EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This Page Intentionally Left Blank

Executive Summary
Table of Contents

Executive Summary ES-1
Introduction ES-1
Purpose and Need ES-1
Planning Issues ES-2
Collaboration ES-2
Alternatives ES-3
The Proposed RMP ES-4
Major Changes from the Draft RMP/EIS to the Proposed RMP/Final EIS ES-5
Comparison of the Alternatives ES-5
Affected Environment ES-29
Vegetation (Upland and Riparian) ES-29
Livestock Grazing ES-32
Recreation ES-32
Energy Development ES-34
Areas of Critical Environmental Concern (ACECs) ES-35
Environmental Consequences ES-37
Consultation and Coordination ES-46

List of Tables

Table ES-1. Summary Comparison of Alternatives. ES-6
Table ES-2. Acres, Historic Fire Regime, and Fire Regime Condition Class Ratings for Potential Natural Vegetation Groups by Vegetation Management Area. ES-29
Table ES-3. Fire Rate of Spread Rating by Vegetation Management Area (Acres) ES-30
Table ES-4. Post-Fire and Baseline Vegetation Composition in the Planning Area by Vegetation Sub-Group ES-31
Table ES-5. Summary Comparison of Effects. ES-38

This Page Intentionally Left Blank

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The purpose of the Jarbidge Proposed Resource Management Plan Final Environmental Impact Statement (Proposed RMP/Final EIS) is to provide direction for managing public lands in the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) Jarbidge Field Office for the next 15 to 20 years. The approved plan will provide the framework for making decisions about managing resources, resource uses, and special designations within the planning area.

The Jarbidge RMP planning area boundary coincides with the boundary of the BLM Jarbidge Field Office. The boundary extends from the Bruneau River on the west to Salmon Falls Creek on the east, and from the Snake River on the north to the northern boundaries of the BLM Elko Field Office and the Humboldt-Toiyabe National Forest on the south (Map 1). It includes parts of Elmore, Owyhee, and Twin Falls Counties in south-central Idaho and Elko County in northern Nevada. Although these counties have a combined population of approximately 165,000 (US Census Bureau, 2013b), Hot Springs, Indian Cove, Murphy Hot Springs, Three Creek, and Roseworth are the only communities within the planning area; each has a population of less than 100 people. The majority of the planning area supports sagebrush steppe and seeded grasslands, mostly from fire rehabilitation projects.

Introduction

An RMP guides land and resource management decisions for land managed by the BLM. The preparation and adoption of an RMP by BLM is a Federal action subject to the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, as amended (NEPA). NEPA requires that an EIS be prepared for any Federal action that may significantly affect the human environment.

The Jarbidge Proposed RMP/Final EIS describes and analyzes a range of management alternatives for the public lands and resources managed by the BLM Twin Falls District, Jarbidge Field Office in south-central Idaho and northern Nevada (Map 1). Within the planning area, the BLM manages approximately 1,371,000 acres of public land surface (Map 2); 1,497,000 acres of Federal mineral estate; and 1,463,000 acres of livestock grazing including 1,371,000 acres of public land surface and an additional 92,000 acres on the US Air Force Saylor Creek Training Range.

Decisions made and management direction taken in the approved Jarbidge RMP will apply to land and resources in the planning area according to the BLM's administrative authority and responsibility for those lands and resources. Management direction includes: goals, objectives, allocations, management actions, and the means for assessing the effectiveness of achieving goals and objectives.

Purpose and Need

The Federal Land Policy and Management Act (FLPMA) requires the BLM to "develop, maintain, and when appropriate, revise land use plans" (43 USC 1712[a]). In general, the purpose of this RMP is to provide a comprehensive framework for the BLM's management of public lands within the planning area and its allocation of resources pursuant to the multiple-use and sustained yield mandate of FLPMA. This RMP is needed in order to address a number of new issues that have arisen since the preparation of the 1987 Jarbidge RMP.

Specifically, the purpose of the Jarbidge RMP is to provide overall management and long-term direction for lands and resources administered by the Twin Falls District, Jarbidge Field Office that will:

- Maintain consistency with FLPMA, which includes:
  - Recognizing the nation's need for domestic sources of minerals, food, timber, and fiber from the public lands;
  - Preserving, where appropriate, lands in their natural condition;
  - Providing food and habitat for fish, wildlife, and domestic animals; and
  - Providing for outdoor recreation, human occupancy, and use;
- Ensure public lands are managed according to the principles of multiple use and sustained yield;
- Provide an overview of goals, objectives, and needs associated with public land management;
- Resolve multiple-use conflicts or issues between resource values and resource uses;

- Maintain or improve ecosystem functions;
- Promote diversity and resilience of biological resources including special status species;
- Preserve important cultural, historical, and physical resources;
- Provide opportunities for sustainable uses of public lands; and
- Address other issues and management concerns raised during the scoping process.

The revised Jarbidge RMP will be comprehensive in nature and will address specific issue categories identified through agency, interagency, and public scoping efforts.

The need to revise the Jarbidge RMP arose from numerous changes in circumstances since the current land use plan decisions were adopted in 1987. In 2001, an evaluation of the existing RMP concluded that there was a need for an updated plan. The following list of specific factors illustrates the need for preparation of an updated RMP:

- Changes in ecological, social, and economic conditions;
- Changes in user demands and impacts that require new management direction;
- New laws, regulations, and policies that created additional public land management considerations; and
- Requirements identified in the September 30, 2005, Stipulated Settlement Agreement in the case of Western Watersheds Project v. Ellis et al. (Case No. CV-04-181-S-BLW) (D. Idaho*).*

This RMP may result in the continuation of some existing land use planning decisions and the development of new land use planning decisions for issues identified internally and through public scoping.

Planning Issues

The following planning issues were identified through scoping and used to develop the Jarbidge Proposed RMP/Final EIS:

- Vegetation (Upland and Riparian):
  - Fuels treatments, fire rehabilitation, and fire suppression;
  - Habitat for fish, wildlife, and special status plants and animals; and
  - Livestock forage;
- Livestock Grazing;
- Recreation;
- Energy Development; and
- Areas of Critical Environmental Concern.

A number of comments were submitted regarding issues and concerns that are not addressed in the RMP because they can be addressed through policy or administrative action or because they are beyond the scope of the Jarbidge RMP. Some comments suggested the China Mountain Wind Energy Project and the Gateway West Transmission Project be addressed through the RMP process. The China Mountain Wind Energy Project has been deferred until the Idaho/southwest Montana Sub-regional Sage-Grouse Plan Amendment and the Jarbidge RMP have been completed. It will be addressed through a separate environmental analysis. The Gateway West Transmission Project has been addressed in the Final Environmental Impact Statement for Gateway West Transmission Line which was released on April 26, 2013.

Collaboration

Tribal Relationships

The Jarbidge Field Office consulted with the Shoshone-Paiute Tribes of the Duck Valley Reservation and the Shoshone-Bannock Tribes of the Fort Hall Reservation throughout the RMP process. Formal government-to-government consultation with the Shoshone-Bannock Tribes is conducted through the Fort Hall Business Council and coordinated with the Shoshone-Bannock environmental staff.

Intergovernmental and Interagency Relationships

The Jarbidge Field Office collaborated with other Federal, State, and local agencies and governmental entities throughout the RMP process. A number of agencies were invited to participate in the RMP planning process as cooperating agencies (see Chapter 5). Seven agencies accepted the BLM's invitation and signed Memoranda of Understanding to formally establish the relationship: Idaho State Department of Agriculture, Idaho Department of Fish and Game, Idaho Department of Lands, Idaho Department of Parks and Recreation, the National Park Service – Hagerman Fossil Beds National Monument, the Twin Falls County Board of Commissioners, and the Elko County Board of Commissioners. The Owyhee County Commissioners participated in the Jarbidge RMP through their existing coordination agreement with the Twin Falls District.

Alternatives

Chapter 2 discusses in detail the alternatives that describe different approaches for management of the resources and uses managed by the BLM in the Jarbidge Field Office. Chapter 2 begins with an explanation of the alternative development process. Each alternative is a complete and reasonable set of desired future conditions based upon:

- Resource management goals and objectives;
- Management actions to meet goals and objectives, and, where appropriate;
- The allocations of land and resources to facilitate multiple resource management.

Seven management alternatives (the No Action Alternative and six "action" alternatives) provide a range of choices for achieving the purpose and need, meeting the multiple-use mandate of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act, and resolving the planning issues identified in detail in Chapter 1:

- **The No Action Alternative** continues to implement the objectives and management actions provided in the 1987 Jarbidge RMP and its amendments, but includes measures to comply with new legislation and policies, where appropriate. Lands in poor ecological condition would be improved, while lands in good and excellent ecological condition would be maintained. Vegetation treatments could use native or non-native species. The majority of the planning area would remain available for resource uses, including livestock grazing, and land use authorizations. Cross-country motorized vehicle use would remain open in the majority of Elmore and Twin Falls Counties but would be limited to existing routes in Owyhee County.
- **Alternative I** focuses on enhancing and sustaining existing and historic uses of the planning area. This alternative would have the largest component of active recreation management, including Special Recreation Management Areas (SRMAs) for motorized recreation, hunting and fishing, hiking, and water-based recreation. Livestock grazing would be maintained near current forage allocation levels. This alternative would focus on implementing management to benefit mule deer more than the other alternatives. Restoration projects would focus on providing habitat for mule deer and special status species, including treatments in some non-native perennial communities. Annual communities would also be a focus for vegetation treatments. Vegetation treatments could use native or non-native species depending on vegetation objectives. Reducing the amount of wildland fire in the planning area would be addressed through treatments to move vegetation toward Fire Regime Condition Class 1, treatments for noxious weeds and invasive plants, and construction of fuel breaks.
- **Alternative II** focuses on increasing commercial uses throughout most of the planning area. Livestock grazing would be increased substantially. Non-native perennial communities would be actively maintained for livestock, and treatments in non-native annual communities would focus on converting these areas to a non-native, more fire tolerant, forage-producing perennial community. Native plant communities would be maintained. Other commercial uses, including energy development, would be allowed throughout most areas and have the fewest restrictions compared to the other alternatives. Vegetation treatments could use native or non-native species depending on vegetation and resource use objectives. Reducing the amount of wildland fire in the planning area would be addressed through treatments to move native vegetation toward Fire Regime Condition Class 1, treatments for noxious weeds and invasive plants, construction of fuel breaks, and fuels reduction through increased permitted livestock grazing.

