Chapter 2. Resource Management Alternatives

2.1. Resource Management Alternatives

This chapter presents four alternative resource management plans (RMPs) for managing the Lander Field Office planning area. The letters A, B, C, and D identify the four alternative plans. Alternative A, the No Action Alternative, represents the continuation of current management direction. Alternatives B and C represent the "bookends," or the range of alternatives. The Bureau of Land Management (BLM) identified Alternative D as its Preferred Alternative in the Draft RMP and Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). Based on comments received during the public comment period on the Draft RMP and EIS, the BLM revised the Preferred Alternative. As modified, Alternative D is now presented as the Proposed RMP in the Final EIS. Each alternative provides a different approach for managing public lands and resources within the planning area, and represents a complete and reasonable land use plan that meets the purpose and need described in Chapter 1.

2.2. Summary of Changes to the Proposed RMP and Final EIS

The Draft RMP and EIS was published in September 2011, and the public comment period closed in January 2012. The BLM identified 1,685 individual comments from the comment documents received, which touched on a wide range of issues. While many of the comments strongly supported the Preferred Alternative in the Draft RMP and EIS, commenters also identified areas where the document could be improved. The Lander Field Office carefully evaluated these comments (see Appendix X (p. 1829)). The Proposed RMP and final EIS contains a number of changes made in response to comments. Before the public comment period for the Draft RMP and EIS ended, the BLM published the Notice of Intent (NOI) for the greater sage-grouse programmatic EIS. The BLM received extensive comments on that planning effort regarding management for the benefit of greater sage-grouse, and the agency also considered these comments during revision of the Draft Lander RMP and EIS. Substantive changes are identified in the document with shaded text. A summary of the key management changes follows.

Changes related to greater sage-grouse: Protections for greater sage-grouse and their habitat were incorporated to better protect sagebrush habitat for the benefit of all sagebrush-obligate species. For example, the BLM incorporated Required Design Features identified by the Sage-grouse National Technical Team (NTT) and other sources to address impacts from surface-disturbing activities. These protections will have the effect of limiting surface disturbance and habitat fragmentation, which will benefit many resources, including soil and water, vegetation, viewshed, and wildlife. For the most part, the Required Design Features were a restatement of existing management practices, such as co-location of rights-of-way (ROWs) or clustering of development infrastructure. Some of the measures recommended by the NTT, while not incorporated in the Proposed RMP and Final EIS, were analyzed under other alternatives. This type of change includes the limitation on use of prescribed fire, the requirement for full suppression of wildfire in Core Area receiving less than 12 inches of precipitation per year, and the prioritization of Core Area for rangeland health assessments and reclamation projects.

Changes of ROW management from exclusion to avoidance: A number of commenters, and particularly local and state Cooperating Agencies, stated that the exclusion areas associated with the Congressionally Designated Trails and the Greater Sage Grouse Reference and Education Area were unnecessarily restrictive, and that the resource objectives could be achieved with avoidance management and appropriate avoidance criteria. Additional analysis by the Lander Field Office confirmed that exclusion was too restrictive because it involved a complete prohibition with no

provision for exception or waiver, whereas avoidance allowed ROWs to be authorized where suitable and properly mitigated. The Proposed RMP manages approximately 411,906 fewer acres as ROW exclusion areas and approximately 321,334 more acres as ROW avoidance areas. The BLM also identified avoidance criteria in Appendix E (p. 1483).

Designation of additional ROW corridors: State and local Cooperating Agencies and industry commented that there were insufficient designated corridors, particularly for underground pipelines. The Governor of Wyoming emphasized the need to facilitate the transportation of carbon dioxide (CO_2) for enhanced oil recovery and carbon sequestration. The Lander Field Office had evaluated the demand for CO_2 transportation, which has been a BLM-authorized use for many years. However, the Governor identified future demands in other parts of Wyoming that could best be supported by pipelines through the planning area. Accordingly, 50,047 additional acres, all in areas with existing disturbance, were designated as ROW corridors.

Broadening the management focus of the Greater Sage Grouse Reference and Education Area: Commenters pointed out that management of the area from Hudson to Atlantic City, identified in the Draft RMP and EIS as emphasizing research on greater sage-grouse, is also the location of other very important values, and that sole species management direction overlooked opportunities to manage the area as a whole to protect those other values. These values include important viewsheds such as the backdrop of the Wind River foothills and the Towns of Lander, Red Canyon, and Atlantic City; important cultural values, including regional and Congressionally Designated Trails; historic mining locations in South Pass; and crucial winter range for elk, mule deer, pronghorn and moose. In addition to emphasizing multiple resource management, the commenters also noted that the management emphasis was too narrowly focused on protecting the greater sage-grouse migration corridor in the proposed Twin Creek ACEC, but overlooked development threats to other resources. The management in the Preferred Alternative was overly restrictive of ROWs, which are a discretionary action for BLM, and did not protect the area from locatable mineral entry, which is a non-discretionary action. Accordingly, the Hudson to Atlantic City area, including the Twin Creek ACEC, and the Lander Slope and Red Canyon ACECs are proposed for withdrawal from locatable mineral entry. Although all of the area is excluded for major ROWs, it is avoided for minor ROWs, which provides the multiple-use management flexibility for the BLM to protect resources but to allow use that does not have adverse impacts. This management focus is in keeping with the management already identified for the Lander Slope, Red Canyon, and South Pass ACECs, and the efforts to work with the State of Wyoming to acquire state trust lands to protect values in the area while allowing the state to acquire lands elsewhere that could be managed to provide more trust income.

Extending mule deer crucial winter range timing stipulations to mule deer winter range: The 1987 RMP protected both elk crucial winter range and winter range because of the importance of the elk herds, but did not do so for mule deer. Since 1987, elk populations have stabilized and in some places increased, but mule deer numbers are down not only in the planning area, but also across the Rocky Mountain region. Several commenters identified the need for special management for mule deer, particularly in response to increasing oil and gas development in important mule deer habitat. Subsequent to the release of the Draft RMP and EIS, the BLM received a proposed Plan of Development for a large oil and gas field in the Lysite area. The Lysite area was identified for intensive development in the Draft RMP and EIS. The Plan of Development, which will be analyzed in an EIS, identifies a larger area than had originally been projected, with increased development pressures on crucial mule deer populations. The Proposed RMP extends the same seasonal restrictions to mule deer winter habitat as crucial winter habitat.

Changes in the National Trails Management Corridor: Between publication of the Draft RMP and EIS and the preparation of the Proposed RMP and Final EIS, national guidance for units of the National Landscape Conservation System (NLCS) changed, with important alterations in the guidance for Congressionally Designated Trails. This change in guidance supported many of the public comments received regarding the boundaries of the Congressionally Designated Trails. The Preferred Alternative managed the corridor in which Congressionally Designated Trails are located as the Heritage Tourism and Recreation Corridor. The boundaries of the Heritage Tourism and Recreation Corridor were based on a 5-mile distance from the Congressionally Designated Trails farthest apart, without regard to the setting or visual resources. Within the 5-mile distance there were two different oil and gas management zones (with controlled surface use [CSU] or no surface occupancy [NSO] management). The Heritage Tourism and Recreation Corridor was excluded to major ROWs except for three designated crossings. Public comments indicated that there was a need for one additional crossing at the location where the Bison Basin Road meets Highway 287. The Proposed RMP and Final EIS incorporates the request for an additional crossing that meets strict criteria, including staying within the existing disturbance of the County Road. The National Trails Management Corridor (NTMC) was redrawn based on the setting of the Congressionally Designated Trails and their nature and purposes, as required by guidance. The overall size of the NTMC is smaller than the Heritage Tourism and Recreation Corridor, but within the NTMC, management is uniform rather than differing by zones. The NTMC is managed as an avoidance area for ROWs but, except for crossing of the actual ruts of the National Historic Trails (NHTs), ROWs may be considered that meet the NTMC nature and purposes and Visual Resource Management (VRM) objectives.

Comments submitted on the Draft RMP and EIS fell within the wide range of alternatives analyzed by the BLM. The changes made in the Proposed RMP and Final EIS prompted by the comments do not require a supplemental EIS because they do not include or raise any issues that were outside the range of the alternatives.

2.3. Alternative Development Process

To comply with National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) requirements in the development of alternatives for this RMP and EIS, the BLM sought public input and analyzed a range of alternatives, including the No Action Alternative (Alternative A). Alternative formulation considered existing land use plan decisions and issues and concerns developed internally and solicited from the public during the scoping process. Broadly, the BLM followed five steps to develop alternatives:

1. Receive Public Input (Scoping)
2. Identify Current Management (Alternative A – No Action Alternative)
3. Develop the Range of Alternatives (alternatives B and C)
4. Analyze the Effects of the Alternatives (alternatives A, B, and C)
5. Develop the Preferred Alternative (Alternative D)

2.3.1. Receive Public Input

The BLM collected and considered public input received during the scoping process in developing the alternatives and the associated management actions. The BLM considers public input throughout the alternative development process. Chapter 5 and the project Scoping Comment Summary (available on the RMP revision website at http://www.blm.gov/wy/st/en/programs/Planning/rmps/lander/docs.html) summarize the results of the public scoping process and opportunities for future public involvement.

2.3.2. Identify Current Management

The 1987 Lander Field Office RMP (existing plan), is the basis for the No Action Alternative (Alternative A) also called current management. Alternative A, in conjunction with the planning criteria and the key issues identified during the scoping process, was used as a baseline for developing the range of alternatives.

2.3.3. Develop the Range of Alternatives

The BLM conducted a series of 10 alternatives development workshops with a team comprised of BLM staff and cooperating agencies. During the initial workshop, the team shared their knowledge and expertise and collaborated to identify goals and objectives for each resource. Each subsequent workshop refined the management composing each alternative and narrowed the scope of alternatives to a reasonable range, limited by the planning criteria (refer to Chapter 1, Planning Criteria). Table 2.1, "Alternatives Development Workshops" (p. 18) identifies the dates and focus of each workshop. Prior to each workshop, the BLM provided preliminary draft alternatives prepared by BLM specialists to the cooperating agencies for each resource to be discussed during the workshop. These preliminary alternatives served as a starting point for alternative formulation and a basis for discussion by team members during the workshops.

Table 2.1. Alternatives Development Workshops

Workshop Number	Dates	Focus
1	March 18 – 20, 2008	Goals and Objectives
2	May 21 – 23, 2008	Range of Alternatives
3	June 18 – 20, 2008	Range of Alternatives
4	August 20 – 21, 2008	Range of Alternatives
5	September 24 – 25, 2008	Range of Alternatives
6	December 3 – 5, 2008	Range of Alternatives
7	January 21 – 23, 2009	Range of Alternatives
8	February 18 – 20, 2009	Range of Alternatives
9	December 9, 2009	Range of Alternatives
10	May 12 – 14, 2010	Preferred Alternative

The team formulated a range of alternatives (alternatives B and C) to meet the purpose and need of this RMP and EIS using different approaches to resource use. The Preferred Alternative was subsequently developed based upon the range identified at the meetings.

Management actions developed under all alternatives are subject to valid existing rights. In addition, management actions may only be implemented when consistent with applicable laws, regulations, and policies. The BLM considered, but did not carry forward for detailed analysis,

alternatives that did not meet the planning criteria or the purpose and need (see Chapter 1), or were already part of an existing plan, policy, requirement, or administrative function that would continue under the revised RMP.

2.3.4. Analyze the Effects of the Alternatives

The fourth step in the alternatives development process involved analyzing the effects of the range of alternatives. This task involved analyzing the impacts of one set of resource management actions on other resources and resource uses. The BLM compiled these data into Chapter 4 and considered them in step five.

2.3.5. Develop the Preferred Alternative

The BLM developed Alternative D, the Preferred Alternative, by considering the impacts analysis (Chapter 4) for alternatives A through C; knowledge of specific issues raised throughout the planning process; planning criteria; and recommendations from cooperating agencies, BLM specialists, and resource experts.

The BLM presented the Preferred Alternative to the team during the Preferred Alternative workshop. Refer to Table 2.1, "Alternatives Development Workshops" (p. 18) for the date of the Preferred Alternative workshop. The BLM refined the Preferred Alternative using the following selection criteria:

- Reflects what the BLM believes to be the best combination of decisions to achieve its goals and policies
- Represents the best solution to the purpose and need as described in Chapter 1
- Provides the best approach to address key planning issues
- Considers cooperating agencies, public scoping comments, and BLM specialists' recommendations

The BLM presented the Preferred Alternative (Alternative D) in the Draft RMP and EIS for public comment. Based on comments received during the public comment period on the Draft RMP and EIS, the BLM revised the Preferred Alternative. As modified, Alternative D is now presented as the Proposed RMP in the Final EIS. Following resolution of protests and the Governor's consistency review, the BLM will prepare a Record of Decision (ROD) and Approved RMP.

2.4. Alternative Components

Each alternative comprises two categories of land use planning decisions: (1) goals and objectives and (2) allowable uses and management actions.

2.4.1. Goals and Objectives

Goals and objectives direct BLM actions to most effectively meet legal mandates, regulations, agency policy, as well as local and regional resource needs. Goals are broad statements of desired outcomes that are usually not quantifiable. The BLM has developed Land Health Standards applicable to all ecosystems and management actions that are typically included as goals in land use plans. Objectives identify specific desired outcomes for resources. Objectives are usually quantifiable and measurable and may have established timeframes for achievement.

When quantified, the indicators associated with Land Health Standards are a possible source of objectives in land use plans. The Detailed Alternative Descriptions by Resource section (Section 2.7 (p. 72)) of this chapter describes the management goals and objectives for each resource.

2.4.2. Allowable Uses and Management Actions

The BLM developed allowable uses and management actions to achieve the goals and objectives defined for each resource.

2.4.2.1. Allowable Uses

Allowable uses are a category of land use decisions that identify where specific land uses are allowed, restricted, or excluded on BLM-administered lands and federal mineral estate in the planning area. Alternatives may include specific land use restrictions to meet goals and objectives and can exclude certain land uses (e.g., mineral leasing, recreation, utility corridors, and livestock grazing) to preserve resource values. For example, alternatives considered in this RMP revision restrict surface-disturbing activities from oil and gas development within certain occupied greater sage-grouse leks and the associated buffers. Allowable uses often contain a spatial component to identify the management prescription for particular geographic areas. Maps of the planning area in Appendix B (p. 1445) illustrate these spatial components and define the geographical extent of the management actions. The maps are for illustrative purposes only and might not accurately reflect all decisions due to the size of the resource area; details can be obscured or not readily apparent, or the size could appear larger on the maps so that the feature stands out when depicted on such a broad scale. The management actions that make up the Proposed RMP are in all cases the decision and not modified by the manner in which the decision is displayed on the maps.

2.4.2.2. Management Actions

Management actions are proactive measures (e.g., measures the BLM will pursue to enhance watershed function and condition), or limitations intended to guide BLM activities in the planning area. An example of this type of management action is to manage forests and woodlands to improve vegetation health and for the benefit of other resources using natural processes to the greatest extent possible.

2.4.2.3. Organization of Allowable Uses and Management Actions in the Alternatives

For simplicity, the remainder of this chapter uses the term “management action” to include both allowable uses and management actions. Therefore, when text refers to management actions, it includes both categories. The alternatives include two types of management actions. *Management actions common to all alternatives*, apply regardless of the alternative. *Management actions by alternative*, represent the range of land use management decisions considered across alternatives. These management actions vary among the alternatives and represent a range of management options the BLM considered to meet the stated goals and objectives and the purpose and need for the RMP revision.

2.5. Alternatives Considered but Not Carried Forward for Detailed Analysis

The BLM considered several alternatives and management options as possible methods for resolving resource management issues and conflicts, but after further review and consideration, did not carry several of those forward for detailed analysis. This section describes these alternatives and options. Reasons for not carrying these alternatives/options forward include: (1) they would not fulfill requirements of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act (FLPMA) or other existing laws or regulations; (2) they would not meet the purpose and need; (3) they were already part of an existing plan, policy, or administrative function; or (4) they did not fall within the limits of the planning criteria.

2.5.1. Require a Plan of Operations for the Entire Field Office

The BLM considered an alternative that would have required a mining Plan of Operations for all locatable mineral activities in the planning area. The requirement for when a Plan of Operations for locatable minerals is needed is determined by federal regulation (43 Code of Federal Regulations [CFR] 3809 et seq.) and is not an RMP decision. Accordingly, the proposed alternative is unreasonable because it is inconsistent with basic policy and regulation.

To the extent that this is a request that the entire planning area be evaluated as an Area of Critical Environmental Concern (ACEC), which is the only RMP decision that would require a Plan of Operations that could be applied to all BLM-administered lands, this alternative would not meet the purpose and need for the EIS and would prevent other reasonable uses. In any event, the proposal does not identify relevant and important values that are more than regionally important or that require special management. To the extent that this is a request for an ACEC for all occupied greater sage-grouse habitat, this is addressed in Section 2.7, "Greater Sage-Grouse Management" (p. 34).

2.5.2. Close Abandoned Mine Land Reclaimed Areas to New Surface Disturbance

A citizen proposal suggested that lands that had been reclaimed under the Abandoned Mine Land program, which the BLM operates in conjunction with the State of Wyoming, be closed to new surface disturbance. The proposal was intended to protect the investment in reclamation that had been made with public funds. The BLM considered prohibiting additional surface disturbance on these lands both to protect the investment already made in reclamation and to help to ensure that the reclamation continued to improve. However, the BLM determined that the decision to allow or not allow new development should be made on a site-specific basis. In some cases, disturbance might not be appropriate, such as where health and safety issues exist because of prior use. A total prohibition was determined to be unreasonable and not to meet the purpose and need of the RMP because it could prevent reasonable multiple use and because the goals of the proposed alternative could be achieved through other means. For example, any new development would be required to meet reclamation standards, something that was not required at the time the original mines were abandoned. Moreover, there are situations where it is less destructive to the ecosystem as a whole to disturb soils in the process of being reclaimed than historically undisturbed areas. This determination must be made on a site-specific basis. The BLM lacks data

or information to support a planning area-wide closure; an alternative considering a closure would be arbitrary and without scientific basis.

2.5.3. Prohibit Oil and Gas Development

A citizen proposal suggested closing all of the planning area to oil and gas development because of important resources such as greater sage-grouse habitat, crucial winter range, and visual resources. The BLM determined that a planning area-wide closure was not in conformance with policy and regulations. Oil and gas development is an authorized use of BLM-administered lands and encouraged by national energy policy. Therefore, it would be arbitrary and inconsistent with existing laws to analyze closing the entire planning area to development. Moreover, that analysis would be misleading since extensive valid lease rights exist that could be developed regardless of changes in management in this RMP revision. The alternatives analyzed include modifications to the approach under Alternative A, in which most of the planning area is open to oil and gas development, with small areas having a NSO restriction. In addition, the alternatives analyzed include modifications of oil and gas development:

- Alternative B closes many areas with resource and use conflicts including approximately 2.4 million acres with only 187,524 acres open to leasing.
- Alternative B has more areas with either NSO restrictions or CSU stipulations, particularly in the vicinity of Congressionally Designated Trails.
- Alternative B analyzes closing all greater sage-grouse Core Area to oil and gas leasing. Approximately 1 percent of the planning area does not contain greater sage-grouse habitat; 29 percent contains general habitat, and 70 percent contains priority greater sage-grouse habitat or Core Area. This action translates to the closure of 70 percent of BLM-administered surface to oil and gas leasing.

A subset of this proposed alternative is to close all occupied greater sage-grouse habitat to oil and gas leasing. Only 1 percent of the planning area is outside greater sage-grouse habitat. Such closure would not be consistent with national energy policy and would, similarly, not meet the purpose and need for this RMP revision.

2.5.4. Identify Oil and Gas Lease Parcels to be Offered Instead of Responding to Industry Requests and Utilize Master Leasing Plans

Several proposals suggested that the BLM identify which parcels would be offered for oil and gas leasing rather than responding to industry nominations. The BLM determined that this alternative is not an RMP level decision. The BLM addresses the issue raised by the approach – that the BLM focus development in areas with low resource conflict – through alternatives that open or close an area to leasing or impose lease restrictions (e.g., CSU or NSO stipulations or timing limitations). In addition, the existing alternatives identify different ways to protect resources while allowing resource use.

Subsequent to the start of the RMP revision process, the BLM issued guidance regarding Master Leasing Plans (MLPs) to address oil and gas leasing in areas with resource values of concern; see Instruction Memorandum (IM) 2010–117. The BLM received nominations for five areas in the planning area (either in whole or in part) for which MLPs were requested. BLM guidance requires land use plan revisions to analyze MLP proposals.

The Wyoming State Office evaluated the proposals for MLPs in the planning area. Two areas were determined to be appropriate for analysis under the MLP concept. The other three areas did not meet the criteria identified in IM 2010–117 because of low development potential or because much of the area is already leased. The Wind River Hydrologic Basin contains areas with moderate to high potential. However, the lands with this potential are substantially leased (Map 33). In addition, other management such as greater sage-grouse protections would achieve similar protection objectives as would be identified in an MLP analysis. The three areas determined not appropriate for analysis under an MLP include:

Sweetwater/South Pass: The nominated portion in the planning area is entirely within an area analyzed under Alternative B as closed to leasing and as an ACEC that is open to oil and gas leasing subject to NSO stipulations under Alternative D. The BLM analyzed other protections for resource values under the alternatives through limitations on surface disturbance and the requirement of a Plan of Operation. BLM determined that these alternatives analyze the types of protections that would be provided for under an MLP analysis.

Green Mountain/Ferris Mountain: The Wyoming State Office determined that the portion of the proposed MLP area in the Green Mountain/Ferris Mountain area of the planning area was within the existing Green Mountain ACEC. Alternative B analyzes closing the entire nominated area to oil and gas leasing, and Alternative D analyzes managing a larger area than the existing ACEC as open to oil and gas leasing subject to NSO stipulations. The southern part of the nominated area that is not part of the ACEC in Alternative D is already leased; IM 2010–117 applies to areas where a substantial portion is not leased. The BLM determined that because the ACEC management would afford the same kind of protections that would be a part of an MLP analysis, the effect of resource protective management through an MLP approach was fully considered.

However, in evaluating the Green Mountain/Ferris Mountain proposal, areas to the south of the ACEC were identified as highly visible with steep slopes that are not suitable for oil and gas surface operations. Accordingly, this area will be open for oil and gas leasing subject to an NSO stipulation under Alternative D. These acres were not included in the Impact Analysis for Planning Model (IMPLAN) analysis of lands open to oil and gas development with major constraints. However, some of this area has overlapping wildlife timing limitations, which would be a major constraint. In addition, the economic impacts associated with this management were not considered to be sufficiently great to reduce the utility of IMPLAN data as a tool to compare alternatives, particularly in light of the relatively small difference in impacts between Alternative B (which is more restrictive than Alternative D) and Alternative C (which is less restrictive than Alternative D). The NSO management is analyzed under Alternative D in Chapter 4.

The Wind River Hydrologic Basin: The proposal to prepare an MLP analysis for the entire Bighorn Basin drainage (which includes the Wind River hydrologic basin) includes a vast area, covering approximately two-thirds of the planning area, and incorporates vastly different resources, including areas that are already substantially leased and areas with little to no mineral potential. This type of "broad stroke" oil and gas management approach is suitable at an RMP level, and not the finer, site-specific planning scale that the MLP approach is designed to achieve. Since such a large scale proposal does not meet MLP guidance, it is not further analyzed.

The two parcels identified for MLPs that the statewide evaluation determined should be analyzed were the Dubois Area and Beaver Rim:

Dubois: The proposal identified many resource values in the Dubois Area, some of which were identified for special management in the 1987 RMP including the East Fork, Whiskey Mountain, and Dubois Badlands ACEC, and the Whiskey Mountain and Dubois Badlands Wilderness Study Areas (WSAs). These areas are managed as open to oil and gas leasing subject to an NSO stipulation. Dubois has high value wildlife resources including three species listed under the Endangered Species Act (ESA): the gray wolf, grizzly bear, and Canada lynx. In addition, Dubois is home to the largest wintering elk herd outside of elk feeding grounds and to the nationally famous bighorn sheep herd in the Whiskey Mountain area. However, the use of an MLP analysis for Dubois was not carried forward for detailed analysis because two alternatives (B and D) manage the entire Dubois Area as closed to leasing. Alternative C manages oil and gas as open subject to standard stipulations, and current management under Alternative A does not include an MLP analysis. As such, protections provided by an MLP are within the range of alternatives already analyzed. The analysis showed that an MLP that allowed leasing under any terms would not meet the resource protections the BLM identified as being required due to the unique resources in the Dubois area. An MLP analysis presumes that leasing would occur and offers additional site-specific resource protections. These lease stipulations would be unnecessary if the entire area is closed to leasing. If at a later date, the BLM made a decision that leasing was appropriate, then a detailed analysis under an MLP would be appropriate. The BLM considered including an MLP analysis area under Alternative C (the resource utilization alternative), but determined that this management did not meet the assumptions for Alternative C management and that maximum utilization under standard lease stipulations would be analyzed.

Beaver Rim: Application of an MLP in the Beaver Rim area is analyzed in detail under Alternative D in Chapter 4. The initial citizens' proposal did not include a map of the proposed MLP area. After preliminary mapping efforts and further input from the citizens' proposal group, the BLM refined the boundary of the Beaver Rim MLP area to the area displayed on Map 135. The Beaver Rim MLP area is further described in the *Leasable Minerals – Oil and Gas* section in Chapter 3.

2.5.5. Defer Oil and Gas Leasing until Infrastructure is in Place to Ensure Price Parity with Other Parts of the Country

The price of natural gas produced in Wyoming is generally lower than gas produced in other locations, which is often attributed to a lack of infrastructure such as pipelines to take the product out of Wyoming. Consequently, there is less competition for Wyoming-produced gas and therefore a lower price is paid. This results in lower revenues to the United States as well as to the State of Wyoming and local governments. A proposed alternative was to defer additional leasing until additional infrastructure is in place in order to increase the competition for Wyoming-produced natural gas and thus increase the economic benefit from oil and gas leasing. The BLM determined that this approach would inappropriately involve the BLM in industry financial decisions. Although the prices of oil and natural gas determine the financial contribution of oil and gas production to Wyoming state and county budgets, lower prices in Wyoming may be more beneficial to the country as a whole. Accordingly, the proposal was not analyzed in further detail because the maximization of tax payments associated with oil and gas pricing was not within the purpose and need for the RMP revision identified in Chapter 1.

2.5.6. Evaluate Oil Shale-Tar Sands Production

The very southern portion of the planning area has potential for oil shale-tar sands or other unconventional oil and gas production (BLM 2009b). However, the potential is not high. The areas are remote from existing oil and gas transportation facilities and have very limited water, a requirement for oil shale-tar sands production. Consequently, the BLM determined that the likelihood for commercially viable oil shale-tar sands production was too remote and speculative to support analysis. Should oil shale-tar sands production become viable in the future, an EIS would determine if such an action is in compliance with the RMP's goals and objectives and whether the RMP would need to be amended. Accordingly, BLM determined that analyzing oil shale-tar sands was not reasonable.

2.5.7. Consolidate All Wild Horse Herd Management Areas in the Green Mountain Common Allotment

The BLM considered if there would be resource benefits to consolidating all seven wild horse Herd Management Areas (HMAs) into one management area in the livestock grazing allotment called the Green Mountain Common Allotment in lieu of the sheep and cattle that currently utilize the allotment (along with one HMA). The BLM determined that there were not sufficient data to make analysis of this alternative feasible. Not enough is known about the benefits of mixing herds with separate genetic ties, some of which are more typical of the mustangs descended from Spanish horses. The BLM does not fully understand the herd structures and what moving the herds would do while still allowing them to be free-roaming. Although identifying an HMA is a land use planning decision, there has been no public support for changing the use of the Green Mountain allotment to wild horses only and substantial opposition to any use of the area by wild horses. Wild horse management is in flux and is being addressed nationally in response to growing herd numbers and conflicts among all public land users. It might be necessary to consider a change in HMAs in response to national direction.

Regarding allocating all forage to wild horses by closing the allotment to livestock grazing, the BLM determined that there were not sufficient resource conflicts to warrant this decision.

2.5.8. Open or Close the Planning Area to Solar Energy Generation

Solar energy generation is authorized by the BLM through ROW grants. The BLM, through land use planning decisions, determines if areas will be open or excluded to solar energy generation ROWs. The BLM determined that the potential for industrial-level solar energy generation in the planning area is low (BLM and DOE 2003) and Wyoming is not included in the study area for the Final Solar Energy Development Programmatic EIS (BLM and DOE 2012). Therefore, specific industrial-level solar energy ROW avoidance and exclusion areas are not analyzed. However, should an industrial solar energy ROW application be received it would be subject to the ROW avoidance and exclusion areas within the selected alternative and would undergo the appropriate environmental analyses. The BLM determined that analysis of solar-energy specific avoidance and exclusion areas was not reasonable and speculative without more information regarding demand and potential. Small, individual solar-energy projects such as are associated with small water wells can be addressed on a site-specific basis.

2.5.9. Close the Lander Slope and Dubois Section 15 Leases to Livestock Grazing

Several citizen proposals identified an alternative that closes Section 15 leases to livestock grazing. (See Chapter 3 for a discussion of the two types of grazing allotments; Section 15 leases are generally small allotments, with more intermingled private lands. The Section 3 leases are on the Lander Slope and in Dubois.) Although closing these leases to livestock grazing would be less arbitrary than closing bigger sections to livestock grazing because the leases involve a smaller area, the data for these allotments still need to be collected as part of rangeland health assessments. The BLM does not have data showing that resource conflicts in these areas can be resolved only by closing them to public land grazing. Moreover, because of the intermingling of private lands, each allotment needs to be evaluated to determine the extent to which additional fencing would be required in order to enforce a grazing closure. The Lander Slope and Dubois areas are very important wildlife habitat (see Chapter 3) and the need for fencing could have far more adverse impacts than the speculative beneficial impacts of removing livestock grazing use. The BLM determined that the issue for closing the Section 15 leases would be based on speculation and not data if achieved at the RMP level and thus would be arbitrary to analyze.

2.5.10. Require Planning Area Wide Phased Development

An alternative was suggested to require planning area-wide "phased development" as an approach to prevent the "boom-bust" aspect of intensive development and to limit additional disturbance until adequate reclamation has been achieved. The BLM determined that the appropriate scale for addressing economic issues and disturbance associated with major development was on a project specific basis. The RMP makes a decision where development may or may not occur by opening or closing areas to mineral and realty development. Other limits such as lease stipulations help on a site-specific basis to limit the potential adverse impacts that may result from major development. However, the market determines when demand for that development will occur and the actual sites for the development. Accordingly, the pace of development can be identified only on a site-specific basis. Adequate NEPA analysis requires that economic and cultural impacts (both direct and cumulative) be analyzed before a particular project is authorized. The same is true for reclamation. The issues raised by this alternative are addressed in Table 2.52, "8000 Socioeconomic Resources (SR) and Health and Safety" (p. 248). Analysis of these impacts across the planning area through the RMP revision process would be speculative and arbitrary.

2.5.11. Manage the Beaver Creek Ski Area as a Special Management Area

The BLM received a citizen proposal to manage the Beaver Creek Ski Area with special management. The type of management was not identified in the proposal. The BLM agrees that the area is appropriate for individual management and, in accordance with extensive scoping and travel management comments, that analysis of the management of the area as a distinct Extensive Recreation Management Area (ERMA) was appropriate.

2.5.12. Manage Highway 287 as a Scenic Byway

Public comment suggested managing Highway 287 as a BLM Scenic Byway, a part of the National Scenic Byway System, and a RMP revision is an appropriate time for making this management decision (BLM 2005b). Generally, this determination is made in conjunction with state designation: "Byways must be identified, designated, planned, developed, and managed within the framework of State programs" (BLM 1993a). The State of Wyoming maintains a program to designate highways as scenic byways called the Wyoming Scenic Byway and Backway Program (Wyoming Department of Transportation 2009). An important consideration for the State of Wyoming in designating a highway is whether it has strong local support including support of adjoining private property owners (Wyoming Department of Transportation 2009). The BLM has not received any indication that this proposal has strong local support; the proposal was not accompanied by any information regarding the interest of the public in establishing this management.

Accordingly, none of the alternatives analyze this management. However, two of the alternatives would manage the lands within the viewshed of Highway 287 to protect its scenic character and its important contributions to the historical setting of the NHTs; see Map 125 and Map 127 which show the protections in the area around Highway 287. Although this management does not have the same effect as byway designation in terms of financial benefits, these alternatives preserve the setting should local support develop.

2.5.13. Manage the Sweetwater River Corridor as a High Priority Management Area

Public comments suggested that the Sweetwater River corridor (which the BLM understood to mean the lands within the watershed of the Sweetwater River) should be managed as a separate, high priority area for resource protection. The BLM analyzed a similar but somewhat different approach to protecting the area's specific resources. The watershed of the Sweetwater River includes the route followed by the Congressionally Designated Trails, which themselves requires management in accordance with BLM Manuals 6250 and 6280 (BLM 2012b and BLM 2012c). Specifically, to the greatest extent possible, the BLM shall manage Congressionally Designated Trails so as to safeguard the nature and purposes of the trails, and in a manner that protects the values for which the components of the trail systems were designated, recognizing the nationally significant scenic, historic, cultural, recreation, natural, and other landscape values (hereinafter referred to as resources, qualities, values, and associated settings) of the public land areas through which such Congressionally Designated Trails may pass, and the primary trail use or uses. Alternatives B would manage the viewshed along the Sweetwater River as a Heritage and Recreation Corridor to protect the viewshed from the Congressionally Designated Trails. Alternative D would manage this area as the NTMC. These protections achieve the same result as protecting the Sweetwater River corridor resources only and therefore would have substantially similar impacts.

The commenters did not identify specific management prescriptions they wished to see applied to the Sweetwater River watershed. However, management of the NTMC provides increased protection for a number of resources, including the Congressionally Designated Trails and their settings, wildlife values including greater sage-grouse, and recreational use.

Certain comments suggested that the RMP analyze closing the area to livestock grazing or substantially reducing grazing. Land health assessments in this area are high priority, so livestock grazing management will be analyzed as soon as the assessments are completed. The BLM completed rangeland health assessments for the Green Mountain Common Allotment, which contains most of the Sweetwater River watershed in the planning area, and completed an Environmental Assessment in 2011 analyzing grazing (including a no action alternative) for this 500,000-acre allotment.

2.5.14. Designate Areas as "Open" to Facilitate Motorized Vehicle Play Areas

Numerous members of the public commented on the need for an area where motorized vehicle use is not restricted to roads and trails; thus allowing for a motorized vehicle "play area." In areas designated as "open" intensive motorized vehicle travel is permitted year-long anywhere within the designated area.

Travel and Transportation Management guidance and 43 CFR 8340.05 have restricted the use of this designation to: "...areas where there are no special restrictions or where there are no compelling resource protection needs, user conflicts, or public safety issues to warrant limiting cross country travel..." The Lander Field Office could not locate an area on public lands that met the above criteria. Some factors that precluded this designation included: ¾ of the field office being located in the Wyoming Governor's greater sage-grouse Core Area, other large areas of critical wildlife habitat (winter and parturition habitat), a multitude of areas where an open designation would cause user conflicts (nonmotorized recreation areas) and public safety issues (near communities), as well as areas with existing safety hazards (hydrogen sulfide gas, mine shafts).

Many comments also requested that WSAs be designated as open to motorized vehicle use. Several other comments recommended building new roads into WSAs or allowing travel on all existing roads in WSAs. Various handbooks and policies, including BLM Manual 6330, *Management of Wilderness Study Areas*, which implements the non-impairment standard contained in Section 603 of FLPMA, do not allow for these decisions in WSAs. The following is from the Land Use Planning Handbook (1601–1):

> At a minimum, the travel management area designation for wilderness study areas (WSAs) must be limited to ways and trails existing at the time the area became a WSA. Open areas within WSAs are appropriate only for sand dune or snow areas designated as such prior to October 21, 1976.

To address the demand for a motorized vehicle play area the BLM analyzed leasing or selling BLM-administered lands to an entity willing to provide and manage a play area for motorized vehicles. Two areas are identified in the recreation alternatives for this purpose: (1) The Coalmine Draw Area near the communities of Hudson, Lander, and Riverton and (2) an area located near the rifle range adjacent to the community of Dubois. In addition, regardless of the alternative proposed in the document ample opportunity for motorized users will be available on existing and designated roads across the majority of the Lander Field Office.

2.6. Livestock Grazing Analysis

2.6.1. Introduction

The Lander RMP emphasizes a broad range of forage allocated to livestock grazing. In August 2012, the Land Use Planning Handbook livestock grazing planning requirements were clarified by Washington Office (WO) IM 2012-169. Both WO IM 2012-169 and the Handbook support analyzing a range of forage allocation. As discussed below, the BLM analyzed closing some allotments to grazing but the number of acres is relatively small. The RMP's range of reasonable grazing alternatives is based on the amount of forage allocated to livestock grazing.

Forage is measured in animal unit months (AUMs), some percentage of which is allocated to livestock and to other grazing animals such as big game; see Holechek et al. 2011. The percentage allocated to livestock is often referred to as a harvest coefficient based on the growth requirements of the plant species necessary to maintain healthy sustainable vegetative communities as well as to account for wildlife forage and habitat requirements (density and cover). Grazing permits may express the forage allocation objectives as a forage-utilization percentage. "Light utilization" is defined as 21 to 40 percent and "moderate utilization" is 41 to 60 percent. Forage may also be expressed as AUMs or the amount of forage needed to sustain a cow and calf for one month. A higher number of AUMs results in a higher livestock utilization percentage.

Early in the RMP planning process for grazing, an interdisciplinary team reviewed the planning area considering range condition, other resource values such as greater sage-grouse habitat, big game crucial winter range, wild horse populations, existing infrastructure, the categorization of the allotments as "I" or improve, "C" or custodial, and "M" or maintain and other factors. The members of the interdisciplinary team all had extensive experience in the Lander area ranging from 10 years to over 30 years resulting in a comprehensive knowledge of the planning area allotments.

The team concluded that grazing utilization under the 1987 RMP (Alternative A) was at the higher end of the 41 to 60 percent range. This utilization averaged 205,000 AUMs billed annually for the 20 years preceding the analysis. The team determined that a reasonable alternative should consider fewer AUMs allocated to livestock based on light utilization in those areas preferred by livestock (based on factors such as distance to water and slope). Theoretically, if the average actual use of 205,000 AUMs equaled 60 percent utilization, the 21-40 percent utilization should be something less than 136,800 AUMs (205,000 AUMs at 60 percent utilization suggests a total available forage of 342,000 AUMs; 40 percent of 342,000 is 136,800).

To verify this theoretical calculation, the team used geographic information system (GIS) analysis to determine reasonably foreseeable AUMs based on a version of Holechek's stocking rate analysis. The interdisciplinary team estimated forage production using the Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) guidelines for ecological sites based on most of the planning area being in a mid to late seral state of succession. The GIS model first allocated forage using a harvest coefficient of 25 percent, i.e., 25 percent of forage produced is available to livestock. (Recent science suggests that 50 percent, which is conventionally used, is only adequate to support requirements of specific plant species, whereas 25 percent accounts for trampling and other uses of that forage.) The interdisciplinary team then applied reductions based on riparian-wetland habitat, greater sage-grouse priority habitat, big game crucial winter range, distance to water and slope. Reductions because of wild horse management areas were considered but eliminated for

reasons described below. The reductions are identified in Table 2.2, "Reductions to Animal Unit Months" (p. 30).

Table 2.2. Reductions to Animal Unit Months

Factor	Reductions
Greater than 2 miles from water	Excluded from calculation of available forage
Slope: 11-30 percent	Forage reduction of 30 percent
Slope: 31-60 percent	Forage reduction of 60 percent
Slope greater than 60 percent	Excluded from calculation of available forage
Greater sage-grouse priority habitat	Forage reduction of 10 percent
Big game crucial winter habitat	Forage reduction of 5 percent
Riparian-wetland areas	Forage reduction of 60 percent

The resulting analysis identified a total forage allocation of approximately 129,000 AUMs, or a reduction of approximately 63 percent from historical actual use. These reductions were anticipated to result in light forage utilization and are below the 136,800 AUMs theoretically predicted for 40 percent utilization.

2.6.2. Implementation

The planning decision in Alternative B would be a light utilization standard for all allotments without regard to range condition so as to allocate more forage for wildlife and to provide cover. This is in keeping with the resource protection theme of Alternative B. If BLM workload were not a limiting feature, the light utilization could be applied to all allotments at any time even those meeting rangeland health standards, since BLM can adjust grazing permits to meet the land use plan. (There are grazing regulations for how this process is conducted which under any circumstances, cannot be done without consultation with the permittees and the State of Wyoming.) With limited BLM staff, the reasonable approach to implementing the light-utilization decision would be applied at the first time a change in the permit were needed such as a request for a range project or while fully processing a permit renewal. If an allotment were determined to not meet rangeland health standards it is likely that the AUM reductions to achieve light utilization would have additional grazing management changes such as season of use, and modifications to grazing strategies (rotations, herding, etc.) because fencing and water development would not be used. The GIS analysis predicted that Alternative B would result in some 129,000 AUMs being reduced over time. During implementation on a case-by-case basis, however, it is likely that the AUMs would be reduced below 129,000 because of other Alternative B management such as closing allotments for forage reserves, voluntary relinquishment of allotments, and extended periods of non-use.

Alternative B management for resources other than grazing would likely reduce AUMs even more. For example, Alternative B manages vegetation communities for the benefit of biological diversity including wildlife, fish, and special status species rather than for livestock grazing, thus naturally reducing the forage for grazing (such as emphasizing non-grass vegetation that is not palatable to livestock). Protections for big game are incorporated that would likely have the effect of reducing livestock grazing.

The economic analysis of Alternative B assumed that the 129,000 AUM reduction would occur at 5 percent per year over the 20 year planning cycle. However, it is likely that the reductions would be heavier in the beginning of implementation of the plan since rangeland health assessments (done in blocks as described in Chapter 3) are prioritized based on degraded riparian-wetland

condition and greater sage-grouse priority habitat. (A comparison of the riparian-wetland areas not meeting Proper Functioning Condition (PFC) as displayed on Map 48 with greater sage-grouse priority habitat on Map 65, shows that addressing the two habitat issues together is efficient.)

The block approach to standards assessments followed by fully processing permits with NEPA analysis (as opposed to renewing expiring permits under the Budget Rider without change) will ensure that over time, the lighter forage utilization would be applied to all allotments in the planning area.

The implementation of the RMP forage allocation decision is comparable to other areas requiring implementation. The RMP decision identifying the local sites Johnny-Behind-the Rocks and the Sinks Canyon Climbing Area for nonmotorized travel, for example, would be implemented after the ROD during travel management planning. The light forage utilization decision would be implemented by adjusting permits whether during permit renewal, resource conflicts, or as staffing allows to make the permit conform to the land use plan following grazing regulations.

2.6.3. Areas Open and Closed to Livestock Grazing

Although the emphasis of the grazing alternatives was a range of forage allocated to livestock, the interdisciplinary team also looked at the 70,000 acres that were closed to livestock grazing in 1987. (Five of the interdisciplinary team members had participated in that planning effort.) Some of these acres were unsuitable for livestock grazing because of terrain considerations such as granite outcroppings which do not support vegetation or areas with important wildlife values. The team determined that the basis for the original closure to livestock grazing had not changed and should not be analyzed by any alternative.

The interdisciplinary team then determined that an additional 13,000 acres of lands had conflicts with livestock grazing that might require grazing closures to resolve. These were conflicts with wildlife habitat in the Dubois area and recreational use in the Sweetwater Canyon pasture of the Silver Creek allotment. While other resource concerns were identified, the interdisciplinary team determined that the conflict could be addressed through a change in grazing management after a more detailed analysis associated with rangeland health assessments and permit renewal, rather than closing the area to livestock grazing in the RMP.

The interdisciplinary team considered other values that were later identified in IM 2012-169.

- NHTs: The team determined that conflict between the NHTs and grazing was a result of range infrastructure that introduces a modern element into the NHTs' setting and also concentrates cattle so that large areas become denuded of vegetation. The random sighting of one or more cows was considered not to be a conflict, because livestock were part of the emigrant experience.
- WSAs: The interim guidance (since revised) allows livestock grazing without additional infrastructure within WSAs. However, the majority of the acreage located within WSAs has been identified as closed to grazing based on conflicts with other resource values or lack of forage production.
- Wild and Scenic Rivers (WSRs): Nine segments have been determined to be eligible. Due to terrain and the difficulty of closure to livestock grazing without fencing (fencing is not permitted in Alternative B), closing the lands surrounding these segments was not analyzed.
- ACECs:

- Lander Slope and Red Canyon: Neither ACEC had livestock grazing conflicts which adversely impacted the ACECs' wildlife and viewsheds. Most of the Red Canyon is managed under the Red Canyon allotment management plan which addressed the vegetation and riparian-wetland impacts from grazing. Grazing did not conflict with the visual resources of the ACECs. Wildlife populations were at or above the Wyoming Game and Fish Department's (WGFD's) herd objectives. Closing the ACECs would also require fencing the extensive intermingled private lands in order to avoid livestock trespass on the public lands. New fences would impede movement of wildlife and wildlife use of the private lands, an important source of winter forage. Accordingly, the team determined that it was not reasonable to further analyze closing these allotments to grazing.
- Beaver Rim: Only new range infrastructure presented a conflict with the ACEC's visual resources; the team did not identify grazing itself as a conflict.
- Green Mountain: Because of terrain and heavily forested areas, there is limited livestock use of the ACEC. The elk numbers in the ACEC are above herd objectives indicating that there is no conflict between the elk (the relevant and important value of the ACEC) and grazing.
- South Pass Historical Landscape: Livestock were a part of the historic landscape; the identified conflict was the use of range infrastructure. Overuse of vegetation that could, over time, be detrimental to the setting could be addressed by stocking numbers and season, based upon rangeland health assessments. These assessments had not been completed as of the date of the Final EIS.

- The interdisciplinary team evaluated the wild horse herd areas which were above appropriate management level. The team, which included two wild horse specialists, determined that continued use of gathers and the administration of birth control would be necessary to control populations, establishing that wild horses had not been limited by forage competition from livestock grazing in HMAs.

2.6.4. Other Potential Grazing Conflicts Considered but Not Analyzed

Conflicts between livestock grazing and valid existing rights such as mining claims are resolved by reducing AUMs based on the acres made unavailable during mining operations; this does not require a grazing closure. Moreover, with rare exceptions, mining disturbance must be reclaimed to native vegetation. In addition, the existence of a valid right does not guarantee that the area will be developed (most mining claims are not). The interdisciplinary team determined the loss of vegetation associated with valid rights could only be addressed in a site-specific analysis based on an approved plan of development which would analyze the loss of forage. The team also considered grazing conflicts where industrial style development was emphasized. Oil and gas wells, for example, typically have 40-acre spacing. Even considering roads and well pads, which the Lander Field Office estimates as averaging 4-6 acres per well, that development leaves substantial acres where the grazing is not impacted.

WO IM 2012-169 identifies a potential conflict with solar energy; there are no industrial-scale solar energy projects identified in the Lander planning area. Should a proposal be received, an RMP amendment would be required prior to approval which would address any grazing conflict. There is no conflict between wind-energy development and livestock grazing; wind energy may make ranch operations more economically sustainable. In any event, the likelihood of wind energy being developed in the planning area is extremely low (forecast to be 50 turbines over the next 20 years), so conflicts with grazing did not arise as a planning issue.

2.6.5. Closure of Substantial Areas or All of the Planning Area to Livestock Grazing

Livestock grazing is a well-established use within the BLM's multiple-use mandate. The BLM considered but did not analyze in detail an alternative that would make all 2.4 million acres of public lands in the planning area unavailable for livestock grazing because such an alternative is not reasonable, viable, or necessary. Instead, and in accordance with BLM's Land Use Planning Handbook and BLM IM No. 2012-169, BLM considered a range of alternatives with respect to both areas that are available or unavailable for livestock grazing and the amount of forage allocated to livestock on an area-wide basis. The range of alternatives considered includes a meaningful reduction in livestock grazing -- both through reduction in areas available to livestock grazing and forage allocation.

As discussed above, the BLM developed a range of alternatives that sharply defines the issues and provides a clear basis for choice among options by the decision-maker. The BLM analyzed closing 70,000 acres to livestock grazing under Alternative A and 83,000 acres under Alternative B where the BLM identified unresolved conflicts concerning various uses of available resources such as between bighorn sheep and elk winter forage or use of the Sweetwater Canyon pasture by recreationists and unsuitability for livestock grazing because of steepness of terrain or lack of vegetation.

The BLM also analyzed a range of alternatives that varied the amount of forage allocated to livestock. In areas open to livestock grazing, Alternative B allocates one-third less forage to livestock than Alternative A. Alternative B requires a stocking rate that will leave residual cover and forage for wildlife and wild horses, which corresponds to "light utilization" or a 21 percent to 40 percent forage-utilization percentage as compared to livestock utilization near 60 percent resulting under Alternative A. Alternative B also reduces AUMs to meet rangeland health standards. Over the twenty year analysis period, permitted AUMs under Alternative B are expected to be reduced from 280,813 to 128,750 (54 percent) and actual-use AUMs from the historic average of 204,993 to 122,320 -- a 40 percent reduction. Alternative B also includes other reductions in livestock grazing through the use of forage reserves, voluntary retirement of allotments, limitations on livestock grazing near cultural or recreation sites and limitations on the use of salt and supplements as well as prohibiting any new range infrastructure.

In addition, all alternatives would allow suitable measures which could include reduction or elimination of livestock grazing, in specific situations where livestock grazing causes or contributes to conflicts with the protection or management of other resource values or uses. Such determinations would be made during site-specific activity planning and associated environmental review. These determinations would be based on several factors, including monitoring studies, review of current range management science, input from livestock operators and interested publics, and ability to meet the standards in Appendix J (p. 1537).

Current resource conditions on BLM-administered land, including range vegetation, watershed, and wildlife habitat, as reflected in land health assessments, do not warrant prohibition of livestock grazing throughout the entire planning area. Such a blanket prohibition, in the absence of resource conflicts, would not meet the purpose and need and would be inconsistent with the policy objectives of the area. However, as described above, the range of alternatives does include a meaningful reduction in grazing throughout the planning area.

2.7. Greater Sage-Grouse Management

2.7.1. National Technical Team Report

On August 22, 2011, the BLM released its National Greater Sage-Grouse Planning Strategy. The strategy was released in response to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) decision that listing of the greater sage-grouse under the ESA was "Warranted but Precluded." The USFWS had identified the principal regulatory mechanism for the BLM as conservation measures in RMPs.

The strategy stated that "the BLM needs to incorporate explicit objectives and adequate conservation measures into RMPs within the next three years in order to conserve greater sage-grouse and avoid a potential ESA listing."

The strategy further identified the NTT to serve as "an independent, technical and science-based team to ensure the best information related to greater sage-grouse management is fully reviewed, evaluated and provided to the BLM for consideration in the land use planning process."

On September 9, 2011, the Notice of Availability (NOA) of the Lander Draft RMP and EIS was published in the *Federal Register*: https://www.federalregister.gov/articles/2011/09/09/2011-22946/notice-of-availability-of-the-draft-resource-management-plan-and-associated-environmental-impact. The NOA stated that comments would be accepted by the BLM until December 7, 2011. At the request of the Wyoming Governor, the Fremont County Commissioners, and others, the comment period was extended to January 20, 2012.

On December 11, 2011, the BLM published a NOI to begin preparation of an EIS and Supplemental EIS to Incorporate Greater Sage-Grouse Conservation Measures into Land Use Plans and Land Management Plans. A copy of this document is available at: https://www.federalregister.gov/articles/2011/12/09/2011-31652/notice-of-intent-to-prepare-environmental-impact-statements-and-supplemental-environmental-impact. The comment period for the NOI ended February 7, 2012.

The NTT released a report on National Greater Sage-Grouse Conservation Measures dated December 21, 2011: http://www.blm.gov/pgdata/etc/medialib/blm/co/programs/wildlife.Par.73607.File.dat/GrSG%20Tech%20Team%20Report.pdf.

On December 27, 2011, the BLM issued IM WO 2012-044, which is available at: http://www.blm.gov/wo/st/en/info/regulations/Instruction_Memos_and_Bulletins/national_instruction/2012/IM_2012-044.html. This IM requires that the conservation measures in the NTT report be analyzed in at least one alternative in the land use planning EIS and that a "hard look" be given to the conservation measures, as applicable to local ecological site variability. The NTT report conservation measures were put into a table which identified the measures analyzed in the EIS and, where appropriate, why some were not analyzed. This document is provided on the Lander RMP website at: http://www.blm.gov/wy/st/en/programs/Planning/rmps/lander.html.

On February 15, 2012, the Wyoming BLM issued IM 2012-019 providing interim guidance for greater sage-grouse conservation during land use plan implementation. This IM may be found at: http://www.blm.gov/pgdata/etc/medialib/blm/wy/resources/efoia/IMs/2012.Par.56874.File.dat/wy2012-019.pdf. The IM identifies Core Area (see discussion under *Special Status Species* in Chapter 3) as the priority habitat for greater sage-grouse in Wyoming. In the planning area, 70 percent of BLM-administered land is within Core Area. In consultation with the WGFD, the

BLM determined an additional 29 percent of the planning area was occupied greater sage-grouse habitat, and that 1 percent of the planning area was non-habitat. The non-habitat is primarily forested or mountainous areas or urban areas.

Many comments were received on the Programmatic EIS NOI. Most included recommendations that the conservation measures identified in the NTT report be incorporated as land use decisions for greater sage-grouse conservation. Additional comments stated that the NTT priority habitat conservation measures should be applied to all occupied habitat. Other comments addressed issues such as wild horses without articulating a tie to greater sage-grouse, which might have considerations or insight into a planning document for an entire resource management area.

The NTT report and the comments on the Programmatic EIS NOI raised issues that merit evaluation in the Lander RMP. Many of these issues had already been addressed and were part of the Draft RMP and EIS published September 9, 2011. Most prominent is the analysis of a 2.5 percent cap on surface disturbance and a greater sage-grouse ACEC. Other important, but subtle, greater sage-grouse protective measures were analyzed, including limits on road proliferation, ROW exclusion and avoidance areas, and habitat protective measures.

Moreover, the Draft RMP and EIS analyzed extensive protections for other resources that had the secondary effect of protecting greater sage-grouse habitat. The 1987 RMP established ACECs to protect big-game habitat, viewsheds, elk crucial winter and parturition ranges, and cultural features, including the four NHTs that cross through the resource area. The Draft RMP and EIS evaluated continuing these protections (Alternative A), expanding them (Alternative B), eliminating them (Alternative C), or some combination thereof (Alternative D).

With the NTT report and comments on the Programmatic EIS NOI being received during the period following the public comment period to the Lander Draft RMP and EIS, the BLM was able to evaluate the information and identify what had been part of the original analysis and what was not, and how consideration of the new matter might change the earlier analysis. The recommendations from the NTT report and a description about how the Lander RMP addresses those recommendations is provided on the Lander RMP website.

The NTT report identified recommendations to be evaluated for application in priority habitat areas, which the State of Wyoming has defined as Core Area (see the Wyoming Governor's Greater Sage-grouse Core Area strategy at: http://wgfd.wyo.gov/web2011/Departments/Wildlife/pdfs/SAGEGROUSE_EO_COREPROTECTION0000651.pdf) and some recommendations for general habitat areas. The Lander Field Office worked with the WGFD to identify what parts of the planning area constituted general habitat areas and what was not greater sage-grouse habitat. The results, described in *Chapter 3*, showed that 99 percent of the planning area was occupied habitat, consisting of Core Area (70 percent) and general habitat areas (29 percent), while 1 percent was non-habitat. Other general habitat areas and priority habitat areas mapping efforts are ongoing and may differ in small respects from the Lander habitat determinations. The BLM is basing its analysis of impacts to greater sage-grouse on the mapping it did in consultation with the WGFD; any deviation from other mapping results is unlikely to have consequences on the scale of the planning area. Moreover, with the possible exception of a few scattered BLM tracts in close proximity to the City of Lander, all of the non-habitat areas are protected as ACECs for other resources, including bighorn sheep and elk. Whether or not greater sage-grouse protections would apply in these areas (and many others in general habitat areas), alternatives A, B, and D analyzed wildlife protections that would secondarily benefit greater sage-grouse that might be occasionally present in the areas or pass through it during migration.

Various recommended conservation practices are reasonable when applied to isolated or scattered parcels. However, when applied to generally contiguous 1,680,000 acres, or 70 percent of the planning area, the overall impact can be to restrict uses in a way that does not meet basic policy objectives for the area. The purpose and need for the RMP is to have a plan that balances protections and uses. Moreover, some of the groups commenting on the NOI recommended that the conservation measures be applied to all occupied habitat, or 99 percent of the planning area (with the remaining 1 percent protected for other wildlife values). Emphasizing wildlife conservation at the expense of all other uses is appropriate for a management plan for a wildlife refuge, not the FLPMA-mandated variety of uses of the public lands. Closing all occupied habitat to leasing, would preclude new oil and gas development in areas that the BLM believes to have moderate to high potential, which would carry substantial fiscal costs and result in an imbalance among resources and resource uses. Restricting livestock grazing on all occupied habitat not only during early brood-rearing (as recommended in the NTT report), but during all nesting brood-rearing, and in winter habitat, would preclude all livestock grazing, even where rangeland health standards were achieved.

Similarly, excluding ROWs in all occupied habitat would not meet the purpose and need for the RMP because such vast amounts of habitat exist. Under BLM guidance, exclusion is a complete prohibition without exception. To limit new ROWs to only 1 percent of the planning area, whether or not co-located in existing disturbance or in a designated corridor, would preclude new authorized activities. However, Alternative B analyzes excluding ROWs in all ACECs, including the Government Draw/Upper Sweetwater Sage-grouse ACEC. This management analyzed excluding ROWs in 80 percent of the planning area, avoiding 13 percent of the planning area. Impacts analysis showed that this management had a substantial adverse impact on all resource uses.

Some recommendations such as certain Required Design Features (generally referred to as Best Management Practices [BMPs]) could be analyzed for the entire planning area and still meet the purpose and need. Other BMPs could not be applied as mandatory parts of all development because without a site-specific analysis, it could not be determined if the application of the BMP would have the effect of precluding the activity. The analysis of the recommendations of the NTT report include BMPs such as locating compressor stations used in connection with oil and gas development outside of Core Area. At its widest point, Core Area in the planning area is 70 by 60 miles in size. Depending on the development, requiring that a needed compressor be located outside of Core Area would have had the effect of precluding the development of that oil and gas lease because engineering might not support a location 30 or 40 miles distant.

On a planning area-wide basis, the BLM lacks the data to evaluate the environmental impacts of applying some of the recommendations without regard to site-specific considerations. For example, requiring compressor stations be located outside of Core Area, as recommended in the NTT Report, could have the effect of making the piping of product unfeasible if the compressor is too far away to achieve the needed pressure in the pipeline. The BLM determined that in the absence of the data that would allow the BLM to evaluate the impacts from the proposed management, it would be arbitrary to require them without analysis. However, it is entirely possible to defer the analysis to a site-specific basis and require that they be analyzed in a project-level NEPA review.

This EIS analyzes the impacts from the mandatory Required Design Features that are applied to every development or surface disturbance in the planning area. Many of these offer protections to many wildlife species and also to livestock, wild horses, and human health and safety.

Accordingly, the EIS analyzes these Required Design Features as being appropriate for all surface disturbance and not just oil and gas development in Core Area. The BMPs not incorporated in the RMP as Required Design Features will be evaluated on a site-specific basis for inclusion as Conditions of Approval (COA) with a thorough or "hard look" at the BMPs that are not made COA.

2.7.2. Timeframes for Travel Management Implementation Planning as Recommended by BLM Policy and in Support of Greater Sage-Grouse

BLM Land Use Planning policy and the NTT report recommend that BLM conduct travel management implementation planning concurrently with land use planning. This includes individual route decisions, such as closure, open to motorized use, limited seasonally, and other conveyance limitations. Importantly, such decisions are required to be based on sight-specific analysis of the individual linear feature. Initially the BLM thought that conducting travel management implementation planning concurrent with the RMP was possible during this planning process.

BLM policy also outlines the necessary data elements required if implementation planning is to be deferred; these items are contained in Appendix W (p. 1813).

Importantly, BLM policy and the NTT report also state that travel management implementation planning should be completed 5 years after the signing of the ROD. Multiple BLM offices (several of them smaller in size than the Lander Field Office) have found that this timeline is not achievable. In addition, 70 percent of the planning area is greater sage-grouse Core Area; therefore it also will not be possible to conduct implementation planning within the 5-year timeframe in greater sage-grouse priority habitat. Therefore, neither recommendation is feasible under current budget and staffing levels. The timeline reflected in Appendix W (p. 1813) reflects an optimistic schedule for travel planning and assumes existing staffing levels as well as limited amounts of funding increases. Importantly, these areas were prioritized based on many factors – the 15 areas with priority greater sage-grouse habitat were prioritized higher than the 2 areas without the habitat. These timelines can be compacted in the event of increased funding and/or non-BLM partner assistance.

There were many suggestions regarding appropriate travel management in greater sage-grouse habitat, including priority habitat (Core Area) and all occupied habitat. Management under the 1987 RMP prohibits cross-country motorized travel and limits travel to existing and designated roads and trails. Alternatives B, C, and D limit travel to existing roads as an interim designation until route-specific planning can occur. Appendix W (p. 1813) identifies how implementation-level planning will occur and identifies preliminary travel management areas as well as the proposed order for analysis. The proposed outcome for travel management implementation in this plan is to designate all the BLM-administered surface as limited to designated routes subject to other limitations where applicable, or closed to motorized travel.

In the interim, Alternative D limits disruptive activities in greater sage-grouse Core Area; it should be noted, however, that casual motorized vehicle use is not considered a disruptive activity. Core Area includes 70 percent of the planning area. Occupied habitat includes an additional 29 percent of the planning area. The 1 percent that is not habitat for greater sage-grouse has seasonal restrictions for the benefit of other wildlife. Restrictions that would either entirely preclude travel

throughout the planning area or seasonally, are beyond the purpose and need of the EIS and would unreasonably limit multiple-use management.

During travel management implementation, impacts to greater sage-grouse from travel management will be evaluated on a site-specific basis (along with other considerations, such as other wildlife values).

2.7.3. Modifications to Issued Authorizations

Comments on the Programmatic EIS to Incorporate Greater Sage-Grouse Conservation Measures into Land Use Plans and Land Management Plans (described above) suggested adding conservation measures to already-issued authorizations such as oil and gas leases and ROWs. The BLM had very early in preparing the Draft RMP and EIS considered modifying leases and other authorizations ex post facto and determined that doing so would not meet the purpose and need, which is to support valid and existing rights.

Some of the conservation measures that were suggested be applied to existing authorizations will be applied if the term of the authorization ends. If an oil and gas lease is not held by production or suspended, it terminates at the end of 10 years. If the lease is offered again, it would be a new lease, and subject to lease stipulations required by the RMP even though the earlier lease was not subject to those stipulations. When a ROW term ends, if the BLM re-issues the grant, it is a new authorization subject to the then-required protections.

The EIS identified opportunities to work with partners or to otherwise obtain funding to "buy out" existing rights, such as claimed mineral estate. However, site-specific NEPA analysis would be required to determine if that money usage provided the most benefits to greater sage-grouse in comparison to other uses. For example, if an oil and gas company wished to utilize offsite mitigation or compensatory mitigation, site-specific analysis would be required to determine the most beneficial offset. If degraded riparian-wetland areas, for example, were identified as an opportunity for offsite mitigation, that might be a more preferable approach than buying out an existing right. This is in accord with the NTT report which states, "Prioritize implementation of restoration projects based on environmental variables that improve chances for project success in areas most likely to benefit sage-grouse."

2.7.4. Historic Climax Plant Community

Several commenters suggested using different approaches to achieve vegetation objectives. Historic Climax Plant Community or Potential Natural Condition and perhaps others have their advantages and disadvantages as theoretical approaches. The Lander RMP manages according to the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) NRCS Ecological Site Descriptions. The decision to use this methodology or approach was based on a determination that Ecological Site Descriptions were tied to local soil and precipitation and were the basis for conducting rangeland monitoring and land health assessments. Further, Ecological Site Descriptions allow for management in accordance with site potential. Cagney et al. (2010) observed that some plant communities have transitioned to a state that cannot return to the reference Historic Climax Plant Community without intervening management. Sites in this state could not return to the reference state simply by a change or cessation of livestock grazing. The authors' research identified that events such as extensive vegetation treatments and reseeding or landscape fires followed by decades of rest could be required to reverse transitions that had taken place over decades. Such interventionist

management is not recommended in greater sage-grouse habitat, particularly Core Area, as demonstrated by many of the NTT recommendations. By managing in accordance with site potential (via the Ecological Site Descriptions) the current potential of the rangeland sites could be used to set greater sage-grouse parameters. The BLM made the decision to analyze vegetation objectives in terms of what could be achieved rather than a theoretical analysis that could not be achieved on the ground.

2.7.5. Invasive Nonnative Species Management and Greater Sage-Grouse

The USFWS and others have not identified cheatgrass and other invasive plants as being a primary threat to greater sage-grouse in the planning area. Habitat loss or degradation through riparian-wetland areas not meeting PFC or through the encroachment of juniper are the greater risk. Accordingly, treatment of invasive species was determined to be a less important use of range improvement funds than other treatments.

Treatment is expensive and with uncertain success at best. It involves highly disruptive management with potential for adverse impacts to greater sage-grouse. With limited budgets available for pest treatments, the BLM chose to emphasize reducing the likelihood of spread through management actions such as requiring livestock flushing, washing of vehicles, and limited surface disturbance.

Identified conservation measures such as not driving through areas with infestation would have the effect of precluding motor vehicle use, because by far the heaviest concentration of invasive nonnative species are along the roadways, as can be seen on Map 46.

Alternative B uses all funds that are available for range improvement projects for non-infrastructure uses such as vegetation treatments and habitat improvement. While current research suggests that vegetation treatments need to be undertaken only after careful analysis of the potentially adverse impacts to greater sage-grouse, the use of prescribed fire is limited as well. Approximately 76 percent of Core Area has less than 12 inches of annual precipitation, so prescribed fire, a type of vegetation treatment, has only marginal benefits to Core Area.

Alternatively, these funds could have been allocated for invasive species treatment. However, there are management opportunities for greater sage-grouse habitat improvements such as treating juniper encroachment or improving riparian-wetland function that the BLM determined would have a greater beneficial impact on greater sage-grouse than treatments to control invasive nonnative species.

2.7.6. Conservation Measures Requiring Site-Specific Analysis

Some of the NTT report conservation measures have the potential for considerable adverse impacts to resource uses if universally required in all parts of priority habitat, such as the large and generally contiguous type of priority habitat present in the planning area. Excluding activities from priority habitat limits those activities to less than 29 percent of the planning area. Adverse impacts associated with the conservation measures that require that facilities that support Core Area activities be located out of priority habitat could present such technical challenges that activities authorized in Core Area (oil and gas development below the surface caps) could be precluded because they are located too far from non-priority habitat for remote

location of facilities. For example, a requirement that all or certain types of oil and gas development infrastructure such as liquid gathering facilities be sited out of Core Area could make development of existing leases technically infeasible if engineering considerations could not be met at a distance (see item 137 on the NTT Conformance Table on the Lander RMP website [http://www.blm.gov/wy/st/en/programs/Planning/rmps/lander.html]). Broad statements of required conservation management may not be justified in all cases given the habitat variation and the size of the Core Area in the Lander Field Office.

