, decreased cost to federal government of managing lands, and/or would serve the public or National interest.</p>	<p>Jurisdictional transfers with other federal agencies would be considered.</p> <p>Types –consolidated for increased efficiency or no longer needed by the other agency and/or would serve the public or National interest.</p>		
3	Lands would be available in the Exemption Area for disposal.	Disposal of lands in the Exemption Area would be considered for sale, exchange or R&PP patent unless the parcel contributes to the designation of an SRMA.	Disposal of lands in the Exemption Area would be considered for sale, or exchange.	Same as Alternative B.
4	National Cemetery expansion proposal would be accepted if it was consistent with management objectives.	Transfer of up to 170 acres of BLM-administered lands to the Black Hills National Cemetery may be allowed, provided that impacts are minimal and the transfer is consistent with management goals and objectives. If the proposed transfer does not occur the land would remain part of the ACEC.	Transfer of BLM-administered lands to the Black Hills National Cemetery would not be allowed.	Same as Alternative B.
5	No specific management action.	A public land transfer of up to 50 acres or authorization may be considered for facilities if requested by the SD Army National Guard, provided that impacts are minimal and the	A public land transfer or authorization would not be considered for facilities if requested by the SD Army National Guard.	Same as Alternative B.

Table 2-2 Summary Comparison of Alternatives				
<i>Management Action</i>	<i>Alternative A (No Action)</i>	<i>Alternative B</i>	<i>Alternative C</i>	<i>Alternative D (Preferred Alternative)</i>
		transfer is consistent with management goals and objectives.		
6	No specific management action	Up to six acres of BLM-administered land in the Fort Meade ACEC (lands adjacent to the sewer lagoons) would be considered for transfer to the City of Sturgis pending additional further environmental review.		
Program: Minerals				
<p>Goal 1: Manage minerals to provide an opportunity for local economic benefits, while protecting the integrity of other resources.</p> <p>Goal 2: Minerals are developed while wildlife, cultural resources, air and water quality, and other resource values are maintained.</p> <p>Goal 3: As mineral development is completed, surface areas are restored similar to pre-existing conditions.</p> <p>Management Common to All Alternatives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minerals are managed with consideration of state laws. • Allow for needed road access, including new roads for mineral extraction operations with consideration of impacts to other resources. • Leasing and development decisions also apply to geophysical exploration. • On BLM administered surface and mineral estate outside of Greater Sage-Grouse PPAs, specific permit limitations may be applied to exploration at the implementation (project) level as needed to protect sensitive or high value resources. • In Greater Sage-Grouse PPAs, geophysical exploration would be limited to the least disruptive method possible. • Mitigation of mineral development and exploration activities would be applied where needed to minimize impacts of mineral development consistent with the management actions and restrictions and stipulations found in this section and the Guidelines and BMPs listed in Appendix B. Mitigation measures would be applied on a case-by-case basis during activity level planning if review of the project area indicates resources would be affected. • Waivers, Exceptions, and Modifications (WEMs) to lease stipulation requirements may be granted by the authorized officer if an environmental review indicates that the stipulation does not apply (WEMs are described in Appendices E.1, E.2, E.3, and E.4). Prior to authorizing Waivers, Exceptions or Modifications (WEMS) for oil and gas leasing, BLM would coordinate with the State of SD including the SD Game, Fish and Parks and other applicable State agencies or surface owner on any potential decision related to the use of WEMs that would affect resources or activities managed by the State or surface owner. • Applicable mitigation and conservation measures described for sage-grouse in Appendix V would apply to mineral development and exploration. • If a waiver, exception or modification is authorized, applicable portions of 43 CFR 3809 regulations would still apply. • In areas with known or potential hazardous waste or materials, BLM may defer oil and gas exploration and would not consider proposals to explore or develop other minerals until such time as the risks of these types of activities are fully known. Remedial action would be required as necessary, subject to existing State and Federal laws and requirements prior to proceeding with a project. • At a minimum, the institutional controls and deed restrictions placed on the abandoned Black Hills Army Depot (BHAD) by the Department of Defense when the surface estate was transferred to private ownership would apply within the BHAD. Other restrictions or closures for the BHAD and the Igloo town site are described under each alternative. 				

<p align="center">Table 2-2 Summary Comparison of Alternatives</p>				
<p><i>Management Action</i></p>	<p><i>Alternative A (No Action)</i></p>	<p><i>Alternative B</i></p>	<p><i>Alternative C</i></p>	<p><i>Alternative D (Preferred Alternative)</i></p>
<p>*The actions shown below apply only to federal minerals that are within the decision space of this RMP/EIS. Refer to Chapter 1, page 2 for additional details about the decision space of this RMP/EIS.</p>				
	<p>No specific objective</p>	<p>Objective: Mineral development would be allowed while minimizing restrictions to mineral development.</p>	<p>Objective: Mineral development would be allowed while minimizing disruption to resources, local residents and public by minimizing surface-disturbing activities and location of developed sites.</p>	<p>Same as Alternative C.</p>
<p>Federal Minerals – Withdrawal and Closure Summary</p>				
<p>1</p>	<p>Locatable federal minerals under Fort Meade ACEC (6,574 acres) and Fossil Cycad ACEC (320 acres) would remain withdrawn; while leasable federal minerals and oil and gas would be closed (no lease).</p>	<p>Locatable, leasable, and salable federal minerals under Fort Meade ACEC (6,574 acres), Fossil Cycad ACEC (320 acres), and Bear Butte National Historic Landmark (410 acres) would remain withdrawn/be recommended for withdrawal, while leasable federal minerals and salable federal minerals would be closed. An exception would be oil and gas which would be open to leasing with an NSO stipulation in Fossil Cycad ACEC and Bear Butte National Historic Landmark. Within the BHAD area and Igloo town site all leasable minerals would be NSO and all salable minerals would be closed. Refer to Figure 3-22.</p>	<p>Locatable federal minerals under Fort Meade (6,574 Acres), Fossil Cycad ACEC (320 Acres), and Bear Butte National Historic Landmark (410 Acres) would remain withdrawn/be recommended for withdrawal, while leasable federal minerals and salable federal minerals would be closed (no lease) in these areas. Within the Greater Sage-Grouse PPAs/ACEC, locatable minerals would be withdrawn and salable and other types of non-energy leasable minerals would be closed. Greater Sage Grouse PPAs for Alternative C are shown in Map 2-5. Greater Sage-Grouse PPAs/ACEC acres in Alternative C would be 93,267 surface acres and 289,288 acres of mineral estate (subsurface). Within the</p>	<p>Locatable federal minerals under Fort Meade (6,574 Acres), Fossil Cycad ACEC (320 Acres), and Bear Butte National Historic Landmark (410 Acres) would remain withdrawn/be recommended for withdrawal, while leasable federal minerals and salable federal minerals would be closed (no lease) in these areas (same as Alternative C). Within the Greater Sage-Grouse PPAs/ACEC, locatable minerals, salable and non-energy leasable minerals would be open with standard stipulations and conservation measures described in the sage-grouse Appendix (V). Within the BHAD area and Igloo town site all leasable minerals would be NSO and all salable minerals would be closed. Refer</p>

Table 2-2. Summary Comparison of Alternatives

Table 2-2 Summary Comparison of Alternatives				
<i>Management Action</i>	<i>Alternative A (No Action)</i>	<i>Alternative B</i>	<i>Alternative C</i>	<i>Alternative D (Preferred Alternative)</i>
			abandoned Black Hills Army Depot (BHAD) and the Igloo town site. All leasable and salable minerals would be closed. Refer to Figure 3-22.	to Figure 3-22.
Cumulative Acres of Federal Mineral Estate Available or Unavailable for Oil and Gas Leasing				
Closed	Fort Meade and Fossil Cycad Surface: 6,894 acres Subsurface: 6,894 acres	Fort Meade Surface: 6,574 acres Subsurface: 6,574 acres	Greater Sage-Grouse PPAs, BHAD, Fort Meade, Fossil Cycad, and Bear Butte Surface: 100,160 acres Subsurface: 309,576 acres	Fort Meade, Fossil Cycad, and Bear Butte Surface: 6,894 acres Subsurface: 7,304 acres
No Surface Occupancy (NSO)	Surface: 15,489 acres Subsurface: 87,349 acres	Surface: 105,837 acres Subsurface: 404,306 acres	Surface: 43,897 acres Subsurface: 355,396 acres	Surface: 107,025 acres Subsurface: 406,005 acres
Controlled Surface Use (CSU)	Surface: 2,954 acres Subsurface: 19,613 acres	Surface: 10,561 acres Subsurface: 158,501 acres	Surface: 1,535 acres Subsurface: 1,535 acres	Surface: 10,031 acres Subsurface: 146,574 acres
Timing Limitations (TL)	Surface: 115,204 acres Subsurface: 450,032 acres	Surface: 61,186 acres Subsurface: 305,570 acres	Surface: 45,836 acres Subsurface: 244,689 acres	Surface: 66,821 acres Subsurface: 340,948 acres
Standard Lease Terms	Surface: 103,033 acres Subsurface: 798,690 acres	Surface: 59,416 acres Subsurface: 487,627 acres	Surface: 52,146 acres Subsurface: 451,382 acres	Surface: 52,803 acres Subsurface: 461,747 acres
Leasable Minerals				
Oil and Gas				
1	Public lands would be open and available for mineral exploration and development unless withdrawn or administratively	Public lands would be open and available for mineral exploration and development unless withdrawn, closed, or administratively restricted. Some acres would be open to oil and gas leasing and development, subject only to the terms and conditions		