- **Alternative III** focuses on restoring the resiliency of ecosystem structure and function through intensive management of fuels and enhanced fire suppression capabilities throughout the planning area. This alternative would provide for the highest amount of fuels treatments. Non-native perennial plant communities would be actively managed to contribute to wildland fire prevention and suppression efforts; this management would include increased levels of permitted livestock grazing. Treatments of annual communities would focus on converting these areas to non-native perennial fire-tolerant communities. Native plant communities would be restored to move toward their historic fire regime; extensive fuels reduction measures may be taken to manage native plant communities. Vegetation treatments may use both native and non-native species, with fire-tolerant and fire-resistant species having a high priority. Other uses would be allowed to the extent they do not contribute to an increase in wildland fire size and intensity. The quality and quantity of infrastructure such as roads and water would be increased to support fire suppression activities more in this alternative than in other alternatives.
- **Alternative IV** focuses on actively restoring the resiliency of ecosystem structure and function through restoration projects and managing uses. Priorities would be to treat at-risk or fragmented habitats and non-native perennial and annual communities. This alternative would provide for active restoration using more tools and more intensive approaches in more areas than in Alternative V. Vegetation treatments could use native or non-native species depending on vegetation objectives. Reducing the amount of wildland fire in the planning area would be addressed through treatments to move vegetation toward Fire Regime Condition Class 1, treatments for noxious weeds and invasive plants, and construction of fuel breaks. Alternative IV has been split into two sub-alternatives. The only difference between the sub-alternatives is the size of the Inside Desert and Jarbidge Foothills Areas of Critical Environmental Concern (ACECs); these ACECs would have larger boundaries in Alternative IV-A than in Alternative IV-B. Differences between Alternatives IV-A and IV-B also appear in sections in which ACEC management is a factor.
- **Alternative V** focuses on the restoration of habitats toward historic vegetation communities. In native plant communities, passive restoration approaches would be preferred. Active restoration would take place in non-native perennial and annual communities; treatments in non-native perennial communities would minimize soil disturbance. Restoration projects would focus on habitat for sage-grouse and other special status species as well as special designations. Vegetation treatments would use only native species. Reducing the amount of wildland fire in the planning area would be addressed through treatments to move vegetation toward Fire Regime Condition Class 1, treatments for noxious weeds and invasive plants, and construction of fuel breaks.
- **Alternative VI (Proposed RMP)** focuses on actively restoring the resiliency of sagebrush steppe ecosystem structure and function through restoration projects and enhanced fire management while balancing uses within the planning area. Vegetation treatments could use native or non-native species, depending on vegetation objectives. Upland vegetation treatments would focus on restoring non-native perennial and native grassland communities to native shrubland, focusing on restoring and connecting habitat for sage-grouse, slickspot peppergrass, other special status species, and big game. Alternative VI emphasizes reducing the extent and number of wildland fires through treatments to move vegetation toward Fire Regime Condition Class 1, treatments for noxious weeds and invasive plants, and construction of fuel breaks. Commercial uses, including energy development, would be allowed, but would be subject to the greatest restrictions within sage-grouse habitat as compared to the other alternatives. More public land would be retained in Alternative VI than the other alternatives. Transportation and travel in the majority of the planning area would be limited to designated routes except for designated play areas in the Deadman and Yahoo SRMAs. The Bruneau-Jarbidge Rivers Wilderness would be closed to motorized and mechanized uses.

Each alternative, as developed, provides a different emphasis for managing public lands and resources within the planning area, and each action alternative represents a complete and reasonable land use plan that meets the purpose and need described in Chapter 1.

The Proposed RMP

Alternative VI (Proposed RMP) was developed after the Draft RMP/EIS was published and comments were received and reviewed by the BLM. The Proposed RMP was developed to provide a practical and workable alternative to actively restore sagebrush steppe ecosystem structure, function, and resiliency

through restoration treatments and enhanced fire management. Although Alternative IV-B (Preferred Alternative) from the Draft RMP/EIS was used as the baseline, the BLM selected goals, objectives, and management actions from the other alternatives that integrated ecological, economic, and social principles in a manner that safeguards the long-term sustainability, diversity, and productivity of the land. Management actions were then refined based on analysis of the alternatives in the Draft RMP and feedback received through comments from the tribes; Federal, State, and county agencies; the public; and organizations. The BLM also incorporated into the Proposed RMP changes in laws, regulations, policy, and species status that occurred between the Draft RMP/EIS and the Proposed RMP/Final EIS.

Major Changes from the Draft RMP/EIS to the Proposed RMP/Final EIS

The BLM made numerous changes between the Draft RMP/EIS and the Proposed RMP/Final EIS. Changes made to the Proposed RMP/Final EIS were in response to a combination of public comments, updated information, and changes in BLM policy and management direction. None of the changes described here meet the regulatory definition for significance in 40 CFR 1508.27(a) and (b) because these changes resulted in minor modifications to what was considered in the Draft RMP/EIS and did not greatly alter the impacts analysis. These regulations require an agency preparing a NEPA document to review the changes for significant new circumstances or information relevant to environmental concerns and bearing on the Proposed RMP or its impacts, using context and intensity as the trigger for significance. The BLM has reviewed each change according to this regulatory standard and has determined that none of the changes, individually or collectively, require a supplement to this Proposed RMP/Final EIS. The following changes have been made between the Draft RMP/EIS and the Proposed RMP/Final EIS:

- The Jarbidge Field Office administrative boundary was corrected, which decreased acres in the planning area from 1,374,000 to 1,371,000.
- The Omnibus Public Lands Management Act (Public Law 111-11) was incorporated throughout the Proposed RMP/Final EIS through the following:
  - The Bruneau-Jarbidge Rivers Wilderness was integrated,
  - Former Wilderness Study Areas were removed,
  - Designated Wild and Scenic Rivers were integrated,
  - Travel Management in Owyhee County was incorporated, and
  - The Bruneau-Jarbidge Special Recreation Management Area (SRMA) was removed because the SRMA is within the boundary of the Bruneau-Jarbidge Rivers Wilderness.
- The Record of Decision and Resource Management Plan Amendments for Geothermal Leasing in the Western United States (BLM, 2008c) was incorporated.
- The Approved Resource Management Plan Amendments/Record of Decision for Designation of Energy Corridors on Bureau of Land Management-Administered Lands in the 11 Western States (BLM, 2009d) was incorporated.
- BLM Manual direction released after publication of the Draft RMP/EIS was incorporated.
- Vegetation data was updated due to large fires in 2007, 2010, and 2011.

The detailed description of the major changes from the Draft RMP/EIs to the Proposed RMP/Final EIS is included in Chapter 1, Section 1.7.

Comparison of the Alternatives

The following tables identify differences among the alternatives for each of the planning issues. Chapter 2 contains the full suite of goals, objectives, allocations, and management actions for each alternative.

Table ES-1 provides a summary of the primary differences between Alternative VI (Proposed RMP) and the other six alternatives as related to the planning issues.

Table ES-1. Summary Comparison of Alternatives.

No Action Alternative	Alternative I	Alternative II	Alternative III	Alternative IV	Alternative V	Alternative VI
Vegetation (Upland and Riparian)						
Upland Vegetation						
Goals						
No goal stated.	Manage vegetation to **enhance and sustain existing and historic uses and to improve big game winter range and habitat for sage-grouse.**	Manage vegetation to **increase commercial uses while maintaining native plant communities and habitat for sage-grouse.**	Manage vegetation to **reduce wildland fire size and intensity while maintaining habitat for sage-grouse.**	Manage vegetation to **restore the resiliency of ecosystem structure and function and reduce fragmentation of habitat for sage-grouse and other native species.**	Manage vegetation to **move toward historic vegetation communities by sustaining, improving, or increasing native plant communities that provide habitat for sage-grouse and other special status species.**	Manage vegetation to **restore the ability of the ecosystem to recover following a disturbance and reduce fragmentation of habitat for sage-grouse and other native species.**
Objectives						
Improve lands in poor ecological condition across all Multiple Use Areas (MUAs; Map 3). Improve lands in MUA 14 through natural plant succession and removal of livestock. Maintain lands that are in good and excellent ecological condition in MUA 10. Maintain non-native perennial communities.	Manage vegetation to achieve the Vegetation sub-group (VSG) acres (+/- 5%) described below: ***VMA A*** VSG — Desired Acres Annual 56,000 Non-Native Perennial 96,000 Non-Native Understory 3,000 Native Grassland 42,000 Native Shrubland 22,000 Unvegetated Areas 2,000 ***VMA B*** VSG — Desired Acres Annual 20,000 Non-Native	Manage vegetation to achieve the VSG acres (+/- 5%) described below: ***VMA A*** VSG — Desired Acres Annual 33,000 Non-Native Perennial 144,000 Non-Native Understory 3,000 Native Grassland 34,000 Native Shrubland 5,000 Unvegetated Areas 2,000 ***VMA B*** VSG — Desired Acres Annual 10,000 Non-Native Perennial 247,000	Manage vegetation to achieve the VSG acres (+/- 5%) described below: ***VMA A*** VSG — Desired Acres Annual 42,000 Non-Native Perennial 128,000 Non-Native Understory 3,000 Native Grassland 37,000 Native Shrubland 5,000 Unvegetated Areas 6,000 ***VMA B*** VSG — Desired Acres Annual 10,000 Non-Native Perennial 242,000	Manage vegetation to achieve the VSG acres (+/- 5%) described below: ***VMA A*** VSG — Desired Acres Annual 33,000 Non-Native Perennial 88,000 Non-Native Understory 3,000 Native Grassland 17,000 Native Shrubland 78,000 Unvegetated Areas 2,000 ***VMA B*** VSG — Desired Acres Annual 10,000 Non-Native Perennial 73,000	Manage vegetation to achieve the VSG acres (+/- 5%) described below: ***VMA A*** VSG — Desired Acres Annual 62,000 Non-Native Perennial 72,000 Non-Native Understory 26,000 Native Grassland 34,000 Native Shrubland 25,000 Unvegetated Areas 2,000 ***VMA B*** VSG — Desired Acres Annual 20,000 Non-Native Perennial 70,000	Manage vegetation to achieve the VSG acres (+/- 5%) described below: ***VMA A*** VSG — Desired Acres Annual 56,000 Non-Native Perennial 96,000 Non-Native Understory 3,000 Native Grassland 42,000 Native Shrubland 22,000 Unvegetated Areas 2,000 ***VMA B*** VSG — Desired Acres Annual 10,000 Non-Native Perennial 73,000