Similarly, recommendations such as "no exceptions" to greater sage-grouse Core Area timing limitations, when applied to 70 percent or more of the planning area is unreasonable when applied to such a large area. The alternatives contain waiver and exception criteria and a process to prevent exceptions being improperly granted. But if protections are followed and no adverse impacts to wildlife would result, there is no rational or scientific reason to refuse to exclude all ROWs. The exception criteria emphasizes the care with which greater sage-grouse timing limitations should be waived. In fact, the BLM regularly denies requests for exceptions, particularly for greater sage-grouse protection. However, there are circumstances when an exception might be granted even if the immediate consequence might be adverse to greater sage-grouse if the alternative would be far more adverse. An example would be if drilling had not been completed by the time seasonal restrictions were in place. An evaluation of the consequences of stopping the drilling program, plugging the well, and removing the equipment, only to repeat the process the following summer might be more adverse than a 1 week exception that allowed the work to be completed without further disruption.

Other examples of well-supported conservation recommendations that need site-specific evaluation are reclamation techniques, the use of Master Development Plans (Recommendation 59 in the NTT Conformance Table on the Lander RMP website) rather than Plans of Development with approval at the Application for Permit to Drill stage, location of facilities that have inherent engineering requirements outside of Core Area. These and many other recommended practices are not reasonable because they would place restrictions on a very large area of land without consideration for particular site-specific features. The EIS analyzed extensive Required Design Features, surface-disturbance caps, avoidance areas, and limitations on surface occupancy. Alternative D would require the BLM to evaluate as potential COAs, on a site-specific basis, these and others that will be developed over time based on an increasing research base and scientific understanding.

2.8. Management Actions Common to All Alternatives

Laws, regulations, and other guidance mandate a variety of management actions under all alternatives. For example, all alternatives must comply with the Clean Water Act (CWA) and the Wyoming Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) smoke management rules for air quality. The BLM is required by law to follow these regulations and as such these management actions do not vary by alternative. Planning criteria ensure that all alternatives comply with these nondiscretionary laws and regulations (refer to Chapter 1, Planning Criteria). These management actions are referred to as "common to all alternatives," because they apply regardless of the alternative. A listing of the laws and regulations that provide some of these mandates are identified in Appendix A (p. 1427).

Some management actions common to all alternatives specify areas that are off-limits to mineral development and other activities because they are incompatible with the area's resource values and would not be allowed under any alternative. Many resource programs require the use of

BMPs to reduce impacts on resource values or management objectives such as to reduce point and nonpoint source pollution to protect water quality. Collaboration with stakeholders and the development of resource specific plans are also a common requirement across resource programs under all alternatives. For example, cultural resources management requires cooperating with local government and stakeholders in consideration of the economic and social impacts of protecting cultural resources. For fish and wildlife resources, the BLM must cooperate with stakeholders and local governments to develop management strategies to prevent the introduction and spread of aquatic invasive species.

All alternatives consider some limitation on resource uses — these limits are a result of management actions for the protection of other values. In the management actions under all alternatives, the effects of these limits are stated in the respective resource use, such as acres closed to oil and gas leasing. For example, management actions for the protection of bighorn sheep in Dubois are identified in the Whiskey Mountain ACEC section of Chapter 2 but the impacts (such as closure to oil and gas leasing) contribute to the acres closed to oil and gas leasing identified in the minerals section. The same is true for livestock grazing, travel management and other resource uses.

The alternatives all analyze withdrawing land from locatable mineral activities. Section 103 of FLPMA defines the term "withdrawal" to mean "withholding an area of Federal land from settlement, sale, location, or entry, under some or all of the general land laws, for the purpose of limiting activities under those laws in order to maintain other public values in the area or reserving the area for a particular public purpose or program."

Section 204 of FLPMA identifies the process for a land use plan to withdraw areas from locatable mineral entry. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to withdraw lands from mining laws following certain procedures. These vary depending on whether the proposed withdrawal is less than 5,000 acres or greater than 5,000 acres. Alternatives A, B, and D propose withdrawing 23,114, 1,632,605, and 449,068 acres, respectively, from the locatable mining laws. These proposed withdrawals include some that are less than 5,000 acres and some that are greater than 5,000 acres. The primary difference between the two processes is that a withdrawal greater than 5,000 acres requires the preparation of an extensive report to support the withdrawal, including a specialist's analysis of the area's mineral potential, and notification to Congress of the proposed withdrawal. Congress may then choose to terminate the withdrawal by concurrent resolution. Withdrawals created after FLPMA's enactment in 1976 cannot be for a period longer than 20 years and must be completed within 2 years following the land use plan decision to pursue the withdrawal.

The process of requesting or applying for the Secretary of the Interior to withdraw the lands is started by the identification of lands in the RMP for which to pursue a withdrawal. Following this RMP decision, a mineral potential report must be prepared to include all of the information required by FLPMA, 43 CFR 2310, and BLM Manual 3060. The withdrawal request, including the mineral potential report, is submitted to the Secretary, who then determines if it should be sent to Congress or denied.

As indicated in several places in this EIS, the RMP is not the decision that withdraws the lands from the mining laws, merely the first step in a lengthy process. It is entirely possible that withdrawals identified in the ROD will not be withdrawn or perhaps not even reach the next step in the process if the Lander Field Office does not complete the supporting report. Therefore, the use of the term "withdrawn" in connection with locatable minerals is a misnomer to the extent it

implies that withdrawal is an RMP decision. The RMP decision is to identify lands for which a locatable mineral withdrawal will be pursued. For the sake of readability, however, these lands are identified as "withdrawn" and the different process for a withdrawal of less than 5,000 acres is not separately discussed.

To have a method of comparing alternatives and their impacts, it is assumed that areas identified to pursue withdrawal will actually result in withdrawal occurring. In addition, unless a withdrawal of public domain land specifically provides otherwise, the land withdrawn is presumed to be available for oil and gas leasing on a discretionary basis as specified in the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920 (as amended), and any other applicable land use decisions.

Tables 2.7 through 2.52 provide a complete list of management actions common to all alternatives for each resource.

2.9. Summaries of Alternatives

This section summarizes the four alternatives (A through D) considered in detail in this RMP and EIS. Due to the breadth of management prescriptions in the alternatives, this section describes only the key elements of alternatives. The summary descriptions provide a general overview of each alternative, the management emphasis associated with each alternative, and key management actions for each alternative. Tables 2.7 through 2.52 provide detailed descriptions of the alternatives. The maps in Appendix B (p. 1445) further illustrate differences in acreage allocations and management prescriptions by alternative.

Alternatives B and C were developed to provide a range of management for analysis. Broadly put, over the course of alternative development, Alternative B and Alternative C gradually evolved into two different approaches to managing public lands. The BLM must meet certain mandates such as the Wyoming Standards for Healthy Rangelands, restoring riparian-wetlands that are not meeting PFC, and protecting special status species. Similarly, BLM is mandated to provide for resource uses such as making energy resources available and supporting economic benefits from the public lands.

Since these mandates apply across all alternatives, the range of management actions required by NEPA is found in the method by which the BLM will meet the mandates. The BLM developed two different methods: one that is a lower level of intervention, using natural processes and avoiding new rangeland infrastructure to reach mandated goals (Alternative B), and one that utilizes a high level of human intervention and resource use (Alternative C). Management under alternatives A and D generally falls in between this range of management.

Alternative A represents continuation of current management and provides a baseline from which to identify potential environmental consequences when compared to the action alternatives. Alternative A describes current resource and land management direction in the planning area under the existing plan. Alternative A establishes rangeland improvement projects on a case-by-case basis and establishes allotment stocking rates to maximize utilization of forage in areas preferred by livestock, while achieving standards for healthy rangeland. Current management identifies constraints on mineral leasing in the planning area to protect resource values that are incompatible with mineral resources activity. The BLM would continue to manage vegetative communities to meet vegetative attributes as identified in the Natural Resource Conservation Service's Ecological Site Guides and utilize vegetation treatments to increase forage production while meeting the Wyoming Standards for Healthy Rangelands. Current management

includes nine ACECs and nine WSR eligible waterways. Constraints on resource uses specifically to protect fish and wildlife resources are only used in a few cases under Alternative A, including seasonal limitations on surface-disturbing activities in important habitat and buffers to restrict surface-disturbing activities around greater sage-grouse leks.

Alternative B emphasizes resource protection over resource use. Greater sage-grouse nesting habitat is closed to oil and gas leasing and all of the proposed ACECs are closed to almost all mineral activities. With areas that have potential resource conflicts closed to oil and gas leasing, MLPs would not be used as a tool to provide more site-specific resource protections. Alternative B uses a low infrastructure approach for resource management. In making progress towards Wyoming Standards for Healthy Rangelands including riparian-wetland health, Alternative B avoids infrastructure, such as fencing, and focuses on livestock grazing management through such systems as seasons of use and lower forage utilization. Because infrastructure will only rarely be built, range improvement projects will emphasize vegetation treatments. Over time, livestock grazing AUMs are expected to decrease or seasons of use shortened in order to continue to make progress towards meeting the Standards. Timber cutting is allowed where natural processes are not able to improve forest health but clear-cuts are prohibited unless they are determined to be warranted in order to mimic natural processes. Alternative B establishes several Special Recreation Management Areas (SRMAs), most in areas of high recreational value, such as Congressionally Designated Trails. The recreational setting of these SRMAs is managed to facilitate specific recreation opportunities, which may limit other types of uses, such as energy development.

Alternative B is more protective of resources such as wildlife and viewshed, utilizing more restrictions on resource uses. These are discussed in more detail below. Alternative B continues (and in some cases expands) existing ACECs and proposes new ACECs and more extensive protections of the Congressionally Designated Trails. Alternative B affords the greatest protections of greater sage-grouse and provides the most limits on ROWs including wind-energy development projects. Alternative B emphasizes protections of the Congressionally Designated Trails with a broad buffer to limit development that would intrude on the setting and recreational use.

Alternative C has fewer protections of resources and focuses on a more intensive human presence on the land to achieve mandated goals. In Alternative C, if rangelands are not meeting Wyoming Standards for Healthy Rangelands, infrastructure including fences and water development projects are utilized along with livestock grazing management to improve conditions. Over time, extensive additional infrastructure will be used to make progress towards meeting the Standards. As a consequence of this emphasis, there will be fewer rangeland improvement projects in the form of vegetation treatment. Timber commodity availability is protected with full fire suppression. Extractive and other industrial uses are maximized, resulting in fewer protections of resources. Alternative C manages the values protected by the existing and proposed ACECs with standard management rather than ACEC designation and the Congressionally Designated Trails with a ¼-mile buffer. Far fewer limitations on ROWs, including wind-energy development projects, are proposed in Alternative C and protections for greater sage-grouse are afforded on a case-by-case basis. Alternative C does not guarantee recreational use; if a conflict arises, the recreational use would shift.

Alternative D balances the use and conservation of planning area resources. The use of range improvement projects is authorized pursuant only to a Comprehensive Grazing Strategy that would help to meet Wyoming Standards for Healthy Rangelands. Alternative D designates the

second largest land area as ACECs and emphasizes moderate constraints on resource uses (e.g., mineral development) to reduce adverse impacts to resource values. Fish and wildlife resources under Alternative D, in general, receive more protection compared to Alternative A, especially within important habitat areas. Under Alternative D, the Wyoming Governor's Greater Sage-grouse Core Area strategy is incorporated into management actions. In areas of high mineral potential, Designated Development Areas (DDA) are established which emphasize mineral use. In Dubois, mineral activities are limited and the area is closed to oil and gas leasing for the protection of special status species and to support destination recreation associated with bighorn sheep. Congressionally Designated Trails are managed within the NTMC, which applies specific prescriptions to protect the trails and their resources, qualities, values, and associated settings, and the primary use or uses. Alternative D closes some areas to mineral development including locatable mineral entry. The Beaver Rim area is identified for an MLP to protect important resources.

Table 2.4, "Comparative Summary of Proposed Land Use Decisions in the Lander Planning Area" (p. 45) lists acreage allocations for resources and resource uses by alternative. In general, avoidance or exclusion of surface-disturbing activities or a particular resource use (e.g., ROW avoidance or exclusion) limits or restricts development activities in these areas to preserve resource characteristics or meet management objectives of a resource program (e.g., prohibiting surface-disturbing activities on slopes greater than 25 percent to decrease soil erosion). Acreage allocations under each alternative reflect the general theme of each alternative (e.g., area open to mineral development is the least under Alternative B to limit adverse impacts to certain physical and biological resources). Acreage figures in Table 2.4, "Comparative Summary of Proposed Land Use Decisions in the Lander Planning Area" (p. 45) are reported for BLM-administered surface, BLM-administered mineral estate, and total surface area in the planning area. Acres of BLM-administered surface include all surface lands managed by the BLM (Map 1). BLM-administered mineral estate includes the sub-surface mineral estate administered by the BLM, including federal mineral estate underlying BLM-administered surface and underlying non-federal land, or split-estate (Map 2). Total surface in the planning area includes all BLM-administered surface as well as private ownership, tribal lands, state lands, and lands managed by other federal agencies (Map 1). The acreage of BLM-administered surface and BLM-administered mineral estate in the planning area is displayed below in Table 2.3, "Acreage of Surface Land and Mineral Estate in the Planning Area" (p. 44) for reference when viewing the summary tables below.

Table 2.3. Acreage of Surface Land and Mineral Estate in the Planning Area

BLM-Administered Surface	BLM-Administered Mineral Estate
2,394,210	2,809,101
Source: BLM 2012a BLM Bureau of Land Management	

Table 2.5, "Comparative Summary of Areas of Critical Environmental Concern by Alternative" (p. 50) lists acreage allocations and the emphasis for management in proposed ACECs. ACECs are managed to protect and prevent irreparable damage to important historic, cultural, scenic, and biological values, and other natural systems or processes. ACECs are also designated to protect life and ensure safety from natural hazards. In general, management in ACECs limit development and surface-disturbing activities that may affect these important values.

For a more detailed discussion of recreation management areas see Appendix C (p. 1453).

All of the tables below provide a comparative summary of acreage allocations under the four alternatives.

Table 2.4. Comparative Summary of Proposed Land Use Decisions in the Lander Planning Area

Topic	Acreage Type	Alternative A (Acres)	Alternative B (Acres)	Alternative C (Acres)	Alternative D (Acres)
Physical, Biological, and Heritage and Visual Resources					
Slopes Greater than 25 Percent (Surface-disturbing Activities Prohibited)	BLM-Administered Surface	182,345	-	182,345	182,345
Slopes Greater than 15 Percent (Surface-disturbing Activities Avoided for Category 3-5 restrictions)	BLM-Administered Surface	-	413,670	-	-
Greater Sage-grouse Occupied Leks Protective Buffer (Surface-disturbing Activities Prohibited)	Total Surface in the Planning Area	20,140	112,218	20,140	145,585[1]
	BLM-Administered Surface	16,283	93,411	16,283	122,890[1]
	BLM-Administered Mineral Estate	18,025	101,315	18,025	131,706[1]
Greater Sage-grouse Nesting Habitat Protective Buffer (Surface-disturbing and Disruptive Activities Subject to Seasonal Limitations)	Total Surface in the Planning Area	966,736	1,680,580	966,736	2,354,825[2]
	BLM-Administered Surface	794,452	1,339,609	794,452	1,806,547[2]
	BLM-Administered Mineral Estate	861,519	1,483,088	861,519	2,024,402[2]
Raptor Nest Protective Buffer (Surface-disturbing and Disruptive Activities Subject to Seasonal Limitations)	BLM-Administered Surface	301,237	781,643	158,199	380,115
	BLM-Administered Mineral Estate	337,588	873,378	177,391	421,105
Elk Winter Range (Surface-disturbing and Disruptive Activities Subject to Seasonal Limitations)[3]	Total Surface in the Planning Area	354,963	354,963	0	373,987
	BLM-Administered Surface	166,525	166,525	0	235,217
	BLM-Administered Mineral Estate	221,232	221,232	0	294,865
Big Game Crucial Winter Range (Surface-disturbing and Disruptive Activities Subject to Seasonal Limitations)[3]	Total Surface in the Planning Area	1,055,702	1,055,702	1,055,702	1,138,471
	BLM-Administered Surface	605,898	605,898	605,898	647,231
	BLM-Administered Mineral Estate	809,393	809,393	809,393	871,020
Wild Horse Herd Management Areas	BLM-Administered Surface[4]	642,081	642,081	642,081	642,081

Topic	Acreage Type	Alternative A (Acres)	Alternative B (Acres)	Alternative C (Acres)	Alternative D (Acres)
Warm Springs Canyon Flume – Management to protect the site as a National Register-eligible property	BLM-Administered Surface	557	834	557	557
Visual Resource Management – Class I	BLM-Administered Surface	57,443	59,317	55,360	60,115
	BLM-Administered Mineral Estate	58,316	60,548	54,994	61,089
Visual Resource Management – Class II	BLM-Administered Surface	202,785	1,284,122	25,730	780,810
	BLM-Administered Mineral Estate	272,523	1,524,787	34,689	996,574
Visual Resource Management – Class III	BLM-Administered Surface	222,121	292,890	722,356	857,979
	BLM-Administered Mineral Estate	302,766	348,132	855,614	951,079
Visual Resource Management – Class IV	BLM-Administered Surface	1,853,862	756,813	1,590,758	694,759
	BLM-Administered Mineral Estate	2,109,234	873,572	1,863,789	799,571
Visual Resource Management – Class V[5]	BLM-Administered Surface	57,995	-	-	-
	BLM-Administered Mineral Estate	66,258	-	-	-
Non-WSA Lands with Wilderness Characteristics Managed to Protect Wilderness Values	BLM-Administered Surface	-	5,490	-	4,954
Resource Uses and Support					
Mineral Resources					
Available for Locatable Mineral Entry	BLM-Administered Mineral Estate	2,777,334	1,167,862	2,800,467	2,351,399
Pursued for Withdrawal from Locatable Mineral Entry	BLM-Administered Mineral Estate	23,114	1,632,605	0	449,068
Existing pre-FLPMA Withdrawals	BLM-Administered Mineral Estate	8,634	8,634	8,634	8,634
Open to Geothermal Leasing Subject to Standard Lease Stipulations	BLM-Administered Mineral Estate	728,277	6,287	797,174	53,898
Open to Geothermal Leasing with Moderate Constraints	BLM-Administered Mineral Estate	1,703,913	322,717	1,738,283	1,198,821

Topic	Acreage Type	Alternative A (Acres)	Alternative B (Acres)	Alternative C (Acres)	Alternative D (Acres)
Open to Geothermal Leasing with Major Constraints	BLM-Administered Mineral Estate	242,226	175,369	165,747	859,566
Closed to Geothermal Leasing	BLM-Administered Mineral Estate	134,686	2,304,728	107,897	696,816
Open to Oil and Gas Leasing Subject to Standard Lease Stipulations	BLM-Administered Mineral Estate	731,144	32,952	804,794	44,945
Open to Oil and Gas Leasing Subject to Moderate Constraints	BLM-Administered Mineral Estate	1,715,341	309,100	1,755,628	1,260,715
Open to Oil and Gas Leasing Subject to Major Constraints	BLM-Administered Mineral Estate	337,481	187,524	248,601	1,336,867
Closed to Oil and Gas Leasing	BLM-Administered Mineral Estate	25,136	2,279,525	78	166,574
Open to Phosphate Leasing Subject to Standard Lease Stipulations	BLM-Administered Mineral Estate	2,590,482	551,440	2,642,047	1,539,655
Closed to Phosphate Leasing	BLM-Administered Mineral Estate	218,619	2,257,661	167,054	1,269,446
Open to Disposal of Mineral Materials	BLM-Administered Mineral Estate	2,493,980	209,842	2,620,997	1,853,090
Closed to Disposal of Mineral Materials	BLM-Administered Mineral Estate	315,121	2,599,259	188,104	956,011
Lands and Realty					
Surface Ownership Retained	BLM-Administered Surface	2,385,637	2,388,774	2,388,774	2,386,137
Land Available for Disposal by Sale, Exchange, or Other Means	BLM-Administered Surface	8,573	5,436	5,436	8,073
Land Available for Disposal with Restrictions on Use	BLM-Administered Surface	1,475	1,435	1,435	6,665
Renewable Energy					
Acres Open to Wind-Energy Development	BLM-Administered Surface	2,113,512	41,372	2,284,235	224,289
Wind-Energy Avoidance Areas	BLM-Administered Surface	64,816	23,887	15,818	1,215,599
Wind-Energy Exclusion Areas	BLM-Administered Surface	215,882	2,328,951	94,157	954,322
Rights-of-Way					
ROW/Utility Corridor Areas	BLM-Administered Surface	4,892	15,364	660,908	103,646

Topic	Acreage Type	Alternative A (Acres)	Alternative B (Acres)	Alternative C (Acres)	Alternative D (Acres)
ROW Avoidance Areas	BLM-Administered Surface	66,099	315,219	11,714	1,369,300
ROW Exclusion Areas	BLM-Administered Surface	205,916	1,919,029	147,053	417,426
Motorized Travel					
Acres Closed to Motorized Travel	BLM-Administered Surface	5,923	71,761	5,472	26,357
Acres Seasonally Closed to Motorized Travel	BLM-Administered Surface	111,002	116,805	-	110,530
Acres Limited to Designated Roads and Trails for Motorized Travel	BLM-Administered Surface	163,075	193,704	50,776	154,772
Acres Limited to Existing Roads and Trails for Motorized Travel	BLM-Administered Surface	2,226,504	2,128,741	2,337,958	2,213,081
Acres Closed to Over-snow Vehicle Use	BLM-Administered Surface	14,729	181,173	-	70,425
Recreation Management Areas					
Total Acreage of SRMAs	BLM-Administered Surface	406,457	307,183	608	293,774
Total Acreage of ERMAs	BLM-Administered Surface	163,187[6]	799,504[6]	901,250[6]	232,275
Livestock Grazing					
Acres Available for Livestock Grazing	BLM-Administered Surface	2,324,934	2,312,095	2,324,934	2,317,368
Acres Not Available for Livestock Grazing[7]	BLM-Administered Surface	69,276	69,276	69,276	69,276
Acres Closed to Livestock Grazing	BLM-Administered Surface	-	12,839	-	7,566
Special Designations					
National Landscape Conservation System	BLM-Administered Surface	101,100	101,100	101,100	101,100
Wild and Scenic Rivers (Eligible Waterways Managed as Suitable for Inclusion in the NWSRS)[8]	BLM-Administered Surface	9,919[9]	9,919	-	6,153
Wilderness Study Areas	BLM-Administered Surface	55,338	55,338	55,338	55,338

Topic	Acreage Type	Alternative A (Acres)	Alternative B (Acres)	Alternative C (Acres)	Alternative D (Acres)
Number of Areas of Critical Environmental Concern (See Table 2.5, "Comparative Summary of Areas of Critical Environmental Concern by Alternative" (p. 50))	Total number	9	15	-	8

Source: BLM 2012a

[1]Buffer acres were calculated around newly available greater sage-grouse lek perimeters for Alternative D versus around lek points in alternatives A, B, and C.
[2]The increase in acreage results from all suitable nesting habitat and early brood-rearing habitat within greater sage-grouse Core Area being subject to seasonal protection versus the lek buffer approach used in alternatives A, B, and C.
[3]Acreage reported for Alternative D reflects best available data at time of publication. Except for elk winter range management under Alternative C, management does not vary by alternative.
[4]Acreage includes portions of Wild Horse Herd Management Areas outside of the planning area.
[5]VRM Class V no longer exists as a class objective option for managing visual resources. As a result, these areas are managed as Class IV visual resources under Alternative A.
[6]Excludes the general Lander ERMA which includes all lands not managed as separate SRMAs or ERMAs.
[7]38,058 acres have been determined to be OSA (Outside Service Area) and unsuitable for grazing. 31,218 acres include a small number of areas such as wildlife areas closed to grazing in 1987 for wildlife values and some additional lands that should be OSA or identified as grazed but managed by other field offices.
[8]Acreage derived using a ¼-mile buffer around each waterway.
[9]All eligible waterways under Alternative A are managed to protect the free-flowing outstandingly remarkable values and tentative classification.

BLM Bureau of Land Management
ERMA Extensive Recreation Management Area
FLPMA Federal Land Policy and Management Act
OSA Outside Service Area
NWSRS National Wild and Scenic River System
ROW right-of-way
SRMA Special Recreation Management Area
VRM Visual Resource Management
WSA Wilderness Study Area
WSR Wild and Scenic River

Table 2.5. Comparative Summary of Areas of Critical Environmental Concern by Alternative

ACEC Name	Value(s) of Concern	Alternative A		Alternative B		Alternative C		Alternative D	
		Existing Designation	BLM Surface (Acres)	Proposed Designation	BLM Surface (Acres)[1]	Proposed Designation	BLM Surface (Acres)	Proposed Designation	BLM Surface (Acres)
Lander Slope	Fish and wildlife, scenic values, natural processes	ACEC	25,065	ACEC	25,065	No ACEC	-	ACEC	25,065
Red Canyon	Wildlife, special status species, scenic values, geologic features	ACEC	15,109	ACEC	15,109	No ACEC	-	ACEC	15,109
Dubois Badlands	Wildlife, soils, scenic values	ACEC	4,903	ACEC	4,903	No ACEC	-	No ACEC	-
Whiskey Mountain	Wildlife, scenic values	ACEC	8,776	ACEC	8,776	No ACEC	-	ACEC	8,776
East Fork	Wildlife	ACEC	4,431	ACEC Expansion	7,744	No ACEC	-	ACEC Expansion	7,745
Beaver Rim	Fish and wildlife, plant communities, scenic values, geologic features, paleontological	ACEC	6,421	ACEC Expansion	20,532	No ACEC	-	ACEC	6,421
Green Mountain	Wildlife, plant communities	ACEC	14,612	ACEC Expansion	24,860	No ACEC	-	ACEC Expansion	21,389
South Pass Historic Mining Area	Hazards, cultural	ACEC	12,576	ACEC Expansion	23,439	No ACEC	-	No ACEC	-
South Pass Historical Landscape[2]	Hazards, cultural	No ACEC	-	No ACEC	-	No ACEC	-	ACEC	124,229
National Historic Trails	Scenic values, cultural	ACEC	27,728	ACEC Expansion	468,183	No ACEC	-	No ACEC	-

ACEC Name	Value(s) of Concern	Alternative A		Alternative B		Alternative C		Alternative D	
		Existing Designation	BLM Surface (Acres)	Proposed Designation	BLM Surface (Acres)[1]	Proposed Designation	BLM Surface (Acres)	Proposed Designation	BLM Surface (Acres)
Continental Divide National Scenic Trail	Scenic values	No ACEC	-	Proposed ACEC	259,380	No ACEC	-	No ACEC	-
Cedar Ridge	Cultural	No ACEC	-	Proposed ACEC	7,039	No ACEC	-	No ACEC	-
Castle Gardens	Cultural	No ACEC	-	Proposed ACEC	8,469	No ACEC	-	No ACEC	-
Sweetwater Rocks	Scenic values, geologic features, cultural	No ACEC	-	Proposed ACEC	152,347	No ACEC	-	No ACEC	-
Regional Historic Trails and Early Highways	Cultural	No ACEC	-	Proposed ACEC	89,016	No ACEC	-	No ACEC	-
Government Draw/Upper Sweetwater Sage-Grouse	Wildlife	No ACEC	-	Proposed ACEC	1,246,791	No ACEC	-	No ACEC	-
Twin Creek[3]	Wildlife	No ACEC	-	No ACEC	-	No ACEC	-	Proposed ACEC	35,102

Source: BLM 2012a

[1] Acreage of ACEC Expansion includes the existing plus the proposed expansion acreage.
[2] The existing South Pass Historic Mining Area ACEC is contained within the area proposed as the South Pass Historical Landscape ACEC under Alternative D.
[3] The proposed Twin Creek ACEC designated under Alternative D is contained within the area proposed as the Government Draw/Upper Sweetwater Sage-Grouse ACEC under Alternative B.

ACEC Area of Critical Environmental Concern
BLM Bureau of Land Management

Restrictions on resource uses (e.g., closed to mineral leasing) apply throughout the life of the RMP, unless changed through a RMP amendment. Category restrictions, which are referred to throughout the remainder of this chapter, define the restrictions applied to mineral and realty actions such as oil and gas leasing, locatable mineral entry, and wind energy or ROW authorizations. The six categories represent a range of restrictions associated with mineral and realty actions, with Category 1 being the least restrictive and Category 6 the most restrictive. An area managed with a Category 1 restriction is open to all mineral and realty actions subject to standard stipulations, while an area managed with a Category 6 restriction is closed or excluded to all mineral and realty actions. The intermediate categories (categories 2 through 5) apply varying levels of restrictions such as avoidance for wind energy and ROW authorizations and seasonal and/or CSU restrictions for mineral leasing. Many management actions include a Category restriction to indicate the types of actions allowed in a certain area. Table 2.6, "Category Restrictions Key" (p. 73) provides a description of each Category restriction.

Management actions developed under all alternatives are subject to valid existing rights. In addition, management actions may only be implemented when consistent with applicable laws, regulations, and policies. Changes in resource use restrictions and a resulting RMP amendment can result due to public demand, statewide or national policy and guidance, or other factors. The timing and degree of implementation of management prescriptions in this RMP and EIS depend on available budget, staffing, and agency priorities. Actions the BLM takes or authorizes during RMP implementation would comply with standard practices, BMPs, guidelines for surface-disturbing activities, and other BLM guidance and policy. Therefore, the BLM considers these practices and guidelines as part of each alternative. Implementation of new BLM policy and guidance during the life of this RMP will be incorporated into the land use planning process and implementation level decisions.

The lack of detailed, implementation level decisions in the land use planning process prohibits the development of specific, detailed mitigation measures. As appropriate, the BLM will perform additional environmental analyses during the implementation stage for site-specific actions and will determine on a case-by-case basis what, if any, mitigation is required.

2.9.1. Alternative A (Current Management)

2.9.1.1. Overview of the Alternative

Alternative A represents the current management of resources on BLM-administered surface and mineral estate within the planning area under the existing plan.

2.9.1.2. Physical Resources

Under Alternative A, the BLM manages physical resources to conserve air, water, and soil resources and to support resources and resource uses. Alternative A places limitations on surface-disturbing activities to protect soil resources by prohibiting surface disturbance on slopes greater than 25 percent, but allows soil-disturbing activities in areas with limited reclamation potential (LRP). Soil reclamation management under Alternative A requires soil stabilization and sediment control in compliance with Wyoming Stormwater Discharge requirements and, on a case-by-case basis, requires seeding of a cover crop to protect topsoil. To conserve water resources within the planning area, the BLM prohibits or avoids surface-disturbing activities in groundwater recharge areas on a case-by-case basis; limits restrictions on pesticide use in aquifer recharge

areas to label instructions; and, in cooperation with stakeholders, implements management actions to prevent degradation of groundwater and surface water quality. Alternative A does not identify special management prescriptions for any lands with wilderness characteristics.

2.9.1.3. Mineral Resources

The BLM manages mineral resource uses by identifying BLM-administered lands and federal mineral estate within the planning area suitable for exploration and development of leasable, locatable, and salable minerals. Management actions also seek to protect other resource values that are incompatible with mineral resources activity. Approximately 23,114 acres are withdrawn from locatable mineral entry in the planning area and 2,777,334 acres are open to locatable mineral entry.

Alternative A closes approximately 25,136 acres of federal mineral estate in the planning area to oil and gas leasing and opens the remaining federal mineral estate in the planning area for oil and gas leasing, subject to the following constraints: 731,144 acres are subject to standard lease stipulations, 1,715,341 acres are subject to moderate constraints, and 337,481 acres are subject to major constraints. No lands are identified for leasing under an MLP. The BLM identifies constraints on mineral leasing in the planning area to protect resource values. Major constraints include more stringent restrictions on oil and gas development, such as NSO restrictions or overlapping timing limitation stipulation (TLS) restrictions, and usually occur in areas with more sensitive resource values. Moderate constraints apply less restriction on development and usually limit the time of construction and operation activities or require specific mitigation or lease stipulations. Standard stipulations subject oil and gas leasing to the terms and conditions of the standard lease form only.

Table 2.4, “Comparative Summary of Proposed Land Use Decisions in the Lander Planning Area” (p. 45) displays the acres of mineral estate available for geothermal and other leasable minerals development.

Disposal of mineral materials under Alternative A is available on a demand basis in areas with Category 1 or 2 restrictions.

2.9.1.4. Fire and Fuels Management

Under Alternative A for fire and fuels management, full suppression is the most likely fire suppression strategy, with other suppression strategies used on a case-by-case basis. The aerial application of fire retardants is prohibited within 300 feet of any waterbody. The appropriate response to wildland fire is based on the circumstances under which a fire occurs and the likely consequences on firefighter and public safety and welfare, natural and cultural resources, and other values to be protected.

Approximately 6,000 acres of fuels reduction and vegetation treatments over 20 years are expected to occur under Alternatives A. Reactive fire management (fire suppression and rehabilitation) is typically more expensive, time consuming, and damaging than proactive fire, fuels, and vegetation management (prescribed burns, mechanical thinning, chemical treatment, and subsequent restoration). The projected fire suppression cost would be along historical trends.

2.9.1.5. Biological Resources

The BLM manages biological resources under Alternative A to provide habitat for fish and wildlife, meet public demand for forest products, protect natural functions in riparian-wetland areas, and control the spread of invasive species. Although the 1987 RMP originally analyzed vegetative resources as a subpart of livestock grazing, the adoption of the Wyoming Standards for Healthy Rangelands in 1997 made vegetative health a consideration in every activity and allows resource use only that supports Wyoming Standards for Healthy Rangelands. Vegetative treatments would be utilized to manage vegetative communities to increase forage production while maintaining healthy rangeland ecosystems. Management of forests and woodlands would continue to emphasize forest health, wildlife habitat, and demand for forest products, allowing clear-cuts of 25 acres or smaller. Various site-specific management actions would be utilized to make progress towards meeting PFC including fencing, resting, deferment, and road closures of riparian-wetland areas within the planning area. Surface-disturbing activities within 500 feet of surface water would be prohibited. For invasive species and pest management, Alternative A manages activities that contribute to the spread of invasive plant species on a case-by-case basis.

The BLM primarily manages potential impacts to fish and wildlife species and their habitats on a case-by-case basis, such as avoiding road construction in big game crucial winter range or reducing the footprint of surface-disturbing activities and facilities. Constraints on resource uses specifically protect fish and wildlife resources in only a few cases under Alternative A. Specific constraints are primarily seasonal limitations on surface-disturbing activities to protect wildlife during important times of the year, such as winter and birthing periods. For example, surface-disturbing activities are prohibited within ¾ mile of active raptor nests from February 1 to July 31 and within elk winter range from November 15 to April 30.

The BLM manages impacts to special status species and their habitats in compliance with the ESA and BLM policy for special status species, including BLM sensitive species. Alternative A has specific protections for greater sage-grouse, such as prohibiting surface-disturbing activities within ¼ mile of occupied greater sage-grouse leks and avoiding surface disturbance in greater sage-grouse nesting habitat within 2 miles of occupied leks from February 1 to July 31, but does not adopt the Wyoming Governor's Core Area strategy. For the majority of special status species, management is directed at avoiding or minimizing impacts from surface disturbance and disruptive activities on a case-by-case basis. For example, Alternative A requires, on a case-by-case basis, anti-perching devices on overhead powerlines and limitations on activities that contribute sediment to waterbodies supporting Yellowstone cutthroat trout, burbot, and sauger.

Management actions for wild horses include considering the impacts on herd health when making management decisions regarding fencing. The BLM does not establish scenic loops for wild horse viewing under Alternative A.

2.9.1.6. Heritage and Visual Resources

Alternative A partially balances the protection of cultural resources with impacts to them, and the BLM attempts to limit effects to cultural resources on a case-by-case basis. For development-related effects, Alternative A has mostly standard measures to protect significant prehistoric, historic, and sacred, spiritual, and/or traditional cultural properties. However, standard protection measures mostly do not address management of historic settings along historic trails and certain historic sites, so protection has been sporadic. The same is true for sacred, spiritual, and/or traditional cultural properties. For natural deterioration and looting/vandalism types of

effects upon cultural resources, Alternative A addresses effects to some specific cultural resource properties, but does not cover effects to unnamed cultural resources. As a result, protection from deterioration and looting/vandalism has been only occasional. For location-specific cultural resource management actions, Alternative A protects 557 acres of the Warm Springs Canyon Flume site. Alternative A has minimal protections for other location-specific resources, such as sacred, spiritual, and/or traditional cultural properties, due to a lack of management direction.

For paleontological resources, Alternative A also partially balances protection with impacts and strives to limit effects on a case-by-case basis. For development-related effects, new paleontological laws and regulations have strengthened the protection of fossil resources, especially in areas of "very high" and "high" potential. However, Alternative A does not address impacts to paleontological resources from natural deterioration and looting/vandalism. For location-specific paleontological resource management actions, Alternative A restricts resource uses to protect the Beaver Rim proposed National Natural Landmark (NNL). For other location-specific resources such as the Bison Basin proposed NNL, and the Bonneville to Lost Cabin, Lander Slope, and Gas Hills high potential paleontological areas, Alternative A has minimal protections.

Under the existing plan, the BLM categorized the management of visual resources in accordance with five VRM classes, each of which provide different levels of management and protection for visual resources. VRM Class V visual resources no longer exist as a class objective and are therefore managed as Class IV under Alternative A. The majority of BLM-administered land under Alternative A is managed as VRM Class IV (1,853,862 acres), which provides for management activities that allow major modification to the existing character of the landscape. The level of change to the characteristic landscape in VRM Class IV areas can be high. The remainder of BLM-administered surface in the planning area is managed as Class I, II, and III, which retain more of the existing character of the landscape.

2.9.1.7. Land Resources

Land resource program actions under Alternative A identify approximately 2,385,637 acres for retention within the planning area and approximately 8,573 acres as available for disposal. Some of these lands would not meet current guidance for disposal and have been removed from the acreage in the other alternatives. Lands identified for disposal are generally small areas (less than 40 acres) and are usually isolated tracts, making them difficult for the BLM to manage. The BLM opens a total of 2,113,512 acres to wind-energy development and manages 64,816 acres as avoidance areas and 215,882 acres as exclusion areas for wind-energy development. This acreage is based upon a ¼-mile buffer around the Congressionally Designated Trails. Under Alternative A, no corridors have been designated for ROWs; therefore, major ROWs are concentrated in existing utility corridors as much as possible. Communication facilities are authorized on a case-by-case basis.

Trails and travel management under Alternative A balances resource protection with access and recreational values. For example, the BLM closes the Lander Slope, Red Canyon, Whiskey Mountain, and portions of Green Mountain areas to motorized travel from December 1 to June 15 to protect sensitive resources. The Dubois Badlands ACEC and Castle Gardens area are closed to motorized travel year-round. Unless otherwise specified, the BLM limits motorized vehicle use to existing roads and trails within the planning area (2,226,504 acres), which prohibits cross-country motorized travel but is less restrictive than limiting travel to designated roads

and trails. Over-snow vehicle travel is prohibited only in the Red Canyon area and is open in the remainder of the planning area.

Alternative A permits livestock grazing on 2,324,934 acres in the planning area. The alternative opens acquired lands for livestock grazing on a case-by-case basis and prohibits the placement of salt and mineral supplements within ¼ mile of water and riparian-wetland areas. The BLM establishes forage utilization levels for livestock and allows new infrastructure types of range improvements on a case-by-case basis. Fences and cattleguards may be removed or modified on a case-by-case basis to allow movement of wildlife, wild horses, and livestock.

Recreation management under Alternative A provides restrictions to protect recreation resources primarily at the developed site level while few restrictions exist to protect other important recreation areas. Under Alternative A, the BLM manages three SRMAs to protect the recreation setting and provide for specific recreation opportunities such as hiking or biking. Alternative A also designates 12 ERMAs which provide less structured recreation opportunities than SRMAs but are used to specifically address local recreation issues. Those lands not included in separate ERMAs or SRMAs are managed as part of the Lander ERMA (1,824,406 acres). See Appendix C (p. 1453) for a detailed discussion of recreation management areas by alternative.

2.9.1.8. Special Designations

Currently, the BLM manages nine ACECs: Lander Slope, Red Canyon, Dubois Badlands, Whiskey Mountains, East Fork, Beaver Rim, Green Mountain, NHTs, and South Pass Historic Mining District. Table 2.5, "Comparative Summary of Areas of Critical Environmental Concern by Alternative" (p. 50) summarizes acreage and management emphasis in each of these ACECs.

In addition to the provisions of BLM Manual 6330, *Management of Wilderness Study Areas*, which in 2012 replaced the Interim Management Policy and Guidelines for Lands Under Wilderness Review (BLM 1995), Alternative A places strict limitations on motorized travel within WSAs by limiting motorized travel in seven of the eight WSAs in the planning area to designated roads and trails that existed and were identified before or during the inventory phase of the Wilderness review. The remaining WSA, the Dubois Badlands, is closed to motorized travel. The BLM manages all WSAs as separate ERMAs to address local recreation issues.

The BLM also manages nine waterway segments that are eligible for inclusion in the National Wild and Scenic River System (NWSRS) for outstanding remarkable values (ORVs) and tentative classification: Baldwin Creek Unit (8.1 miles), Sweetwater River Unit (12.9 miles), Ice Slough (1.6 miles), Little Popo Agie River (1.5 miles), North Popo Agie River (0.7 miles), Rock Creek (4.0 miles), Warm Springs Creek (1.3 miles), Willow Creek (1.3 miles), and Wind River (0.5 miles).

Under Alternative A, the BLM manages two Congressionally Designated Trails. The entire Continental Divide National Scenic Trail (CDNST) is included in a SRMA, but no allowable use decisions exist for the area. For NHTs, the BLM manages mineral and realty actions with Category 4 restrictions within ¼ mile of each side of the trails but also applies specific Category restrictions to certain trail sections. The BLM manages NHTs as VRM Classes I and II, only authorizing highly visible projects on a case-by-case basis in order to protect the NHTs from visual intrusions. As noted above, the BLM manages the Oregon, Mormon Pioneer, California, and Pony Express NHTs as an ACEC under Alternative A, the areal extent of which is defined as the area within ¼ mile of each side of the NHTs.

2.9.1.9. Socioeconomic Resources

The BLM's management includes analyzing impacts on socioeconomic resources from the implementation of projects through the NEPA process.

2.9.2. Alternative B

2.9.2.1. Overview of the Alternative

Alternative B emphasizes conservation of physical, biological, heritage and visual resources when managing the public lands for multiple use. Land uses would still be authorized, but greater restrictions would be placed on where and how they occur. Alternative B utilizes a low impact approach to resource management, utilizing natural systems to achieve goals and objectives, particularly achieving Wyoming Standards for Healthy Rangelands, PFC, and forest health, and employing the least infrastructure and human presence as possible. There would be little to no infrastructure range improvements and a correspondingly higher amount of vegetation treatments. In order to avoid potential lasting impacts from more intense management actions, making improvements to resource condition may take longer to achieve than a more development-oriented approach. Compared to other alternatives, Alternative B would preserve the most land area for physical, biological, and heritage resources; would designate the highest number of ACECs; and would be the most restrictive to motorized travel and mineral development. Alternative B adheres to all BLM policies related to greater sage-grouse, incorporates conservation measures from the NTT report, and manages greater sage-grouse breeding, nesting, and brooding areas either consistent with or more restrictive than the Wyoming Governor's Core Area strategy.

2.9.2.2. Physical Resources

Under Alternative B, the BLM manages physical resources with an emphasis on conserving these resources. This alternative is less focused on supporting resource uses than the other alternatives. Alternative B places more limitations on surface-disturbing activities to protect soil resources than the other alternatives. For example, Alternative B avoids surface disturbance on slopes greater than 15 percent and prohibits soil disturbance in areas with LRP. Reclamation standards are also more stringent than the other alternatives. Management under Alternative B includes more proactive management protections for surface and groundwater resources including avoiding surface disturbance and prohibiting pesticide use in known or inferred aquifer recharge areas.

Unlike alternatives A and C, Alternative B identifies special management prescriptions for certain lands with wilderness characteristics, including the Little Red Creek Complex.

2.9.2.3. Mineral Resources

Mineral resource uses are subject to additional constraints under Alternative B compared to other alternatives (see Table 2.4, "Comparative Summary of Proposed Land Use Decisions in the Lander Planning Area" (p. 45)). Within the planning area, 1,167,862 acres are available for locatable mineral entry, while 1,632,605 acres are recommended for withdrawal from mineral entry.

Alternative B closes approximately 2,279,525 acres of federal mineral estate to oil and gas leasing and opens the remaining federal mineral estate to oil and gas leasing subject to the following

constraints: 32,952 acres are subject to standard lease stipulations, 309,100 acres are subject to moderate constraints, and 187,524 acres are subject to major constraints. Although lands were identified by external nominations as appropriate for leasing subject to an MLP analysis, all were located in the 2,279,525 acres that are closed to leasing entirely. While it is possible that more refined or focused approaches under an MLP analysis could have reduced the acreage that would be closed under Alternative B because of resource conflicts, analyzing the more severe constraint was reasonable and provided a complete range of alternatives.

Table 2.4, "Comparative Summary of Proposed Land Use Decisions in the Lander Planning Area" (p. 45) displays the acres of mineral estate available for geothermal and other leasable minerals.

For salable minerals, approximately 209,842 acres are open to disposal with Category 1 or 2 restrictions, while 2,599,259 acres with Category 3 to 6 restrictions are closed to mineral material disposal.

2.9.2.4. Fire and Fuels Management

Fire and fuels management actions under Alternative B include using full suppression of wildland fire within the wildland-urban interface (WUI) and where necessary to minimize critical resource damage. The aerial application of fire retardant is prohibited within ¼ mile of waterbodies that support certain special status fish species. Full suppression will be applied if needed to protect greater sage-grouse habitat including the approximately 70 percent of the BLM-administered surface that is located in the Wyoming Governor's Core Area. As with Alternative A, the appropriate response to wildland fire would be based on the circumstances under which a fire occurs and the likely consequences on firefighter and public safety and welfare, natural and cultural resources, and other values to be protected.

Alternative B assumes 20,000 acres of fuels treatment over 20 years, or more than triple the acres projected for Alternative A. More acres of strategic fuels treatment will lead to reduced fire suppression costs in areas adjacent to WUI or public infrastructure in comparison to alternatives A and C. Some moderation of the suppression costs would be achieved with this alternative due to the emphasis on the management of natural ignitions for resources benefits, but that benefit would be limited to those areas outside of Core Area or where Core Area annual precipitation exceeds 12 inches.

2.9.2.5. Biological Resources

Biological resources management under Alternative B places more emphasis on conservation of habitat for fish and wildlife, ecosystem management, protection of natural functions in riparian-wetland areas, and control of invasive species compared to Alternative A. Vegetative communities under Alternative B would be managed to benefit biological diversity of wildlife, fish and special status species. Treatments would be done to restore diversity of ecological sites and their transitional states within these sites. Management of forests and woodlands would emphasize the improvement of vegetative health and would prohibit clear-cuts and harvest methods that create clear-cuts. The BLM would use the natural healing capacity of the land to make progress towards meeting PFC, using management actions such as road closures and livestock grazing management. Surface-disturbing activities would be prohibited within 1,320 feet of surface water and riparian-wetland areas. Invasive species and pest management would be similar to Alternative A but with extra precautions designed to minimize the spread of invasive

species. An Authorized Officer may adjust the terms of an authorized activity if it is determined the activity is contributing to the spread of noxious or invasive species.

Alternative B places a greater emphasis on the conservation of habitat for fish and wildlife and places more constraints on resource uses that affect biological resources compared to Alternative A. For example, Alternative B prohibits surface-disturbing activities within 1½ miles of active raptor nests during species specific nesting periods and, in all cases, requires minimizing the footprint of surface-disturbing activities to the smallest practical to protect wildlife and their habitats. Similar to Alternative A, Alternative B prohibits surface-disturbing activities within identified elk winter range from November 15 to April 30.

Special status species receive increased protection under Alternative B through larger protective buffers, timing stipulations, and other constraints on resource uses. Alternative B extends the protective buffer around greater sage-grouse leks from ¼ mile under Alternative A to 0.6 mile, and limits surface disturbance in greater sage-grouse nesting habitat within 3 miles of occupied leks from February 1 to July 31. Wind-energy development and oil and gas leasing are closed in the Wyoming Governor's Core Area and surface disturbance is cap at 2.5 percent and 1 energy development in 640 acres. Livestock water developments are not allowed in greater sage-grouse nesting areas. To protect special status plants, Alternative B does not allow chemical vegetation treatments within ¼ mile of habitat for BLM sensitive plant species and closes areas with special status plant populations to motorized and mechanized travel. Alternative B preserves traditional migration and travel corridors for all special status species, and, to protect special status fish populations, does not authorize activities that could contribute sediment to waterbodies that support Yellowstone cutthroat trout, burbot, and sauger.

Management of wild horses under Alternative B allows more opportunity for wild horse viewing by the public compared to Alternative A through the establishment of scenic loops. Alternative B also calls for the removal or modification of existing fences to allow free movement among herd populations.

2.9.2.6. Heritage and Visual Resources

Alternative B provides increased protection for heritage resources through constraints on resource uses and proactive management to identify important cultural or paleontological sites. Under Alternative B, the BLM conducts assessments in areas where cultural and paleontological resources are threatened by development and prioritizes endangered sites for additional protections. The BLM also manages a larger area, compared to Alternative A, around the Warm Springs Canyon Flume site (834 acres) to protect the area as a National Register of Historic Places (NRHP)-eligible property. Alternative B manages the Beaver Rim NNL and proposed Bison Basin NNL with greater protection; mineral and realty actions within these areas are managed with restrictions on all mineral and realty actions except locatable minerals. Additionally, Alternative B increases the protection for the sacred, spiritual, and/or traditional cultural properties by managing these areas with surface restrictions and avoidance within 3 miles. As under Alternative A, the BLM conducts inventories for paleontological resources in areas having a “very high” or “high” Potential Fossil Yield Classification prior to all surface-disturbing activities, but also pursues more detailed analysis of the planning area to further identify areas of high potential for significant paleontological resources.

Under Alternative B, the BLM places a greater emphasis on protecting visual resources and preserving the character of the landscape. Over 50 percent of BLM-administered land in the

planning area is managed as VRM Class II (1,284,122 acres) which seeks to retain the existing character of the landscape by limiting surface disturbance. Alternative B allows fewer visual intrusions than Alternative A by limiting VRM Class IV visual resources (756,813 acres) to existing oil and gas fields and around large open pit mines.

2.9.2.7. Land Resources

Land resource program actions under Alternative B identify approximately 2,388,774 acres for retention within the planning area, slightly more than under Alternative A, and approximately 5,436 acres as available for disposal. The BLM opens a total of 41,372 acres to wind-energy development and manages 23,887 acres as avoidance areas and 2,328,951 acres as exclusion areas for wind-energy development. Alternative B establishes ROW corridors which would allow major ROWs to remain in areas of existing disturbance to the greatest extent possible. Communication facilities would be required to be co-located with existing sites. At their expiration, existing ROW grants would be reviewed with appropriate NEPA analysis.

Trails and travel management under Alternative B places a greater emphasis on the protection of other resource values and, therefore, places more limitations on motorized and mechanized travel. For example, the BLM limits motorized and mechanized travel in the Lander Slope, Red Canyon, Whiskey Mountain, and Green Mountain areas to designated roads and trails to protect sensitive resources. Alternative B also closes more acres to motorized and mechanized travel within the planning area and limits motorized travel to existing roads and trails on fewer acres (2,128,741 acres) than Alternative A. Alternative B closes more acres to over-snow travel than Alternative A but still allows over-snow vehicle travel on 2,213,037 acres within the planning area.

Alternative B places more restrictions on livestock grazing compared to Alternative A, opening a total of 2,312,095 acres to livestock grazing and closing 12,839 acres to grazing. Progress towards rangeland health will be achieved by reducing livestock AUMs as monitoring shows that resource conflicts exist. Over time, livestock grazing is likely to be reduced by as much as 60 percent or more, depending upon resource conflicts. Alternative B approaches making progress towards meeting Wyoming Standards for Healthy Rangelands without the use of infrastructure development such as fencing and water developments. Instead, as monitoring conditions reflect a need for change, other livestock grazing management tools will be used to achieve Wyoming Standards for Healthy Rangelands such as reduction in use or change of season of use. Acquired lands under Alternative B are not available to livestock grazing and Alternative B prohibits the placement of salt and mineral supplements within ½ mile of water, within 0.6 mile of greater sage-grouse leks, on areas being reclaimed, and within 3 miles of NHTs. On an allotment-by-allotment basis, the BLM establishes livestock use that would not exceed light utilization in areas preferred by livestock in order to leave sufficient forage and hiding cover for wildlife.

Alternative B places a priority on natural landscapes and the use of livestock grazing as the primary tool to meet natural resource objectives, related to vegetation, wildlife and aesthetics. Range improvement projects would only be employed when they offer no conflict with any other values. Range betterment funds would go primarily to weed abatement and other types of vegetation treatment. Harvest efficiency of vegetation would be no more than 25 percent of the total production (pounds per acre) produced, and distance from water and slope (suitability) would be applied to assure that forage resources are carefully managed to achieve rangeland health standards. When and where opportunities exist, fences and cattleguards would be removed and/or modified to accommodate other resource values. This alternative further allows for the

establishment and management of future common forage reserve allotments. The opportunities would be solely voluntary within the planning area or considered on acquired lands.

Under Alternative B, recreation management emphasizes protection of resources and recreational experiences, and includes more restrictions on resource uses than the other alternatives. The recreational experience is directed at a natural setting and low infrastructure development in a way that is compatible with visual, historic, and wildlife resources. This alternative emphasizes nonmotorized recreation and utilizes allowable use decisions to protect important recreation areas as well as existing and new facilities. For example, Alternative B manages mineral and realty actions within developed recreation sites with the most stringent category restrictions (Category 6), making these areas off limits to mineral entry, leasing, and other realty actions. Alternative B also supports and provides seasonal use stipulations as well as other allowable use decisions to protect several WGFD hunt units managed under special management criteria. Alternative B maintains seven SRMAs and 13 ERMAs. The Lander Slope SRMA is managed in three recreation management zones (RMZs), which are managed for distinctly different recreation products. Each RMZ has certain defining characteristics such as a recreation niche and setting character designed to meet the strategically targeted primary recreation market demand. For example, the Sinks Canyon Climbing RMZ is designed to support muscle-powered recreationists to engage in climbing and hiking. Similarly, Alternative B manages two RMZs within each the CDNST and NHT Destination SRMAs. The BLM manages those lands not included in separate ERMAs or SRMAs as part of the Lander ERMA (1,287,636 acres). See Appendix C (p. 1453) for a detailed discussion of recreation management areas by alternative.

2.9.2.8. Special Designations

Alternative B designates the most land area for special designations and applies the most stringent restrictions on other resource uses in the areas. Alternative B includes 15 ACECs – the nine existing areas (five of which the BLM proposes for expansion), and six new ACECs. The five existing ACECs the BLM proposes to expand are East Fork, Beaver Rim, Green Mountain, NHTs, and South Pass Historic Mining Area. The six new proposed ACECs are Castle Gardens, Cedar Ridge, Government Draw/Upper Sweetwater Sage-Grouse, Sweetwater Rocks, CDNST, and Regional Historic Trails and Early Highways. Table 2.5, “Comparative Summary of Areas of Critical Environmental Concern by Alternative” (p. 50) summarizes acreage and management emphasis in each of these ACECs.

Alternative B places stricter limitations on activities within WSAs to protect wilderness characteristics, including closing all eight WSAs to motorized and mechanized travel.

Management of WSR eligible waterways is similar to Alternative A except that all nine waterways are recommended as suitable for inclusion in the NWSRS and are managed to maintain and enhance ORVs.

Under Alternative B, the BLM manages 82,778 acres of the CDNST as an SRMA and 4,589 acres as a separate ERMA to specifically address local recreation issues. A portion of the CDNST is also managed as a 259,380-acre ACEC with Category 4 restrictions. Alternative B manages mineral and realty actions within 5 miles of each side of NHTs with Category 6 restrictions. To protect the scenic character of the NHTs and associated landscape, Alternative B manages the NHTs as VRM Class II within 15 miles of the trails and as VRM Class III at all designated NHT crossings.

2.9.2.9. Socioeconomic Resources

Under Alternative B, the BLM seeks to actively minimize adverse socioeconomic impacts associated with permitted actions. The BLM's approach to socioeconomic resources is more proactive than the other alternatives and considers paced development options for mineral development to avoid adverse impacts on socioeconomic conditions.

2.9.3. Alternative C

2.9.3.1. Overview of the Alternative

Alternative C emphasizes resource uses and reduces constraints placed on resource uses to protect physical, biological, heritage, and visual resources. Alternative C gives priority to land uses such as oil and gas development, mining, ROWs, and livestock grazing when managing the public lands for multiple use. Fewer restrictions protecting biological, physical, heritage and visual resources would be placed on surface-disturbing and disruptive activities to facilitate land uses and development. Compared to other alternatives, Alternative C would preserve the least land area for physical, biological, and heritage resources and is the least restrictive to motorized vehicle use and mineral development. Alternative C uses all management actions to achieve maximum resource utilization even if a heavier human presence results.

2.9.3.2. Physical Resources

Under Alternative C, the BLM generally manages physical resources similar to Alternative A, but with instances of less stringent management restrictions. Reclamation management is focused primarily on stabilizing soils and establishing ground cover sufficient to reduce and/or prevent accelerated soil erosion and invasive plant species infestation. While Alternative C does not prohibit surface-disturbing activities in known or inferred groundwater recharge areas, it requires the implementation of BMPs to prevent contamination. Alternative C does not separately manage any lands with wilderness characteristics for naturalness and outstanding opportunities for solitude or primitive and unconfined recreation.

2.9.3.3. Mineral Resources

Mineral resource uses are subject to the fewest constraints under Alternative C compared to other alternatives (see Table 2.4, "Comparative Summary of Proposed Land Use Decisions in the Lander Planning Area" (p. 45)). Under Alternative C, 2,800,467 acres are available for locatable mineral entry. No new withdrawals from locatable mineral entry are recommended and existing withdrawals would be allowed to expire.

Alternative C closes approximately 78 acres of federal mineral estate to oil and gas leasing in the planning area and opens the remaining federal mineral estate to oil and gas leasing subject to the following constraints: A total of 804,794 acres are subject to standard lease stipulations, 1,755,628 acres are subject to moderate constraints, and 248,601 acres are subject to major constraints. None of the lands identified in internal and external evaluations would be leased subject to an MLP under Alternative C.

Table 2.4, "Comparative Summary of Proposed Land Use Decisions in the Lander Planning Area" (p. 45) displays the acres of mineral estate available for geothermal and other leasable minerals development.

Additionally, 2,620,997 acres are open to mineral material disposal with Category 1 or 2 restrictions, while 188,104 acres with Category 3 to 6 restrictions are closed to mineral material disposal.

2.9.3.4. Fire and Fuels Management

Fire and fuels management under Alternative C places fewer restrictions on suppression tactics than the other alternatives, allowing the full range of management options across the planning area. As with alternatives A and B, the appropriate response to wildland fire would be based on the circumstances under which a fire occurs and the likely consequences on firefighter and public safety and welfare, natural and cultural resources, and other values to be protected.

Alternative C projects the same 6,000 acres of fuels and vegetation treatment as Alternative A and would therefore have the same effect on reducing the costs of suppression, which is less than one-third that of Alternative B.

2.9.3.5. Biological Resources

The BLM manages biological resources under Alternative C similarly to Alternative A, but with fewer constraints on resource uses and a greater emphasis on human intervention to achieve management objectives than natural processes. Vegetative communities would be managed to maximize forage production of a given ecological site. The use of soil and vegetative treatments would be implemented to increase forage production when consistent with healthy rangeland ecosystems. Management of forest and woodlands would emphasize using all available treatment methods to maintain and improve forest health and provide forest products. In riparian-wetland areas all tools such as fences, travel management and road construction would be utilized to make progress towards PFC. Surface-disturbing activities would be prohibited within 500 feet of surface water and riparian-wetland areas, unless a lesser distance is shown to provide equivalent protection. Invasive species and pest management under Alternative C is the same as under Alternative A.

Fish and wildlife under Alternative C, in general, receive less protection compared to Alternative A. For example, the BLM prohibits surface-disturbing activities within ½ mile of active raptor nests, compared to ¾ mile under Alternative A. Alternative C does not require the footprint of surface-disturbing activities to be reduced to protect wildlife and their habitat. Surface-disturbing and disruptive activities within identified elk winter range are not subject to seasonal limitations. Wildlife in areas protected as ACECs in Alternative A are not similarly protected in Alternative C since those areas are managed with standard management.

Management of special status species under Alternative C is similar to Alternative A, especially in not adopting the Wyoming Governor's Core Area strategy; however, Alternative C provides fewer protections for these species. For example, Alternative C allows chemical vegetation treatment within identified habitat for BLM sensitive plant species unless treatment would result in direct mortality of the plant population. Alternative C also allows surface-disturbing activities in areas with special status plant populations unless the activity would result in the loss of the population. Similar to Alternative A, Alternative C prohibits surface disturbance within ¼ mile of greater

sage-grouse leks and limits disruptive activities in greater sage-grouse nesting habitats within 2 miles of occupied leks from February 1 to July 31. The BLM allows authorized activities that could contribute sediment to waterbodies that support Yellowstone cutthroat trout, burbot, and sauger unless it is determined that additional sediment would result in species mortality.

Alternative C establishes scenic loops for viewing wild horses and, similar to Alternative A, considers the impacts on herd health when making management decisions regarding fencing. However, Alternative C allows greater adverse impacts to wild horses as a result of greater use of fences to benefit livestock grazing.

2.9.3.6. Heritage and Visual Resources

Alternative C protects heritage resources similarly to Alternative A. Differences include: Alternative C imposes the minimum restrictions required by regulation on activities that could cause adverse effects to NRHP-eligible properties; manages mineral and realty actions in the Warm Springs Canyon Flume site with Category 1 restrictions as opposed to Category 5 restrictions under Alternative A; and does not identify special management prescriptions for the Beaver Rim and Bison Basin areas.

The BLM manages visual resources under Alternative C in similar fashion to Alternative A, although less acreage is allocated as either VRM Class I or II under Alternative C. Over 95 percent of BLM-administered land in the planning area is managed as VRM Class IV (1,590,758 acres) and Class III (722,356 acres), which allow for moderate to major changes to the characteristic landscape.

2.9.3.7. Land Resources

Land resource program actions under Alternative C identify approximately 2,388,774 acres for retention within the planning area, and approximately 5,436 acres as available for disposal as does Alternative B. The BLM opens a total of 2,284,235 acres to wind-energy development and manages 15,818 acres as avoidance areas and 94,157 acres as exclusion areas for wind-energy development. This alternative establishes ROW corridors with a maximum width of 3 miles. Similar to Alternative A, communication facilities are authorized on a case-by-case basis.

Trails and travel management under Alternative C is similar to Alternative A, but with less restriction on travel. There are no seasonal travel stipulations under Alternative C and fewer acres are closed to motorized travel within the planning area compared to Alternative A. Alternative C limits more acreage to existing roads and trails (2,337,958 acres) than Alternative A and does not close any area to over-snow vehicle travel.

Alternative C emphasizes infrastructure projects and grazing management strategies that promote higher AUM usage as the preferred means to meet the Wyoming Standards for Healthy Rangelands. The planning area is open to livestock grazing on the same acreage as Alternative A. Acquired lands are available for livestock grazing and salt and mineral supplements are prohibited within ¼ mile of water and riparian-wetland areas. Similar to Alternative A, the BLM establishes livestock use that would not exceed moderate utilization in areas preferred by livestock.

Alternative C emphasizes the implementation of a rigorous range improvement program at the landscape level. Installing range improvement projects such as fences, water developments and vegetative treatments would make almost the entire planning area usable by livestock. There are,

however, small areas that would not be suitable for additional water development because the federal lands are too small size or with scattered parcels to develop water. Under Alternative C, range improvement infrastructure and non-infrastructure projects would be installed in all areas possible where mitigation to other resource values would be considered while achieving rangeland health. Weed eradication and vegetation treatment be a minor part of range improvement projects. A harvest efficiency of total vegetative production could be increased to 28 percent as grazing management would be accomplished over most of the planning area. Further, fences and cattleguards would be modified or removed to facilitate improved livestock management on the landscape. Common forage reserve allotments would not be established and flexibility in providing alternative pasture for permittees and lessees would not occur.

Alternative C focuses on dispersed recreation experience with little concern for setting and places few constraints to preserve recreational experiences. Facilities and visitor services would be removed and relocated to accommodate resource uses under this alternative. This alternative does not establish allowable use stipulations on other resource uses to protect the recreation resource. Within developed recreation sites, the BLM manages mineral and realty actions with only standard stipulations. Overall, the BLM conducts little proactive management, primarily ensuring that recreation does not conflict with other resource uses and protecting human health and safety. This alternative recognizes one SRMA and manages 14 ERMAs to specifically address local recreation issues. The BLM manages those lands not included in separate ERMAs or SRMAs as part of the Lander ERMA (1,492,351 acres). See Appendix C (p. 1453) for a detailed discussion of recreation management areas by alternative.

2.9.3.8. Special Designations

The BLM retains no existing ACECs and proposes no new ACECs under Alternative C.

Alternative C also does not recommend any of the nine eligible WSR segments as suitable for inclusion in the NWSRS. Management of these areas would be in accordance with standard management without special protections (Category 1). More mineral activities and realty actions would be allowed.

Management of WSAs is the same as described under Alternative A.

The BLM manages the entire CDNST with a ¼-mile buffer as an ERMA with Category 1 restrictions. Alternative C manages mineral and realty actions within ¼ mile of Condition Class I and II Historic Trail segments with Category 4 restrictions, and authorizes highly visible projects only on a case-by-case basis in order to protect the NHTs from visual intrusions. The BLM manages ¼ mile on either side of the NHTs as VRM Class II.

2.9.3.9. Socioeconomic Resources

Similar to Alternative A, BLM's management under Alternative C includes analyzing impacts on socioeconomic resources from the implementation of projects through the NEPA process. However, Alternative C would also minimize constraints on the pace of development for large development projects.

2.9.4. Alternative D (Proposed RMP)

2.9.4.1. Overview of the Alternative

Alternative D balances the use and conservation of planning area resources. This alternative generally allows resource use if the activity can be conducted in a manner that conserves physical, biological, heritage, and visual resources. Alternative D designates the second most land area as SRMAs and ACECs and emphasizes moderate constraints on resource uses (e.g., mineral development) to reduce impacts to resource values. In areas of high mineral potential, DDAs are established which emphasize mineral use. In Dubois, mineral activities are limited and the area is closed to oil and gas leasing for the protection of special status species and to support destination recreation associated with bighorn sheep. The NTMC is designated to meet the nature and purposes of the Congressionally Designated Trails in a manner that protects the values for which the trails were designated, and recognizes the nationally significant scenic, historic, cultural, recreation, natural, and other landscape values of the public land areas through which the trails pass, and the primary trail use or uses. Protective management, including some areas recommended for withdrawal from locatable mineral entry and oil and gas management with NSO stipulations, is applied across the Lander Front, east to the Hudson area (omitting the Beaver Creek DDA), and south to the Atlantic City area where it meets the NTMC, for the benefit of overlapping wildlife, historic, viewshed, and other values. The Wyoming Governor's Core Area strategy is incorporated into management actions. Protections of winter habitat as well as crucial winter habitat are applied for the benefit of mule deer and elk. An MLP is applied to oil and gas development in the Beaver Rim area.

