EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

INTRODUCTION

This Final Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) analyzes the proposed action to revise the existing Kemmerer Resource Management Plan (RMP) for the Kemmerer, Wyoming planning area. The Federal Land Policy and Management Act (43 United States Code [USC] § 1701 et seq.) (FLPMA) requires developing, maintaining, and, as appropriate, revising land use plans for public lands. The purpose, or goal, of the land use plan is to ensure lands administered by the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) are managed in accordance with the FLPMA and the principles of multiple use and sustained yield.

Revising an existing land use plan is a major federal action for the BLM. The National Environmental Policy Act (42 USC § 4321 et seq.) (NEPA) of 1969, as amended, requires federal agencies to prepare an EIS for major federal actions; thus, this Proposed RMP and Final EIS is a combined document. The Final EIS analyzes the impacts of four alternative RMPs for the planning area, including the No Action Alternative and agency Preferred Alternative (now the Proposed RMP). The No Action Alternative reflects current management (the existing plan).

PURPOSE AND NEED

Within the Kemmerer planning area, the BLM manages approximately 1.4-million acres of BLM-administered public land surface and 1.6-million acres of federal mineral estate. Since 1986, the existing plan has served as the framework for managing these BLM-administered lands; however, the existing plan has undergone more than 30 maintenance actions, including updates and amendments, and is in need of revision. Since the Record of Decision (ROD) was signed in 1986 for the existing plan, new data have become available, new policies established, and old policies revised. This, along with emerging issues and changing circumstances, resulted in the need for revision. This new version will address the changing needs of the planning area and select a management strategy that best achieves a combination of the following:

- Employing a community-based planning approach and complying with applicable tribal, federal, and state laws, standards, and implementation plans, as well as BLM policies and regulations.
- Establishing goals and objectives (desired outcomes) for managing resources and resource uses according to the principles of multiple use and sustained yield.
- Identifying land use plan decisions to guide future land-management actions and subsequent site-specific implementation decisions.
- Identifying management actions and allowable uses anticipated to achieve the established goals and objectives and reach desired outcomes.
- Providing comprehensive management direction by making land use decisions for all appropriate resources and resource uses administered by the BLM Kemmerer Field Office.
- Recognizing the nation's needs for domestic sources of minerals, food, timber, and fiber, and incorporating requirements of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act Reauthorization, the Energy Policy Act, the National Fire Plan, the Healthy Forest Restoration Act, and the Healthy Forest Initiative.
- Retaining flexibility to adapt to new and emerging issues and opportunities, and providing for adjustments to decisions over time based on new information and monitoring.
- Striving to be compatible with existing plans and policies of adjacent local, state, tribal, and federal agencies and consistent with federal law, regulations, and BLM policy.

PLANNING ISSUES AND CRITERIA

Planning issues identified through the scoping process and other public outreach efforts focus on conflicts among resources and resource uses. Major issues described and analyzed in this Final EIS include the following:

Energy and Mineral Resources

- What areas are suitable or not suitable for energy and mineral resource development?
- What conflicting resource issues should be considered in areas suitable for energy and mineral resource development?

Vegetation and Habitat Management

- How should soil, water, and vegetation be managed to reduce fuel loads and achieve forest health and healthy rangelands while providing for livestock grazing and fish and wildlife habitats?
- How should special status species conservation strategies be applied given the BLM's requirement for multiple-use management and sustained yield? How will these strategies affect other public land resources?

Land Ownership Adjustments, Access, and Transportation

- What land adjustments are necessary to improve access and management of public lands?
- How should travel be managed to provide access for recreation, commercial uses, and general enjoyment of the public lands while protecting cultural and natural resources?

National Historic Trails Management

- How should National Historic Trails be managed to protect the physical trail trace and the integrity of the setting?
- How should BLM manage areas with National Historic Trails that no longer retain their physical properties or setting characteristics?

Special Designations

- What areas, if any, contain unique or sensitive resources requiring special management?