No Action Alternative	Alternative I	Alternative II	Alternative III	Alternative IV	Alternative V	Alternative VI
	Perennial 169,000 Non-Native Understory 13,000 Native Grassland 106,000 Native Shrubland 298,000 Unvegetated Areas 24,000 ***VMA C*** VSG / Desired Acres Annual 2,000 Non-Native Perennial 30,000 Non-Native Understory 7,000 Native Grassland 75,000 Native Shrubland 188,000 Unvegetated Areas 11,000 ***VMA D*** VSG / Desired Acres Annual 500 Non-Native Perennial 13,000 Non-Native Understory 12,000 Native Grassland 19,000 Native Shrubland 150,000 Unvegetated Areas 11,000	Non-Native Understory 13,000 Native Grassland 211,000 Native Shrubland 125,000 Unvegetated Areas 24,000 ***VMA C*** VSG / Desired Acres Annual 2,000 Non-Native Perennial 59,000 Non-Native Understory 13,000 Native Grassland 150,000 Native Shrubland 78,000 Unvegetated Areas 11,000 ***VMA D*** VSG / Desired Acres Annual 500 Non-Native Perennial 5,000 Non-Native Understory 12,000 Native Grassland 80,000 Native Shrubland 97,000 Unvegetated Areas 11,000	Non-Native Understory 19,000 Native Grassland 96,000 Native Shrubland 230,000 Unvegetated Areas 33,000 ***VMA C*** VSG / Desired Acres Annual 2,000 Non-Native Perennial 49,000 Non-Native Understory 26,000 Native Grassland 68,000 Native Shrubland 152,000 Unvegetated Areas 16,000 ***VMA D*** VSG / Desired Acres Annual 250 Non-Native Perennial 6,000 Non-Native Understory 11,000 Native Grassland 57,000 Native Shrubland 119,000 Unvegetated Areas 12,000	Non-Native Understory 76,000 Native Grassland 106,000 Native Shrubland 341,000 Unvegetated Areas 24,000 ***VMA C*** VSG / Desired Acres Annual 2,000 Non-Native Perennial 0 Non-Native Understory 48,000 Native Grassland 37,000 Native Shrubland 215,000 Unvegetated Areas 11,000 ***VMA D*** VSG / Desired Acres Annual 500 Non-Native Perennial 0 Non-Native Understory 5,000 Native Grassland 8,000 Native Shrubland 181,000 Unvegetated Areas 11,000	Non-Native Understory 160,000 Native Grassland 141,000 Native Shrubland 215,000 Unvegetated Areas 24,000 ***VMA C*** VSG / Desired Acres Annual 2,000 Non-Native Perennial 14,000 Non-Native Understory 58,000 Native Grassland 75,000 Native Shrubland 153,000 Unvegetated Areas 11,000 ***VMA D*** VSG / Desired Acres Annual 500 Non-Native Perennial 1,000 Non-Native Understory 15,000 Native Grassland 27,000 Native Shrubland 151,000 Unvegetated Areas 11,000	Non-Native Understory 76,000 Native Grassland 106,000 Native Shrubland 341,000 Unvegetated Areas 24,000 ***VMA C*** VSG / Desired Acres Annual 2,000 Non-Native Perennial 30,000 Non-Native Understory 17,000 Native Grassland 37,000 Native Shrubland 216,000 Unvegetated Areas 11,000 ***VMA D*** VSG / Desired Acres Annual 500 Non-Native Perennial 0 Non-Native Understory 5,000 Native Grassland 40,000 Native Shrubland 149,000 Unvegetated Areas 11,000

No Action Alternative	Alternative I	Alternative II	Alternative III	Alternative IV	Alternative V	Alternative VI
Management Actions						
The order of priority for vegetation treatment would be: • Areas where unacceptable soil loss is occurring, • Areas where the livestock operator is grazing at levels below preference, • Areas where excessive annual vegetation is causing management problems or economic burdens (i.e., season of use restriction or high fire management costs), • Areas where unacceptable wildlife habitat condition exists (appropriate seed mixtures for wildlife will be used), and • Areas for overall multiple use improvement using seed mixtures for both wildlife and livestock.	Focus restoration treatments on habitat for sage-grouse, other special status species, and mule deer. The priority for implementing vegetation treatments would be: • Treatments identified for Vegetation Management Area (VMA) C to improve habitat for mule deer and sage-grouse and • Treatments identified for VMA A to move toward perennial vegetation.	Focus vegetation on habitat for sage-grouse and other special status species. The priority for implementing vegetation treatments would be: • Treatments identified for VMA A to increase perennial forage for livestock and • Treatments identified for VMA B to increase forage for livestock.	Focus vegetation treatments on protecting or restoring habitat for sage-grouse and other special status species. The priority for implementing vegetation treatments would be: • Treatments identified for VMA A to help lengthen the fire return interval and • Treatments identified for VMA D to protect native shrubland communities.	Focus restoration treatments on habitat for sage-grouse, other special status species, mule deer, and pronghorn. The priority for implementing vegetation treatments would be: • Treatments identified for VMA D to improve sage-grouse habitat and • Treatments identified for VMA C to reconnect and expand habitat for sage-grouse.	Focus restoration treatments on habitat for sage-grouse and other special status species. The priority for implementing vegetation treatments would be: • Treatments identified for VMA A to move toward native perennial vegetation and • Treatments identified for VMA C to reconnect and expand habitat for sage-grouse.	Focus restoration on habitat for sage-grouse, slickspot peppergrass, other special status species, mule deer, and pronghorn. The priority for implementing vegetation treatments would be: • Treatments identified for VMA D to improve sage-grouse habitat and • Treatments identified for VMA C to reconnect and expand habitat for sage-grouse.
Burning is proposed to reduce the amount of big sagebrush and/or other brush on a site. Chemical control of	The toolbox to restore or treat upland vegetation communities would include:	The toolbox to restore or treat upland vegetation communities would include:	Same as Alternative II.	Same as Alternative II.	The toolbox to restore or treat upland vegetation communities would include:	Same as Alternative II.

No Action Alternative	Alternative I	Alternative II	Alternative III	Alternative IV	Alternative V	Alternative VI
sagebrush would not be allowed.	• Chemical, mechanical, and biological treatments; • Seeding and planting; and • Targeted grazing.	• Chemical, mechanical, and biological treatments; • Seeding and planting; • Targeted grazing; and • Prescribed fire.			• Chemical, mechanical, and biological treatments; • Seeding and planting; • Removal of grazing; and • Prescribed fire.	
No reference areas would be identified.	Establish 75 ungrazed reference areas (12,000 acres total) in annual, non-native perennial, non-native understory, native grassland, and native shrubland communities. Each reference area would be approximately 160 acres.	Establish 52 ungrazed reference areas (2,000 acres total) in native grassland and native shrubland communities, as well as non-native perennial communities that have burned multiple times in the last 20 years. Each reference area would be approximately 40 acres.	Establish 75 ungrazed reference areas (3,000 acres total) in annual, non-native perennial, non-native understory, native grassland, and native shrubland communities. Each reference area would be approximately 40 acres.	Establish 75 ungrazed reference areas (12,000 acres total) in annual, non-native perennial, non-native understory, native grassland, and native shrubland communities. Each reference area would be approximately 160 acres.	Establish 40 ungrazed reference areas (194,000 acres total) in annual, non-native perennial, non-native understory, native grassland, and native shrubland communities. Each reference area would consist of an entire pasture.	Establish up to 52 ungrazed upland reference areas in annual, non-native perennial, non-native understory, native grassland, and native shrubland communities. Each upland reference area could be up to 40 acres in size.
Riparian Vegetation						
Objectives						
Maintain 1987 condition of riparian habitat in Multiple Use Areas (MUAs) 4, 6, 7, 12, 13, and 16; **improve 44.4 miles** of riparian habitat in MUAs 10, 11, 14, and 15.	**Maintain 85 miles** of Priority 3 streams at proper functioning condition (PFC); **improve 60 miles** of Priority 1 streams to achieve PFC; and **improve the remaining 17 miles** of Priority 1 streams and **63 miles** of Priority 2 streams to be moving toward PFC over the life of the plan.	**Maintain 85 miles** of Priority 3 streams at PFC and improve the Priority 1 and 2 streams to be moving toward PFC over the life of the plan.	**Maintain 85 miles** of Priority 3 streams at PFC; **improve 77 miles** of Priority 1 streams and **21 miles** of Priority 2 streams to achieve PFC; and **improve the remaining 42 miles** of Priority 2 streams to be moving toward PFC over the life of the plan.	Same as Alternative III.	Same as Alternative III.	Same as Alternative III.