2.9.4.2. Physical Resources

Under Alternative D, the BLM manages physical resources similar to Alternative A with some increased management restrictions. For example, the BLM prohibits surface-disturbing activities on slopes greater than 25 percent as in Alternative A, but also applies CSU restrictions for slopes between 15 and 24 percent. The BLM would also prioritize areas with soil disturbance that were not successfully reclaimed on a case-by-case basis. Water resources would receive similar protection as under Alternative A, although the BLM places a greater emphasis on protecting aquifers by avoiding surface-disturbing activities with potential to contaminate groundwater in identified or inferred groundwater recharge areas. Alternative D applies more protections for areas with the potential to have groundwater impacted by oil and gas development, although less than under Alternative B, which closes more areas to oil and gas leasing. BMPs are evaluated to be applied as COAs for the protection of groundwater.

Similar to Alternative B, the BLM manages certain lands to protect naturalness and outstanding opportunities for solitude or primitive and unconfined recreation. Alternative D would manage 4,954 acres of the Little Red Creek Complex as non-WSA lands to protect wilderness characteristics.

2.9.4.3. Mineral Resources

Alternative D places more constraints on mineral development than Alternative A. Approximately 2,351,399 acres are available for locatable mineral entry under this alternative. However, Alternative D segregates the Lander Slope and Red Canyon ACECs, lands in the Hudson to

Atlantic City area, greater sage-grouse leks, and the ruts and swales of the NHTs to recommend a locatable mineral withdrawal.

Alternative D closes approximately 166,574 acres of federal mineral estate to oil and gas leasing in the planning area (plus additional acreage associated with Boysen Reservoir that was not included in the reasonable foreseeable development [RFD] scenario for oil and gas). The remaining federal mineral estate is open to oil and gas leasing subject to the following constraints: 44,945 acres are subject to standard lease stipulations, 1,260,715 acres are subject to moderate constraints, and 1,336,867 acres are subject to major constraints (plus additional acreage associated with an NSO in the Green Mountain area that was not included in the RFD scenario for oil and gas).

As described above under *Alternatives Considered but Not Carried Forward for Detailed Analysis*, Alternative D applies an MLP only to the Beaver Rim area (150,782 acres; see Map 135) to reduce resource conflicts. Approximately 29,527 acres within the MLP are open to oil and gas leasing subject to an NSO stipulation and 121,255 acres are open to leasing subject to CSU stipulations. Management within the MLP stipulates other requirements designed to protect resource values where there may be a conflict with oil and gas development, such as requiring watershed monitoring to ensure effectiveness of watershed protections. In the portion of the Green Mountain area that would be part of the expanded ACEC under Alternative B, but not so designated under Alternative D, an NSO stipulation would be applied. This management was not included in the RFD as a major constraint because the management was not identified until after the RFD was finalized, but the area may already be included as a major constraint because of overlapping timing limitations that exceed 6 months.

Table 2.4, "Comparative Summary of Proposed Land Use Decisions in the Lander Planning Area" (p. 45) displays the acres of mineral estate available for geothermal and other leasable minerals. Lands in the Red Canyon and Lander Slope ACECs as well as other lands throughout the planning area are closed to phosphate leasing to protect other resource values, including wildlife and viewsheds.

Additionally, 1,853,090 acres are open to mineral material disposal with surface use restrictions, while 956,011 acres are closed to mineral material disposal.

In contrast to the other alternatives, Alternative D also establishes DDAs to facilitate intensive mineral exploration, development, and production. New fluid and solid mineral leases and mineral material disposals within these areas would be subject to standard stipulations. Exceptions to these stipulations would be authorized through an expedited approval process. Reclamation would be required in accordance with reclamation standards in DDAs identified in Appendix D (p. 1477). In non-DDAs, lease stipulations are extended to identified operations and maintenance actions.

2.9.4.4. Fire and Fuels Management

Fire and fuels management under Alternative D allows for full suppression of wildland fire within the WUI and in areas of high resource values. As with alternatives A, B, and C, the appropriate response to wildland fire would be based on the circumstances under which a fire occurs and the likely consequences on firefighter and public safety and welfare, natural and cultural resources, and values to be protected. Extensive wildlife BMPs are identified, with an emphasis on greater sage-grouse as described in Appendix H (p. 1521).

Fuels and vegetation treatments are expected to be approximately 10,000 acres over 20 years, which is greater than the 6,000 acres under alternatives A and C but half of that under Alternative

B. Therefore, fire suppression costs would be expected to decrease from alternatives A and C but only half as much as under Alternative B.

2.9.4.5. Biological Resources

In some cases, the BLM manages biological resources under Alternative D similarly to Alternative A. Vegetation management supports both resources and resource uses and often requires proactive and case-by-case management to respond to conditions on the ground. For example, Alternative D authorizes clear-cuts and determines their size and location on a combination of resource values and silvicultural objectives. Forest harvesting BMPs are provided. Riparian-wetland management emphasizes a more proactive approach to address watershed health by using a full range of techniques to achieve PFC. Similar to Alternative A, Alternative D prohibits surface-disturbing activities within 500 feet of riparian-wetland areas but would allow such activity in DDAs if a lesser distance is shown to provide equal protection. Invasive species and pest management under Alternative D is the same as under Alternative B.

Fish and wildlife under Alternative D, in general, receive more protection compared to Alternative A, especially within important habitat areas. For example, the BLM prohibits surface-disturbing activities within 1 mile of bald eagle nests and ¾ mile of all active raptor nests but additionally increases the buffer to 1 mile for ferruginous hawk nests. Management also emphasizes minimizing the footprint of surface-disturbing activities to the extent practical to protect wildlife and their habitats. Protections for mule deer are stronger than under Alternative A through application of winter stipulations to winter range and migration areas. Some important mule deer habitat is identified for withdrawal from locatable mineral entry and some mule deer habitat is open to oil and gas leasing subject to NSO stipulations.

Similarly, Alternative D provides more protection for special status species than Alternative A, such as increasing the size of protective buffers and limiting incompatible activities near the habitats of these species. For example, Alternative D allows chemical vegetation treatments within identified sensitive plant populations only if the treatment benefits the population. For greater sage-grouse, constraints on resource uses are greater within Core Area than outside Core Area and restrictions are placed on the amount of surface disturbance allowed inside Core Area. Alternative D prohibits surface disturbance within 0.6 mile of greater sage-grouse leks in Core Area and recommends the leks for withdrawal from locatable mineral entry. Lands within ¼ mile of leks outside Core Area are closed to surface disturbance. BMPs are identified for evaluation at site-specific analysis to be incorporated as COAs for the protection of wildlife, with a special emphasis on greater sage-grouse. The Dubois area is closed to oil and gas leasing to protect special status species and bighorn sheep related tourism (Map 3).

Alternative D would also avoid activities that contribute sediment to waterbodies containing certain special status fish unless activities will not harm species or adequate mitigations can be applied.

Alternative D establishes scenic loops for viewing wild horses, but limits road improvements to those necessary for public safety and encourages the establishment of remote viewing opportunities. In consideration of herd health, Alternative D allows the removal or modification of fences to allow free movements among herd populations.

2.9.4.6. Heritage and Visual Resources

Alternative D generally increases the protection of cultural and paleontological resources compared to Alternative A by placing more limitations on activities near known cultural and paleontological sites. Alternative D protects the same area in the Warm Springs Canyon Flume site as Alternative A but manages mineral and realty actions in the surrounding area with more stringent Category restrictions. However, protection from development-related effects continues to be managed on a case-by-case basis as under Alternative A. Alternative D's identification of lands for withdrawal from locatable mineral entry is more protective of the cultural resources in those areas than Alternative A. Alternative D does increase proactive inventory efforts compared to Alternative A in areas of significant resources such as in the Gas Hills High potential fossil areas. Both the Beaver Rim and Bison Basin proposed NNL are managed the same as Alternative A.

The BLM manages visual resources under Alternative D in similar fashion to Alternative A, although more acreage is allocated as either VRM Class I or II under Alternative D. Over 66 percent of BLM-administered land in the planning area is managed as VRM Class III (857,979 acres) and Class IV (694,759 acres), which allow for moderate to major changes to the characteristic landscape.

2.9.4.7. Land Resources

Land resource program actions under Alternative D identify approximately 2,386,137 acres for retention within the planning area, and approximately 8,073 acres as available for disposal (plus 6,665 additional acres available for disposal with restrictions on use). Alternative D increases the lands identified for disposal based on recommendations by the public and by the BLM in response to proposed land exchanges, as well as lands to be transferred to the Department of Energy (DOE) for long-term legacy management of uranium mill sites. Alternative D places less restriction on renewable energy development compared to Alternative B, opening 224,289 acres to wind-energy development and managing 1,215,599 acres as avoidance areas and 954,322 acres as exclusion areas for wind-energy development. Alternative D recognizes that until the impacts of wind-energy development to greater sage-grouse are determined, Core Area will be closed to wind energy (although identified on maps as an avoidance area, pending research). Avoidance criteria have been identified and provided in Appendix E (p. 1483). In contrast, Alternative D places more limitations on ROW and corridor management than Alternative A, including managing much more area as ROW avoidance and exclusion areas in which ROW authorizations are restricted. More routes are designated as ROW corridors, primarily for underground ROWs such as CO_2 or oil and gas transport, and to match corridor designations in other field offices.

Alternative D provides for a more comprehensive approach to travel planning, with a particular emphasis on supporting biological resources by placing timing limitations on various modes of travel. Therefore, management is more site-specific than Alternative A and includes travel prescriptions for specific areas. For example, travel is limited to designated roads and trails in portions of the Lander Slope, Red Canyon, Whiskey Mountain, and Green Mountain areas to protect resource values. In areas not identified for site-specific management, however, travel is limited to existing roads and trails, which under Alternative D applies to more area (2,213,081 acres) than Alternative A. This is an interim designation; travel management implementation will identify routes as designated or closed to motorized travel. Alternative D closes more acres to over-snow travel than Alternative A but still allows over-snow vehicle travel on 2,323,785 acres

within the planning area so long as sufficient snow is on the ground to protect on-the-ground resources.

Alternative D increases restrictions on livestock grazing in certain areas for the protection of other resource values compared to Alternative A but also increases proactive management approaches to improve rangeland health. Alternative D opens less land to livestock grazing compared to Alternative A and increases the areas where the placement of salt and mineral supplements is prohibited. Acquired lands are available to livestock grazing on a case-by-case basis. Stocking rates would be established that allow for utilization by livestock, while providing sufficient forage to support wildlife and wild horse populations and to achieve the Wyoming Standards for Healthy Rangelands. Range infrastructure projects would be employed to improve rangeland health but only in consideration of other resource values and with a clear link to a Comprehensive Grazing Strategy. Over time, the number of AUMs authorized would be reduced if needed to meet the Wyoming Standards for Healthy Rangelands based upon monitoring information and rangeland health assessments. Vegetation treatments would rarely be utilized as range improvement projects. Fence marking for the protection of greater sage-grouse would be required and there would be no net gain in fencing in wildlife migration corridors.

Alternative D focuses more on protecting the setting and recreational experience compared to Alternative A. The alternative also places a greater emphasis on nonmotorized recreation and utilizes allowable use decisions to protect important recreation areas. Alternative D increases many of the resource use limitations within certain recreation areas compared to Alternative A to protect the values for which the area was designated. Alternative D maintains seven SRMAs and six ERMAs. Similar to Alternative B, within the Lander Valley, NHT Destination, and CDNST SRMAs, the BLM manages seven RMZs to meet specific recreation market demand. See Appendix C (p. 1453) for a detailed discussion of recreation management areas by alternative. Recreation use near the Congressionally Designated Trails would be managed to support the nature and purpose of the Congressionally Designated Trails.

2.9.4.8. Special Designations

Alternative D designates the lands associated with the landscape, recreation, and setting of the Congressionally Designated Trails as the NTMC with limitations on mineral development, ROWs, realty actions, and other resource uses to protect the nature and purpose of the Congressionally Designated Trails. This management includes the withdrawal of the ruts and swales of the NHTs; ACEC management of the Congressionally Designated Trails as provided by Alternative A would be applied if the withdrawal is not approved.

WSAs in the planning area are managed to improve access while protecting sensitive areas from resource damage. To that end, three WSAs are closed to motorized vehicle use (Dubois Badlands, Copper Mountain, and Whiskey Mountain) while the remaining WSAs are limited to designated roads and trails. Within these limited open areas, travel systems and linear features found to be in conflict with wilderness values may be modified, including closures, to protect these values.

Alternative D identifies three waterways, the Baldwin Creek Unit, Warm Springs Segment 1, and the Sweetwater River Unit, as suitable for inclusion in the NWSRS. Management of these areas is similar to Alternative A although more limitations are placed on activities that could degrade the ORVs of these waterways, including livestock grazing and motorized vehicle use.

The BLM manages eight ACECs, including six existing ACECs, two of which, East Fork and Green Mountain, include expansion areas. Alternative D would also designate the South Pass Historical Landscape ACEC and the Twin Creek ACEC, which is contained in an area identified for withdrawal from locatable mineral entry to protect important wildlife values. Should the withdrawal not be approved, the wildlife values would be protected through management of the Twin Creek ACEC; the NHTs would also be designated as an ACEC as provided in Alternative A.Table 2.5, "Comparative Summary of Areas of Critical Environmental Concern by Alternative" (p. 50) summarizes acreage and management emphasis in each of these ACECs.

Under Alternative D, the BLM manages 82,778 acres of the CDNST as an SRMA and 4,589 acres as a separate ERMA to specifically address local recreation issues. The BLM also designates trails-related land subject to mining impacts as the South Pass Historical Landscape ACEC and trails-related land outside this ACEC as the NTMC associated with the Congressionally Designated Trails. The NTMC is managed as VRM Class II while the designated utility crossings and the CDNST ERMA are VRM Class III. Highly visible projects outside of 5 miles of the NTMC (except within the main Lost Creek utility corridor) are authorized only if the project causes no more than a weak contrast.

Alternative D provides special management for those areas identified as having relevant and important values but not designated as ACECs.

2.9.4.9. Socioeconomic Resources

BLM management under Alternative D emphasizes the continued analysis of impacts on socioeconomic resources and addresses monitoring of economic and social impacts as part of implementation. This alternative would also consider paced development options for mineral development projects in the planning area to avoid adverse impacts to socioeconomic resources. This alternative manages high potential mineral areas to facilitate mineral development and emphasizes recreation as well as heritage and wildlife tourism. Alternative D applies protective measures to important wildlife habitat areas, including those for mule deer, to proactively address potential adverse impacts from mineral development, which, if not properly addressed, could lead to the need for resource protections that could have far more substantial impacts on social and economic interests.

Alternative D emphasizes protections for the areas on the Lander Front and in the Dubois area that are important to the local economies for their visual, recreation, and wildlife values as well as for their importance for recreation and tourism income. The NTMC is managed to support the nature and purposes of the Congressionally Designated Trails and their recreational use. Trail protections are limited to those areas needed for the nature and purpose of the Congressionally Designated Trails and not applied to lands not so needed to avoid unnecessary use limitations.

The economic well-being of the planning area and adjoining communities has been addressed through the designation of ROW corridors, particularly the pipelines necessary to support enhanced oil and gas recovery and the transmission of product. Alternative D applies avoidance management and avoidance criteria so that identified needs for additional ROWs can be accommodated without the need for a plan amendment. A suite of BMPs are provided (with new ones being developed over time) from which site-specific COAs can be applied, thus avoiding overly broad regulations. Application of seasonal restrictions on oil and gas operations will be routinely waived in DDAs to facilitate year-round development. While seasonal restrictions are applied to operations and maintenance activities outside of DDAs, these do not apply in the case

of emergency needs or if a threat to health and human safety exist. These seasonal limitations may be waived by the Authorized Officer based on identified waiver criteria.

2.10. Detailed Description of Alternatives by Resource

Two components comprise this section. Table 2.6, "Category Restrictions Key" (p. 73) provides a key to the numbered category restrictions used in the alternatives. To streamline language associated with restrictions for mineral and realty actions (e.g., locatable mineral withdrawals, NSO restrictions, areas closed to phosphate, ROW avoidance and exclusion areas), the alternatives use a numbered category system to describe restrictions for a given area. The category restriction for a given area applies to all mineral and realty actions described in the key.

Tables 2.7 through 2.52 identify goals and objectives, management actions common to all alternatives, and management actions by alternative for each resource. Tables 2.7 through 2.52 are arranged according to the following eight resource topics:

Number	Resource Topic
1000	Physical Resources (PR)
2000	Mineral Resources (MR)
3000	Fire and Fuels Management (FM)
4000	Biological Resources (BR)
5000	Heritage and Visual Resources (HR)
6000	Land Resources (LR)
7000	Special Designations (SD)
8000	Socioeconomic Resources (SR)

The numbering system and abbreviations for each of the eight resource topics appear as headings and serve to organize Tables 2.7 through 2.52. Following the headings are the applicable goals and objectives for each resource topic. The goals and objectives in Tables 2.7 through 2.52 apply to all four alternatives under consideration for the entire planning area and would apply for the life of the RMP.

Management actions are anticipated to achieve the goals and objectives identified for each resource topic. Some management actions are constant across all alternatives and are listed for each resource topic under the Management Actions Common to All Alternatives sections. Other management actions vary by alternative and are identified in the Management Actions by Alternative sections.

Actions apply for the life of the RMP, but can be changed by amending the RMP. For example, areas identified as closed to mineral leasing refer to federal mineral estate closed from leasing for the life of the RMP unless changed through an RMP amendment. Furthermore, where seasonal or other restrictions or limitations apply to development, the Authorized Officer may issue written exceptions, waivers, or modifications, including documented supporting analysis, to these limitations (Appendix E (p. 1483)); this applies to all restrictions and limitations.

The maps provided with this document are for illustrative purposes only and may not accurately reflect all decisions due to the size of the resource area; details can be obscured or not readily apparent, or the size may appear larger on the maps so that the feature stands out when depicted on such a broad scale. The management actions that make up the Proposed RMP are in all cases the decision and not modified by the manner in which the decision is displayed on the maps.

Table 2.6. Category Restrictions Key

Restriction Category	Mineral Resources Actions				Realty Actions			
	Oil and gas, Geothermal, and Other Fluid Leasable Minerals	**Phosphate**	**Locatable Minerals**	**Mineral Materials (Salables)**	**Wind Energy**	**Major Utility Systems**	**Miscellaneous projects, including minor ROWs**	**Large developments (e.g., power plants)**
Category 1	**Open** with standard lease stipulations	**Open** with standard stipulations	**Open** subject to CFR 3809	**Open** with standard stipulations	**Open** with standard stipulations	**Open** with standard stipulations	**Open** with standard stipulations	**Open** with standard stipulations
Category 2	**Open** with seasonal and/or CSU restrictions	**Open** with seasonal and/or CSU restrictions	**Open** subject to CFR 3809	**Open** with seasonal and/or CSU restrictions	**Open** with seasonal and/or CSU restrictions	**Open** with seasonal and/or CSU restrictions	**Open** with seasonal and/or CSU restrictions	**Open** with seasonal and/or CSU restrictions
Category 3	**Open** with NSO	**Open**	**Open** subject to CFR 3809	**Closed**	**Avoided**	**Avoided**	**Avoided**	**Avoided**
Category 4	**Open** with NSO	**Closed**	**Open** subject to CFR 3809	**Closed**	**Excluded**	**Excluded**	**Excluded**	**Excluded**
Category 5	**Open** with NSO	**Closed**	**Pursue withdrawal**	**Closed**	**Excluded**	**Excluded**	**Excluded**	**Excluded**
Category 6	**Closed** to leasing	**Closed**	**Pursue withdrawal**	**Closed**	**Excluded**	**Excluded**	**Excluded**	**Excluded**

CFR Code of Federal Regulations
CSU Controlled Surface Use
NSO No Surface Occupancy
ROW right-of-way

Table 2.7. Detailed Alternative Descriptions by Resource

MANAGEMENT GOALS COMMON TO ALL RESOURCES AND ALTERNATIVES					
Record #	**Goal/Obj.**	**Alternative A (Current Management)**	**Alternative B (Most Resource Conservation)**	**Alternative C (Most Resource Utilization)**	**Alternative D (Proposed RMP)**
The BLM Lander Field Office will:					
GOAL Common: 1 Manage the public lands within the requirements of all applicable federal and state laws, policy, and guidance. Manage to support valid and existing rights.					
GOAL Common: 2 Use cooperative consultation with all applicable state and local governments to aid in effective cross-jurisdictional management of land and resources.					
GOAL Common: 3 Manage public land resources and resource uses in consideration of all other resource values of the applicable lands.					
GOAL Common: 4 Manage public land resources within the natural variations and capability of the applicable lands.					
GOAL Common: 5 Require onsite mitigation and encourage voluntary offsite mitigation to offset the adverse impacts of projects or actions. Do not use offsite mitigation to justify unnecessary or undue onsite degradation.					
GOAL Common: 6 Manage vegetation, soil, landform, water quantity and quality, and air quality to maintain, meet, make substantial progress towards or exceed the Wyoming Standards for Healthy Rangelands.					
GOAL Common: 7 Use an integrated management approach (mechanical, chemical, or biological treatments, prescribed fire, or grazing management techniques) to achieve desired vegetative communities, to reduce fuel loading and to control invasive species. Implementing management actions consistent with Partners Against Weeds and state and local weed management plans.					
GOAL Common: 8 Co-locate ROWs whenever possible.					
GOAL Common: 9 Conduct appropriate project level NEPA analysis and make consideration for levels of analyzed impacts.					
GOAL Common: 10 Manage resources to contribute to the economic stability of local communities.					

Table 2.8. 1000 Physical Resources (PR) – Air Quality

1000 PHYSICAL RESOURCES (PR) – AIR QUALITY					
Record #	**Goal/Obj.**	**Alternative A (Current Management)**	**Alternative B (Most Resource Conservation)**	**Alternative C (Most Resource Utilization)**	**Alternative D (Proposed RMP)**
Goal PR: 1 Minimize the impact of management actions in the planning area on air quality by complying with all applicable air quality laws, rules, and regulations. **Objectives:** **PR: 1.1** Maintain concentrations of criteria pollutants in compliance with applicable state and federal Ambient Air Quality Standards within the scope of BLM's authority. **PR: 1.2** Maintain concentrations of PSD pollutants associated with management actions in compliance with the applicable increment. **Goal PR: 2** Implement management actions in the planning area to improve air quality as practicable. **Objectives:** **PR: 2.1** Reduce visibility-impairing pollutants in accordance with the reasonable progress goals and timeframes established within the State of Wyoming's Regional Haze State Implementation Plan. **PR: 2.2** Reduce atmospheric deposition pollutants to levels below generally accepted levels of concern and levels of acceptable change.					
MANAGEMENT ACTIONS COMMON TO ALL ALTERNATIVES					
1001	PR: 1.1, 1.2	Work cooperatively with agencies and stakeholders to develop an Air Quality Assessment Protocol to estimate potential future air quality.			
1002	PR: 1.1, 2.1	Define a criteria pollutant and AQRV monitoring strategy and work cooperatively to establish a monitoring network by creating a method for siting air quality monitors in order to provide additional data for describing background concentrations.			
1003	PR: 1.1, 1.2, 2.1, 2.2	Require Best Management Practices to meet air quality goals.			
1004	PR: 2.1	Require dust abatement measures for all BLM-authorized activities. Mandate dust abatement control techniques in identified problem areas.			
1005	PR: 1	In cooperation with the Wyoming DEQ AQD, ensure that the BLM's prescribed fire actions comply with applicable smoke-management regulations.			
1006	PR: 2.1, 1.1	Utilize and enhance a cooperative process to share information on proposed emission sources and air quality issues with the public and federal, state, and county agencies.			
1007	PR: 1, 2	In all project-level EISs and EAs, on a case-by-base basis in accordance with the Lander Air Resources Management Plan (Appendix F (p. 1491)), require quantitative air quality modeling of industrial activities in order to determine the potential impacts of proposed emission sources and subsequent potential mitigation strategies.			

1000 PHYSICAL RESOURCES (PR) – AIR QUALITY					
Record #	**Goal/Obj.**	**Alternative A (Current Management)**	**Alternative B (Most Resource Conservation)**	**Alternative C (Most Resource Utilization)**	**Alternative D (Proposed RMP)**
MANAGEMENT ACTIONS BY ALTERNATIVE					
1008	PR: 1, 1.1, 1.2	Require that all BLM-authorized activities minimize adverse impacts to air quality. Allow air quality impacts up to applicable standards and guidelines.	Same as Alternative A, plus in cooperation with Wyoming DEQ, implement prevention and mitigation measures to reduce emissions in the planning area from current levels and to improve air quality.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.

Table 2.9. 1000 Physical Resources (PR) – Soil

1000 PHYSICAL RESOURCES (PR) – SOIL					
Record #	**Goal/Obj.**	**Alternative A (Current Management)**	**Alternative B (Most Resource Conservation)**	**Alternative C (Most Resource Utilization)**	**Alternative D (Proposed RMP)**
Goal PR: 3 Prevent impairment of soil productivity from accelerated loss, physical or chemical degradation of the soil resource, or surface disturbance. **Objectives:** **PR: 3.1** Develop, test, and apply soil interpretations to guide the use and management of soils and related resources. **PR: 3.2** Collect and maintain soil resource information at a level of detail consistent with management needs and in accordance with the National Cooperative Soil Survey program and the BLM Wyoming Strategic Soil Survey Plan, which details criteria that determine funding priority for areas needing soil survey information. **PR: 3.3** Manage to minimize degradation of soils. Consider prevention of soil degradation when authorizing activities. **PR: 3.4** Manage soil to achieve stability and to support the hydrologic cycle by providing for water capture, storage, and sustained release. **Goal PR: 4** Ensure that management actions are consistent with inherent soil resource capabilities. **Objective:** **PR: 4.1** Require that management actions and BLM-authorized activities consider soil suitability and limitations for the proposed use in the planning and design stages.					
MANAGEMENT ACTIONS COMMON TO ALL ALTERNATIVES					
N/A	N/A	Note: Reclamation goals, objectives, and alternatives are found below under the Soil Reclamation section. Management actions for oil and gas produced water are in the Leasable-Oil and Gas section. See Record 4011 for limits of slope related to timber harvest methods.			
1009	PR: 3.1, 3.2	Pursue and support the completion of Order 3 soil surveys and identify areas with LRP.			
1010	PR: 3.1, 4.1	Develop/adopt a soil interpretation for soil rehabilitation potential. Consider soil suitability for proposed use and soil rehabilitation at the planning and design phase of all BLM-authorized activities.			
1011	PR: 3.3	Prohibit surface-disturbing activities during periods when soil material is saturated or times when watershed damage is likely to occur. Surface-disturbing activities during periods when soil is frozen will be evaluated on a site-specific project level. The proposed activities will be analyzed to determine the impacts to the soil and plant resources and compare these impacts on frozen soil versus non-frozen soil.			
1012	PR: 3.3	Require a very detailed site analysis and reclamation plan before development if soil in LRP areas (Map 11) will be disturbed.			
MANAGEMENT ACTIONS BY ALTERNATIVE					

1000 PHYSICAL RESOURCES (PR) – SOIL					
Record #	**Goal/Obj.**	**Alternative A (Current Management)**	**Alternative B (Most Resource Conservation)**	**Alternative C (Most Resource Utilization)**	**Alternative D (Proposed RMP)**
1013	PR: 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 4.1	Authorize soil-disturbing activities in areas with LRP soils (Map 11). Mineral and realty actions in these areas are managed with Category 2 restrictions.	Prohibit soil-disturbing activities in areas with LRP (Map 11). Mineral and realty actions in these areas are managed with Category 6 restrictions.	Same as Alternative A.	Soil-disturbing activities will be open with CSU restrictions in areas with LRP soils. Avoidance of LRP soils will be implemented on site-specific locations whenever possible, but is not a requirement.
1014	PR: 3.3, 3.4, 4.1	Prohibit surface-disturbing activities on slopes greater than 25 percent (Map 10) unless an exception, waiver, or modification is granted by the Authorized Officer.	Prohibit surface-disturbing activities on slopes greater than 15 percent (Map 10) unless an exception, waiver, or modification is granted by the Authorized Officer.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A, plus manage slopes between 15 and 24 percent with CSU restrictions.

Table 2.10. 1000 Physical Resources (PR) – Soil Reclamation

1000 PHYSICAL RESOURCES (PR) – SOIL RECLAMATION					
Record #	**Goal/Obj.**	**Alternative A (Current Management)**	**Alternative B (Most Resource Conservation)**	**Alternative C (Most Resource Utilization)**	**Alternative D (Proposed RMP)**
Goal PR: 5 Require successful reclamation of surface-disturbing activities to restore healthy, functioning plant communities and watershed function. **Objectives:** **PR: 5.1** Revegetate to stabilize surface soils, establish natural plant composition and self-perpetuating plant communities capable of supporting the post-disturbance land use. **PR: 5.2** Develop interim, and final reclamation standards appropriate for resource and resource use enhancement on a project-specific basis.					
MANAGEMENT ACTIONS COMMON TO ALL ALTERNATIVES					
1015	PR: 5.1, 5.2	Implement BLM National and Wyoming Reclamation Policies requiring reclamation plans be developed for all federal actions authorized, conducted, or funded by the BLM that disturb vegetation and/or the mineral/soil resources. For future actions, require a full reclamation bond specific to the site in accordance with 43 CFR 3104.2, 3104.3, and 3104.5. Ensure bonds are sufficient for costs relative to reclamation (Connelly et al. 2000, Hagen et al. 2007) that would result in full restoration of the lands to their condition before disturbance. Base the reclamation costs on the assumption that contractors for the BLM will perform the work.			
1016	PR: 5.1, 5.2	Require that surface-disturbing activities minimize the surface disturbance footprint to the maximum extent possible to limit the areas requiring reclamation. Limit disturbance of desirable vegetative communities established during interim reclamation when implementing final reclamation.			
1017	PR: 5.1, 5.2	Require that all reclamation plans identify the desired plant community for final reclamation.			
1018	PR: 5.1, 5.2	Consider wildlife habitat objectives in all final reclamation objectives. In Core Area, final reclamation objectives will be to restore greater sage-grouse habitat. Include metrics to ensure that restoration goals are met.			
1019	PR: 3.3, 3.4, 4.1	Require site stabilization and sediment control in compliance with Wyoming Stormwater Discharge requirements and BLM reclamation policies.			
MANAGEMENT ACTIONS BY ALTERNATIVE					

1000 PHYSICAL RESOURCES (PR) – SOIL RECLAMATION					
Record #	**Goal/Obj.**	**Alternative A (Current Management)**	**Alternative B (Most Resource Conservation)**	**Alternative C (Most Resource Utilization)**	**Alternative D (Proposed RMP)**
1020	PR: 5.1, 5.2	Soil management and reclamation practices will be identified based on site-specific characteristics and implemented according to BLM reclamation policies.	Same as Alternative A, plus require that site-specific interim and final reclamation practices be developed in accordance with reclamation policies that will meet the non-DDA reclamation standards as identified in Appendix D (p. 1477).	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A, plus require that site-specific interim and final reclamation practices be developed in accordance with national and Wyoming reclamation policies that will meet the reclamation standards as identified in Appendix D (p. 1477). The type and detail of the reclamation plan will be commensurate with the extent and duration of soil disturbance. For extensive disturbance such as a full-field oil and gas development, a detailed, multi-phase plan such as the Continental Divide Creston oil and gas project (CDC) reclamation plan attached as Appendix G (p. 1505) will be required. (Note: The CDC oil and gas reclamation plan is offered as an example of the type of detailed plan that would be required. It is not considered to be a final plan, but only an example.)

1000 PHYSICAL RESOURCES (PR) – SOIL RECLAMATION					
Record #	**Goal/Obj.**	**Alternative A (Current Management)**	**Alternative B (Most Resource Conservation)**	**Alternative C (Most Resource Utilization)**	**Alternative D (Proposed RMP)**
1021	PR: 5.2	Require that during and following reclamation activities, the land user is responsible for monitoring to help ensure reclamation success as defined in reclamation policies. Require follow-up seeding and/or other corrective or remedial erosion-control measures on areas of surface disturbance, as appropriate. During and following reclamation activities the land user is responsible for monitoring and, if necessary, protecting the reclaimed landscape until reclamation standards have been achieved.	Same as Alternative A, plus monitoring and follow-up reclamation practices will continue on interim and final reclaimed areas until the standards for non-DDA areas as identified in Appendix D (p. 1477) have been successfully achieved.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A, plus monitoring and follow-up reclamation practices will continue on interim and final reclaimed areas until the standards identified in Appendix D (p. 1477) have been successfully achieved.
1022	PR: 5	Identify areas with soil disturbance that have not been successfully reclaimed in accordance with reclamation policies, as opportunities occur.	Inventory BLM-administered lands to identify areas with soil disturbance that have not been successfully reclaimed. Prioritize reclamation projects in consideration of impacts to water quality, wildlife habitat, and visual resources. Utilize inventory if offsite mitigation is being considered. Require reclamation in accordance with reclamation policies and the non-DDA reclamation standards as identified in Appendix D (p. 1477).	Same as Alternative A.	Identify areas with soil disturbance that were not successfully reclaimed. Priorities are determined on a case-by-case basis with an emphasis on greater sage-grouse Core Area and other important wildlife habitat. Require reclamation in accordance with reclamation policies and reclamation standards as identified in Appendix D (p. 1477). Develop partnerships and funding sources to implement reclamation where no responsible party has the reclamation obligation.

1000 PHYSICAL RESOURCES (PR) – SOIL RECLAMATION					
Record #	**Goal/Obj.**	**Alternative A (Current Management)**	**Alternative B (Most Resource Conservation)**	**Alternative C (Most Resource Utilization)**	**Alternative D (Proposed RMP)**
1023	PR: 5	Adapt reclamation methods to specific requirements based on plant communities within potential ecological sites and site-specific objectives.	Focus reclamation practices on restoring surface-disturbing activities to an ecological condition equal to or better than predisturbance composition and production levels based on habitat objectives. Require reclaimed areas to meet non-DDA reclamation standards identified in Appendix D (p. 1477) or restore to habitat objectives, whichever requires a higher level of standards to meet final reclamation success.	Focus reclamation on stabilizing soils and establishing ground cover sufficient to reduce and/or prevent accelerated soil erosion and noxious weed infestation.	Same as Alternative A, plus incorporate reclamation objectives and require reclamation plans, including reclamation standards as identified in Appendix D (p. 1477) on a site-specific basis.
1024	PR: 5	Utilize management practices to achieve reclamation standards as defined in BLM reclamation policies and implement project-specific reclamation practices.	Utilize management practices that achieve reclamation objectives and standards for non-DDA, select management practices based on restoring the site potential, and emphasize plant communities that are habitat compatible (see Appendix D (p. 1477)).	Utilize management practices that achieve site-specific reclamation objectives specific to site stabilization. Select management practices based on the ability to establish ground cover for erosion control purposes.	Utilize management practices including phased development recognized in Appendix H (p. 1521) and required BLM reclamation policies to achieve reclamation success. Require Reclamation Objectives and Standards as identified in Appendix D (p. 1477) in all reclamation plans.
1025	PR: 5	Reclamation management practices will select native plant species based on site characteristics and ecological site descriptions.	Reclamation management practices will select and emphasize native plant species conducive to the site potential and habitat compatibility and require reclaimed areas to meet non-DDA reclamation standards identified in Appendix D (p. 1477).	Reclamation management practices would utilize native and approved nonnative plant species to achieve reclamation objectives.	Same as Alternative A, plus reclamation success will be determined based on the criteria and standards identified in Appendix D (p. 1477).

Table 2.11. 1000 Physical Resources (PR) – Water

1000 PHYSICAL RESOURCES (PR) – WATER					
Record #	**Goal/Obj.**	**Alternative A (Current Management)**	**Alternative B (Most Resource Conservation)**	**Alternative C (Most Resource Utilization)**	**Alternative D (Proposed RMP)**
Goal PR: 6 Maintain or improve surface water and groundwater quantity and quality consistent with applicable state and federal standards and regulations. **Objectives:** **PR: 6.1** Take appropriate actions to protect all Wyoming surface water designated uses including but not limited to fisheries, aquatic life, drinking water supplies, recreation, and agriculture, and to control all potential causes of impairment. **PR: 6.2** Maintain the physical, chemical, and biological integrity of surface waters in accordance with Standards 2 and 5 of the Wyoming Standards for Healthy Rangelands. **PR: 6.3** Enhance the physical, chemical, and biological integrity of surface waters that are functioning below PFC. **PR: 6.4** Protect Class 1 waters (Outstanding Surface Waters) as determined by the State of Wyoming. (See Wild and Scenic Rivers section in Special Designations for additional actions). **PR: 6.5** Restore, maintain, and enhance watershed, wetland, and riparian functions. **PR: 6.6** Protect and improve groundwater quality and quantity through appropriate measures (e.g., predictive modeling, monitoring, and protection of known water recharge areas) during BLM activities and permitted actions over the life of the plan. **PR: 6.7** Coordinate with appropriate entities to rehabilitate or reclaim functionally compromised reservoirs on BLM-administered lands. **PR: 6.8** Minimize degradation of surface water and groundwater resources. Require the treatment of surface water and groundwater that has been impacted by spills or other releases of chemicals, petroleum products, and produced water on BLM-administered lands. Require compliance with Wyoming DEQ requirements for reporting and treating of spills and releases of chemicals, petroleum products, and produced water.				
MANAGEMENT ACTIONS COMMON TO ALL ALTERNATIVES					
1026	PR: 6.6, 6.7, 6.8	Identify potential surface and groundwater quality impairments through inventories and routine monitoring activities and report potential impairments to Wyoming DEQ.			
1027	PR: 6.1, 6.2, 6.6	Require the use of Best Management Practices and mitigation applied as COAs to reduce point and nonpoint source pollution and to limit groundwater contamination.			
1028	PR: 6.1, 6.6, 6.7	Control nonpoint source pollution by improving riparian-wetland health and by controlling dust, accelerated erosion, and other surface disturbances.			
1029	PR: 6.1, 6.3, 6.5, 6.6, 6.7, 6.8	Participate in the development, implementation, and monitoring of watershed management plans and/or TMDLs with interested stakeholders including the Wyoming DEQ to improve water quality.			

1000 PHYSICAL RESOURCES (PR) – WATER					
Record #	**Goal/Obj.**	**Alternative A (Current Management)**	**Alternative B (Most Resource Conservation)**	**Alternative C (Most Resource Utilization)**	**Alternative D (Proposed RMP)**
1030	PR: 6.1, 6.3, 6.5, 6.6, 6.7, 6.8	Incorporate requirements and methodology for achieving watershed improvement into activity plans, as the BLM deems appropriate, on BLM-administered lands.			
1031	PR: 6.1, 6.4	Control sources of pollution to Class 1 waters. Collaborate with the Wyoming DEQ to prevent water quality degradation of Class 1 waters (Map 6).			
1032	PR: 6.3	Prioritize management to improve water quality of waters listed on the current CWA 303(d) list or which do not meet Standards 2 or 5 of the Wyoming Standards for Healthy Rangelands.			
1033	PR: 6.1, 6.2, 6.6	Enter into agreements with state and local governments as they develop source water and wellhead protection plans that detail specific provisions to protect drinking water sources and the quality of surface and groundwater. Consider impacts to domestic water supplies in treating invasive species.			
1034	PR: 6.2, 6.5	Avoid the authorization of activities likely to cause accelerated channel erosion and adverse adjustments in channel geometry (dimension, pattern, or profile).			
1035	PR: 6.3, 6.7, 6.8	Take actions to improve the biological, chemical, and geomorphic conditions of streams and riparian-wetland areas adversely impacted by BLM-authorized activities or by activities upstream of BLM-administered lands.			
1036	PR: 6.1, 6.2, 6.3, 6.4, 6.6, 6.8	Integrate soil, groundwater, and surface water management to maintain or improve groundwater and surface water quality. Evaluate the need to require groundwater monitoring as part of site-specific NEPA analysis.			
1037	PR: 6.1, 6.4	Manage BLM-administered lands to support in-stream flow designations.			
1038	PR: 6.6	Develop and implement integrated pest management to control and eradicate invasive species in consideration of impacts to domestic water supplies.			
1039	PR: 6.1	Develop and implement watershed management plans as necessary and cooperate with existing and ongoing watershed management initiatives started by other stakeholders.			
1040	PR: 6.1	Partner with the Wyoming DEQ in protecting groundwater quality and quantity through monitoring plans and implementing these with the support of project proponents.			
1041	PR: 6.6	Inventory reservoirs and assess condition and suitability of design to limit mosquito breeding. Identify functionally compromised reservoirs and partner with interested entities to rehabilitate or reclaim compromised reservoirs. Prioritize reservoirs in consideration of potential for failure, impacts to water quality, and importance for wild horses, wildlife, and livestock grazing. Utilize prioritization when identifying opportunities for offsite mitigations.			
1042	PR: 6.1	Enforce measures to limit degradation of water quality such as avoiding disturbance of soils with high erosion potential, implementing zero runoff programs on large-scale surface-disturbing activities, requiring bonding for site reclamation, and reclaiming abandoned surface disturbances.			
1043	PR: 6.2, 6.5, 6.6, 6.8	For all projects, require the testing of precipitated solids where the BLM has documented the possibility of contamination. Require the removal of contaminated solids when identified.			
MANAGEMENT ACTIONS BY ALTERNATIVE					

1000 PHYSICAL RESOURCES (PR) – WATER					
Record #	**Goal/Obj.**	**Alternative A (Current Management)**	**Alternative B (Most Resource Conservation)**	**Alternative C (Most Resource Utilization)**	**Alternative D (Proposed RMP)**
1044	PR: 6.1, 6.2, 6.3	On a case-by-case basis, prohibit or avoid surface-disturbing activities in groundwater recharge areas to prevent contamination. Mineral and realty actions in these areas are managed with Category 1 restrictions.	Prioritize the identification of Sole Source Aquifers, Wyoming DEQ Water Zones 1-3 and groundwater recharge areas. Avoid surface-disturbing activities with potential to contaminate groundwater in identified or inferred groundwater recharge areas. Mineral and realty actions in areas underlain by an identified Sole Source Aquifer are managed with Category 3 restrictions.	Allow surface-disturbing activities in known or inferred groundwater recharge areas, but implement Best Management Practices to prevent contamination.	Same as Alternative B, except that Wyoming DEQ Water Zones 1-3 are managed with controlled surface use.
1045	PR: 6.6	Restrictions on pesticide use in aquifer recharge areas are limited to label instructions.	Prohibit pesticide use in known or inferred aquifer recharge areas (as formally designated) and any areas underlain by a Sole Source Aquifer or Wellhead Protection Area.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative B.
1046	PR: 6.1, 6.2, 6.3, 6.8	In cooperation with stakeholders, implement management actions to prevent degradation of ground and surface water quality on a case-by-case basis, utilizing existing watershed plans where possible.	Implement management actions on a watershed basis to prevent degradation of ground and surface water and to improve water quality, utilizing existing watershed plans where possible.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A, plus require project-level NEPA analyses for oil and gas development with project-specific comprehensive groundwater monitoring plans and programs to track potential groundwater impacts as drilling and productions occur. The level of monitoring will depend on the size of the proposed project, the groundwater vulnerability, the target zone of operations, and other site-specific factors.
1047	PR: 6.1, 6.2, 6.5, 6.8	Permanent facilities in floodplains and riparian-wetland areas (Map 5) are managed with Category 4 restrictions, except to benefit watershed health or vegetation.	Permanent facilities, including road crossings, in floodplains and riparian-wetland areas are managed with Category 6 restrictions (Map 5).	Allow new permanent facilities in floodplains and riparian-wetland areas, provided there are no practicable alternatives and sufficient mitigation is	Do not authorize permanent facilities including roads in 100-year floodplains (where mapped) and riparian-wetland areas (Map 5) except to benefit

1000 PHYSICAL RESOURCES (PR) – WATER					
Record #	**Goal/Obj.**	**Alternative A (Current Management)**	**Alternative B (Most Resource Conservation)**	**Alternative C (Most Resource Utilization)**	**Alternative D (Proposed RMP)**
		Linear watercourse crossings are considered on a case-by-case basis.	All linear underground facilities crossing watercourses are bored to avoid riparian-wetland area disturbance.	undertaken so that the action will meet the requirements of Executive Orders 11988 and 11990, wetland protections afforded under the CWA, and federal and state water quality actions. Linear watercourse crossings are considered on a case-by-case basis.	watershed health or vegetation. Linear watercourse crossings are considered on a case-by-case basis and authorized only with mitigation such as crossing at right angles or temporary bridges.

Table 2.12. 1000 Physical Resources (PR) – Cave and Karst Resources

1000 PHYSICAL RESOURCES (PR) – CAVE AND KARST RESOURCES					
Record #	**Goal/Obj.**	**Alternative A (Current Management)**	**Alternative B (Most Resource Conservation)**	**Alternative C (Most Resource Utilization)**	**Alternative D (Proposed RMP)**
Goal PR: 7 Conserve significant cave and karst resources. **Objective:** **PR: 7.1** Identify and inventory caves and karst resources and determine if they meet the significance criteria of 43 CFR 37.11(c).					
MANAGEMENT ACTIONS COMMON TO ALL ALTERNATIVES					
1048	PR: 7.1	As cave or karst resources are identified, develop site-specific management prescriptions to protect significant cave and karst resources, such as managing the resource as an SRMA.			
MANAGEMENT ACTIONS BY ALTERNATIVE					
N/A	N/A	There are no management actions by alternative identified for cave and karst resources.			

Table 2.13. 1000 Physical Resources (PR) – Lands with Wilderness Characteristics

1000 PHYSICAL RESOURCES (PR) – LANDS WITH WILDERNESS CHARACTERISTICS					
Record #	**Goal/Obj.**	**Alternative A (Current Management)**	**Alternative B (Most Resource Conservation)**	**Alternative C (Most Resource Utilization)**	**Alternative D (Proposed RMP)**
Goal PR: 8 Maintain existing wilderness characteristics associated within identified areas (outside of WSAs) found to contain wilderness characteristics. **Objective:** **PR: 8.1** Maintain wilderness characteristics in areas managed as non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics.					
MANAGEMENT ACTIONS BY ALTERNATIVE					
1049	PR: 8.1	Lands with wilderness characteristics are not specially managed to protect wilderness values. Portions of the area identified as the Little Red Creek Complex are contained within the Whiskey Mountain ACEC and managed in accordance with the ACEC prescriptions (Map 12).	The following areas will be managed as non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics to protect wilderness values: • Little Red Creek Complex including Red Creek and Torrey Rim, (5,490 acres) (Map 13).	Do not separately manage areas as non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics to protect wilderness values.	The following areas will be managed as non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics to protect wilderness values: • Little Red Creek Complex including Red Creek and portions of Torrey Rim (4,954 acres) (Map 14).
1050	PR: 8.1	Travel management actions for the Whiskey Mountain ACEC portion of the Little Red Creek Complex are in the Special Designations section. Limit motorized travel in the non-ACEC portion of the Little Red Creek Complex to existing roads and trails.	Close the Little Red Creek Complex to motorized and mechanized travel.	Same as Alternative A.	Close the Little Red Creek Complex to motorized travel and limit mechanized travel to designated routes. Closures will be located at strategic locations on BLM-administered lands, motorized travel will be allowed on some roads up to the identified closure points.
1051	PR: 8.1	No similar action.	Manage recreational use in the Little Red Creek Complex to maintain wilderness characteristics.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative B.
1052	PR: 8.1	No similar action.	Work with partners, cooperators, tribal groups, and willing landowners to pursue foot and horseback access to the Little Red Creek Complex and the adjacent Fitzpatrick Wilderness Area (Map 13).	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative B.

Table 2.14. 2000 Mineral Resources (MR)

2000 MINERAL RESOURCES (MR)					
Record #	**Goal/Obj.**	**Alternative A (Current Management)**	**Alternative B (Most Resource Conservation)**	**Alternative C (Most Resource Utilization)**	**Alternative D (Proposed RMP)**
Goal MR: 1 Develop available federal mineral estate. **Objectives:** **MR: 1.1** Provide opportunities to explore for, permit, and sell mineral materials. **MR: 1.2** Provide opportunities for mining claimants to explore for and develop locatable minerals. **MR: 1.3** Provide opportunities for the exploration and development of solid and fluid leasable minerals. **Goal MR: 2** Support the use of mineral resources to meet domestic demand. **Goal MR: 3** Provide protections for resource values in areas of conflict with mineral exploration and development. **Objectives:** **MR: 3.1** Manage oil and gas operations in the Beaver Rim MLP area (150,782 acres) to prevent degradation of visual and geological resources, sensitive soils, Native American or culturally significant sites, unique vegetation communities, wild horse migration routes, and headwaters of Platte River (Map 132). **MR: 3.2** Prevent degradation of headwaters of the Sweetwater River occurring in the Beaver Rim MLP area. **MR: 3.3** Protect the visual setting of Native American sites in the Beaver Rim MLP area. **MR: 3.4** Protect paleontological resources in the Beaver Rim MLP area. **MR: 3.5** Protect the free range and genetic diversity of wild horses in the Beaver Rim MLP area. Improve opportunities for public viewing of wild horses. **MR: 3.6** Protect unique plant communities in the Beaver Rim MLP area.				
MANAGEMENT ACTIONS COMMON TO ALL ALTERNATIVES					
2001	MR: 1.3	Require a Land Use Plan amendment before leasing coal or oil shale-tar sands.			
2002	MR: 1.3	Incorporate proponent committed or BLM Required Design Features or mitigation such as BMPs as COAs for any authorized mineral activity for federal minerals, regardless of surface ownership. In project-level EISs and EAs, require, on a case-by-case basis, the development of a wildlife resource monitoring and mitigation plan to address potential impacts from mineral development on wildlife populations and/or habitat.			

2000 MINERAL RESOURCES (MR)					
Record #	**Goal/Obj.**	**Alternative A (Current Management)**	**Alternative B (Most Resource Conservation)**	**Alternative C (Most Resource Utilization)**	**Alternative D (Proposed RMP)**
2003	MR: 1.3	Areas within the NLCS are closed to geothermal energy development. Additional management for NLCS lands provided below under Special Designations. These areas include: • WSAs (55,338 acres) (Map 128) • CDNST (Map 121) • NHTs (Map 123) • NWSRS-eligible waterway segments (9,919 acres) (Map 129)			
2004	MR: 1.3	All oil and gas and other mineral leases are subject to standard lease stipulations; additional stipulations may apply in some areas. Require unitization when deemed necessary for proper development and operation of an area or to facilitate more orderly (e.g., phased and/or clustered) development as a means of minimizing adverse impacts to resources, including greater sage-grouse, so long as the unitization plan adequately protects the rights of all parties, including the United States. In areas that are closed to mineral leasing (Category 6 restrictions), do not re-offer existing leases when they expire. If drainage occurs in an area closed to oil and gas leasing, authorize leasing on a case-by-case basis with Category 4 restrictions. Identified areas with *Yermo xanthocephalus* ("Yermo") are NSO for oil and gas leasing. The locatable mineral withdrawal for Yermo critical habitat will be extended. When conducting site-specific NEPA analysis of a proposed action in Core Area, closely examine the applicability of categorical exclusions. If extraordinary circumstances review is applicable, determine whether those circumstances exist.			
2005	MR: 1.3	Encourage geophysical operators to share scientific information in order to minimize surface impacts.			
2006	MR: 1.3	Identify areas disturbed by expired mineral material sales including free-use permits and community use pits. Prioritize reclamation of these sites, starting with those in Core Area where restoration as long-term greater sage-grouse habitat is possible. Next in priority are those in riparian-wetland areas, ACECs, the NTMC, VRM Class II areas, general greater sage-grouse habitat, and wildlife migration corridors. Seek partnerships with others, including applicants seeking suitable offsite mitigation opportunities.			
MANAGEMENT ACTIONS BY ALTERNATIVE					
LOCATABLE MINERALS					
2007	MR: 1.2	Approximately 23,114 acres are maintained for withdrawal from locatable mineral entry and extensions are applied for as needed (Map 21). (Approximately 8,634 acres are withdrawn in pre-FLPMA actions which would continue indefinitely.) See corresponding alternatives for specific details and acreage of withdrawals. A total of 2,777,334 acres are open to locatable mineral entry (Map 21).	Approximately 1,632,605 acres are pursued for withdrawal from locatable mineral entry (Map 22). (Approximately 8,634 acres are withdrawn in pre-FLPMA actions which would continue indefinitely.) See corresponding alternatives for specific details and acreage of withdrawals. A total of 1,167,862 acres are open to locatable mineral entry (Map 22).	Approximately 0 acres are pursued for withdrawal from locatable mineral entry (Map 23). (Approximately 8,634 acres are withdrawn in pre-FLPMA actions which would continue indefinitely.) See corresponding alternatives for specific details and acreage of withdrawals. A total of 2,800,467 acres are open to locatable mineral entry (Map 23).	Approximately 449,068 acres are pursued for withdrawal from locatable mineral entry (Map 24). (Approximately 8,634 acres are withdrawn in pre-FLPMA actions which would continue indefinitely.) Any existing [mining] claims within the withdrawal area subject to validity exams. See corresponding alternatives for specific details of acreage of withdrawals.

2000 MINERAL RESOURCES (MR)					
Record #	**Goal/Obj.**	**Alternative A (Current Management)**	**Alternative B (Most Resource Conservation)**	**Alternative C (Most Resource Utilization)**	**Alternative D (Proposed RMP)**
		Note: Withdrawals are a realty action and are identified here just for information purposes.			A total of 2,351,399 acres are open to locatable mineral entry (Map 24).
LEASABLE MINERALS – GEOTHERMAL					
2008	MR: 1.3	728,277 acres of federal mineral estate are open to geothermal leasing subject to a case-by-case analysis of impacts to ACECs and other resource conflicts. 1,703,913 acres of federal mineral estate are open to geothermal leasing with moderate constraints (Map 25). 242,226 acres of federal mineral estate are open to geothermal leasing with major constraints (Map 25). 134,686 acres of federal mineral estate are closed to geothermal leasing (Map 25).	322,717 acres of federal mineral estate are open to geothermal leasing with moderate constraints (Map 26). 175,369 acres of federal mineral estate are open to geothermal leasing with major constraints (Map 26). 2,304,728 acres of federal mineral estate are closed to geothermal leasing (Map 26). Constraints applied for oil and gas leasing also apply to geothermal leasing.	797,174 acres of federal mineral estate are open to geothermal leasing subject to a case-by-case analysis of impacts to ACECs and other resource conflicts. 1,738,283 acres of federal mineral estate are open to geothermal leasing with moderate constraints (Map 27). 165,747 acres of federal mineral estate are open to geothermal leasing with major constraints (Map 27). 107,897 acres of federal mineral estate are closed to geothermal leasing (Map 27).	1,198,821 acres of federal mineral estate are open to geothermal leasing with moderate constraints (Map 28). 859,566 acres of federal mineral estate are open to geothermal leasing with major constraints (Map 28). 696,816 acres of federal mineral estate are closed to geothermal leasing (Map 28). Constraints applied for oil and gas leasing also apply to geothermal leasing.
LEASABLE MINERALS – OIL AND GAS					
2009	MR: 1.3	Approximately 731,144 acres of federal mineral estate are open to oil and gas leasing subject only to *standard* lease stipulations (Map 29).	Approximately 32,952 acres of federal mineral estate are open to oil and gas leasing subject only to *standard* lease stipulations (Map 30).	Approximately 804,794 acres of federal mineral estate are open to oil and gas leasing subject only to *standard* lease stipulations (Map 31).	Approximately 44,945 acres of federal mineral estate are open to oil and gas leasing subject only to *standard* lease stipulations (Map 32).
2010	MR: 1.3	Approximately 1,715,341 acres of federal mineral estate are open to oil and gas leasing subject to *moderate* constraints (Map 29).	Approximately 309,100 acres of federal mineral estate are open to oil and gas leasing subject to *moderate* constraints (Map 30).	Approximately 1,755,628 acres of federal mineral estate are open to oil and gas leasing subject to *moderate* constraints (Map 31).	Approximately 1,260,715 acres of federal mineral estate are open to oil and gas leasing subject to *moderate* constraints (Map 32).

2000 MINERAL RESOURCES (MR)					
Record #	**Goal/Obj.**	**Alternative A (Current Management)**	**Alternative B (Most Resource Conservation)**	**Alternative C (Most Resource Utilization)**	**Alternative D (Proposed RMP)**
2011	MR: 1.3	Approximately 337,481 acres of federal mineral estate are open to oil and gas leasing subject to *major* constraints (Map 29).	Approximately 187,524 acres of federal mineral estate are open to oil and gas leasing subject to *major* constraints (Map 30).	Approximately 248,601 acres of federal mineral estate are open to oil and gas leasing subject to *major* constraints (Map 31).	Approximately 1,336,867 acres of federal mineral estate are open to oil and gas leasing subject to *major* constraints (Map 32).
2012	MR: 1.3	Approximately 25,136 acres of federal mineral estate are closed to oil and gas leasing (Map 29).	Approximately 2,279,525 acres of federal mineral estate are closed to oil and gas leasing (Map 30).	Approximately 78 acres of federal mineral estate are closed to oil and gas leasing (Map 31).	Approximately 166,574 acres of federal mineral estate are closed to oil and gas leasing (Map 32).
2013	PR: 3.3	Consider soil erosion, degradation of soil quality, sedimentation, and other factors in determining the management of produced water on a case-by-case basis in accordance with Onshore Oil and Gas Order No. 7.	Same as Alternative A, except avoid surface discharge of produced water in all new oil and gas development projects.	Same as Alternative A.	Disposal of produced water is authorized in accordance with Onshore Oil and Gas Order #7, Produced Water Handling and in compliance with state regulations. If there is WYPDES permitted discharge, consider soil erosion, degradation of soil quality, sedimentation, and other factors in coordination with the State of Wyoming.
GEOPHYSICAL EXPLORATION					
2014	MR: 1.3	Allow geophysical exploration subject to identified Conditions of Approval. If a particular geophysical exploration can be conducted within the constraints necessary to protect other resources, it will be allowed.	The planning area is open to geophysical exploration except for lands identified as closed to oil and gas exploration and development or subject to major constraints. Geophysical exploration is subject to motorized travel limitations and restrictions on surface-disturbing and disruptive activities. See sections below.	Same as Alternative A.	The planning area is open to geophysical exploration except for lands identified as closed to mineral leasing or NSO to oil and gas leasing. Geophysical exploration is subject to motorized travel limitations and restrictions on surface-disturbing and disruptive activities.
LEASABLE MINERALS – OTHER LEASABLES (PHOSPHATE)					

2000 MINERAL RESOURCES (MR)					
Record #	**Goal/Obj.**	**Alternative A (Current Management)**	**Alternative B (Most Resource Conservation)**	**Alternative C (Most Resource Utilization)**	**Alternative D (Proposed RMP)**
2015	MR: 1.3	2,590,482 acres of federal mineral estate are open to phosphate leasing subject to standard lease stipulations (Map 38). 218,619 acres of federal mineral estate are closed to phosphate leasing (Map 38).	551,440 acres of federal mineral estate are open to phosphate leasing subject to standard lease stipulations (Map 39). 2,257,661 acres of federal mineral estate are closed to phosphate leasing (Map 39).	2,642,047 acres of federal mineral estate are open to phosphate leasing subject to standard lease stipulations (Map 40). 167,054 acres of federal mineral estate are closed to phosphate leasing (Map 40).	1,539,655 acres of federal mineral estate are open to phosphate leasing subject to standard lease stipulations (Map 41). 1,269,446 acres of federal mineral estate are closed to phosphate leasing (Map 41).
SALABLE MINERALS					
2016	MR: 1.1	2,493,980 acres with Category 1 or 2 restrictions are open for mineral material disposal on a demand basis (Map 34). 315,121 acres with Category 3-6 restrictions are closed to mineral material disposal (Map 34).	209,842 acres with Category 1 or 2 restrictions are open to mineral material disposal. 2,599,259 acres with Category 3-6 restrictions are closed to mineral material disposal (Map 35). Restrictions for oil and gas, other mineral withdrawals, and VRM restrict the disposal of mineral materials; see those sections.	2,620,997 acres with Category 1 or 2 restrictions are open to mineral material disposal. 188,104 acres with Category 3-6 restrictions are closed to mineral material disposal (Map 36). Areas withdrawn from locatable mineral entry are not available for disposal of mineral materials.	Approximately 1,853,090 acres with Category 1 or 2 restrictions are open for mineral material disposal on a demand basis (Map 37). 956,011 acres with Category 3-6 restrictions are closed to mineral material disposal (Map 37).
DESIGNATED DEVELOPMENT AREAS (DDAs)					
N/A	N/A	Note: Additional management actions regarding DDAs include Records 4033, 4056, and 7137.			
2017	MR: 1.1, 1.2, 1.3	Do not establish DDAs.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Establish DDAs for intensive mineral exploration, development, and production (364,630 acres) (Map 134).

2000 MINERAL RESOURCES (MR)					
Record #	**Goal/Obj.**	**Alternative A (Current Management)**	**Alternative B (Most Resource Conservation)**	**Alternative C (Most Resource Utilization)**	**Alternative D (Proposed RMP)**
2018	MR: 1.3	Exceptions to stipulations are considered on a site-specific basis following standard practices.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	New fluid and solid mineral leases and mineral material disposals in DDAs will include standard stipulations. Stipulations will be reviewed at the permit stage and not applied unless required to follow federal laws and policies, or the BLM identifies a site-specific real-time need for the stipulation. Review of requests for exception in DDAs will be expedited. Wildlife seasonal protections for maintenance and operation actions determined to be detrimental to wildlife will not be applied inside DDAs. Refer to Appendix I (p. 1535).
2019	MR: 1.1, 1.2, 1.3	Exceptions to timing limitations for threatened and endangered and species and migratory bird species are granted only in consultation with the USFWS, and if migratory bird take permits or other required permits are obtained.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A including in DDAs.
2020	MR: 1.1	Standard reclamation will be required in all areas.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Reclamation will be required in accordance with DDA interim and final reclamation objectives in Appendix D (p. 1477).

2000 MINERAL RESOURCES (MR)					
Record #	**Goal/Obj.**	**Alternative A (Current Management)**	**Alternative B (Most Resource Conservation)**	**Alternative C (Most Resource Utilization)**	**Alternative D (Proposed RMP)**
2021	MR: 1.1, 1.2, 1.3	No lands are managed as DDAs.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Federal lands and mineral estate not inside a DDA may be designated and managed as DDAs if project-specific environmental analysis determines that adverse impacts to other resources can be successfully mitigated with design features, operating methods, and other mitigation and if a geology and/or reservoir analysis determines that extraction efficiently and adequately produces the mineral resource. Designation of new areas as DDAs or expansion of existing DDA requires an RMP amendment.
MASTER LEASING PLANS (MLPs) – BEAVER RIM					
2022	MR: 3	Do not identify any areas for MLPs.	Do not apply any MLPs. Do not consider MLPs in areas that are closed to oil and gas leasing.	Same as Alternative A.	Apply an MLP to 150,782 acres in the Beaver Rim area (Map 135).
2023	MR: 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 3.5, 3.6	The Beaver Rim area is managed subject to standard stipulations.	The Beaver Rim area is closed to oil and gas leasing because it is located in greater sage-grouse nesting habitat.	Same as Alternative A.	Apply the following provisions of the Beaver Rim MLP to 150,782 acres (Map 135). ● 29,527 acres in the Beaver MLP area are open to oil and gas leasing subject to an NSO stipulation. ● The remainder of the MLP area (121,255 acres) is open to oil and gas leasing subject to CSU stipulations. If any of these acres are determined to be within a mapped floodplain before

2000 MINERAL RESOURCES (MR)					
Record #	**Goal/Obj.**	**Alternative A (Current Management)**	**Alternative B (Most Resource Conservation)**	**Alternative C (Most Resource Utilization)**	**Alternative D (Proposed RMP)**
					the lease is issued, an NSO stipulation, rather than a CSU stipulation will be applied.
2024	MR: 3.1, 3.3	Visual simulations may be required in VRM Class II areas of Beaver Rim. There is no special management of visual resources for the area.	Same as Alternative A, plus VRM reflects limits on mineral and realty actions.	Same as Alternative A.	In VRM Class II areas of the Beaver Rim MLP area: ● Visual simulations in accordance with VRM directive will be required. ● Manage the landscape associated with Beaver Rim so that visitors continue to enjoy the unique geologic features.
2025	MR: 3.1, 3.3	There is no special management of visual resources for VRM Class III areas.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	In VRM Class III areas of the Beaver Rim MLP area: ● Roads should be sited to follow the contours of the landscape and co-located unless that is not feasible. ● Site wells to where they will be less visible and where cuts and fills can be minimized. ● Consolidate and use low-profile equipment. ● Paint equipment to blend with the background. ● Bury pipelines. ● Place all linear disturbance such as powerlines in common corridors. ● Additional management may be required on a site-specific basis to lessen adverse impacts to visual resources and sensitive soils.

2000 MINERAL RESOURCES (MR)					
Record #	**Goal/Obj.**	**Alternative A (Current Management)**	**Alternative B (Most Resource Conservation)**	**Alternative C (Most Resource Utilization)**	**Alternative D (Proposed RMP)**
2026	MR: 3.1, 3.2, 3.6	Final reclamation of oil and gas surface disturbance will restore the original landform and re-establish the native plant community.	The Beaver Rim area is closed to oil and gas leasing.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A, plus reclamation will improve riparian-wetland conditions in the Beaver Rim MLP area.
2027	MR: 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.5, 3.6	Parcels are made available for oil and gas leasing in response to nominations. Standard greater sage-grouse management is applied with no minimum spacing of disturbances required.	The Beaver Rim area is closed to oil and gas leasing. Greater sage-grouse Core Area management is applied to the area. No minimum distance between existing disturbance is applied.	Same as Alternative A.	Make parcels in the Beaver Rim area available for lease starting in the CSU areas outside of crucial winter range. Allow no more than 5 percent surface disturbance in the township in which the parcel is located until interim reclamation goals are achieved. Require co-location of new disturbance if technically feasible. If new disturbances cannot be co-located, they must be at least 1.2 miles from existing disturbance.
2028	MR: 3.1, 3.2	Apply a 500-foot riparian-wetland setback.	Apply a 1,320-foot riparian-wetland setback.	Same as Alternative A.	Apply a riparian-wetland setback greater than 500 feet where NEPA analysis determines that a larger area is needed to protect riparian-wetland resources.
2029	MR: 3.2	Do not require watershed monitoring in the Beaver Rim area.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Require watershed monitoring including wetlands to verify the effectiveness of watershed protections. Monitoring protocols will establish key variables, such as depth of standing water, duration of saturation, temperature, sediment loading, and other metrics, as determined on a site-specific basis. Strengthen protections, including BMPs, when monitoring indicates ongoing degradation or

2000 MINERAL RESOURCES (MR)					
Record #	**Goal/Obj.**	**Alternative A (Current Management)**	**Alternative B (Most Resource Conservation)**	**Alternative C (Most Resource Utilization)**	**Alternative D (Proposed RMP)**
					inadequate benefits from mitigation, including additional site protections and wetland restorations.
2030	MR: 3.1, 3.3	Tribal consultation is initiated on a case-by-case basis.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Pending the results of tribal consultation, do not authorize surface disturbance within ¼ mile of sites known to be of interest to Native American tribes (e.g., stone circles, cairns, rock art) as mapped in the Lander Field Office GIS database. Following tribal consultation, apply site-specific management that will protect Native American spiritual and/or cultural values.
2031	MR: 3.4	Conduct inventories for paleontological resources in areas with "very high" and "high" PFYC prior to all surface-disturbing activities.	No similar action.	Same as Alternative A.	Develop an inventory of fossil localities in areas identified as high or very high PFYC to be used in managing mineral activities to protect paleontological resources (see the *Paleontological Resources* section).
2032	MR: 3.4	No similar action.	No similar action.	No similar action.	Prior to leasing any parcels in the Beaver Rim area, the special management prescriptions identified under the *Paleontologic Resources* section will be completed.