Planning criteria are the standards, rules, and guidelines that help direct the RMP planning process. In conjunction with planning issues, planning criteria ensure the planning process is focused and incorporates appropriate analyses. Planning criteria for the Kemmerer RMP revision also apply to development of the final RMP and are summarized below.

- The revised RMP will recognize valid existing rights.
- Decisions in the revised RMP will comply with all applicable laws and regulations. Decisions may comply, as appropriate, with policy and guidance.
- Planning decisions in the revised RMP will cover BLM-administered public lands, including split-estate lands where the subsurface minerals are severed from the surface right. On split-estate lands, the BLM has legal jurisdiction over one or the other (surface land or subsurface minerals).

- The RMP planning effort will be collaborative and multi-jurisdictional in nature. The BLM will strive to ensure that its management decisions are complementary to its planning jurisdictions and adjoining properties within the boundaries described by law and regulation.
- The environmental analysis will consider a reasonable range of alternatives that focus on the relative values of resources and respond to the issues. Management prescriptions will reflect the principles of multiple use and sustained yield.
- The BLM will consider current scientific information, research, new technologies, and the results of resource assessments, monitoring, and coordination to determine appropriate local and regional management strategies to enhance or restore impaired ecosystems.
- The *Standards for Healthy Rangelands and Guidelines for Livestock Grazing Management for the Public Lands Administered by the BLM in the State of Wyoming* (BLM 1998a) will apply to all activities and uses.
- The BLM will provide for public safety and welfare relative to fire, hazardous materials, and abandoned mine lands.
- Visual resource management class designations will be analyzed and modified to reflect present conditions and future needs.
- The BLM will consider current and potential future uses of the public lands through the development of reasonable foreseeable future development and activity scenarios based on historical, existing, and projected levels of use.
- Planning decisions will include the preservation, conservation, and enhancement of cultural, historical, paleontological, and natural components of public land resources, while considering energy development and other activities.
- The BLM will coordinate with tribes to identify sites, areas, and objects important to their cultural and religious heritages.
- Planning decisions will comply with the Endangered Species Act and BLM interagency agreements with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.
- Areas potentially suitable for an Area of Critical Environmental Concern (ACEC) or other special management designations will be identified and, where appropriate, brought forward for analysis in this EIS.
- Waterway segments are classified and determinations of eligibility and suitability will be made in accordance with Section 5(d) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act. Appropriate management prescriptions for maintaining or enhancing the outstanding remarkable values and classifications of waterway segments meeting suitability factors will be part of the RMP revision.
- Off-highway vehicle (OHV) use management decisions in the revised RMP will be consistent with the BLM's National OHV Strategy (BLM 2001b).
- A coal lease application—the Haystack Lease by Application—is located in northwestern Uinta County. Coal-screening determinations were made on this area during planning efforts for the Kemmerer RMP (BLM 2004b). No additional coal-screening determinations or coal-planning decisions are anticipated for the Kemmerer Field Office RMP, unless public submissions of coal resource information or surface resource issues indicate a need to update these determinations.

OVERVIEW OF ALTERNATIVES

The BLM conducted a series of four workshops in the Kemmerer Field Office with an Interdisciplinary (ID) Team comprised of BLM staff and government cooperating agencies. During the initial workshop, the ID Team shared their respective knowledge and expertise and collaborated to identify goals and objectives (desired outcomes) representing a full range of alternatives for each resource. The second workshop narrowed the scope of alternatives to a reasonable range bounded by the planning criteria.

The BLM formulated four action alternatives from the information gathered during the first two workshops; the ID Team reviewed these Action Alternatives during the third workshop. The BLM analyzed the potential impacts of the four action alternatives and the No Action Alternative. Based on this analysis, the similarity among alternatives became apparent and, therefore, the BLM eliminated two of the four action alternatives prior to the fourth workshop. During the fourth workshop, the ID Team considered the No Action Alternative (A) and the two remaining Action Alternatives (B and C) and provided the BLM with recommendations for selecting the agency's Preferred Alternative (D). BLM selected the Preferred Alternative based on the following criteria:

1. Satisfies statutory requirements.
2. Reflects the best combination of decisions to achieve BLM goals and policies.
3. Represents the best solution to the purpose and need.
4. Provides the best approach addressing key planning issues.
5. Considers government cooperating agencies and BLM specialists' recommendations.