No Action Alternative	Alternative I	Alternative II	Alternative III	Alternative IV	Alternative V	Alternative VI
Management Actions						
Utilize a 1,000 foot (500 feet for each side) riparian buffer zone for the total exclusion of the following activities: • Oil and gas occupancy and/or surface disturbance and • Introduction of chemical toxicants as a result of construction, mining, or agriculture.	Identify Riparian Conservation Areas (RCAs) around riparian areas and wetlands that contain or are tributaries to streams that contain special status species or their habitat to protect riparian vegetation, fisheries, and water quality. RCA widths would be as follows: • **Category 1** – Fish-bearing streams: The RCA consists of the stream and the area on either side of the stream. This area extends from the edges of the active channel to the top of the inner gorge, to the outer edges of the 100-year floodplain, to the outer edges of the riparian vegetation, or 300 feet slope distance (600 feet, including both sides of the stream channel), whichever is widest. • **Category 2** – Permanently flowing nonfish-bearing streams: The RCA consists of the stream and the area on either side of the stream. This area extends from the edges of the active channel to the top of the inner gorge, to the outer edges of the 100-year floodplain, to the outer edges of the riparian vegetation, or 150 feet slope distance (300 feet, including both sides of the stream channel), whichever is widest. • **Category 3** – Ponds, lakes, reservoirs, and wetlands greater than one acre: The RCA consists of the body of water or wetland and the area to the outer edges of the riparian vegetation, to the extent of the seasonally saturated soil, or 150 feet slope distance from the edge of the maximum pool elevation of constructed ponds and reservoirs, or from the edge of the wetland, pond, or lake, whichever is widest. • **Category 4** – Seasonally flowing or intermittent streams, wetlands less than one acre, landslides, and landslide-prone areas: This category includes features with high variability in size and site-specific characteristics. The RCA includes the intermittent stream channel and the area to the top of the inner gorge, the intermittent stream channel or wetland and the area to the outer edges of the riparian vegetation, the area from the edges of the stream channel, wetland, or slide /landslide prone area, or 50 feet slope distance, whichever is widest.					
In those areas where fish/riparian values are identified as high priority, all other management practices would be designed to accommodate those priority needs.	Stream reaches with game fish or habitat suitable for game fish would be a high priority for restoration.	Fish-bearing stream reaches, including reaches containing game and non-game fish, would be a high priority for restoration.	Stream reaches and riparian areas with the potential to serve as fire breaks would be a high priority for restoration.	Stream reaches containing special status species or their habitat would be a high priority for restoration.	Stream reaches containing special status species or their habitat would be a high priority for restoration. Active restoration would be limited to FAR-DN and NF reaches.	Focus restoration on fish- bearing streams containing special status species.
No reference areas would be identified.	Establish 10 ungrazed riparian reference areas (3,000 acres total).	Establish 10 ungrazed riparian reference areas (1,000 acres total).	Establish 10 ungrazed riparian reference areas (1,000 acres total).	Establish 10 ungrazed riparian reference areas (3,000 acres total).	Establish 6 ungrazed riparian reference areas (23,000 acres total).	Establish up to 10 ungrazed riparian reference areas (up to 3,000 acres total).
Fuels Treatments, Fire Rehabilitation, and Fire Suppression						
Goals						
No goal stated.	Fire management strategies would result in firefighter and public safety and protection of property and natural and cultural resources, while considering suppression and rehabilitation costs.					
No goal stated.	Reduce fire hazard within the WUI.					
No goal stated.	Manage vegetation communities **outside the WUI to maintain or restore their fire regimes and mosaic of successional classes to within their historic range.**	Same as Alternative I.	Manage vegetation communities **to lengthen the fire return interval.**	Same as Alternative I.	Same as Alternative I.	Same as Alternative I.

No Action Alternative	Alternative I	Alternative II	Alternative III	Alternative IV	Alternative V	Alternative VI
Objectives						
No objective stated.	Strive to reduce average wildland fire size and number of human-caused fire starts within the Wildland Urban Interface (WUI).	Strive to reduce average wildland fire size and number of human-caused fire starts within the WUI.	Strive to reduce average wildland fire size, number of human-caused fire starts, and number of acres burned within and outside the WUI throughout the planning area.	Strive to reduce average wildland fire size and number of human-caused fire starts within the WUI.	Strive to reduce average wildland fire size and number of human-caused fire starts within the WUI.	Strive to reduce average wildland fire size, number of human-caused fire starts, and number of acres burned within and outside the WUI throughout the planning area.
No objective stated.	Reduce acres burned in vegetation types outside the WUI where more wildland fires have burned than desired/historic levels to enhance and sustain existing and historic uses of the planning area.	Reduce acres burned in vegetation types outside the WUI where more wildland fires have burned than desired/historic levels to facilitate commercial use of the planning area.	No similar objective stated.	Reduce acres burned in vegetation types outside the WUI where more wildland fires have burned than desired/historic levels to achieve resilient ecosystem structure and function.	Reduce acres burned in vegetation types outside the WUI where more wildland fires have burned than in the Historic Fire Regime.	No similar objective stated.
No similar objective.	Manage plant communities **outside the WUI to move toward Fire Regime Condition Class (FRCC) 1.**	Manage **native plant communities outside the WUI, excluding Sandberg/non-native areas, to move toward FRCC 1.**	Manage **native plant communities outside the WUI to move toward FRCC 1. Manage non-native plant communities to reduce wildland fire size and intensity, which may not be toward FRCC 1.**	Same as Alternative I.	Same as Alternative I.	Manage **native plant communities outside the WUI to move toward FRCC 1. Manage non-native plant communities to reduce wildland fire size and intensity.**
No similar objective.	Implement fuels treatments to **protect critical suppression areas; limit the spread, size, and intensity of wildland fire; and maintain or improve vegetation.**	Same as Alternative I.	Implement fuels treatments to **protect critical suppression areas and limit the spread, size, and intensity of wildland fire.**	Same as Alternative I.	Same as Alternative I.	Same as Alternative I.
Rehabilitate public lands affected by wildland fires to accomplish multiple use objectives and	Rehabilitate and stabilize areas to help stabilize soils, promote natural recovery, **and establish pre-fire or**	Same as Alternative I.	Rehabilitate and stabilize areas to help stabilize soils, promote natural recovery, **and establish fire-tolerant**	Same as Alternative I.	Same as Alternative I.	Same as Alternative I.

No Action Alternative	Alternative I	Alternative II	Alternative III	Alternative IV	Alternative V	Alternative VI
designed to reduce fire size.	**historic vegetation communities.**		**vegetation communities.**			
Management Actions						
Manage the entire planning area (1,371,000 acres) for full suppression.	Critical suppression areas within the planning area would be (**491,000 acres**): • Wildland Urban Interface (WUI); • Bruneau-Jarbidge, Lower Bruneau Canyon, Middle Snake, and Salmon Falls Creek Areas of Critical Environmental Concerns (ACECs); and • Key sage-grouse habitat.	Critical suppression areas within the planning area would be (**170,000 acres**): • WUI.	Critical suppression areas within the planning area would be (**476,000 acres**): • WUI, • Bruneau-Jarbidge and Salmon Falls Creek ACECs, and • Key sage-grouse habitat.	Critical suppression areas within the planning area would be (**594,000 acres in Alternative VI-A**; **552,000 acres in Alternative VI-B**): • WUI; • Bruneau-Jarbidge, Inside Desert, Jarbidge Foothills, and Lower Bruneau Canyon ACECs; and • Key sage-grouse habitat.	Critical suppression areas within the planning area would be (**1,041,000 acres**): • WUI; • Lower Bruneau Canyon, Middle Snake, and Sagebrush Sea ACECs; and • Key sage-grouse habitat.	Critical suppression areas within the planning area would be (**597,000 acres**): • WUI, • ACECs, • Saylor Creek Herd Management Area, • Occupied habitat and designated critical habitat for slickspot peppergrass, • Designated critical habitat for bull trout, and • Key sage-grouse habitat.
No similar management action.	Improve water availability for fire suppression **in high recreational use areas**, in accordance with Idaho State Law regarding the appropriation and use of water.	Improve water availability for fire suppression **in native plant communities and the Wildland Urban Interface (WUI),** in accordance with Idaho and Nevada State Law regarding the appropriation and use of water.	Improve water availability for fire suppression **throughout the planning area**, in accordance with Idaho and Nevada State Law regarding the appropriation and use of water.	Same as Alternative III.	**Maintain water availability for fire suppression at 2009 levels.**	Same as Alternative III.
No similar management action.	Consistent with other resource objectives, implement measures to reduce response time for fire suppression activities including, but not limited to: • **Building new**	Consistent with resource use objectives, implement measures to reduce response time for fire suppression activities including, but not limited to: • **Building new**	Implement measures to reduce response time for fire suppression activities including: • **Building new guard stations,** • **Building new or improving**	Same as Alternative I.	Consistent with other resource objectives, implement measures to reduce response time for fire suppression activities including, but not limited to: • **Improving roads,**	Implement measures to reduce response time for fire suppression activities including: • **Building new guard stations,** • **Building new or improving**

No Action Alternative	Alternative I	Alternative II	Alternative III	Alternative IV	Alternative V	Alternative VI
	guard stations, • **Improving roads,** • **Building new roads in areas with limited access,** • **Improving stream crossings, and** • **Developing better signage.**	**guard stations,** • **Improving roads,** • **Building new roads in areas with limited access,** • **Improving stream crossings, and** • **Developing better signage.**	**existing airstrips,** • **Building helipads,** • **Improving roads,** • **Building new roads in areas with limited access,** • **Improving stream crossings, and** • **Developing better signage.**		• **Improving stream crossings, and** • **Developing better signage.**	**existing airstrips,** • **Building helipads,** • **Improving roads,** • **Building new roads,** • **Improving stream crossings, and** • **Developing better signage.**
No similar management action.	Implement fuels treatments to reduce fuel loads with consideration for other resource and resource use objectives.	Same as Alternative I.	Implement fuels treatments to reduce fuel loads as appropriate to reduce wildland fire size and intensity.	Implement fuels treatments to reduce fuel loads with consideration for other resource objectives.	Same as Alternative IV.	Same as Alternative IV.
No similar management action.	Fuels treatments in the WUI would focus on **areas with high and high/moderate relative risk ratings in the northern portion of the planning area.**	Same as Alternative I.	Fuels treatments in the WUI would focus on **areas with high, high/moderate, and moderate relative risk ratings in the northern portion of the planning area and near Roseworth and Three Creek.**	Same as Alternative I.	Fuels treatments in the WUI would focus on **areas with high relative risk ratings in the northern portion of the planning area.**	Same as Alternative III.
No similar management action.	Outside Special Recreation Management Areas (SRMAs), fuel breaks would **follow disturbance corridors or would protect restoration and Emergency Stabilization and Burned Area Rehabilitation (ES&BAR) treatments; fuel**	Fuel breaks would **focus on protecting commercial facilities; fuel breaks would also be placed in non-native communities to protect native communities.**	Fuel breaks would **focus on strategic locations to disrupt the continuity of fuels and to protect structures and important resources such as habitat for sage-grouse and slickspot peppergrass.**	Fuel breaks would **follow disturbance corridors or would protect restoration or ES&BAR treatments.**	Fuel breaks would only **follow designated roads and designated primitive roads.**	Fuel breaks would **focus on strategic locations to disrupt the continuity of fuels and to protect structures and important resources such as habitat for sage-grouse and slickspot peppergrass.**