2000 MINERAL RESOURCES (MR)					
Record #	**Goal/Obj.**	**Alternative A (Current Management)**	**Alternative B (Most Resource Conservation)**	**Alternative C (Most Resource Utilization)**	**Alternative D (Proposed RMP)**
2033	MR: 3.5	Authorize fences on a case-by-case basis.	Fences are not authorized in wild horse HMAs.	Same as Alternative A.	Do not authorize fences in portions of the Beaver Rim MLP area that are used by wild horses to move among HMAs in order to support genetic diversity, unless necessary to improve riparian-wetland conditions. Avoid wild horse HMAs for roads and other linear disturbances.
2034	MR: 3.6	Consider surface disturbance impacts from oil and gas development to unique plant communities.	The Beaver Rim area is closed to oil and gas leasing.	Same as Alternative A.	Avoid surface disturbance in unique plant communities.

Table 2.15. 3000 Fire and Fuels Management (FM)

3000 FIRE AND FUELS MANAGEMENT (FM)					
Record #	**Goal/Obj.**	**Alternative A (Current Management)**	**Alternative B (Most Resource Conservation)**	**Alternative C (Most Resource Utilization)**	**Alternative D (Proposed RMP)**
Goal FM: 1 Protect human life, property, communities at risk from fire and other communities, and enhance and protect the public land resources through vegetation management and the response to wildland fire. **Objectives:** **FM: 1.1** The BLM will first provide for firefighter and public safety in every fire management activity. **FM: 1.2** Maintain partnerships with interagency cooperators to strengthen coordination of all fire suppression and fuels management activities. **FM: 1.3** Promote community assistance and enhance the fire prevention and public education program regarding wildland fire management and vegetation management activities. **FM: 1.4** Conduct appropriate emergency stabilization and rehabilitation where necessary after wildfire to address current and anticipated needs to resource values at risk. **Goal FM: 2** Manage fire and fuels to restore or maintain natural ecosystem functions, restore fire-adapted ecosystems, reduce losses from landscape-level wildland fire, and protect multiple-use values. **Objectives:** **FM: 2.1** Consistent with the 10-year Comprehensive Strategy, prioritize and implement hazardous fuels reduction treatments where the adverse impacts of wildland fire are greatest. **FM: 2.2** Consult and cooperate with private landowners, affected partners, and local, state, tribal and other federal agencies on individual treatments (such as prescribed fire and biological, mechanical, and chemical treatments) designed to reduce or modify hazardous fuels accumulations. **FM: 2.3** Working with private landowners, affected partners, and local, state, tribal and other federal agencies, identify areas for potential use of wildland fire to protect, maintain and enhance resources through collaborative development of operational plans. **FM: 2.4** Restore natural fire regimes and frequency to the landscape. **FM: 2.5** Using the best available science and on the ground inventory, determine existing condition class of vegetation communities and manage landscapes to improve condition class and ecological conditions described in NRCS Ecological Site Descriptions. **FM: 2.6** Utilize fuels and vegetation treatments to maintain and enhance greater sage-grouse habitat where applicable.				
MANAGEMENT ACTIONS COMMON TO ALL ALTERNATIVES					

3000 FIRE AND FUELS MANAGEMENT (FM)					
Record #	**Goal/Obj.**	**Alternative A (Current Management)**	**Alternative B (Most Resource Conservation)**	**Alternative C (Most Resource Utilization)**	**Alternative D (Proposed RMP)**
3001	FM: 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4	Utilize a full suite of wildland fire suppression tactics based on a full evaluation of the highest priority of firefighter and public safety and other factors, such as the circumstances under which a fire occurs, the threat to human infrastructure, important natural and cultural resources, and other values to be protected. Coordinate responses to wildland fire across jurisdictional boundaries. Conduct emergency stabilization and rehabilitation as needed. In greater sage-grouse Core Area, prioritize suppression to conserve the habitat immediately after firefighter and public safety. Where applicable and technically feasible, apply greater sage-grouse BMPs such as those identified in Appendix H (p. 1521).			
3002	FM: 2.5	Partner with the University of Wyoming and other research entities to develop a greater understanding of the ecology and disturbance regime of sagebrush steppe, woodland, and forested vegetation communities found within the planning area. Use this information to develop a regionally specific scientific foundation to vegetation management activities.			
3003	FM: 1.2, 2.3, 2.4, 2.5	Inventory the FRCC (Map 42) of the vegetative communities found within the fire management units (Map 43). In coordination with stakeholders and in consideration of greater sage-grouse Core Area objectives, prioritize areas requiring treatment and utilize appropriate vegetation treatment techniques to improve the condition class across a landscape. Prioritize those projects in areas with the greatest benefits to wildlife and the highest likelihood of wildfire.			
3004	FM: 1.1, 2.1, 2.2, 2.5	Use chemical, biological, and mechanical treatments to reduce the risk of landscape-level wildfire within priority areas, alter fuel loading and improve ecological condition of vegetation communities. Consider the presence and potential for noxious and nonnative plant species when designing wildland fire response and fuels treatments.			
3005	FM: 2, 1.3, 2.2, 2.4, 2.5	Use personal use and commercial vegetation sale permits, where not otherwise constrained or prohibited, for removal of firewood, post and pole, Christmas trees, sawlogs, and wildlings, for hazardous fuels management.			
3006	FM: 2.6	Allow vegetation treatments in greater sage-grouse Core Area that conserve, enhance, or restore greater sage-grouse habitat (this includes treatments that benefit livestock as part of an AMP/Conservation Plan to improve greater sage-grouse habitat). In identified greater sage-grouse winter range, vegetation treatments should emphasize strategically reducing wildfire risk around or in the winter range and maintaining winter range habitat quality. Prioritize restoration treatments in areas that are thought to limit greater sage-grouse distribution and/or abundance. Focus vegetation treatments outward from existing, intact greater sage-grouse habitat. Utilize BMPs, such as those in Appendix H (p. 1521) and other current habitat management guidelines, when designing and implementing the project.			
3007	FM: 1.1, 1.4	Do not reduce sagebrush canopy cover to less than 15 percent within a defined treatment polygon in suitable greater sage-grouse Core Area habitat unless a vegetation management objective requires additional reduction in sagebrush cover to protect or to conserve habitat quality for greater sage-grouse or other sagebrush steppe dependent and obligate species. Maintain sagebrush and understory diversity (relative to ecological site description) unless such removal is necessary to achieve greater sage-grouse habitat management objectives. Remove conifers or reduce the density of conifers that have encroached into sagebrush plant communities.			
3008	FM: 2.3, 2.4	Outside of greater sage-grouse Core Area, emphasize the reintroduction of fire into its natural role in the ecosystem. Where possible, use wildland fire and prescribed fire to achieve management objectives including reducing hazardous fuel loading, restoring vegetation communities, improving and/or protecting wildlife habitat, enhancing forage production, and addressing forest and woodland health issues such as pine beetle outbreaks.			
3009	FM: 2.2, 2.3	Cooperate with stakeholders to conduct landscape level treatments resulting in enhanced fuels management and/or restoration of fire-adapted ecosystems. In cooperation with stakeholders, manage to promote the growth and persistence of native shrubs, grasses, and forbs.			

3000 FIRE AND FUELS MANAGEMENT (FM)					
Record #	**Goal/Obj.**	**Alternative A (Current Management)**	**Alternative B (Most Resource Conservation)**	**Alternative C (Most Resource Utilization)**	**Alternative D (Proposed RMP)**
3010	FM: 2	Monitor fuels treatment and wildfire burn areas for sufficient time after treatment or fire event in order to determine short-term and long-term project success, detect weed infestations and accelerated soil erosion, and assess overall vegetation recovery. Utilize all available rehabilitation tools to control weed infestation and accelerated soil erosion. Implement rest of treated areas from livestock grazing for two full growing seasons on all prescribed or wildland fire burn areas unless vegetation recovery dictates otherwise.			
3011	FM: 2	Limit the use of fire to treat sagebrush in areas receiving less than 12 inches of annual precipitation. Prescribed fire to reduce hazardous fuels or enhance land health in areas receiving less than 12 inches of annual precipitation could be considered after exploring other potential treatment methods and where cheatgrass is a very minor component of the understory.			
3012	FM: 2	Utilizing Required Design Features and BMPs applied as COAs such as those identified in Appendix H (p. 1521), establish fuels treatment projects at strategic locations to minimize the size of wildfires and limit further loss of greater sage-grouse habitat. Restore native or desirable plants and create landscape patterns to benefit greater sage-grouse. In suitable habitat within greater sage-grouse Core Area, incorporate greater sage-grouse specific habitat objectives and apply appropriate seasonal restrictions for implementing vegetation management treatments in greater sage-grouse Core Area. Do not allow treatments in Core Area winter concentration areas unless the treatments are designed to strategically reduce wildfire risk around or in the winter range and will maintain winter range habitat quality. Power wash all fire vehicles including engines, water tenders, personnel vehicles, and OHVs after they have been in the field to help to prevent the establishment or spread of invasive weeds.			
3013	FM: 1.2	Restrict the use of aerial applied fire retardant near identified rock art sites unless values at risk, such as human life and safety, require their use.			
3014	FM: 1.2	Use MIST for wildfire suppression where appropriate, with special consideration for areas of significant cultural resources or historic trails, areas with significant wildlife habitat or biological sensitivity and in areas of visual resource sensitivity unless human life or public safety is threatened.			
MANAGEMENT ACTIONS BY ALTERNATIVE					
3015	FM: 1.1, 1.4	Full suppression is the most likely fire suppression strategy with other fire suppression strategies used on a case-by-case basis.	Full suppression of wildland fire is used within the WUI and to minimize critical resource damage. The use of unplanned ignition to achieve resource benefit is allowed on a case-by-case basis.	Full suppression of wildland fire is the most likely response throughout the planning area, with other suppression strategies used on a case-by-case basis. The use of unplanned ignition to achieve resource benefit is not allowed.	Full suppression of wildland fire is used within the WUI and in areas of high resource values including greater sage-grouse Core Area. A full range of wildland fire suppression tactics are allowed throughout the planning area, including the use of unplanned ignition to achieve resource benefit.
3016	FM: 1	Do not aerially apply fire retardants during suppression activities within 300 feet of any waterbody including those that support Yellowstone cutthroat trout, burbot, and sauger.	Same as Alternative A, plus do not authorize aerial or hand use of fire suppression foam within ¼ mile of waterbodies that support Yellowstone cutthroat trout, burbot, and sauger.	Same as Alternative A.	Do not aerially apply fire retardants during suppression activities within 300 feet of any waterbody. Do not apply fire retardants within 500 feet of waterways that support Yellowstone cutthroat trout, burbot, and sauger unless

3000 FIRE AND FUELS MANAGEMENT (FM)					
Record #	**Goal/Obj.**	**Alternative A (Current Management)**	**Alternative B (Most Resource Conservation)**	**Alternative C (Most Resource Utilization)**	**Alternative D (Proposed RMP)**
					values at risk require the use of retardants within 500 feet from identified waterways.

Table 2.16. 4000 Biological Resources (BR) – Vegetation - General

4000 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES (BR) – VEGETATION - GENERAL					
Record #	**Goal/Obj.**	**Alternative A (Current Management)**	**Alternative B (Most Resource Conservation)**	**Alternative C (Most Resource Utilization)**	**Alternative D (Proposed RMP)**
Goal BR: 1 Manage vegetation communities to restore, maintain, or enhance vegetation community health, composition, and diversity. Provide a mix of natural succession stages that incorporate diverse structure and composition into each vegetation type. **Objectives:** **BR: 1.1** Maintain, improve, enhance, or restore habitat to facilitate the conservation, recovery, and maintenance of populations of native and desirable nonnative plant species. **BR: 1.2** Maintain, improve, or enhance areas of ecological importance, priority plant species and habitats, and unique plant communities. **BR: 1.3** Maintain, improve, or enhance sustainable forage levels for all grazing/browsing animals depending upon identified desirable vegetation communities. **BR: 1.4** Utilize mechanical, chemical, and biological methods, including fire and livestock grazing, to achieve desirable vegetation communities. **BR: 1.5** Manage grazing/browsing use levels in consideration of plant, riparian-wetland, and soil health requirements. **BR: 1.6** Maintain, restore, and enhance aspen, forest, woodland, and non-sagebrush shrub communities for a healthy mix of successional stages. Emphasize stand diversity, sustainability, and consideration of other resources and uses in forest and woodland communities. **BR: 1.7** Manage vegetation communities across the landscape to improve FRCC. **BR: 1.8** Manage vegetative resources to optimize protection and recovery from drought, disease, insect infestations, and wildfire. **BR: 1.9** Coordinate with local, state, and federal agencies and stakeholders to protect and recover vegetative resources and other habitat components affected by dry conditions, drought, disease, severe insect infestations, noxious weeds, and wildfires. **Goal BR: 2** Maintain, enhance, or restore forest-stand community health, composition, and diversity to an ecologically appropriate mosaic considering factors such as density, basal area, canopy cover, age class, stand health, successional stages, and understory. **Objectives:** **BR: 2.1** Limit infestation and epidemics in forests and woodlands as much as possible by managing for endemic populations of native insects, diseases, and pathogens. **BR: 2.2** Maintain and protect characteristics and composition of mature forest and woodland communities with old growth characteristics. **BR: 2.3** Improve opportunities to sustainably harvest forest products in identified areas while providing for other forest values and uses. Improve forest and woodland health to protect watershed values and support wildlife habitat requirements.					

Table 2.17. 4000 Biological Resources (BR) – Vegetation - Forests, Woodlands, and Aspen Communities

4000 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES (BR) – VEGETATION - FORESTS, WOODLANDS, AND ASPEN COMMUNITIES					
Record #	**Goal/Obj.**	**Alternative A (Current Management)**	**Alternative B (Most Resource Conservation)**	**Alternative C (Most Resource Utilization)**	**Alternative D (Proposed RMP)**
MANAGEMENT ACTIONS COMMON TO ALL ALTERNATIVES					
4001	BR: 1, 1.2, 1.5, 2	Update and complete inventory of forests and woodlands, identifying characteristics such as areas of woodland encroachment, areas of unique or old growth characteristics or ecological significance, areas of damage from insect and disease, fuel loading within the WUI, general forest and woodland health, as well as areas suitable for commercial timber sales.			
4002	BR: 1.2	Manage forests and woodlands to improve stand diversity, sustainability, and consideration of other resources and resource uses while following Wyoming Silvicultural BMPs (Appendix H (p. 1521)).			
4003	BR: 1.9	Cooperate with other agencies, partners, adjacent landowners and other relevant parties to develop cooperative partnerships and implement landscape-wide, cross-boundary forest management within the South Pass, Lander Slope, Green Mountain, and Dubois Primary Forest Resource Areas (Map 47).			
4004	BR: 1.4	Identify areas in which wildland fire could be implemented as a management tool to enhance forest and woodland health.			
4005	BR: 1.6, 2	Actively promote aspen regeneration throughout the Lander Field Office using a variety of treatment methods to enhance wildlife habitat and improve overall ecological health.			
4006	BR: 2.1	Allow the sale of personal use permits to meet public demand for post and poles, firewood, sawlogs, Christmas trees, burlwood and other vegetative products consistent with forest health objectives and wildlife habitat requirements. After NEPA analysis, authorize commercial use for seed collections for use in habitat restoration or research.			
4007	BR: 1.1, 1.2, 2.1	Manage old growth and rare forest and woodland communities to maintain the ecological characteristics unique to the site(s).			
FORESTS AND WOODLANDS					
4008	BR: 1, 1.1, 1.2	Manage forests and woodlands in response to conditions on the ground, including forest health, wildlife habitat, and demand for forest products.	Manage forests and woodlands to improve vegetative health and for the benefit of other resources using natural processes to the greatest extent possible.	Manage forests and woodlands using all available treatment methods to maintain and improve forest health across the forested landscape and to provide forest products to the public.	Same as Alternative A.
4009	BR: 1.3, 2	Implement forest replanting after sale, vegetative treatment, or fire on a case-by-case basis if natural regeneration does not occur within a timeframe appropriate for vegetative type.	Implement forest replanting after sale, vegetative treatment, or fire on a case-by-case basis to benefit forest health and to improve carbon sequestration.	Implement forest replanting as soon as possible after sale, vegetative treatment, or fire on a case-by-case basis to more effectively sustain commodity production.	Same as Alternative A.

4000 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES (BR) – VEGETATION - FORESTS, WOODLANDS, AND ASPEN COMMUNITIES					
Record #	**Goal/Obj.**	**Alternative A (Current Management)**	**Alternative B (Most Resource Conservation)**	**Alternative C (Most Resource Utilization)**	**Alternative D (Proposed RMP)**
4010	BR: 1.9	Authorize a variety of silvicultural techniques to protect resource values and maintain forest health.	Implement active silvicultural techniques only where natural processes are not able to accomplish forest and woodland health goals.	Authorize the full range of silvicultural techniques such as thinning and selective cuts and prescribed fire to maintain forest and woodland health and to reduce the risk of mortality by insects, disease, and wildfire.	Same as Alternative C.
4011	BR: 1.1, 1.2, 1.4, 1.8, 2.1	Allow clear-cuts within the following parameters: ● Cannot exceed 25 acres in size ● Cannot be within 100 feet of riparian-wetland areas ● Cannot be on slopes greater than 45 percent	Prohibit clear-cuts and harvest methods that create clear-cuts.	Authorize clear-cuts within the following parameters: ● Can be of any size ● Cannot be within 100 feet of riparian-wetland areas ● Limit ground based logging systems to a maximum of 45 percent slope; any slope greater than 45 percent may be logged with cable systems or by helicopter	Allow clear-cuts. Determine clear-cut size, location, and slope based on a combination of resource values and silvicultural objectives on a site-specific basis.
4012	BR: 1.2, 1.8, 1.9, 2.1	Manage forest insect and disease outbreaks on a case-by-case basis.	Manage forest insect and disease outbreaks only as necessary for human health and safety such as in areas around developed campgrounds and within the WUI.	Manage forest insect and disease outbreaks with the full range of silviculture techniques and treatment methods.	Same as Alternative A.
4013	BR: 1.1, 1.2, 2.1	Manage unique forest and woodland communities as they are identified on a case-by-case basis including some removal as appropriate.	Same as Alternative A, except manage all unique communities to maintain the ecological characteristics unique to the site.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A, except ensure unique forests and woodland communities are managed to maintain the ecological characteristics unique to the site.
4014	BR: 1.3, 1.4, 1.5, 2	Manage forest product sales in the following areas on a case-by-case basis with the following restrictions and in response to local and regional market conditions (Map 47): ● Lander Slope: Authorize 10 MMBF over a 5-year period followed by a 10-year period	Develop forest management plans for the Green Mountain, South Pass, Lander Slope, and Dubois Primary Forest Resource Areas (Map 47) for forest product sales and management of pine beetle and other infestation. Lander Slope, Red Canyon, and South	Develop forest management plans for the Green Mountain, South Pass, Lander Slope, and Dubois Primary Forest Resource Areas for forest product sales and management for forest health and commercial production.	Develop a forest management plan for the Green Mountain Primary Forest Resource Area and as funding permits for the South Pass and Dubois Primary Forest Resource Areas (Map 47) for commercial and over-the-counter forest product sales, enhancement of forest health, addressing fuel

4000 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES (BR) – VEGETATION - FORESTS, WOODLANDS, AND ASPEN COMMUNITIES					
Record #	**Goal/Obj.**	**Alternative A** **(Current Management)**	**Alternative B** **(Most Resource Conservation)**	**Alternative C** **(Most Resource Utilization)**	**Alternative D** **(Proposed RMP)**
		of rest to enhance diversity and uneven age stand. ● Red Canyon: Authorize forest product sales on a case-by-case basis to improve wildlife conditions. Limit aspen cuts to 5 acres in size and only allow to enhance stand health. Limit cuts of conifer stands to dead or dying trees to facilitate regeneration. ● South Pass: Authorize sales of small volumes of timber on a demand basis to remove dead or dying timber and to help regeneration.	Pass are managed as one area with the following restrictions: ● Lander Slope: Prohibit forest product sales unless necessary because of human health and safety issues or to improve wildlife habitat and overall forest health. ● Red Canyon: Prohibit forest product sales unless necessary because of human health and safety issues or to improve wildlife habitat and overall forest health. ● South Pass: Prohibit forest product sales unless necessary because of human health and safety issues or to improve wildlife habitat and overall forest health.		loading within the WUI and management of pine beetle and other infestation. Manage the Lander Slope and Red Canyon as one area. Prohibit commercial forest product sales in this area unless necessary because of human health and safety issues (WUI) or to improve wildlife habitat and overall forest health.

Table 2.18. 4000 Biological Resources (BR) – Vegetation - Grassland and Shrubland Communities

4000 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES (BR) – VEGETATION - GRASSLAND AND SHRUBLAND COMMUNITIES					
Record #	**Goal/ Obj.**	**Alternative A (Current Management)**	**Alternative B (Most Resource Conservation)**	**Alternative C (Most Resource Utilization)**	**Alternative D (Proposed RMP)**
MANAGEMENT ACTIONS COMMON TO ALL ALTERNATIVES					
N/A	N/A	Note: Management actions to minimize disturbance to vegetation through application of Best Management Practices, mitigation, and reclamation practices for all surface-disturbing activities are in the Soil Reclamation section. Management actions for vegetation resources for the benefit of wildlife and special status species are located in those respective sections.			
4015	BR: 1.1, 1.3, 1.6	Manage for specific species and vegetative attributes (plant density, composition, cover, and diversity) using ecologically sustainable practices.			
4016	BR: 1, 1.1, 1.2	Manage grazing in sagebrush communities in accordance with the site's ecological site description to accommodate the plant growth requirements of the larger cool season bunchgrasses such as needle and thread, bluebunch wheatgrass, green needlegrass, and Indian ricegrass.			
4017	BR: 1.2	Identify unique plant communities and manage to protect, preserve, or enhance these communities.			
MANAGEMENT ACTIONS BY ALTERNATIVE					
4018	BR: 1, 1.1, 1.2, 1.3	Manage vegetation communities for vegetative attributes described in NRCS Ecological Site Guides and to meet identified vegetative goals.	Manage vegetation communities to benefit biological diversity including wildlife, fish, and special status species.	Manage vegetation communities to maximize forage production for the ecological site.	Same as Alternative A, plus when existing Ecological Site Descriptions have not been developed, are too general, or are not correct to serve adequately as benchmarks, identify and document local areas of similar potential within each specific ecological site that exemplify achievement of appropriate habitat objectives, and use these sites for the development of new reference sheets to be used as the benchmark reference. Establish measurable objectives related to greater sage-grouse habitat.
4019	BR: 1.4	On a case-by-case basis, use vegetation treatments to increase forage production when consistent with healthy rangeland ecosystems.	Use vegetation treatments to restore diversity of ecological sites and transitional states, and to benefit all resources.	Use vegetation treatments to change plant community composition in a manner that achieves rangeland health objectives and facilitates grazing management. Assure that projects conform to wildlife objectives, particularly with regard to greater sage-grouse.	Use vegetation treatments to change plant community composition in a manner that achieves wildlife objectives, rangeland health objectives, and facilitates grazing management. Assure that projects conform to resource objectives for the site.

Table 2.19. 4000 Biological Resources (BR) – Invasive Species and Pest Management

4000 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES (BR) – INVASIVE SPECIES AND PEST MANAGEMENT					
Record #	**Goal/Obj.**	**Alternative A (Current Management)**	**Alternative B (Most Resource Conservation)**	**Alternative C (Most Resource Utilization)**	**Alternative D (Proposed RMP)**
Goal BR: 3 Manage for healthy native plant communities by reducing, preventing expansion of, or eliminating the occurrence of INNS, undesirable vegetation, or noxious weeds (predatory plant pests or disease) by implementing management actions consistent with goals included in Partners Against Weeds and consistent with state and local weed management plans. **Objectives:** **BR: 3.1** Maintain adequate baseline information, inventory and monitoring, regarding the extent and control of invasive species to make informed decisions, evaluate effectiveness of management actions, and assess progress toward goals to improve invasive species management. Develop a prevention and early detection program. **BR: 3.2** Coordinate with adjoining jurisdictions in management and control of INNS across jurisdictional and political boundaries. **BR: 3.3** Include provisions for INNS management in all BLM-funded or authorized actions. **Goal BR: 4** Support internal and external education and awareness of noxious weeds. **Objective:** **BR: 4.1** Develop and deploy educational and public awareness programs and materials in cooperation with other agencies and organizations. **Goal BR: 5** In all parts of the planning area, manage for the reduction, prevention, and halting the expansion of cheatgrass in the planning area. Emphasize the prevention of invasive annual grass and woody plants in greater sage-grouse Core Area.					
MANAGEMENT ACTIONS COMMON TO ALL ALTERNATIVES					
4020	BR: 3.1, 3.3	Cooperate with other federal and state agencies, counties, conservation districts, Weed and Pest Management Areas, and other entities to control weed infestation. Cooperate with APHIS and other stakeholders to control grasshoppers and Mormon crickets on BLM-administered lands in conjunction with control efforts initialized on adjoining non-federal lands.			
4021	BR: 3.1, 3.2, 3.3	Integrated pest management is consistent with Partners Against Weeds (BLM 1996). Use fire and mechanical/chemical treatments to control weeds. Reseed or replant as necessary to promote vegetative growth in consultation and cooperation with interested parties.			
4022	BR: 4	Develop and implement a program promoting public awareness of Wyoming Declared Noxious Weeds and Pests as well as INNS.			
4023	BR: 3.2, 3.3	Manage weed treatments to maintain and improve greater sage-grouse habitat. Apply Required Design Features and BMPs as COAs such as those in Appendix H (p. 1521).			
4024	BR: 3.2, 3.3	Require the use of certified noxious-weed free forage, mulch, and other land-applied products by BLM-authorized activities on BLM-administered lands.			
4025	BR: 3.3	Should INNS become established in a location, develop and implement site-specific plans to eradicate/control invasive weeds in all surface-disturbing activities in the immediate vicinity. Priority for control will be: (1) Wyoming Declared Weed and Pest Species, (2) those weeds on the Western States Combined Declared Noxious Weed List, (3) those annual/biennial invasive weeds interfering with reclamation efforts, and (4) those INNS interfering with a management objective.			

4000 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES (BR) – INVASIVE SPECIES AND PEST MANAGEMENT					
Record #	**Goal/Obj.**	**Alternative A (Current Management)**	**Alternative B (Most Resource Conservation)**	**Alternative C (Most Resource Utilization)**	**Alternative D (Proposed RMP)**
4026	BR: 5	Develop a plan to manage cheatgrass in coordination with other agencies and individuals with the local (County) Weed & Pest Control Districts acting as the point of contact among all parties.			
4027	BR: 3.3	Require that all equipment and vehicles used for BLM-authorized activities be cleaned for seeds of noxious weeds and INNS before moving onto BLM-administered lands. Prohibit project vehicles accessing BLM-administered lands via cross-county travel from driving through infestations during access to the site. If the area on which BLM-authorized activities take place is identified as being a high risk for invasive and/or noxious weeds, require that vehicles be cleaned before leaving the worksite with prescriptions for the disposal of wash water.			
MANAGEMENT ACTIONS BY ALTERNATIVE					
4028	BR: 3.3	Do not require livestock flushing to prevent the spread of INNS.	If the Authorized Officer determines that livestock are likely carrying ingested seeds of INNS, the Authorized Officer may require that livestock be flushed for weeds for a period of 72 hours before allowing livestock to move onto BLM-administered lands.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative B.
4029	BR: 3.3	Manage activities that contribute to the spread of noxious weeds on a case-by-case basis in accordance with factors identified in Executive Order 13112.	If the Authorized Officer determines that BLM-authorized activities are contributing to the spread of noxious or invasive species, adjust the terms of the authorized activity to aid in the control of the species.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative B.

Table 2.20. 4000 Biological Resources (BR) – Riparian-Wetland Resources

4000 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES (BR) – RIPARIAN-WETLAND RESOURCES					
Record #	**Goal/Obj.**	**Alternative A (Current Management)**	**Alternative B (Most Resource Conservation)**	**Alternative C (Most Resource Utilization)**	**Alternative D (Proposed RMP)**
Note: Vegetation Goals BR: 1-2 apply to Riparian-Wetland Resources as well. **Goal BR: 6** Maintain, enhance, or restore riparian-wetland areas to support biodiversity and provide the appropriate natural potential combination of vegetation, landform, or large woody debris to: (a) dissipate stream energy associated with high water flows or energies associated with wind and/or wave action and overland flow from adjacent sites, (b) reduce erosion and improve water quality, (c) filter sediment, (d) capture bedload, (e) allow for floodplain development, (f) improve floodwater retention and groundwater recharge, (g) develop root masses that stabilize stream banks, islands and shoreline features against cutting action, (h) allow for natural rates of water percolation, and (i) develop diverse ponding and channel characteristics to provide the habitat and the water depth, duration, and temperature necessary for fish production, waterfowl breeding, and other uses. **Objectives:** **BR: 6.1** Develop recovery management prescriptions for riparian-wetland areas that are not functioning properly and/or have impaired water quality. **BR: 6.2** Develop management plans capable of ensuring riparian-wetland areas will achieve or exceed PFC. **BR: 6.3** Manage all resources and resource uses to maintain, enhance, or restore riparian-wetland habitats. **BR: 6.4** Maintain, enhance, or restore aquatic ecosystems including stream geomorphology.					
MANAGEMENT ACTIONS COMMON TO ALL ALTERNATIVES					
4030	BR: 6	Identify riparian-wetland management actions to promote biodiversity and develop an implementation plan to incorporate actions into BLM-authorized activities. Manage riparian-wetland areas and wet meadows to achieve or maintain diverse species richness that includes a component of perennial forbs in conjunction with desirable riparian sedges, rushes, bulrushes, and grasses, as appropriate.			
4031	BR: 6.1, 6.2, 6.3, 6.4	Implement identified management actions to have riparian-wetland areas meet or exceed PFC and Standard 2 of the Wyoming Standards for Healthy Rangelands.			
4032	BR: 6.4	Design utility line watercourse crossings to limit impacts to riparian-wetland areas.			
MANAGEMENT ACTIONS BY ALTERNATIVE					

4000 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES (BR) – RIPARIAN-WETLAND RESOURCES					
Record #	**Goal/Obj.**	**Alternative A (Current Management)**	**Alternative B (Most Resource Conservation)**	**Alternative C (Most Resource Utilization)**	**Alternative D (Proposed RMP)**
4033	BR: 6.2, 6.3, 6.4	Prohibit surface-disturbing activities within 500 feet of surface water, riparian-wetland areas, and playas unless activities are determined to be necessary and when impacts can be mitigated. Mineral and realty actions in these areas are managed with Category 4 restrictions (Map 5).	Prohibit surface-disturbing activities within 1,320 feet of surface water, riparian-wetland areas, playas, and 100-year floodplains, where mapped. Mineral and realty actions in these areas are managed with Category 4 restrictions (Map 5).	Same as Alternative A, unless on a site-specific basis a lesser distance is shown to provide equivalent protection of surface water, riparian-wetland areas, and playas.	Same as Alternative C in DDAs. Same as Alternative A in all other areas.
4034	BR: 6.1, 6.2, 6.3	On a case-by-case basis, use various site-specific management actions to make significant progress towards PFC including fencing, resting, deferred use, and road closures.	Use the natural healing capacity of the land to make significant progress towards PFC utilizing management actions such as road closures, lease stipulations, and livestock allotment management.	Use all management tools such as range improvement projects, travel management, and road construction, to make significant progress towards PFC.	Use all tools to make significant progress towards PFC including but not limited to making adjustments in livestock grazing such as season of use, rest/deferment, modification of the number of livestock, and installing range improvement projects designed to implement comprehensive livestock grazing strategies, travel management (i.e., road closures), and other authorizations.

Table 2.21. 4000 Biological Resources (BR) – Fish and Wildlife

4000 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES (BR) – FISH AND WILDLIFE					
Record #	**Goal/Obj.**	**Alternative A (Current Management)**	**Alternative B (Most Resource Conservation)**	**Alternative C (Most Resource Utilization)**	**Alternative D (Proposed RMP)**
Goal BR: 7 Manage for the biological integrity and habitat function of terrestrial and aquatic ecosystems to sustain and optimize distribution and abundance of all native and desirable nonnative fish and wildlife species consistent with habitat capability. **Objectives:** **BR: 7.1** Manage habitats to support WGFD in the attainment of big game herd unit objectives, fish management objectives, and well-distributed, healthy populations of fish and wildlife species consistent with the WGFD's Strategic Habitat Plan, State Wildlife Action Plan, and strategic population plans, and to achieve the stated purpose of designated WHMAs. **BR: 7.2** Maintain habitats sufficient to fulfill the life-cycle requirements of diverse fish and wildlife species. Manage to protect important breeding and natal or parturition habitats for terrestrial and aquatic species. **BR: 7.3** Maintain or improve habitat integrity, continuity, connectivity and productivity for fish and wildlife on a landscape scale. **BR: 7.4** Provide barrier-free movement and habitat protection from disturbance and fragmentation in identified wildlife migration routes and fish passages. **BR: 7.5** Maintain, restore, or enhance fisheries habitats so they achieve optimal channel geomorphology and vegetative structure for productivity and biological diversity. **BR: 7.6** Provide healthy and stable ecosystems that support fish and wildlife habitat values, appropriate species' habitat needs, and the existing species' diversity. **Goal BR: 8** Manage direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts to fish and wildlife and their habitats such that no unnecessary or undue degradation results from BLM actions and authorized activities. **Objectives:** **BR: 8.1** In the absence of voluntary offsite mitigation or in areas with site-specific allowances, manage for no greater than a 10 percent net loss of acres of big game crucial winter range and parturition habitat over the life of the plan. **BR: 8.2** Implement proactive management and conservation measures to prevent and/or reduce adverse impacts to wildlife and aquatic species. **BR: 8.3** Coordinate with USDA Wildlife Services to avoid non-target species mortality and minimize other disturbances to fish and wildlife from predator control activities. **BR: 8.4** Maintain and protect critical fish spawning, egg incubation, and fry areas. **Goal BR: 9** Manage terrestrial and aquatic ecosystems to provide recreational and educational benefits and opportunities for the public,					

4000 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES (BR) – FISH AND WILDLIFE					
Record #	**Goal/Obj.**	**Alternative A (Current Management)**	**Alternative B (Most Resource Conservation)**	**Alternative C (Most Resource Utilization)**	**Alternative D (Proposed RMP)**
		Objectives: **BR: 9.1** Improve public awareness and support, including partnerships, for the conservation, restoration, and management of vegetation, fish, wildlife, and special status species programs. **BR: 9.2** Work with partners to develop and provide fish, wildlife, and habitat outreach and educational materials to the public. **BR: 9.3** Identify and provide opportunities for consumptive, non-consumptive or recreational use of fish and wildlife and their habitats. **Goal BR: 10** Manage for quality habitats that would support the introduction, reintroduction, and augmentation of identified high priority fish and wildlife species on BLM-administered lands. **Objective:** **BR: 10.1** Identify opportunities in coordination with stakeholders to introduce or reintroduce fish and wildlife species.			
MANAGEMENT ACTIONS COMMON TO ALL ALTERNATIVES					
4035	BR: 7.2	Choose and implement appropriate mitigation and Best Management Practices to minimize decreases in habitat function. Mitigate impacts as near to the impact, for the same or similar impacted species or habitats, as soon as possible. In cases where impacts cannot be mitigated to an acceptable level onsite or where the BLM and WGFD agree that mitigation or additional habitat protections farther away will be of greater benefit to wildlife, offsite mitigation will be considered. Apply the same conservation measures on split-estate lands unless, in the case of federal minerals, this would not be consistent with the surface owner's rights.			
4036	BR: 7.3	Minimize adverse impacts to fish and wildlife during the life of projects through project placement and maintenance of connectivity between large contiguous blocks of undisturbed habitat in cooperation with interested stakeholders. Require seasonal restrictions or other identified mitigation as needed to minimize impacts to migratory birds and their habitats protected by the Migratory Bird Treaty Act.			
4037	BR: 7.2	Prohibit surface-disturbing and disruptive activities within identified big game crucial winter range (Maps 50-54) from November 15 to April 30 and within identified big game parturition areas (Maps 50-54) from May 1 to June 30 unless an exception, waiver, or modification is granted by the Authorized Officer. Authorize exceptions for reclamation seeding when appropriate. Mineral and realty actions in these areas are managed with Category 1 restrictions, except as provided below.			
4038	BR: 8.2	Use an integrated management approach (mechanical, chemical, or biological treatments, prescribed fire, and grazing management techniques) to manipulate vegetative communities to achieve fish, wildlife, and watershed objectives.			
4039	BR: 7.3, 7.4	Remove or modify identified wildlife hazard fences that are adversely affecting wildlife where opportunities exist. Require wildlife escape ramps be installed in stock water troughs and tanks.			
4040	BR: 8.3	Coordinate BLM-authorized animal damage control with APHIS-Wildlife Services and other agencies using guidance provided by the existing MOU with APHIS.			
4041	BR: 8.1, 9.2, 9.3	Identify opportunities to develop wildlife viewing areas in cooperation with stakeholders.			

4000 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES (BR) – FISH AND WILDLIFE					
Record #	**Goal/Obj.**	**Alternative A (Current Management)**	**Alternative B (Most Resource Conservation)**	**Alternative C (Most Resource Utilization)**	**Alternative D (Proposed RMP)**
4042	BR: 10.1	Cooperate with and provide support to WGFD, USFWS, and stakeholders in reintroducing native fish and wildlife species into historic or suitable ranges.			
4043	BR: 7.1	Cooperate with the WGFD to recommend adjustments to herd objectives in light of the habitat condition. Recommend wildlife use adjustments if monitoring data indicate that adjustments are necessary. Cooperate with WGFD to update and adjust seasonal range maps to incorporate new information/data.			
4044	BR: 7.5	Design, locate, and, where feasible, modify road crossings of streams to minimize impacts to fish populations and habitat.			
4045	BR: 7.6, 9.1, 9.2	Work cooperatively with stakeholders and local governments to develop and implement management strategies to prevent the introduction and spread of aquatic invasive species.			
4046	BR: 7.1	Manage habitat within the Whiskey Mountain bighorn sheep area in cooperation with the WGFD and the USFS as provided in the Special Designations section for the Whiskey Mountain ACEC.			
4047	BR: 7.1	Manage in accordance with the recommendations of the statewide Bighorn/Domestic Sheep Interaction Report and the 2012 WAFWA Recommendations for Domestic Sheep and Goat Management in Wild Sheep Habitat (WSWG 2012). Do not allow the use of domestic goats, llamas, etc., in Bighorn Sheep core Herd Units. Allow the use of domestic goats, llamas, etc. in the rest of the planning area where bighorn sheep are not present.			
4048	BR: 8.2	Avoid the movement of water from one drainage to another drainage to prevent aquatic invasive species and disease transfer. If equipment has been used in an area known to contain aquatic invasive species, the equipment will need to be inspected by an authorized aquatic invasive species inspector certified in the State of Wyoming prior to use in any water in the planning area. If aquatic invasive species are found, the equipment will need to be decontaminated following procedures found in Appendix H (p. 1521).			
4049	BR: 8.2	Require monitoring of impacts to wildlife from wind-energy development and apply appropriate mitigation.			
4050	BR: 7.6, 9.3	The Dubois, Red Canyon, Lander Slope, Green Mountain, greater sage-grouse Core Area, and the Sweetwater River watershed are priorities for management of fish and wildlife and their habitat. See the Special Designation-ACEC section for management alternatives.			
4051	BR: 7.2, 8.2	To minimize impacts to wildlife from oil and gas development, consider implementing recommendations found in WGFD document *Recommendations for Development of Oil and Gas Resources within Important Wildlife Habitats* (WGFD 2009a). To minimize impacts to wildlife from wind-energy development, consider implementing recommendations found in the WGFD document *Wildlife Protection Recommendations for Wind Energy Development in Wyoming* (WGFD 2010).			
MANAGEMENT ACTIONS BY ALTERNATIVE					
FISH					

4000 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES (BR) – FISH AND WILDLIFE					
Record #	**Goal/Obj.**	**Alternative A (Current Management)**	**Alternative B (Most Resource Conservation)**	**Alternative C (Most Resource Utilization)**	**Alternative D (Proposed RMP)**
4052	BR: 8.4	Apply seasonal protections for surface-disturbing activities that would adversely impact fish spawning on a case-by-case basis. Mineral and realty actions in these areas are managed with Category 2 restrictions on a case-by-case basis (Map 49).	Apply seasonal protections for surface-disturbing activities within the floodplain or 1,000 feet (whichever is greater) of fish bearing streams to protect game and nongame fish species during spawning, egg incubation, and fry stages. Dates will vary by species and location. Mineral and realty actions in these areas are managed with Category 2 restrictions.	Do not apply seasonal protections for fish spawning. Mineral and realty actions in these areas are managed with Category 2 restrictions.	Apply timing limitations to surface-disturbing activities within water channels that will adversely affect spawning, egg incubation, and fry areas in fish-bearing streams. Spring spawning is protected March 15 to July 31 and fall spawning is protected September 15 to November 30. Dates may vary by species and location.
4053	BR: 8.4, 9.3	Manage human caused barriers to fish passage on a case-by-case basis.	Remove human caused barriers to fish passage where feasible to facilitate genetic diversity and population stability. Place barriers as needed to protect conservation populations of fish species from hybridization or competition. Build fish passages where necessary.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A, plus remove barriers, build passages, or place barriers to protect conservation populations from hybridization or competition.
4054	BR: 7.5	On a case-by-case basis, authorize actions under the jurisdiction of the BLM that would result in the removal or depletion of water from fish bearing streams.	Prohibit new actions under the jurisdiction of the BLM that would result in the removal or depletion of water from fish bearing streams. Modify or remove existing projects that affect the sustainability of fish populations.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A, unless authorized actions would result in the loss of a sustainable fish population. Existing projects that affect the sustainability of fish populations will be modified or removed on a case-by-case basis. For the protection of aquatic habitat and water quality, the area adjacent to Boysen State Park adjacent to Highway 20 is closed to oil and gas leasing.
GENERAL WILDLIFE					

4000 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES (BR) – FISH AND WILDLIFE					
Record #	**Goal/Obj.**	**Alternative A (Current Management)**	**Alternative B (Most Resource Conservation)**	**Alternative C (Most Resource Utilization)**	**Alternative D (Proposed RMP)**
4055	BR: 7.1, 8.2	On a case-by-case basis, reduce the footprint of surface-disturbing activities and facilities to the smallest practical to protect wildlife and their habitats.	In all cases, minimize the footprint of surface-disturbing activities and facilities to the smallest practical to protect wildlife and their habitats.	Do not reduce the footprint of surface-disturbing activities and facilities to protect wildlife and their habitats.	To protect wildlife and their habitats, except when safety and maintenance issues are identified, reduce the footprint of surface-disturbing activities and facilities to the smallest size necessary to achieve the purpose for the disturbance. To protect wildlife and their habitat and other resource values, including cultural and visual resources, and to avoid conflict with the Westside Energy Corridor, the BLM-administered lands in Townships 40 and 41 North are closed to phosphate leasing. Other types of surface disturbance, such as mineral material sales, will be authorized only in consideration of these values.
4056	BR: 8.2	Wildlife seasonal protections for surface-disturbing and disruptive activities do not limit maintenance and operation actions unless specifically identified in project analysis.	Wildlife seasonal protections for surface-disturbing and disruptive activities also apply to maintenance and operation actions of a developed project when the activity is determined to be detrimental to wildlife.	Do not apply wildlife seasonal protections to maintenance and operation actions.	Outside of DDAs, wildlife seasonal protections from surface-disturbing and disruptive activities apply to maintenance and operations actions when the activity is determined to be detrimental to wildlife (see Appendix I (p. 1535)). Reclamation of surface disturbance will be in accordance with Appendix D (p. 1477) for non-DDA areas.

4000 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES (BR) – FISH AND WILDLIFE					
Record #	**Goal/Obj.**	**Alternative A (Current Management)**	**Alternative B (Most Resource Conservation)**	**Alternative C (Most Resource Utilization)**	**Alternative D (Proposed RMP)**
4057	BR: 8.2	Do not avoid surface-disturbing activities in reptile hibernacula (den) sites.	For the protection of reptiles and their habitat, avoid surface-disturbing and disruptive activities within 1,000 feet of identified hibernacula (den) sites. Mineral and realty actions in these areas are managed with Category 3 restrictions.	Same as Alternative A.	For the protection of reptiles and their habitat, prohibit surface-disturbing activities within 200 feet of identified hibernacula (den) sites.
4058	BR: 7.3	Approve new fences and remove or modify existing fences on a case-by-case basis to address habitat fragmentation and big game migration corridors (Map 60).	Do not approve new fences (except for those necessary to exclude and/or protect wildlife or for human health and safety) and remove existing fences, when appropriate, to reduce habitat fragmentation and allow big game passage through migration corridors (Map 60).	Same as Alternative A.	Approve new fences on a case-by-case basis and do not construct fences across identified big game migration corridors unless fence is critical to the success of a Comprehensive Grazing Strategy that makes significant progress toward meeting the Wyoming Standards for Healthy Rangelands and adverse project impacts are mitigated. Look at opportunities to remove existing fences in migration corridors to manage for a no net gain of fences in corridors. Remove or modify existing fences to address habitat fragmentation and barriers to migration on a case-by-case basis. Type E fence will be required for any new or modified highway ROW fence except in those areas bordering domestic sheep allotments or in areas where another fence standard is preferable.
4059	BR: 7.4	On a case-by-case basis, close and reclaim redundant roads to reduce road density and habitat fragmentation.	Identify and close and/or reclaim unnecessary roads to reduce road density and habitat fragmentation.	Do not close and reclaim unnecessary roads.	Same as Alternative A, plus conduct in coordination with adjacent landowners and/or state and county governments.

4000 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES (BR) – FISH AND WILDLIFE					
Record #	**Goal/Obj.**	**Alternative A (Current Management)**	**Alternative B (Most Resource Conservation)**	**Alternative C (Most Resource Utilization)**	**Alternative D (Proposed RMP)**
4060	BR: 8.1	Manage wind-energy development on a case-by-case basis in consideration of greater sage-grouse, raptor concentration areas, big game crucial winter range, migration corridors, and parturition areas.	Exclude wind-energy development in big game crucial winter range, migration corridors, and parturition areas, raptor concentration areas, and areas within 3 miles of greater sage-grouse leks, as identified.	Same as Alternative A.	Limit wind-energy development in greater sage-grouse Core Area to no more than one location per 640 acres and require that the cumulative disturbance from all sources is no more than 5 percent of sagebrush habitat within the project area. Until such time as research on impacts to greater sage-grouse is completed and adequate mitigation can be developed, greater sage-grouse Core Area will be closed to wind-energy development. Same as Alternative A in big game crucial winter range, migration corridors, and parturition areas, raptor concentration areas, and outside of greater sage-grouse Core Area.
BIG GAME					
4061	BR: 7.6	On a case-by-case basis, consider forage requirements for big game herd objectives when making forage allocations for livestock and wild horses.	Adjust livestock and wild horse forage allocations as needed to meet forage requirements for big game herd objectives.	Give priority to livestock forage needs when allocating vegetative resources.	Ensure that wildlife forage requirements are met for big game herd objectives when making forage allocations for livestock and wild horses.
4062	BR: 7.1	On a case-by-case basis, manage vegetation in identified crucial winter range and parturition areas to benefit the identified species (Maps 50-54).	In areas identified as crucial winter range and parturition areas, manage vegetation to benefit the identified big game species (Maps 50-54).	In areas identified as crucial winter range and parturition areas, manage vegetation to benefit all grazing/browsing animals (Maps 50-54).	Same as Alternative A.

4000 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES (BR) – FISH AND WILDLIFE					
Record #	**Goal/Obj.**	**Alternative A (Current Management)**	**Alternative B (Most Resource Conservation)**	**Alternative C (Most Resource Utilization)**	**Alternative D (Proposed RMP)**
4063	BR: 8.2	On a case-by-case basis, authorize livestock water development projects in big game crucial winter range and parturition areas (Maps 50-54).	Prohibit livestock water development projects in big game crucial winter range and parturition areas (Maps 50-54).	Authorize livestock water development projects in big game crucial winter range and parturition areas (Maps 50-54).	Authorize livestock water development projects in big game crucial winter range and parturition areas (Maps 50-54) only if the project is critical to the success of a Comprehensive Grazing Strategy and project impacts are mitigated.
4064	BR: 8.1, 8.2	On a case-by-case basis, avoid authorizing road development in big game crucial winter range and parturition areas.	Prohibit road development in big game crucial winter range and parturition areas unless, on a case-by-case basis, it can be shown that there are no impacts to the species.	Do not limit BLM-authorized road development in big game crucial winter range and parturition areas except in those areas closed to surface-disturbing activities.	Same as Alternative A.
4065	BR: 8.2	Prohibit surface-disturbing and disruptive activities within identified elk winter range from November 15 to April 30 (Map 51). Mineral and realty actions in these areas are managed with Category 1 restrictions.	Same as Alternative A.	Surface-disturbing and disruptive activities within identified elk winter range are not subject to seasonal limitations.	Same as Alternative A, plus the seasonal protection is also for identified mule deer winter range. For the benefit of mule deer and their habitat, close the area in Townships 40 and 41 and the area south of Highway 28 near South Pass that is not part of an ACEC or the Hudson to Atlantic City to phosphate leasing.
RAPTORS					
4066	BR: 8.2	Prohibit surface-disturbing and disruptive activities within ¾ mile of active raptor nests except bald eagles (Map 62) from February 1 to July 31. Actual distances and dates may vary based on topography, species, season of use, and other pertinent factors. See Record 4072 for management of bald eagle nests.	Prohibit surface-disturbing and disruptive activities within 1½ miles of active raptor nests except bald eagle nests (Map 62) during the following time periods: • February 1 to July 15: golden eagle, barn owl, red-tailed hawk, great-horned owl, other raptors • March 1 to July 31: short-eared owl, long-eared owl,	Same as Alternative B, except prohibit surface-disturbing and disruptive activities within ½ mile of active raptor nests except bald eagle nests (Map 62). See Record 4072 for management of bald eagle nests.	Prohibit surface-disturbing and disruptive activities within ¾ mile of active raptor nests, except ferruginous hawk nests where surface-disturbing and disruptive activities are prohibited within 1 mile, during the following time periods: • February 1 to July 31 for all raptors except northern goshawk and burrowing owl

4000 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES (BR) – FISH AND WILDLIFE					
Record #	**Goal/Obj.**	**Alternative A** **(Current Management)**	**Alternative B** **(Most Resource Conservation)**	**Alternative C** **(Most Resource Utilization)**	**Alternative D** **(Proposed RMP)**
			ferruginous hawk, peregrine falcon, screech owl ● April 1 to July 31: osprey, merlin, sharp-shinned hawk, kestrel, prairie falcon, northern harrier, Swainson's hawk, Cooper's hawk ● April 1 to September 15 (or whenever the young have fledged): burrowing owl ● April 1 to August 31: northern goshawk See Record 4072 for management of bald eagle nests.		● April 1 to August 31 for northern goshawk ● April 1 to September 15 for burrowing owl See Record 4072 for management of bald eagle nests. Distances and dates may vary based on raptor species, chick fledging, topography, and other pertinent factors.

Table 2.22. 4000 Biological Resources (BR) – Special Status Species

4000 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES (BR) – SPECIAL STATUS SPECIES					
Record #	**Goal/Obj.**	**Alternative A (Current Management)**	**Alternative B (Most Resource Conservation)**	**Alternative C (Most Resource Utilization)**	**Alternative D (Proposed RMP)**
Goal BR: 11 Manage for the biological integrity and habitat function to facilitate the conservation, recovery and maintenance of populations of fish, wildlife, and plant special status species. **Objectives:** **BR: 11.1** Protect or enhance areas of ecological importance for special status species. Manage for no net loss of habitat for any special status species. **BR: 11.2** Conserve and recover special status species by determining and implementing strategies, restoration opportunities, use restrictions, and management actions. **BR: 11.3** Manage specific environmental hazards, risks, and impacts in a manner compatible with special status species health. **BR: 11.4** Identify habitat thresholds necessary to sustain well-distributed healthy populations of special status species to avoid future listings under the ESA. **BR: 11.5** Develop and implement habitat management plans, activity plans, or use other mechanisms to protect high priority special status species. **Goal BR: 12** Provide quality habitats to support the introduction, reintroduction, and augmentation of identified high priority fish, wildlife, and plant special status species. **Objective:** **BR: 12.1** Identify opportunities in coordination with stakeholders to introduce or reintroduce special status species. **Goal BR: 13** 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. Sustain the integrity of the sagebrush biome to provide the amount, continuity, and quality of habitat that is necessary to maintain sustainable populations of greater sage-grouse and other species by achieving the objectives below. **Objectives:** **BR: 13.1** Maintain large patches of high quality sagebrush habitats with emphasis on patches occupied by greater sage-grouse. **BR: 13.2** Maintain connections between sagebrush habitats, with emphasis on connections between habitats occupied by greater sage-grouse. **Goal BR: 14** Identify the amount of habitat that should undergo restoration and/or rehabilitation during the life of the plan and initiate restoration and/or rehabilitation by achieving the objective below. **Objective:**				

4000 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES (BR) – SPECIAL STATUS SPECIES					
Record #	**Goal/Obj.**	**Alternative A (Current Management)**	**Alternative B (Most Resource Conservation)**	**Alternative C (Most Resource Utilization)**	**Alternative D (Proposed RMP)**
BR: 14.1 Restore and/or reconnect large patches of sagebrush habitat with emphasis on reconnecting patches occupied by stronghold and isolated populations of greater sage-grouse.					
MANAGEMENT ACTIONS COMMON TO ALL ALTERNATIVES					
4067	BR: 11.2	Develop and implement protective measures for federally listed species in coordination with the USFWS. BLM will closely examine the applicability of categorical exclusions in priority habitat. If extraordinary circumstances review is applicable, BLM should determine whether those circumstances exist. BLM will continue to take action in cooperation with the USFWS to facilitate the recovery of threatened and endangered plant species that occur on BLM-administered land.			
4068	BR: 11.2	Require black-footed ferret surveys before authorizing surface-disturbing activities in prairie dog towns suitable as potential habitat for black-footed ferrets, unless cleared by the USFWS.			
4069	BR: 11.2, 11.5	Upon designation of special status species, identify distribution, key habitat areas, and special management needs to be used in developing activity plans. Apply appropriate Required Design Features and BMPs as COAs (such as those identified in Appendix H (p. 1521)) to reduce adverse impacts to special status species.			
4070	BR: 12.1	Coordinate with agencies, including state and local governments, in the restoration, reintroduction, augmentation, or reestablishment of threatened, endangered, and other special status species populations and/or habitats.			
4071	BR: 11.2	Implement appropriate conservation agreements, conservation measures, and BLM-endorsed management strategies for threatened, endangered, and other special status species. Comply with terms of the Statewide Programmatic Section 7 consultations (conservation measures from the letters of concurrence, biological assessments, and biological opinions) for management of threatened, endangered, proposed, and candidate species.			
4072	BR: 11.2	Implement conservation measures, terms and conditions, appropriate Best Management Practices, required design features and reasonable and prudent measures within existing state programmatic biological opinions for the bald eagle. Surface-disturbing and disruptive activities are prohibited within 1 mile of a bald eagle nest from February 1 to August 15.			
4073	BR: 11.2	To protect mountain plover habitat, including a ¼-mile buffer, prohibit surface-disturbing and disruptive activities from April 10 to July 10 unless surveys indicate the absence of breeding/nesting mountain plovers. Mineral and realty actions in these areas are managed with Category 1 restrictions.			
4074	BR: 11.2, 11.5	Develop site-specific measures for BLM-authorized activities to protect threatened, endangered, and sensitive species. Reduce the footprint of development and facilities to the smallest practical to protect special status species and their habitat. Incorporate Required Design Features and BMPs as COAs, such as those identified in Appendix H (p. 1521) as appropriate for authorized activities to address adverse impacts to special status species. Require seasonal restrictions or other identified mitigation as needed to minimize impacts to migratory birds and their habitats protected by the Migratory Bird Treaty Act.			
4075	BR: 11.2	Provide information to fire personnel to prevent fire suppression vehicles from staging in and driving over special status species plant populations. Currently, only the desert yellowhead population has been identified (Map 67).			
4076	BR: 11.1	Prohibit surface-disturbing and disruptive activities in greater sage-grouse winter concentration areas, as they are identified, from December 1 to March 14 unless data indicate a date modification is necessary to better protect wintering greater sage-grouse. Mineral and realty actions in these areas are managed with Category 1 restrictions.			

4000 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES (BR) – SPECIAL STATUS SPECIES					
Record #	**Goal/Obj.**	**Alternative A (Current Management)**	**Alternative B (Most Resource Conservation)**	**Alternative C (Most Resource Utilization)**	**Alternative D (Proposed RMP)**
4077	BR: 11.2	Maintain the current locatable mineral withdrawal for desert yellowhead critical habitat. Mineral and realty actions in this area are managed with Category 5 restrictions. Prohibit surface-disturbing activities and apply a NSO to mineral leasing activities within the Cedar Rim population of desert yellowhead.			
4078	BR: 11.1, 13.1, 13.2, 14.1	The Dubois area and Wyoming Governor's greater sage-grouse Core Area (Map 63) are priorities for management of special status fish and wildlife species and their habitats.			
4079	BR: 13.1, 13.2, 14.1	Maintain sagebrush and understory diversity (relative to ecological site description) in seasonal greater sage-grouse and other sagebrush obligate species habitats unless such removal is necessary to achieve habitat management objectives. Vegetation treatments for greater sage-grouse would follow the "Wyoming Game and Fish Department Protocols for Treating Sagebrush to be Consistent with Wyoming Executive Order 2011-5; Greater Sage-Grouse Core Area Protection" (WGFD 2011) or the most current science available. See IM 2012-019 Attachment 6 or the most current guidance available.			
4080	BR: 13.1, 13.2, 14.1	Maintain seeps, springs, wet meadows, and riparian vegetation in a functional and diverse condition for young greater sage-grouse and other species that depend on forbs and insects associated with these areas. Restore lost riparian functioning systems by repairing abnormally incised drainages to raise water tables and increase water storage and brood-rearing habitats, within greater sage-grouse habitat.			
4081	BR: 11.2, 11.5	If the grizzly bear is delisted, manage habitat in accordance with the recommendations of the Wyoming Grizzly Bear Management Plan.			
4082	BR: 11.2	Discourage the use of broad-spectrum insecticides where insect control is required. Target pest control toward key problem areas and schedule applications to be the smallest amount effective in greater sage-grouse brood-rearing areas.			
4083	BR: 11.2, 11.3	In cooperation with stakeholders, design and locate fences so as not to disturb important greater sage-grouse habitat areas. Increase the visibility of existing fences to reduce hazards to flying greater sage-grouse. Require the installation of fence markers on new wire fences constructed in greater sage-grouse habitat to increase fence visibility and reduce collision potential.			
4084	BR: 11.2, 11.3	To minimize adverse impacts to greater sage-grouse from allowable uses, utilize recommendations from the following sources: "Grazing Influence, Management, and Objective Development in Wyoming's Greater Sage-Grouse Habitat – With Emphasis on Nesting and Early Brood Rearing"; "Sage-Grouse Habitat Management Guidelines for Wyoming"; Studies in Avian Biology article "Ecology and Conservation of Greater Sage-Grouse: A Landscape Species and Its Habitats"; "WAFWA Greater Sage-Grouse Conservation Strategy" and additional information as it becomes available.			
4085	BR: 11.2, 11.3	Establish forage utilization levels in greater sage-grouse nesting habitat to ensure adequate residual cover remains.			
GENERAL SPECIAL STATUS SPECIES					
4086	BR: 11.2	On a case-by-case basis, require surveys for BLM sensitive species as part of authorizing actions. Require protective actions when appropriate.	Require surveys for presence of BLM sensitive species before authorizing surface-disturbing and disruptive activities. Authorize activities only if protective measures can mitigate or eliminate adverse impacts to species and their habitat.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.

4000 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES (BR) – SPECIAL STATUS SPECIES					
Record #	**Goal/Obj.**	**Alternative A (Current Management)**	**Alternative B (Most Resource Conservation)**	**Alternative C (Most Resource Utilization)**	**Alternative D (Proposed RMP)**
4087	BR: 11.4, 11.5, 13.1, 13.2, 14.1	Limits on habitat loss for special status species are not addressed in the current RMP. Manage habitat loss for special status species on a case-by-case basis.	Establish limits of acceptable habitat loss including habitat modification, fragmentation, and loss of function for special status species.	Do not establish limits on habitat loss for special status species except as required to protect threatened and endangered species. Address habitat loss on a case-by-case basis.	Establish limits of acceptable cumulative habitat loss including habitat modification, fragmentation, and loss of function for special status species on a case-by-case basis. Limits of habitat loss and fragmentation for greater sage-grouse in Core Area are addressed in Record 4097.
SPECIAL STATUS PLANTS					
4088	BR: 11.3	Allow chemical vegetation treatments within identified habitat for BLM sensitive plant species on a case-by-case basis.	Prohibit chemical vegetation treatments within ¼ mile of habitat for BLM sensitive plant species unless the purpose is to protect or enhance sensitive species. Increased buffers to protect plant populations may be required on a case-by-case basis.	Allow chemical vegetation treatments within identified habitat for BLM sensitive plant species unless treatment would result in direct mortality of the plant population.	Allow chemical vegetation treatments within identified sensitive plant populations so long as treatments will benefit the population.
4089	BR: 11.2	Apply specific measures to protect known special status plant populations from BLM-authorized activities and motorized travel on a case-by-case basis.	Close areas with special status plant populations to motorized and mechanized travel. Mineral and realty actions in these areas are managed with Category 4 restrictions.	Allow surface-disturbing activities in areas with special status plant populations unless the activity would result in the loss of the population. Limit motorized travel to existing road and trails. Mineral and realty actions in these areas are managed with Category 1 restrictions.	Same as Alternative A, plus close desert yellowhead critical habitat to motorized and mechanized travel.
4090	BR: 11.2	On a case-by-case basis, require inventory of potential habitats for BLM sensitive plant species prior to authorizing activity. If a sensitive species is present, apply appropriate protective measures where possible.	Prohibit activities until the site is inventoried for BLM sensitive plant species and appropriate protective measures are applied.	Do not inventory for BLM sensitive plant species prior to authorizing activities. Apply appropriate protective measures on a case-by-case basis.	Same as Alternative A.

4000 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES (BR) – SPECIAL STATUS SPECIES					
Record #	**Goal/Obj.**	**Alternative A (Current Management)**	**Alternative B (Most Resource Conservation)**	**Alternative C (Most Resource Utilization)**	**Alternative D (Proposed RMP)**
4091	BR: 11.2	Authorize range improvement projects in BLM sensitive plant species habitat on a case-by-case basis.	Prohibit range improvement projects within ½ mile of BLM sensitive plant species habitat unless a benefit to the plant species will be achieved.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A, plus, as needed, buffer with the minimum distance necessary to protect population from grazing impacts.
SPECIAL STATUS FISH					
4092	BR: 11.2	Activities that could contribute sediment to waterbodies that support Yellowstone cutthroat trout, burbot, and sauger are authorized on a case-by-case basis.	Prohibit activities that could contribute sediment to waterbodies that support Yellowstone cutthroat trout, burbot, and sauger unless determined that additional sediment would benefit the species.	Authorize activities that could contribute sediment to waterbodies that support Yellowstone cutthroat trout, burbot, and sauger unless determined that additional sediment would result in species mortality.	Avoid activities that contribute sediment to waterbodies that support Yellowstone cutthroat trout, burbot, and sauger unless determined that additional sediment will not harm species or adequate mitigations can be applied.
SPECIAL STATUS WILDLIFE					
4093	BR: 11.2	Greater sage-grouse Core Area is open to oil and gas and geothermal leasing subject to standard stipulations including stipulations for the protection of greater sage-grouse.	Greater sage-grouse Core Area is closed to oil and gas and geothermal leasing.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A, subject to the management actions described below and in the Special Designations section.
4094	BR: 11.2	Prohibit surface-disturbing and disruptive activities on or within ¼ mile of occupied greater sage-grouse leks (16,283 acres) (Map 63).	Prohibit surface-disturbing and disruptive activities on or within 0.6 mile of occupied or undetermined greater sage-grouse leks (93,411 acres) (Map 64).	Same as Alternative A.	Prohibit surface-disturbing or surface occupancy on or within a 0.6-mile radius of the perimeter of occupied greater sage-grouse leks in Core Area and on or within a ¼-mile radius of the perimeter of occupied greater sage-grouse leks outside Core Area unless greater sage-grouse or lek integrity would not be adversely affected, or unless an exception is granted pursuant to Appendix E (p. 1483) (Map 65). In Core Area, keep any new roads or road upgrades 1.9 miles from the perimeter of the lek.

4000 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES (BR) – SPECIAL STATUS SPECIES					
Record #	**Goal/Obj.**	**Alternative A (Current Management)**	**Alternative B (Most Resource Conservation)**	**Alternative C (Most Resource Utilization)**	**Alternative D (Proposed RMP)**
4095	BR: 11.2	Avoid surface-disturbing and disruptive activities in greater sage-grouse nesting habitat within 2 miles of occupied leks (794,452 acres) from February 1 to July 31 (Map 63).	Avoid surface-disturbing and disruptive activities in greater sage-grouse nesting habitat within 3 miles of occupied leks (1,339,609 acres) from February 1 to July 31 (Map 64).	Same as Alternative A.	Prohibit surface-disturbing and/or disruptive activities from March 15 to June 30 in Core Area. Surface disturbance or disruption defined as notice-level activity pursuant to 43 CFR 3809.21 in Core Area during the period March 15 to June 30 is considered to be unnecessary or undue degradation unless the proponent is able to establish that it is not, based on site-specific information. Outside Core Area, prohibit surface-disturbing and/or disruptive activities from March 15 to June 30 within 2 miles of the perimeter of occupied leks (Map 65). Where credible data support different timeframes for these seasonal restrictions, dates may be expanded 14 days prior to or subsequent to the above dates.
4096	BR: 11.2	Avoid BLM-authorized human activity within ¼ mile of occupied greater sage-grouse leks (16,283 acres) between 8 p.m. and 8 a.m. from March 1 to May 15 on a case-by-case basis (Map 63).	Prohibit BLM-authorized human activity on or within 0.6 mile of perimeter of occupied or undetermined greater sage-grouse leks (93,411 acres) between one hour before sunset to one hour after sunrise from March 1 to May 15 unless activity is specific to inventorying, monitoring or viewing of greater sage-grouse (Map 64).	Avoid BLM-authorized human activity within ¼ mile of perimeter of occupied greater sage-grouse leks (16,283 acres) between 8 p.m. and 8 a.m. from March 1 to May 15 unless activity is specific to inventorying, monitoring or viewing of greater sage-grouse (Map 63).	Prohibit disruptive activities between 6 p.m. and 8 a.m. from March 1 to May 15 on or within 0.6-mile radius of the perimeter of occupied greater sage-grouse leks in Core Area (Map 65).