After careful consideration of both public and internal comments received on the Draft RMP and EIS, adjustments and clarifications have been made to Alternative D. As modified, Alternative D is now presented as the Proposed RMP in the Final EIS. The major issues addressed include: (1) energy and mineral resource exploration and development; (2) vegetation and habitat management; (3) landownership adjustments, access and transportation; (4) National Historic Trails management; and (5) special designations.

Including the No Action Alternative (A), the four alternatives analyzed in this Final EIS represent differing approaches to managing resources and resource uses in the planning area. Each alternative comprises two categories of land use planning decisions: (1) desired outcomes (goals and objectives) and (2) allowable uses and management actions.

Goals and objectives provide overarching direction for BLM actions in meeting the Agency's legal, regulatory, policy, and strategic requirements. Goals are broad statements of desired outcome, but generally are immeasurable. Objectives are more specific statements of a desired outcome that may include a measurable component. Objectives generally are anticipated to achieve the stated goals.

Allowable uses and management actions are anticipated to achieve the desired outcomes (goals and objectives). Management actions are proactive measures or limitations intended to guide BLM activities in the planning area. Allowable uses are a category of land use decisions that identify where specific land uses are allowed, restricted, or prohibited on BLM-administered surface lands and federal mineral estate in the planning area. Alternatives may include specific management actions to meet goals and objectives and may exclude certain land uses to protect resource values.

For each alternative, the BLM predicted actions and associated surface disturbance acreage for each resource over the life of the plan. These predicted actions, allowable uses, and management actions form the basis for the impact analysis of alternatives described in Chapter 4. The three Action Alternatives and the No Action Alternative are described in detail in Chapter 2 and summarized in the following section.

Alternative A

The No Action Alternative represents a continuation of current management and provides a baseline from which to identify potential environmental consequences when compared to the Action Alternatives. The No Action Alternative describes current resource and land management direction as represented in the existing plan and associated maintenance actions, updates, and amendments. Current management addresses resource conflicts on a case-by-case basis. The current designation of the Raymond Mountain ACEC does not change, and no other Management Areas (MAs) are identified if the No Action Alternative is selected. Selection of the No Action Alternative results in no revision to the existing plan at this time and does not meet the purpose and need of the proposed action.

Alternative B

Alternative B emphasizes conservation of physical, biological, and heritage resources with the most constraints on resource uses compared to all other alternatives. Alternative B designates the highest number of ACECs (10) and establishes the most land area for other MAs (3), Research Natural Areas (RNAs) (2), Wild and Scenic River waterway segments (13), and Back Country Byways (1). Alternative B also manages contiguous blocks of native vegetation to minimize habitat fragmentation, includes the most restrictions to protect highly erosive soils, and is the most restrictive to OHV use, wind-energy development, and leasing for oil and gas and other solid leasable minerals.

Alternative C

Alternative C emphasizes resource uses (e.g., energy and minerals, grazing, recreation, and forest products) while reducing some resource conservation measures to protect physical, biological, and heritage resource values. Compared to all alternatives, Alternative C conserves the least land area for protecting physical, biological, and heritage resource values; designates no ACECs; identifies the smallest area for special management; is the least restrictive to OHV use; places the fewest constraints on resource uses; and allows the most land area for leasing oil and gas and other solid leasable minerals.

Alternative D (Proposed RMP)

Alternative D is the BLM's Proposed RMP because it reflects the best combination of decisions to achieve BLM goals and policies, meet purpose and need, address the major planning issues, and consider the recommendations of government cooperating agencies and BLM specialists.