No Action Alternative	Alternative I	Alternative II	Alternative III	Alternative IV	Alternative V	Alternative VI
	breaks for SRMAs could be used to protect adjacent areas, protect facilities, and protect high-use areas.					
No similar management action.	No similar management action.	Landscape-scale fuels reduction would occur primarily through increased allocation of vegetation for permitted livestock grazing and through increased livestock grazing utilization.	Landscape-scale fuels reduction would occur primarily through increased allocation of annual and non-native perennial vegetation for permitted livestock grazing and through increased livestock grazing utilization in annual and non-native perennial communities.	No similar management action.	No similar management action.	No similar management action.
Habitat for Fish, Wildlife, and Special Status Plants and Animals						
Goals						
No goal stated.	Manage upland vegetation communities to promote soil stability, water infiltration, nutrient cycling, and energy flow; provide habitat for sage-grouse and other sagebrush steppe obligates; and provide for multiple use.					
No goal stated.	Manage vegetation to enhance and sustain existing and historic uses and to improve big game winter range and habitat for sage-grouse.	Manage vegetation to increase commercial uses while maintaining native plant communities and habitat for sage-grouse.	Manage vegetation to reduce wildland fire size and intensity while maintaining habitat for sage-grouse.	Manage vegetation to restore the resiliency of ecosystem structure and function and reduce fragmentation of habitat for sage-grouse and other native species.	Manage vegetation to move toward historic vegetation communities by sustaining, improving, or increasing native plant communities that provide habitat for sage-grouse and other special status species.	Manage vegetation to restore the ability of the ecosystem to recover following a disturbance and reduce fragmentation of habitat for sage-grouse and other native species.
No goal stated.	Manage public lands to contribute to the conservation and recovery of sage-grouse and other special status species.					
Objectives						
Protect and enhance Endangered, Threatened, and Sensitive species' habitats in order to maintain or enhance populations within the planning area.	Maintain or improve the quality and quantity of habitat for sage-grouse and other special status species by managing public land activities to sustain or benefit those	Maintain or improve the quality of habitat for sage-grouse and other special status species by managing public land activities to sustain or benefit those species.	Maintain or improve the quality of habitat for sage-grouse and other special status species by managing public land activities to sustain or benefit those species.	Maintain or improve the quality and quantity of habitat for sage-grouse and other special status species by managing public land activities to sustain or benefit those	Maintain or improve the quality and quantity of habitat for sage-grouse and other special status species by managing public land activities to sustain or benefit those	Maintain or improve the quality and quantity of habitat for sage-grouse and other special status species by managing public land activities to sustain or benefit those

No Action Alternative	Alternative I	Alternative II	Alternative III	Alternative IV	Alternative V	Alternative VI
Enhance, restore and/or maintain habitat conditions and availability for special status species and prevent all avoidable loss of habitat.	species.			species.	species.	species.
Management Actions						
Maintain present areas for sage-grouse nesting habitat in Multiple Use Area (MUA) 13, and improve sage-grouse nesting through seeding and rehabilitation in MUA 10.	Manage native shrubland communities in a landscape context to ensure that the seasonal habitat needs of sage-grouse and other sagebrush-obligate species are met across the planning area, where site conditions are suitable.					
Manage all wildlife habitat within the planning area to provide a diversity of vegetation and habitats.	Focus vegetation treatments for mule deer winter range. Focus restoration treatments identified for each Vegetation Management Area (VMA) on habitat for sage-grouse, other special status species, and mule deer.	Focus vegetation treatments identified for each VMA on habitat for sage-grouse and other special status species.	Focus vegetation treatments identified for each VMA on protecting or restoring habitat for sage-grouse and other special status species.	Focus vegetation treatments for mule deer and pronghorn winter range. Focus restoration treatments identified for each VMA on habitat for sage-grouse, other special status species, mule deer, and pronghorn.	Focus restoration treatments identified for each VMA on habitat for sage-grouse and other special status species.	Focus vegetation treatments for mule deer and pronghorn in winter range and migration corridors. Focus restoration treatments identified for each VMA on habitat for sage-grouse, slickspot peppergrass, other special status species, mule deer, and pronghorn.
No similar management action.	Upland vegetation management to benefit sage-grouse and other sagebrush-obligate special status species includes but is not limited to: • Restoring annual, non-native perennial, and	Upland vegetation management to benefit sage-grouse and other sagebrush-obligate special status species includes, but is not limited to: • Allowing native grassland communities to	Upland vegetation management to benefit sage-grouse and other sagebrush-obligate special status species includes, but is not limited to: • Introducing shrubs to native grassland	Upland vegetation management to benefit sage-grouse and other sagebrush-obligate special status species includes, but is not limited to: • Restoring annual, non-native perennial, and	Upland vegetation management to benefit sage-grouse and other sagebrush-obligate special status species includes, but is not limited to: • Restoring annual communities toward native and	Upland vegetation management to benefit sage-grouse and other sagebrush-obligate special status species includes: • Restoring annual, non-native perennial, and non-native

No Action Alternative	Alternative I	Alternative II	Alternative III	Alternative IV	Alternative V	Alternative VI
	non-native understory communities toward native; • Restoring native grassland communities to native shrublands; and • Introducing forbs and late-seral grasses to native shrubland communities.	transition to native shrubland communities and • Introducing late-seral grasses to native grassland and native shrubland communities.	communities and • Protecting islands of sagebrush habitat through extensive fuel breaks.	non-native understory communities toward native; • Restoring native grassland communities to native shrublands; and • Introducing forbs and late-seral grasses to native shrubland communities.	• Introducing shrubs to non-native perennial communities and native grassland communities.	understory communities toward native; • Restoring native grassland communities to native shrublands; and • Introducing forbs and late-seral grasses to native shrubland communities.
No similar management action.	Critical suppression areas within the planning area **include** key sage-grouse habitat.	Critical suppression areas within the planning area **do not include** key sage grouse habitat.	Same as Alternative I.	Same as Alternative I.	Same as Alternative I.	Same as Alternative I.
No similar management action.	Follow BLM guidelines for livestock grazing management in sage-grouse habitat.					
No similar management action.	Locate new transmission and phone lines, communications towers, meteorological towers, and wind turbines **at least one to three miles** away from occupied and unknown-status sage-grouse leks if it can be documented the structure would not conflict with the lek.	Locate new transmission and phone lines, communications towers, meteorological towers, and wind turbines **more than one mile** from occupied sage-grouse leks.	Locate new transmission and phone lines, communications towers, meteorological towers, and wind turbines **more than three miles** from occupied and unknown-status sage-grouse leks.	Locate new transmission and phone lines, communications towers, meteorological towers, and wind turbines **more than five miles** from occupied and unknown-status sage-grouse leks.	Same as Alternative IV.	Outside the sage-grouse management area, locate new tall structures (e.g. overhead power and phone lines, communications towers, meteorological towers, and wind turbines) **more than four miles** from occupied and unknown-status sage-grouse leks.
No similar management action.	Restrict wind energy site testing, monitoring, and development from occupied habitat for special status plants and animals, and	Restrict wind turbines and meteorological towers from occupied habitat for Endangered, Threatened, Proposed,	Restrict wind energy site testing and monitoring and wind energy development from occupied habitat for special status	Restrict wind energy site testing and monitoring and wind energy development from occupied and suitable habitat for	Same as Alternative IV.	Outside the sage-grouse management area, renewable energy site testing, monitoring, and development should

No Action Alternative	Alternative I	Alternative II	Alternative III	Alternative IV	Alternative V	Alternative VI
	cultural resources where direct and indirect adverse effects cannot be mitigated.	and Candidate species where their direct adverse effects cannot be mitigated.	plants and animals, and cultural resources where their direct and indirect adverse effects cannot be mitigated.	special status species, wildlife habitat, and cultural resources where their direct and indirect adverse effects cannot be mitigated.		avoid special status species habitat unless unavoidable adverse effects can be mitigated.
Crucial wildlife habitats shown below would be open to mineral leasing with No Surface Occupancy during the following time periods: • December through mid-February in sage-grouse and sharp-tailed grouse winter range, • Mid-February through June in sage-grouse and sharp-tailed grouse breeding grounds, and • April through June in within two miles of leks in sage-grouse and sharp-tailed grouse nesting and brood rearing habitat.	Key sage-grouse habitat would be open to mineral leasing with moderate constraints: No surface use would be allowed (e.g., exploration, construction, and drilling) within key sage-grouse habitat from mid-February through mid-June.	Key sage-grouse habitat would be open to mineral leasing without constraints.	Same as Alternative II.	Same as Alternative I.	Same as Alternative I.	The sage-grouse management area would be open to mineral leasing with moderate constraints: No surface use would be allowed (e.g., exploration, construction, and drilling) within the sage-grouse management area from March through June.
Livestock Forage						
Allocations						
Continue allocating approximately **200,000 animal unit months (AUMs)** for livestock. As the plan is implemented, between 160,000 and 260,000 AUMs could be issued for livestock depending on implementation of	Allocate vegetation production as follows: • Native perennial grass production: o 65% to 75% to watershed and wildlife, o Less than 1% to wild	Allocate vegetation production as follows: • Native perennial grass production: o 50% to 60% to watershed and wildlife and o 40% to 50%	Allocate vegetation production as follows: • Native perennial grass production: o 55% to 65% to watershed and wildlife, o Less than 1% to wild	Allocate vegetation production as follows: • Native perennial grass production: o 75% to 85% to watershed and wildlife, o Less than1% to wild	Allocate vegetation production as follows: • Native perennial grass production: o 80% to 90% to watershed and wildlife, o Less than1% to wild	Allocate vegetation production as follows: • Native perennial grass production: o 60% or greater to watershed and wildlife, o Less than 1%