4000 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES (BR) – SPECIAL STATUS SPECIES					
Record #	**Goal/Obj.**	**Alternative A (Current Management)**	**Alternative B (Most Resource Conservation)**	**Alternative C (Most Resource Utilization)**	**Alternative D (Proposed RMP)**
4097	BR: 11.2	No similar action.	In identified greater sage-grouse breeding, nesting, and brood-rearing habitat, limit the density of disturbances to 1 per 640 acres and cumulative surface disturbance to less than or equal to 2.5 percent of the sagebrush habitat in the same 640 acres.	Do not limit the density of disturbances or acres of surface disturbance in identified greater sage-grouse breeding, nesting, and brood-rearing habitat.	In greater sage-grouse Core Area, limit the density of disturbances to an average of one oil and gas or mining location per 640 acres. The one location and cumulative value of existing disturbances will not exceed 5 percent of habitat. See IM 2012-019 or subsequent guidance with regard to disturbance calculations.
4098	BR: 11, 11.1, 11.2, 11.3, 11.4, 11.5,	No similar action.	If greater sage-grouse Core Area prescriptions, including limitations on surface disturbance, would prevent access to non-federal lands or valid rights existing at the time the ROD was signed, authorize construction of the required new ROW to the absolute minimum standard necessary to provide access. If the new disturbance for the ROW coupled with existing disturbance would exceed 2.5 percent of the area, the ROW would be contingent upon the ROW applicant securing mitigation to offset the disturbance.	Same as Alternative A.	If the new disturbance for a ROW in greater sage-grouse Core Area coupled with existing disturbance would exceed 5 percent (see IM 2012-019 or subsequent guidance with respect to disturbance calculations), then additional effective mitigation is necessary to offset the resulting loss of greater sage-grouse habitat. Interim reclamation following construction of the ROW and final reclamation following the relinquishment of the ROW will ensure reestablishment of the predisturbance greater sage-grouse habitat, with the reclamation bond amount set in consideration of this reclamation obligation.

4000 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES (BR) – SPECIAL STATUS SPECIES					
Record #	**Goal/Obj.**	**Alternative A (Current Management)**	**Alternative B (Most Resource Conservation)**	**Alternative C (Most Resource Utilization)**	**Alternative D (Proposed RMP)**
4099	BR: 11.2, 11.3, 11.5	Major overhead powerlines are authorized on a case-by-case basis, except that ACECs are avoided for major ROWs.	Core Area is closed to major ROWs, except in designated corridors.	Core Area is open to major ROWs.	In Core Area, major overhead powerlines will not be authorized unless within 0.5 mile of an existing 115 kV or greater powerline or in a designated corridor authorized for overhead powerlines. Minor overhead powerlines will not be authorized unless adequate mitigation to protect greater sage-grouse is provided and the Authorized Officer determines that overhead installation has the fewest adverse impacts to greater sage-grouse.
4100	BR: 11.2, 11.3, 11.5	No similar action.	Core Area is closed to wind-energy development.	Same as Alternative A.	Until research on impacts of wind energy to greater sage-grouse is completed and adequate mitigation can be developed, exclude wind-energy development in Core Area.
4101	BR: 11.2	Allow livestock water development projects in greater sage-grouse nesting areas on a case-by-case basis.	Prohibit livestock water development projects in greater sage-grouse nesting areas (Map 64).	Allow livestock water development projects in greater sage-grouse nesting habitats.	Allow livestock water development projects in greater sage-grouse nesting habitat if the project will contribute to improved greater sage-grouse habitat, developments can be designed to be compatible with greater sage-grouse, and if they are part of a Comprehensive Grazing Strategy. When fences are authorized, require a design that has the fewest adverse impacts to greater sage-grouse including features to reduce greater sage-grouse strikes and mortality. Remove, modify, or mark fences in high-risk areas.

4000 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES (BR) – SPECIAL STATUS SPECIES					
Record #	**Goal/Obj.**	**Alternative A (Current Management)**	**Alternative B (Most Resource Conservation)**	**Alternative C (Most Resource Utilization)**	**Alternative D (Proposed RMP)**
4102	BR: 11.2	Allow new high-profile structures within greater sage-grouse nesting habitats on a case-by-case basis.	Prohibit new, permanent, high-profile structures (higher than 12 feet) within 1 mile of occupied greater sage-grouse nesting habitat (Map 64). Mineral and realty actions in these areas are managed with Category 4 restrictions.	Allow high-profile structures within greater sage-grouse nesting habitats. Mineral and realty actions in these areas are managed with Category 1 restrictions.	New permanent, high-profile structures within greater sage-grouse nesting habitat will be allowed on a case-by-case basis. Require the installation of anti-perching devices on appropriate structures to reduce predation opportunities.
4103	BR: 11.2	Manage wind-energy development on a case-by-case basis in consideration of impacts to greater sage-grouse and its habitat.	Exclude wind-energy development in greater sage-grouse Core Area.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A, but in conformity with Records 4060 and 4097. Until research on impacts of wind-energy development to greater sage-grouse is completed and adequate mitigation can be developed, exclude wind-energy development in greater sage-grouse Core Area.
4104	BR: 11.2	On a case-by-case basis, require facilities be located and noise levels of equipment be reduced to minimize the impacts of continuous noise on breeding and nesting greater sage-grouse.	Limit noise sources to 10 dBA above natural ambient noise measured at the perimeter of occupied greater sage-grouse leks.	Limit noise sources to 10 dBA above natural ambient noise measured at the perimeter of occupied greater sage-grouse leks from March 1 to May 15.	Same as Alternative C, unless scientific findings indicate a different noise level is appropriate. In addition, limit noise sources in other important greater sage-grouse habitats if research and/or policy indicates the need.
4105	BR: 11.3	To minimize raptor use, require anti-perching devices on new overhead powerlines and wind energy meteorological towers in greater sage-grouse, prairie dog, mountain plover, and pygmy rabbit habitats on a case-by-case basis.	Install anti-perching devices on all new overhead powerlines and on wind energy meteorological towers in greater sage-grouse, prairie dog, mountain plover and pygmy rabbit habitats. Work with ROW holders to install anti-perching devices on existing overhead powerlines in these habitats.	Same as Alternative A.	To minimize raptor use, require anti-perching devices on new overhead powerlines in greater sage-grouse Core Area. Require anti-perching devices on new overhead powerlines and wind energy meteorological towers in prairie dog, mountain plover, and pygmy rabbit habitats on a case-by-case basis. Work with ROW holders to install anti-perching devices on existing powerlines in these habitats.

4000 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES (BR) – SPECIAL STATUS SPECIES					
Record #	**Goal/Obj.**	**Alternative A (Current Management)**	**Alternative B (Most Resource Conservation)**	**Alternative C (Most Resource Utilization)**	**Alternative D (Proposed RMP)**
4106	BR: 11.3	Allow above ground low voltage utility lines or require burying lines in greater sage-grouse, prairie dog, mountain plover, and pygmy rabbit habitats on a case-by-case basis.	Bury all new low voltage utility lines and high voltage utility lines where technologically feasible in greater sage-grouse, prairie dog, mountain plover, and pygmy rabbit habitats.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A, plus evaluate and take advantage of opportunities such as the renewal of existing ROWs to remove or modify existing powerlines, prioritizing greater sage-grouse Core Area.
4107	BR: 11.2	On a case-by-case basis, avoid surface-disturbing activities in occupied pygmy rabbit habitats.	Prohibit surface-disturbing activities within 328 feet (100 meters) of suitable pygmy rabbit habitat.	Allow surface-disturbing activities in occupied pygmy rabbit habitats on a case-by-case basis.	Prohibit surface-disturbing activities within 200 feet of occupied pygmy rabbit habitat.
4108	BR: 11.2	Avoid surface-disturbing activities in occupied white-tailed prairie dog colonies where possible.	Prohibit surface-disturbing activities in all white-tailed prairie dog colonies.	On a case-by-case basis, avoid surface-disturbing activities in white-tailed prairie dog complexes larger than 100 acres.	Same as Alternative A.
4109	BR: 11.2, 11.3	Avoid surface-disturbing and disruptive activity impacts to bat maternity roosts and hibernation areas on a case-by-case basis.	Prohibit surface-disturbing and disruptive activities within ¼ mile of identified bat maternity roosts and hibernation areas that would adversely impact bats and their habitat.	Allow surface-disturbing and disruptive activities adjacent to or in bat maternity roosts and hibernation areas unless direct bat mortality would occur.	Same as Alternative B.
4110	BR: 11.1	Manage travel corridors for threatened and endangered species and BLM sensitive species on a case-by-case basis (Map 66). (Note: Only Canada lynx analysis units have been identified to date.)	Preserve traditional migration and travel corridors for all special status species as corridors are identified.	Preserve essential migration and travel corridors for threatened and endangered species as corridors are identified.	Same as Alternative A, plus manage permitted activities within travel corridors to avoid adverse impacts to sensitive species.

4000 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES (BR) – SPECIAL STATUS SPECIES					
Record #	**Goal/Obj.**	**Alternative A (Current Management)**	**Alternative B (Most Resource Conservation)**	**Alternative C (Most Resource Utilization)**	**Alternative D (Proposed RMP)**
4111	BR: 11.1	Mineral and realty actions in the Dubois area not included in an ACEC are managed as follows: ● Open to oil and gas leasing subject standard stipulations ● Open to geophysical exploration ● Open to phosphate leasing ● Open to locatable minerals ● Open to mineral material disposals ● Open to major ROWs ● Open to minor ROWs	To protect the concentration of special status species and their habitats, mineral and realty actions in the Dubois area not included in an ACEC are managed as follows: ● Closed to oil and gas leasing ● Closed to geophysical exploration ● Closed to phosphate leasing ● Open to locatable minerals ● Closed to mineral material disposals ● Excluded to major ROWs ● Avoided for minor ROWs	Same as Alternative A.	To protect the concentration of special status species and their habitats, mineral and major realty actions in the Dubois area not included in a WSA or an ACEC are managed as follows: ● Closed to oil and gas leasing ● Closed to geophysical exploration ● Closed to phosphate leasing ● Open to locatable minerals ● Closed to mineral material disposals unless entirely contained within the 120 acres located in T41N, R107W, Sec. 1 N1/2SE1/4.1 ● Excluded to major ROWs ● Avoided for minor ROWs
4112	BR: 11.2	On a case-by-case basis, adjust livestock grazing season of use dates to avoid conflict with grizzly bears.	Adjust livestock grazing season of use dates to avoid conflict with grizzly bears.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.

Table 2.23. 4000 Biological Resources (BR) – Wild Horses

4000 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES (BR) – WILD HORSES					
Record #	**Goal/Obj.**	**Alternative A (Current Management)**	**Alternative B (Most Resource Conservation)**	**Alternative C (Most Resource Utilization)**	**Alternative D (Proposed RMP)**
Goal BR: 15 Manage healthy wild horse herds within appropriate management levels that will maintain a thriving natural ecological balance between wild horse populations, wildlife, livestock, vegetation resources, and other resource values. **Objectives:** **BR: 15.1** Adjust and maintain wild horse numbers and HMAs to comply with federal policies and applicable agreements with the State of Wyoming, including the August 2003 Consent Decree as applicable to the management situation. **BR: 15.2** Maintain or enhance herd viability, genetic integrity, and unique characteristics that distinguish individual herds. **BR: 15.3** Provide opportunities for viewing wild horses.					
MANAGEMENT ACTIONS COMMON TO ALL ALTERNATIVES					
4113	BR: 15.1	Conduct regular and periodic gathers when necessary to maintain a thriving natural ecological balance or when required by emergency to maintain the initial Appropriate Management Level ranges (number of horses) listed below. If NEPA analysis indicates a need for a change in the viable population of horses, Appropriate Management Levels may be changed without an amendment to the RMP. ● Antelope Hills/Cyclone Rim: 60-82 ● Conant Creek: 60-100 ● Crooks Mountain: 65-85 ● Dishpan Butte: 50-100 ● Green Mountain: 170-300 ● Muskrat Basin: 160-250 ● Rock Creek Mountain: 50-86			
4114	BR: 15.1, 15.2	Utilize chemical and other population control measures as needed to maintain Appropriate Management Level ranges.			
4115	BR: 15.1	Gather wild horses outside the established HMAs during routine periodic gathers (Map 68). Prioritize gathers in greater sage-grouse Core Area unless removals are necessary in other areas to prevent serious environmental issues, including herd health impacts. Utilize Required Design Features and BMPs (such as those in Appendix H (p. 1521)) as COAs to promote genetic diversity and limit adverse impacts to wild horses from gathers.			
4116	BR: 15.2	Employ selective removal criteria during periodic gathers to increase desired genotype and phenotype.			
4117	BR: 15.1	Utilize monitoring and evaluation data to assess habitat and populations within HMAs.			
4118	BR: 15.1	Conduct animal health monitoring.			
4119	BR: 15.1	Manage the North Lander four herds as one herd to promote good distribution, but maintain separate horse Appropriate Management Levels in existing HMAs.			
4120	BR: 15.1	Maintain sufficient year-round water sources to sustain wild horses. Evaluate all proposed range improvement projects to benefit wild horses for impacts to other resources and uses.			

4000 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES (BR) – WILD HORSES					
Record #	**Goal/Obj.**	**Alternative A (Current Management)**	**Alternative B (Most Resource Conservation)**	**Alternative C (Most Resource Utilization)**	**Alternative D (Proposed RMP)**
4121	BR: 15.1	Update the Herd Management Area Plan as needed to meet herd health objectives, including Appropriate Management Levels, and to address impacts to other resources. Consider forage competition and evaluate overall utilization levels by all grazing animals and incorporate greater sage-grouse habitat management objectives.			
4122	BR: 15.1	Manage wind-energy development within wild horse HMAs and adjacent lands so as not to preclude the ability to manage wild horses within the HMAs.			
MANAGEMENT ACTIONS BY ALTERNATIVE					
4123	BR: 15.3	Do not establish scenic loops for viewing wild horses.	Establish scenic loops for viewing wild horses in some or all of the following areas (Map 68): • Antelope Hills to Cyclone Rim • Green Mountain Herd Area • Muskrat Basin to Dishpan Butte	Same as Alternative B.	Same as Alternative B, but limit road improvements to those necessary for public safety keeping as small a footprint as possible. Encourage primitive recreation and outfitters to add wild-horse viewing opportunities. Identify locations for web cams or electronic viewing opportunities, to expand opportunities to view wild horses from a distance. Partner with state and local tourism promoters to encourage wild-horse viewing.
4124	BR: 15.1, 15.2	Consider impacts on herd health, including genetic diversity, when making management decisions regarding fencing.	Remove or modify existing fences to allow free movement among herd populations.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A, plus remove or modify existing fences to allow free movements among herd populations as opportunities arise.

Table 2.24. 5000 Heritage Resources (HR) – Cultural Resources

5000 HERITAGE RESOURCES (HR) – CULTURAL RESOURCES					
Record #	**Goal/Obj.**	**Alternative A (Current Management)**	**Alternative B (Most Resource Conservation)**	**Alternative C (Most Resource Utilization)**	**Alternative D (Proposed RMP)**
Goal HR: 1 Identify, preserve, and protect significant cultural resources and ensure that they are available for appropriate uses by present and future generations (FLPMA, Section 103(c), 201(a) and (c); NHPA, Section 110(a); ARPA, Section 14(a)). **Objectives:** **HR: 1.1** Compile a record of known cultural resources in the Lander Field Office and assign those resources to appropriate uses. Manage each type of cultural resource according to their proper use allocation, and monitor those resources' condition and use. **HR: 1.2** Maintain a representative sample of each cultural resource type for future generations. **Goal HR: 2** Seek to reduce imminent threats and resolve potential conflicts from natural or human-caused deterioration, or potential conflict with other resource uses (FLPMA Section 103(c), NHPA 106, 110 (a)(2)) by ensuring that all authorizations for land use and resource use will comply with the NHPA Section 106. **Objectives:** **HR: 2.1** Develop activity plans or project/site-specific treatment plans or other protective measures for significant cultural resources at risk from deterioration or adverse effects from other uses (e.g., Beaver Creek Oil and Gas Unit). Coordinate with other BLM programs to prevent potential conflicts before they are allowed to occur. **HR: 2.2** Consult with Native American tribal governments regarding proposed land uses having the potential to affect cultural resources identified as having tribal interests or concerns. Determine the types of resources of concern to various tribes, and take tribal views into consideration when making land use allocations or decisions. **Goal HR: 3** Protect significant cultural resources while endeavoring to minimize economic and social impacts to private landowners and local communities. **Objectives:** **HR: 3.1** Consult and coordinate with affected landowners and local communities when devising protection measures for cultural resources. **HR: 3.2** Consult and coordinate with affected landowners and local communities when devising recreational use plans for cultural resources. **Goal HR: 4** Maintain existing and establish new working relationships with Native American tribes for purposes of advancing the protection of cultural resources. **Objective:** **HR: 4.1** Consult, as appropriate, with Native Americans to identify tribally-sensitive resources or places that may be present within the Lander Field Office. Safeguard all information considered by tribes to be confidential, and utilize the information to prevent conflicts with incompatible uses.					

5000 HERITAGE RESOURCES (HR) – CULTURAL RESOURCES					
Record #	**Goal/Obj.**	**Alternative A (Current Management)**	**Alternative B (Most Resource Conservation)**	**Alternative C (Most Resource Utilization)**	**Alternative D (Proposed RMP)**

Goal HR: 5 Promote stewardship, conservation, and appreciation of cultural and paleontological resources.

Objectives:

HR: 5.1 Maintain and enhance programs that provide opportunities for scientific research of cultural and paleontological resources. Develop relationships and cooperative agreements with the University of Wyoming and other research institutions.

HR: 5.2 Provide opportunities for public education, interpretation, and scientific research of cultural and paleontological resources. Continue Project Archeology teaching courses, and continue to conduct public presentations for schools, community organizations, and the public. Provide for appropriate interpretation of sites of high public interest. Provide selected cultural and paleontological resources for scientific research.

HR: 5.3 Preserve and stabilize significant cultural and paleontological resources, especially resources that face immediate threat, and/or historic structures in high public use areas.

HR: 5.4 Pursue establishment of site stewardship programs at vulnerable cultural sites, e.g., the Castle Gardens Rock Art Site.

Goal HR: 6 Preserve and protect the historical remains and historical settings of the Oregon, Mormon Pioneer, California, and Pony Express NHTs. See the Congressionally Designated Trails section for management alternatives for these resources. If they are not designated as an ACEC then management actions for them will be analyzed in this (5000 – Heritage Resources) section.

Goal HR: 7 Preserve and protect the historical remains and historical settings of intact portions of the Warm Springs Canyon Flume.

Objectives:

HR: 7.1 Coordinate with operations and other programs to stabilize and/or repair suitable portions of the Flume.

HR: 7.2 Establish appropriate management prescriptions to maintain or improve the historic and physical integrity of the Flume and its settings.

HR: 7.3 Ensure recreation use in the area near the Flume will be compatible with private landowner concerns and historical values.

Goal HR: 8 Preserve and protect the historical remains and historical settings of the South Pass Historic Mining Area and associated sites, including Miner's Delight and South Pass City. See the Areas of Critical Environmental Concern section for management alternatives for these resources. If they are not designated as ACEC then management actions for them will be analyzed in this (5000 – Heritage Resources) section.

Goal HR: 9 Preserve and protect the historical remains and historical settings of other significant trails and roads, including intact portions of the Bridger Trail; the Rawlins-Fort Washakie, the Casper-Lander, the Green River to Fort Washakie, the Point of Rocks to South Pass, and the Birdseye Pass Stage Trails; and the Yellowstone/National Park to Park Highways. See the Areas of Critical Environmental Concern section for management alternatives for these resources. If they are not designated ACECs, then management actions for them will be analyzed in this (5000 – Heritage Resources) section.

5000 HERITAGE RESOURCES (HR) – CULTURAL RESOURCES					
Record #	**Goal/Obj.**	**Alternative A (Current Management)**	**Alternative B (Most Resource Conservation)**	**Alternative C (Most Resource Utilization)**	**Alternative D (Proposed RMP)**
Goal HR: 10 Preserve and protect the prehistoric remains and natural settings of the Castle Gardens Rock Art Site. See the Areas of Critical Environmental Concern section for management alternatives for these resources. If they are not designated ACECs, then management actions for them will be analyzed in this (5000 – Heritage Resources) section. **Goal HR: 11** Preserve and protect the cultural remains and natural settings of Cedar Ridge Traditional Cultural Property. See the Areas of Critical Environmental Concern section for management alternatives for these resources. If they are not designated ACECs, then management actions for them will be analyzed in this (5000 – Heritage Resources) section. **Goal HR: 12** Preserve and protect the cultural remains and natural settings of Sacred, Spiritual, and/or Traditional Cultural Properties.					
MANAGEMENT ACTIONS COMMON TO ALL ALTERNATIVES					
5001	HR: 1	Identify representative samples of cultural resource types (prehistoric and historic) from each Archeological Study Unit, and protect and preserve them for appreciation by future generations.			
5002	HR: 4.1	Continue existing relationships and develop new relationships with Native American tribes, in order to identify sites, areas, and resources important to them. Document and keep confidential important sites, areas, and resources, as appropriate. Incorporate the information into the planning system, to identify conflicts in the earliest stages, and to avoid conflicts whenever possible. Manage identified areas of tribal importance to minimize disturbance to them and to ensure continued access.			
5003	HR: 4.1	Ensure that areas important to Native American communities are not transferred from federal ownership, physically modified, or affected by management actions in ways that restrict or deny access and/or use.			
5004	HR: 4.1	Protect and manage sites that are eligible for or listed on the NRHP (Map 69). Manage sites allocated for conservation, traditional use, or public use to avoid adverse effects; manage sites allocated for scientific or experimental use for their research potential. Protect and manage NHLs, NHTs, and NNLs through management of non-compatible uses.			
5005	HR: 1.1, 2.1	Identify areas of significant prehistoric cultural resources that are at high risk from development, as data becomes available.			
5006	HR: 3.1, 3.2	In cooperation with local government and stakeholders (including Fremont County entities such as the Museums Board and the Historic Preservation Board), consider the economic and social effects of protecting cultural resources. Coordinate with affected landowners, local communities, and agencies on any decisions that could affect their use or operations. Consistent with cultural resource protection goals and objectives, devise management actions that do not adversely affect the objectives of private landowners or local communities.			
5007	HR: 12	Manage sacred, spiritual, and/or traditional cultural properties as they are identified.			
5008	HR: 12	Limit motorized travel to existing or designated roads and trails in the areas around sacred, spiritual, and/or traditional properties.			
MANAGEMENT ACTIONS BY ALTERNATIVE					

5000 HERITAGE RESOURCES (HR) – CULTURAL RESOURCES					
Record #	**Goal/Obj.**	**Alternative A** **(Current Management)**	**Alternative B** **(Most Resource Conservation)**	**Alternative C** **(Most Resource Utilization)**	**Alternative D** **(Proposed RMP)**
5009	HR: 2.1	Allow BLM-authorized activities to proceed in accordance with current Wyoming State Protocol and NHPA regulations. For cultural resources significant for their information potential, require the recovery of scientific data if an activity would cause adverse effects. For cultural resources significant for reasons other than information potential, require detailed documentation.	Allow BLM-authorized activities to proceed in accordance with current Wyoming State Protocol and NHPA regulations, with an emphasis on avoiding National Register-eligible properties (Map 69).	Allow BLM-authorized activities to proceed in accordance with current Wyoming State Protocol and NHPA regulations. Allow development to proceed by imposing the minimum restrictions required by regulation on activities that could cause adverse effects to National Register-eligible properties.	Allow BLM-authorized activities to proceed in accordance with RMP decisions and current Wyoming State Protocol and NHPA regulations. For cultural resources significant for their information potential, require avoidance whenever possible. If avoidance is not possible, require the recovery of scientific data if an activity would cause adverse effects. For cultural resources significant for reasons other than information potential, require avoidance whenever possible; if avoidance is not possible, require detailed documentation.
5010	HR: 2.1, 6	On a case-by-case basis for Significant (see Glossary) cultural resources, implement appropriate viewshed protections, limit degradation, promote educational opportunities, and limit effects from development and BLM-authorized activities. Continue to preserve and stabilize significant sites known to be in danger of degradation or as brought to the attention of the BLM.	Conduct assessments in areas where cultural resources are threatened by development or are known to be in danger of degradation. Identify and prioritize endangered sites and apply the following management: • Sites where the historic setting is important: implement landscape or viewshed-wide protections of cultural resources and limit degradation of the historic setting. Sites include the NHTs, RHT&EHs, Castle Gardens, South Pass Historic Mining Area, Warm Springs Canyon Flume, sacred sites, and Cedar Ridge.	Same as Alternative A, except impose the minimum restrictions required by regulation on activities that could cause adverse effects to National Register-eligible properties.	Same as Alternative A.

5000 HERITAGE RESOURCES (HR) – CULTURAL RESOURCES					
Record #	**Goal/Obj.**	**Alternative A (Current Management)**	**Alternative B (Most Resource Conservation)**	**Alternative C (Most Resource Utilization)**	**Alternative D (Proposed RMP)**
			• Sites threatened with degradation: develop funding for conservation of sites, working in cooperation with interested partners. Sites include the NHTs, RHT&EHs, Castle Gardens, South Pass Historic Mining Area, and Warm Springs Canyon Flume.		
5011	HR: 2.2	Consult with tribes when specific projects may have the potential to adversely affect resources important to them. Consider tribal views when uses threaten these sites and protect tribally important sites, areas, and resources whenever possible.	Same as Alternative A, plus conduct ethnographic research to identify sensitive sites throughout the Lander Field Office. Protect all tribally important sites. Develop standards for programmatic management based on the type of site.	Same as Alternative A, except that in areas where protection would conflict with other uses, impose the minimum restrictions required by regulation on activities that could cause adverse effects to National Register-eligible properties.	Same as Alternative A.
5012	HR: 5.1	Continue cooperative agreements with the University of Wyoming to make mitigation and research projects more timely and cost-effective.	Same as Alternative A, plus establish cooperative relationships with other partners to increase scientific research of cultural and paleontological resources.	Same as Alternative A.	Continue cooperative agreements with the University of Wyoming to make mitigation and research projects more timely and cost-effective. Establish cooperative relationships with other partners to increase scientific research of cultural resources when opportunities arise.
5013	HR: 1.1	Conduct inventories for cultural resources prior to all surface-disturbing activities.	Same as Alternative A, except use Class I Regional Overview to proactively identify areas of high, medium, and low probability for the discovery of cultural sites. Conduct non-project specific Class III inventories in areas of high development potential and of high probability for cultural resource sites.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.
SPECIFIC CULTURAL RESOURCES					
See the Special Designations section for management alternatives for cultural resources that are managed or are nominated for management as Special Designations.					

5000 HERITAGE RESOURCES (HR) – CULTURAL RESOURCES					
Record #	**Goal/Obj.**	**Alternative A (Current Management)**	**Alternative B (Most Resource Conservation)**	**Alternative C (Most Resource Utilization)**	**Alternative D (Proposed RMP)**
WARM SPRINGS CANYON FLUME, NATURAL BRIDGE, AND GEYSER					
5014	HR: 7.1, 7.2, 7.3	Manage the Warm Springs Canyon Flume site (557 acres) (Map 69) to protect the site as a National Register-eligible property.	Manage the Warm Springs Canyon Flume site and surroundings (834 acres) (Map 69) to protect the area as a National Register-eligible property.	Same as Alternative A.	Manage the Warm Springs Canyon Flume site (557 acres) and the area around it (Map 69) to protect and stabilize the area as a National Register-eligible property.
5015	HR: 7.3	Mineral and realty actions in the 557-acre Warm Springs Canyon Flume Site area are managed with Category 5 restrictions. Mineral and realty actions in the remainder of the area (277 acres) are managed with Category 2 restrictions.	Mineral and realty actions in the 834-acre Warm Springs Canyon Flume Site are managed with Category 6 restrictions.	Mineral and realty actions in the 557-acre Warm Springs Canyon Flume Site are managed with Category 1 restrictions.	Mineral and realty actions in the 557-acre Warm Springs Canyon Flume Site are managed with Category 5 restrictions. Mineral and realty actions in the remainder of the area (277 acres) are managed with Category 4 restrictions.
5016	HR: 7.2	The Flume area is available for livestock grazing, subject to standard Protocol and NHPA measures to protect the site.	Same as Alternative A, except do not authorize new range improvement projects within the 834 acres.	Same as Alternative A.	The Flume area is available for livestock grazing, but prohibit activities that could result in damage to the flume.
5017	HR: 7.2	Limit motorized travel to existing roads and trails.	Limit motorized travel to designated roads and trails.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.
5018	HR: 7.2	Develop a cultural resource management plan for the Flume, including stabilization of selected segments of the Flume.	Same as Alternative A, plus manage the Flume and surroundings in cooperation with USFS and nearby landowners to better preserve the property.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative B.
SACRED, SPIRITUAL, and/or TRADITIONAL CULTURAL PROPERTIES					

5000 HERITAGE RESOURCES (HR) – CULTURAL RESOURCES					
Record #	**Goal/Obj.**	**Alternative A (Current Management)**	**Alternative B (Most Resource Conservation)**	**Alternative C (Most Resource Utilization)**	**Alternative D (Proposed RMP)**
5019	HR: 12	Mineral and realty actions are subject to the following restrictions (1,118 acres): • 0 to ¼ mile from a property is managed with Category 3 restrictions. • The area beyond ¼ mile from a property is managed with Category 1 restrictions and subject to standard Protocol and NHPA measures.	Mineral leasing, mining, and realty actions are subject to the following restrictions (60,700 acres): • 0 to 3 miles from a property is managed with Category 4 restrictions. • The area beyond 3 miles from a property is managed with Category 1 restrictions and subject to standard Protocol and NHPA measures.	Same as Alternative A.	Mineral leasing, mining, and realty actions in the established protection zones around the following sites [48FR301 (2,940 acres), 48FR311 (555 acres), 48FR3997 (1,045 acres), 48FR4070 (3,378 acres), 48FR4489 (930 acres)], 48FR773 (588), 48FR6125 (770 acres), new sacred sites as they are identified and then verified by tribes and the BLM, are managed with the following restrictions (10,206 total acres): • Open to oil and gas leasing subject to NSO stipulations • Open to geophysical exploration • Closed to solid mineral leasing • Open to locatable minerals • Closed to salable minerals • Excluded to major ROWs • Avoided for minor ROWs
5020	HR: 12	Properties are available for livestock grazing, subject to standard Protocol and NHPA measures to protect them.	Same as Alternative A, except do not authorize new range improvement projects within 2 miles of each property.	Same as Alternative A.	Sites listed in Record 5019 are available for livestock grazing, but prohibit new range improvement projects within the site protection zones unless these projects are designed to protect the sites. Consult with grazing permittees on extent of site protection areas.
5021	HR: 1, 7	Develop cultural resource management plans for each property as time and funding permit.	Develop cultural resource management plans for each property in consultation with affected tribes. Complete ethnographic studies, archeological surveys, and	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.

5000 HERITAGE RESOURCES (HR) – CULTURAL RESOURCES					
Record #	**Goal/Obj.**	**Alternative A (Current Management)**	**Alternative B (Most Resource Conservation)**	**Alternative C (Most Resource Utilization)**	**Alternative D (Proposed RMP)**
			stewardship programs to better manage the properties.		

Table 2.25. 5000 Heritage Resources (HR) – Paleontological Resources

5000 HERITAGE RESOURCES (HR) – PALEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCES					
Record #	**Goal/Obj.**	**Alternative A (Current Management)**	**Alternative B (Most Resource Conservation)**	**Alternative C (Most Resource Utilization)**	**Alternative D (Proposed RMP)**
Goal HR: 13 Locate, evaluate, manage, and protect, where appropriate, paleontological resources on BLM-administered lands.					
		Objectives:			
		HR: 13.1 Compile a record of known paleontological resources in the Lander Field Office and assign those resources to appropriate uses. Manage each type of paleontological resource according to their proper use allocation, and monitor those resources' condition and use.			
		HR: 13.2 Maintain a representative sample of each paleontological resource type for future generations.			
Goal HR: 14 Facilitate the appropriate scientific, educational, and recreational uses of paleontological resources, such as research and interpretation.					
		Objectives:			
		HR: 14.1 Develop management recommendations to promote the scientific, educational, and recreational uses of paleontological resources.			
		HR: 14.2 Continue to work closely with paleontological researchers who carry permits to scientifically survey, collect, and excavate fossil resources on BLM-administered lands.			
Goal HR: 15 Ensure that proposed land uses, initiated or authorized by the BLM, do not inadvertently damage or destroy important paleontological resources on BLM-administered lands.					
		Objectives:			
		HR: 15.1 Utilize the BLM PFYC system to assess possible resource impacts and mitigation needs for federal actions.			
		HR: 15.2 Require surveys, monitoring, and excavation where appropriate to identify and protect important paleontological resources from surface-disturbing activities.			
Goal HR: 16 Foster public awareness and appreciation of our nation's rich paleontological heritage.					
		Objectives:			
		HR: 16.1 Maintain and enhance programs that provide opportunities for scientific research of paleontological resources. Develop relationships and cooperative agreements with the University of Wyoming and other research institutions.			
		HR: 16.2 Provide opportunities for public education, interpretation, and scientific research of paleontological resources. Provide for appropriate interpretation of sites of high public interest. Provide selected paleontological resources for scientific research.			

5000 HERITAGE RESOURCES (HR) – PALEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCES					
Record #	**Goal/Obj.**	**Alternative A (Current Management)**	**Alternative B (Most Resource Conservation)**	**Alternative C (Most Resource Utilization)**	**Alternative D (Proposed RMP)**
HR: 16.3 Preserve and stabilize significant paleontological resources, especially resources that face immediate threat, and/or paleontological localities in high public use areas.					
MANAGEMENT ACTIONS COMMON TO ALL ALTERNATIVES					
5022	HR: 13.1, 15.1, 15.2	Mineral and realty actions in areas with "very high" or "high" PFYC (Map 70) are managed with Category 2 restrictions. When disturbing formations considered to have "very high" or "high" PFYC, survey and/or monitor for the discovery of significant paleontological resources. Protect paleontological resources which are considered to be significant (vertebrate fossils and invertebrate or plant fossils considered scientifically important by professional paleontologists) from the effects of development projects. Protection also includes data recovery through scientific collection or excavation, and/or protection/stabilization. Develop special management plans for areas of unusual or concentrated significant paleontological resources.			
5023	HR: 13.2, 15.1, 15.2, 16.1, 16.3	Protect significant paleontological resources from natural degradation and from non-project human-caused damage. Continue to protect significant fossil localities suffering from natural weathering and erosion through collection efforts. Continue to protect significant localities suffering from vandalism through physical and administrative measures.			
MANAGEMENT ACTIONS BY ALTERNATIVE					
5024	HR: 13.2, 15.1, 15.2, 16.1, 16.3	Allow standard development and BLM-authorized activities to proceed in accordance with resource protections identified in regulations and guidelines. For significant paleontological resources, require the recovery of scientific data if an activity would cause adverse effects.	Same as Alternative A, plus identify resources that would be useful for public interpretation and pursue funding to allow visitation and interpretation.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative B.
5025	HR: 16.1, 16.2, 16.3	On a case-by-case basis for significant paleontological resources, limit degradation, promote educational opportunities, and limit impacts from development and BLM-authorized activities. Continue to preserve and stabilize significant fossil localities known to be in danger of degradation or as brought to the attention of the BLM.	Same as Alternative A, plus conduct inventories in areas where paleontological resources are threatened by development or are known to be in danger of degradation. Identify and prioritize endangered sites and apply the following management: • Localities threatened by development: implement protections based on level of threat and importance of resource; prohibit development where needed.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A, plus conduct inventories in areas where significant paleontological resources are known to be threatened by development or to be in danger of degradation. Identify and prioritize endangered sites and apply the following management: • Significant localities threatened by development: implement protections based on level of threat and importance of resource;

5000 HERITAGE RESOURCES (HR) – PALEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCES					
Record #	**Goal/Obj.**	**Alternative A (Current Management)**	**Alternative B (Most Resource Conservation)**	**Alternative C (Most Resource Utilization)**	**Alternative D (Proposed RMP)**
			• Localities with educational potential: work cooperatively to protect these areas from degradation; develop and improve educational values of these localities. • Sites threatened with degradation: develop funding for conservation of paleontological localities, working in cooperation with interested partners.		prohibit development where needed. • Significant localities with educational potential: work cooperatively to protect these areas from degradation; develop and improve educational values of these localities. • Significant localities threatened with natural deterioration: develop funding for conservation of paleontological localities, working in cooperation with interested partners.
5026	HR: 14.2, 16.3	Continue cooperative relationships with the University of Wyoming and other institutions to make mitigation and research projects more feasible.	Same as Alternative A, plus establish cooperative relationships with other partners to increase scientific research of paleontological resources.	Same as Alternative A.	Continue cooperative relationships with the University of Wyoming and other institutions to make mitigation and research projects more feasible. Establish cooperative relationships with other partners to increase scientific research of paleontological resources where opportunities arise.
5027	HR: 13.1, 15.1, 15.2	Conduct inventories for paleontological resources in areas with "very high" and "high" PFYC prior to all surface-disturbing activities.	Same as Alternative A, plus pursue more detailed analyses of the planning area to further identify areas of high potential for significant paleontological resources.	Same as Alternative A.	Prior to surface-disturbing activities, conduct inventories in areas with "very high" and "high" PFYC, and as needed in areas with "moderate" PFYC. Require monitoring of surface-disturbing activities based on inventory results.

5000 HERITAGE RESOURCES (HR) – PALEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCES					
Record #	**Goal/Obj.**	**Alternative A (Current Management)**	**Alternative B (Most Resource Conservation)**	**Alternative C (Most Resource Utilization)**	**Alternative D (Proposed RMP)**
5028	HR: 14.1, 15.2, 16.2, 16.3	Beaver Rim proposed NNL (1,120 acres within the Beaver Rim ACEC): Continue current management of the Beaver Rim ACEC (see Special Designations – ACECs for current management of the Beaver Rim ACEC), which will protect the NNL's fossil resources. Mineral and realty actions in the Beaver Rim proposed NNL are managed with Category 3 restrictions and a Plan of Operations is required for locatable mineral activities.	Mineral and realty actions in the Beaver Rim proposed NNL are managed with Category 5 restrictions. In addition, apply the following restrictions and management within the Beaver Rim fossil area: ● Complete paleontological inventory of the area to define significant fossil localities. ● Develop a management plan to preserve and protect significant paleontological resources. ● Limit motorized travel to existing roads and trails. ● Do not authorize any use that NEPA analysis determines to cause a significant adverse impact to a fossil area. ● Close significant fossil localities to land disposals.	Manage paleontological resources on a case-by-case basis.	Same as Alternative A.
5029	HR: 14.1	Mineral and realty actions in the Bison Basin proposed NNL (1,280 acres) are managed with Category 2 restrictions.	Mineral and realty actions in the Bison Basin NNL are managed with Category 5 restrictions. In addition, apply the following restrictions and management within the Bison Basin fossil area: ● Complete a paleontological inventory of the area to define significant fossil localities. ● Develop a management plan to preserve and protect significant paleontological resources. ● Limit motorized travel to existing roads and trails. ● Do not authorize any use that NEPA analysis determines to	Manage paleontological resources on a case-by-case basis.	Same as Alternative A.

5000 HERITAGE RESOURCES (HR) – PALEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCES					
Record #	**Goal/Obj.**	**Alternative A (Current Management)**	**Alternative B (Most Resource Conservation)**	**Alternative C (Most Resource Utilization)**	**Alternative D (Proposed RMP)**
			cause a significant adverse impact to a fossil area. • Close significant fossil localities to land disposals.		
5030	HR: 15.1, 16.3	In the Bonneville to Lost Cabin high potential fossil area, continue inventory and monitoring of surface-disturbing activities in areas with "very high" and "high" PFYC to manage fossil resources.	Same as Alternative A, plus complete a paleontological reconnaissance of the area and develop a management plan to protect significant paleontological resources.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.
5031	HR: 15.1, 16.3	In the Lander Slope high potential fossil area, continue inventory and monitoring of surface-disturbing activities in areas with "very high" and "high" PFYC to manage fossil resources.	Same as Alternative A, plus complete a paleontological reconnaissance of the area and develop a management plan to preserve and protect significant paleontological resources.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.
5032	HR: 15.1, 16.3	In the Gas Hills high potential fossil area, continue inventory and monitoring of surface-disturbing activities in areas with "very high" and "high" PFYC to manage fossil resources.	Same as Alternative A, plus complete a paleontological reconnaissance of the area and develop a management plan to preserve and protect significant paleontological resources.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative B.

Table 2.26. 5000 Heritage Resources (HR) – Visual Resources

5000 HERITAGE RESOURCES (HR) – VISUAL RESOURCES					
Record #	**Goal/Obj.**	**Alternative A (Current Management)**	**Alternative B (Most Resource Conservation)**	**Alternative C (Most Resource Utilization)**	**Alternative D (Proposed RMP)**
Goal HR: 17 Maintain the overall scenic (visual) quality of BLM-administered lands. **Objectives:** **HR: 17.1** VRM Class I Objective: Preserve the existing character of the landscape. Provide for natural ecological changes; however, preserving the landscape will not preclude very limited management activity. The level of change to the characteristic landscape will be very low and will not attract attention. **HR: 17.2** VRM Class II Objective: Retain the existing character of the landscape. The level of change to the characteristic landscape will be low. Management activities may be seen but will not attract the attention of the casual observer. Any changes must repeat the basic elements of form, line, color, and texture found in the predominant natural features of the characteristic landscape. **HR: 17.3** VRM Class III Objective: Partially retain the existing character of the landscape. The level of change to the characteristic landscape will be moderate. Management activities may attract attention but should not dominate the view of the casual observer. Changes will repeat the basic elements found in the predominant natural features of the characteristic landscape. **HR: 17.4** VRM Class IV Objective: Provide for management activities which require major modification to the existing character of the landscape. The level of change to the characteristic landscape can be high. These management activities may dominate the view and be the major focus of viewer attention. However, every attempt will be made to minimize the impact of these activities through careful location, minimal disturbance, and repeating the basic elements found in the predominant natural features of the characteristic landscape. **Note:** Management actions associated with Scenic ACECs, NHTs, and Scenic Trails are contained within the Special Designations section.					
MANAGEMENT ACTIONS COMMON TO ALL ALTERNATIVES					
5033	HR: 17.1	Manage WSAs as VRM Class I visual resources (Map 128).			
5034	HR: 17.1, 17.2	Prohibit surface-disturbing activities within important scenic areas (VRM Class I and II visual resources). Grant exceptions if it can be demonstrated through a visual simulation and contrast rating worksheet (from all key observation points within the area) that the project or identified mitigation will meet or exceed VRM Class I or II objectives. This restriction does not apply to temporary structures such as drilling rigs.			
5035	HR: 17.1, 17.2	Work with private landowners and partners to pursue conservation easements on lands adjacent to areas managed as VRM Class I and II visual resources.			
MANAGEMENT ACTIONS BY ALTERNATIVE					

5000 HERITAGE RESOURCES (HR) – VISUAL RESOURCES					
Record #	**Goal/Obj.**	**Alternative A** **(Current Management)**	**Alternative B** **(Most Resource Conservation)**	**Alternative C** **(Most Resource Utilization)**	**Alternative D** **(Proposed RMP)**
5036	HR: 17.1, 17.2, 17.3, 17.4	Maintain existing VRM Class designations for BLM-administered surface lands in the planning area (Map 75): • VRM Class I: 57,443 acres • VRM Class II: 202,785 acres • VRM Class III: 222,121 acres • VRM Class IV: 1,853,862 acres • VRM Class V*: 57,995 acres *VRM Class V no longer exists as a Class objective option for managing visual resources. As a result, these areas are managed as VRM Class IV.	Allow fewer visual intrusions on BLM-administered surface lands in the planning area by reducing the amount of VRM Class IV visual resource inventory areas to existing oil and gas fields and around large open pit mines (Map 76). This would result in the following approximate land use allocations: • VRM Class I: 59,317 acres • VRM Class II: 1,284,122 acres • VRM Class III: 292,890 acres • VRM Class IV: 756,813 acres	Allow for more visual intrusions on BLM-administered surface lands except in areas managed as VRM Class I visual resources (Map 77). This would result in the following approximate land use allocations: • VRM Class I: 55,360 acres • VRM Class II: 25,730 acres • VRM Class III: 722,356 acres • VRM Class IV: 1,590,758 acres	Adjust the new Lander Field Office VRM designations to allow for resource development while also protecting important scenic features: • VRM Class I: 60,115 acres • VRM Class II: 780,810 acres • VRM Class III: 857,979 acres • VRM Class IV: 694,759 acres
5037	HR: 17.1, 17.2	No similar action.	On a case-by-case basis in areas managed as VRM Class III and IV, prohibit surface-disturbing and disruptive activities that create a moderate to strong contrast with the existing visual environment that can be observed from areas managed as VRM Class I and II, such as wind development.	Allow surface-disturbing activities in areas managed as VRM Class III and IV visual resources that can be observed from areas managed as VRM Class I and II, regardless of the degree of visual contrast.	Surface-disturbing activities within VRM Class III and IV not within view of Congressionally Designated Trails will be evaluated based on the VRM Class designation at the site of the surface disturbance. Surface-disturbing activities out of scale with the surrounding landscape within view of the Congressionally Designated Trails will be evaluated based on VRM Class II standards. To protect visual resource values, areas south of the Green Mountain ACEC are closed to wind-energy development (Map 100).
5038	HR: 17.1, 17.2, 17.3	All proposed actions within areas managed as VRM Class I, II, and	Same as Alternative A, plus all proposed actions within areas managed as VRM Class I and II visual resources require a visual	Same as Alternative A, except on a case-by-case basis determine if the project applicant would be required to utilize a visual	Same as Alternative C.

5000 HERITAGE RESOURCES (HR) – VISUAL RESOURCES					
Record #	**Goal/Obj.**	**Alternative A (Current Management)**	**Alternative B (Most Resource Conservation)**	**Alternative C (Most Resource Utilization)**	**Alternative D (Proposed RMP)**
		III visual resources require a VRM contrast rating worksheet.	simulation prior to analysis and/or mitigation design (Map 76).	simulation to test or show mitigation measures.	

Table 2.27. 6000 Land Resources (LR) – Lands and Realty

6000 LAND RESOURCES (LR) – LANDS AND REALTY					
Record #	**Goal/Obj.**	**Alternative A (Current Management)**	**Alternative B (Most Resource Conservation)**	**Alternative C (Most Resource Utilization)**	**Alternative D (Proposed RMP)**
Goal LR: 1 Manage the acquisition, disposal, withdrawal, and use of BLM-administered lands to meet the needs of internal and external customers and to preserve important resource values. **Objectives:** **LR: 1.1** Develop and maintain a land-ownership pattern that will provide access for managing and protecting BLM-administered lands. **LR: 1.2** Use appropriate actions such as disposal and acquisition to resolve issues related to intermixed land-ownership patterns. **LR: 1.3** Maintain availability of BLM-administered lands to meet the habitation, cultivation, trade, mineral development, recreation, and manufacturing needs of external customers and the general public. Improve access to BLM-administered lands. **LR: 1.4** Withdraw BLM-administered lands to meet resource protection needs. **LR: 1.5** Identify areas for R&PP actions.					
MANAGEMENT ACTIONS COMMON TO ALL ALTERNATIVES					
6001	LR: 1.1, 1.2	Respond to specific proposals for land use authorizations on a case-by-case basis. Do not classify, open, or make available any BLM-administered lands for agricultural leasing or agricultural entry under either the Desert Land Entry or Indian Allotment for one or more of the following reasons: unsuitable topography, presence of sensitive resources or resource conflicts, lack of water or access, small parcel size, or unsuitable soils.			
6002	LR: 1.2	Identify lands for acquisition through exchange and/or purchase (Map 1) with priority on meeting special management objectives such as greater sage-grouse Core Area, ACECs, and NLCS lands. Prioritize lands that do not have split estate unless in Core Area where greater sage-grouse management objectives would benefit.			
6003	LR: 1.3	The BLM currently leases 35 acres under the R&PP Act. The Recreation section has alternatives for two new R&PP leases. Consider R&PP leases and patents through the planning area as requested by qualified entities.			
6004	LR: 1.2	Lands identified for disposal or disposal with restrictions will be classified under Sections 203, 206, and 209 of FLPMA.			
6005	LR: 1.1	No parcels within an NLCS unit or an ACEC or in greater sage-grouse Core Area are identified for disposal unless the disposal would benefit the goals and objectives of the area's priority values or other important resource values. (In the 1987 RMP, parcels in NLCS units were identified for disposal but Alternative A management is to retain all parcels in these areas.) Acquire lands in areas with mixed ownership and where land exchanges would result in additional or more contiguous federal ownership patterns or would improve management for the benefit of priority resources.			
MANAGEMENT ACTIONS BY ALTERNATIVE					
RETENTION OF BLM-ADMINISTERED LANDS					
6006	LR: 1.1, 1.2	Retain approximately 2,385,637 acres of BLM-administered land.	Retain approximately 2,388,774 acres of BLM-administered land.	Same as Alternative B.	Retain approximately 2,386,137 acres of BLM-administered land.

6000 LAND RESOURCES (LR) – LANDS AND REALTY					
Record #	**Goal/Obj.**	**Alternative A (Current Management)**	**Alternative B (Most Resource Conservation)**	**Alternative C (Most Resource Utilization)**	**Alternative D (Proposed RMP)**
DISPOSAL OF BLM-ADMINISTERED LANDS					
6007	LR: 1.1, 1.2	8,573 acres of BLM-administered land are available for disposal by sale, exchange, or other means (Map 94).	5,436 acres of BLM-administered land are available for disposal by sale, exchange, or other means (Map 95).	Same as Alternative B.	8,073 acres of BLM-administered land are available for disposal by sale, exchange, or other means (Map 94).
6008	LR: 1.1, 1.2	1,475 acres of BLM-administered land are available for disposal with restrictions on use (Map 94).	1,435 acres of BLM-administered land are available for disposal with restrictions on use (Map 95), including offsite compensation or mitigation, including the establishment of a conservation easement.	Same as Alternative B.	6,665 acres of BLM-administered land are available for disposal with restrictions on use (Map 94), including offsite compensation or mitigation, including the establishment of a conservation easement.
BLM WITHDRAWALS					
6009	LR: 1.4	23,114 acres are identified for withdrawal (Map 21). 8,634 acres are withdrawn in pre-FLPMA actions.	Pursue withdrawals on a total of 1,632,605 acres in the planning area (Map 22) including the acres identified in Alternative B. Renew existing withdrawals before expiration. 8,634 acres are withdrawn in pre-FLPMA actions.	Do not pursue new withdrawals. Existing withdrawals other than the desert yellowhead withdrawal, are allowed to expire. 8,634 acres are withdrawn in pre-FLPMA actions.	Pursue withdrawals on 449,068 acres (Map 24). Renew existing withdrawals before they expire. 8,634 acres are withdrawn in pre-FLPMA actions.

Table 2.28. 6000 Land Resources (LR) – Renewable Energy

6000 LAND RESOURCES (LR) – RENEWABLE ENERGY					
Record #	**Goal/Obj.**	**Alternative A (Current Management)**	**Alternative B (Most Resource Conservation)**	**Alternative C (Most Resource Utilization)**	**Alternative D (Proposed RMP)**
Goal LR: 2 Provide opportunities for developing alternative energy resources. **Objective:** **LR: 2.1** Identify areas suitable for locating alternative energy developments where important cultural and natural resource values will not be adversely affected by these facilities.					
MANAGEMENT ACTIONS COMMON TO ALL ALTERNATIVES					
6010	LR: 2	Management prescriptions for wind-energy development in important wildlife habitat, areas managed as VRM Class I and II, RMZs, areas with cultural resources, and special designations are found in those respective sections.			
6011	LR: 2	Consider non-wind renewable energy development on a case-by-case basis consistent with management and objectives identified in the RMP. Approval of non-wind renewable energy development inconsistent with management and objectives in the RMP would require a Land Use Plan amendment.			
6012	LR: 2	Programmatic policies and Best Management Practices for wind-energy development are identified in the ROD for Wind-Energy Development on Bureau of Land Management-Administered Land in the Western States (2006) and IM 2009-043. The ROD identified the following areas within the NLCS as wind-energy development exclusion areas: ● WSAs (55,338 acres) (Map 128) ● CDNST (no buffer is identified) (Map 121) ● NHTs (no buffer is identified) (Map 123) ● NWSRS-eligible waterway segments (9,919 acres of BLM-administered surface) (Map 129)			
6013	LR: 2	Initiate government-to-government consultation with the appropriate tribal governments if it is determined that wind-energy development proposals might directly and substantially affect tribes.			
6014	LR: 2	Programmatic policies, Best Management Practices, leasing procedures, and stipulations identified in the ROD for the PEIS for Geothermal Leasing in the Western United States (2008) are analyzed in the minerals section.			
MANAGEMENT ACTION BY ALTERNATIVE					
6015	LR: 2	Manage 2,113,512 acres as open to wind-energy development (Map 97). Manage 64,816 acres as wind-energy development avoidance areas (Map 97). Manage 215,882 acres as wind-energy development exclusion areas (Map 97).	Manage 41,372 acres as open to wind-energy development (Map 98). Manage 23,887 acres as wind-energy development avoidance areas (Map 98). Manage 2,328,951 acres as wind-energy development exclusion areas (Map 98).	Manage 2,284,235 acres as open to wind-energy development (Map 99). Manage 15,818 acres as wind-energy development avoidance areas (Map 99). Manage 94,157 acres as wind-energy development exclusion areas (Map 99).	Manage 224,289 acres as open to wind-energy development (Map 100). Manage 1,215,599 acres as wind-energy development avoidance areas (Map 100). Manage 954,322 acres as wind-energy development exclusion areas (Map 100).

Table 2.29. 6000 Land Resources (LR) – Rights-of-Way and Corridors

6000 LAND RESOURCES (LR) – RIGHTS-OF-WAY AND CORRIDORS					
Record #	**Goal/Obj.**	**Alternative A (Current Management)**	**Alternative B (Most Resource Conservation)**	**Alternative C (Most Resource Utilization)**	**Alternative D (Proposed RMP)**
Goal LR: 3 Manage BLM-administered lands to meet transportation and ROW needs. **Objectives:** **LR: 3.1** Provide opportunities to meet the needs of ROW customers. **LR: 3.2** Support the availability of ROWs consistent with federal policies regarding the development of renewable energy sources.					
MANAGEMENT ACTIONS COMMON TO ALL ALTERNATIVES					
6016	LR: 3.1, 3.2	In accordance with the ROD for Designation of Energy Corridors on Bureau of Land Management-Administered Lands in the 11 Western States (2009), Energy Corridor 79-216 is a designated corridor.			
6017	LR: 3.1	The preferred location for new ROWs and access route authorizations is in areas already disturbed by existing ROWs. See Appendix H (p. 1521) for design constraints to limit surface disturbance associated with new ROWs. Locate linear ROWs such as fiber optic and low-voltage powerline corridors along currently established road systems (e.g., state highways and county roads). Identify opportunities to reclaim duplicative ROWs or those no longer in use. Utilize IM 2012-019 Attachment 5 or later guidance to calculate disturbance associated with ROWs.			
6018	LR: 3.1	Allow carbon dioxide sequestration and research. Lands that are available to oil and gas leasing are available to carbon dioxide sequestration and research subject to the same surface limitations as would be applied to oil and gas operations. Lands that are closed to oil and gas leasing are excluded for carbon dioxide sequestration and research.			
6019	LR: 3	Close the Beef Gap section of the Sweetwater Rocks complex to any new ROWs even if co-located with existing ROWs.			
MANAGEMENT ACTIONS BY ALTERNATIVE					
6020	LR: 3.1	On a case-by-case basis concentrate major utility ROWs in existing utility corridors whenever possible (Map 105).	Allow proposed major utility ROWs only in designated utility corridors. Designate the following routes as utility corridors and access routes and prefer these locations for the placement of utility ROWs (Map 106): • The Lost Creek Corridor, which runs north/south from Wamsutter to Lysite (approximately ¼ mile wide, except near the NHTs, where it is 400 feet wide).	Evaluate proposed major utility ROWs on a case-by-case basis. Allow major utility corridors up to 3 miles wide in the planning area in the following locations (Map 107): • Lost Creek Spur • Lost Creek • Pathfinder • Sand Draw to Casper • Highway 20\26 • Beaver Creek North • Shoshoni\Badwater • Bairoil	The following corridors are designated as corridors for major ROW development (Map 108). Please note: the location of the designated corridors as represented on the map are approximate and subject to verification based on existing disturbance, particularly in the Sand Draw to Casper corridor through the Gas Hills mining district. The corridor widths shown on Map 108 are overstated to improve clarity. • Jim Bridger (containing the Spence-Mustang-Jim Bridger

6000 LAND RESOURCES (LR) – RIGHTS-OF-WAY AND CORRIDORS					
Record #	**Goal/Obj.**	**Alternative A (Current Management)**	**Alternative B (Most Resource Conservation)**	**Alternative C (Most Resource Utilization)**	**Alternative D (Proposed RMP)**
			• Sand Draw to Casper-approximately 10 miles of corridor connecting Lost Creek and the Casper Field Office's designated corridor.	• Boysen Scenic Byway • Lost Cabin\Pony Express • Colorado Interstate Gas • Pacificorp Transmission • Sand Draw • Bison Basin • Frontier • Frontier-Anadarko • Pacificorp	existing 230 kV powerline) from where it enters the Lander planning area in Township 25 North, Range 94 West to where it intersects with the Lost Creek pipeline: above and below ground. • Lost Creek: variously below ground only and above and below ground as follows: ○ Lost Creek 1: from where the pipeline enters the Lander planning area in the south in Township 25 North, Range 93 West to where the pipeline meets the existing 230 kV powerline in the Jim Bridger corridor: below ground only. ○ Lost Creek 2: from the Jim Bridger meeting point northward until the Lost Creek pipeline meets the Sand Draw to Casper designated corridor: above and below ground. ○ Lost Creek 3: from the Sand Draw to Casper meeting point north to Highway 20/26: below ground only. ○ Lost Creek 4: from north of Highway 20/26 to the Westwide Corridor: above and below ground.

6000 LAND RESOURCES (LR) – RIGHTS-OF-WAY AND CORRIDORS					
Record #	**Goal/Obj.**	**Alternative A (Current Management)**	**Alternative B (Most Resource Conservation)**	**Alternative C (Most Resource Utilization)**	**Alternative D (Proposed RMP)**
					The section of the corridor through the Jeffrey City area that is not within the NTMC is open to oil and gas leasing subject to CSU stipulations. ● Pathfinder: below ground only. (The Pathfinder corridor is only in the Lander planning area in Township 30 North, Range 85 West.) ● Sand Draw to Casper: above and below ground ● Highway 20/26: above and below ground ● Beaver Creek (formerly called Beaver Creek North and Lost Creek Spur): below ground only ● Shoshoni/Badwater: below ground ● Bairoil: below ground only ● Sand Draw: below ground only ● Bison Basin: below ground only ● Frontier going southwest from Bairoil to where it leaves the Lander planning area: below ground only ● Frontier-Anadarko (now called Rattlesnake Hills) north of Black Rock: below ground ● Pacificorp (now called Black Rock): above and below ground

6000 LAND RESOURCES (LR) – RIGHTS-OF-WAY AND CORRIDORS					
Record #	**Goal/Obj.**	**Alternative A (Current Management)**	**Alternative B (Most Resource Conservation)**	**Alternative C (Most Resource Utilization)**	**Alternative D (Proposed RMP)**
					• Pacificorp (going east-west in Township 35): above and below ground Widths for these corridors are ½ mile unless there are resource conflicts, then the width will be adjusted accordingly (i.e., neck down as necessary). Designated corridors are subject to the prescriptions for resource protections except that they are open for ROWs even if the surrounding areas are excluded or avoided. Major ROWs will not be authorized outside of designated corridors unless the proponent establishes that location in a designated corridor is not possible. Additional expense does not, by itself, render the location within a designated corridor "not possible."
6021	PR: 3.3 BR: 1.1, 11.1, 11.2	See Record 6017.	See Record 6017.	See Record 6017.	ROWs outside of designated corridors are co-located in existing disturbance unless the proponent establishes that co-location is not possible or that the new location minimizes adverse impacts to other resources compared to co-location.

6000 LAND RESOURCES (LR) – RIGHTS-OF-WAY AND CORRIDORS					
Record #	**Goal/Obj.**	**Alternative A (Current Management)**	**Alternative B (Most Resource Conservation)**	**Alternative C (Most Resource Utilization)**	**Alternative D (Proposed RMP)**
6022	LR: 3.1	Authorize communication facilities under site-specific leases on a case-by-case basis. The areas avoided for utility corridors are also avoided by communication sites. Encourage co-location with existing sites. The site on Whiskey Peak is limited to facilities that will be contained within the existing building footprint.	Require new communication facilities to be co-located with the following existing sites (Map 106): ● Atlantic City ● Black Rock ● Cedar Rim ● Crooks Mountain ● Gun Barrel ● Horse Heaven ● Muskrat The site on Whiskey Peak is limited to facilities that will be contained within the existing building footprint. Communication facility leases will be for a maximum of 10 years. Review applications for renewal of existing leases to determine if improvement in technology makes the site unnecessary.	Authorize communication facilities under site-specific leases on a case-by-case basis.	Require new communication facilities be co-located with the following existing sites unless proponent demonstrates existing sites are unable to meet the public needs and project is consistent with the Land Use Plan (Map 108): ● Atlantic City ● Cedar Rim ● Crooks Mountain ● Gun Barrel ● Horse Heaven ● Muskrat The site on Whiskey Peak is limited to facilities that will be contained within the existing building footprint. The following sites are closed to new communication facilities and existing facilities are allowed to expire at the end of the existing ROW grant (Map 108): ● BLM Ridge ● Black Rock
6023	LR: 3	Manage 66,099 acres as ROW avoidance areas (Map 101).	Manage 315,219 acres as ROW avoidance areas (Map 102).	Manage 11,714 acres as ROW avoidance areas (Map 103).	Manage 1,369,300 acres as ROW avoidance areas (Map 104). See Appendix E (p. 1483) for avoidance criteria.
6024	LR: 3	Manage 205,916 acres as ROW exclusion areas (Map 101).	Manage 1,919,029 acres as ROW exclusion areas (Map 102).	Manage 147,053 acres as ROW exclusion areas (Map 103).	Manage 417,426 acres as ROW exclusion areas (Map 104).

Table 2.30. 6000 Land Resources (LR) – Comprehensive Trails and Travel Management

6000 LAND RESOURCES (LR) – COMPREHENSIVE TRAILS AND TRAVEL MANAGEMENT					
Record #	**Goal/Obj.**	**Alternative A (Current Management)**	**Alternative B (Most Resource Conservation)**	**Alternative C (Most Resource Utilization)**	**Alternative D (Proposed RMP)**
Goal LR: 4 Utilize a comprehensive approach to travel planning and management to sustain and enhance recreational opportunities and experiences, visitor access/safety, and resource conservation and use.					
		Objective:			
		LR: 4.1 In consideration of the various resources, resource uses, and special designations, all BLM-administered lands within the Lander Field Office will be classified as open, limited, or closed to motorized travel.			
Goal LR: 5 Manage the use of OHVs (see Glossary) in partnership with other land-management agencies, local governments, communities, and interest groups.					
		Objective:			
		LR: 5.1 Pursue the opportunities (such as supplemental funding and labor contributions) to aid the BLM in implementing transportation and travel management planning decisions.			
Goal LR: 6 Utilize a travel management approach to provide and improve sustainable access for public needs and experiences.					
		Objectives:			
		LR: 6.1 At minimum, travel management areas will provide route networks and locations in consideration of primary travelers and valid existing rights.			
		LR: 6.2 Travel management areas where access is deemed a priority will provide for sufficient route networks and locations to meet public needs.			
		LR: 6.3 Travel management areas where access is deemed essential for visitor recreation experiences will provide for sufficient route networks and locations to produce targeted recreation settings.			
Goal LR: 7 Utilize a travel management approach to protect natural resources and settings.					
		Objectives:			
		LR: 7.1 At a minimum, travel management areas will provide route networks and locations that meet or exceed Wyoming Standards for Healthy Rangelands (see Appendix J (p. 1537)).			
		LR: 7.2 Travel management areas intensively managed to protect natural and cultural resources will provide networks and locations that maintain or enhance the quality of the identified resource.			

6000 LAND RESOURCES (LR) – COMPREHENSIVE TRAILS AND TRAVEL MANAGEMENT					
Record #	**Goal/Obj.**	**Alternative A (Current Management)**	**Alternative B (Most Resource Conservation)**	**Alternative C (Most Resource Utilization)**	**Alternative D (Proposed RMP)**
LR: 7.3 Travel management areas intensively managed to protect recreational, archeological, paleontological, and visual settings will provide route densities and locations that maintain or enhance the identified setting quality. **Goal LR: 8** Utilize a travel management approach to promote the safety of public land users. **Objective:** **LR: 8.1** Provide route networks, locations, or visitor information to promote the safety of public land users. **Goal LR: 9** Utilize a travel management approach to minimize conflicts among the various users of BLM-administered lands. **Objective:** **LR: 9.1** Provide route networks, route locations, or visitor information to minimize resource use/user conflict.					
MANAGEMENT ACTIONS COMMON TO ALL ALTERNATIVES					
6025	LR: 6.1, 6.2, 6.3, 7.1, 7.2, 7.3, 8.1, 9.1	Evaluate management decisions concerning modifications to "limited areas" and recreational facility or trail proposals through activity level planning. Evaluate Comprehensive Trails and Travel Management decisions to determine whether they are consistent with meeting specific land use plan and management objectives, prescriptions, or the Wyoming Standards for Healthy Rangelands. Adjust travel systems to ensure they remain in compliance with meeting area-specific land use plan and other management objectives, including providing access to BLM-administered lands. Maintain the existing roadless areas, within the Greer Peak and Lysite Mountain regions.			
6026	LR: 6.1, 6.2, 6.3, 7.1, 7.2, 7.3, 8.1, 9.1	Evaluate modifications (as needed to meet planning objectives) to all 'limited' travel designations through activity level planning.			
6027	LR: 6.1, 6.2, 6.3, 7.1, 7.2, 7.3, 8.1, 9.1	Grant administrative use authorizations on a case-by-case basis with approval from the Authorized Officer. All access agreements will specify the following: what type of use is allowed and for what purpose, times, dates or seasons of access, where the use will occur, and additional stipulations required to provide for adequate resource protection and to meet pertinent planning decisions.			
6028	LR: 7.2	Close critical habitat of the desert yellowhead (360 acres) to motorized travel to protect sensitive plant habitat (Map 67).			
6029	LR: 6.1, 6.2, 6.3, 7.1, 7.2, 7.3, 8.1, 9.1	In areas with limited travel designations, limit motorized and mechanized travel to within 300 feet from motorized/mechanized routes for direct access for big game carcass retrieval provided that: (1) no resource damage occurs, (2) no new routes are created, and (3) such access is not otherwise prohibited by the Authorized Officer.			
6030	LR: 7.2	Close the Rocky Ridge segment of the NHTs to motorized travel to protect sensitive historic resources (Map 123).			