<p align="center">Table 2-2 Summary Comparison of Alternatives</p>				
<p><i>Management Action</i></p>	<p><i>Alternative A (No Action)</i></p>	<p><i>Alternative B</i></p>	<p><i>Alternative C</i></p>	<p><i>Alternative D (Preferred Alternative)</i></p>
	<p>restricted. Mineral development may occur along with other resource uses. Programs to obtain and evaluate current energy and mineral data are encouraged. (from SDRA 1985 RMP)</p> <p>The following oil and gas related determinations would apply to federal minerals administered by the BLM within the South Dakota Resource Area.</p> <p>Some acres would be open to oil and gas leasing and development, subject only to the terms and conditions identified on the standard BLM lease form, or subject to additional seasonal or other minor constraints or subject to additional no surface occupancy (NSO) or similar major constraints.</p> <p>Stipulations attached to a lease may be waived, excepted, or modified at the discretion of the authorizing officer.</p> <p>Some acres would be closed to oil and gas leasing and development. (1992 MCFO RMP/EIS Amendment).</p>	<p>identified on the standard BLM lease form, or subject to additional seasonal or other minor constraints or subject to additional no surface occupancy (NSO) or similar major constraints.</p> <p>Stipulations attached to a lease may be excepted, modified, or waived at the discretion of the authorizing officer.</p>		
2	Federal oil and gas under Fort	Federal oil and gas under Fort	Federal oil and gas under Fort	Same as Alternative C except

**Table 2-2
Summary Comparison of Alternatives**

Management Action	Alternative A (No Action)	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D (Preferred Alternative)																																																																								
	<p>Meade ACEC (6,574 Acres) and under Fossil Cycad ACEC (320 Acres) closed (no lease).</p> <p>Refer to Map 2-25.</p>	<p>Meade ACEC (6,574 Acres) would be closed (no lease). Federal oil and gas under Fossil Cycad ACEC (320 Acres) and Bear Butte National Historic Landmark (410 Acres) would be open to leasing with an NSO stipulation. Refer to Map 2-26.</p> <p>Greater Sage-Grouse PPAs (83,744 surface acres and 253,357 subsurface acres) would be open to oil and gas leasing but would have an NSO stipulation.</p> <p>All leasable minerals in the abandoned Black Hills Army Depot (BHAD) and the Igloo town site would be NSO.</p>	<p>Meade (6,574 acres), Fossil Cycad ACEC (320 Acres), and Bear Butte National Historic Landmark (410 Acres) would be closed (no lease).</p> <p>The Greater Sage-Grouse PPAs/ ACEC would be closed to oil and gas leasing (93,266 surface acres and 289,562 subsurface acres). PPAs in Alternative C are shown in Map 2-5. Oil and gas restrictions are shown in Map 2-27. All leasable minerals in the abandoned Black Hills Army Depot (BHAD) and the Igloo town site would be closed to exploration and development of oil and gas.</p>	<p>Greater Sage-Grouse PPAs and the BHAD and Igloo town site would be open to oil and gas leasing but would have NSO stipulations.</p> <p>Greater Sage-Grouse PPAs would include the same areas as Alternative B as shown in Map 2-4 (83,744 surface acres and 253,357 subsurface acres). Refer to Map 2-28 for oil and gas restrictions.</p>																																																																								
3	<p>Least acres restricted as shown below.</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Restriction Type</th> <th>Surface Acres</th> <th>O&G Mineral Acres</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Closed</td> <td>6,894</td> <td>6,894</td> </tr> <tr> <td>NSO stips</td> <td>15,489</td> <td>87,349</td> </tr> <tr> <td>CSU stips</td> <td>2,954</td> <td>19,613</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Timing stips</td> <td>115,204</td> <td>450,032</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Standard Terms</td> <td>103,033</td> <td>798,690</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Restriction Type	Surface Acres	O&G Mineral Acres	Closed	6,894	6,894	NSO stips	15,489	87,349	CSU stips	2,954	19,613	Timing stips	115,204	450,032	Standard Terms	103,033	798,690	<p>Intermediate acres restricted as shown below.</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Restriction Type</th> <th>Surface Acres</th> <th>O&G Mineral Acres</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Closed</td> <td>6,574</td> <td>6,574</td> </tr> <tr> <td>NSO stips</td> <td>105,837</td> <td>404,306</td> </tr> <tr> <td>CSU stips</td> <td>10,561</td> <td>158,501</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Timing stips</td> <td>61,186</td> <td>305,570</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Standard Terms</td> <td>59,416</td> <td>487,627</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Restriction Type	Surface Acres	O&G Mineral Acres	Closed	6,574	6,574	NSO stips	105,837	404,306	CSU stips	10,561	158,501	Timing stips	61,186	305,570	Standard Terms	59,416	487,627	<p>Acres restricted Similar to Alt. B, as shown below.</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Restriction Type</th> <th>Surface Acres</th> <th>O&G Mineral Acres</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Closed</td> <td>100,160</td> <td>309,576</td> </tr> <tr> <td>NSO stips</td> <td>43,897</td> <td>355,396</td> </tr> <tr> <td>CSU stips</td> <td>1,535</td> <td>1,535</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Timing stips</td> <td>45,836</td> <td>244,689</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Standard Terms</td> <td>52,146</td> <td>451,382</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>* Many CSU acres from Alternative B are NSO acres in</p>	Restriction Type	Surface Acres	O&G Mineral Acres	Closed	100,160	309,576	NSO stips	43,897	355,396	CSU stips	1,535	1,535	Timing stips	45,836	244,689	Standard Terms	52,146	451,382	<p>Most acres restricted as shown below.</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Restriction Type</th> <th>Surface Acres</th> <th>O&G Mineral Acres</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Closed</td> <td>6,894</td> <td>7,304</td> </tr> <tr> <td>NSO stips</td> <td>107,025</td> <td>406,005</td> </tr> <tr> <td>CSU stips</td> <td>10,031</td> <td>146,574</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Timing stips</td> <td>66,821</td> <td>340,948</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Standard Terms</td> <td>52,803</td> <td>461,747</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Restriction Type	Surface Acres	O&G Mineral Acres	Closed	6,894	7,304	NSO stips	107,025	406,005	CSU stips	10,031	146,574	Timing stips	66,821	340,948	Standard Terms	52,803	461,747
Restriction Type	Surface Acres	O&G Mineral Acres																																																																										
Closed	6,894	6,894																																																																										
NSO stips	15,489	87,349																																																																										
CSU stips	2,954	19,613																																																																										
Timing stips	115,204	450,032																																																																										
Standard Terms	103,033	798,690																																																																										
Restriction Type	Surface Acres	O&G Mineral Acres																																																																										
Closed	6,574	6,574																																																																										
NSO stips	105,837	404,306																																																																										
CSU stips	10,561	158,501																																																																										
Timing stips	61,186	305,570																																																																										
Standard Terms	59,416	487,627																																																																										
Restriction Type	Surface Acres	O&G Mineral Acres																																																																										
Closed	100,160	309,576																																																																										
NSO stips	43,897	355,396																																																																										
CSU stips	1,535	1,535																																																																										
Timing stips	45,836	244,689																																																																										
Standard Terms	52,146	451,382																																																																										
Restriction Type	Surface Acres	O&G Mineral Acres																																																																										
Closed	6,894	7,304																																																																										
NSO stips	107,025	406,005																																																																										
CSU stips	10,031	146,574																																																																										
Timing stips	66,821	340,948																																																																										
Standard Terms	52,803	461,747																																																																										

<p align="center">Table 2-2 Summary Comparison of Alternatives</p>				
<p><i>Management Action</i></p>	<p><i>Alternative A (No Action)</i></p>	<p><i>Alternative B</i></p>	<p><i>Alternative C</i></p>	<p><i>Alternative D (Preferred Alternative)</i></p>
			Alternative C.	
4	<p>103,033 surface acres open to leasing without BLM restrictions other than standard terms and conditions.</p> <p>798,690 mineral acres open without BLM restrictions other than standard terms and conditions.</p>	<p>59,416 surface acres open to leasing without BLM restrictions other than standard terms and conditions.</p> <p>487,627 mineral acres open without BLM restrictions other than standard terms and conditions.</p>	<p>52,146 surface acres open to leasing without BLM restrictions other than standard terms and conditions.</p> <p>451,382 mineral acres open without BLM restrictions other than standard terms and conditions.</p>	<p>52,803 surface acres open to leasing without BLM restrictions other than standard terms and conditions.</p> <p>461,747 mineral acres open without BLM restrictions other than standard terms and conditions.</p>
5	No similar action	When applicable, stipulations developed for oil and gas development may be applied to other resource uses and activities pending environmental review at the project level (implementation level).		
<p>Coal</p>				
1	No specific management action	<p>Refer to Alternatives considered but not analyzed. No interest has been expressed in coal development in South Dakota. An RMP Amendment would be necessary to address future expressions of interest in coal leasing, as well as following other laws relating to the analysis of coal development, such as SMCRA (currently). Selected conservation areas (Fort Meade and Fossil Cycad ACECs, and Bear Butte National Historic Landmark) and Greater Sage-Grouse PPAs as developed by alternative would be unsuitable (closed) to coal leasing. PPAs shown in Map 2-4.</p>	<p>Same as Alternative B except that in the Greater Sage-Grouse PPAs/ACEC, the abandoned Black Hills Army Depot (BHAD) and Igloo town site, coal would be unsuitable (closed). Greater Sage-Grouse PPAs in Alternative C are shown in Map 2-5. The BHAD and Igloo town site is shown in Figure 3-22.</p>	Same as Alternative B.