Alternative D emphasizes a moderate level of protection for physical, biological, and heritage resource values and moderate constraints on resource uses. Alternative D retains the Raymond Mountain ACEC, designates the Bridger Butte ACEC, and two additional ACECs, one for special status plant species habitats and one for cushion plant communities. Alternative D is a balanced approach to land management that the BLM believes best addresses the issues, management concerns, and purpose and need for revising the existing RMP.

In addition to the four alternatives analyzed in the Draft EIS, several alternatives were considered, but were not carried forward for detailed analysis because they

- Did not fulfill requirements of the FLPMA or other existing laws or regulations.
- Did not fulfill the purpose and need.
- Were already part of an existing plan, policy, requirement, or administrative function.
- Did not fall within the limits of the planning criteria.

ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES

Environmental consequences potentially resulting from each of the four alternatives were analyzed relative to meaningful direct, indirect, short-term, long-term, and cumulative impacts. The impacts of

each alternative are summarized in Table 2-4 and described in more detail in Chapter 4. This analysis includes an estimate of the social and economic impacts that are anticipated as a result of the alternatives considered. It may also provide a starting point for local governments to use in local planning efforts. Also included in Chapter 4 is a discussion of cumulative impacts that could result from the incremental impact of each alternative when added to other past, present, and reasonable foreseeable future actions.

COOPERATING AGENCIES

As the lead federal agency for the RMP revision, the BLM invited local, state, and federal agencies to participate as cooperating agencies. Lincoln, Sweetwater, and Uinta County Commissioners and conservation districts agreed to participate as cooperating agencies in the RMP revision. The State of Wyoming and the Bureau of Reclamation also are cooperating agencies. The BLM and cooperating agencies participated in four workshops to formulate alternatives and multiple meetings to keep cooperating agencies informed and to solicit their inputs. Development of this Final EIS considered comments from cooperating agencies on previous administrative drafts.

COORDINATION WITH NATIVE AMERICANS

The BLM also invited tribes to participate as cooperating agencies and conducted ongoing coordination throughout the RMP revision process. Coordination included letters, multiple phone calls, and face-to-face meetings with interested tribal representatives to identify places and issues of concern regarding the RMP revision.

PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT

The BLM issued a Notice of Intent (NOI), on June 16, 2003, indicating a revision of the existing plan and preparation of this EIS. Issuance of the NOI initiated a 5-month scoping period to solicit input from the public and interested agencies on the nature and extent of issues and impacts addressed in the Draft EIS. The BLM conducted three individual public scoping meetings in Evanston, Rock Springs, and Kemmerer, Wyoming, during the 5-month scoping period to identify planning issues and introduce the public to the project and preliminary planning criteria. The BLM also established a project website (www.blm.gov/rmp/kemmerer) to keep the public informed about the RMP revision and to provide an ongoing method for public comment.

The BLM issued a Notice of Availability (NOA) of the Draft RMP and EIS on July 13, 2007, beginning the 90-day comment period. During the comment period a series of two open houses and three public meetings were held in Cokeville, Kemmerer, Rock Springs, Evanston, and Lyman, Wyoming.

CHANGES SINCE PUBLICATION OF DRAFT RMP AND EIS

Public comments, requests for additional information, and updated information resulted in a number of changes from the Draft RMP and EIS that are reflected in the Proposed RMP and Final EIS. The majority of these changes are editorial in nature and serve to clarify sections of the main document.

Primarily in response to public comments, some changes were made in the management actions of specific alternatives, described in detail in Table 2-3. A brief summary of those changes is listed below.

- Common to all alternatives:
  - Added avoidance of disruptive activity in elk calving areas from May 1 through June 30.
  - Health and Safety Management Action for emergency situations.