6000 LAND RESOURCES (LR) – COMPREHENSIVE TRAILS AND TRAVEL MANAGEMENT					
Record #	**Goal/Obj.**	**Alternative A (Current Management)**	**Alternative B (Most Resource Conservation)**	**Alternative C (Most Resource Utilization)**	**Alternative D (Proposed RMP)**
6031	LR: 5.1, 7.3	Pursue opportunities to develop inter-agency implementation and enforcement of travel management decisions to improve public education regarding travel and to reduce non-compliance.			
6032	LR: 4	Define an over-snow vehicle as a motorized vehicle that is designed for use over snow and runs on a track or tracks and/or a ski or skis. An over-snow vehicle does not include machinery used strictly for the grooming of nonmotorized trails.			
6033	LR: 9.1	On groomed nonmotorized winter trails (e.g., Beaver Creek Nordic Ski Area), restrict travel to only nonmotorized uses during the grooming season (December 1 to May 1) unless otherwise approved by the Authorized Officer (Map 109).			
MANAGEMENT ACTIONS BY ALTERNATIVE					
OVER-LAND TRAVEL					
6034	LR: 6.1, 7.1, 7.2, 7.3	To protect winter wildlife habitat, sensitive soils, erodible slopes, watersheds, and visual resources, limit motorized travel in the following areas to designated roads and trails subject to seasonal travel limitations (closed December 1 to June 15) (Map 109): ● Lander Slope (21,575 acres) ● Red Canyon (14,730 acres) ● Whiskey Mountain (7,699 acres) ● Green Mountain above 7,000 feet (63,491 acres)	To protect wildlife winter/parturition habitat, sensitive soils, erodible slopes, watersheds, and visual resources, limit motorized and mechanized travel in the following areas to designated roads and trails subject to seasonal travel limitations (closed December 1 to June 15) (Map 110): ● Lander Slope (21,575 acres) ● Red Canyon (14,730 acres) ● Whiskey Mountain (2,728 acres) ● Green Mountain (63,491 acres) Close 5,490 acres of the existing Whiskey Mountain area to motorized and mechanized travel.	Do not apply seasonal travel limitations (Map 111).	To protect wildlife winter/parturition habitat, sensitive soils, erodible slopes, watersheds, and visual resources, limit motorized and mechanized travel in the following areas to designated roads and trails subject to seasonal travel limitations (Map 112): ● Lander Slope ACEC (except the Bus @ Baldwin Creek, Sinks Canyon Climbing Area and Baldwin Creek Canyon which are discussed below) is closed to motorized vehicles December 1 to June 15 (25,065 acres). ● Red Canyon is closed to all travel (human presence) from December 1 to April 30 and closed to motorized travel from December 1 to June 15 (15,109 acres) (Map 113). ● Whiskey Mountain ACEC (except Whiskey Mountain WSA and lands with wilderness characteristics which are discussed below) is closed to motorized vehicles December 1 to May 1).

6000 LAND RESOURCES (LR) – COMPREHENSIVE TRAILS AND TRAVEL MANAGEMENT					
Record #	**Goal/Obj.**	**Alternative A (Current Management)**	**Alternative B (Most Resource Conservation)**	**Alternative C (Most Resource Utilization)**	**Alternative D (Proposed RMP)**
					• Green Mountain is closed to motorized vehicle use December 1 to June 15 at identified points on roads and trails rather than based on elevation.
6035	LR: 6.1, 7.1, 7.2, 7.3	To protect winter wildlife habitat and watersheds, limit motorized travel in the following area to existing roads (Map 109) without seasonal restrictions: • East Fork (4,431 acres) • Beaver Rim ACEC (6,421 acres)	To protect winter wildlife habitat and watersheds, limit motorized and mechanized travel in the following areas to designated roads and trails (Map 110): • East Fork (14,802 acres) subject to seasonal travel limitations (closed December 1 to June 15) • Beaver Rim Area (20,254 acres) • Cedar Ridge (7,039 acres)	Same as Alternative A.	To protect winter wildlife habitat and watersheds, limit motorized and mechanized travel in the East Fork ACEC to designated roads and trails (Map 112). The East Fork ACEC is seasonally closed to all travel December 16 to May 15 (consistent with surrounding WGFD lands) except for those BLM-administered lands directly accessed from East Fork County Road.
6036	LR: 6.1, 7.1, 7.2, 7.3	Limit motorized travel in the Beaver Rim ACEC (6,421 acres) to existing roads and trails (Map 109).	Limit motorized and mechanized travel in the Beaver Rim Area (20,254 acres) to designated roads and trails (Map 110).	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A, until a Travel Management Plan is completed, at which time motorized travel will be limited to designated routes.
6037	LR: 6.1, 7.1, 7.2, 7.3	Close the Dubois Badlands ACEC (4,897 acres) to motorized travel to protect natural resources, recreational values, the WSA, and scenic resources (Map 109).	Same as Alternative A.	Limit motorized travel in the WSA portion of the Dubois Badlands ACEC to designated roads and trails that existed and were identified before or during the inventory phase of the wilderness review. Limit motorized travel in the area within the ACEC, but outside of the WSA to existing roads and trails (Map 111).	The WSA portion of the area is closed to motorized vehicles. Management of the non-WSA lands is discussed in the ACEC - East Fork section.

6000 LAND RESOURCES (LR) – COMPREHENSIVE TRAILS AND TRAVEL MANAGEMENT					
Record #	**Goal/Obj.**	**Alternative A (Current Management)**	**Alternative B (Most Resource Conservation)**	**Alternative C (Most Resource Utilization)**	**Alternative D (Proposed RMP)**
6038	LR: 6.1, 7.1, 7.2, 7.3	The Castle Gardens TCP area (78 acres) is closed to motorized travel to protect natural and cultural resources (Map 109) except for one designated road to the parking area. Travel management in the area outside of the TCP identified in Alternative B as part of the ACEC area is limited to existing roads and trails.	Same as Alternative A, except that travel in the part of the proposed ACEC outside of the TCP is limited to designated roads and trails.	Limit motorized travel within the Castle Gardens area (78 acres) and the adjacent areas to existing roads and trails (Map 111).	Limit motorized travel within the immediate Castle Gardens area and the periphery (1734 acres) to designated roads and trails (Map 112).
6039	LR: 6.1, 7.1, 7.2, 7.3	Limit motorized travel in the areas adjacent to WSAs (Map 109) to existing roads and trails up to the boundary of the WSA.	To provide logical visitor management boundaries, limit motorized and mechanized travel in the area directly adjacent to the following WSAs to designated roads and trails (Map 110): ● Copper Mountain (6,936 acres) ● Sweetwater Rocks (including the area around Split Rock, Lankin Dome, Miller Springs, and Savage Peak WSAs) (34,186 acres) ● Sweetwater Canyon (9,135 acres)	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A, until a Travel Management Plan is completed, at which time motorized travel will be limited to designated routes.
6040	LR: 6.1, 6.3, 7.1, 7.3	Open the following areas to mechanized travel (Map 109): ● The Bus @ Baldwin Creek ● The Dubois Mill Site ● Johnny Behind the Rocks/Blue Ridge ● Sinks Canyon Climbing Area	To manage areas in accordance with the recreation alternatives, limit mechanized travel in the following areas to designated roads and trails (Map 110): ● The Bus @ Baldwin Creek ● The Dubois Mill Site ● Johnny Behind the Rocks/Blue Ridge ● Sinks Canyon Climbing Area	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.

6000 LAND RESOURCES (LR) – COMPREHENSIVE TRAILS AND TRAVEL MANAGEMENT					
Record #	**Goal/Obj.**	**Alternative A** **(Current Management)**	**Alternative B** **(Most Resource Conservation)**	**Alternative C** **(Most Resource Utilization)**	**Alternative D** **(Proposed RMP)**
6041	LR: 6.1, 6.3, 7.1, 7.3	Limit motorized travel in the following areas to existing roads and trails (Map 109): ● Johnny Behind the Rocks/Blue Ridge Limit motorized travel in the following areas to designated roads and trails (Map 109): ● The Bus @ Baldwin Creek ● The Dubois Mill Site ● Sinks Canyon Climbing Area	To manage RMZs in the manner detailed in the recreation alternatives, close the following areas to motorized travel (Map 110): ● The Bus @ Baldwin Creek ● The Dubois Mill Site ● Johnny Behind the Rocks/Blue Ridge ● Sinks Canyon Climbing Area	Same as Alternative A.	To manage RMZs in the manner detailed in the recreation alternatives, close the following areas to motorized travel (Map 112): ● The Bus @ Baldwin Creek ● Johnny Behind the Rocks/Blue Ridge ● Sinks Canyon Climbing Area
6042	LR: 6.1, 7.1, 7.2, 7.3	Do not specially manage lands with wilderness characteristics.	In order to maintain lands with wilderness characteristics, close the following area to motorized and mechanized vehicle travel (Map 110): Little Red Creek Complex (5,490 acres) including: ● Glacier Trail ● Red Creek ● Torrey Rim	Same as Alternative A.	In order to maintain lands with wilderness characteristics, close the following area to motorized travel and limit mechanized travel to designated roads and trails (Map 112): Little Red Creek Complex (4,954 acres) including: ● Red Creek ● Portions of Torrey Rim
6043	LR: 6.1, 7.1, 7.2, 7.3	In order to maintain the outstanding remarkable values of eligible WSR waterways, motorized travel in Sweetwater Canyon and Baldwin Creek Canyon is limited to designated roads and trails.	In order to maintain the outstanding remarkable values of suitable WSR waterways, close the following areas to motorized and mechanized travel (Map 110): ● Baldwin Creek Canyon (2,349 acres) ● Sweetwater Canyon (9,135 acres)	Do not manage any watercourses as tentatively classified eligible and suitable WSR waterways.	Same as Alternative B for motorized and mechanized travel in Baldwin Creek Canyon. Travel management in Sweetwater Canyon is in accordance with BLM Manual 6330, *Management of Wilderness Study Areas*. See the Special Designations section for Sweetwater Canyon travel management.

6000 LAND RESOURCES (LR) – COMPREHENSIVE TRAILS AND TRAVEL MANAGEMENT					
Record #	**Goal/Obj.**	**Alternative A** **(Current Management)**	**Alternative B** **(Most Resource Conservation)**	**Alternative C** **(Most Resource Utilization)**	**Alternative D** **(Proposed RMP)**
6044	LR: 6.1, 7.1, 8.1, 9.1	Limit motorized travel in the planning area, unless otherwise specified, to existing roads, primitive roads, and trails (2,226,504 acres) (Map 109) at a minimum, until such time as travel management planning is complete and routes are either designated or closed. This designation is an interim designation until route-specific planning can occur. At the point at which route planning is implemented, motorized travel in the area will be limited to designated roads and trails. For more information on this process see Appendix W (p. 1813).	Same as Alternative A, except limit motorized travel on 2,128,741 acres to existing roads, primitive roads, and trails (Map 110). This designation is an interim designation until route-specific planning can occur. At the point at which route planning is implemented, motorized travel in the area will be limited to designated roads and trails. For more information on this process see Appendix W (p. 1813).	Same as Alternative A, except limit motorized travel on 2,337,958 acres to existing roads, primitive roads, and trails (Map 111). This designation is an interim designation until route-specific planning can occur. At the point at which route planning is implemented, motorized travel in the area will be limited to designated roads and trails. For more information on this process see Appendix W (p. 1813).	Same as Alternative A, except limit motorized travel on 2,213,081 acres (Map 112). This designation is an interim designation until route-specific planning can occur. At the point at which route planning is implemented, motorized travel in the area will be limited to designated roads and trails. For more information on this process see Appendix W (p. 1813).
6045	LR: 6.1, 6.2, 6.3	Limit motorized travel in the remainder of the planning area to existing roads and trails (Map 109), except for the performance of necessary tasks requiring motorized travel (e.g., retrieving big game carcasses, repairing range improvements, managing livestock, and mineral activities where surface disturbance does not total more than 5 acres as described in the "5 acre exemption" under the 43 CFR 3809 regulations).	Prohibit cross-country motorized travel in all areas with limited and closed travel management designations (Map 110), with the following exceptions and supplementary stipulations: ● BLM authorization to exercise valid existing rights ● For emergency and other purposes as authorized under 8340.0-5(a)(2), (3), (4) and (5) ● Any non-amphibious registered motorboat ● Any military, fire, emergency, or law enforcement vehicle while being used for emergency purposes ● Any vehicle whose use is expressly authorized by	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative B. Authorizations or permits that include motorized vehicle activities shall address the use of motorized vehicles as part of the authorization or permit. Authorized motorized vehicle activities will require NEPA analysis and other environmental compliance actions and should be compatible with the RMP goals and objectives. Any motorized vehicle use associated with applying for an authorization or permit is subject to the regulations and policies related to the particular application process. See Management Actions Common to All Alternatives for

6000 LAND RESOURCES (LR) – COMPREHENSIVE TRAILS AND TRAVEL MANAGEMENT					
Record #	**Goal/Obj.**	**Alternative A (Current Management)**	**Alternative B (Most Resource Conservation)**	**Alternative C (Most Resource Utilization)**	**Alternative D (Proposed RMP)**
			the Authorized Officer, or otherwise officially approved ● Vehicles in official use ● Any combat or combat support vehicle when used in times of national defense emergencies		additional information regarding use authorizations.
OVER-SNOW TRAVEL					
6046	LR: 6, 7, 8, 9	Do not limit over-snow vehicle travel.	Areas open to over-snow vehicle travel must have a minimum average of 12 inches of snow or be recognized as a groomed motorized trail such as the Continental Divide Snowmobile Trail. If these conditions do not exist, then the over-land travel designations regulate travel in the area.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative B.
6047	LR: 7.1, 7.2, 7.3, 8.1, 9.1	Close the Red Canyon area (14,730 acres) to all forms of over-snow travel including motorized and nonmotorized use (Map 114).	Same as Alternative A, plus explicitly close the following areas to over-snow motorized travel (Map 115): ● Beaver Creek Nordic Ski Area (33 acres) ● East Fork (14,802 acres) ● Green Mountain (63,491 acres) ● Lander Slope (21,575 acres) ● Whiskey Mountain (2,209 acres) Close the following WSAs to over-snow motorized travel: ● Copper Mountain (6,936 acres) ● Lankin Dome (6,347 acres) ● Miller Springs (6,697 acres) ● Savage Peak (7,178 acres) ● Split Rock (13,963 acres) ● Sweetwater Canyon (9,135 acres)	Do not close any areas to over-snow motorized travel.	The following areas are limited (closed) seasonally to over-snow motorized travel (Map 116): ● Lander Slope ACEC (except the Bus @ Baldwin Creek, Sinks Canyon Climbing Area and Baldwin Creek Canyon which are discussed below) closed to over the snow motorized vehicles December 1 to June 15 (21,558 acres) ● Red Canyon closed to travel (human presence) from December 1 to April 30 and closed to motorized over-snow travel December 1 to June 15 (15,109 acres) ● Whiskey Mountain ACEC (except Whiskey Mountain WSA and lands with wilderness characteristics

6000 LAND RESOURCES (LR) – COMPREHENSIVE TRAILS AND TRAVEL MANAGEMENT					
Record #	**Goal/Obj.**	**Alternative A** **(Current Management)**	**Alternative B** **(Most Resource Conservation)**	**Alternative C** **(Most Resource Utilization)**	**Alternative D** **(Proposed RMP)**
			• Whiskey Mountain (519 acres) Close the Little Red Creek Complex (5,490 acres) of lands with wilderness characteristics to over-snow vehicle travel.		which are discussed below) closed to motorized over-snow travel December 1 to May 15 (5,089 acres) • East Fork (except for contiguous BLM-administered lands intersected by the East Fork County Road) closed to all travel consistent with WGFD-managed lands which are currently closed December 16 to May 15 • Green Mountain closed to motorized vehicles December 1 to June 15 Close the following areas to over-snow motorized travel: • Beaver Creek Nordic Ski Area • The Bus @ Baldwin Creek • Sinks Canyon Climbing Area • Baldwin Creek Canyon • Little Red Creek Complex of lands with wilderness characteristics Close the following WSAs to over-snow motorized travel: • Copper Mountain (6,936 acres) • Lankin Dome (6,347 acres) • Miller Springs (6,697 acres) • Savage Peak (7,177 acres) • Split Rock (13,963 acres) • Sweetwater Canyon (9,135 acres)

6000 LAND RESOURCES (LR) – COMPREHENSIVE TRAILS AND TRAVEL MANAGEMENT					
Record #	**Goal/Obj.**	**Alternative A (Current Management)**	**Alternative B (Most Resource Conservation)**	**Alternative C (Most Resource Utilization)**	**Alternative D (Proposed RMP)**
					• Whiskey Mountain (519 acres)
6048	LR: 6.1, 6.2, 6.3	Open the remainder of the planning area to over-snow motorized travel (2,379,481 acres) (Map 114). Do not limit over-snow travel based on snow depth.	Open the remainder of the planning area to over-snow motorized travel subject to snow depth limits contained in Record 6046 (2,213,037 acres) (Map 115).	The planning area is open to over-snow motorized travel. Do not limit over-snow travel based on snow depth.	The remainder of the planning area is open to over-snow motorized travel subject to snow depth limits contained in Record 6046 (2,323,785 acres) (Map 116).

Table 2.31. 6000 Land Resources (LR) – Livestock Grazing Management

6000 LAND RESOURCES (LR) – LIVESTOCK GRAZING MANAGEMENT					
Record #	**Goal/ Obj.**	**Alternative A (Current Management)**	**Alternative B (Most Resource Conservation)**	**Alternative C (Most Resource Utilization)**	**Alternative D (Proposed RMP)**
Goal LR: 10 Maintain or enhance rangeland health and livestock grazing opportunities. **Objectives:** **LR: 10.1** Continue to assess rangeland health on a 10-year cycle in accordance with the Wyoming Standards for Healthy Rangelands. Use rangeland health assessments to prioritize rangeland management. **LR: 10.2** Implement grazing strategies, including range improvement projects, to maintain or enhance vegetative communities and ecosystem functions and to achieve the Wyoming Standards for Healthy Rangelands and grazing objectives in cooperation, consultation, and coordination with permittees/lessees, cooperators and the interested public. Design all range projects in a manner that minimizes potential for invasive species establishment. Monitor for, and treat invasive species associated with existing range improvements **LR: 10.3** Manage allotment and pasture boundaries to facilitate grazing management that maintains and enhances rangeland health. **LR: 10.4** Update and use the allotment priority ranking (Maintain, Improve, and Custodial categorization process) established in the 1987 RMP and update allotment categories with new information as it becomes available. **LR: 10.5** Manage grazing to provide sustainable forage and establish allowable use levels in those areas authorized for livestock grazing. **LR: 10.6** Develop a forage reserve plan to identify and manage voluntary forage reserves within the planning area. **LR: 10.7** Identify and determine areas and/or allotments available for livestock grazing. **LR: 10.8** Support livestock grazing AUM levels consistent with multiple use and the ability of BLM-administered lands to provide adequate habitat and forage. **LR: 10.9** Manage grazing to assist with successful recovery, reclamation, rehabilitation and restoration of disturbed rangelands to meet the Wyoming Standards for Healthy Rangelands. **LR: 10.10** As opportunities arise, remove or modify fences to facilitate livestock, wild horse, and wildlife movement and to reduce threats to animal safety.					
MANAGEMENT ACTIONS COMMON TO ALL ALTERNATIVES					
6049	N/A	Common Goals 3 and 5 apply to values associated with livestock grazing.			

6000 LAND RESOURCES (LR) – LIVESTOCK GRAZING MANAGEMENT					
Record #	**Goal/ Obj.**	**Alternative A (Current Management)**	**Alternative B (Most Resource Conservation)**	**Alternative C (Most Resource Utilization)**	**Alternative D (Proposed RMP)**
6050	LR: 10.1, 10.2	In cooperation, consultation, and coordination with permittees/lessees, cooperators, and stakeholders including interested parties, develop and implement appropriate livestock grazing management actions to address the Wyoming Standards for Healthy Rangelands, improve forage for livestock, and enhance rangeland health. Within greater sage-grouse Core Area, incorporate greater sage-grouse habitat objectives and management considerations into all BLM grazing allotments containing greater sage-grouse habitat through AMPs or permit renewals. Consider the application of BMPs for the protection of greater sage-grouse as terms and conditions of grazing permit/lease renewals. In areas where Wyoming Standards for Healthy Rangelands are not being met or are not making progress towards meeting standards, because of current livestock grazing, modify existing permits or condition the issuance of new permits on the implementation of new grazing strategies to meet standards in accordance with grazing regulations. Apply appropriate BMPs (Appendix H (p. 1521)) as terms and conditions of the permit.			
6051	LR: 10.4	Categorize allotments as M, I, and C (see Appendix K (p. 1547)) and re-categorize as necessary. Re-categorizations from the 1987 RMP are identified in Appendix K (p. 1547).			
6052	LR: 10.2, 10.3, 10.5	A total of 69,276 acres, of which 38,058 acres cannot be made suitable for grazing and includes previously retired allotments, are unavailable for grazing (Maps 117-119).			
6053	LR: 10.7	Retain designated stock driveways. Permit other livestock trails on a case-by-case basis.			
6054	LR: 10.1	Monitor precipitation and vegetative production trends on BLM-administered lands as a tool to understand impacts to soil, water, and vegetative resources. Monitor measurable objectives and evaluate grazing management to assume that management actions are achieving greater sage-grouse habitat objectives.			
6055	LR: 10.1	On a case-by-case basis adjust allotment and pasture boundaries, including combining allotments, to facilitate management and to achieve progress towards rangeland health. Review livestock conversions on a case-by-case basis.			
6056	LR 10.8	Require that forage supplements have label information stating that the material is safe/compatible for sheep, wildlife, and wild horses in areas where conflicts exist. Require that all forage supplement labels be submitted to the field office for approval by the Authorized Officer prior to use.			
6057	LR: 10.3	Conduct grazing program monitoring (see Glossary) of allotments by focusing on Category I allotments in order of priority starting with those allotments that have degraded riparian-wetland areas or are in whole or in part in greater sage-grouse Core Area. The level of monitoring will be commensurate with the intensity of grazing. Modify BLM-authorized grazing use on an allotment-by-allotment basis to protect soil, water, vegetative resources, and wildlife.			
6058	LR: 10.9	Modify or implement livestock grazing strategies (Appendix K (p. 1547)) to facilitate successful reclamation efforts.			
6059	LR: 10.3, 10.5	Continue implementation of existing AMPs. Develop and implement new comprehensive grazing strategies and AMPs with grazing permittees/lessees and interested publics to achieve desired resource goals. Grant administrative use authorizations on a case-by-case basis with approval from the Authorized Officer. All access agreements will specify the following: what type of use is allowed and for what purpose, times, dates or seasons of access, where the use will occur, and additional stipulations required to provide for adequate resource protection and to meet pertinent planning decisions.			
6060	LR: 10	Changes in the current amounts, kinds, and season of livestock grazing use will be based on a rangeland health assessment or if resource monitoring indicates that a grazing use adjustment is necessary or an analysis indicates that a requested change in grazing use is appropriate.			
MANAGEMENT ACTIONS BY ALTERNATIVE					

6000 LAND RESOURCES (LR) – LIVESTOCK GRAZING MANAGEMENT					
Record #	**Goal/ Obj.**	**Alternative A (Current Management)**	**Alternative B (Most Resource Conservation)**	**Alternative C (Most Resource Utilization)**	**Alternative D (Proposed RMP)**
6061	LR: 10.7, 10.8	The planning area is open to livestock grazing except for parcels identified on Map 117. 2,324,934 acres are open to grazing. 69,276 acres are unavailable to livestock grazing.	The planning area is open to livestock grazing except for parcels identified on Map 118. 2,312,095 acres are open to grazing. 69,276 acres are unavailable to livestock grazing.	Same as Alternative A.	The planning area is open to livestock grazing except for parcels identified on Map 119. 2,317,368 acres are open to grazing. 69,276 acres are unavailable to grazing.
6062	LR: 10.3, 10.5, 10.6	Acquired lands are open to livestock grazing on a case-by-case basis consistent with the management objectives for the acquisition or the area in which the land is located, such as an ACEC.	Acquired lands are closed to livestock grazing.	Acquired lands are open to livestock grazing.	Same as Alternative A.
6063	LR: 10.3, 10.5, 10.6	No similar action.	Where livestock grazing permits are voluntarily relinquished, the BLM will close the area to livestock grazing.	Re-offer relinquished livestock grazing permits; do not close the area to livestock grazing.	When livestock grazing permits and/or grazing preference are voluntarily relinquished in portions of or all of an allotment, analyze appropriate livestock grazing management including considering closure to livestock grazing based on benefits to resources and other uses.
6064	LR: 10.5, 10.6	No similar action.	Establish and manage future forage reserves as opportunities arise within the planning area on a voluntary basis or as lands are acquired.	Do not establish forage reserves.	Same as Alternative B.

6000 LAND RESOURCES (LR) – LIVESTOCK GRAZING MANAGEMENT					
Record #	**Goal/ Obj.**	**Alternative A (Current Management)**	**Alternative B (Most Resource Conservation)**	**Alternative C (Most Resource Utilization)**	**Alternative D (Proposed RMP)**
6065	LR: 10.7	No similar action.	Permit extended periods of non-use of grazing preference, without penalty, on a case-by-case basis when the advantage to greater sage-grouse habitat or other resource values warrant, and a permittee or lessee voluntarily takes non-use of their grazing preference in a specific grazing allotment.	No similar action.	Same as Alternative B.
6066	LR: 10.2, 10.5, 10.8	Allow new range improvements on a case-by-case basis.	Utilize non-infrastructure livestock grazing management to maintain, enhance, or achieve rangeland health. Prohibit new range improvements if adverse impacts to other resources would result.	Utilize all livestock grazing management including infrastructure and non-infrastructure to maintain, enhance, or achieve rangeland health.	Utilizing Required Design Features and BMPs such as those in Appendix H (p. 1521) applied as COA, develop and install range improvement projects necessary to implement comprehensive grazing strategies leading to improved rangeland health or to enhance successful comprehensive grazing strategies (see Glossary) already in place. Benefits associated with the projected improvement in rangeland health should exceed the adverse impacts associated with the project infrastructure. Avoid projects that would expand grazing on the landscape without a clear link to a Comprehensive Grazing Strategy and consideration of other resources.

6000 LAND RESOURCES (LR) – LIVESTOCK GRAZING MANAGEMENT					
Record #	**Goal/ Obj.**	**Alternative A (Current Management)**	**Alternative B (Most Resource Conservation)**	**Alternative C (Most Resource Utilization)**	**Alternative D (Proposed RMP)**
6067	LR: 10.10	No similar action (many of these items are addressed on a case-by-case basis).	No similar action (many of these items are addressed on a case-by-case basis).	No similar action (many of these items are addressed on a case-by-case basis).	Include terms and conditions on grazing permits and leases that ensure plant growth requirements are met, and residual forage remains available for greater sage-grouse hiding cover as necessary. Specify as necessary: ● No new range improvement projects within ½ mile of water and riparian-wetland areas, regional historic trails, and early highways (or as needed to protect the setting, so long as impacts are not visible). ● Intensity of use (utilization) subject to the provisions of Records 4018, 6050, and 6068; ● Develop project-specific BMPs that become terms and conditions.
6068	LR: 10.5, 10.8	Unless otherwise specified, establish allotment stocking rates to maximize utilization of forage in areas preferred by livestock, while achieving standards for rangeland health. This action generally corresponds with a moderate (41 to 60 percent) utilization level.	Establish allotment stocking rates in areas preferred by livestock to achieve an adequate residual forage standard used as cover for wildlife and to be made available for utilization by wildlife and wild horses. This action generally corresponds with a light (21 to 40 percent) utilization level.	Same as Alternative A.	Establish stocking rates in areas preferred by livestock that allow for appropriate utilization levels by livestock adjusted for the anticipated intensity of use necessary to provide sufficient forage and cover to support and maintain healthy diverse wildlife and wild horse populations, and to achieve Wyoming Standards for Healthy Rangelands. Utilization levels may vary based on the implementation of a Comprehensive Grazing Strategy or as needed to achieve vegetation objectives.

6000 LAND RESOURCES (LR) – LIVESTOCK GRAZING MANAGEMENT					
Record #	**Goal/ Obj.**	**Alternative A (Current Management)**	**Alternative B (Most Resource Conservation)**	**Alternative C (Most Resource Utilization)**	**Alternative D (Proposed RMP)**
6069	LR: 10.9, 10.10	No similar action (many of these items are addressed on a case-by-case basis).	No similar action (many of these items are addressed on a case-by-case basis).	No similar action (many of these items are addressed on a case-by-case basis).	Prioritize completion of land health assessments and processing of grazing permits within greater sage-grouse Core Area and on allotments with riparian-wetland areas in failing condition. Emphasize allotments that have the best opportunities for riparian-wetland improvement or for conserving, enhancing, or restoring habitat for greater sage-grouse. When conducting land health assessments, include indicators and measurements of structure, condition, and composition of vegetation specific to achieving greater sage-grouse habitat objectives. If local/state seasonal habitat objectives are not available, use greater sage-grouse habitat recommendations from Connelly et al. 2000 and Hagen et al. 2007 or as more recent research suggests. Work cooperatively with permittees, lessees, and other landowners to develop comprehensive grazing strategies to develop site-specific objectives to conserve, enhance or restore greater sage-grouse Core Area and general habitat areas. Develop a Comprehensive Grazing Strategy to achieve these objectives. In Core Area, monitor measurable objectives in representative sites

6000 LAND RESOURCES (LR) – LIVESTOCK GRAZING MANAGEMENT					
Record #	**Goal/ Obj.**	**Alternative A (Current Management)**	**Alternative B (Most Resource Conservation)**	**Alternative C (Most Resource Utilization)**	**Alternative D (Proposed RMP)**
					and evaluate grazing management to ensure that management actions are achieving greater sage-grouse habitat objectives.
6070	LR: 10.2, 10.9	No similar action (many of these items are addressed on a case-by-case basis).	No similar action (many of these items are addressed on a case-by-case basis).	No similar action (many of these items are addressed on a case-by-case basis).	Prioritize the management of hot-season grazing on riparian and meadow complexes to promote recovery or maintenance of appropriate vegetation and water quality through the use of comprehensive grazing strategies as identified in Appendix K (p. 1547). In areas of continuous season-long grazing where rangeland health standards are not met, modify existing grazing permits to incorporate rest and/or deferment of grazing to facilitate rangeland health recovery and attainment of rangeland health standards.
6071	LR:10.8, 10.9	No similar action (many of these items are addressed on a case-by-case basis).	No similar action (many of these items are addressed on a case-by-case basis).	No similar action (many of these items are addressed on a case-by-case basis).	Manage drought and post-drought recovery periods for the maintenance and improvement of rangeland health, and the cover and forage needs of all grazing animals and wildlife.

6000 LAND RESOURCES (LR) – LIVESTOCK GRAZING MANAGEMENT					
Record #	**Goal/ Obj.**	**Alternative A (Current Management)**	**Alternative B (Most Resource Conservation)**	**Alternative C (Most Resource Utilization)**	**Alternative D (Proposed RMP)**
6072	LR: 10.9	No similar action (many of these items are addressed on a case-by-case basis).	No similar action (many of these items are addressed on a case-by-case basis).	No similar action (many of these items are addressed on a case-by-case basis).	Evaluate existing project infrastructure in the development of comprehensive grazing strategies. Identify projects that are no longer necessary, or that are contributing to adverse impacts to other resources, and modify or remove projects as appropriate to mitigate impacts, in conjunction with comprehensive grazing strategies. Evaluate whether the infrastructure contributes to the introduction or spread of INNS, and develop mitigation (including removal of infrastructure) to reduce or eliminate weed infestation and spread.
6073	LR: 10.2	Prohibit placement of salt and mineral supplements such as low moisture block supplements within ¼ mile of water and riparian-wetland areas.	Prohibit placement of salt and mineral supplements, such as low moisture block supplements: ● closer than ½ mile to water and riparian-wetland areas and regional historic trails and early highways or as needed to protect setting ● within 0.6 mile of a greater sage-grouse lek ● on areas being reclaimed ● within 3 miles on each side of the NHTs unless the project and its associated impacts are not visible from the NHTs	Same as Alternative A, plus use the placement of salt and mineral supplements to maximize the utilization of the resource.	Prohibit placement of salt and mineral supplements, such as low moisture block supplements in the following areas: ● within ½ mile of water and riparian-wetland areas, regional historic trails and early highways or as needed to protect setting, so long as impacts are not visible. ● within 0.6 mile of the perimeter of greater sage-grouse leks ● on areas being reclaimed Locate supplements (salt or mineral blocks) in a manner designed to conserve, enhance, or restore greater sage-grouse habitat.
6074	LR: 10.10	Remove or modify fences and cattleguards on a case-by-case basis to facilitate livestock, wild	Where opportunities exist, remove or modify existing fences and	Where opportunities exist, remove or modify fences and cattleguards	Same as Alternative A, plus remove or modify fences and cattleguards

6000 LAND RESOURCES (LR) – LIVESTOCK GRAZING MANAGEMENT					
Record #	**Goal/ Obj.**	**Alternative A (Current Management)**	**Alternative B (Most Resource Conservation)**	**Alternative C (Most Resource Utilization)**	**Alternative D (Proposed RMP)**
		horses, and wildlife movement and management.	cattleguards to enhance other resource values.	as needed to facilitate livestock movement and management.	while enhancing other resource values.

Table 2.32. 6000 Land Resources (LR) – Recreation

6000 LAND RESOURCES (LR) – RECREATION					
Record #	**Goal/ Obj.**	**Alternative A (Current Management)**	**Alternative B (Most Resource Conservation)**	**Alternative C (Most Resource Utilization)**	**Alternative D (Proposed RMP)**
Goal LR: 11 Respond to distinct recreation customer demand by providing for customer realization of diverse activity, experience, and benefit opportunities. **Objectives:** **LR: 11.1** Manage SRMAs for specific visitors, affected community residents, local governments and private sector businesses, or other constituents and the communities or other places where these customers originate (recreation-tourism market). **LR: 11.2** SRMA Objective: Specific outcome-focused objectives, recreation setting character conditions, and the administrative, marketing, and monitoring framework can be found in Appendix C (p. 1453). **Goal LR: 12** Manage to maintain or improve visitor safety, respond to use/user conflicts, and provide for resource protection. **Objectives:** **LR: 12.1** Visitor Services Resource Protection Objective: Increase awareness, understanding, and a sense of stewardship in recreational activity participants so their conduct safeguards cultural and natural resources as defined by Wyoming Standards for Public Land Health or area-specific (such as ACEC and WSR) objectives. **LR: 12.2** Visitor Health and Safety Objective: Ensure that visitors are not exposed to unhealthy or unsafe human-created conditions (defined by a repeat or recurring incident in the same year, of the same type, in the same location, due to the same cause). **LR: 12.3** Use/User Conflict Objective: Achieve a minimum level of conflict between recreation participants and (1) other resource/resource uses sufficient to enable the achievement of identified land use plan goals, objectives, and actions; (2) private landowners sufficient to curb illegal trespass and property damage; and (3) other recreation participants sufficient to maintain a diversity of recreation activity participation. **Goal LR: 13** Ensure the facilitation of Hunting Heritage and Wildlife Conservation. **Objectives:** **LR: 13.1** Expand wildlife-dependent recreational opportunities on BLM-administered lands. **LR: 13.2** Improve and enhance access to BLM-administered lands important for wildlife-dependent recreational opportunities. **LR: 13.3** Ensure the enjoyment of wildlife-dependent recreation among various demographic groups. **LR: 13.4** Facilitate trophy/high quality hunting opportunities in WGFD hunt units targeted for special management criteria.				
MANAGEMENT ACTIONS COMMON TO ALL ALTERNATIVES					

6000 LAND RESOURCES (LR) – RECREATION					
Record #	**Goal/ Obj.**	**Alternative A (Current Management)**	**Alternative B (Most Resource Conservation)**	**Alternative C (Most Resource Utilization)**	**Alternative D (Proposed RMP)**
6075	LR: 11	Continue to allow for all recreation activity types in areas allocated as an SRMA or RMZ unless otherwise specified in this land use plan or a subsequent activity level plan. In greater sage-grouse Core Area, authorize SRPs that, through mitigation or design, will have neutral or beneficial impacts to greater sage-grouse.			
6076	LR: 12.1, 12.2, 12.3	As funding allows, utilize on the ground monitoring to ensure objectives 8.1-8.3 are achieved. Through an adaptive management approach, utilize the minimum necessary remedial actions to achieve the stated objective(s).			
6077	LR: 12.1, 12.2, 12.3	Apply a 14-day campsite occupancy limit throughout the planning area.			
6078	LR: 12.1, 12.2, 12.3	Issue SRPs for commercial, competitive, or organized group activities as tools to achieve area specific planning goals, objectives, and decisions.			
6079	LR: 12	Establish new fee sites on a case-by-case basis consistent with the provisions of the REA and as necessary to support management and maintenance of developed sites and related amenities. Where appropriate to the recreational setting of all CDNST SRMAs and ERMAs, enhance the availability of dependable non-potable water sources for users.			
6080	LR: 13.2	Cooperatively pursue offsite mitigation opportunities and other partnerships to enhance wildlife-dependent recreational access to: (1) landlocked BLM-administered lands, and (2) voluntary participation of private lands with high wildlife values.			
6081	LR: 13.3	Allow any individual possessing a valid disabled hunter permit or disabled hunter companion permit from the WGFD to utilize cross-country motorized travel (in all areas except those closed to motorized travel) to retrieve big game carcasses. Additionally exempt scooters or wheelchairs utilized by valid permit holders from travel management restrictions.			
6082	LR: 13.4	Several WGFD hunt units managed under special criteria overlap with the landscapes associated with Congressionally Designated Trails and most ACECs considered in the Special Designations section. Additional management actions and allowable uses associated with WGFD hunt units managed under special criteria are therefore contained in the Special Designations section.			
6083	LR: 11.1	Additional management actions for SRMAs and ERMAs are contained in Appendix C (p. 1453).			
MANAGEMENT ACTIONS BY ALTERNATIVE					
DEVELOPED SITE MANAGEMENT					
6084	LR: 11, 12	Mineral and realty actions within the following developed recreation sites (Map 120) are managed with Category 5 restrictions: ● Castle Gardens Archeology Site (78 acres) ● Atlantic City Campground (184 acres) ● Big Atlantic Gulch (181 acres) ● Cottonwood Campground (80 acres)	Same as Alternative A, plus mineral and realty actions within developed recreation sites and the following areas are managed with Category 6 restrictions (Map 120): ● Devils Gate Interpretive Site (112 acres) ● Martins Cove Trail (927 acres) ● Split Rock Rest Interpretive Site (242 acres)	The developed recreation sites identified in Alternative A are subject to Category 1 restrictions.	Same locations as alternatives A and B, but mineral and realty actions in all these areas are managed as follows (Map 120): ● Open to oil and gas leasing subject to NSO stipulations ● Closed to geophysical exploration ● Closed to phosphate leasing ● Closed to pursue withdrawal from locatable mineral entry (to the extent the areas are not

6000 LAND RESOURCES (LR) – RECREATION					
Record #	**Goal/ Obj.**	**Alternative A (Current Management)**	**Alternative B (Most Resource Conservation)**	**Alternative C (Most Resource Utilization)**	**Alternative D (Proposed RMP)**
		• Lands adjacent to the Fremont County Campground (20 acres) • Miners Delight (239 acres) • Wildhorse Point (20 acres)	• Steamboat Lake Overlook (128 acres)		withdrawn under pre-FLMPA withdrawals.) • Closed to mineral materials disposal • Excluded to major ROWs • Excluded to minor ROWs
6085	LR: 11, 12	No similar action.	Future developed recreation sites and future national/regional trails, local system trails that connect communities, and trailheads and interpretive sites with exceptional recreational values or significant public interest are managed with Category 2 restrictions.	Relocate or remove new sites and trails in the event that leasable mineral activity cannot be sufficiently mitigated.	In the Green Mountain ERMA (129,579 acres) future and existing recreation sites, national/regional trails, local system trails, and trailheads and interpretive sites with exceptional recreational values or significant public interest are managed with Category 2 restrictions.
RECREATION AND VISITOR SERVICES OVERVIEW					
6086	LR: 11, 11.1, 13.1, 13.3	Manage the following three SRMAs for the protection of the recreation outcomes and setting prescriptions (Map 90): • The CDNST SRMA (111,276 acres) • The Oregon-Mormon Pioneer NHT SRMA (281,316 acres) • South Pass Historic Mining Area SRMA (13,865 acres) Note: The guidance on SRMA management has changed since the 1987 RMP. SRMA management for the above areas would resemble the management detailed for Alternative B.	Administratively recognize the following SRMAs for the protection of the recreation outcomes and setting prescriptions (Map 91) (66,363 acres) (Appendix C (p. 1453)): **Lander Valley Community SRMA** (6,892 acres): The SRMA includes 3 RMZs: 1. Sustain or enhance the Johnny Behind the Rocks RMZ (5,594 acres) for nonmotorized recreationists to engage in horseback riding, hiking, trail running, wildlife viewing, and mountain biking so that visitors report a higher than average realization	Administratively recognize one SRMA for the protection of the recreation outcomes and setting prescriptions (Map 92) (Appendix C (p. 1453)): **Dubois Mill Site Community SRMA** (608 acres): Sustain or enhance the SRMA for nonmotorized and motorized recreationists to engage in hiking, walking, horseback riding, and motorized vehicle trail riding so that visitors report a higher than average realization of experience and benefit outcomes listed in Appendix C (p. 1453).	Administratively recognize the following SRMAs for the protection of the recreation outcomes and setting prescriptions (Map 93) (Appendix C (p. 1453)): **Lander Valley Community SRMA** (6,126 acres): The SRMA includes 3 RMZs: 1. Sustain or enhance the Johnny Behind the Rocks RMZ (4,828 acres) for nonmotorized recreationists to engage in horseback riding, hiking, trail running, wildlife viewing, and mountain biking so that visitors report a higher than average realization of experience and benefit

6000 LAND RESOURCES (LR) – RECREATION					
Record #	**Goal/ Obj.**	**Alternative A (Current Management)**	**Alternative B (Most Resource Conservation)**	**Alternative C (Most Resource Utilization)**	**Alternative D (Proposed RMP)**
			of experience and benefit outcomes listed in Appendix C (p. 1453). 2. Sustain or enhance The Bus @ Baldwin Creek RMZ (1,159 acres) for nonmotorized recreationists to engage in horseback riding, hiking, trail running, and mountain biking so that visitors report a higher than average realization of experience and benefit outcomes listed in Appendix C (p. 1453). 3. Sustain or enhance the Sinks Canyon Climbing RMZ (139 acres) for muscle-powered recreationists to engage in climbing and hiking so that participants in visitor assessments/surveys report a higher than average (average of 4.0 on a 5 point scale) realization of experience and benefit outcomes listed in Appendix C (p. 1453). **Dubois Mill Site Community SRMA** (608 acres): Sustain or enhance the SRMA for nonmotorized recreationists to engage in hiking, walking, horseback riding, wildlife viewing, and hunting so that visitors report a higher than average realization of experience and benefit outcomes listed in Appendix C (p. 1453).		outcomes listed in Appendix C (p. 1453). 2. Sustain or enhance The Bus @ Baldwin Creek RMZ (1,159 acres) for nonmotorized recreationists to engage in horseback riding, hiking, trail running, and mountain biking so that visitors report a higher than average realization of experience and benefit outcomes listed in Appendix C (p. 1453). 3. Sustain or enhance the Sinks Canyon Climbing RMZ (139 acres) for muscle-powered recreationists to engage in climbing and hiking so that participants in visitor assessments/surveys report a higher than average (average of 4.0 on a 5 point scale) realization of experience and benefit outcomes listed in Appendix C (p. 1453). **Dubois Mill Site Community SRMA** (608 acres): Sustain or enhance the SRMA for nonmotorized recreationists to engage in hiking, walking, horseback riding, wildlife viewing, and hunting so that visitors report a higher than average realization of experience and benefit outcomes listed in Appendix C (p. 1453).

6000 LAND RESOURCES (LR) – RECREATION					
Record #	**Goal/ Obj.**	**Alternative A (Current Management)**	**Alternative B (Most Resource Conservation)**	**Alternative C (Most Resource Utilization)**	**Alternative D (Proposed RMP)**
			Sweetwater Rocks Undeveloped SRMA (49,727 acres): Sustain or enhance the SRMA for back country enthusiasts to engage in hiking, backpacking, climbing, horseback riding, hunting, and wildlife viewing so that visitors report a higher than average realization of experience and benefit outcomes listed in Appendix C (p. 1453). **Sweetwater Canyon Undeveloped SRMA** (9,136 acres): Sustain or enhance the SRMA for back country enthusiasts to engage in hiking, backpacking, fishing, horseback riding, hunting, and wildlife viewing so that visitors report a higher than average realization of experience and benefit outcomes listed in Appendix C (p. 1453).		**Sweetwater Rocks Undeveloped SRMA** (41,806 acres): Sustain or enhance the SRMA for back country enthusiasts to engage in hiking, backpacking, climbing, horseback riding, hunting, and wildlife viewing so that visitors report a higher than average realization of experience and benefit outcomes listed in Appendix C (p. 1453). **Sweetwater Canyon Undeveloped SRMA** (9,136 acres): Sustain or enhance the SRMA for back country enthusiasts to engage in hiking, backpacking, fishing, horseback riding, hunting, and wildlife viewing so that visitors report a higher than average that realization of experience and benefit outcomes listed in Appendix C (p. 1453).

6000 LAND RESOURCES (LR) – RECREATION					
Record #	**Goal/ Obj.**	**Alternative A (Current Management)**	**Alternative B (Most Resource Conservation)**	**Alternative C (Most Resource Utilization)**	**Alternative D (Proposed RMP)**
6087	LR: 12.1, 12.2, 12.3, 13.1, 13.3	Manage the following areas as individual ERMAs to specifically address local recreation issues (Map 90): • Beaver Rim (2,937 acres) • Castle Gardens (78 acres) • Copper Mountain (6,936 acres) • Dubois Badlands (3,499 acres) • Government Draw (2,988 acres) • Green Mountain (53,302 acres) • Lander Slope/Red Canyon (40,175 acres) • Lysite Badlands (6,867 acres) • Sweetwater Canyon (9,135 acres) • Sweetwater Rocks (34,186 acres) • Whiskey Mountain/East Fork (3,084 acres) Manage BLM-administered lands not included in separate ERMAs or SRMAs as part of the Lander ERMA.	Manage the following areas as individual ERMAs to specifically address local recreation issues (Map 91): • Agate Flats (444,594 acres) • Beaver Creek Nordic Ski Area (64 acres) • Castle Gardens (78 acres) • Copper Mountain (6,936 acres) • Dubois Badlands (4,561 acres) • Coalmine Draw (2,272 acres) • Green Mountain (127,458 acres) • Lander Slope/Red Canyon (38,874 acres) • Muskrat Basin (120,120 acres) • Whiskey Mountain/East Fork (15,234 acres) Manage BLM-administered lands not within ERMAs or SRMAs as part of the Lander ERMA.	Identify the following areas as individual ERMAs to specifically address local recreation issues: Same as Alternative B with the following changes (Map 92): • Agate Flats (497,353 acres) • Sweetwater Canyon (9,137 acres) • Sweetwater Rocks (34,156 acres) • The Coalmine Draw area is not managed as an ERMA. Instead, lease the Coalmine Draw area through a R&PP Act lease. Manage BLM-administrated lands not included in separate ERMAs (above) or SRMAs as part of the Lander ERMA.	Manage the following areas as individual ERMAs to specifically address local recreation issues (Map 93): • Beaver Creek Nordic Ski Area (748 acres) • Green Mountain (129,579 acres) • Lander Slope/Red Canyon (38,876 acres) • Whiskey Mountain/East Fork (15,913 acres)
6088	LR: 12.1, 12.2, 12.3	Mineral and realty actions in the Beaver Creek Ski Area are managed with Category 1 restrictions.	Mineral and realty actions in the Beaver Creek Ski Area are managed with Category 2 restrictions to protect trail investments and human health and safety (Map 91).	Same as Alternative A.	Manage the Beaver Creek Ski Area as VRM Class II.
LANDER VALLEY					
JOHNNY BEHIND THE ROCKS					

6000 LAND RESOURCES (LR) – RECREATION					
Record #	**Goal/ Obj.**	**Alternative A (Current Management)**	**Alternative B (Most Resource Conservation)**	**Alternative C (Most Resource Utilization)**	**Alternative D (Proposed RMP)**
6089	LR: 11.2, 12.1, 12.2, 12.3, 13.1, 13.2, 13.3	Review mineral leases in the Johnny Behind the Rocks area on a case-by-case basis and apply mitigation through activity level planning. Mineral and realty actions in the area are managed with Category 1 restrictions.	Mineral and realty actions in the Johnny Behind the Rocks RMZ are managed with Category 4 restrictions.	Mineral and realty actions in the Johnny Behind the Rocks area are managed with Category 1 restrictions. Relocate or remove visitor services and facilities as necessary to accommodate leasing actions.	Mineral and realty actions in the Johnny Behind the Rocks RMZ are managed with the following restrictions: • Oil and gas leasing subject to NSO. • Closed to geophysical exploration. • Closed to phosphate exploration. • Closed in order to pursue withdrawal from locatable mineral entry. • Closed to mineral material sales. • Excluded from realty actions.
6090	LR: 11.2, 12.1, 12.2, 12.3, 13.1, 13.2, 13.3	Limit motorized travel in the Johnny Behind the Rocks area to existing roads and trails.	Close the Johnny Behind the Rocks RMZ to motorized travel.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative B, except with an allowance for administrative access agreement with livestock grazing permittees. Do not close roads in Blue/Ridge Johnny Spring Area. Cedar ridge road will be closed as a result of this decision.
6091	LR: 11.2, 12.1, 12.2, 12.3, 13.1, 13.2, 13.3	Open the Johnny Behind the Rocks area to cross-country mechanized travel.	Limit mechanized travel in the Johnny Behind the Rocks RMZ to designated routes.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.
6092	LR: 11.2, 12.1, 12.2, 12.3, 13.1, 13.2, 13.3	Manage the Johnny Behind the Rocks area as VRM Class III and IV.	Manage the Johnny Behind the Rocks RMZ as VRM Class II.	Manage the Johnny Behind the Rocks area as VRM Class IV.	Same as Alternative B.
THE BUS @ BALDWIN CREEK AREA					

6000 LAND RESOURCES (LR) – RECREATION					
Record #	**Goal/ Obj.**	**Alternative A (Current Management)**	**Alternative B (Most Resource Conservation)**	**Alternative C (Most Resource Utilization)**	**Alternative D (Proposed RMP)**
6093	LR: 11.2, 12.1, 12.2, 12.3	Mineral and realty actions in The Bus @ Baldwin Creek area are managed with Category 3 restrictions.	Mineral and realty actions in The Bus @ Baldwin Creek RMZ are managed with Category 6 restrictions.	Mineral and realty actions in The Bus @ Baldwin Creek area are managed with Category 1 restrictions. Relocate or remove visitor services and facilities as necessary to accommodate leasing actions.	Mineral and realty actions in The Bus @ Baldwin Creek RMZ is within the Lander Slope ACEC; therefore, the mineral and realty actions in this area are detailed in the Special Designations section.
6094	LR: 11.2, 12.1, 12.2, 12.3	Limit motorized travel in The Bus @ Baldwin Creek Area to designated roads and trails.	Close The Bus @ Baldwin Creek RMZ to motorized travel.	Limit motorized travel in The Bus @ Baldwin Creek area to existing roads and trails.	Same as Alternative B, plus allow livestock grazing administrative use authorization.
6095	LR: 11.2, 12.1, 12.2, 12.3	The Bus @ Baldwin Creek area is open to cross-country mechanized travel.	Limit mechanized travel in The Bus @ Baldwin Creek RMZ to designated routes.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.
6096	LR: 11.2, 12.1, 12.2, 12.3	Manage The Bus @ Baldwin Creek area as VRM Class III.	Manage The Bus @ Baldwin Creek RMZ as VRM Class II.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative B.
SINKS CANYON CLIMBING AREA					
6097	LR: 11.2, 12.1, 12.2, 12.3	Mineral and realty actions in the Sinks Canyon Climbing area are managed with Category 3 restrictions.	Mineral and realty actions in the Sinks Canyon Climbing RMZ are managed with Category 6 restrictions.	Mineral and realty actions in the Sinks Canyon Climbing area are managed with Category 1 restrictions.	Mineral and realty actions in the Sinks Canyon Climbing RMZ are restricted by the Lander Slope ACEC. See the Special Designations alternatives for applicable management.
6098	LR: 11.2, 12.1, 12.2, 12.3	The Sinks Canyon Climbing area is open to cross-country mechanized travel.	Limit mechanized travel in the Sinks Canyon Climbing RMZ to designated routes.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.
6099	LR: 11.2, 12.1, 12.2, 12.3	Limit motorized travel in the Sinks Canyon Climbing area to designated roads and trails. No designated motorized route exists within this area.	Close the Sinks Canyon Climbing RMZ to motorized travel.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.
6100	LR: 11.2, 12.1, 12.2, 12.3	Manage the Sinks Canyon Climbing area as VRM Class II.	Same as Alternative A.	Manage the Sinks Canyon Climbing area as VRM Class III.	Same as Alternative A.
DUBOIS MILL-SITE AREA					

6000 LAND RESOURCES (LR) – RECREATION					
Record #	**Goal/ Obj.**	**Alternative A (Current Management)**	**Alternative B (Most Resource Conservation)**	**Alternative C (Most Resource Utilization)**	**Alternative D (Proposed RMP)**
6101	LR: 11.2, 12.1, 12.2, 12.3, 13.1, 13.2, 13.3	Mineral and realty actions in the Dubois Mill-Site area are managed with Category 3 restrictions.	Mineral and realty actions in the Dubois Mill-Site SRMA area are managed with Category 6 restrictions.	Mineral and realty actions in the Dubois Mill-Site SRMA are managed with Category 1 restrictions.	Mineral and realty actions in the Dubois Mill-Site SRMA are managed with the following restriction: • Closed to oil and gas leasing • Closed to geophysical exploration • Closed to phosphate leasing • Open to locatable minerals • Closed to mineral material disposals • Excluded to major ROWs • Avoided for minor ROWs
6102	LR: 11.2, 12.1, 12.2, 12.3, 13.1, 13.2, 13.3	Limit motorized travel in the Dubois Mill-Site area to designated roads and trails.	Close the Dubois Mill-Site SRMA to motorized travel.	Limit motorized travel in the Dubois Mill-Site SRMA to existing roads and trails.	Motorized travel in the Dubois Mill-Site SRMA will be limited seasonally (closed between December 1 to May 15) and to designated roads and trails.
6103	LR: 11.2, 12.1, 12.2, 12.3, 13.1, 13.2, 13.3	Open the Dubois Mill-Site area to cross-country mechanized travel.	Limit mechanized travel in the Dubois Mill-Site SRMA to designated routes.	Same as Alternative A.	Mechanized travel in the Dubois Mill- Site SRMA will be limited seasonally (closed between December 1 to May 15) and to designated roads and trails.
6104	LR: 11.2, 12.1, 12.2, 12.3, 13.1, 13.2, 13.3	Manage the Dubois Mill-Site area as VRM Class III.	Manage the Dubois Mill-Site SRMA as VRM Class II.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative B.
SWEETWATER CANYON					
6105	LR: 11.2, 12.1, 12.2, 12.3, 13.1, 13.2, 13.3	The Sweetwater Canyon WSA is open to livestock grazing. Note: Livestock grazing in all WSAs, including the Sweetwater Canyon WSA, is managed in accordance with BLM Manual 6330, *Management of Wilderness Study Areas*.	The fenced area of the Sweetwater Canyon SRMA is closed to livestock grazing in order to enhance recreation, watershed, and wilderness values.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A. If grazing permits in Sweetwater Canyon are voluntarily relinquished the BLM will close the area to livestock grazing.
SWEETWATER ROCKS					

6000 LAND RESOURCES (LR) – RECREATION					
Record #	**Goal/ Obj.**	**Alternative A (Current Management)**	**Alternative B (Most Resource Conservation)**	**Alternative C (Most Resource Utilization)**	**Alternative D (Proposed RMP)**
6106	LR: 11.2, 12.1, 12.2, 12.3, 13.1, 13.2, 13.3	No similar action.	Work in cooperation with all partners to pursue improved nonmotorized access.	Same as Alternative B.	Same as Alternative B.
6107	LR: 11.2, 12.1, 12.2, 12.3, 13.1, 13.2, 13.3	Mineral and realty actions in the area inside the WSA are managed under BLM Manual 6330, *Management of Wilderness Study Areas*. Mineral and realty actions in the area outside of the WSA (15,542 acres) are managed with Category 1 restrictions.	Mineral and realty actions in the area inside of the WSA are managed under BLM Manual 6330, *Management of Wilderness Study Areas*. Mineral and realty actions in the area outside of the WSA (15,542 acres) are managed with Category 5 restrictions.	Mineral and realty actions in the area inside of the WSA are managed under BLM Manual 6330, *Management of Wilderness Study Areas*. Mineral and realty actions in the area outside of the WSA (15,542 acres) are managed with Category 1 restrictions.	Mineral and realty actions in the area inside of the WSA are managed under BLM Manual 6330, *Management of Wilderness Study Areas*. Mineral and realty actions in the area outside of the WSA (7,622 acres) are managed in the fashion detailed under the Sweetwater Rocks special designations section.
6108	LR: 11.2, 12.1, 12.2, 12.3, 13.1, 13.2, 13.3	Limit motorized travel in the area outside of the WSA to existing roads and trails.	Limit motorized travel within the SRMA in the area outside of the WSA to designated roads and trails.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A, until a Travel Management Plan is completed, at which time motorized travel will be limited to designated routes.
6109	LR: 11.2, 12.1, 12.2, 12.3, 13.1, 13.2, 13.3	Open the area outside of the WSA to cross-country mechanized travel.	Limit mechanized travel in the area of the SRMA outside of the WSA to designated routes.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.
6110	LR: 11.2, 12.1, 12.2, 12.3, 13.1, 13.2, 13.3	No similar action.	Work in cooperation with all partners to pursue improved nonmotorized access.	Same as Alternative B.	Same as Alternative B.
6111	LR: 11.2, 12.1, 12.2, 12.3	Manage the area outside of the WSA as VRM Class II.	Same as Alternative A.	Manage the area outside of the WSA as VRM Class III.	See management in the Sweetwater Rocks Special Designations section for VRM management in this area.
COALMINE DRAW AREA					
6112	LR: 12.1, 12.2, 12.3	Manage the Coalmine Draw area as part of the Government Draw ERMA (Map 90). Focus visitor management in this area on resource protection, ensuring human health and safety, and reducing resource use/user conflict.	Same as Alternative A.	No similar action (see below).	Same as Alternative C.

6000 LAND RESOURCES (LR) – RECREATION					
Record #	**Goal/ Obj.**	**Alternative A (Current Management)**	**Alternative B (Most Resource Conservation)**	**Alternative C (Most Resource Utilization)**	**Alternative D (Proposed RMP)**
6113	LR: 12.1, 12.2, 12.3	Do not lease the Coalmine Draw area through a R&PP action.	Same as Alternative A.	Transfer the Coalmine Draw area to a private entity through a R&PP Act action (Map 92). The purpose of this transfer will be to provide for a cross-country OHV and intensive target shooting area. Prior to the transfer being executed, establish a fenced boundary around the area to ensure impacts associated with such use do not spread on to adjacent private and public lands.	Same as Alternative A.
PUBLIC LAND EAST OF DUBOIS RIFLE RANGE ERMA					
6114	LR: 12.1, 12.2, 12.3	Manage the BLM-administered land east of the Dubois Rifle Range as part of the Lander Field Office ERMA. Focus visitor management in this area on resource protection, ensuring human health and safety, and reducing resource use and user conflict.	Same as Alternative A.	No similar action.	Same as Alternative C.
6115	LR: 12.1. 12.2, 12.3	Do not lease this land for recreation.	Same as Alternative A.	Transfer the BLM-administered lands directly east of the Dubois Rifle Range (Map 92) to a private entity through a R&PP Act action. The purpose of this transfer is to provide for a cross-country OHV area. Prior to the transfer being executed, establish a fenced boundary around the area to ensure impacts associated with such use do not spread onto adjacent private and public lands.	Same as Alternative A.
MUSKRAT BASIN ERMA					

6000 LAND RESOURCES (LR) – RECREATION					
Record #	**Goal/ Obj.**	**Alternative A (Current Management)**	**Alternative B (Most Resource Conservation)**	**Alternative C (Most Resource Utilization)**	**Alternative D (Proposed RMP)**
6116	LR: 13.1, 13.3, 13.4	No similar action. Mineral and realty actions in the Muskrat Basin ERMA of Mule Deer Hunt Area 90 and Antelope Hunt Area 67 are managed with Category 1 restrictions.	Mineral and realty actions in the Muskrat Basin ERMA of Mule Deer Hunt Area 90 and Antelope Hunt Area 67 are managed with Category 2 restrictions from September 1 to November 15.	Cooperatively develop mitigation measures to reduce the impact or intensity of disruptive activities in the Muskrat Basin ERMA of Mule Deer Hunt Area 90 and Antelope Hunt Area 67. Mineral and realty actions in these areas are managed with Category 1 restrictions.	Do not designate this as an ERMA but cooperatively develop mitigation measures to reduce the impact or intensity of disruptive activities in Mule Deer Hunt Area 90 and Antelope Hunt Area 67. Mineral and realty actions in these areas are open with standard stipulations.
RED CANYON/LANDER SLOPE ERMA. See the ACEC section for additional management actions and allowable use decisions for the Lander Slope/Red Canyon ERMA.					
6117	LR: 13.1, 13.3	No similar action.	Increase back country acreage in the Weiser draw area from 2,487 acres to 4,471 acres.	Maintain existing back country acreage in the Weiser draw area (2,487 acres).	Same as Alternative C.
6118	LR: 13.1, 13.3	No similar action.	Develop and improve a primitive motorized loop route system from Highway 28 to the Limestone Mountain Road.	Same as Alternative B, except add the route to the transportation system and maintain at a standard that allows the passage of low clearance vehicles.	Same as Alternative A.
6119	LR: 13.1, 13.3	No similar action.	Minimally maintain the Shoshoni Lake Road to Paradise Creek to protect resources and ensure passage of high clearance 4x4 vehicles. The remainder of the route will be a motorized trail for OHV use where passage of normal or stock 4x4 vehicles may not be ensured.	Same as Alternative B, except enroll The Shoshoni Lake Road as a 'trail' in the state trails program. Maintenance will provide a challenging trail experience while ensuring safety of users and resource protection.	Same as Alternative B.
6120	LR: 12.2, 12.3	Open the Baldwin Creek Climbing trail to forest product removal.	Close the Baldwin Creek Climbing area and access trail to forest product removal.	Same as Alternative A.	Commercial timber sales and harvests in the Baldwin Creek Unit are subject to VRM Class II requirements.
AGATE FLATS ERMA					

6000 LAND RESOURCES (LR) – RECREATION					
Record #	**Goal/ Obj.**	**Alternative A (Current Management)**	**Alternative B (Most Resource Conservation)**	**Alternative C (Most Resource Utilization)**	**Alternative D (Proposed RMP)**
6121	LR: 13.1, 13.3, 13.4	Mineral and realty actions in the Agate Flats ERMA of Antelope Hunt Areas 68, 69, and 106 are managed with Category 1 restrictions.	Mineral and realty actions in the Agate Flats ERMA of Antelope Hunt Areas 68, 69, and 106 are managed with Category 3 restrictions from September 1 to October 22.	Cooperatively develop mitigation measures to reduce the impact or intensity of disruptive activities in the Agate Flats ERMA of Antelope Hunt Areas 68, 69, and 106.	Do not designate this as an ERMA but cooperatively develop mitigation measures to reduce the impact or intensity of disruptive activities in Antelope Hunt Areas 68, 69 and 106. Mineral and realty actions in these areas are open with standard stipulations.
GREEN MOUNTAIN ERMA. See the Green Mountain ACEC section for additional management actions and allowable use decisions for those portions of the ERMA within the ACEC.					
6122	LR: 13.1, 13.3	No similar action.	Increase back country acreage in the Whiskey Peak area from 10,250 acres to 13,780 acres.	Maintain existing back country acreage in the Whiskey Peak area (10,250 acres).	Same as Alternative C.
6123	LR: 13.1, 13.2, 13.3	Maintain the Green Mountain Loop to provide access and opportunities for low clearance vehicles.	Same as Alternative A, plus enhance wildlife and wild horse viewing opportunities and consider additional watchable wildlife interpretation opportunities.	Same as Alternative B.	Same as Alternative B.
6124	LR: 12.1, 12.2, 12.3, 13.1, 13.2, 13.3	Additional management actions and allowable use decisions for the Green Mountain ERMA are contained in the ACEC section.	Same as Alternative A.	Do not manage the Green Mountain area as an ERMA.	Same as Alternative A.

Table 2.33. 7000 Special Designations (SD) – Congressionally Designated Trails

7000 SPECIAL DESIGNATIONS (SD) – CONGRESSIONALLY DESIGNATED TRAILS					
Record #	**Goal/Obj.**	**Alternative A (Current Management)**	**Alternative B (Most Resource Conservation)**	**Alternative C (Most Resource Utilization)**	**Alternative D (Proposed RMP)**
Goal SD: 1 Provide users with opportunities to view, experience, and appreciate examples of prehistoric and historic human use of the resources along the Congressionally Designated Trails showing the ways these resources are being managed (1) in harmony with the environment, (2) in support of the nature and purposes for which the trail was established, and (3) yet do not detract from the overall experience of the trail. **Objectives:** **SD: 1.1** VRM Class I Objective: Preserve the existing character of the landscape. Provide for natural ecological changes; however, preserving the landscape will not preclude very limited management activity. The level of change to the characteristic landscape will be very low and will not attract attention. **SD: 1.2** VRM Class II Objective: Retain the existing character of the landscape. The level of change to the characteristic landscape will be low. Management activities may be seen, but will not attract the attention of the casual observer. Any changes must repeat the basic elements of form, line, color, and texture found in the predominant natural features of the characteristic landscape. **SD: 1.3** VRM Class III Objective: Partially retain the existing character of the landscape. The level of change to the characteristic landscape will be moderate. Management activities may attract attention but should not dominate the view of the casual observer. Changes will repeat the basic elements found in the predominant natural features of the characteristic landscape. **SD: 1.4** VRM Class IV Objective: Allow management activities that require major modification to the existing character of the landscape. The level of change to the characteristic landscape can be high. These management activities may dominate the view and be the major focus of viewer attention. However, every attempt will be made to minimize the impact of these activities through careful location, minimal disturbance, and repeating the basic elements found in the predominant natural features of the characteristic landscape. **Goal SD: 2** Maintain the CDNST corridor to provide high-quality scenic, primitive hiking, and horseback riding opportunities, and to conserve natural historic and cultural resources along the trail. **Goal SD: 3** Use of the CDNST will minimally affect adjacent natural and cultural environments and harmonize with the management objectives of land and resource uses which are or may be occurring on the lands through which the trail passes. **Goal SD: 4** Preserve and protect the historical remains and historical settings of the Oregon, Mormon Pioneer, California, and Pony Express NHTs and their associated historic sites for public use and enjoyment. **Objectives:** **SD: 4.1** Maintain and enhance the significant qualities of high-potential NHT segments and sites as defined in the National Trails System Act. Avoid adverse effects (as defined in the NHPA and the BLM/SHPO Wyoming State Protocol) upon intact NHT segments, their settings, and associated sites.					