Table 2-2. Summary Comparison of Alternatives

<p align="center">Table 2-2 Summary Comparison of Alternatives</p>				
<i>Management Action</i>	<i>Alternative A (No Action)</i>	<i>Alternative B</i>	<i>Alternative C</i>	<i>Alternative D (Preferred Alternative)</i>
Leasable Solid Minerals other than Coal (leasable non-energy minerals)				
1	No specific management action	Area wide terms, conditions or other special considerations needed to protect other resources or values would be implemented while exploring or developing these types of minerals under the non-energy leasable regulations. Leasable solid Federal minerals other than coal under Fort Meade and Fossil Cycad ACECs, and Bear Butte National Historic Landmark would be closed.	Same as Alternative B except that leasable minerals other than coal (non-energy leasable minerals) would be closed within Greater Sage-Grouse PPAs/ACEC. Greater Sage-Grouse PPAs in Alternative C are shown in Map 2-5. The BHAD and the Igloo town site would be closed to exploration and leasing of leasable solid minerals (refer to Figure 3-22).	Same as Alternative B.
Geothermal				
1	No specific management action	Leasing and development of federal minerals for geothermal resource development within the planning area would be evaluated and considered if requested unless withdrawn or administratively restricted. Stipulations adapted for oil and gas leasing and operations would be applied to geothermal leasing and operations. Selected conservation areas (Fort Meade and Fossil Cycad ACECs, and Bear Butte National Historic Landmark) would be recommended for withdrawal from further consideration for geothermal leasing.	Same as Alternative B except that leasing of federal minerals for geothermal development would be closed within Greater Sage-Grouse PPAs/ACEC. PPAs/ACEC in Alternative C are shown in Map 2-5. The abandoned BHAD would be closed to exploration and leasing of geothermal minerals (refer to Figure 3-22).	Same as Alternative B except the abandoned BHAD would be NSO.

<p align="center">Table 2-2 Summary Comparison of Alternatives</p>				
<i>Management Action</i>	<i>Alternative A (No Action)</i>	<i>Alternative B</i>	<i>Alternative C</i>	<i>Alternative D (Preferred Alternative)</i>
2	No specific management action	Oil and gas stipulations for Alternative B would also apply to geothermal exploration and development.	Oil and gas stipulations for Alternative C would also apply to geothermal exploration and development.	Oil and gas stipulations for Alternative D would also apply to geothermal exploration and development.
Locatable Minerals				
1	<p>No specific management action.</p> <p>(Public lands are open to mineral entry by the 1872 Mining Law unless specifically withdrawn from mineral entry.)</p> <p>Locatable federal minerals under Fort Meade ACEC Federal (6,574 acres) and Fossil Cycad ACEC (320 acres) withdrawn.</p>	<p>Locatable Federal Minerals would be open and available for mineral exploration and development subject to special considerations needed to protect other resource values while conducting activities under the operation of the mining laws. BMPs (Appendix B), or other selected management actions, including the leasable mineral restrictions, may be applied to a locatable mineral Plan of Operation or Notice (if applicable or needed to protect resources).</p> <p>Locatable federal minerals under Fort Meade ACEC (6,574 acres), Fossil Cycad ACEC (320 acres), and Bear Butte National Historic Landmark (410 acres of mineral estate) would be recommended for withdrawal from further consideration for locatable minerals.</p>	<p>Same as Alternative B except that the Greater Sage-Grouse PPAs/ACEC would be recommended for withdrawal from locatable mineral entry. Greater Sage-Grouse PPAs in Alternative C are shown in Map 2-5.</p>	<p>Same as Alternative B.</p>
Salable Minerals				
1	No specific management action - Demand for salable minerals are	Salable Federal Minerals would be open and available for saleable	Same as Alternative B except that Greater Sage-Grouse PPAs/ACEC	Same as Alternative B.

<p align="center">Table 2-2 Summary Comparison of Alternatives</p>				
<i>Management Action</i>	<i>Alternative A (No Action)</i>	<i>Alternative B</i>	<i>Alternative C</i>	<i>Alternative D (Preferred Alternative)</i>
	currently being met through sales or free-use permits on a case-by-case basis.	<p>mineral exploration and development subject to special considerations needed to protect other resource values while operating under the mineral materials regulations, except under Fort Meade Recreation Area and Fossil Cycad ACECs, and Bear Butte National Historic Landmark, which would be recommended for closure to the mining laws for exploration or development. The abandoned Black Hills Army Depot (BHAD) would be closed to salable mineral development and exploration (refer to Figure 3-22).</p> <p>Minerals requested to be sold as saleable minerals would be evaluated for heavy metal and acid-generating potential in applicable areas, or if a potential problem is otherwise indicated. (In applicable cases, mineral material sales would not be made to prevent pollution problems.)</p>	<p>would be closed to salable minerals. Greater Sage-Grouse PPAs in Alternative C are shown in Map 2-5.</p> <p>The abandoned Black Hills Army Depot (BHAD) would be closed to salable mineral development and exploration (refer to Figure 3-22).</p>	
<p>Program: Renewable Energy Resources</p> <p>Goal 1: Make lands available for renewable energy development, consistent with goals to manage other resources.</p> <p>Goal 2: Provide opportunities for renewable energy development, especially for wind energy, while avoiding or minimizing adverse impacts to wildlife, cultural, visual, and other resource values.</p> <p>Goal 3: Restore areas to near natural conditions when renewable energy development is decommissioned.</p> <p>Management Common to All Alternatives:</p>				

**Table 2-2
Summary Comparison of Alternatives**

<i>Management Action</i>	<i>Alternative A (No Action)</i>	<i>Alternative B</i>	<i>Alternative C</i>	<i>Alternative D (Preferred Alternative)</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consider proposals for renewable energy development such as wind, biomass, and solar, except where otherwise restricted. BLM would adopt the BMPs provided in the Wind Energy Programmatic EIS (December 2005) for the planning area, and follow directives on renewable energy development as outlined in BLM policy and guidance. Develop mitigation measures at the project level based on current science. Oil and Gas stipulations would be applied to renewable energy when appropriate (Appendix E). <p>Note: Renewable energy proposals are authorized by BLM on BLM-administered surface estate only.</p>				
1	<p>267,795 acres (98% of BLM surface acres) in western SD would be open to renewable energy development.</p> <p>5,522 acres would be renewable energy ROWs exclusion areas.</p> <p>Refer to Map 2-20 and Appendix R.</p>	<p>107,186 acres (39% of BLM surface estate in western SD) would be open to renewable energy development.</p> <p>Manage 77,570 acres of the open area as Potential Wind Development Areas.</p> <p>166,131 acres would be renewable energy ROWs avoidance areas.</p> <p>Refer to Map 2-21 and Appendix R.</p>	<p>98,157 acres (36% of BLM surface estate in western SD) would be open to renewable energy development.</p> <p>Manage 69,811 acres of the open area as Potential Wind Development Areas.</p> <p>175,158 acres would be renewable energy ROWs exclusion areas.</p> <p>Refer to Map 2-22 and Appendix R.</p>	<p>99,310 acres (36% of BLM surface estate in western SD) would be open to renewable energy development.</p> <p>Manage 69,811 acres of the open area as Potential Wind Development Areas.</p> <p>40,527 acres would be renewable energy ROWs avoidance areas.</p> <p>133,580 acres would be renewable energy ROW exclusion areas.</p> <p>Refer to Map 2-23 and Appendix R.</p>
2	<p>All areas would be open for Renewable Energy ROW actions except for the Fort Meade ACEC. Utility and transmission line ROWs would be allowed in the Fort Meade ROW utility corridors (Figure 2-2). Refer to summary below. For additional details refer to Appendix R.</p>	<p>There would be no exclusion areas for renewable energy. Fort Meade and Fossil Cycad ACECs, VRM Class II areas, important wildlife, special status species habitat, floodplains, and soils that are vulnerable to impacts would be Renewable Energy ROW avoidance areas except for the Fort Meade utility ROW corridors</p>	<p>The Fort Meade, Fossil Cycad and Sage-Grouse PPAs ACECs, VRM Class II areas, important wildlife and special species habitat, floodplains, and soils that are vulnerable to impacts would be Renewable Energy ROW exclusion areas except for the Fort Meade utility ROW corridors which would be open to utility and</p>	<p>The Fort Meade and Fossil Cycad ACECs, the Exemption Area, VRM Class II areas, Greater Sage-Grouse PPAs, areas near sage-grouse leks raptor nests and sharp-tailed grouse leks, greater prairie-chicken leks and wintering areas for sage-grouse would be Renewable Energy ROWs exclusion areas except for the Fort</p>