- Changes under Alternative A:
  - Two parcels, totaling 243 acres, were dropped from the list available for disposal because they are not BLM-administered lands.
  - Additional sustained yield forage could be allocated for livestock use on an allotment-by-allotment basis if the results of an evaluation based on the Wyoming Standards for Healthy Rangelands and monitoring data determined the forage was available. (43 Code of Federal Regulation [CFR] 411.3-1)
- Changes under Alternative B:
  - Minimize impacts of continuous noise on species relying on aural cues for successful breeding.
  - Within a six-tenths (0.6) mile radius of the perimeter of occupied or undetermined sage-grouse leks, prohibit all surface disturbance or surface occupancy, and limit human activity between one hour before sunset to one hour after sunrise from March 1 – May 15.
  - Prohibit surface disturbing activities and/or disruptive activities in suitable sage-grouse nesting and early brood rearing habitat within 3 miles of an occupied sage-grouse lek or in identified nesting or brood rearing habitat outside the 3-mile buffer from March 15 – July 15.
  - Prohibit surface disturbing activities and/or disruptive activities in suitable sage-grouse winter concentration areas from November 15 – March 14.
  - Mid-scale mapping of sagebrush ecosystems and sage-grouse seasonal habitats will be completed within one year of the ROD.
  - BLM-administered lands (33,445 acres) in the Dempsey Ridge area would be managed as an SRMA.
  - No new fluid mineral leasing would occur on currently unleased areas within large, contiguous blocks of federal land containing sagebrush, mountain shrub, and aspen habitat. When leases in these areas expire they would not be reoffered. This will result in an increase of 100,000 acres of federal minerals that are administratively unavailable for leasing.
  - A reclamation plan will be developed and approved prior to any surface disturbing activities being authorized. Reclamation will be required within the first available planting season and monitoring of reclamation success according to developed performance standards will begin during the first growing season after seeding.
  - Additional sustained yield forage would not be allocated for livestock use.
- Changes under Alternative C:
  - BLM-administered lands (33,445 acres) in the Dempsey Ridge area would be managed as an SRMA.
  - Additional sustained yield forage could be allocated for livestock use on an allotment-by-allotment basis if the results of an evaluation based on the Wyoming Standards for Healthy Rangelands and monitoring data determined the forage was available. (43 CFR 411.3-1)
  - Mechanized vehicle use would not be allowed in the WSA.
  - Two parcels, totaling 243 acres, were dropped from the list available for disposal because they are not BLM-administered lands.
- Changes under Alternative D:
  - Consider all new ROW actions on a case-by-case basis and encourage the use of existing disturbed areas in the Bear River Divide MA.
  - Minimize impacts of continuous noise on species relying on aural cues for successful breeding.
  - Within a six-tenths (0.6) mile radius of the perimeter of occupied or undetermined sage-grouse leks, prohibit or restrict surface disturbance or surface occupancy, and limit human activity between one hour before sunset to one hour after sunrise from March 1 – May 15.

- Prohibit or restrict surface disturbing activities and/or disruptive activities in suitable sage-grouse nesting and early brood rearing habitat within 3 miles of an occupied sage-grouse lek or in identified nesting or brood rearing habitat outside the 3-mile buffer from March 15 – July 15.
- Prohibit or restrict surface disturbing activities and/or disruptive activities in suitable sage-grouse winter concentration areas from November 15 – March 14.
- Mid-scale mapping of sagebrush ecosystems and sage-grouse seasonal habitats will be completed within one year of the ROD. Detailed mapping of sagebrush ecosystems and sage-grouse seasonal habitats in the Slate Creek and Moxa Arch areas will be completed within two years of the ROD.
- BLM-administered lands (33,445 acres) in the Dempsey Ridge area would be managed as an SRMA.
- Prevention and control of weeds will be required in new disturbance areas. Emphasis will be focused on the control of the infestation of cheatgrass.
- Fluid mineral leasing is allowed on areas within large, contiguous blocks of federal land containing sagebrush, mountain shrub, and aspen habitat.
- Mechanized vehicle use would not be allowed in the WSA.
- Two parcels, totaling 243 acres, were dropped from the list available for disposal because they are not BLM-administered lands.
- Additional sustained yield forage could be activated for livestock use on an allotment-by-allotment basis if the results of an evaluation based on the Wyoming Standards for Healthy Rangelands, monitoring data, range surveys, or other scientific information determined the forage was available.
- The former chariot race area east of Lyman (80 acres between I-80 and the frontage road.) was deleted from the areas proposed to be open to OHV use.
- Visual resource impacts will be evaluated based on the visual contrast of proposed projects from key observation points.
- The Emigrant Springs Back Country Byway route would not be designated.