7000 SPECIAL DESIGNATIONS (SD) – CONGRESSIONALLY DESIGNATED TRAILS					
Record #	**Goal/Obj.**	**Alternative A (Current Management)**	**Alternative B (Most Resource Conservation)**	**Alternative C (Most Resource Utilization)**	**Alternative D (Proposed RMP)**
		SD: 4.2 Protect remnants, ruts, traces, graves, campsites, landmarks, artifacts, and other remains associated with the NHTs to enhance historical research and public use and enjoyment. **Goal SD: 5** Provide for the outdoor recreation needs of an expanding population and promote the preservation of public access and enjoyment of the open air, outdoor areas, and historic resources of the nation, in a manner that supports the nature and purpose of the Congressionally Designated Trails. **Objectives:** **SD: 5.1** Manage the landscape (viewshed) associated with the NHTs so that visitors continue to get a sense of how this landscape influenced emigrants along the trails. **SD: 5.2** Manage SRMAs along Congressionally Designated Trails for specific visitors, affected community residents, local governments and private sector businesses, or other constituents and the communities or places where these customers originate (recreation-tourism market). **SD: 5.3** Congressionally Designated Trails SRMA Objective: Specific outcome-focused objectives, recreation setting character conditions, and the administrative, marketing, and monitoring framework can be found in Appendix C (p. 1453). **SD: 5.4** Congressionally Designated Trails visitor Services Resource Protection Objective: Increase awareness, understanding, and a sense of stewardship in NHTs recreational activity participants so their conduct safeguards cultural and natural resources as defined by Wyoming Standards for Public Land Health and other resource objectives. **SD: 5.5** Congressionally Designated Trails visitor Health and Safety Objective: Ensure that visitors are not exposed to unhealthy or unsafe human-created conditions (defined by a repeat incident in the same year, of the same type, in the same location, due to the same cause). **SD: 5.6** Congressionally Designated Trails use/User Conflict Objective: Achieve a minimum level of conflict between recreation participants and (1) other resource/resource uses sufficient to enable the achievement of identified land use plan goals, objectives, and actions; (2) private land owners sufficient to curb illegal trespass and property damage; and (3) other recreation participants sufficient to maintain a diversity of recreation activity participation.			
MANAGEMENT ACTIONS COMMON TO ALL ALTERNATIVES					
7001	SD: 4.2, 5.1, 5.2, 5.3, 5.6	Continue to allow for all recreation activity types in an area recognized as a SRMA or RMZ along a Congressionally Designated NHT unless otherwise specified in this Land Use Plan or subsequent activity level plan.			
7002	SD: 5.6	The NHTs and CDNST are open to livestock grazing.			
MANAGEMENT ACTIONS BY ALTERNATIVE					
CONGRESSIONALLY DESIGNATED TRAIL ALLOCATIONS AND DESIGNATIONS					

7000 SPECIAL DESIGNATIONS (SD) – CONGRESSIONALLY DESIGNATED TRAILS					
Record #	**Goal/Obj.**	**Alternative A** **(Current Management)**	**Alternative B** **(Most Resource Conservation)**	**Alternative C** **(Most Resource Utilization)**	**Alternative D** **(Proposed RMP)**
7003	SD: 1.2, 4, 4.1, 4.2	Designate lands within ¼ mile of either side of the NHTs as a 27,728 acre ACEC (Map 124). No portion of the CDNST is designated as an ACEC but a portion of the CDNST is co-located with the Seminoe Cutoff section of the NHTs ACEC.	Designate the National Historic Trails Management Corridor including the lands within 5 miles on each side of the NHTs as a 468,183 acre ACEC (Map 125). Designate the visible area within 5 miles of the CDNST from Unnamed Spring (out of view of Happy Springs oil field) northwest to the Lander Field Office boundary (near South Pass City) as a 259,380 acre ACEC to protect nationally important scenic values (Map 121).	Recognize ¼ mile on either side of the NHT as the NLCS landscape associated with the NHTs (Map 126). Recognize ¼ mile on either side of the CDNST as the NLCS landscape associated with the trail.	Manage lands associated with the Congressionally Designated Trails as the NTMC with the allocations described below (Map 127, 481,557 acres). Designate the lands in the western end of the NTMC as the South Pass Historical Landscape ACEC (124,229 acres). The remaining part of the corridor is not designated as an ACEC.
7004	SD: 2, 3	The 1987 RMP recognizes the entire CDNST and NHT as an SRMA (with detailed management deferred to future planning). No additional land use allocations or allowable use decisions accompany the SRMA designation.	The following trail related areas and associated RMZs are recognized as SRMAs for the protection of recreation outcomes and settings: CDNST Destination SRMA (82,778 acres) (Map 91): This SRMA includes two RMZs: 1. Alkali Basin RMZ (37,384 acres) is sustained or enhanced for thru-travelers and middle-country hunters to engage in horseback riding, hiking, hunting, and mountain biking so that visitors indicate a higher than average realization of experience and benefit outcomes listed in Appendix C (p. 1453). 2. Sweetwater Mining RMZ (45,394 acres) is sustained or enhanced for day travelers	No CDNST SRMA exists in this alternative, see ERMA alternatives below.	Same as Alternative B, except the National Trails Undeveloped SRMA is 92,598 acres (Map 93).

7000 SPECIAL DESIGNATIONS (SD) – CONGRESSIONALLY DESIGNATED TRAILS					
Record #	**Goal/Obj.**	**Alternative A** **(Current Management)**	**Alternative B** **(Most Resource Conservation)**	**Alternative C** **(Most Resource Utilization)**	**Alternative D** **(Proposed RMP)**
			and CDNST thru-travelers to engage in cultural site visitation, driving for pleasure, photography, horseback riding, hiking, and mountain biking so that visitors indicate a higher than average realization of experience and benefit outcomes listed in Appendix C (p. 1453). National Trails Undeveloped SRMA (95,711 acres) (Map 91): This SRMA is sustained or enhanced for individuals or small groups of historic trail "rut buffs," CDNST thru-hikers, and middle-country hunters to engage in cultural site visitation, driving for pleasure, photography, horseback riding, hunting, and hiking so that visitors indicate a higher than average realization of experience and benefit outcomes listed in Appendix C (p. 1453). NHT Destination SRMA (62,331 acres) (Map 91): This SRMA includes two RMZs: 1. Auto Tour Route RMZ (25,098 acres) is sustained or enhanced for highway travelers to engage in historic site visitation/learning, teaching history, photography, and driving for pleasure		

7000 SPECIAL DESIGNATIONS (SD) – CONGRESSIONALLY DESIGNATED TRAILS					
Record #	**Goal/Obj.**	**Alternative A (Current Management)**	**Alternative B (Most Resource Conservation)**	**Alternative C (Most Resource Utilization)**	**Alternative D (Proposed RMP)**
			visitors indicate a higher than average realization of experience and benefit outcomes. 2. Group Use RMZ (37,233 acres) is sustained or enhanced for organized groups and other trail enthusiasts to engage in physically demanding cultural site visitation/learning, photography, and historic reenactments so that visitors indicate a higher than average realization of experience and benefit outcomes.		
7005	SD: 2, 3	No similar action.	Trail-related ERMAs: The following trail areas are recognized as ERMAs where visitor services are focused on limiting recreational use impact, ensuring visitor safety, reducing recreational conflicts, and supporting the nature and purpose of the associated Congressionally Designated Trails. Recognize lands within ¼ mile of the CDNST, from Happy Springs Oil Field east to the Lander Field Office boundary in the Crooks Gap area (the CDNST ERMA [4,589 acres]): Recognize lands within ¼ mile on either side of the NHT not encompassed in a SRMA and the Willow Creek area as ERMAs (34,724 acres):	Trail-related ERMAs: The following trail areas are recognized as ERMAs where visitor services are focused on limiting recreational use impact, ensuring visitor safety, and reducing recreational conflicts. CDNST ERMA (14,010 acres): Recognize ¼ mile on either side of the CDNST as the CDNST ERMA. NHT ERMA (30,436 acres): Recognize ¼ mile on either side of the NHT as the NHT ERMA.	Same as Alternative B.

7000 SPECIAL DESIGNATIONS (SD) – CONGRESSIONALLY DESIGNATED TRAILS					
Record #	**Goal/Obj.**	**Alternative A (Current Management)**	**Alternative B (Most Resource Conservation)**	**Alternative C (Most Resource Utilization)**	**Alternative D (Proposed RMP)**
			Recognize lands in close proximity to the NHT not encompassed in a SRMA as the NHT ERMA (see Map 91).		
7006	SD: 2, 3	Manage ¼ mile on either side of the NHTs as VRM Classes I and II. Since the CDNST was not designated in the 1987 RMP, the VRM land use allocations for the CDNST landscape did not recognize the need to manage the visual resources of the trail. VRM Class designations within 15 miles on each side of the CDNST are as follows: • VRM Class I: 2% (11,241 acres) • VRM Class II: 14% (114,962 acres) • VRM Class III: 5% (41,494 acres) • VRM Class IV: 79% (627,569 acres)	Manage the NHT and associated landscapes as: • VRM Class II within 15 miles in all directions • VRM Class III for all designated NHTs crossings. In order to maintain the scenic character of the CDNST, recognize the sensitive nature of the landscape as directed by the 2009 CDNST comprehensive plan and provide for SRMAs. VRM Class designations within 15 miles on each side of the CDNST are as follows: • VRM Class I: 1% (11,370 acres) • VRM Class II: 88% (715,468 acres) • VRM Class III: 6% (45,502 acres) • VRM Class IV: 5% (42,185 acres)	Manage ¼ mile on either side of Congressionally Designated Trails as VRM Class II.	Manage the NTMC Corridor as VRM Class II. The designated utility crossings and the CDNST ERMA are VRM Class III. • On a case-by-case basis, remove or reclaim visually intrusive existing roads, facilities, and ROWs not necessary to attain NHT or CDNST management objectives.
CONGRESSIONALLY DESIGNATED TRAILS ALLOWABLE USES AND MANAGEMENT ACTIONS					

7000 SPECIAL DESIGNATIONS (SD) – CONGRESSIONALLY DESIGNATED TRAILS					
Record #	**Goal/Obj.**	**Alternative A** **(Current Management)**	**Alternative B** **(Most Resource Conservation)**	**Alternative C** **(Most Resource Utilization)**	**Alternative D** **(Proposed RMP)**
7007	SD: 4.1, 4.2, 5.2, 5.3, 5.6	Range improvement projects and mineral supplementation and their associated impacts are subject to the following restrictions (Map 124): ● Projects are avoided within ¼ mile on each side of designated portions of the NHTs or the visible horizon, whichever is closer. The area beyond ¼ mile from the NHTs is subject to standard Protocol and NHPA measures to minimize the effects to the NHTs.	Range improvement projects and mineral supplementation and their associated impacts are subject to the following restrictions (Map 125): ● Do not authorize projects within 3 miles on each side of the NHTs unless the project and its associated impacts are not visible from the NHTs. Do not authorize projects 3 to 5 miles on each side of the NHTs unless the project and its associated impacts cause no more than a weak contrast, as defined in the BLM Visual Resource Manual.	Same as Alternative A, except apply the standard NHPA measures to Condition Class I and II Historic Trail segments only, and not to Condition Class III and IV Historic Trail segments (Map 122).	Range projects and mineral supplementation and their associated impacts within the NTMC are allowed consistent with VRM Class objectives (Map 78).
7008	SD: 2.2, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 4.1, 4.2, 5.1, 5.2, 5.3, 5.5, 5.6	CDNST - Mineral and realty actions are reviewed on a case-by-case basis and mitigation is applied through activity level planning. Mineral and realty actions in the CDNST SRMA area are managed with Category 2 restrictions. NHTs - Mineral and realty actions are subject to the following restrictions (Map 123): ● Mineral and realty actions within ¼ mile on each side of designated portions of the NHTs or the visible horizon, whichever is closer, are managed with Category 4 restrictions. A Plan of Operations is required for locatable mineral activities.	CDNST - Mineral and realty actions in the CDNST ACEC are managed with Category 4 restrictions. NHTs - Mineral and realty actions, except for highly visible projects and/or projects out of scale with the surrounding environment (e.g., wind farms, gas plants, large transmission lines, and power plants), are subject to the following restrictions (Map 125): ● Mineral and realty actions within 5 miles on each side of the NHTs are managed with Category 6 restrictions unless the proposed project and its associated impacts are not visible from the NHTs. (The historic sites listed under	CDNST - Mineral and realty actions in the CDNST ERMA area are managed with Category 1 restrictions. Visitor services and facilities may be relocated or removed as necessary to accommodate BLM-authorized actions. NHTs - Same as Alternative A for the NHTs, except apply the restrictions for NHTs and sites to Condition Class I and II Historic Trail segments only, and not to Condition Class III and IV Historic Trail segments.	Mineral and realty actions in the NTMC are managed with the following prescriptions: ● Open to oil and gas leasing subject to NSO stipulations ● Closed to geophysical exploration within 1 mile of each trail. All trail-related SRMAs are closed to geophysical exploration between June 1 and October 31 to avoid conflicts during the heavy recreational use period. ● Closed to phosphate leasing ● Locatable mineral entry: ○ Existing locatable mineral withdrawals are retained. These include: ■ Split Rock area (645 acres)

7000 SPECIAL DESIGNATIONS (SD) – CONGRESSIONALLY DESIGNATED TRAILS					
Record #	**Goal/Obj.**	**Alternative A** **(Current Management)**	**Alternative B** **(Most Resource Conservation)**	**Alternative C** **(Most Resource Utilization)**	**Alternative D** **(Proposed RMP)**
		• Mineral and realty actions in the area from ¼ mile to 5 miles from the NHTs are managed with Category 2 restrictions. • Mineral and realty actions in the Ice Slough area (1,367 acres) are managed with Category 4 restrictions (Map 123). • Mineral and realty actions in the Split Rock area (645 acres) are managed with Category 5 restrictions (Map 123). • Mineral and realty actions in the Rocky Ridge area (833 acres) are managed with Category 5 restrictions (Map 123). • Mineral and realty actions in the Martins Cove area (603 acres) are managed with Category 5 restrictions (Map 123). • Mineral and realty actions in the other Oregon Trail withdrawal areas (315 acres) are managed with Category 5 restrictions. • Mineral and realty actions in the Devil's Gate area (395 acres) are managed with Category 5 restrictions (Map 123).	Alternative A are within the 0- to 5-mile zone.) • Mineral and realty actions within 5 to 15 miles on each side of the NHTs are managed with Category 2 restrictions unless the proposed project and its associated impacts are not visible from the NHTs.		▪ Rocky Ridge area (833 acres) ▪ Martins Cove area (603 acres) ▪ Devil's Gate area (395 acres) ▪ Other Oregon Trail withdrawals (315 acres) ○ The ruts and swales of the NHTs and 10 feet on each side of the ruts and the following individual sites are closed to pursue locatable mineral withdrawal: ▪ Gilespie Place area (41 acres) ▪ Rock Creek Hollow (51 acres) ▪ Ice Slough (110 acres) • Realty actions and mineral material disposals: ○ Except in designated utility corridors, realty actions and mineral material disposals are avoided. ○ Industrial wind-energy development is excluded. ○ Electrical transmission and distribution ROWs will be located only in designated utility corridors, except to deliver power to end users. ○ No realty actions and mineral material disposals will be authorized if it is determined by the Authorized Officer that

7000 SPECIAL DESIGNATIONS (SD) – CONGRESSIONALLY DESIGNATED TRAILS					
Record #	**Goal/Obj.**	**Alternative A (Current Management)**	**Alternative B (Most Resource Conservation)**	**Alternative C (Most Resource Utilization)**	**Alternative D (Proposed RMP)**
					impacts (both direct and cumulative) associated with the action will conflict with the nature and purpose of the Congressionally Designated Trails. ○ Realty actions and mineral material disposals associated with access and improvements on private land will be authorized if it is determined by the Authorized Officer that the following can be achieved: ■ They create no more than a weak contrast as viewed from the Congressionally Designated Trails; and ■ They meet VRM designations for the disturbance area, as viewed from Key Observation Points impacted by the disturbance. ● Other realty actions and mineral material disposals will be authorized if it is determined by the Authorized Officer that the following can be achieved: ○ They are hidden from the Congressionally Designated Trails; and ○ They meet the VRM designation for the disturbance area, as viewed from Key Observation

7000 SPECIAL DESIGNATIONS (SD) – CONGRESSIONALLY DESIGNATED TRAILS					
Record #	**Goal/Obj.**	**Alternative A (Current Management)**	**Alternative B (Most Resource Conservation)**	**Alternative C (Most Resource Utilization)**	**Alternative D (Proposed RMP)**
					Points impacted by the disturbance. • Pursue opportunities to acquire lands within the NTMC to support the goals and objectives of the Corridor. Lands within the Corridor may be disposed of if subject to an easement or other restriction on use that would ensure conformity with the goals and objectives of the Corridor and the disposal would serve important public values.
TRAIL AND SITE-SPECIFIC ALLOWABLE USES AND MANAGEMENT ACTIONS					
CONTINENTAL DIVIDE NATIONAL SCENIC TRAIL					
7009	SD: 3.2	No allowable use decisions currently exist for the CDNST and its surrounding landscape. Review actions on a case-by-case basis and apply mitigation through the activity level planning process.	At a minimum, apply restrictions (site-specific relocation) on developed (and future) recreation sites and to mapped (and future) national/regional trails, local system trails that connect communities, and trailheads and interpretive sites with exceptional recreation values or significant public interest.	When a proposed or BLM-authorized activity is deemed to threaten the health and safety of trail users, relocate the CDNST within the area defined as the "zone of concern" (50 miles on either side of the physical continental divide) as established by the CDNST advisory council. In the event the trail cannot be practically relocated, identify adequate site-specific mitigation measures and make trail users aware of the potential threat or safety hazard.	Same as Alternative B.

7000 SPECIAL DESIGNATIONS (SD) – CONGRESSIONALLY DESIGNATED TRAILS					
Record #	**Goal/Obj.**	**Alternative A (Current Management)**	**Alternative B (Most Resource Conservation)**	**Alternative C (Most Resource Utilization)**	**Alternative D (Proposed RMP)**
7010	SD: 3.2	No similar action.	No BLM-authorized activity will expose CDNST trail users to heavy/frequent motorized traffic, unless the proposed activity is in an area of the CDNST that is located on or near an existing ROW or a maintained roadway.	Same as Alternative A.	Motorized vehicle crossings or use on the CDNST is managed in accordance with the 2009 Comprehensive Plan. The BLM will not authorize activities that will expose CDNST trail users to heavy/frequent motorized traffic along the trail unless the proposed activity is within a location that currently experiences heavy/frequent motorized traffic (county and BLM-maintained roads).
NATIONAL HISTORIC TRAILS					
7011	SD: 4.1, 4.2, 5.1, 5.2, 5.3, 5.5, 5.6	NHT crossings by ROWs are subject to the following restrictions: • Allow NHT crossings by new major utility systems in areas where trail ruts have been modified by modern uses, where previous crossings exist, or where new corridor crossings would not damage trail remains. Require that all crossings avoid fragile trail resources.	Allow NHT crossings by new major systems only in designated utility corridors. Designate the following route as a utility corridor across the NHTs (Map 106): • The Lost Creek Corridor, which runs north/south from Wamsutter to Lysite Near the crossing of the NHTs: • 0 to 5 miles north of the NHTs corridor, the corridor would be 400 feet wide • 0 to 2 miles south of the NHTs corridor, the corridor would be 400 feet wide	Same as Alternative A, except apply the restrictions to Condition Class I and II Historic Trail segments only, and not to Condition Class III and IV Historic Trail segments (Map 122).	Allow NHT crossings by new major utility systems only in designated utility corridors. Designate the following routes as utility corridors across the NHTs: • Lost Creek Corridor (Map 108). This corridor is for above and below ground ROW. • Lost Creek Lateral Corridor (Map 108). This corridor is for below ground ROW only. • Pathfinder Reservoir/Sinclair Corridor (Map 108). This corridor is for below ground ROW only. • Bison Basin Road Corridor (Map 108). This corridor is for below ground lines only, and must follow the criteria listed in Appendix E (p. 1483). • For all of the above designated corridors, where a proposed project is close enough to

7000 SPECIAL DESIGNATIONS (SD) – CONGRESSIONALLY DESIGNATED TRAILS					
Record #	**Goal/Obj.**	**Alternative A (Current Management)**	**Alternative B (Most Resource Conservation)**	**Alternative C (Most Resource Utilization)**	**Alternative D (Proposed RMP)**
					adversely impact the NHTs, the project shall employ every feasible practice to limit disturbance to as small an area as possible. These practices include, but are not limited to: ○ Reducing the amount of surface disturbance as much as possible; ○ Co-locating the project ROW unless the proponent can clearly demonstrate that it cannot be co-located; ○ Confining new disturbance within existing disturbance areas, unless the proponent can clearly demonstrate that it cannot be confined; ○ Locating the new project within or immediately adjacent to existing disturbance zones, unless the proponent can clearly demonstrate why it cannot be done; ○ Bore under high-quality ruts; ○ Additional mitigation and BMPs will be developed in response to site-specific proposals.

7000 SPECIAL DESIGNATIONS (SD) – CONGRESSIONALLY DESIGNATED TRAILS					
Record #	**Goal/Obj.**	**Alternative A (Current Management)**	**Alternative B (Most Resource Conservation)**	**Alternative C (Most Resource Utilization)**	**Alternative D (Proposed RMP)**
7012	SD: 4.1, 4.2, 5.1, 5.2, 5.3, 5.5, 5.6	Authorize highly visible projects and/or projects out of scale with the surrounding environment (such as plants and power plants) on a case-by-case basis avoiding adverse impacts to the NHTs.	Highly visible projects and/or projects out of scale with the surrounding environment are subject to the following restrictions: • Mineral and realty actions within 20 miles on each side of the NHTs are managed with Category 5 restrictions unless the proposed project and its associated impacts are not visible from the NHTs.	Same as Alternative A.	Highly visible projects and/or projects out of scale with the surrounding environment (such as large wind-energy development projects, gas plants, power plants, high voltage transmission lines, etc.) are subject to the following restriction: • Projects of this type outside of the NTMC are authorized only if the project causes no more than a weak contrast, as defined in the BLM Visual Resource Manual.
7013	SD: 4.1, 4.2, 5.2, 5.3, 5.6	New audible (noise) and atmospheric (smoke, dust, etc.) effects to the NHTs are subject to NHPA measures to minimize the impacts to the NHTs.	New audible and atmospheric effects will not exceed current levels existing along the NHT corridors.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative B.

Table 2.34. 7000 Special Designations (SD) – Wilderness Study Areas

7000 SPECIAL DESIGNATIONS (SD) – WILDERNESS STUDY AREAS					
Record #	**Goal/ Obj.**	**Alternative A (Current Management)**	**Alternative B (Most Resource Conservation)**	**Alternative C (Most Resource Utilization)**	**Alternative D (Proposed RMP)**
Goal SD: 6 Manage WSAs so as to not impair the suitability of such areas for preservation as wilderness. **Objectives:** **SD: 6.1** Preserve wilderness characteristics in WSAs in accordance with BLM Manual 6330, *Management of Wilderness Study Areas*, until Congress either designates these lands as Wilderness or releases them for other purposes. **SD: 6.2** SRMA Objective for the Sweetwater Rocks and Sweetwater Canyon WSAs: See Appendix C (p. 1453) for specific outcome-focused objectives, recreation setting character conditions, and the administrative, marketing, and monitoring framework.					
MANAGEMENT ACTIONS COMMON TO ALL ALTERNATIVES					
7014	SD: 6	Under BLM guidance, the BLM does not have the authority to designate new WSAs nor does BLM have the authority to reverse, repeal, or amend existing WSAs.			
7015	SD: 6.1, 6.2	The following eight WSAs are managed under BLM Manual 6330, *Management of Wilderness Study Areas* (Map 128): ● Sweetwater Rocks Complex: ○ Split Rock (13,964 acres) ○ Lankin Dome (6,347 acres) ○ Miller Spring (6,697 acres) ○ Savage Peak (7,178 acres) ○ Sweetwater Canyon (9,135 acres) ● Whiskey Mountain (519 acres) ● Copper Mountain (6,936 acres) ● Dubois Badlands (4,561 acres)			
7016	SD: 6.1	Manage all WSAs as VRM Class I visual resources (Map 128).			
7017	SD: 6.1	Grandfathered uses (as defined in BLM Manual 6330, *Management of Wilderness Study Areas*) are allowed on lands under Wilderness review in the manner and degree in which these uses were performed on October 21, 1976, so long as they do not cause unnecessary or undue degradation of the lands.			
7018	SD: 6.1	Non-Grandfathered uses (as defined in BLM Manual 6330, *Management of Wilderness Study Areas*) are subject to the non-impairment standard discussed in Objective SD: 6.1.			
7019	SD: 6.1	Livestock grazing in all WSAs, including the Sweetwater Canyon WSA, is managed in accordance with BLM Manual 6330, *Management of Wilderness Study Areas*. See the Recreation section for management actions associated with the Sweetwater Canyon SRMA.			
7020	SD: 6.2	In the event Congress releases any of the Lander Field Office WSAs without management direction, the BLM will continue to manage the released area(s) under similar direction as detailed in BLM Manual 6330, *Management of Wilderness Study Areas* until a Land Use Plan amendment is developed detailing management direction for the area(s). The Land Use Plan amendment process will include updated inventories, recreational user surveys, community workshops, detailed adjacent land use analysis, etc. in order to ensure management of released areas is consistent with the existing plan and meets the future needs of the American public.			

7000 SPECIAL DESIGNATIONS (SD) – WILDERNESS STUDY AREAS					
Record #	**Goal/ Obj.**	**Alternative A (Current Management)**	**Alternative B (Most Resource Conservation)**	**Alternative C (Most Resource Utilization)**	**Alternative D (Proposed RMP)**
7021	N/A	Additional allocations, allowable uses, and management actions to support recreation in WSAs can be found in the Recreation section.			
MANAGEMENT ACTIONS COMMON TO ALL ALTERNATIVES					
7022	SD: 6.1	Close the Dubois Badlands WSA to motorized travel (Map 128). Limit motorized travel in the following WSAs to designated roads and trails that existed and were identified before or during the inventory phase of the wilderness review (Map 128): ● Sweetwater Rocks Complex: ○ Split Rock (13,964 acres) ○ Lankin Dome (6,347 acres) ○ Miller Spring (6,697 acres) ○ Savage Peak (7,178 acres) ● Sweetwater Canyon (9,135 acres) ● Whiskey Mountain (519 acres) ● Copper Mountain (6,936 acres)	Close all WSAs to motorized and mechanized travel (Map 128).	Same as Alternative A.	The following WSAs with the same acreage as in Alternative A are closed to motorized travel (Map 128): ● Dubois Badlands ● Copper Mountain ● Whiskey Mountain In the following WSAs motorized travel is limited to designated roads and trails that existed and were identified before or during the inventory phase of the wilderness review. Travel systems and linear features in conflict with wilderness values will be modified (mitigated or closed) through implementation planning (Map 128). ● Sweetwater Rocks Complex: ○ Split Rock ○ Lankin Dome ○ Miller Spring ○ Savage Peak ● Sweetwater Canyon

Table 2.35. 7000 Special Designations (SD) – Wild and Scenic Rivers

7000 SPECIAL DESIGNATIONS (SD) – WILD AND SCENIC RIVERS					
Record #	**Goal/Obj.**	**Alternative A (Current Management)**	**Alternative B (Most Resource Conservation)**	**Alternative C (Most Resource Utilization)**	**Alternative D (Proposed RMP)**
Goal SD: 7 Protect outstanding remarkable values of eligible and suitable WSR waterway segments recommended for inclusion in the NWSRS. **Objective:** **SD: 7.1** Maintain the outstandingly remarkable scenic, recreational, and wild values of all segments of waterways found to be eligible and suitable for inclusion in the NWSRS.					
MANAGEMENT ACTIONS COMMON TO ALL ALTERNATIVES					
7023	SD: 7.1	Do not authorize stream impoundments, channelization, and/or rip-rapping along BLM shorelines of eligible waterways. BLM-administered lands within ¼ mile on either side of eligible waterways are closed to land disposal actions unless the disposal would be subject to an easement or other restriction on use that would ensure conformity with the goals and objectives of the waterway management and the disposal would serve important public values. Exchanges of BLM-administered lands outside of the corridor could be considered for acquiring private or state lands within the corridor or between public land parcels along the creek; however, BLM-administered lands within the corridor will not be exchanged unless it benefits the goals and objectives of the management.			
7024	SD: 7.1	Any fire suppression activities on BLM-administered lands within ¼ mile on either side of eligible waterways will use 'light-on-the land' techniques. No motorized vehicle ground equipment should be used to suppress fires. Air tanker and helicopter bucket drops and the use of chainsaws may be allowed if no permanent impacts would occur. Evaluate any fire rehabilitation plans to determine whether they comply with the interim management stipulations for a wild waterway area.			
7025	SD: 7.1	Vegetation treatment and manipulation on BLM-administered lands within ¼ mile on either side of eligible waterways must be consistent with guidance provided for the interim management of wild waterway areas under the Wild and Scenic River Act. Timber sales are not authorized in the ¼-mile area on either side of eligible waterways.			
7026	SD: 7.1	To resist invasion by noxious weeds, manage native plant communities and soils within ¼ mile on either side of eligible waters to maintain an ecologically healthy and vigorous condition. Control noxious weeds and undesirable invasive species using integrated pest management.			
MANAGEMENT ACTIONS BY ALTERNATIVE					

7000 SPECIAL DESIGNATIONS (SD) – WILD AND SCENIC RIVERS					
Record #	**Goal/Obj.**	**Alternative A** **(Current Management)**	**Alternative B** **(Most Resource Conservation)**	**Alternative C** **(Most Resource Utilization)**	**Alternative D** **(Proposed RMP)**
7027	SD: 7.1	Apply interim management to the 9 eligible waterways to protect the free-flowing outstandingly remarkable values and tentative classification. Eligible waterways include the following (Map 129): ● Baldwin Creek Unit: 8.1 miles (Wild, Scenic) ○ Upper Baldwin Creek Segment: 6.96 miles (Wild, Scenic) ○ Lower Baldwin Creek Segment: 1.14 miles (Wild) ● Sweetwater River Unit: 12.88 miles (Wild) ○ Sweetwater River Segment: 8.64 miles (Wild) ○ Granite Creek Segment: 1.04 miles (Wild) ○ Mormon Creek Segment: 1.08 miles (Wild) ○ Willow Creek Segment: 1.32 miles (Wild) ○ Strawberry Creek Segment: 0.81 miles (Wild) ● Ice Slough Segment: 1.6 miles (Recreational) ● Little Popo Agie River Segment: 1.5 miles (Wild) ● North Popo Agie River Segment: 0.7 miles (Wild) ● Rock Creek Segment: 4.0 miles (Scenic) ● Warm Springs Creek Segment: 1.3 miles (Scenic) ● Willow Creek (South Pass) Segment: 1.3 miles (Scenic)	Same as Alternative A, plus recommend all 9 eligible waterways as suitable for inclusion in the NWSRS (Map 129). Manage these waterways to maintain or enhance the suitability.	Recommend none of the 9 eligible waterways as suitable for inclusion in the NWSRS. Manage these areas in accordance with other resource and use prescriptions.	Recommend the Baldwin Creek Unit, Warm Springs Segment 1 only (1.3 miles), and Sweetwater River Unit as identified in Alternative A as suitable for inclusion in the NWSRS (Map 129). Manage these waterways to maintain or enhance the suitability. Do not authorize timber sales upstream of the waterways unless the waterway would not be adversely impacted by timber removal. Work cooperatively with other land owners and managers to avoid adverse impacts to the waterways.

7000 SPECIAL DESIGNATIONS (SD) – WILD AND SCENIC RIVERS					
Record #	**Goal/Obj.**	**Alternative A (Current Management)**	**Alternative B (Most Resource Conservation)**	**Alternative C (Most Resource Utilization)**	**Alternative D (Proposed RMP)**
		• Wind River Segment: 0.5 miles (Scenic) Manage these waterways to maintain or enhance the suitability. Do not authorize timber sales upstream of the waterways unless the waterways would not be adversely impacted by timber removal. Work cooperatively with other land owners and managers to avoid adverse impacts to the waterways. Chapter 2 of the WSR report (BLM 2002a) provides a complete description of the above waterway segments and interim management.			
INTERIM MANAGEMENT OF IDENTIFIED ELIGIBLE WATERWAYS					
7028	SD: 7	Interim management for eligible waterways will ensure protection of free-flowing values, documented outstanding remarkable values, and ensure maintenance of tentative river classification. Detailed interim management for the Baldwin Creek and Sweetwater River Unit has been further developed as discussed below.	Waterways recommended as suitable for inclusion in the NWSRS are managed as detailed below. Management will protect free-flowing values, outstanding remarkable values, and ensure maintenance of eligible and suitable classifications.	No eligible waterway is recommended as suitable for inclusion in the NWSRS; therefore management of these areas will not be required to maintain WSR characteristics.	Same as Alternative B.
7029	SD: 7.1	The Baldwin Creek Unit is within the Lander Slope ACEC and managed in accordance with ACEC prescriptions. The Sweetwater River Unit is within the Sweetwater Canyon WSA and managed in accordance with BLM Manual 6330, *Management of Wilderness Study Areas*. There are no WSR management prescription.	Prohibit any activities that diminish the free-flowing character of the waterway, or outstanding remarkable values, and/or any physical or visual intrusions on the eligible and suitable waterways.	Same as Alternative A for the Sweetwater Canyon WSA. No similar action for the Baldwin Creek Unit.	Same as Alternative B.

7000 SPECIAL DESIGNATIONS (SD) – WILD AND SCENIC RIVERS					
Record #	**Goal/Obj.**	**Alternative A (Current Management)**	**Alternative B (Most Resource Conservation)**	**Alternative C (Most Resource Utilization)**	**Alternative D (Proposed RMP)**
7030	SD: 7.1	Mineral and realty actions in the Baldwin Creek Unit are managed with Category 3 restrictions and in the Sweetwater Canyon WSA are managed under BLM Manual 6330, *Management of Wilderness Study Areas*.	Mineral and realty actions within ¼ mile of eligible and suitable waterways are managed with Category 6 restrictions. Allow existing mineral leases to expire.	Same as Alternative A, except mineral and realty actions in the Baldwin Creek Unit are managed with Category 1 restrictions.	Same as Alternative A. Mineral and realty actions in the ACEC are managed as follows: ● Open to oil and gas leasing subject to NSO stipulations ● Closed to geophysical exploration ● Closed to phosphate leasing ● Open to locatable minerals ● Closed to mineral material sales ● Excluded to major ROWs ● Avoided for minor ROWs
7031	SD: 7.1	Water impoundments, diversions, or hydroelectric power facilities are subject to mitigation measures necessary to maintain free flowing characteristics.	Prohibit water impoundments, diversions, or hydroelectric power facilities in eligible and suitable WSR waterway segments.	Same as Alternative A for the Sweetwater Canyon Unit. No similar action for the Baldwin Creek Unit.	Same as Alternative B.
7032	SD: 7.1	Limit motorized travel in the Baldwin Creek Unit and Sweetwater River Unit to designated roads and trails.	Close the Baldwin Creek Unit and the Sweetwater River Unit to motorized and mechanized travel.	Limit motorized travel in the Baldwin Creek Unit to existing roads and trails. Limit motorized travel in the Sweetwater River Unit to designated roads and trails.	Close the Baldwin Creek Unit to motorized travel. Motorized travel in the Sweetwater River and Warm Springs Units will be limited to designated roads and trails.
7033	SD: 7.1	Commercial timber sales and harvests in the Baldwin Creek Unit are subject to VRM Class II requirements. Commercial timber sales and harvests in the Sweetwater Canyon Unit are subject to BLM Manual 6330, *Management of Wilderness Study Areas*.	Close BLM-administered lands within the Baldwin Creek, Warm Springs, and Sweetwater River Units to commercial timber sales or harvesting. Prohibit cutting or removal of forest products and stand conversion type treatments.	Same as Alternative A for the Sweetwater River Unit. No similar action for the Baldwin Creek Unit.	Same as Alternative B.

7000 SPECIAL DESIGNATIONS (SD) – WILD AND SCENIC RIVERS					
Record #	**Goal/Obj.**	**Alternative A (Current Management)**	**Alternative B (Most Resource Conservation)**	**Alternative C (Most Resource Utilization)**	**Alternative D (Proposed RMP)**
7034	SD: 7.1	Identification of WSR eligibility does not change livestock grazing management.	The Baldwin Creek and Sweetwater River Units are closed to livestock grazing. On a case-by-case basis, allow construction of new range improvements that protect or enhance outstanding remarkable values and do not result in adverse impacts to the wild classification.	Same as Alternative A.	Manage livestock grazing in the Units to support the outstanding remarkable values. Allow construction of new range improvements that protect or enhance outstanding remarkable values and do not result in adverse impacts to the wild classification.
7035	SD: 7.1	Manage the Baldwin Creek Unit as VRM Class II and the Sweetwater River Units as VRM Class I.	Manage BLM-administered lands within the Baldwin Creek and Sweetwater River Units as VRM Class I.	Same as Alternative A for the Sweetwater River Unit. Manage the Baldwin Creek Unit as VRM Class III.	Same as Alternative B, the Warm Springs Unit will be managed as VRM Class II.
7036	SD: 7.1	Manage eligible waterways under interim management until which time suitability determinations can be made.	Manage waterways considered eligible to improve characteristics which would facilitate future suitability classification.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative B.

Table 2.36. 7000 Special Designations (SD) – Areas of Critical Environmental Concern

7000 SPECIAL DESIGNATIONS (SD) – AREAS OF CRITICAL ENVIRONMENTAL CONCERN					
Record #	**Goal/Obj.**	**Alternative A (Current Management)**	**Alternative B (Most Resource Conservation)**	**Alternative C (Most Resource Utilization)**	**Alternative D (Proposed RMP)**
Goal SD: 8 Maintain, protect and enhance the relevant and important values for each ACEC and provide opportunities for other compatible uses where appropriate.					
MANAGEMENT ACTIONS COMMON TO ALL ALTERNATIVES					
7037	SD: 8	Retain lands within the ACECs for long-term management unless the disposal would benefit the goals and objectives of the ACEC such as blocking up land, improving access, or facilitating ACEC management or would otherwise facilitate important public objectives and values. Pursue land acquisition within or near the ACEC to benefit the goals and objectives of the ACEC. Manage the federal mineral estate on split-estate lands located within the boundary of an ACEC consistently with the management of BLM-administered surface lands.			
7038	SD: 8	Develop and implement fire and fuels management in consideration of the resource(s) for which the ACEC is designated with consideration of the WUI, if present.			
7039	SD: 8	Management of the NHTs ACEC is discussed in the NHTs section.			
MANAGEMENT ACTIONS BY ALTERNATIVE					
7040	SD: 8	Retain the ACEC designations in the following areas (Map 130): ● Lander Slope (25,065 acres) ● Red Canyon (15,109 acres) ● Dubois Badlands (4,903 acres) ● Whiskey Mountain (8,776 acres) ● East Fork (4,431 acres) ● Beaver Rim (6,421 acres) ● Green Mountain (14,612 acres) ● NHTs (27,728 acres): See the Congressionally Designated Trails section for management ● South Pass Historic Mining Area (12,576 acres)	Retain the ACEC designation in the following areas (Map 131): ● Lander Slope: Same as Alternative A (25,065 acres) ● Red Canyon: Same as Alternative A (15,109 acres) ● Dubois Badlands: Same as Alternative A (4,903 acres) ● Whiskey Mountain: Same as Alternative A (8,776 acres) Retain and expand the ACEC designation in the following areas (Map 131): ● East Fork: Same as Alternative A, plus 3,313 acres ● Beaver Rim: Same as Alternative A, plus 14,111 acres ● Green Mountain: Same as Alternative A, plus 10,248 acres ● NHTs: Same as Alternative A, plus 440,455 acres. See the	Do not retain the areas identified in the 1987 RMP as ACECs.	Retain the ACEC designations in the following areas (Map 132): ● Lander Slope (25,065 acres) ● Red Canyon (15,109 acres) ● Whiskey Mountain (8,776 acres) ● Beaver Rim (6,421 acres) Retain and expand the ACEC designation in the following areas (Map 132): ● East Fork: Same as Alternative A, plus 3,314 acres ● Green Mountain: Same as Alternative A, plus 6,777 acres Designate the South Pass Historic Mining Area and a portion of the CDNST and the NHTs as the following ACEC (Map 132) (see the Congressionally Designated Trails section for management of trails-related lands outside the ACEC):

7000 SPECIAL DESIGNATIONS (SD) – AREAS OF CRITICAL ENVIRONMENTAL CONCERN					
Record #	**Goal/Obj.**	**Alternative A** **(Current Management)**	**Alternative B** **(Most Resource Conservation)**	**Alternative C** **(Most Resource Utilization)**	**Alternative D** **(Proposed RMP)**
			Congressionally Designated Trails section for management ● South Pass Historic Mining Area: Same as Alternative A, plus 10,863 acres Designate the following areas as ACECs (Map 131): ● Continental Divide National Scenic Trail (259,380 acres): See the Congressionally Designated Trails section for management ● Cedar Ridge (7,039 acres) ● Castle Gardens (8,469 acres) ● Sweetwater Rocks (152,347 acres) ● Regional Historic Trails and Early Highways (89,016 acres) ● Government Draw/Upper Sweetwater Sage-Grouse (1,246,791 acres)		● South Pass Historical Landscape (124,229 acres) Designate the following area as an ACEC in the Hudson to Atlantic City area (Map 132): ● Twin Creek (35,102 acres) The WSA portion of the Dubois Badlands ACEC is not designated an ACEC. The ACEC lands outside the WSA (342 acres) are incorporated into the East Fork ACEC. Do not designate the following areas as ACECs but manage to protect the identified relevant and important characteristics. Management for these areas will be moved to the appropriate program: ● Castle Gardens (see the Castle Gardens ACEC (Proposed) section for management) ● Cedar Ridge (see the Cedar Ridge ACEC (Proposed) section for management) ● Sweetwater Rocks (see the Sweetwater Rocks ACEC (Proposed) section for management) ● CDNST (see the Congressionally Designated Trails section for management within the NTMC) ● Regional Historic Trails and Early Highways (see

7000 SPECIAL DESIGNATIONS (SD) – AREAS OF CRITICAL ENVIRONMENTAL CONCERN					
Record #	**Goal/Obj.**	**Alternative A (Current Management)**	**Alternative B (Most Resource Conservation)**	**Alternative C (Most Resource Utilization)**	**Alternative D (Proposed RMP)**
					the Regional Historic Trails and Early Highways ACEC (Proposed) section for management) ● NHTs (see the Congressionally Designated Trails section for management within the NTMC) ● Government Draw/Upper Sweetwater Sage-Grouse (1,246,791 acres) (see the Government Draw/Upper Sweetwater Sage-Grouse ACEC (Proposed) for management within this area.)

Table 2.37. 7000 Special Designations (SD) – The Lander Slope ACEC (Existing)

7000 SPECIAL DESIGNATIONS (SD) – THE LANDER SLOPE ACEC (EXISTING)					
Record #	**Goal/Obj.**	**Alternative A (Current Management)**	**Alternative B (Most Resource Conservation)**	**Alternative C (Most Resource Utilization)**	**Alternative D (Proposed RMP)**
Goal SD: 9 Manage the Lander Slope with the following objectives: **Objectives:** **SD: 9.1** Maintain adequate winter forage for elk and mule deer so as to support WGFD herd objectives. **SD: 9.2** Maintain and improve habitat for elk and mule deer and, where appropriate, bighorn sheep so as to support WGFD herd objectives. **SD: 9.3** Maintain and improve the views of the Lander Slope so that no action has more than a "weak contrast" with the characteristic landscape. **SD: 9.4** Maintain or improve the water quality in the watershed of the Middle Fork of the Popo Agie River. **SD: 9.5** Route densities and locations will maintain or enhance the quality of the scenic and wildlife values.					
MANAGEMENT ACTIONS COMMON TO ALL ALTERNATIVES					
7041	SD: 9	The ACEC is open to livestock grazing and managed to meet the goals and objectives for the ACEC.			
7042	SD: 9	Travel and road density in the ACEC are managed to support ACEC objectives. See the Comprehensive Trails and Travel Management section for specific management actions.			
MANAGEMENT ACTIONS BY ALTERNATIVE					
7043	SD: 9	Designate BLM-administered lands in the Lander Slope area as a 25,065-acre ACEC (Map 130).	Same as Alternative A, but manage in accordance with the prescriptions in the following records.	Do not designate BLM-administered lands in the Lander Slope area as an ACEC.	Same as Alternative A.
7044	SD: 9	Manage different parts of the ACEC as VRM Class II or III.	Manage the ACEC as VRM Class II.	Manage different parts of the former ACEC as VRM Class III or IV.	Same as Alternative B.

7000 SPECIAL DESIGNATIONS (SD) – THE LANDER SLOPE ACEC (EXISTING)					
Record #	**Goal/Obj.**	**Alternative A (Current Management)**	**Alternative B (Most Resource Conservation)**	**Alternative C (Most Resource Utilization)**	**Alternative D (Proposed RMP)**
7045	SD: 9	Mineral and realty actions in the ACEC are managed with Category 3 restrictions.	Mineral and realty actions in the ACEC are managed with Category 6 restrictions.	Mineral and realty actions in the former ACEC are managed with Category 1 restrictions.	Mineral and realty actions in the ACEC are managed as follows: ● Open to oil and gas leasing subject to NSO stipulations ● Closed to geophysical exploration ● Closed to phosphate leasing ● Closed to pursue withdrawal from locatable mineral entry ● Closed to mineral materials disposal ● Excluded to major ROWs ● Avoided for minor ROWs
7046	SD: 9	Manage plant communities for rangeland health and to protect important wildlife habitat primarily for elk and mule deer and, where appropriate, bighorn sheep.	Manage plant communities to provide elk and mule deer and, where appropriate, bighorn sheep forage.	Manage plant communities to maximize production for all grazing animals.	Same as Alternative A.
7047	SD: 9	Range improvement projects are constructed on a case-by-case basis.	Range improvement projects are prohibited.	Allow range improvement projects.	Construct range improvement projects when the purpose is to enhance ACEC values.
7048	SD: 9	On a case-by-case basis, determine management prescriptions including livestock grazing management of acquired lands in the ACEC.	Manage any lands acquired and added to the ACEC in accordance with the ACEC management prescriptions. Forage associated with newly acquired lands is not allocated for livestock use.	Acquired lands in the former ACEC are open to livestock grazing.	Same as Alternative A.

Table 2.38. 7000 Special Designations (SD) – Red Canyon ACEC (Existing)

7000 SPECIAL DESIGNATIONS (SD) – RED CANYON ACEC (EXISTING)					
Record #	**Goal/Obj.**	**Alternative A (Current Management)**	**Alternative B (Most Resource Conservation)**	**Alternative C (Most Resource Utilization)**	**Alternative D (Proposed RMP)**
Goal SD: 10 Manage Red Canyon with the following objectives: **Objectives:** **SD: 10.1** Maintain adequate winter forage for elk, mule deer, and moose so as to support WGFD herd objectives. **SD: 10.2** Maintain and improve winter habitat for elk, mule deer, moose, and elk calving habitat. **SD: 10.3** Maintain the views of Red Canyon from Highway 28 and within the Canyon so that no proposed action has more than a weak contrast with the characteristic landscape. **SD: 10.4** Route densities and locations will maintain or enhance the scenic and wildlife values. **SD: 10.5** Maintain and improve the habitat for sensitive plant species. **SD: 10.6** Protect significant prehistoric rock art sites and the complex of petroglyph sites that runs along the east flank of the Wind River Mountain Range that is within the Red Canyon area.					
MANAGEMENT ACTIONS COMMON TO ALL ALTERNATIVES					
7049	SD: 10	Manage the NNL portion of Red Canyon as VRM Class I.			
7050	SD: 10	The ACEC is open to livestock grazing and managed to meet the goals and objectives for the ACEC. Maintain the 500 AUM forage allocation for elk.			
7051	SD: 10	Travel and road density in the ACEC are managed to support ACEC objectives. See the Comprehensive Trails and Travel Management section for specific management actions.			
MANAGEMENT ACTIONS BY ALTERNATIVE					
7052	SD: 10	Designate BLM-administered lands in the Red Canyon area as a 15,109-acre ACEC (Map 130).	Same as Alternative A, but manage in accordance with the prescriptions in the following records.	Do not designate BLM-administered lands in the Red Canyon area as an ACEC.	Same as Alternative A.
7053	SD: 10	Manage the remainder of the ACEC as VRM Class II.	Same as Alternative A.	Manage the remaining areas of the former ACEC as VRM Class III.	Same as Alternative A.

7000 SPECIAL DESIGNATIONS (SD) – RED CANYON ACEC (EXISTING)					
Record #	**Goal/Obj.**	**Alternative A (Current Management)**	**Alternative B (Most Resource Conservation)**	**Alternative C (Most Resource Utilization)**	**Alternative D (Proposed RMP)**
7054	SD: 10	Mineral and realty actions in the ACEC are managed with Category 3 and 4 restrictions.	Mineral and realty actions in the ACEC are managed with Category 6 restrictions.	Mineral and realty actions in the former ACEC are managed with Category 1 restrictions.	Mineral and realty actions in the ACEC are managed as follows: ● Open to oil and gas leasing subject to NSO stipulations ● Closed to geophysical exploration ● Closed to phosphate leasing ● Closed to pursue a withdrawal from locatable mineral entry ● Closed to mineral material sales ● Excluded to major ROWs ● Avoided for minor ROWs
7055	SD: 10	Close the ACEC to all winter sport activities from December 1 to June 15.	Close the ACEC to human presence from December 1 to June 15.	Do not close the former ACEC to winter sport activities.	Close the ACEC to human presence from December 1 through April 30 and motorized vehicle use from December 1 through June 15.
7056	SD: 10	Manage plant communities for rangeland health and to protect important wildlife habitat primarily for elk, mule deer, and moose.	Manage plant communities to provide elk, mule deer, and moose forage.	Manage plant communities to maximize production for all grazing animals.	Same as Alternative A.
7057	SD: 10	On a case-by-case basis, undertake treatments for invasive species to protect wildlife and sensitive plant species habitat.	Develop and implement integrated pest management to control and eradicate invasive species to protect wildlife and sensitive plant species habitat.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.
7058	SD: 10	Range improvement projects are constructed on a case-by-case basis.	Range improvement projects are prohibited.	Allow range improvement projects.	Construct range improvement projects when the purpose is to enhance ACEC values.
7059	SD: 10	On a case-by-case basis, determine management prescriptions, including livestock grazing management, of acquired lands in the ACEC.	Manage any lands acquired and added to the ACEC in accordance with the ACEC management prescriptions. Forage associated with newly acquired lands is not available for livestock use.	Acquired lands in the former ACEC are open to livestock grazing.	Same as Alternative A.

Table 2.39. 7000 Special Designations (SD) – Dubois Badlands ACEC (Existing)

7000 SPECIAL DESIGNATIONS (SD) – DUBOIS BADLANDS ACEC (EXISTING)					
Record #	**Goal/ Obj.**	**Alternative A (Current Management)**	**Alternative B (Most Resource Conservation)**	**Alternative C (Most Resource Utilization)**	**Alternative D (Proposed RMP)**
Goal SD: 11 Manage Dubois Badlands with the following objectives: **Objectives:** **SD: 11.1** Maintain and improve winter habitat for bighorn sheep. **SD: 11.2** Maintain and enhance fragile soils. **SD: 11.3** Maintain the views of the Dubois Badlands from Highway 28/287 and from the town of Dubois so that no proposed action has more than a weak contrast with the characteristic landscape.					
MANAGEMENT ACTIONS COMMON TO ALL ALTERNATIVES					
7060	SD: 11	Management prescriptions that are unique to the portion of the Dubois Badlands ACEC that is a WSA are found primarily in the WSA section.			
7061	SD: 11	Manage the Dubois Badlands WSA as VRM Class I.			
7062	SD: 11	Travel and road density in the ACEC are managed to support ACEC and WSA objectives. See the Comprehensive Trails and Travel Management and WSA sections for specific management actions.			
MANAGEMENT ACTIONS BY ALTERNATIVE					
7063	SD: 11	Designate BLM-administered lands in the Dubois Badlands area as a 4,903-acre ACEC (Map 130).	Same as Alternative A, but manage in accordance with the prescriptions in the following records.	Do not designate BLM-administered lands in the Dubois Badlands area as an ACEC.	Same as Alternative C, except that the non-WSA lands are managed as part of the East Fork ACEC (Map 132).
7064	SD: 11	Manage the portion of the Dubois Badlands ACEC outside of the WSA as VRM Class II.	Same as Alternative A.	Manage the former ACEC lands outside the WSA as VRM Class III.	Same as Alternative A. See East Fork ACEC for visual resources management for this area.
7065	SD: 11	Manage the WSA portions of the ACEC in accordance with BLM Manual 6330, *Management of Wilderness Study Areas* (see WSA section). Mineral and realty actions on BLM-administered lands outside the WSA are managed with Category 3 restrictions.	Manage the WSA portions of the ACEC in accordance with BLM Manual 6330, *Management of Wilderness Study Areas*. Mineral and realty actions in the ACEC are managed with Category 6 restrictions.	Manage the WSA portions of the former ACEC in accordance with BLM Manual 6330, *Management of Wilderness Study Areas*. Mineral and realty actions on former ACEC lands outside the WSA are managed with Category 1 restrictions.	The WSA is managed in accordance with BLM Manual 6330, *Management of Wilderness Study Areas*. See East Fork ACEC for mineral and realty management for the parcels that had been part of the ACEC in Alternative A that have been added to the East Fork ACEC.

7000 SPECIAL DESIGNATIONS (SD) – DUBOIS BADLANDS ACEC (EXISTING)					
Record #	**Goal/ Obj.**	**Alternative A (Current Management)**	**Alternative B (Most Resource Conservation)**	**Alternative C (Most Resource Utilization)**	**Alternative D (Proposed RMP)**
7066	SD: 11	The ACEC is open to livestock grazing.	Same as Alternative A, except that the parcels in the ACEC outside of the WSA are closed to livestock grazing to provide adequate wildlife forage.	The former ACEC is open to livestock grazing.	The WSA is managed in accordance with BLM Manual 6330, *Management of Wilderness Study Areas*. See East Fork ACEC for livestock grazing management for the non-WSA lands.
7067	SD: 11	Range improvement projects are constructed on a case-by-case basis.	Range improvement projects are prohibited.	Allow range improvement projects.	Livestock grazing in the WSA is managed in accordance with BLM Manual 6330, *Management of Wilderness Study Areas*. See East Fork ACEC for the management of non-WSA lands in the ACEC.
7068	SD: 11	On a case-by-case basis, determine management prescriptions, including livestock grazing management, of acquired lands in the ACEC.	Manage any lands acquired and added to the ACEC in accordance with the ACEC management prescriptions. Forage associated with newly acquired lands is not available for livestock use.	Acquired lands in the former ACEC are open to livestock grazing.	See East Fork ACEC for the management of non-WSA lands in the ACEC.

Table 2.40. 7000 Special Designations (SD) – Whiskey Mountain ACEC (Existing)

7000 SPECIAL DESIGNATIONS (SD) – WHISKEY MOUNTAIN ACEC (EXISTING)					
Record #	**Goal/ Obj.**	**Alternative A (Current Management)**	**Alternative B (Most Resource Conservation)**	**Alternative C (Most Resource Utilization)**	**Alternative D (Proposed RMP)**
Goal SD: 12 Manage Whiskey Mountain with the following objectives: **Objectives:** **SD: 12.1** Maintain adequate winter forage for bighorn sheep so as to support WGFD herd objectives. **SD: 12.2** Maintain and improve winter bighorn sheep habitat. **SD: 12.3** Work cooperatively with the WGFD and the USFS to support joint management objectives. **SD: 12.4** Route densities and locations will maintain or enhance the scenic and wildlife values.					
MANAGEMENT ACTIONS COMMON TO ALL ALTERNATIVES					
7069	SD: 12	Manage the Whiskey Mountain WSA as VRM Class I.			
7070	SD: 12	Travel and road density in the ACEC are managed to support ACEC objectives. See the Comprehensive Trails and Travel Management section for specific management actions.			
MANAGEMENT ACTIONS BY ALTERNATIVE					
7071	SD: 12	Designate BLM-administered lands in the Whiskey Mountain area as an 8,776-acre ACEC (Map 130).	Same as Alternative A, but manage in accordance with the prescriptions in the following records.	Do not designate BLM-administered lands in the Whiskey Mountain area as an ACEC.	Same as Alternative A.
7072	SD: 12	Manage the portions of the Whiskey Mountain ACEC outside of the WSA as VRM Class II.	Same as Alternative A.	Manage the portions of the former ACEC outside of the WSA as VRM Class III.	Same as Alternative A.
7073	SD: 12	Mineral and realty actions in the ACEC are managed with Category 6 restrictions.	Same as Alternative A.	Manage the WSA portions of the former ACEC in accordance with BLM Manual 6330, *Management of Wilderness Study Areas*. Mineral and realty actions on former ACEC lands outside the WSA are managed with Category 1 restrictions.	Mineral and realty actions in the ACEC are as follows: ● Closed to oil and gas leasing ● Closed to geophysical exploration ● Closed to phosphate leasing ● Proposed for withdrawal from locatable minerals ● Closed to mineral material sales ● Excluded for major ROWs ● Avoided for minor ROWs

7000 SPECIAL DESIGNATIONS (SD) – WHISKEY MOUNTAIN ACEC (EXISTING)					
Record #	**Goal/ Obj.**	**Alternative A (Current Management)**	**Alternative B (Most Resource Conservation)**	**Alternative C (Most Resource Utilization)**	**Alternative D (Proposed RMP)**
7074	SD: 12	Part of the ACEC (2,670 acres) is open to livestock grazing (Map 130).	The ACEC is closed to livestock grazing.	The former ACEC is open to livestock grazing.	Part of the ACEC (2,670 acres) is open to livestock grazing (Map 132). (Closure of CM Whiskey Basin Pasture).
7075	SD: 12	Range improvement projects are constructed on a case-by-case basis.	Range improvement projects are prohibited.	Allow range improvement projects.	Construct range improvement projects when the purpose is to enhance ACEC values.
7076	SD: 12	On a case-by-case basis, determine management prescriptions, including livestock grazing management, of acquired lands in the ACEC.	Manage any lands acquired and added to the ACEC in accordance with the ACEC management prescriptions. Forage associated with newly acquired lands is not available for livestock use.	Acquired lands in the former ACEC are open to livestock grazing.	Same as Alternative A.

Table 2.41. 7000 Special Designations (SD) – East Fork ACEC (Existing)

7000 SPECIAL DESIGNATIONS (SD) – EAST FORK ACEC (EXISTING)					
Record #	**Goal/ Obj.**	**Alternative A (Current Management)**	**Alternative B (Most Resource Conservation)**	**Alternative C (Most Resource Utilization)**	**Alternative D (Proposed RMP)**
Goal SD: 13 Manage East Fork with the following objectives: **Objectives:** **SD: 13.1** Maintain adequate winter forage for elk and bighorn sheep so as to support WGFD herd objectives. **SD: 13.2** Maintain winter habitat for elk and bighorn sheep. **SD: 13.3** Work cooperatively with the WGFD to support joint management objectives. **SD: 13.4** Road densities and locations will maintain scenic and wildlife values.					
MANAGEMENT ACTIONS COMMON TO ALL ALTERNATIVES					
7077	SD: 13	Visual resources are managed in accordance with prescriptions in the Visual Resources section.			
7078	SD: 13	Travel and road density in the ACEC are managed to support ACEC objectives. See the Comprehensive Trails and Travel Management section for specific management actions.			
MANAGEMENT ACTIONS BY ALTERNATIVE					
7079	SD: 13	Designate BLM-administered lands in East Fork as a 4,431-acre ACEC (Map 130).	Same as Alternative A, but expand the ACEC by 3,313 acres for a total of 7,744 acres (Map 131).	Do not designate BLM-administered lands in East Fork as an ACEC.	Same as Alternative B, plus include 342 acres in the East Fork ACEC transferred from the Dubois Badlands ACEC for a total of 7,745 acres.
7080	SD: 13	Mineral and realty actions in the existing ACEC are managed with Category 6 restrictions. Mineral and realty actions on the land within the proposed expanded ACEC in Alternative B are managed with Category 1 restrictions.	Mineral and realty actions in the expanded ACEC are managed with Category 6 restrictions.	Mineral and realty actions in the former ACEC are managed with Category 1 restrictions.	Mineral and realty actions in the expanded ACEC are managed as follows: ● Closed to oil and gas leasing ● Closed to geophysical exploration ● Closed to phosphate leasing ● Withdrawn from locatable mineral entry (of the 7,745 acres of surface estate in the ACEC, there are 1,290 acres of pre-FLPMA withdrawals and 6,455 acres proposed for withdrawal)

7000 SPECIAL DESIGNATIONS (SD) – EAST FORK ACEC (EXISTING)					
Record #	**Goal/ Obj.**	**Alternative A (Current Management)**	**Alternative B (Most Resource Conservation)**	**Alternative C (Most Resource Utilization)**	**Alternative D (Proposed RMP)**
					• Closed to mineral material sales • Excluded for major ROWs • Avoided for minor ROWs
7081	SD: 13	The existing ACEC is closed to livestock grazing; 691 acres within the proposed expanded ACEC in Alternative B are open to livestock grazing. The remaining 2,281 acres in the expansion area are not offered for grazing but are not closed.	The ACEC is closed to livestock grazing, except for 641 acres which are open for livestock grazing.	The former ACEC is closed to livestock grazing; 2,972 acres within the proposed expanded ACEC are open to livestock grazing.	Same as Alternative B.
7082	SD: 13	Range improvement projects are constructed on a case-by-case basis.	Range improvement projects are prohibited.	Allow range improvement projects.	Construct range improvement projects when the purpose is to enhance ACEC values.
7083	SD: 13	On a case-by-case basis, determine management prescriptions, including livestock grazing management, of acquired lands in the ACEC.	Manage any lands acquired and added to the ACEC in accordance with the ACEC management prescriptions. Forage associated with newly acquired lands is not available for livestock use.	On a case-by-case basis, determine management prescriptions, including livestock grazing management, of acquired lands in the former ACEC.	Same as Alternative A.

Table 2.42. 7000 Special Designations (SD) – Beaver Rim ACEC (Existing)

7000 SPECIAL DESIGNATIONS (SD) – BEAVER RIM ACEC (EXISTING)					
Record #	**Goal/Obj.**	**Alternative A (Current Management)**	**Alternative B (Most Resource Conservation)**	**Alternative C (Most Resource Utilization)**	**Alternative D (Proposed RMP)**
Goal SD: 14 Manage Beaver Rim with the following objectives: **Objectives:** **SD: 14.1** Maintain wildlife habitat, especially for raptors. **SD: 14.2** Maintain the views of Beaver Rim from Highway 287, views from the areas below the Rim, and the views looking out from the Rim. **SD: 14.3** Maintain the habitat for sensitive plant species and unique plant communities. **SD: 14.4** Protect significant Traditional Cultural Properties associated with the Rim. **SD: 14.5** Protect the geological resources of the Rim. **SD: 14.6** Work cooperatively to improve the educational and recreational values of the Rim.					
MANAGEMENT ACTIONS COMMON TO ALL ALTERNATIVES					
7084	SD: 14	Beaver Rim is open to livestock grazing and managed to meet the goals and objectives for the area.			
7085	SD: 14	Work cooperatively with partners to develop and implement aggressive plans to control and eradicate invasive species.			
7086	SD: 14	Travel and road density in the ACEC are managed to support ACEC objectives. See the Comprehensive Trails and Travel Management section for specific management actions.			
MANAGEMENT ACTIONS BY ALTERNATIVE					
7087	SD: 14	Designate BLM-administered lands in Beaver Rim as a 6,421-acre ACEC (Map 130).	Same as Alternative A, but expand the ACEC by 14,111 acres for a total of 20,254 acres (Map 131).	Do not designate the BLM-administered lands in Beaver Rim as an ACEC.	Same as Alternative A.
7088	SD: 14	Manage different parts of the ACEC as VRM Class II to IV. (6,421 acres).	Manage different parts of the ACEC as VRM Class II or III.	Manage different parts of Beaver Rim as VRM Class III or IV.	Manage the ACEC as VRM Class II.

7000 SPECIAL DESIGNATIONS (SD) – BEAVER RIM ACEC (EXISTING)					
Record #	**Goal/Obj.**	**Alternative A (Current Management)**	**Alternative B (Most Resource Conservation)**	**Alternative C (Most Resource Utilization)**	**Alternative D (Proposed RMP)**
7089	SD: 14	Mineral and realty actions in the ACEC are managed with Category 3 restrictions in areas with moderate, low, or no potential for oil and gas. Areas with high potential are managed with Category 1 restrictions. Locatable minerals are subject to restrictions in areas where these activities could cause adverse impacts to other significant resource values. Mineral and realty actions on land within the proposed expanded ACEC in Alternative B are managed with Category 1 restrictions.	Mineral and realty actions in the expanded ACEC are managed with Category 6 restrictions.	Mineral and realty actions in the former ACEC are managed with Category 1 restrictions.	Mineral and realty actions in the ACEC are managed as follows: ● Open to oil and gas leasing subject to NSO stipulations ● Oil and gas leasing in the 14,111 acres designated as an expanded ACEC in Alternative B is open subject to an MLP ● Closed to geophysical exploration ● Closed to solid mineral leasing ● Open with a Plan of Operations to locatable minerals ● Closed to mineral material disposal ● Excluded for major ROWs ● Avoided for minor ROWs
7090	SD: 14	On a case-by-case basis, protect sensitive plant species and unique plant communities and focus plant community management on wildlife habitat.	Manage the plant community to provide wildlife habitat and to protect sensitive plant species and unique plant communities.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative B.
7091	SD: 14	Do not focus management on developing interpretation.	Cooperate with the State of Wyoming and others to develop educational signage, driving loops, and kiosks regarding unique plant communities, unique geology, and visual resources.	Same as Alternative B.	Same as Alternative B.
7092	SD: 14	Range improvement projects are constructed on a case-by-case basis.	Range improvement projects are prohibited.	Allow range improvement projects.	Construct range improvement projects when the purpose is to enhance ACEC values.
7093	SD: 14	On a case-by-case basis, determine management prescriptions, including livestock grazing management, of acquired lands in the ACEC.	Manage any lands acquired and added to the ACEC in accordance with the ACEC management prescriptions. Forage associated with newly acquired lands is not available for livestock use.	Acquired lands in the former ACEC are open to livestock grazing.	Same as Alternative A.