**Table 2-2
Summary Comparison of Alternatives**

Management Action	Alternative A (No Action)	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D (Preferred Alternative)																																																																																																		
		which would be open to utility and transmission line ROWs (Figure 2-2). VRM Classes III and IV would be open to Renewable Energy ROWs. Refer to summary below. For additional details refer to Appendix R.	transmission line ROWs (Figure 2-2). The Exemption area would be an ROW avoidance area for renewable energy. VRM Classes III and IV would be open to Renewable Energy ROWs. Refer to summary below. For additional details refer to Appendix R.	Meade utility ROW corridors which would be open to utility and transmission line ROWs (Figure 2-2). Other important wildlife and special status species habitat, floodplains, and soils that are vulnerable to impacts would be ROWs avoidance areas. VRM Classes III and IV would be open to Renewable Energy ROWs. Refer to summary below. For additional details refer to Appendix R.																																																																																																		
3	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Resource</th> <th>Restriction</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Fort Meade ACEC</td> <td>Exclusion</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Fossil Cycad ACEC</td> <td>Open</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Exemption Area</td> <td>Open</td> </tr> <tr> <td>SRMA buffers</td> <td>Open</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Greater Sage-Grouse PPAs/lek buffers</td> <td>Open</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Greater Sage-Grouse nesting & brood rearing areas</td> <td>Open</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Big game/sage-grouse wintering areas</td> <td>Open</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Sharp-tailed grouse/greater prairie-chicken lek buffers</td> <td>Open</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Spec. status species (SSS) raptor nests</td> <td>Open</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Other raptor nests (non SSS)</td> <td>Open</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Bighorn sheep</td> <td>Open</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Resource	Restriction	Fort Meade ACEC	Exclusion	Fossil Cycad ACEC	Open	Exemption Area	Open	SRMA buffers	Open	Greater Sage-Grouse PPAs/lek buffers	Open	Greater Sage-Grouse nesting & brood rearing areas	Open	Big game/sage-grouse wintering areas	Open	Sharp-tailed grouse/greater prairie-chicken lek buffers	Open	Spec. status species (SSS) raptor nests	Open	Other raptor nests (non SSS)	Open	Bighorn sheep	Open	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Resource</th> <th>Restriction</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Fort Meade ACEC</td> <td>Avoidance</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Fossil Cycad ACEC</td> <td>Avoidance</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Exemption Area</td> <td>Avoidance</td> </tr> <tr> <td>SRMA buffers</td> <td>Avoidance</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Greater Sage-Grouse PPAs/lek buffers</td> <td>Avoidance</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Greater Sage-Grouse nesting & brood rearing areas</td> <td>Avoidance</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Big game/sage-grouse wintering areas</td> <td>Avoidance</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Sharp-tailed grouse/greater prairie-chicken lek buffers</td> <td>Avoidance</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Spec. status raptor nests</td> <td>Avoidance</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Other raptor nests</td> <td>Avoidance</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Bighorn sheep range</td> <td>Avoidance</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Least terns/piping</td> <td>Avoidance</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Resource	Restriction	Fort Meade ACEC	Avoidance	Fossil Cycad ACEC	Avoidance	Exemption Area	Avoidance	SRMA buffers	Avoidance	Greater Sage-Grouse PPAs/lek buffers	Avoidance	Greater Sage-Grouse nesting & brood rearing areas	Avoidance	Big game/sage-grouse wintering areas	Avoidance	Sharp-tailed grouse/greater prairie-chicken lek buffers	Avoidance	Spec. status raptor nests	Avoidance	Other raptor nests	Avoidance	Bighorn sheep range	Avoidance	Least terns/piping	Avoidance	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Resource</th> <th>Restriction</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Fort Meade ACEC</td> <td>Exclusion</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Fossil Cycad ACEC</td> <td>Exclusion</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Exemption Area</td> <td>Avoidance</td> </tr> <tr> <td>SRMA buffers</td> <td>Exclusion</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Greater Sage-Grouse PPAs/ ACEC/lek buffers</td> <td>Exclusion</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Greater Sage-Grouse nesting & brood rearing areas</td> <td>Exclusion</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Big game/sage-grouse wintering areas</td> <td>Exclusion</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Sharp-tailed grouse/greater prairie-chicken lek buffers</td> <td>Exclusion</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Spec. status raptor nests</td> <td>Exclusion</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Other raptor nests</td> <td>Exclusion</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Bighorn sheep range</td> <td>Exclusion</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Least terns/piping</td> <td>Exclusion</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Resource	Restriction	Fort Meade ACEC	Exclusion	Fossil Cycad ACEC	Exclusion	Exemption Area	Avoidance	SRMA buffers	Exclusion	Greater Sage-Grouse PPAs/ ACEC/lek buffers	Exclusion	Greater Sage-Grouse nesting & brood rearing areas	Exclusion	Big game/sage-grouse wintering areas	Exclusion	Sharp-tailed grouse/greater prairie-chicken lek buffers	Exclusion	Spec. status raptor nests	Exclusion	Other raptor nests	Exclusion	Bighorn sheep range	Exclusion	Least terns/piping	Exclusion	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Resource</th> <th>Restriction</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Fort Meade ACEC</td> <td>Exclusion</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Fossil Cycad ACEC</td> <td>Exclusion</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Exemption Area</td> <td>Exclusion</td> </tr> <tr> <td>SRMA buffers</td> <td>Exclusion</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Sage-grouse PPAs/lek buffers</td> <td>Exclusion</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Greater Sage-Grouse nesting & brood rearing areas</td> <td>Avoidance</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Big game wintering Areas</td> <td>Avoidance</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Greater Sage-Grouse wintering areas</td> <td>Exclusion</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Sharp-tailed grouse/ greater prairie-chicken lek buffers</td> <td>Exclusion</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Sharp-tailed grouse/ greater</td> <td>Avoidance</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Resource	Restriction	Fort Meade ACEC	Exclusion	Fossil Cycad ACEC	Exclusion	Exemption Area	Exclusion	SRMA buffers	Exclusion	Sage-grouse PPAs/lek buffers	Exclusion	Greater Sage-Grouse nesting & brood rearing areas	Avoidance	Big game wintering Areas	Avoidance	Greater Sage-Grouse wintering areas	Exclusion	Sharp-tailed grouse/ greater prairie-chicken lek buffers	Exclusion	Sharp-tailed grouse/ greater	Avoidance
Resource	Restriction																																																																																																					
Fort Meade ACEC	Exclusion																																																																																																					
Fossil Cycad ACEC	Open																																																																																																					
Exemption Area	Open																																																																																																					
SRMA buffers	Open																																																																																																					
Greater Sage-Grouse PPAs/lek buffers	Open																																																																																																					
Greater Sage-Grouse nesting & brood rearing areas	Open																																																																																																					
Big game/sage-grouse wintering areas	Open																																																																																																					
Sharp-tailed grouse/greater prairie-chicken lek buffers	Open																																																																																																					
Spec. status species (SSS) raptor nests	Open																																																																																																					
Other raptor nests (non SSS)	Open																																																																																																					
Bighorn sheep	Open																																																																																																					
Resource	Restriction																																																																																																					
Fort Meade ACEC	Avoidance																																																																																																					
Fossil Cycad ACEC	Avoidance																																																																																																					
Exemption Area	Avoidance																																																																																																					
SRMA buffers	Avoidance																																																																																																					
Greater Sage-Grouse PPAs/lek buffers	Avoidance																																																																																																					
Greater Sage-Grouse nesting & brood rearing areas	Avoidance																																																																																																					
Big game/sage-grouse wintering areas	Avoidance																																																																																																					
Sharp-tailed grouse/greater prairie-chicken lek buffers	Avoidance																																																																																																					
Spec. status raptor nests	Avoidance																																																																																																					
Other raptor nests	Avoidance																																																																																																					
Bighorn sheep range	Avoidance																																																																																																					
Least terns/piping	Avoidance																																																																																																					
Resource	Restriction																																																																																																					
Fort Meade ACEC	Exclusion																																																																																																					
Fossil Cycad ACEC	Exclusion																																																																																																					
Exemption Area	Avoidance																																																																																																					
SRMA buffers	Exclusion																																																																																																					
Greater Sage-Grouse PPAs/ ACEC/lek buffers	Exclusion																																																																																																					
Greater Sage-Grouse nesting & brood rearing areas	Exclusion																																																																																																					
Big game/sage-grouse wintering areas	Exclusion																																																																																																					
Sharp-tailed grouse/greater prairie-chicken lek buffers	Exclusion																																																																																																					
Spec. status raptor nests	Exclusion																																																																																																					
Other raptor nests	Exclusion																																																																																																					
Bighorn sheep range	Exclusion																																																																																																					
Least terns/piping	Exclusion																																																																																																					
Resource	Restriction																																																																																																					
Fort Meade ACEC	Exclusion																																																																																																					
Fossil Cycad ACEC	Exclusion																																																																																																					
Exemption Area	Exclusion																																																																																																					
SRMA buffers	Exclusion																																																																																																					
Sage-grouse PPAs/lek buffers	Exclusion																																																																																																					
Greater Sage-Grouse nesting & brood rearing areas	Avoidance																																																																																																					
Big game wintering Areas	Avoidance																																																																																																					
Greater Sage-Grouse wintering areas	Exclusion																																																																																																					
Sharp-tailed grouse/ greater prairie-chicken lek buffers	Exclusion																																																																																																					
Sharp-tailed grouse/ greater	Avoidance																																																																																																					

**Table 2-2
Summary Comparison of Alternatives**

<i>Management Action</i>	<i>Alternative A (No Action)</i>	<i>Alternative B</i>	<i>Alternative C</i>	<i>Alternative D (Preferred Alternative)</i>																																																																		
	<table border="1"> <tr><td>range</td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>Least terns/piping plover habitat</td><td>Open</td></tr> <tr><td>Fisheries</td><td>Open</td></tr> <tr><td>VRM Class II</td><td>Open</td></tr> <tr><td>VRM Class III & IV</td><td>Open</td></tr> <tr><td>Floodplains</td><td>Open</td></tr> <tr><td>Sensitive soils</td><td>Open</td></tr> <tr><td>Slopes over 25%</td><td>Open</td></tr> </table>	range		Least terns/piping plover habitat	Open	Fisheries	Open	VRM Class II	Open	VRM Class III & IV	Open	Floodplains	Open	Sensitive soils	Open	Slopes over 25%	Open	<table border="1"> <tr><td>plover habitat</td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>Fisheries</td><td>Avoidance</td></tr> <tr><td>VRM Class II</td><td>Avoidance</td></tr> <tr><td>VRM Class III & IV</td><td>Open</td></tr> <tr><td>Floodplains</td><td>Avoidance</td></tr> <tr><td>Sensitive soils</td><td>Avoidance</td></tr> <tr><td>Slopes over 25%</td><td>Avoidance</td></tr> </table>	plover habitat		Fisheries	Avoidance	VRM Class II	Avoidance	VRM Class III & IV	Open	Floodplains	Avoidance	Sensitive soils	Avoidance	Slopes over 25%	Avoidance	<table border="1"> <tr><td>plover habitat</td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>Fisheries</td><td>Exclusion</td></tr> <tr><td>VRM Class II</td><td>Exclusion</td></tr> <tr><td>VRM Class III & IV</td><td>Open</td></tr> <tr><td>Floodplains</td><td>Exclusion</td></tr> <tr><td>Sensitive soils</td><td>Exclusion</td></tr> <tr><td>Slopes over 25%</td><td>Exclusion</td></tr> </table>	plover habitat		Fisheries	Exclusion	VRM Class II	Exclusion	VRM Class III & IV	Open	Floodplains	Exclusion	Sensitive soils	Exclusion	Slopes over 25%	Exclusion	<table border="1"> <tr><td>prairie-chicken nesting/ brood rearing areas</td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>Spec. status raptor nests</td><td>Exclusion</td></tr> <tr><td>Raptor nests</td><td>Exclusion</td></tr> <tr><td>Bighorn sheep range</td><td>Avoidance</td></tr> <tr><td>Least terns/piping plover habitat</td><td>Avoidance</td></tr> <tr><td>Fisheries</td><td>Avoidance</td></tr> <tr><td>VRM Class II</td><td>Exclusion</td></tr> <tr><td>VRM Class III & IV</td><td>Open</td></tr> <tr><td>Floodplains</td><td>Avoidance</td></tr> <tr><td>Sensitive soils</td><td>Avoidance</td></tr> <tr><td>Slopes over 25%</td><td>Avoidance</td></tr> </table>	prairie-chicken nesting/ brood rearing areas		Spec. status raptor nests	Exclusion	Raptor nests	Exclusion	Bighorn sheep range	Avoidance	Least terns/piping plover habitat	Avoidance	Fisheries	Avoidance	VRM Class II	Exclusion	VRM Class III & IV	Open	Floodplains	Avoidance	Sensitive soils	Avoidance	Slopes over 25%	Avoidance
range																																																																						
Least terns/piping plover habitat	Open																																																																					
Fisheries	Open																																																																					
VRM Class II	Open																																																																					
VRM Class III & IV	Open																																																																					
Floodplains	Open																																																																					
Sensitive soils	Open																																																																					
Slopes over 25%	Open																																																																					
plover habitat																																																																						
Fisheries	Avoidance																																																																					
VRM Class II	Avoidance																																																																					
VRM Class III & IV	Open																																																																					
Floodplains	Avoidance																																																																					
Sensitive soils	Avoidance																																																																					
Slopes over 25%	Avoidance																																																																					
plover habitat																																																																						
Fisheries	Exclusion																																																																					
VRM Class II	Exclusion																																																																					
VRM Class III & IV	Open																																																																					
Floodplains	Exclusion																																																																					
Sensitive soils	Exclusion																																																																					
Slopes over 25%	Exclusion																																																																					
prairie-chicken nesting/ brood rearing areas																																																																						
Spec. status raptor nests	Exclusion																																																																					
Raptor nests	Exclusion																																																																					
Bighorn sheep range	Avoidance																																																																					
Least terns/piping plover habitat	Avoidance																																																																					
Fisheries	Avoidance																																																																					
VRM Class II	Exclusion																																																																					
VRM Class III & IV	Open																																																																					
Floodplains	Avoidance																																																																					
Sensitive soils	Avoidance																																																																					
Slopes over 25%	Avoidance																																																																					
4	No specific management action.	Require multi-year preconstruction studies to confirm migration, wintering or breeding season concentrations of raptors and other wildlife in proposed renewable energy development areas.																																																																				