No Action Alternative	Alternative I	Alternative II	Alternative III	Alternative IV	Alternative V	Alternative VI
treatments described in the *Upland Vegetation* section.	horses, and o 25% to 35% to livestock. • Non-native perennial grass production: o 60% to 70% to watershed and wildlife, o Less than 1% to wild horses, and o 30% to 40% to livestock. • Annual grass production: o 70% to 80% to watershed and wildlife and o 20% to 30% to livestock. • Shrub and forb production: o 89% to 92% to watershed and wildlife and o 8% to 11% to livestock. Allocate approximately **189,000 to 259,000 AUMs** to livestock at initial implementation and approximately **179,000 to 245,000** at full implementation.	to livestock. • Non-native perennial grass production: o 40% to 50% to watershed and wildlife and o 50% to 60% to livestock. • Annual grass production: o 20% to 30% to watershed and wildlife and o 70% to 80% to livestock. • Shrub and forb production: o 84% to 88% to watershed and wildlife and o 12% to 16% to livestock. Allocate approximately **350,000 to 423,000 AUMs** to livestock at initial implementation and approximately **362,000 to 440,000** at full implementation.	horses, and o 35% to 45% to livestock. • Non-native perennial grass production: o 50% to 60% to watershed and wildlife, o Less than 1% to wild horses, and o 40% to 50% to livestock. • Annual grass production: o 50% to 60% to watershed and wildlife and o 40% to 50% to livestock. • Shrub and forb production: o 86% to 89% to watershed and wildlife and o 11% to 14% to livestock. Allocate approximately **273,000 to 344,000 AUMs** to livestock at initial implementation and approximately **276,000 to 348,000** at full implementation.	horses, and o 15% to 25% to livestock. • Non-native perennial grass production: o 70% to 80% to watershed and wildlife, o Less than1% to wild horses, and o 20% to 30% to livestock. • Annual grass production: o 100% to watershed and wildlife. • Shrub and forb production: o 100% to watershed and wildlife. Allocate approximately **94,000 to 147,000 AUMs** for livestock at initial implementation in Alternative IV-A and approximately **97,000 to 151,000** in Alternative IV-B. At full implementation, allocate approximately **78,000 to 123,000 AUMs** for livestock in Alternative IV-A and **81,000 to 127,000** in Alternative IV-B.	horses, and o 10% to 20% to livestock. • Non-native perennial grass production: o 80% to 90% to watershed and wildlife, o Less than 1% to wild horses, and o 10% to 20% to livestock. • Annual grass production: o 100% to watershed and wildlife. • Shrub and forb production: o 100% to watershed and wildlife. Allocate approximately **46,000 to 93,000 AUMs** for livestock at initial implementation and approximately **42,000 to 85,000** at full implementation.	to wild horses, and o Up to 40% to livestock. • Non-native perennial grass production: o Up to 70% to watershed and wildlife, o Less than 1% to wild horses, and o Up to 45% to livestock. • Annual grass production: o Up to 60% to watershed and wildlife and o Up to 50% to livestock. • Shrub and forb production: o Up to 89% to watershed and wildlife and o Up to 14% to livestock. Allocate approximately **216,000 to 326,000 AUMs** for livestock at initial implementation and approximately **186,000 to 279,000** at full implementation.

No Action Alternative	Alternative I	Alternative II	Alternative III	Alternative IV	Alternative V	Alternative VI
Livestock Grazing						
Goals and Objectives						
Design and establish grazing management practices to meet fisheries, riparian, and water quality needs.	Provide for livestock grazing through proper grazing management to **enhance and sustain existing and historic uses and to improve habitat for big game and sage-grouse.**	Provide for livestock grazing through proper grazing management to **maintain or improve the condition of forage resources while maintaining native plant communities and habitat for sage-grouse.**	Provide for livestock grazing through proper grazing management to **reduce wildland fire size and intensity while maintaining habitat for sage-grouse.**	Provide for livestock grazing through proper grazing management to **support restoration of the resiliency of ecosystem structure and function and to reduce fragmentation of habitat for sage-grouse and other native species.**	Provide for livestock grazing through proper grazing management **to move vegetation toward historic plant communities that provide habitat for sage-grouse and other special status species.**	Allocate a stable level of available forage for livestock grazing through proper grazing and adaptive management to **support maintenance and restoration of resilient ecosystem structure and function.**
Allocations						
The majority of the planning area would be available for livestock grazing (**1,412,000 acres**). Salmon Falls Creek Canyon would not be available for livestock grazing (**3,000 acres**). An additional **48,000 acres** are not contained within grazing allotments and therefore are not grazed, even though the 1987 RMP does not specifically make these areas unavailable for livestock grazing; these areas would continue to be unavailable for livestock grazing.	The majority of the planning area would be available for livestock grazing (**1,389,000 acres**). The following areas would not be available for livestock grazing (**74,000 acres**): • Canyons associated with the Bruneau and Jarbidge Rivers and Salmon Falls Creek; • Middle Snake Area of Critical Environmental Concern (ACEC), except the Asquena pasture; • Wildlife tracts; • Reference areas; • Areas open to cross-country motorized vehicle use; and • Areas not	The majority of the planning area would be available for livestock grazing (**1,408,000 acres**). The following areas would not be available for livestock grazing (**55,000 acres**): • Canyons associated with the Bruneau and Jarbidge Rivers and Salmon Falls Creek, • Reference areas, • Wildlife tracts, and • Areas not contained within grazing allotments.	The majority of the planning area would be available for livestock grazing (**1,407,000 acres**). The following areas would not be available for livestock grazing (**56,000 acres**): • Canyons associated with the Bruneau and Jarbidge Rivers and Salmon Falls Creek, • Reference areas, • Wildlife tracts, and • Areas not contained within grazing allotments.	The majority of the planning area would be available for livestock grazing (**1,324,000 acres in Alternative IV-A; 1,355,000 acres in Alternative IV-B**). The following areas would not be available for livestock grazing (**139,000 acres in Alternative IV-A; 108,000 acres in Alternative IV-B**): • Canyons or riparian corridors associated with the Bruneau and Jarbidge Rivers and the following creeks: Deer (NV), Dave, Rocky Canyon, and Salmon Falls; • Inside Desert ACEC; • Wildlife tracts; • Reference areas; and	The majority of the planning area would be available for livestock grazing (**1,160,000 acres**). The following areas would be not available for livestock grazing (**303,000 acres**): • Canyons or riparian corridors associated with the Bruneau and Jarbidge Rivers and the following creeks: Upper Cedar, Deer (ID), Deer (NV), Clover, Rocky Canyon, Flat, Shack, Dave, China, and Salmon Falls; • Middle Snake, Sand Point, and Lower Bruneau Canyon ACECs; • The Brown's Bench/China Mountain area;	The majority of the planning area would be available for livestock grazing (**1,406,000 acres**). The following areas would not be available for livestock grazing (**57,000 acres**): • Canyons associated with the Bruneau and Jarbidge Rivers and Salmon Falls Creek (below the dam), • Reference areas, • Salmon Falls Creek ACEC, • Wildlife tracts, and • Areas not contained within grazing allotments.

No Action Alternative	Alternative I	Alternative II	Alternative III	Alternative IV	Alternative V	Alternative VI
	contained within grazing allotments.			• Areas not contained within grazing allotments.	• Wildlife tracts; • Reference areas; and • Areas not contained within grazing allotments.	
Management Actions						
Develop grazing systems to maintain condition in Multiple Use Areas (MUA) 4. Develop grazing management systems on fair condition range in MUA 11 to improve to good or better condition. Additional grazing systems would be implemented elsewhere.	Manage livestock grazing to ensure achievement of or movement towards meeting *Idaho Standards for Rangeland Health and Guidelines for Livestock Grazing Management 2005*.					
	Implement adaptive management using grazing use indicators to meet resource and special designation area objectives. Grazing use indicators include: • Utilization for upland vegetation and riparian areas, • Bank and soil surface alteration, and • Other indicators identified on an allotment-specific basis depending on the resources present.					
	Implement drought management guidelines during periods of drought to maintain or achieve long-term resource productivity (Appendix F).					
No similar management action.	Temporary Non-Renewable (TNR) permits would be allowed except in the following areas: • Pastures containing areas within the Bruneau-Jarbidge Rivers Wilderness, • The riparian pasture of the Lower Saylor Creek Allotment in the Sand Point Area of Critical Environmental Concern (ACEC), • Pastures comprised of more than 50% big game winter	Temporary Non-Renewable (TNR) permits would be allowed, except in pastures containing areas within the Bruneau-Jarbidge Rivers Wilderness. Criteria for issuing TNR permits in a particular pasture would include: • TNR permits may be allowed in years where additional forage for livestock is temporarily available, as determined by utilization levels; • TNR permits must	Temporary Non-Renewable (TNR) permits would be allowed except in the following areas: • Pastures containing areas within the Bruneau-Jarbidge Rivers Wilderness, • The riparian pasture of the Lower Saylor Creek Allotment in the Sand Point Area of Critical Environmental Concern, • Pastures comprised of more than 50% big game winter	Temporary Non-Renewable (TNR) permits would be allowed except in the following areas: • Pastures containing areas within the Bruneau-Jarbidge Rivers Wilderness, • The riparian pasture of the Lower Saylor Creek Allotment in the Sand Point ACEC, • Pastures comprised of more than 50% big game winter range, or • Pastures	Temporary Non-Renewable (TNR) permits would not be issued.	Temporary Non-Renewable (TNR) permits would be considered in the Jarbidge Field Office. However, TNR permits would not be allowed in the following areas: • Pastures containing areas within the Bruneau-Jarbidge Rivers Wilderness and • The riparian pasture of the Lower Saylor Creek Allotment in the Sand Point ACEC.