In Chapter 4, Environmental Consequences, text was added to expand certain sections. None of the changes summarized below altered the conclusions presented in Chapter 4 of the draft RMP and EIS, nor did the changes result in any major modification of land use allocations presented as the Proposed RMP (Alternative D). The following are examples of the most extensive additions and edits:

- Sections 4.1.1.2, 4.1.2.2, 4.1.3.2, 4.2.2.2, 4.4, 4.8.1.2, 4.8.2.2, and 4.9 have been updated to address the additional acreage under Alternative B that would be designated administratively unavailable for leasing on currently unleased areas within large, contiguous blocks of federal land containing sagebrush, mountain shrub, and aspen habitat.
- Section 4.2.4.2: text modified to address restrictions applied in the MMTA
- Sections 3.4.8 and 4.4.8 were updated to reflect changes in status of some listed or protected species and updated management plans as appropriate.
- Section 4.4.1.1: text modified to clarify methods and assumptions
- Section 4.5.1: text modified to further describe the management and protection of National Historic Trails
- Section 4.6.2: text modified to clarify areas unavailable for wind energy development with the addition of a map for Alternative D
- Section 4.6.6.2: text modified to address road management in winter closure areas
- Section 4.6.8.2: text modified to address mitigation for Visual Resource Management

- Section 4.4: text modified to address the establishment of native plant communities in the descriptions of impacts of Alternative B
- Section 4.8: text modified to reference collaboration in socioeconomic analysis during local planning efforts
- Information was added to Table 4-11 to display the potential effects of expanded buffer zones to protect sage-grouse leks and nesting and early brood rearing habitats.
- BLM internal reviews indicated that airborne emissions resulting from geophysical exploration should be added to the list of sources contributing to regional and cumulative air quality. This resulted in minor changes to Tables 4-24 to 4-27.

Changes to appendices and maps in Volume 2 were made to provide additional information or clarification and to support some of the changes to the analyses in Chapter 4. Changes and new appendices are summarized below.

- Appendix A was edited to include only those species listed as Threatened, Endangered, Proposed, or Candidate species under the Endangered Species Act (ESA). Because the species list and management recommendations for BLM designated sensitive species can change as new information is gathered, Appendix A now refers readers to the Wildlife Management Program page of the BLM Wyoming website, for the most recent conservation measures, conservation agreements, and BLM-endorsed management strategies for BLM sensitive species.
- Four appendices were added to the Proposed RMP and Final EIS:
  - Appendix P lists the main laws, regulations, policies, and guidance which guide BLM management (formerly located in Chapter 1 of the Draft RMP and EIS).
  - Appendix Q provides additional analysis of an alternative proposed during the public comment period.
  - Appendix R presents an analysis of the public comments received on the Draft RMP and EIS.
  - Appendix S contains a report that supplements the 2006 Reasonable Foreseeable Development Scenario (BLM 2006b) in order to support the effects analysis of a potential new alternative presented in Appendix Q.
- New maps were added in response to comments and revised constraints maps are included in this Proposed RMP and Final EIS.
  - Four new maps (8A, 9A, 10A, 11A) were added to display the location of proposed oil and gas stipulations under each alternative.
  - Map 66 was added to display the Key Observation Points for evaluating VRM classifications.
  - The four original oil and gas constraints maps (8, 9, 10, 11) were modified as follows:
    - Map 8 (Alternative A)— Less area of moderate constraints due to elimination of sensitive soils or floodplains
    - Map 9 (Alternative B)—More area unavailable for leasing; more area of major constraints due to increased acreage of sensitive soils and floodplains, as well as increased size of sage-grouse lek buffers
    - Map 10 (Alternative C)—Less area of moderate constraints due to elimination of sensitive soils or floodplains
    - Map 11 (Alternative D)—Increase in acreage administratively unavailable for leasing in the MMTA; more area of major constraints due to due to increased acreage of sensitive soils and floodplains, as well as increased size of sage-grouse lek buffers