Program: Special Designations

Areas of Critical Environmental Concern (ACECs)

- Goal 1:** Protect relevant and important values through Area of Critical Environmental Concern (ACEC) designation and apply special management where standard or routine management is not adequate to protect the areas from risks or threats of damage/degradation or to provide for public safety from natural hazards.
- Goal 2:** Historic and cultural sites are preserved. Sites are interpreted as vulnerability to degradation and budget determine.

Management Common to All Alternatives:

- Fort Meade would continue to be designated as an ACEC for historical and archaeological relevance and importance (Refer to the Fort Meade ACEC section below in this table). Use (special recreation permits, livestock grazing leasing, timber sales, military exercises, etc.) would be authorized if such use is consistent with policy and ACEC designation.
- Fossil Cycad would continue to be designated as an ACEC for paleontological relevance and importance (Refer to the Fossil Cycad ACEC section below

Table 2-2 Summary Comparison of Alternatives				
<i>Management Action</i>	<i>Alternative A (No Action)</i>	<i>Alternative B</i>	<i>Alternative C</i>	<i>Alternative D (Preferred Alternative)</i>
	in this table).			
	Back Country Byway			
	Goal 3: Back Country Byway – Highlight and interpret scenic, historic, archeological, or other interest values associated with back country byways in partnership with communities, interest groups, and state and federal entities.			
	Management Common to All Alternatives			
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continue Fort Meade Back Country Byway Designation on Fort Meade ACEC. • Fort Meade Back Country Byway maintenance and interpretation would be managed through the 1996 Fort Meade ACEC Management Plan or subsequent updates. • No additional byways would be proposed. • Fort Meade Back Country Byway is a well-maintained gravel road that is a safe but slow route. An appealing natural setting is viewable. The road may be closed periodically for special events or for emergency conditions. 			
	National and Designated Trails			
	Goal 4: National Trails – Assist in cooperative efforts to manage current and future National Trails to protect the values for which they were designated.			
	Goal 5: Designated trails or portions of trails on BLM land are in good repair and meet the intent of the trail designation.			
	Management Common to All Alternatives			
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continue administrative designation and manage National Recreation Trails those portions of the Centennial Trail in the Fort Meade ACEC and Mickelson Trail in the Exemption Area on BLM land in coordination with their sponsoring agencies. • Proposals for additions to National Trails would be evaluated if they were consistent with management objectives. 			
	Goal 6: Wild and Scenic River Designations – Evaluate river segments for inclusion in the Wild and Scenic River System.			
	Wild and Scenic River System			
	Management Common to All Alternatives:			
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There would be no recommendation for inclusion in the Wild and Scenic River System. 			

**Table 2-2
Summary Comparison of Alternatives**

<i>Management Action</i>	<i>Alternative A (No Action)</i>	<i>Alternative B</i>	<i>Alternative C</i>	<i>Alternative D (Preferred Alternative)</i>
Alternatives Specific to the Fort Meade Recreation Area ACEC (Unless specified otherwise in this section, alternatives that apply to the entire planning area would also apply)				
<p>Management Common to All Alternatives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fort Meade ACEC would continue to be designated as an ACEC for historical and archaeological relevance and importance. Fort Meade ACEC would be designated as Travel Management Areas (TMAs). Motorized travel would be limited to designated routes except for administrative, authorized or emergency use. Back Country Byway designation and management would continue as detailed in the 1996 Ft. Meade ACEC Management Plan. Designated transportation /utility corridors would be located along I-90, State Highway 34 and the Bear Butte Road as described in the 1996 Fort Meade ACEC Plan Figure 2-2. Temporary travel restrictions would be implemented in emergency situations to comply with fire restrictions or protect the soil and water quality Travel routes through cultural resource sites would be rerouted or mitigated. Lands within the Fort Meade ACEC would not be considered for disposal except 5.83 acres of the SDM 74900. Mineral at the Fort Meade ACEC would be withdrawn from mineral entry. Snowmobiles would be prohibited in the Fort Meade ACEC. Recreational gold panning would be prohibited. Camping would be prohibited outside designated campgrounds. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recreation Use Permits (RUPs) would be required at designated campgrounds. Special Recreation Use Permits (SRUPs) would be authorized where consistent with National BLM SRP policy. The BLM would continue management of Fort Meade according to the goals and objectives of the 1987 Cultural Resource Management Plan (CRMP) and the 1996 Fort Meade Recreation Area ACEC Management Plan. This includes Management Objectives such as: (1) Inventory and evaluate sites/features on public lands to determine their best use, (2) Protect significant sites/features, and (3) Insure their proper use. A minimum of 8 to 12 inches of residual herbaceous growth would be maintained on 50 percent of the uplands needed for nesting by ground-nesting birds, particularly sharp-tailed grouse and waterfowl. 				
Management of Vegetation in the Fort Meade Recreation Area ACEC				
1	<p>BLM would maintain or improve all rangeland uplands and riparian areas to proper functioning condition.</p> <p>Introduced vegetative species would be decreased while</p>	<p>Vegetative management practices would include Rx fire, integrated pest management, and grazing to maintain health and productivity of native plant species recognizing that some non-native species such as smooth brome and Kentucky</p>	<p>Vegetative management practices would include Rx fire, integrated pest management, grazing, seeding, and mechanical methods to manage strictly for native plants with intent to eliminate or drastically reduce the levels of</p>	<p>Vegetative management practices would include Rx fire, integrated pest management, and grazing to maintain health and productivity of native plant species recognizing that some non-native species such as smooth brome and Kentucky</p>

Table 2-2. Summary Comparison of Alternatives

<p align="center">Table 2-2 Summary Comparison of Alternatives</p>				
<i>Management Action</i>	<i>Alternative A (No Action)</i>	<i>Alternative B</i>	<i>Alternative C</i>	<i>Alternative D (Preferred Alternative)</i>
	increasing native vegetation.	bluegrass have become too well established to eradicate. Attempts to conduct large-scale conversion of grasslands back to native species using chemicals, seeding, Rx fire, and mechanical methods, etc. would not occur unless future research determines that a specific course of action has a high probability of success and such methods are within budget and staffing capabilities.	non-native herbaceous plant species.	bluegrass have become too well established to eradicate.
Management of Cultural Resources and Traditional Cultural Properties in the Fort Meade Recreation Area ACEC				
1	Continue with present National Register of Historic Places District Boundary for Fort Meade includes 3,200 acres.	Complete a formal nomination of Fort Meade as a National Register Landmark listing of 6,570 acres.	Revise the National Register of Historic Places Fort Meade District nomination to incorporate 3,370 additional acres inside the District Boundary and incorporate the entire Military Reservation. Total acres in Historic District would be changed to 6,570.	Revise the current National Register of Historic Places Nomination for the Fort Meade Historic District site boundary to incorporate all additional acres, approximately 3,370 acres, inside the original Military Reservation that are administered by the BLM. Consider a National Historic Landmark nomination, contingent on other partnering agency cooperation.
Management of Visual Resource Management in the Fort Meade Recreation Area ACEC				
1	VRM acres were partially classified in the Fort Meade ACEC designation and management plan and would be approximately:	Completing the VRM designation on Fort Meade ACEC would result in the following Visual Resource Management Classification approximate acres would be:	Visual Resource Management Classification designating all of Fort Meade ACEC as VRM Class II except for Recreation Development Zones which would be retained in Class IV would	Same as Alternative B.