Table 2.43. 7000 Special Designations (SD) – Green Mountain ACEC (Existing)

7000 SPECIAL DESIGNATIONS (SD) – GREEN MOUNTAIN ACEC (EXISTING)					
Record #	**Goal/Obj.**	**Alternative A (Current Management)**	**Alternative B (Most Resource Conservation)**	**Alternative C (Most Resource Utilization)**	**Alternative D (Proposed RMP)**
Goal SD: 15 Manage Green Mountain with the following objectives: **Objectives:** **SD: 15.1** Maintain adequate forage for elk to support WGFD herd objectives. **SD: 15.2** Maintain or enhance habitat for elk. **SD: 15.3** Road densities and locations will maintain scenic and wildlife values. **SD: 15.4** Protect the historical integrity of Sparhawk Cabin.					
MANAGEMENT ACTIONS COMMON TO ALL ALTERNATIVES					
7094	SD: 15	The ACEC is open to livestock grazing and managed to meet the goals and objectives for the ACEC.			
7095	SD: 15	Travel and road density in the ACEC are managed to support ACEC objectives. See the Comprehensive Trails and Travel Management section for specific management actions.			
MANAGEMENT ACTIONS BY ALTERNATIVE					
7096	SD: 15	Designate BLM-administered lands in the Green Mountain area as a 14,612-acre ACEC (Map 130).	Same as Alternative A, but expand the ACEC by 10,248 acres for a total of 24,860 acres (Map 131).	Do not designate BLM-administered lands in the Green Mountain area as an ACEC.	Same as Alternative A, but expand the ACEC by 6,777 acres for a total of 21,389 acres (Map 132).
7097	SD: 15	Mineral and realty actions in the ACEC are managed with Category 3 restrictions. Management of mineral and realty actions in those portions of the ACEC that are campgrounds and picnic sites is addressed in the Recreation section.	Mineral and realty actions in the expanded ACEC are managed with Category 6 restrictions.	Mineral and realty actions in the former ACEC are managed with Category 1 restrictions. Management of mineral and realty actions in those portions of the ACEC that are campgrounds and picnic sites is addressed in the Recreation section.	Mineral and realty actions in the expanded ACEC are managed as follows: ● Open to oil and gas leasing subject to NSO stipulations ● Closed to geophysical exploration ● Closed to solid mineral leasing ● Open with a Plan of Operations to locatable minerals ● Closed to mineral material disposals ● Excluded for major ROWs ● Avoided for minor ROWs

7000 SPECIAL DESIGNATIONS (SD) – GREEN MOUNTAIN ACEC (EXISTING)					
Record #	**Goal/Obj.**	**Alternative A (Current Management)**	**Alternative B (Most Resource Conservation)**	**Alternative C (Most Resource Utilization)**	**Alternative D (Proposed RMP)**
					The expanded ACEC area under Alternative B that is not designated as part of the ACEC (7,383 acres) is managed with the same prescriptions as the ACEC except that no Plan of Operations is required for locatable mineral disturbances less than 5 acres.
7098	SD: 15	Manage different parts of the ACEC as VRM Class II or III (Map 130).	Same as Alternative A.	Manage different parts of the former ACEC as VRM Class III or IV.	The ACEC will be managed as VRM Class II.
7099	SD: 15	The forested areas are available for commercial timber sales and managed to promote elk habitat.	Same as Alternative A.	Manage forested areas to improve their potential for salable timber.	Same as Alternative A.
7100	SD: 15	Range improvement projects are constructed on a case-by-case basis.	Range improvement projects are prohibited.	Allow range improvement projects.	Construct range improvement projects when the purpose is compatible with ACEC values.
7101	SD: 15	On a case-by-case basis, determine management prescriptions, including livestock grazing management, of acquired lands in the ACEC.	Manage any lands acquired and added to the ACEC in accordance with the ACEC management prescriptions. Forage associated with newly acquired lands is not available for livestock use.	Acquired lands in the former ACEC are open to livestock grazing.	Same as Alternative A.

Table 2.44. 7000 Special Designations (SD) – South Pass Historic Mining Area ACEC (Existing)

7000 SPECIAL DESIGNATIONS (SD) – SOUTH PASS HISTORIC MINING AREA ACEC (EXISTING)					
Record #	**Goal/Obj.**	**Alternative A (Current Management)**	**Alternative B (Most Resource Conservation)**	**Alternative C (Most Resource Utilization)**	**Alternative D (Proposed RMP)**
Goal SD: 16 Manage the South Pass Historic Mining Area, including the historic sites of Miner's Delight and South Pass City, with the following objectives: **Objectives:** **SD: 16.1** Protect significant historic sites and the intact settings around them. **SD: 16.2** Work cooperatively with the State of Wyoming and others to reduce the hazards from AML. **SD: 16.3** Work cooperatively with the State of Wyoming and others to maintain and enhance the recreational use of the Area. **Goal SD: 17** Maintain the ACEC to provide an opportunity to experience and reflect upon the wide variety of scenic, cultural, historic, and physiographic setting characteristics of the land. **Goal SD: 18** Use of the ACEC will minimally affect adjacent natural and cultural environments and harmonize with the management objectives of land and resource uses which are or may be occurring on the lands through which the trail passes. **Goal SD: 19** Preserve and protect the historical remains and historical settings of the Oregon, Mormon Pioneer, California, and Pony Express NHTs and their associated historic sites for public use and enjoyment. **Goal SD: 20** Provide for the outdoor recreation needs of an expanding population and promote the preservation of public access and enjoyment of the open air, outdoor areas, and historic resources of the nation.					
MANAGEMENT ACTIONS COMMON TO ALL ALTERNATIVES					
7102	SD: 16	Conform to local zoning ordinances that apply to the area around South Pass City.			
7103	SD: 16	The area is open to livestock grazing. Fence off historic sites that are adversely impacted by livestock grazing. Make forage associated with newly acquired lands available for livestock use.			
7104	SD: 16	Travel and road density in the ACEC are managed to support ACEC objectives. See the Comprehensive Trails and Travel Management section for specific management actions.			
MANAGEMENT ACTIONS BY ALTERNATIVE					
7105	SD: 16	Designate BLM-administered lands in the South Pass Historic Mining Area as a 12,576-acre ACEC (Map 130).	Same as Alternative A, but expand the ACEC by 10,863 acres for a total of 23,439 acres (Map 131).	Do not designate BLM-administered lands in the South Pass Historic Mining Area as an ACEC.	Designate the 124,229-acre South Pass Historical Landscape ACEC, which includes the 1987 South Pass Historic Mining Area ACEC (12,576 acres) (Map 132).

7000 SPECIAL DESIGNATIONS (SD) – SOUTH PASS HISTORIC MINING AREA ACEC (EXISTING)					
Record #	**Goal/Obj.**	**Alternative A** **(Current Management)**	**Alternative B** **(Most Resource Conservation)**	**Alternative C** **(Most Resource Utilization)**	**Alternative D** **(Proposed RMP)**
7106	SD: 16	Manage different parts of the ACEC as VRM Class II to IV (Map 75).	Manage different parts of the ACEC as VRM Class II or III (Map 76).	Manage different parts of the former ACEC as VRM Class III or IV (Map 77).	Manage the South Pass Historical Landscape ACEC as VRM Class II (Map 78). On a case-by-case basis, remove or reclaim visually intrusive existing roads, facilities, and ROW not necessary to attain NHT or CDNST management objectives.
7107	SD: 16	Mineral and realty actions in the ACEC are managed with Category 3 restrictions. Withdraw a portion of the ACEC (1,727 acres around sites such as Miner's Delight and South Pass City) (Map 130) except for casual use.	Mineral and realty actions in the ACEC are managed with Category 6 restrictions.	Mineral and realty actions in the former ACEC are managed with Category 1 restrictions.	Mineral and realty actions, except for major ROWs, within the South Pass Historical Landscape ACEC are managed as follows: ● Open to oil and gas leasing subject to NSO stipulations ● Closed to geophysical exploration ● Closed to solid mineral leasing ● Open with a Plan of Operations unless otherwise withdrawn to locatable minerals ● Closed to mineral material disposals ● Excluded for major ROWs ● Avoided for minor ROWs Portions of the South Pass Historical Landscape ACEC are within the Hudson to Atlantic City mineral withdrawal for the benefit of wildlife, viewsheds, and cultural resources. The ACEC is entirely within the NTMC (see the Congressionally Designated Trails section), which is avoided for major ROWs except in designated corridors. ACEC management excludes the South Pass Historical

7000 SPECIAL DESIGNATIONS (SD) – SOUTH PASS HISTORIC MINING AREA ACEC (EXISTING)					
Record #	**Goal/Obj.**	**Alternative A (Current Management)**	**Alternative B (Most Resource Conservation)**	**Alternative C (Most Resource Utilization)**	**Alternative D (Proposed RMP)**
					Landscape ACEC for major ROWs.
7108	SD: 17, 18, 19	No similar action.	No similar action.	No similar action.	Highly visible projects and/or projects out of scale with the surrounding environment (such as large wind-energy development projects, gas plants, power plants, transmission lines, etc.) are subject to the following restriction: Projects of this type outside of 5 miles on each side of the NHTs (except within the main Lost Creek utility corridor) are authorized only if the project causes no more than a weak contrast, as defined in the BLM Visual Resource Manual.
7109	SD: 17, 18, 19	No similar action.	No similar action.	No similar action.	Range projects and mineral supplementation and their associated impacts within the new South Pass Historical Landscape ACEC: analyze projects on a case-by-case base and allow those that conform to the VRM Class for the area.
7110	SD: 17, 18, 19	No similar action.	No similar action.	No similar action.	0 to 5 miles on each side of NHTs: new audible and atmospheric effects will not exceed current levels existing along the NHT corridors.

7000 SPECIAL DESIGNATIONS (SD) – SOUTH PASS HISTORIC MINING AREA ACEC (EXISTING)					
Record #	**Goal/Obj.**	**Alternative A (Current Management)**	**Alternative B (Most Resource Conservation)**	**Alternative C (Most Resource Utilization)**	**Alternative D (Proposed RMP)**
7111	SD: 16	When possible, implement fire and fuels management to reduce dangers from fire in the WUI.	Where appropriate in consideration of wildlife and visual resources, develop and implement fire and fuels management to reduce dangers from fire in the WUI.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.
7112	SD: 16	Develop a cultural resource management plan for the South Pass Historic Mining Area.	Develop a cultural resource protection and management plan for the South Pass Historic Mining Area, including stabilization, recreation, stewardship, and public education plans for Miner's Delight, Lemley Mill, and the BLM-administered portion of South Pass City.	No similar action.	Same as Alternative B.

Table 2.45. 7000 Special Designations (SD) – National Historic Trails ACEC (Existing)

7000 SPECIAL DESIGNATIONS (SD) – NATIONAL HISTORIC TRAILS ACEC (EXISTING)					
Record #	**Goal/ Obj.**	**Alternative A (Current Management)**	**Alternative B (Most Resource Conservation)**	**Alternative C (Most Resource Utilization)**	**Alternative D (Proposed RMP)**
Goals and objectives for the National Historic Trails ACEC are contained in the Congressionally Designated Trails section.					
MANAGEMENT ACTIONS COMMON TO ALL ALTERNATIVES					
N/A	N/A	Note: Management actions for the National Historic Trails ACEC are provided in the Congressionally Designated Trails section.			

Table 2.46. 7000 Special Designations (SD) – Continental Divide National Scenic Trail ACEC (Proposed)

7000 SPECIAL DESIGNATIONS (SD) – CONTINENTAL DIVIDE NATIONAL SCENIC TRAIL ACEC (PROPOSED)					
Record #	**Goal/ Obj.**	**Alternative A (Current Management)**	**Alternative B (Most Resource Conservation)**	**Alternative C (Most Resource Utilization)**	**Alternative D (Proposed RMP)**
Goals and objectives for the Continental Divide National Scenic Trail ACEC are contained in the Congressionally Designated Trails section.					
MANAGEMENT ACTIONS COMMON TO ALL ALTERNATIVES					
N/A	N/A	Note: Management actions for the Continental Divide National Scenic Trail ACEC are provided in the Congressionally Designated Trails section.			

Table 2.47. 7000 Special Designations (SD) – Cedar Ridge ACEC (Proposed)

7000 SPECIAL DESIGNATIONS (SD) – CEDAR RIDGE ACEC (PROPOSED)					
Record #	**Goal/Obj.**	**Alternative A (Current Management)**	**Alternative B (Most Resource Conservation)**	**Alternative C (Most Resource Utilization)**	**Alternative D (Proposed RMP)**
Goal SD: 21 Manage Cedar Ridge with the following objectives: **Objectives:** **SD: 21.1** Protect and enhance the site's traditional cultural importance. **SD: 21.2** Prevent disturbance to the site. **SD: 21.3** Protect and enhance access to the site. **SD: 21.4** Protect archeologically significant properties such as stone alignments, cairns, effigies, and circles. **SD: 21.5** Protect artifacts and evidence of prehistoric activity.					
MANAGEMENT ACTIONS COMMON TO ALL ALTERNATIVES					
7113	SD: 21	Travel and road density in the area are managed to support ACEC objectives. (See 6000-Comprehensive Trails and Travel Management for specific management actions.)			
7114	SD: 21	The area is open to livestock grazing and managed to meet the goals and objectives for the cultural property.			
MANAGEMENT ACTIONS BY ALTERNATIVE					
7115	SD: 21	Manage Cedar Ridge to protect the area as a TCP subject to standard Protocol and NHPA measures. Manage visual effects to the Traditional Cultural Property on a case-by-case basis using standard Protocol and NHPA measures.	Designate BLM-administered lands in Cedar Ridge area as a 7,039-acre ACEC (Map 131).	Same as Alternative A.	Manage the Cedar Ridge TCP (255 acres) and its periphery (3,284 acres) to protect its cultural and sacred resources. Do not designate the TCP and periphery as an ACEC.
7116	SD: 21	Manage different parts of Cedar Ridge as VRM Class II to IV.	Manage the ACEC as VRM Class II.	Manage different parts of Cedar Ridge as VRM Class III or IV.	Manage the Cedar Ridge TCP as VRM Class II. Manage the periphery area as VRM Class III.

7000 SPECIAL DESIGNATIONS (SD) – CEDAR RIDGE ACEC (PROPOSED)					
Record #	**Goal/Obj.**	**Alternative A** **(Current Management)**	**Alternative B** **(Most Resource Conservation)**	**Alternative C** **(Most Resource Utilization)**	**Alternative D** **(Proposed RMP)**
7117	SD: 21	Mineral and realty actions in the Cedar Ridge area are managed with Category 2 restrictions.	Mineral and realty actions in the ACEC are managed with Category 6 restrictions.	Mineral and realty actions in the Cedar Ridge area are managed with Category 1 restrictions.	Mineral and realty actions in the TCP are managed as follows: ● Open to oil and gas leasing subject to NSO stipulations ● Closed to geophysical exploration ● Closed to solid minerals leasing ● Closed to pursue locatable mineral withdrawal ● Closed to mineral material disposal ● Excluded to major ROWs ● Avoided for minor ROWs Mineral and realty actions in the periphery are managed as follows: ● Open to oil and gas leasing subject to CSU stipulations ● Open to geophysical exploration subject to CSU stipulations ● Open to solid minerals leasing for 5 acres or less, subject to limits on surface use comparable the CSU for oil and gas. ● Open to mineral material disposals subject to CSU stipulations ● Avoided for major ROWs ● Open to minor ROWs subject to CSU stipulations

7000 SPECIAL DESIGNATIONS (SD) – CEDAR RIDGE ACEC (PROPOSED)					
Record #	**Goal/Obj.**	**Alternative A (Current Management)**	**Alternative B (Most Resource Conservation)**	**Alternative C (Most Resource Utilization)**	**Alternative D (Proposed RMP)**
7118	SD: 21	Range improvement projects are authorized on a case-by-case basis.	Range improvement projects are prohibited.	Authorize range improvement projects.	Do not authorize new range improvement projects or mineral supplementation in the TCP. The periphery is open to range improvements and mineral supplementation subject to a CSU stipulation.
7119	SD: 21	On a case-by-case basis, determine management prescriptions, including livestock grazing management, of acquired lands in the Cedar Ridge area.	Manage any lands acquired and added to the ACEC in accordance with the ACEC management prescriptions. Forage associated with newly acquired lands is not considered for livestock use.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.
7120	SD: 21	On a case-by-case basis, manage to protect archeological values but do not develop a management and protection plan or site stewardship plan.	Complete an archeological inventory of the ACEC and develop a management and protection plan (including a site stewardship plan) for the ACEC.	Same as Alternative A.	In conjunction with the Casper Field Office, develop a management and protection plan (including a site stewardship plan) for the TCP and periphery.

Table 2.48. 7000 Special Designations (SD) – Castle Gardens ACEC (Proposed)

7000 SPECIAL DESIGNATIONS (SD) – CASTLE GARDENS ACEC (PROPOSED)					
Record #	**Goal/ Obj.**	**Alternative A (Current Management)**	**Alternative B (Most Resource Conservation)**	**Alternative C (Most Resource Utilization)**	**Alternative D (Proposed RMP)**
Goal SD: 22 Manage Castle Gardens with the following objectives: **Objectives:** **SD: 22.1** Establish appropriate management prescriptions to improve the integrity of this site. Utilize public and tribal input to redesign the constructed facilities to enhance the visitor's experience. Utilize scientific expertise to repair damage to, reduce vandalism upon, and better preserve the prehistoric rock art. **SD: 22.2** Decrease vandalism, cross-country use, and erosion through better interpretation, removal of existing graffiti where possible, and redesign of constructed facilities. **SD: 22.3** Make recreation use compatible with cultural and scientific values. Redesign the constructed facilities to reduce erosion and damage to soils, vegetation, and buried cultural resources. **SD: 22.4** Coordinate with recreation and other programs to improve interpretation of the site's rock art (i.e., low profile informational signs at selected locations within the site, incorporating new scientific information about the site); improve public enjoyment and appreciation of the site (i.e., improved barriers, viewing areas, and paths to the rock art panels). **SD: 22.5** Provide opportunities for appropriate scientific research at the site.					
MANAGEMENT ACTIONS COMMON TO ALL ALTERNATIVES					
7121	SD: 22	Travel and road density in the area are managed to support ACEC objectives. (See 6000-Comprehensive Trails and Travel Management for specific management actions.)			
7122	SD: 22	The 78 acre immediate site area is closed to livestock grazing and managed to meet the goals and objectives for the cultural property.			
MANAGEMENT ACTIONS BY ALTERNATIVES					
7123	SD: 22	Manage BLM-administered lands immediately around the Castle Gardens site as a cultural/recreational site (78 acres).	Designate BLM-administered lands within a 3-mile radius around the Castle Gardens site as an 8,469-acre ACEC (Map 131).	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A, plus manage approximately 1,656 acres around the periphery of the site to support cultural values (see Map 132). (The periphery area includes the 3 BLM sections to the northwest, northeast, and southeast of Castle Gardens minus any private lands in these sections). Do not designate the Castle Garden area or periphery as an ACEC.

7000 SPECIAL DESIGNATIONS (SD) – CASTLE GARDENS ACEC (PROPOSED)					
Record #	**Goal/ Obj.**	**Alternative A (Current Management)**	**Alternative B (Most Resource Conservation)**	**Alternative C (Most Resource Utilization)**	**Alternative D (Proposed RMP)**
7124	SD: 22	Manage different parts of the area as VRM Class II to IV.	Manage different parts of the ACEC as VRM Class II or III.	Manage the cultural/recreational site as a VRM Class III, but manage the lands around it as VRM Class IV.	Manage the Castle Gardens site and periphery as VRM Class II.
7125	SD: 22	Mineral and realty actions in the 78-acre area are managed with Category 5 restrictions, and outside the 78 acres are managed with Category 1 restrictions.	Mineral and realty actions in the 78-acre area are managed with Category 5 restrictions. Mineral and realty actions in the remainder of the ACEC (8,391 acres) are managed with Category 4 restrictions.	Same as Alternative A.	Mineral and realty actions in the 78-acre area are managed with the following restrictions: ● Open to oil and gas leasing subject to NSO stipulations ● Closed to geophysical exploration ● Closed to solid mineral leasing ● Withdrawn from locatable mineral entry in pre-FLPMA action ● Closed to mineral material disposal ● Excluded to major ROWs ● Excluded for minor ROWs Mineral and realty actions in the periphery area are managed with the following restrictions: ● Open to oil and gas leasing subject to NSO stipulations ● Open to geophysical exploration ● Closed to solid mineral leasing ● Closed to mineral material disposal ● Excluded to major ROWs ● Avoided for minor ROWs

7000 SPECIAL DESIGNATIONS (SD) – CASTLE GARDENS ACEC (PROPOSED)					
Record #	**Goal/ Obj.**	**Alternative A (Current Management)**	**Alternative B (Most Resource Conservation)**	**Alternative C (Most Resource Utilization)**	**Alternative D (Proposed RMP)**
7126	SD: 22	Manage the area to facilitate recreational use while protecting resource values.	Develop and implement a new protection and management plan, including redesigning the site stewardship program and continuing the research program. Modify access to the ACEC and manage recreational use to limit damage to the rock art and sacred sites. Remove improved recreational facilities, such as the picnic area, in the 78-acre area. Limit road access to outside of the 78-acre core.	Same as Alternative A.	Develop and implement a new protection and management plan, including redesigning the site, implementing a stewardship program, and continuing the research program.
7127	SD: 22	Range improvement projects in the periphery area are constructed on a case-by-case basis.	Do not allow new range improvement projects, including mineral supplementation and their associated impacts, within the boundaries of the Castle Gardens ACEC.	Same as Alternative A.	Construct range improvement projects in the periphery only when compatible with the area's cultural values.
7128	SD: 22	On a case-by-case basis, determine management prescriptions, including livestock grazing management, of acquired lands in the area.	Manage any lands acquired and added to the ACEC in accordance with the ACEC management prescriptions. Forage associated with newly acquired lands is not considered for livestock use.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.

Table 2.49. 7000 Special Designations (SD) – Sweetwater Rocks ACEC (Proposed)

7000 SPECIAL DESIGNATIONS (SD) – SWEETWATER ROCKS ACEC (PROPOSED)					
Record #	**Goal/Obj.**	**Alternative A (Current Management)**	**Alternative B (Most Resource Conservation)**	**Alternative C (Most Resource Utilization)**	**Alternative D (Proposed RMP)**
Goal SD: 23 Manage the Sweetwater Rocks with the following objectives: **Objectives:** **SD: 23.1** Maintain the views of the Sweetwater Rocks from Wyoming State Highway 220 and U.S. Highway 287 and the viewshed looking out from the Rocks. **SD: 23.2** Route densities and locations will maintain or enhance the scenic and wilderness characteristics. **SD: 23.3** The areas within the Sweetwater Rocks WSAs are managed in accordance with BLM Manual 6330, *Management of Wilderness Study Areas*.					
MANAGEMENT ACTIONS COMMON TO ALL ALTERNATIVES					
7129	SD: 23	Visual resource, livestock grazing, mineral, realty and travel management actions for the WSA portions of the proposed ACEC are found in the WSA section.			
MANAGEMENT ACTIONS BY ALTERNATIVE					
7130	SD: 23	Do not designate the Sweetwater Rocks area as an ACEC.	Designate BLM-administered lands in the Sweetwater Rocks area as a 152,347 acre ACEC (Map 131).	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.
7131	SD: 23	Manage the areas outside of the WSA as VRM Class II to IV.	Manage the areas outside of the WSAs as VRM Class II to III.	Manage the areas outside of the WSAs as VRM Class II to IV.	Manage the area outside of the WSAs as VRM Class II except that portion that is within the Lost Creek ROW corridor which is managed as Class III.
7132	SD: 23	Mineral and realty actions in the area outside of the WSAs are managed with Category 1 restrictions.	Mineral and realty actions in the ACEC are managed with Category 6 restrictions.	Same as Alternative A.	Mineral and realty actions in the area outside of the WSAs (118,165 acres) are managed with the following restrictions: ● Open to oil and gas leasing subject to CSU stipulations ● Open to geophysical exploration ● Open to solid mineral leasing ● Closed to mineral material disposal except for preexisting sales and free use permits. ● Open to major ROWs

7000 SPECIAL DESIGNATIONS (SD) – SWEETWATER ROCKS ACEC (PROPOSED)					
Record #	**Goal/Obj.**	**Alternative A (Current Management)**	**Alternative B (Most Resource Conservation)**	**Alternative C (Most Resource Utilization)**	**Alternative D (Proposed RMP)**
					• Open to minor ROWs
7133	SD: 23	On a case-by-case basis, determine management prescriptions, including livestock grazing management, of acquired lands in Sweetwater Rocks.	Manage any lands acquired and added to the ACEC in accordance with the ACEC management prescriptions. Forage associated with newly acquired lands is not considered for livestock use.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.

Table 2.50. 7000 Special Designations (SD) – Regional Historic Trails and Early Highways ACEC (Proposed)

7000 SPECIAL DESIGNATIONS (SD) – REGIONAL HISTORIC TRAILS AND EARLY HIGHWAYS ACEC (PROPOSED) (RHT&EHs)					
Record #	**Goal/Obj.**	**Alternative A (Current Management)**	**Alternative B (Most Resource Conservation)**	**Alternative C (Most Resource Utilization)**	**Alternative D (Proposed RMP)**
Goal SD: 24 Manage the RHT&EHs with the following objectives: **Objectives:** **SD: 24.1** Maintain and enhance the significant qualities of RHT&EH segments and sites. Avoid adverse effects, as defined in the NHPA and the BLM/SHPO Wyoming State Protocol, upon intact RHT&EH segments, their settings, and associated sites. **SD: 24.2** Protect remnants, ruts, traces, graves, campsites, landmarks, artifacts, and other remains associated with the RHT&EHs. The following are RHT&EHs determined Eligible for the NRHP: ● Bridger Trail ● Casper to Lander Road ● Rawlins-Fort Washakie Stage Trail ● Green River to South Pass to Fort Washakie Stage Trail ● Birdseye Pass Stage Trail ● Point of Rocks to South Pass Stage Trail ● Yellowstone/National Park to Park Highway					
MANAGEMENT ACTIONS COMMON TO ALL ALTERNATIVES					
7134	SD: 24	Pursuant to Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 as amended, the National Programmatic Agreement and the Wyoming State Protocol, case-by-case reviews for specific undertakings require analysis and assessments of effects. Such analysis and assessment may reveal the need for additional restrictions beyond those specifically described in the RMP.			
7135	SD: 24	RHT&EHs and acquired lands added to RHT&EHs are open to livestock grazing.			
MANAGEMENT ACTIONS BY ALTERNATIVE					
7136	SD: 24	Do not designate the RHT&EH as an ACEC. Manage RHT&EHs on a case-by-case basis in consideration of resource values and in accordance with the NHPA (Map 79).	Designate BLM-administered lands within ½ mile on each side of intact segments of each RHT&EH as a 89,016-acre ACEC (Map 131).	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.

7000 SPECIAL DESIGNATIONS (SD) – REGIONAL HISTORIC TRAILS AND EARLY HIGHWAYS ACEC (PROPOSED) (RHT&EHs)					
Record #	**Goal/Obj.**	**Alternative A** **(Current Management)**	**Alternative B** **(Most Resource Conservation)**	**Alternative C** **(Most Resource Utilization)**	**Alternative D** **(Proposed RMP)**
7137	SD: 24	Mineral and realty actions are subject to the following restrictions (Map 79): ● Within ¼ mile on each side of designated portions of the RHT&EHs or the visible horizon, whichever is closer, are managed with Category 2 restrictions. ● The area beyond ¼ mile from the RHT&EHs is managed with Category 1 restrictions and NHPA measures to minimize the effects to these RHT&EHs.	Mineral and realty actions, except for highly visible projects (e.g., wind farms, gas plants, and power plants), are subject to the following restrictions (Map 80): ● Within ½ mile on each side of intact segments of the RHT&EHs is managed with Category 5 restrictions. ● ½ to 2 miles on each side of intact segments of the RHT&EHs are managed with Category 4 restrictions unless the proposed project and its associated impacts are not visible from the RHT&EHs. ● 2 to 5 miles on each side of intact segments of the RHT&EHs are managed with Category 2 restrictions unless the proposed project and its associated impacts are not visible from the RHT&EHs. ● Outside of 5 miles on each side of the RHT&EHs are managed with Category 1 restrictions.	Mineral and realty actions along the RHT&EHs are managed with Category 1 restrictions.	Inside of DDAs, maintain and develop MOAs for RHT&EH management within DDAs. Where MOAs are not developed mineral and realty actions are managed with standard Protocol and NHPA measures and (Map 79): ● Open to oil and gas leasing subject to CSU stipulations ● Open to geophysical exploration ● Open to solid mineral leasing ● Open to mineral material disposal subject to CSU stipulations ● Open to major ROWs ● Open to minor ROWs Outside of DDAs, protect the foreground of Historic Trails (defined in Glossary) up to 2 miles where setting is an important aspect of the integrity for the trail, and use Best Management Practices (Appendix H (p. 1521)) to avoid or mitigate adverse effects. Pursue site-specific protection plans or MOAs for RHT&EH management.

7000 SPECIAL DESIGNATIONS (SD) – REGIONAL HISTORIC TRAILS AND EARLY HIGHWAYS ACEC (PROPOSED) (RHT&EHs)					
Record #	**Goal/Obj.**	**Alternative A (Current Management)**	**Alternative B (Most Resource Conservation)**	**Alternative C (Most Resource Utilization)**	**Alternative D (Proposed RMP)**
7138	SD: 24	Highly visible projects and/or projects out of scale with surrounding environment (e.g., wind farms, gas plants, and power plants) are managed with Category 2 restrictions from 0 to 5 miles on each side of intact segments of the RHT&EHs unless the proposed project and its associated impacts are not visible from the RHT&EHs.	Highly visible projects and/or projects out of scale with surrounding environment (e.g., wind farms, gas plants, and power plants) are managed with Category 5 restrictions from 0 to 5 miles on each side of intact segments of the RHT&EHs unless the proposed project and its associated impacts are not visible from the RHT&EHs. Areas outside of 5 miles on each side of the RHT&EHs are managed with Category 1 restrictions.	Highly visible projects and/or projects out of scale with surrounding environment (e.g., wind farms, gas plants, and power plants) are managed with Category 1 restrictions from 0 to 5 miles on each side of intact segments of the RHT&EHs unless the proposed project and its associated impacts are not visible from the RHT&EHs.	Highly visible projects and/or projects out of scale with surrounding environment (e.g., wind farms, gas plants, and power plants) are managed on a case-by-case basis.
7139	SD: 24	Do not authorize commercial motorized travel or ROWs on non-historic existing roads and trails.	Limit motorized and mechanized travel to designated roads and trails.	Limit motorized travel to existing roads and trails.	Same as Alternative A.
7140	SD: 24	Range improvement projects and mineral supplementation and their associated impacts are subject to the following restrictions (Map 79): ● Avoid within ¼ mile on each side of designated portions of the RHT&EHs or the visible horizon, whichever is closer. ● The area beyond ¼ mile from the RHT&EHs is open subject to Standard Protocol and NHPA measures to minimize the effects to the RHT&EHs.	Range improvement projects and mineral supplementation and their associated impacts are subject to the following restrictions (Map 80): ● Do not authorize within 2 miles on each side of the RHT&EHs unless these actions and their associated impacts are not visible from the RHT&EHs. ● Authorize from 2 to 5 miles on each side of the RHT&EHs only if these actions and their associated impacts cause no more than a weak contrast, as defined in the BLM Visual Resource Manual.	Same as Alternative A.	Range projects (including mineral supplementation) and their associated impacts are subject to the following restrictions within ½ mile of the trail (Map 79): ● Projects and their associated impacts are considered on a case-by-case basis to ensure that they are either hidden from the trails, are too far away to be seen, or are designed or camouflaged to cause no more than a weak contrast, as defined in the BLM Visual Resource Manual.

Table 2.51. 7000 Special Designations (SD) – Government Draw/Upper Sweetwater Sage-Grouse ACEC (Proposed)

7000 SPECIAL DESIGNATIONS (SD) – GOVERNMENT DRAW/UPPER SWEETWATER SAGE-GROUSE ACEC (PROPOSED)					
Record #	**Goal/ Obj.**	**Alternative A (Current Management)**	**Alternative B (Most Resource Conservation)**	**Alternative C (Most Resource Utilization)**	**Alternative D (Proposed RMP)**
Goal SD: 25 Manage the Government Draw/Upper Sweetwater Sage-Grouse area with the following objectives: **Objectives:** **SD: 25.1** Maintain and improve forage and cover for greater sage-grouse. **SD: 25.2** Maintain and improve leks, brood-rearing, and winter habitats for greater sage-grouse. **SD: 25.3** Protect water sources for greater sage-grouse. **SD: 25.4** Consider greater sage-grouse needs and protections in permitting activities on BLM-administered land. **SD: 25.5** Route densities and locations will maintain or enhance greater sage-grouse habitat.					
MANAGEMENT ACTIONS COMMON TO ALL ALTERNATIVES					
7141	SD: 25	VRM prescriptions are contained in the Visual Resources section.			
7142	SD: 25	Travel management for the area is in the Comprehensive Trails and Travel Management section.			
7143	SD: 25	The area is open to livestock grazing.			
MANAGEMENT ACTIONS BY ALTERNATIVE					
7144	SD: 25	Do not designate the Government Draw/Upper Sweetwater Sage-Grouse area as an ACEC.	Designate BLM-administered lands in the Government Draw/Upper Sweetwater Sage-Grouse area as an ACEC (1,246,791 acres) (Map 131).	Same as Alternative A.	Designate 35,102 acres in the Hudson to Atlantic City area as the Twin Creek ACEC (Map 132).

7000 SPECIAL DESIGNATIONS (SD) – GOVERNMENT DRAW/UPPER SWEETWATER SAGE-GROUSE ACEC (PROPOSED)					
Record #	**Goal/ Obj.**	**Alternative A (Current Management)**	**Alternative B (Most Resource Conservation)**	**Alternative C (Most Resource Utilization)**	**Alternative D (Proposed RMP)**
7145	SD: 25	Mineral and realty actions in the area are managed with Category 1 restrictions.	Mineral and realty actions in the ACEC are managed with Category 6 restrictions. Do not re-offer for lease expired existing oil and gas leases, except as necessary to provide drainage protection.	Mineral and realty actions in the area are managed with Category 1 restrictions.	Mineral and realty actions on 306,360 acres of land in the Hudson to Atlantic City area (including the Twin Creek ACEC) are managed as follows to protect multiple resource values: ● Open to oil and gas leasing subject to NSO stipulations ● Closed to geophysical exploration ● Closed to solid mineral leasing ● Withdrawn from locatable mineral entry. Conduct validity exams as staffing allows. Evaluate opportunities, including working with partners to buy out valid claims beneficial to resource values. Encourage buy-out of valid claims for offsite mitigation of surface disturbance in important wildlife habitat, including Core Area. ● Closed to new mineral material disposals ● Avoided for major ROWs except for designated corridors ● Avoided for minor ROWs
7146	SD: 25	No similar action.	Actively pursue opportunities to reclaim existing roads and trails and ROWs not necessary to attain management objectives in order to protect greater sage-grouse and their habitat.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative B, except as opportunities arise. (See the Recreation section for motorized travel in Johnny Behind the Rocks.)

7000 SPECIAL DESIGNATIONS (SD) – GOVERNMENT DRAW/UPPER SWEETWATER SAGE-GROUSE ACEC (PROPOSED)					
Record #	**Goal/ Obj.**	**Alternative A (Current Management)**	**Alternative B (Most Resource Conservation)**	**Alternative C (Most Resource Utilization)**	**Alternative D (Proposed RMP)**
7147	SD: 25	The area is open to livestock grazing.	The area is open to livestock grazing and managed to maintain or enhance greater sage-grouse habitat. (See the Vegetation and Grazing sections for additional management for greater sage-grouse habitat objectives.)	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative B.
7148	SD: 25	Range improvement projects are constructed on a case-by-case basis.	Range improvement projects are prohibited.	Allow range improvement projects.	Construct range improvement projects when the purpose is compatible with Area values.
7149	SD: 25	Consider greater sage-grouse habitat when authorizing vegetation treatments.	Limit vegetation treatments to those that improve and enhance sagebrush steppe habitat.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative B, plus only allow vegetation treatments if they will maintain or enhance greater sage-grouse habitat. See additional management actions in the Fire and Fuels Management section.
7150	SD: 25	On a case-by-case basis, determine management prescriptions, including livestock grazing management, of acquired lands in the area.	Manage any lands acquired and added to the ACEC in accordance with the ACEC management prescriptions. Forage associated with newly acquired lands is not available for livestock use.	Same as Alternative A.	Same of Alternative A.

Table 2.52. 8000 Socioeconomic Resources (SR) and Health and Safety

8000 SOCIOECONOMIC RESOURCES (SR) and HEALTH AND SAFETY					
Record #	**Goal/Obj.**	**Alternative A (Current Management)**	**Alternative B (Most Resource Conservation)**	**Alternative C (Most Resource Utilization)**	**Alternative D (Proposed RMP)**
Goal SR: 1 Provide sustainable economic development opportunities for a diversity of resources including energy, grazing and other agricultural activities, recreation, wildlife, fisheries, tourism, and others. **Objective:** **SR: 1.1** Provide resources and necessary access, consistent with multiple and sustainable use, for economic, cultural, and social viability at the national, regional, and local levels. **Goal SR: 2** Consider local and regional economic development and land use plans in BLM decision making. Provide opportunities for economic and social sustainability at the national, regional and local level. **Objective:** **SR: 2.1** Consider the impact of BLM management actions on community health, welfare, infrastructure, services, housing, employment, custom, and culture. **Goal SR: 3** Respect, recognize, and support public health and safety needs. **Objectives:** **SR: 3.1** Reduce potential threats to public health and safety on BLM-administered lands. **SR: 3.2** On a case-by-case basis, permit commercial use of BLM-administered lands with a requirement to submit a safety plan prior to use of the area. **SR: 3.3** Reduce or minimize risk to humans and the environment from hazardous materials on BLM-administered lands in the planning area where possible. **Goal SR: 4** Reduce risk to health and safety from geologic hazards on BLM-administered lands within the planning area. **Objectives:** **SR: 4.1** Avoid geologic hazards on BLM-administered lands within the planning area, where possible. **SR: 4.2** Inventory, assess, and manage geologic hazards on BLM-administered lands within the planning area. **SR: 4.3** Reduce or eliminate hazards from abandoned mines on BLM-administered lands within the planning area, where possible.					
MANAGEMENT ACTIONS COMMON TO ALL ALTERNATIVES					
8001	SR: 2	Consider local county and community plans regarding socioeconomic conditions during the decision making process.			

8000 SOCIOECONOMIC RESOURCES (SR) and HEALTH AND SAFETY					
Record #	**Goal/Obj.**	**Alternative A (Current Management)**	**Alternative B (Most Resource Conservation)**	**Alternative C (Most Resource Utilization)**	**Alternative D (Proposed RMP)**
8002	SR: 3	Manage hazardous materials to reduce health and safety risks to the public, to restore contaminated lands, and to carry out emergency response activities, per appropriate laws, policies, and regulations.			
8003	SR: 3	In emergency situations, protect the health and safety of the public first and stabilize the situation with regard to the BLM's responsibilities and decision-making authority second.			
8004	SR: 2.1	Use partners to effectively leverage funding and facilitate AML projects. Prioritize AML projects with greater weight given to national evaluation criteria than to risk-based criteria.			
8005	SR: 4.3	Cooperate with the State of Wyoming on its AML program.			
8006	SR: 4.3	Identify locations of AML projects in the planning area and erect warning fencing and signing as funding allows.			
8007	SR: 3.1, 3.3, 4.2, 4.3	Reclaim AML to productive uses including, but not limited to, grazing, recreation, fish and wildlife habitat, and preservation of historical/cultural resources. Monitor success of AML reclamation projects and maintain reclamation and shaft/adit closures where needed.			
8008	SR: 3.3	Bond amounts for uranium and other surface-disturbing and disruptive activities will be adequate to ensure reclamation of project areas to prevent any potential impacts to the health and safety of the public.			
8009	SR: 3.2	Require that all new major ROWs, pipelines, and trenches across roads be closed as soon as possible to reduce hazards to the public, livestock, and wildlife after initial surface disturbance.			
8010	SR: 3.2	Require pipeline gates with soft plugs every ¼ mile along an open trench.			
8011	SR: 3.1, 3.2	Prohibit channel-disturbing activities on Rock Creek and Willow Creek in the Upper Sweetwater river drainage to avoid the mobilization of mercury.			
8012	SR: 3.1, 3.2	Comply with Onshore Oil and Gas Order #6 (43 CFR 3160) for drilling operations conducted in areas which are known or could reasonably be expected to contain H_2S.			
MANAGEMENT ACTIONS BY ALTERNATIVE					
8013	SR: 2.1	Analyze impacts on socioeconomic resources from the implementation of projects in the planning through the NEPA process.	Minimize adverse socioeconomic impacts associated with permitted actions such as boom and bust economies, and adverse impacts to community infrastructure. Encourage a balanced approach to economic diversity and enhance the local economy by providing opportunities for grazing, the development of recreational opportunities (e.g., fishing, hunting, and wildlife viewing), and renewable energy.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.

8000 SOCIOECONOMIC RESOURCES (SR) and HEALTH AND SAFETY					
Record #	**Goal/Obj.**	**Alternative A (Current Management)**	**Alternative B (Most Resource Conservation)**	**Alternative C (Most Resource Utilization)**	**Alternative D (Proposed RMP)**
8014	SR: 2.1	No similar action.	Consider paced development options for mineral and energy development projects in the planning area to avoid adverse impacts to socioeconomic conditions.	Minimize constraints on the pace of development for large development projects.	Same as Alternative B.
8015	SR: 3.1, 4.1	Consider landslide potential when authorizing activities.	Avoid construction activities on unstable soils, landslide deposits, and in subsidence areas.	Allow BLM-authorized construction activities within areas of known landslide hazard.	Same as Alternative A.

ACEC Area of Critical Environmental Concern
AML Abandoned Mine Lands
AMP Allotment Management Plan
APHIS Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service
AQD Air Quality Division
AQRV Air Quality Related Values
ARPA Archeological Resources Protection Act
AUM Animal Unit Month
BLM Bureau of Land Management
BMP Best Management Practice
CDC Continental Divide-Creston
CDNST Continental Divide National Scenic Trail
CFR Code of Federal Regulations
CSU Controlled Surface Use
CWA Clean Water Act
dBA Decibels with an A-weighted scale
DDA Designated Development Area
DEQ Department of Environmental Quality
DOE Department of Energy
EA Environmental Assessment
EIS Environmental Impact Statement
ERMA Extensive Recreation Management Area
ESA Endangered Species Act
FLPMA Federal Land Policy and Management Act
FR Federal Register
FRCC Fire Regime Condition Class
GIS Geographic Information System
H_2S Hydrogen Sulfide
HMA Herd Management Area
HMAP Herd Management Area Plan
IM Instruction Memorandum
INNS Invasive Nonnative Species
LRP Limited Reclamation Potential
MLP Master Leasing Plan
MMBF Million Board Feet
MOA Memorandum of Agreement
MOU Memorandum of Understanding
N/A Not Applicable
NEPA National Environmental Policy Act
NHL National Historic Landmark
NHPA National Historic Preservation Act
NHT National Historic Trail
NLCS National Landscape Conservation System
NNL National Natural Landmark
NRCS Natural Resources Conservation Service
NRHP National Register of Historic Places
NSO No Surface Occupancy
NTMC National Trails Management Corridor
NWSRS National Wild and Scenic River System
OHV Off-Highway Vehicle
PEIS Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement
PFC Proper Functioning Condition
PFYC Potential Fossil Yield Classification
PSD Prevention of Significant Deterioration
R&PP Recreation and Public Purposes
REA Recreation Enhancement Act
RMP Resource Management Plan
RMZ Recreation Management Zone
ROD Record of Decision
ROW Right-Of-Way
RHT&EH Regional Historic Trails and Early Highways
SHPO State Historic Preservation Office
SRMA Special Recreation Management Area
SRP Special Recreation Permit
TCP Traditional Cultural Property
TLS Timing Limitation Stipulation
TMDL Total Maximum Daily Load
USDA United States Department of Agriculture
USFS United States Forest Service
USFWS United States Fish and Wildlife Service
VRM Visual Resource Management
WAFWA Western Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies
WGFD Wyoming Game and Fish Department
WHMA Wildlife Habitat Management Area
WSA Wilderness Study Area
WSR Wild and Scenic River
WUI Wildland-Urban Interface
WYPDES Wyoming Pollutant Discharge Elimination System

2.11. Summary of Environmental Consequences by Alternative

Table 2.53, "Summary of Environmental Consequences by Alternative" (p. 253) summarizes potential impacts under alternatives A through D. Where appropriate, the table quantifies potential impacts anticipated from BLM-authorized actions. Table 2.53, "Summary of Environmental Consequences by Alternative" (p. 253) summarizes impacts under the four alternatives in acres (e.g., more acreage implies more impact, either beneficial or adverse) or qualitative descriptions comparing the impact potential among the alternatives (e.g., highest potential, lowest potential, or moderate potential) with brief descriptions of the qualifying rational. The Summary of Impacts section for each resource in Chapter 4 provides a more detailed comparison of impacts between alternatives. Chapter 4 describes cumulative impacts from non-BLM actions; Table 2.53, "Summary of Environmental Consequences by Alternative" (p. 253) does not include cumulative impacts.

The environmental consequences of alternatives are not anticipated to exceed known legal thresholds or standards over the life of this RMP. Standard practices, BMPs, and guidelines for surface-disturbing activities are built into each alternative to avoid and minimize potential impacts. The BLM would consider mitigation of residual impacts during subsequent implementation-level projects and any associated environmental analyses performed at that time. All alternatives include reclamation of surface disturbance to reduce long-term impacts.

Table 2.53. Summary of Environmental Consequences by Alternative

Resources	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D
Air Quality				
NAAQS	Not anticipated to exceed.	Not anticipated to exceed.	Not anticipated to exceed.	Not anticipated to exceed.
WAAQS	Not anticipated to exceed.	Not anticipated to exceed.	Not anticipated to exceed.	Not anticipated to exceed.
Visibility Impacts	Moderate Potential. Moderate amount of projected VOC and particulate matter emissions.	Lowest Potential. Least amount of projected VOC and particulate matter emissions.	Highest Potential. Greatest amount of projected VOC and particulate matter emissions.	Moderate Potential. Moderate amount of projected VOC and particulate matter emissions.
Projected Greenhouse Gas Emissions	1.17 million metric tons of CO_2 equivalents for 2018.	0.81 million metric tons of CO_2 equivalents for 2018.	1.19 metric tons of CO_2 equivalents for 2018.	1.11 metric tons of CO_2 equivalents for 2018.
Soil and Water				
Acres of Surface Disturbance Anticipated from BLM Actions	52,591 short-term/ 12,439 long-term	74,689 short-term/ 7,502 long-term	160,065 short-term/ 60,631 long-term	53,894 short-term/ 11,453 long-term
Impacts from Long-term Erosion	Moderate Potential. 2,777,334 acres available for locatable mineral entry. Soil-disturbing activities allowed in areas with LRP with mitigation on a project-by-project basis.	Lowest Potential. 1,167,862 acres available for locatable mineral entry. Soil-disturbing and disruptive activities prohibited in areas with LRP.	Highest Potential. 2,800,467 acres available for locatable mineral entry. Soil-disturbing activities allowed in areas with LRP with mitigation on a project-by-project basis.	Moderate Potential. 2,351,399 acres available for locatable mineral entry. Soil-disturbing activities allowed in areas with LRP with mitigation on a project-by-project basis.
Groundwater Impacts	Moderate Potential. Mineral and realty actions in groundwater recharge areas are subject to standard stipulations. 2,274 new federal oil and gas and CBNG wells are projected.	Lowest Potential. Mineral and realty actions in areas underlain by a sole source aquifer are managed with moderate restrictions. 1,528 new federal oil and gas and CBNG wells are projected.	Highest Potential. Mineral and realty actions in groundwater recharge areas are managed with standard stipulations. 2,284 new federal oil and gas and CBNG wells are projected.	Lowest Potential. Mineral and realty actions in areas underlain by a sole source aquifer are managed with moderate restrictions. 2,125 new federal oil and gas and CBNG wells are projected.
Potential for Produced Water To Impact Soils	Moderate Potential. Impacts to soils are considered on a case-by-case basis when managing produced water. This alternative is projected to result in the second-most new federal oil and gas and CBNG wells.	Lowest Potential. Impacts to soils are considered on a case-by-case basis when managing produced water. This alternative is projected to result in the least new federal oil and gas and CBNG wells. Surface discharge of produced water in all new oil and gas development projects is avoided.	Highest Potential. Impacts to soils are considered on a case-by-case basis when managing produced water. This alternative is projected to result in the most new federal oil and gas and CBNG wells.	Moderate Potential. Impacts to soils are considered in coordination with the State of Wyoming. This alternative is projected to result in the second-least new federal oil and gas and CBNG wells.
Exceed Water Quality Standards	Not anticipated.	Not anticipated.	Not anticipated.	Not anticipated.

Resources	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D
Lands with Wilderness Characteristics				
Potential to Impact Lands with Wilderness Characteristics	Moderate Potential. No management actions are prescribed to enhance wilderness character of the Little Red Creek Complex. Resource uses are limited in this area by ACEC management.	Lowest Potential. The Little Red Creek Complex (5,490 acres) is managed as non-WSA land with wilderness characteristics to protect wilderness values.	Highest Potential. No management actions are prescribed to enhance wilderness character of the Little Red Creek Complex. ACEC and travel management designations are removed from the area.	Lowest Potential. 4,954 acres of the Little Red Creek Complex are managed as non-WSA land with wilderness characteristics to protect wilderness values. 536 fewer acres are managed to protect wilderness values compared to Alternative B.
Minerals				
Acres Proposed for Withdrawal with High Potential for Locatable Minerals	0	278,906	0	0
Percent of Federal Mineral Estate Pursued for Withdrawal from Locatable Mineral Entry	<1%	58.1%	<1%	16%
Percent of Federal Mineral Estate Closed to Oil and Gas Leasing	<1%	81%	<1%	4%
Percent of Federal Mineral Estate Closed to Mineral Material Disposals	11.2%	92.5%	6.7%	34%
Total Projected New Federal Oil and Gas and CBNG Wells	2,274	1,528	2,284	2,125
Acres of BLM-administered Mineral Estate with Phosphate Potential Closed to Leasing	10,047	39,592	1,721	42,164
Fire and Fuels Management				
Acres of Short-term Surface Disturbance from Prescribed Fire	6,000	20,000	6,000	10,000

Resources	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D
Acres of Short-term Surface Disturbance from Mechanical Fuels Treatment	10,000	30,000	10,000	10,000
Potential for Fire Suppression Strategies To Limit Landscape-level Wildfires outside of greater sage-grouse Core Area	Moderate Potential. Full suppression of wildland fire used on a case-by-case basis.	Lowest Potential. Full suppression of wildland fire used only within the WUI, and other areas of critical resource values, with other suppression strategies used on a case-by-case basis, with emphasis in sagebrush areas including unplanned ignition to achieve resource benefit.	Highest Potential. Full suppression of wildland fire is the most likely response throughout the planning area.	Moderate Potential. Full suite of suppression tactics used across the planning area, with opportunities for use of wildland fire and full suppression tactics used on a case-by-case basis with emphasis in sagebrush areas.
Vegetation				
Acres of Projected Short-term Surface Disturbance Per Year from Forest and Woodland Management to Provide Forest Products and Improve Forest Health	375. (Overall forest health is balanced with sustainably providing commercial forest products.)	550. (Natural processes are emphasized to achieve forest health objectives.)	550. (All available tools and silvicultural techniques are allowed to provide forest products and maintain forest health.)	600. (All available tools and silvicultural techniques are allowed to provide forest products and maintain forest health.)
Potential to Fragment Vegetation Communities	Moderate Potential. 12,439 acres of long-term surface disturbance would affect vegetation communities.	Lowest Potential. 7,502 acres of long-term surface disturbance would affect vegetation communities.	Highest Potential. 60,631 acres of long-term surface disturbance would affect vegetation communities.	Moderate Potential. 11,453 acres of long-term surface disturbance would affect vegetation communities.
Potential Impact of Surface Disturbance on Riparian-Wetland Resources	Moderate Potential. Surface-disturbing activities are prohibited within 500 feet of surface water and riparian-wetland areas. Mineral and realty actions managed with moderate restrictions.	Lowest Potential. Surface-disturbing activities are prohibited within 1,320 feet of surface water, riparian-wetland areas, playas, and 100-year floodplains where mapped (except for areas of high and moderate oil and gas potential). Mineral and realty actions are managed with moderate restrictions.	Highest potential. Surface-disturbing activities are allowed on a case-by-case basis in riparian-wetland areas and floodplains.	Moderate Potential. Surface-disturbing activities are prohibited within 500 feet of surface water and riparian-wetland areas except in DDAs. More restrictions are applied to mineral and realty actions outside of DDAs. Implementation of Required Design Features to minimize surface disturbance and protect other resources.
Invasive Species and Pest Management				

Resources	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D
Potential To Spread Invasive and Nonnative Species.	Moderate Potential. 52,591 acres of total short-term surface disturbance contributes to the spread of INNS. Reclamation plans are required in LRP areas. 5,923 acres are closed to motorized travel. Livestock flushing is not required.	Lowest Potential. 74,689 acres of total surface disturbance contributes to the spread of INNS. Soil disturbing activities are prohibited in LRP areas. 71,761 acres are closed to motorized travel. The Authorized Officer may require livestock flushing for a period of 72 hours.	Highest Potential. 160,065 acres of total surface disturbance contributes to the spread of INNS. Reclamation plans are required in LRP areas. 5,472 acres are closed to motorized vehicle use. Livestock flushing is not required.	Moderate Potential. 53,894 acres of total surface disturbance contributes to the spread of INNS. Reclamation plans are required in LRP areas. 26,357 acres are closed to motorized travel. The Authorized Officer may require livestock flushing for a period of 72 hours. Use of Required Design Features will further reduce potential for INNS spread.
Fish and Wildlife				
Impacts to Water Quality and Fish Habitat	Moderate potential. 12,439 acres of long-term surface disturbance contributes to sedimentation and alters flow regimes. Surface-disturbing activities and placement of salt and mineral supplements are prohibited within 500 feet and ¼ mile of surface water, respectively. Forage utilization levels for livestock are established on a case-by-case basis.	Lowest Potential. 7,502 acres of long-term surface disturbance contributes to sedimentation and alters flow regimes. Surface-disturbing activities and placement of salt and mineral supplements are prohibited within 1,320 feet and ½ mile of surface water, respectively. Forage utilization established at 21-40% in livestock-preferred areas on a case-by-case basis.	Highest Potential. 60,631 acres of long-term surface disturbance contributes to sedimentation and alters flow regimes. Surface-disturbing activities and placement of salt and mineral supplements are prohibited on a site-specific basis near and within ¼ mile of surface water, respectively. Forage utilization established at 41-60% in livestock-preferred areas on a case-by-case basis.	Moderate Potential. 11,453 acres of long-term surface disturbance contributes to sedimentation and alters flow regimes. Surface-disturbing activities and placement of salt and mineral supplements are prohibited within 500 feet and ½ mile of surface water, respectively. Forage utilization levels established in livestock-preferred areas to achieve resource objectives. Indirect benefit from Required Design Features.
Acres of Elk and Bighorn Sheep Parturition Areas Closed to Mineral Leasing	237	23,055	0	7,942
Acres/Percent of Big Game Crucial Winter Range Managed as ROW Exclusion	102,461/ 16.9%	518,163/ 85.5%	58,270/ 9.6%	238,472/ 38.6%
Potential Impact of Motorized Vehicle Use on Wildlife	Moderate Potential. Motorized travel is limited to existing roads and trails in 93% of the planning area. 111,002 acres are closed seasonally.	Lowest Potential. Motorized travel is limited to existing roads and trails on 89% of the planning area. 116,805 acres are closed seasonally.	Highest Potential. Motorized travel is limited to existing roads and trails on 98% of the planning area. No areas are closed seasonally.	Moderate Potential. Motorized travel is limited to existing roads and trails on 92% of the planning area. 110,530 acres are closed seasonally.

Resources	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D
Special Status Species				
Adverse Impacts to Special Status Species within the Planning Area	Moderate Potential. In general, this alternative applies moderate restrictions to surface-disturbing activities that will destroy or degrade habitat. Second-most (2,274) projected new federal oil and gas and CBNG wells may fragment habitat.	Lowest Potential. In general, this alternative applies the most restrictions to surface-disturbing activities. Fewest (1,528) projected new federal oil and gas and CBNG wells would limit habitat fragmentation.	Highest Potential. In general, this alternative applies the least restrictions to surface-disturbing activities. Most (2,284) projected new federal oil and gas and CBNG wells may result in the most habitat fragmentation.	Moderate Potential. In general, this alternative applies moderate restrictions to surface-disturbing activities, but is more restrictive than Alternative A in important habitat, particularly Special Designation areas. Second-fewest (2,125) projected new federal oil and gas and CBNG wells would limit habitat fragmentation. Inclusion of Required Design Features to reduce adverse impacts.
Acres of Protective Buffer around Occupied Greater Sage-grouse Leks to Prohibit Surface-disturbing Activities	16,283	93,411	16,283	122,890
Acres of Greater Sage-grouse Core Area Open to Locatable Mineral Entry	1,720,190	458,112	1,720,542	1,358,699
Acres of Raptor Nesting Areas in Phosphate Potential Areas Open to Mineral Leasing	1,002	836	1,367	589
Potential for Density of Development to Affect Greater Sage-grouse Habitat	Highest Potential. The density of disturbances and cumulative acres of disturbance are not limited in identified breeding, nesting, and brood-rearing habitat.	Lowest Potential. In identified breeding, nesting, and brood-rearing habitat, the density of disturbances is limited to 1 per 640 acres and the cumulative surface disturbance is limited to 2.5% of the sagebrush habitat in the same 640 acres.	Highest Potential. The density of disturbances and cumulative acres of disturbance are not limited in identified breeding, nesting, and brood-rearing habitat.	Low Potential. In Core Area, the density of disturbances is limited to 1 per 640 acres and the cumulative surface disturbance is limited to 5% of the sagebrush habitat in the same 640 acres. Inclusion of Required Design Features.
Wild Horses				

Resources	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D
Potential To Impact the Free-roaming Nature of Wild Horses	Highest Potential. 125,098 acres in HMAs with high wind potential are open to wind-energy development. ROW development in HMAs is allowed on a case-by-case basis.	Lowest Potential. Wind-energy development is excluded in HMAs. Most area in HMAs is managed as ROW avoidance or exclusion.	Highest Potential. 125,098 acres in HMAs with high wind potential are open to wind-energy development. Least area in HMAs managed as ROW avoidance or exclusion.	Moderate Potential. 23,365 acres in HMAs with high wind potential are open to wind-energy development. Portions of HMAs managed as ROW avoidance or exclusion.
Heritage Resources				
Potential to Impact Eligible/Listed Cultural Sites and Paleontological Localities	Moderate Potential. Proactive management used to preserve known sites of importance. Recovery of scientific data or detailed documentation required for threatened significant cultural resources.	Lowest Potential. Avoidance of eligible/listed cultural sites and fossil localities is emphasized. This alternative contains the most extensive proactive management to better preserve the setting of cultural sites and spiritual/sacred/traditional sites. Important paleontological areas are closed to mineral leasing.	Highest Potential. Minimum restrictions required by regulation are imposed on activities that could cause adverse impacts to National Register-eligible properties. This alternative contains the least proactive management to preserve eligible/listed cultural sites and fossil localities.	Low Potential. Significant cultural resources are avoided whenever possible and scientific data recovery or detailed documentation is required if avoidance is not possible. This alternative contains more extensive proactive management to better preserve the setting of cultural sites and spiritual/sacred/traditional sites than Alternative A.
Visual Resources				
Acres Managed as VRM Class I-III	482,349	1,636,329	803,446	1,698,904
Inventory Class I/VRM Class I (percent of planning area)[1]	2.3%/ 2.4%	2.3%/ 2.5%	2.3%/ 2.3%	2.3%/ 2.5%
Inventory Class II/VRM Class II (percent of planning area)[1]	23.8%/ 8.5%	23.8%/ 53.6%	23.8%/ 1.1%	23.8%/ 32.6%
Inventory Class III/VRM Class III (percent of planning area)[1]	35.5%/ 9.3%	35.5%/ 12.2%	35.5%/ 30.2%	35.5%/ 35.8%
Inventory Class IV/VRM Class IV (percent of planning area)[1]	38.3%/ 77.4%	38.3%/ 31.6%	38.3%/ 66.4%	38.3%/ 29.0%
Potential To Impact Areas with Unique Scenic Features	Moderate Potential. Sensitive and unique scenic features managed to partially retain the existing character of the landscape, frequently allowing major modifications.	Lowest Potential. Sensitive and unique scenic features managed to retain the existing character of the landscape.	Highest Potential. Sensitive and unique scenic features managed to more frequently allow major modifications to the landscape.	Moderate Potential. Sensitive and unique scenic features managed to retain characteristics of the landscape, infrequently allowing major modifications.

Resources	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D
Renewable Energy				
Acres Open to Renewable Energy Development in Areas with High Wind Potential	283,647	867	321,870	9,998
Rights-of-Way and Corridors				
Potential To Limit the Development of ROWs	Low Potential. 66,099 acres avoidance 205,916 acres exclusion	Highest Potential. 315,219 acres avoidance 1,919,029 acres exclusion	Lowest Potential. 11,714 acres avoidance 147,053 acres exclusion	Moderate Potential. 1,369,300 acres avoidance 417,426 acres exclusion
Acres of Designated Right-of-Way Corridors	4,892	15,364	660,908	103,646
Comprehensive Trails and Travel Management				
Acres of Disturbance from New Roads and Trails Due to ROW Authorizations	231.8	36.36	237.93	115.5
Potential To Limit Over-snow Travel	Moderate Potential. 14,729 acres closed to over-snow travel.	Highest Potential. 181,173 acres closed to over-snow travel.	Lowest Potential. The entire planning area is open to over-snow travel.	Moderate Potential. 70,425 acres closed to over-snow travel.
Livestock Grazing				
Total Permitted AUMs[2] Lost from Adjustments to Meet Rangeland Health Standards, Closures, and Surface-disturbing Activity	1,414	152,054	30,322	51,808
Total Actual AUMs[3] Lost from Adjustments to Meet Rangeland Health Standards, Closures, and Surface-disturbing Activity	1,031	82,672	22,135	37,820
Actual AUMs[3] Projected at the End of the Planning Cycle/Percent Reduction from Baseline (204,993)	203,962 <1%	122,321 40% AUMs under Alternative B are projected to be reduced over time in order to meet rangeland health standards without infrastructure.	182,858 11%	167,173 18%

Resources	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D
Potential To Limit New Range Improvement Projects	Moderate Potential. Range improvement projects are designed to meet allotment management objectives on a case-by-case basis.	Highest Potential. Range improvement projects are prohibited if they would cause adverse impacts to other resource values.	Lowest Potential. Range improvement projects are designed to maximize livestock forage and distribution.	Moderate Potential. Range improvement projects implemented as part of comprehensive grazing strategies to improve rangeland health.
Recreation				
Acres of Recreation Setting Trending Toward Primitive	5,923	71,761	5,472	26,357
Acres of Recreation Setting Maintained at Existing Condition	146,717	1,739,972	16,330	714,824
Acres of Recreation Setting Trending Toward Urban/Industrialized	2,241,570	582,477	2,372,408	1,653,961
Number/Total Acres of SRMAs	3/406,457	7/307,183	1/608	7/293,774
Special Designations				
Total Acres of Special Designations (ACECs, WSR-eligible waterways managed as suitable, WSAs)	184,879[4]	1,558,247	55,338	646,543
Areas of Critical Environmental Concern				
Number/Total Acres of ACECs	9/119,622	15/1,492,990	0/0	8/243,838
Congressionally Designated Trails				
Recreation Specific Beneficial Outcomes of Congressionally Designated Trails	Lowest Potential. No allowable use decisions or management actions to protect important recreation areas or the recreation setting.	Highest Potential. Allowable use decisions and management actions within SRMAs designed to meet visitor demand and sustain and/or enhance the recreation setting.	Moderate Potential. No allowable use decisions or management actions to protect important recreation areas or meet visitor demand. Limited protection for the recreation setting.	Highest Potential. Allowable use decisions and management actions within SRMAs designed to meet visitor demand and sustain and/or enhance the recreation setting. Implementation of the NTMC.
Effect on Visual Resource within Congressionally Designated Trail Landscapes	Highest Potential. 15% of the corridor[5] area managed as VRM Classes I-II. 85% managed as VRM Class III-IV.	Low Potential. 94% of the corridor area managed as VRM Classes I-II. 6% managed as VRM Class III-IV.	Moderate Potential. 5% of the corridor[5] area managed as VRM Class I-II. 95% managed as VRM Class III-IV.	Low Potential. 97% of the NTMC is managed as VRM Classes I-II. 3% managed as VRM Class III-IV.
Socioeconomics				

Resources	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D
Effect on Planning Area Population	Lowest Potential. Activities related to oil and gas, livestock grazing, and recreation will support 2.9% of employment in the planning area. BLM-authorized activities are not anticipated to alter historical population trends in the planning area.	Highest Potential. Activities related to oil and gas, livestock grazing, and recreation will support 2.1% of employment in the planning area. The decrease in employment opportunities may decrease the population in the planning area.	Lowest Potential. Activities related to oil and gas, livestock grazing, and recreation will support 2.9% of employment in the planning area. BLM-authorized activities are not anticipated to alter historical population trends in the planning area.	Low Potential. Activities related to oil and gas, livestock grazing, and recreation will support 2.8% of employment in the planning area. BLM-authorized activities are not anticipated to alter historical population trends in the planning area.
Effect on Housing and Community Services	Lowest Potential. Alternative A is not anticipated to result in a change in the total demand for housing or its geographical distribution.	Highest Potential. Alternative B may result in the greatest decrease in population and, therefore, a decreased demand for housing and community services as well as a reduced tax base for providing community services.	Lowest Potential. Alternative C will result in approximately the same population and, therefore, the same demand for housing and community services compared to Alternative A.	Moderate Potential. Alternative D will result in similar demands for housing and community services as Alternative A, but a slightly smaller tax base for providing these services.
Impacts on Quality of Life and Local Culture	Lowest Potential. As Alternative A continues existing BLM policies in their current state, quality of life and local culture will be impacted minimally. Alternative A will have relatively little impact on the economics of ranching.	Highest Potential. Economic opportunities are reduced but impacts to air quality and other nonmarket values will be less than historic trends. Subdivision of ranch land may be more intense than historic trends as ranching becomes less economically viable.	Moderate Potential. Alternative C will result in similar economic opportunities as Alternative A, but greater adverse impacts to air quality, wildlife, and other resources. Alternative C will have relatively little impact on the economics of ranching.	Moderate Potential. Economic opportunities are slightly reduced, as are adverse impacts to air quality, wildlife, and other resources related to natural characteristics. Alternative D will have relatively little impact on the economics of ranching.
Forecasted annual earnings (millions of 2007 dollars) due to activities on BLM-administered surface[6]	195.6	138.8	195.9	184.2
Forecasted annual employment due to activities on BLM-administered surface[6]	3,622	2,621	3,617	3,424

Resources	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D

[1] The visual resources inventory is used to classify the aesthetic value of BLM-administered lands based on scenic quality, visual sensitivity, and distance from travel or observation points. VRM Classes establish a measurable standard for the amount of change allowed to a specific area's visual resource. For example, under Alternative A, 8.5 percent of the planning area is managed as VRM Class II, yet 23.5 percent is rated as Class II, suggesting a high potential for impacts to visual resources in these areas.
[2] Permitted AUMs are AUMs that are allowed on a permit/lease that can be used on any given year provided the forage is available.
[3] Actual AUMs are the AUMs actually billed for and paid for each year by the permittee/lessee. The ratio of historical average authorized use to permitted use in the planning area is 73 percent. The ratio of actual use to permitted used under Alternative B is projected to increase gradually over the life of the plan to 95 percent. See Appendix L (p. 1583) and the *Livestock Grazing* section of Chapter 4 for further discussion regarding reductions in AUMs.
[4] All eligible waterways under Alternative A are managed to protect the free-flowing outstandingly remarkable values and tentative classification.
[5] The trail corridor encompasses ¼ mile on either side of the trails.
[6] Estimate of annual earnings and employment includes direct, indirect, and induced economic activity (the "multiplier effect").

ACEC Area of Critical Environmental Concern
AUM animal unit month
BLM Bureau of Land Management
CBNG coalbed natural gas
CO_2 carbon dioxide
DDA Designated Development Area
HMA Herd Management Area
INNS invasive nonnative species
LRP Limited Reclamation Potential
NTMC National Trails Management Corridor
MIST Minimum Impact Suppression Tactics
NAAQS National Ambient Air Quality Standards
ROW right-of-way
SRMA Special Recreation Management Area
VRM Visual Resource Management
VOC Volatile Organic Compound
WAAQS Wyoming Ambient Air Quality Standards
WSA Wilderness Study Area
WSR Wild and Scenic River
WUI Wildland Urban Interface
< less than
% percent