THE NEXT STEPS

This Proposed RMP and Final EIS considered all substantive oral and written comments received during the 90-day public comment period for the Draft RMP and EIS. Publication of the Proposed RMP and

Final EIS is followed by a 30-day protest period. Members of the public with standing have the opportunity to protest the content of the Proposed RMP and Final EIS during the specified 30-day period. Upon resolution of any protests, the Governor's Consistency Review, and a determination that a supplemental Proposed RMP and Final EIS is not warranted, the BLM will issue the Approved Plan and ROD.

READER'S GUIDE TO THIS DOCUMENT

Volume 1

Chapter 1. Purpose and Need for Action. This chapter introduces the Final EIS, describes the purpose and need to which BLM is responding, provides an overview of the BLM planning process, identifies planning issues and criteria, summarizes consultation and coordination, and identifies topics not addressed by this RMP revision.

Reader's Guide

Volume 1
Chapter 1 – Purpose and Need for Action
Chapter 2 – Resource Management Alternatives
Chapter 3 – Affected Environment
Chapter 4 – Environmental Consequences
Chapter 5 – References
Chapter 6 – List of Preparers

Volume 2
Appendices
Glossary
Maps

Chapter 2. Resource Management Alternatives. Chapter 2 describes how the four alternatives (A through D) were developed, the components and content of each alternative, and discusses the alternatives considered but eliminated from further consideration. It also presents a comparative summary of impacts of each alternative. Resource discussions in chapters 2, 3, and 4 are organized according to the following eight resource topics:

- **1000** Physical Resources – Air, Soil, and Water
- **2000** Mineral Resources – Locatable, Leasable, and Salable Minerals
- **3000** Fire and Fuels Management – Unplanned/Wildland Fire, Planned/Prescribed Fire, and Stabilization and Rehabilitation
- **4000** Biological Resources – Vegetation, Fish and Wildlife, Special Status Species, and Invasive, Nonnative Species
- **5000** Heritage Resources – Cultural, Native American Concerns, Tribal Treaty Rights and Trust Responsibilities, and Paleontological
- **6000** Land Resources – Lands and Realty, Renewable Energy, Rights-of-way and Corridors, Livestock Grazing, Recreation, Travel Management, OHV, and Visual
- **7000** Special Designations – ACECs, MAs, RNAs, Wild and Scenic Rivers, Wilderness Study Areas, and Back Country Byways
- **8000** Socioeconomic Resources – Social and Economic Conditions, Health and Safety, and Environmental Justice.

Chapter 3. Affected Environment. This chapter describes the Kemmerer planning area and the existing environmental conditions that could be impacted by the alternatives.

Chapter 4. Environmental Consequences. Chapter 4 forms the scientific and analytic basis for comparing environmental impacts of each alternative, including the No Action Alternative. Impacts are described in terms of direct or indirect and short-term or long-term, when applicable. Potential cumulative and unavoidable impacts and irreversible and irretrievable commitments also are discussed in this chapter.

Chapter 5. References. This chapter provides full citation information for all references cited within the document.

Chapter 6. List of Preparers. Chapter 6 presents the names and qualifications of the people responsible for preparing this EIS.

Volume 2

Appendices. The appendices include documents that support existing resource conditions or situations, substantiate analyses, provide resource management guidance, explain processes, or provide information directly relevant to or support conclusions in the RMP revision. Nineteen appendices, labeled Appendix A to Appendix S, are included.

Glossary. The glossary defines select terms used throughout this document.

Maps. Maps depict the alternatives by resource. In hardcopy documents, maps can be found on a CD attached to the inside back cover of Volume 1. For CD versions of the document, maps are provided as a separate file on the CD. Electronic copies of the maps are also available on the RMP website (www.blm.gov/rmp/kemmerer/).