**Table 2-2
Summary Comparison of Alternatives**

<i>Management Action</i>	<i>Alternative A (No Action)</i>	<i>Alternative B</i>	<i>Alternative C</i>	<i>Alternative D (Preferred Alternative)</i>																																										
	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>VRM Acres</th> <th>VRM Class</th> <th>Acres</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>0</td> <td>I</td> <td>0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1,231</td> <td>II</td> <td>1,231</td> </tr> <tr> <td>5,284</td> <td>III</td> <td>4,993</td> </tr> <tr> <td>218</td> <td>IV</td> <td>218</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>0 (No Designation)</td> <td>291</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	VRM Acres	VRM Class	Acres	0	I	0	1,231	II	1,231	5,284	III	4,993	218	IV	218		0 (No Designation)	291	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>VRM Class</th> <th>Acres</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>I</td> <td>0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>II</td> <td>1,231</td> </tr> <tr> <td>III</td> <td>5,284</td> </tr> <tr> <td>IV</td> <td>218</td> </tr> <tr> <td>0 (No Designation)</td> <td>0</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	VRM Class	Acres	I	0	II	1,231	III	5,284	IV	218	0 (No Designation)	0	result in: <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>VRM Class</th> <th>Acres</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>I</td> <td>0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>II</td> <td>6,515</td> </tr> <tr> <td>III</td> <td>0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>IV</td> <td>218</td> </tr> <tr> <td>0 (No Designation)</td> <td>0</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	VRM Class	Acres	I	0	II	6,515	III	0	IV	218	0 (No Designation)	0	
VRM Acres	VRM Class	Acres																																												
0	I	0																																												
1,231	II	1,231																																												
5,284	III	4,993																																												
218	IV	218																																												
	0 (No Designation)	291																																												
VRM Class	Acres																																													
I	0																																													
II	1,231																																													
III	5,284																																													
IV	218																																													
0 (No Designation)	0																																													
VRM Class	Acres																																													
I	0																																													
II	6,515																																													
III	0																																													
IV	218																																													
0 (No Designation)	0																																													
Management of Forest and Woodland Products in the Fort Meade Recreation Area ACEC																																														
1	Same as the rest of the planning area.	Same as the rest of the planning area except no new permanent roads would be allowed.	Same as the rest of the planning area.	Same as the rest of the planning area except no new permanent roads would be allowed. Rerouting and maintenance of existing authorized roads would be allowed to reduce impacts to resources. Temporary roads would be allowed after project level planning, and decommissioned as part of the project.																																										
2	Same as the rest of the planning area.	Incidental use of plant materials would be allowed, except that only above ground plant gathering would be allowed in the Fort Meade ACEC.																																												
Management of Livestock Grazing in the Fort Meade Recreation Area ACEC																																														
Objectives: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Maintain or enhance proper functioning condition of Bear Butte Creek and the associated riparian zone. Provide for a diversity of vegetation types across the landscapes including healthy functioning riparian areas, woody draws, pine forests and grasslands. Perennial grasses make up at least 60% of the vegetative cover in the mid grass association. Ensure that adequate food and cover will be available for wildlife before, during and after livestock use. 																																														
1	A bid process would continue to be conducted to establish	Same as Alternative A, except the Westside Pasture Allotment(s)	Same as Alternative A (No Action).	Same as Alternative B.																																										

**Table 2-2
Summary Comparison of Alternatives**

<i>Management Action</i>	<i>Alternative A (No Action)</i>	<i>Alternative B</i>	<i>Alternative C</i>	<i>Alternative D (Preferred Alternative)</i>
	vegetative grazing use contracts for the Fort Meade and the Bear Butte Allotments. (Per 43 CFR 4110.1-1 and previous use administered by the Veterans Administration at time of acquisition.)	could be separate from the Bear Butte Allotment and managed under a Section 15 grazing lease(s). Billing for the Westside Pasture Allotment(s) would be conducted in a manner consistent with all other Section 15 grazing leases.		
2	Fort Meade Allotment would have 2,620 acres and 562 AUMs. Bear Butte Allotment would have 2,750 acres and 1,261 AUMs.	Fort Meade Allotment could have 2,520 acres and 540 AUMs. Bear Butte Allotment would have 2,531 acres and 1,161 AUMs.	Same as Alternative A (No Action).	Same as Alternative B:
3	Livestock grazing on the West Side Pasture (219 acres) of the Bear Butte Allotment would continue to be part of the allotment as leased through the bidding process.	Livestock grazing on the West Side Pasture (219 acres and 100 AUMs) of the Bear Butte Allotment would become a separate allotment(s). Westside Pasture Allotment(s) would then be available as a Section 15 (see glossary) grazing lease(s) with grazing preference available to adjacent land owners.	Same as Alternative A (No Action).	Grazing preference for livestock grazing on the West Side Pasture (219 acres and 100 AUMs) of the Bear Butte Allotment would be offered as a separate Section 15 grazing lease(s) under a new allotment(s). If applications for grazing preference do not show that they will meet the goals and objectives of the Fort Meade ACEC, the pasture would remain part of the Bear Butte Allotment.
4	SDSU Pasture on Fort Meade ACEC would contain 657 acres with 193 AUMs.	SDSU Pasture on Fort Meade ACEC would contain 607 acres with 178 AUMs.	Same as Alternative A (No Action).	Same as Alternative B.
5	No specific management action.	Up to 170 acres of public land could be considered for transfer to the Black Hills National Cemetery. There would be 22 AUMs removed from the Fort Meade Allotment if the transfer	No public land would be considered for transfer to the Black Hills National Cemetery.	Same as Alternative B.

Table 2-2 Summary Comparison of Alternatives				
<i>Management Action</i>	<i>Alternative A (No Action)</i>	<i>Alternative B</i>	<i>Alternative C</i>	<i>Alternative D (Preferred Alternative)</i>
		was completed.		
6	No specific management action.	A public land transfer or authorization of up to 50 acres could be considered for facilities if requested by the National Guard. There would be 15 AUMs removed from the SDSU Allotment.	A public land transfer or authorization would not be considered for facilities if requested by the National Guard.	Same as Alternative B.
7	Cattle grazing would not be allowed within campground areas, the Fort Meade cemetery, Bear Butte Creek and Fort Meade Reservoir exclosures (fenced areas that exclude livestock), Camp Fechner, and the two water guzzlers. 138 acres within exclosures.	Same as Alternative A (No Action) except exclosures could be grazed for fuels management or resource benefits. This would also apply to any additional exclosures that may be built.	Same as Alternative B.	Same as Alternative B.
8	At least four inches of herbaceous stubble would remain in the riparian areas within Fort Meade ACEC after the grazing treatment or rotation has been completed to promote sediment filtering.		Same as Alternative A (No Action), except stubble would be 6 inches.	Same as Alternatives A and B.
9	Livestock grazing would be limited at Fort Meade ACEC to May 15 th through October 15 th to enhance wildlife habitat.	Livestock grazing would be limited to May 1 st through October 31 st .	Same as Alternative A (No Action).	Same as Alternative B.
Management of Recreation in the Fort Meade Recreation Area ACEC				
1	No specific management action.	Fort Meade ACEC would be designated a Special Recreation Management Area (SRMA), and would continue as an Area of Critical Environmental Concern (ACEC).	Same as Alternative B.	Same as Alternative B.
2	Objective: Fort Meade ACEC would be managed for Front Country recreation setting characteristics.			

**Table 2-2
Summary Comparison of Alternatives**

<i>Management Action</i>	<i>Alternative A (No Action)</i>	<i>Alternative B</i>	<i>Alternative C</i>	<i>Alternative D (Preferred Alternative)</i>
3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Camping stay limits would be consistent with current BLM policy, and allowed only in two designated campgrounds: Alkali Creek Trailhead Campground; Alkali Creek Horse Camp. b) Motorized travel across country for camping purposes would not be allowed. c) Campfires would be allowed only in established fire pits or grates at designated sites. Additional use restrictions would be implemented under extreme fire conditions. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Camping stay limits would be consistent with current BLM policy, and allowed in designated campgrounds: Alkali Creek Trailhead Campground; Alkali Creek Horse Camp; Fort Meade Reservoir, if it is developed. b) Same as Alternative A. c) Same as Alternative A. 	Same as Alternative A.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Camping stay limits would be consistent with current BLM policy, and allowed in designated campgrounds: Alkali Creek Trailhead Campground; Alkali Creek Horse Camp; Fort Meade Reservoir, if it is developed. b) Motorized travel cross country would not be allowed. c) Campfires would be allowed only in established fire pits or grates at designated sites. Additional use restrictions would be implemented under extreme fire conditions.
4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Same as rest of the planning area except only non-motorized travel would be allowed on existing trails, and snowmobiling would be prohibited. b) Approximately 9 miles of the Centennial Trail would be on BLM-administered lands. Routing and maintenance of the Centennial Trail would be coordinated with the U.S. Forest Service, the lead agency for the trail. c) No new trails would be proposed. d) Maintenance of existing trails (Nature Trail, Longstone 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Same as Alternative A. b) Same as Alternative A. c) Additional local trails may be developed. d) Same as Alternative A. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Same as Alternative A. b) Same as Alternative A. c) Same as Alternative A. d) Same as Alternative A. 	Same as Alternative B.

Table 2-2 Summary Comparison of Alternatives				
<i>Management Action</i>	<i>Alternative A (No Action)</i>	<i>Alternative B</i>	<i>Alternative C</i>	<i>Alternative D (Preferred Alternative)</i>
	Building Trail, VFW Chapel Trail, Centennial Trail) would be allowed.			
5	<p>a) Same as the rest of the planning area except hunting with firearms or shooting of firearms would be prohibited on certain portions of Fort Meade ACEC (Figure 2-2). No traps or snares would be allowed.</p> <p>b) No specific management action.</p> <p>c) No target shooting would be allowed except in the muzzleloader range utilizing only black powder firearms.</p>	<p>a) Same as the rest of the planning area except hunting with firearms or shooting of firearms would be prohibited on certain portions of Fort Meade ACEC (Figure 2-2). No traps or snares would be allowed unless authorized in writing for such purposes as research or problem animal removal.</p> <p>b) Pneumatic devices such as pellet guns or air rifles would not be allowed unless authorized in writing.</p> <p>c) No target shooting ranges would be allowed except in the muzzleloader range utilizing black powder firearms or archery.</p>	Same as Alternative B.	<p>a) Same as the rest of the planning area except hunting with firearms or shooting of firearms would be prohibited on certain portions of Fort Meade ACEC (Figure 2-2).</p> <p>b) Same as Alternative B.</p> <p>c) No new permanent target shooting ranges would be allowed. Target shooting ranges would be allowed in the existing muzzleloader range only, utilizing black powder firearms with the following exceptions: Applications for temporary firearm or archery use for education purposes would be considered in areas adjacent to or near the existing muzzleloader range (within the fenced enclosure north of highway 34), if such use is not in conflict with other uses that are authorized at the time of application.</p>
6	No specific management action.	Incidental use of above ground plant materials is allowed.	Same as Alternative B.	Same as Alternative B.