No Action Alternative	Alternative I	Alternative II	Alternative III	Alternative IV	Alternative V	Alternative VI
	range, or • Pastures comprised of more than 50% native communities (by cover) excluding Sandberg/non-native areas.	be consistent with the drought management guidelines; • TNR permits may not be allowed within the operation of the permittee if grazing use criteria are exceeded in any pasture in planning area; and • TNR permits must be consistent with other resource objectives.	range, or • Pastures comprised of more than 50% native communities (by cover) excluding Sandberg/non-native areas.	comprised of more than 25% native communities (by cover) excluding Sandberg/non-native areas.		
Recreation						
Goals and Objectives						
Protect the Salmon Falls Creek Canyon (rim-to-rim) for its natural and scenic values through special designation and management as a Special Recreation Management Area (SRMA).	Provide and sustain a variety of dispersed and developed recreational opportunities and experiences while avoiding or minimizing resource impacts. Provide basic information on recreational opportunities on public lands not designated as Special Recreation Management Areas (SRMAs) or Extensive Recreation Management Areas (ERMAs). Provide access and minimal facilities (e.g., signs, protective fences) as needed to ensure visitor health and safety, reduce user conflict, and protect resources.					
Allocations						
Continue managing the following SRMAs: • Hagerman-Owsley Bridge SRMA (3,000 acres), • Oregon Trail SRMA (16,000 acres), • Bruneau-Jarbidge SRMA (57,000 acres), • Jarbidge Forks	Manage **326,000 acres** as SRMAs. Designate the following SRMAs: • Deadman/Yahoo SRMA (36,000 acres), • Balanced Rock SRMA (500 acres), • Little Pilgrim SRMA (300	Manage 7**,000 acres** as SRMAs. Designate the following SRMAs: • Little Pilgrim SRMA (300 acres), • Jarbidge Forks SRMA (2,000 acres), and • Salmon Falls Reservoir SRMA	Manage **42,000 acres** as SRMAs. Designate the following SRMAs: • Deadman/Yahoo SRMA (34,000 acres), • Balanced Rock SRMA (500 acres), • Little Pilgrim SRMA (300	Manage **190,000 acres** as SRMAs. Designate the following SRMAs: • Deadman/Yahoo SRMA (34,000 acres), • Jarbidge Forks SRMA (2,000 acres), • Canyonlands SRMA (149,000	Manage **5,000 acres** as SRMAs. Designate the following SRMAs: • Yahoo SRMA (3,000 acres) and • Jarbidge Forks SRMA (2,000 acres).	Manage **20,000 acres** as SRMAs and **304,000 acres** as ERMAs. Designate the following SRMAs: • Yahoo SRMA (3,000 acres), • Deadman SRMA (13,000 acres), • Jarbidge Forks SRMA (2,000

No Action Alternative	Alternative I	Alternative II	Alternative III	Alternative IV	Alternative V	Alternative VI
SRMA (4,000 acres), and • Salmon Falls Creek SRMA (6,000 acres).	acres), • Jarbidge Forks SRMA (2,000 acres), • Canyonlands SRMA (149,000 acres), • Jarbidge Foothills SRMA (133,000 acres), and • Salmon Falls Reservoir SRMA (5,000 acres).	(5,000 acres).	acres), • Jarbidge Forks SRMA (2,000 acres), and • Salmon Falls Reservoir SRMA (5,000 acres).	acres), and • Salmon Falls Reservoir SRMA (5,000 acres).		acres), • Balanced Rock SRMA (500 acres), • Little Pilgrim SRMA (300 acres), and • Salmon Falls Reservoir SRMA (1,000 acres). Designate the following ERMAs: • Jarbidge Foothills ERMA (133,000 acres), • Canyonlands ERMA (149,000 acres), • Rosevear ERMA (19,000 acres), and • Luds Point ERMA (3,000 acres).
Management Actions						
No similar management action.	The Deadman/Yahoo Special Recreation Management Area (SRMA) would consist of four Recreation Management Zones (RMZs): • Deadman, • Pasadena, • Yahoo, and • Rosevear Gulch.	No similar management action.	The Deadman/Yahoo SRMA would consist of three RMZs: • Deadman, • Yahoo, and • Rosevear Gulch.	Same as Alternative III.	No similar management action.	No similar management action.
No similar management action.	The Salmon Falls Reservoir SRMA would consist of three RMZs: • Antelope Bay, • Cedar Creek, and • Luds Point.	Same as Alternative I.	Same as Alternative I.	Same as Alternative I.	No similar management action.	The Salmon Falls Reservoir SRMA would consist of two RMZs: • Antelope Bay and • Cedar Creek.

No Action Alternative	Alternative I	Alternative II	Alternative III	Alternative IV	Alternative V	Alternative VI
No similar management action.	Dispersed camping would be allowed. Dispersed camping may be closed or limited seasonally if resource objectives are impacted.	Same as Alternative I.	Same as Alternative I.	Same as Alternative I.	Same as Alternative I.	Dispersed camping would be allowed in any of the existing dispersed campsites adjacent to, or at the end of existing roads and motorized routes. Dispersed camping up to 100 feet from center line of existing roads or trails would be allowed if site is accessed by the most direct route possible. Dispersed camping may be closed or limited seasonally or as impacts or environmental conditions warrant.
No similar management action.	Require organized group permits for groups with **50 or more people.**	Same as Alternative I.	Require organized group permits for groups with **30 or more people.**	Same as Alternative III,	Require organized group permits for groups with **20 or more people.**	Authorize SRPs for commercial use or competitive events. Organized group/event permits may be required for group outdoor recreation activities or events which are neither commercial nor competitive at the discretion of the BLM authorized officer.
No similar management action.	Game retrieval using motorized vehicles would be allowed within 300 feet of a designated route, but would not be allowed within areas closed to motorized vehicle use.	Game retrieval using motorized vehicles would be allowed off designated routes, but would not be allowed within areas closed to motorized vehicle use. Motorized or mechanized game retrieval would not be allowed within the	Game retrieval using motorized vehicles would not be allowed off designated routes.	Same as Alternative III.	Same as Alternative III.	Same as Alternative III.

No Action Alternative	Alternative I	Alternative II	Alternative III	Alternative IV	Alternative V	Alternative VI
		Bruneau-Jarbidge Rivers Wilderness.				
Energy Development						
Objectives						
No similar objective.	Provide for the development of renewable energy resources, transportation routes, utility corridors, transmission lines, communication sites and other uses with consideration for resource objectives.	Same as Alternative I.	Provide for the development of renewable energy resources, transportation routes, utility corridors, transmission lines, communication sites and other uses with consideration for resource objectives and wildland fire prevention and suppression objectives.	Same as Alternative I.	Same as Alternative I.	Same as Alternative I.
Allocations						
The following areas would be utility avoidance/restricted areas (935,000 acres): • Areas within US Air Force (USAF) Military Operating Areas; • Eligible, suitable, and designated Wild and Scenic River corridors; • Paleontological sites at Glenns Ferry and Pasadena Valley (surface, underground); • Sand Point Area of Critical Environmental Concern (ACEC) (surface,	The following areas would be avoidance areas for right-of-ways (ROWs; 1,001,000 acres): • Areas within USAF Military Operating Areas; • Lands with Wilderness Characteristics managed for wilderness characteristics; • Oregon National Historic Trail protective zone; • Eligible, suitable, and designated Wild and Scenic River corridors; and • Bruneau-Jarbidge	The following areas would be avoidance areas for right-of-ways (ROWs; 1,001,000 acres): • Areas within USAF Military Operating Areas; • Oregon National Historic Trail protective zone; and • Eligible, suitable, and designated Wild and Scenic River corridors.	The following areas would be avoidance areas for right-of-ways (ROWs; 1,001,000 acres): • Areas within USAF Military Operating Areas; • Oregon National Historic Trail protective zone; • Eligible, suitable, and designated Wild and Scenic River corridors; and • Bruneau-Jarbidge and Salmon Falls Creek ACECs.	The following areas would be avoidance areas for right-of-ways (ROWs; 1,001,000 acres): • Areas within USAF Military Operating Areas; • Oregon National Historic Trail protective zone; • Eligible, suitable, and designated Wild and Scenic River corridors; and • Bruneau-Jarbidge ACEC.	The following areas would be avoidance areas for right-of-ways (ROWs; 1,227,000 acres): • Areas within USAF Military Operating Areas; • Oregon National Historic Trail protective zone; • Eligible, suitable, and designated Wild and Scenic River corridors; and • Sagebrush Sea ACEC.	The following areas would be avoidance areas for right-of-ways (ROWs; 1,234,000 acres): • Areas within USAF Military Operating Areas; • Oregon National Historic Trail protective zone and Kelton and Toana Freight Roads; • Eligible, suitable, and designated Wild and Scenic River corridors; • Upper Bruneau and Salmon Falls Creek ACECs; and • Sage-grouse

No Action Alternative	Alternative I	Alternative II	Alternative III	Alternative IV	Alternative V	Alternative VI
underground); • Dove Springs; • 96 paleontological sites; • All rutted segments of Oregon Trail (overhead, surface, underground); • Bruneau-Jarbidge ACEC (overhead, surface, underground); • Portions of 24,080 acres of the Dry Lakes/Bruneau River Complex and Post Office Cultural areas (surface, underground); • Portions of 4,480 acres of three cultural resource complexes at Juniper Ranch, Clover Creek, and Devil Creek (surface, underground); and • Salmon Falls Creek Canyon (overhead, surface, underground).	and Salmon Falls Creek Areas of Critical Environmental Concern (ACECs).					management area.
The following areas would be exclusion areas for right-of-way (ROW) (62,000 acres): • Bruneau-Jarbidge Rivers Wilderness and	The following areas would be exclusion areas for ROW (63,000 acres): • Bruneau-Jarbidge Rivers Wilderness, • Lower Salmon	The following areas would be exclusion areas for ROW (62,000 acres): • Bruneau-Jarbidge Rivers Wilderness and	Same as Alternative I.	The following areas would be exclusion areas for ROW (100,000 acres): • Bruneau-Jarbidge Rivers Wilderness, • Lower Salmon	The following areas would be exclusion areas for ROW (167,000 acres): • Bruneau-Jarbidge Rivers Wilderness, • Lower Salmon	Same as Alternative I.