Table 2-2 Summary Comparison of Alternatives				
<i>Management Action</i>	<i>Alternative A (No Action)</i>	<i>Alternative B</i>	<i>Alternative C</i>	<i>Alternative D (Preferred Alternative)</i>
Management of Travel and Transportation in the Fort Meade Recreation Area ACEC				
1	Motorized travel would be limited to designated routes except for administrative, authorized or emergency use.			Motorized travel would be limited to designated routes except for administrative, authorized or emergency use. Temporary road construction would be allowed and decommissioned as part of the project.
2	No snowmobiles would be allowed except for emergency or administrative use.	Same as Alternative A, but also prohibits other vehicles specifically modified to travel across snow.	Same as Alternative B.	Same as Alternative B.
3	No new ROWs would be allowed under the 1996 ACEC Plan.	The existing Old Hooper Dairy Road would be authorized as a new ROW.		
4	Construction of new roads would not be allowed.	Construction of new permanent roads is not allowed except for rerouting of existing authorized roads to reduce impacts to resources.	Same as Alternative B.	Construction of new permanent roads is not allowed except for rerouting of existing authorized roads to reduce impacts to resources. Temporary road construction and decommissioning would be allowed on a project specific basis.
5	BLM would establish and maintain a system of marked equestrian, hiking and biking trails through partnerships with user groups.	Establish and maintain a system of marked equestrian, hiking and biking trails. Partnerships with user groups would be the preferred method for planning, establishment, and maintenance. New trail establishment would be allowed.	Existing trails would be designated as to a particular use such as foot, horse or bike, horse-drawn wagon (non-motorized). No new trails would be established.	Same as Alternative B.

Table 2-2 Summary Comparison of Alternatives				
<i>Management Action</i>	<i>Alternative A (No Action)</i>	<i>Alternative B</i>	<i>Alternative C</i>	<i>Alternative D (Preferred Alternative)</i>
Management of Lands and Realty in the Fort Meade Recreation Area ACEC				
1	No new R&PP leases.	New R&PP leases could be allowed provided they are compatible with the objectives in the Fort Meade ACEC management plan.		
2	Trespass would be resolved by removal of structures. Disposal is not an option.	Unauthorized use, occupancy and development of public lands would be investigated and resolved either through termination and removal of facilities or issuance of an authorization where it is compatible with the objectives of the Fort Meade ACEC management plan. Disposal is not an option.		
3	New firearm or archery ranges would be prohibited.	No target shooting ranges would be allowed except in the existing muzzleloader range utilizing black powder firearms or archery.	Same as Alternative B.	No new permanent target shooting ranges would be allowed. Target shooting ranges would be allowed in the existing muzzleloader range only, utilizing black powder firearms with the following exceptions: Applications for temporary firearm or archery use for education purposes would be considered in areas adjacent to or near the existing muzzleloader range (within the fenced enclosure north of highway 34), if such use is not in conflict with other uses that are authorized at the time of application.
4	Allow military exercises within the management area with the appropriate authorization.	Allow military exercises that are compatible with the objectives of the Fort Meade ACEC management plan.		
5	ROW exclusion or avoidance areas would not be designated within Fort Meade ACEC but several restrictions on specific activities. Allow new ROWs through the Fort Meade ACEC subject to the following guidelines:	Designate the entire Fort Meade ACEC as an ROW avoidance area except for Hooper Dairy Road, all other valid existing rights and corridors as designated in the Fort Meade ACEC management plan of 1996 as shown in Figures 2-1 and 2-2.		

Table 2-2. Summary Comparison of Alternatives

<p align="center">Table 2-2 Summary Comparison of Alternatives</p>				
<i>Management Action</i>	<i>Alternative A (No Action)</i>	<i>Alternative B</i>	<i>Alternative C</i>	<i>Alternative D (Preferred Alternative)</i>
	<p>a. Would have minimal impact on existing uses other than temporary disruptions caused by construction activities.</p> <p>b. Utility transmission and transportation ROWs would be restricted to the corridors shown.</p> <p>c. Would be compatible with other resource guidelines.</p>			
6	All new power transmission lines 33KV or less would be buried.	Within the designated Fort Meade ROW corridor, all power/utility lines that can be safely buried would be buried provided that the burial of lines does not conflict with other resource values. Refer to Figure 2-2 for a display of the Fort Meade ROW corridor.	Same as Alternative B.	Same as Alternative B.
7	Burial of power lines 33 to 69 KV would be required if location allows.	Fort Meade ACEC would be an avoidance area for power/utility lines except for the designated corridor (See Figure 2-2). Refer to management action 6 regarding burial of lines in the designated corridor.	Fort Meade ACEC would be an exclusion area for power/utility lines except for the designated corridor (See Figure 2-2). Refer to management action 6 regarding burial of lines in the designated corridor.	Same as Alternative C.
8	Construction of new roads would not be allowed.	Construction of new roads is not allowed except for rerouting of existing authorized roads to reduce impacts to resources and address safety issues.		
<p>Land Tenure Adjustments in the Fort Meade Recreation Area ACEC</p>				
1	No specific management action	When opportunities exist, BLM would consider acquisition of land adjacent or near Fort Meade ACEC to protect or enhance cultural, historic values, and other resource values such as recreation and wildlife.		
2	No specific management action.	A public land transfer of up to 50 acres or authorization may be considered for facilities if	A public land transfer or authorization would not be considered for facilities if	Same as Alternative B.

Table 2-2 Summary Comparison of Alternatives				
<i>Management Action</i>	<i>Alternative A (No Action)</i>	<i>Alternative B</i>	<i>Alternative C</i>	<i>Alternative D (Preferred Alternative)</i>
		requested by the SD Army National Guard, provided that impacts are minimal and the transfer is consistent with management goals and objectives.	requested by the SD Army National Guard.	
3	National Cemetery expansion proposal would be accepted if it was consistent with management objectives.	Transfer of up to 170 acres of BLM-administered lands to the Black Hills National Cemetery may be allowed, provided that impacts are minimal and the transfer is consistent with management goals and objectives. If the proposed transfer does not occur the land would remain part of the ACEC.	Transfer of BLM-administered lands to the Black Hills National Cemetery would not be allowed.	Same as Alternative B.
4	No Similar Action	Up to six acres of BLM-administered land in the Fort Meade ACEC (lands adjacent to the sewer lagoons) would be considered for transfer to the City of Sturgis pending additional further environmental review.		
Management of Minerals Program in the Fort Meade Recreation Area ACEC				
1	Would remain withdrawn from locatable mineral entry. Would remain closed to leasable mineral and salable mineral entry.			
Management of Renewable Energy in the Fort Meade Recreation Area ACEC				
1	Renewable energy projects would not be restricted unless projects compromise ACEC values.	The Fort Meade Recreation Area would be a ROW avoidance area for renewable energy projects unless the project is deemed necessary for the management of the Fort Meade ACEC.	The Fort Meade Recreation Area would be a ROW Exclusion area for renewable energy projects unless the project is deemed necessary for the management of the Fort Meade ACEC.	Same as Alternative C.
Management of Special Designations in the Fort Meade Recreation Area ACEC				
1	National Cemetery expansion proposal would be accepted if it was consistent with management	Transfer of up to 170 acres of BLM-administered lands to the Black Hills National Cemetery	Transfer of BLM-administered lands to the Black Hills National Cemetery would not be allowed.	Same as Alternative B.

Table 2-2. Summary Comparison of Alternatives

<p align="center">Table 2-2 Summary Comparison of Alternatives</p>				
<i>Management Action</i>	<i>Alternative A (No Action)</i>	<i>Alternative B</i>	<i>Alternative C</i>	<i>Alternative D (Preferred Alternative)</i>
	objectives.	may be allowed, provided that impacts are minimal and the transfer is consistent with management goals and objectives. If the proposed transfer does not occur the land would remain part of the ACEC.		
2	Continue with present National Register of Historic Places District Boundary for Fort Meade includes 3,200 acres.	Complete a formal nomination of Fort Meade as a National Register Landmark listing of 6,570 acres.	Revise the National Register of Historic Places Fort Meade District nomination to incorporate 3,370 additional acres inside the District Boundary and incorporate the entire Military Reservation. Total acres in Historic District would be changed to 6,570.	Revise the current National Register of Historic Places Nomination for the Fort Meade Historic District site boundary to incorporate all additional acres, approximately 3,370 acres, inside the original Military Reservation that are administered by the BLM. Consider a National Historic Landmark nomination, contingent on other partnering agency cooperation.
3	No specific management action.	A public land transfer of up to 50 acres or authorization may be considered for facilities if requested by the SD Army National Guard, provided that impacts are minimal and the transfer is consistent with management goals and objectives.	A public land transfer or authorization would not be considered for facilities if requested by the SD Army National Guard.	Same as Alternative B.
<p align="center">Alternatives Specific to the Fossil Cycad ACEC (Unless specified otherwise in this section, alternatives that apply to the entire planning area would also apply)</p>				
<p>Goal 1: Protect relevant and important values through Area of Critical Environmental Concern (ACEC) designation (Appendix T) and apply special management where standard or routine management is not adequate to protect the areas from risks or threats of damage/degradation or to provide for public safety from natural hazards.</p>				

Table 2-2 Summary Comparison of Alternatives				
<i>Management Action</i>	<i>Alternative A (No Action)</i>	<i>Alternative B</i>	<i>Alternative C</i>	<i>Alternative D (Preferred Alternative)</i>
Goal 2: Paleontological resources are preserved. Sites are interpreted for vulnerability to degradation.				
Management Common to All Alternatives:				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fossil Cycad would be retained in public ownership (land retention category 1). • All 320 acres within the current ACEC boundary would continue to be managed as an ACEC. • No sale of forest products would be allowed. 				
Management of Vegetation in the Fossil ACEC				
1	No related management action exists.	Incidental use of plant materials would be allowed, except that only above ground plant gathering would be allowed in the Fossil Cycad ACEC.		
Management of Visual Resources Management in the Fossil Cycad ACEC				
1	Fossil Cycad would be managed as VRM Class IV.	Fossil Cycad would be managed as VRM Class II.		
Management of Renewable Energy in the Fossil Cycad ACEC				
1	No specific management action.	The Fossil Cycad ACEC would be an avoidance area for renewable energy development, including testing and monitoring.	The Fossil Cycad ACEC would be an exclusion area for renewable energy development, including testing and monitoring.	Same as Alternative C.
Management of Minerals in the Fossil Cycad ACEC				
1	Locatable federal minerals under Fossil Cycad ACEC withdrawn. Leasable federal minerals and oil and gas under Fossil Cycad ACEC (320 acres) would be closed (no lease).	Locatable federal minerals under Fossil Cycad ACEC would be recommended for withdrawal. Leasable federal minerals under Fossil Cycad ACEC would be closed (no lease) except for oil and gas which would be open to leasing with an NSO-stipulation. Salable federal minerals would be closed (no lease).	Locatable federal minerals under Fossil Cycad ACEC would be recommended for withdrawal, while leasable federal minerals and salable federal minerals would be closed (no lease).	Same as Alternative C.
Alternatives Specific to the Greater Sage-Grouse Protection Priority Areas (PPAs) ACEC (Unless specified otherwise in this section, alternatives that apply to the entire planning area would also apply)				
Goal 1: Protect the Relevance and Importance values as shown in Appendix T.				

<p align="center">Table 2-2 Summary Comparison of Alternatives</p>				
<p><i>Management Action</i></p>	<p><i>Alternative A (No Action)</i></p>	<p><i>Alternative B</i></p>	<p><i>Alternative C</i></p>	<p><i>Alternative D (Preferred Alternative)</i></p>
<p>Management Actions Common to All Alternatives, as described in the Special Status Species section of this Table, would apply to the Greater Sage-Grouse PPAs ACEC.</p>				
<p>1</p>	<p>No ACEC designation of Greater Sage-Grouse PPAs.</p>		<p>Greater Sage-Grouse PPAs would be designated as an ACEC.</p> <p>Actions specific to Greater Sage-Grouse PPAs/ACEC as shown in the Special Status Species PPA section under Alternative C would apply. Refer to the Special Status Species section of this table for details.</p> <p>Summary of major actions specific to Greater Sage-Grouse PPAs/ACEC in Alternative C include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Within the PPAs/ACEC, oil and gas leasing would be closed, locatable minerals would be recommended for withdrawal, and salable and other non-energy leasable minerals would be closed. • The Greater Sage-Grouse PPAs/ACEC would be excluded from all types of ROWs. • Prescribed fire would not be used in the Greater Sage-Grouse PPAs/ACEC. 	<p>No ACEC designation of Greater Sage-Grouse PPAs.</p>

<p align="center">Table 2-2 Summary Comparison of Alternatives</p>				
<p><i>Management Action</i></p>	<p><i>Alternative A (No Action)</i></p>	<p><i>Alternative B</i></p>	<p><i>Alternative C</i></p>	<p><i>Alternative D (Preferred Alternative)</i></p>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All BLM-administered surface estate in the Greater Sage-Grouse PPAs/ACEC would be managed as a Travel Management Area. Travel would be limited to existing routes until such time as a Travel Plan is written. After a Travel Plan is written, travel would be limited to designated routes. 	
<p>Program: Social and Economic</p> <p>Goal 1: Provide opportunities for economic sustainability at the national, regional and local level. Goal 2: Provide for a diverse array of opportunities that result in social benefits for local residents, businesses, recreationists, visitors, interested citizens and future generations, while minimizing the negative social effects.</p> <p>Management Common to All Alternatives: The goals and objectives for social and economic conditions and environmental justice would provide for a diverse array of opportunities that result in social and economic benefits for interested groups and individuals such as local residents, recreationists, permittees, etc.</p> <p>The use of lands and minerals managed by the BLM provide opportunities to contribute to local, state, and economic development and growth. Opportunities to use and develop these lands and minerals, as well as the costs and likelihood of these lands and minerals being used and developed given other management objectives and constraints, vary among the alternatives described and analyzed. The positive and negative social effects to the various groups and individuals are identified in the effects analysis. During social effects analysis, identify disproportionate negative effects to minority or low income populations per Executive Order 12898, Environmental Justice. If negative disproportionate effects are identified, remediate these effects to the extent possible by identifying mitigation to be added to the alternatives where the effects are found.</p>				
<p>Program: Public Safety</p> <p>Management Concern: Abandoned Mine Lands</p> <p>Goal 1: Reclaim AML sites on public land to improve water quality, plant communities, and diverse fish and wildlife habitat. Goal 2: Reduce and/or eliminate risks to human health from hazardous mine openings and other physical and chemical safety hazards. Goal 3: Protect historic resources and wildlife habitat commonly associated with AML sites.</p>				

Table 2-2 Summary Comparison of Alternatives				
<i>Management Action</i>	<i>Alternative A (No Action)</i>	<i>Alternative B</i>	<i>Alternative C</i>	<i>Alternative D (Preferred Alternative)</i>
<p>Goal 4: Remove the greatest risks, preserve bat habitat, restore the environment, and preserve representative or significant cultural resources.</p> <p>Management Common to All Alternatives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> To the extent possible on BLM lands, BLM would strive to meet state and federal water quality standards in watersheds impacted by historic mining. BLM would assess level of risks at AML sites and prioritize for reclamation based on standardized risk assessment. Reclamation would be implemented at the highest risk sites first. Where deemed appropriate by BLM personnel, BLM would restore severely impacted soils and watersheds as close as possible to pre-disturbed conditions that support productive plant communities and ensure properly functioning watersheds. Closures of dangerous inactive and abandoned mine sites would be designed to reduce to the risks to human health and safety, restore the environment, preserve bat habitat, and protect some mine sites as cultural resources and meet or move toward meeting Land Health Standards. Restoration and reclamation activities and repositories would be monitored to determine effectiveness of reclamation practices. Repositories would be maintained to assure cap integrity, including maintaining vegetation for stability, yet preventing tree growth to forestall root penetration of the cap. <p>No Specific Alternatives were identified to address Abandoned Mine Lands other than the Management Common to All Alternatives.</p>				
Management Concern: Hazardous Materials				
<p>Goal 1: Mitigate threats and reduce risks to the public and environment from hazardous materials.</p> <p>Goal 2: Healthy public lands.</p> <p>Management Common to All Alternatives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Disposal of hazardous materials on public lands would generally not be permitted. When the use or storage of hazardous materials is authorized (i.e., in mining operations, pesticide application or other types of commercial activities) special stipulations would be applied to comply with appropriate laws, regulations, and policies. In the event of hazardous materials incidents on public land, standard operating procedures would be used to respond. Cleanups and reclamation would be conducted in accordance with the National Oil and Hazardous Substances Pollution Contingency Plan and the NEPA or Removal Site Evaluation (RSE) / Engineering Evaluation Cost Analysis (EECA) decision. BLM would promote and support the appropriate use and recycling of hazardous materials in public facilities and on public land to prevent or minimize the generation and disposal of hazardous wastes. Environmental Site Assessments would be conducted for land acquisitions, land disposals, and for right-of-ways if applicable. Land uses would be authorized and managed to reduce the occurrence and severity of hazardous materials incidences on public land. BLM would assess level of risk at hazard sites and conduct remediation at highest priority sites that are the greatest risks to the public and environment. In areas with known or potential hazardous waste or materials, BLM may defer oil and gas exploration and would not consider proposals to explore or develop other minerals until such time as the risks of these types of activities are fully known. Remedial action would be required as necessary, subject to existing State and Federal laws and requirements prior to proceeding with a project. 				

**Table 2-2
Summary Comparison of Alternatives**

<i>Management Action</i>	<i>Alternative A (No Action)</i>	<i>Alternative B</i>	<i>Alternative C</i>	<i>Alternative D (Preferred Alternative)</i>
1	No similar action	<p>CSU: at U.S. Air Force abandoned Minuteman missile sites.</p> <p>Surface-disturbing activity would be restricted on the sites. Subsurface activity would be prohibited under the sites. Proposals for surface disturbance will be assessed on a case-by-case basis.</p>	Same as Alternative B, except that the restrictions will also apply to approximately 1/8 mile (approximately 200 meters) beyond the sites.	<p>Same as Alternative B, except that the restrictions will also apply to approximately 1/8 mile (approximately 200 meters) beyond the sites.</p> <p>This stipulation can be excepted by the authorized officer if it is determined that the disturbance would not intercept and contribute to the spreading of potential residual wastes by a plan that addresses the design of the proposal, stockpiling and respreading of soil materials, and sampling and testing.</p>
Management Concern: Debris Flows				
<p>Goal 1: Prevent debris flows on public lands from occurring if possible. Goal 2: Reduce risks from debris flows from public lands. Goal 3: Protect the public from debris flows on public land. Goal 4: No reasonably preventable debris flow potential caused by management or lack of management.</p> <p>Management Common to All Alternatives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Take action to prevent/mitigate debris flows with available tools (such as Burned Area Emergency Rehabilitation (BAER) teams), and protect the public, if imminent dangers are discovered on public lands. 				