No Action Alternative	Alternative I	Alternative II	Alternative III	Alternative IV	Alternative V	Alternative VI
• Lower Salmon Falls Creek Wilderness Study Area (WSA).	Falls Creek WSA, and • Sand Point Area of Critical Environmental Concern (ACEC).	• Lower Salmon Falls Creek WSA.		Falls Creek WSA, • Sand Point ACEC, and • Lands with Wilderness Characteristics managed for wilderness characteristics.	Falls Creek WSA, • Sand Point ACEC, and • Lands with Wilderness Characteristics managed for wilderness characteristics.	
Management Actions						
No similar management action.	Wind energy developments could be considered in areas with annual or non-native vegetation communities, consistent with stipulations for right-of-way (ROW) avoidance areas and outside ROW exclusion areas and utility ROW corridors. Applications for solar energy developments would be considered on a case-by-case basis.	Wind energy development can be considered throughout the planning area, consistent with stipulations for ROW avoidance areas and outside ROW exclusion areas and utility ROW corridors. Applications for solar energy developments would be considered on a case-by-case basis.	Wind energy development can be considered in areas with annual or non-native vegetation communities, consistent with stipulations for ROW avoidance areas and outside ROW exclusion areas and utility ROW corridors. Applications for solar energy developments would be considered on a case-by-case basis.	Wind energy development can be considered in areas with annual or non-native perennial communities, consistent with stipulations for ROW avoidance areas and outside ROW exclusion areas and utility ROW corridors. Applications for solar energy developments would be considered on a case-by-case basis.	Wind energy development can be considered in areas with annual or non-native perennial vegetation, consistent with stipulations for ROW avoidance areas and outside ROW exclusion areas and utility ROW corridors. Applications for solar energy developments would be considered on a case-by-case basis.	Commercial wind and solar energy developments would not be permitted inside the sage-grouse management area or within utility ROW corridors.
Restrict wind energy development from wildlife habitat where adverse effects could not be mitigated.	Restrict wind energy site testing, monitoring, and development from occupied habitat for special status plants and animals, and cultural resources where direct and indirect adverse effects cannot be mitigated.	Restrict wind turbines and meteorological towers from occupied habitat for Endangered, Threatened, Proposed, and Candidate species where their direct adverse effects cannot be mitigated.	Restrict wind energy site testing and monitoring and wind energy development from occupied habitat for special status plants and animals, and cultural resources where their direct and indirect adverse effects cannot be mitigated.	Restrict wind energy site testing and monitoring and wind energy development from occupied and suitable habitat for special status species, wildlife habitat, and cultural resources where their direct and indirect adverse effects cannot be mitigated.	Restrict wind energy site testing and monitoring and wind energy development from occupied and suitable habitat for special status species, wildlife habitat, and cultural resources where their direct and indirect adverse effects cannot be mitigated.	Outside the sage-grouse management area, renewable energy site testing, monitoring, and development should avoid special status species habitat unless unavoidable adverse effects can be mitigated.

No Action Alternative	Alternative I	Alternative II	Alternative III	Alternative IV	Alternative V	Alternative VI
Areas of Critical Environmental Concern (ACECs)						
Goals						
No goal stated.	ACECs would be managed to protect the important biological, cultural, scenic, and historic resources that meet the criteria for relevance and importance.	No alternative-specific goal stated	ACECs would be managed to protect the important biological, cultural, scenic, and historic resources that meet the criteria for relevance and importance.	ACECs would be managed to protect the important biological, cultural, scenic, and historic resources that meet the criteria for relevance and importance.	ACECs would be managed to protect the important biological, cultural, scenic, and historic resources that meet the criteria for relevance and importance.	ACECs would be managed to protect the important biological, cultural, scenic, and historic resources that meet the criteria for relevance and importance.
Management Actions						
• Manage the lands within the **Bruneau-Jarbidge ACEC** to protect the cultural values of the Dry Lake/Bruneau River Complex and Arch Canyon and the scenic and recreation values of the Bruneau and Jarbidge Rivers through special designation and management. • Manage the lands within the **Salmon Falls Creek ACEC** to protect the Salmon Falls Creek Canyon (rim-to-rim) for its natural and scenic values through special designation and management. • Manage the lands within the **Sand**	• Manage the lands within the **Bruneau-Jarbidge ACEC** to protect their fish, wildlife, botanical, scenic, and cultural resource values. • Manage the lands within the **Lower Bruneau Canyon ACEC** to protect vertebrate and invertebrate paleontological resources; restore and protect special status plant habitat for Packard's cowpie buckwheat, spine-node milkvetch, and rare desert annuals. • Manage the lands within the **Middle Snake ACEC** to protect their fish and botanical values. • Manage the lands	No ACECs would be designated.	• Manage the lands within the **Bruneau-Jarbidge ACEC** to protect their fish, wildlife, botanical, scenic, and cultural resource values. • Manage the lands within the **Salmon Falls Creek ACEC** to protect scenic values, redband trout habitat, golden eagle nests, and special status wildlife including prairie falcons and spotted bats, and native vegetation communities. • Manage the lands within the **Sand Point ACEC** to protect the Oregon NHT, archaeological sites, vertebrate and invertebrate paleontological	• Manage the lands within the **Bruneau-Jarbidge ACEC** to protect their fish, wildlife, botanical, scenic, and cultural resource values. • Manage the lands within the **Inside Desert ACEC** to protect their botanical values. *Alternative IV-A:* • Manage the lands within the **Jarbidge Foothills ACEC** to protect their cultural, fish, wildlife, and botanical values. *Alternative IV-B:* • Manage the lands within the **Jarbidge Foothills ACEC** to protect their cultural, wildlife, and botanical	• Manage the lands within the **Lower Bruneau Canyon ACEC** to protect vertebrate and invertebrate paleontological resources; restore and protect special status plant habitat for Packard's cowpie buckwheat, spine-node milkvetch, and rare desert annuals. • Manage the lands within the **Middle Snake ACEC** to protect their fish and botanical values. • Manage the lands within the **Sagebrush Sea ACEC** to protect their cultural, fish, wildlife, and botanical values. • Manage the lands within the **Sand Point ACEC** to	• Manage the lands within the **Upper Bruneau Canyon ACEC** to protect and maintain habitat for California bighorn sheep, other special status wildlife, interior redband trout and native fishery, special status plants including Davis peppergrass, scenic, and cultural resource values. • Manage the lands within the **Lower Bruneau Canyon ACEC** to protect vertebrate and invertebrate paleontological resources; restore and protect special status plant habitat for Packard's cowpie buckwheat, spine-

No Action Alternative	Alternative I	Alternative II	Alternative III	Alternative IV	Alternative V	Alternative VI
Point ACEC to protect and manage the Sand Point Paleontologic Area. Protect its paleontological and cultural resources from destruction and loss, protect the geologic features present, and ensure that its scenic and wildlife values are maintained.	within the **Salmon Falls Creek ACEC** to protect scenic values, redband trout habitat, golden eagle nests, special status wildlife including prairie falcons and spotted bats, and native vegetation communities. • Manage the lands within the **Sand Point ACEC** to protect the Oregon National Historic Trail (NHT), archaeological sites, vertebrate and invertebrate paleontological resources, and the Glenns Ferry geologic formation.		resources, and the Glenns Ferry geologic formation.	values. • Manage the lands within the **Lower Bruneau Canyon ACEC** to protect vertebrate and invertebrate paleontological resources; restore and protect special status plant habitat for Packard's cowpie buckwheat, spine-node milkvetch, and rare desert annuals. • Manage the lands within the **Sand Point ACEC** to protect the Oregon NHT, archaeological sites, vertebrate and invertebrate paleontological resources, and the Glenns Ferry geologic formation.	protect the Oregon NHT, archaeological sites, vertebrate and invertebrate paleontological resources, and the Glenns Ferry geologic formation.	node milkvetch, and rare desert annuals. • Manage the lands within the **Salmon Falls Creek ACEC** to protect scenic values, redband trout habitat, golden eagle nests, special status wildlife including prairie falcons and spotted bats, and native vegetation communities. • Manage the lands within the **Sand Point ACEC** to protect the Oregon NHT, archaeological sites, vertebrate and invertebrate paleontological resources, and the Glenns Ferry geologic formation.

Affected Environment

The following sections describe the current condition of the resources in the planning area as related to the planning issues. Chapter 3 describes in detail the current condition of tribal rights and interests, resources, resources uses, special designations, and social and economic features.

Vegetation (Upland and Riparian)

Fuels Treatments, Fire Rehabilitation, and Fire Suppression

Between 1987 and 2011, an average of 72,000 acres burned in the planning area each year, with a total of 1,806,000 acres burned during that 25-year period. The number of acres burned each year varied from a low of 600 acres in 2009 to a high of 505,000 acres in 2007. Approximately one-third of the planning area (688,000 acres) has burned at least once during this 25-year period. These figures are based on fires greater than 10 acres and include all areas burned regardless of ownership.

During this time there were 532 fires for an average of 21 fires per year. The majority of wildland fire ignitions in the planning area (62%) were caused by lightning, while human-caused fires comprised 38%. This includes all wildland fire ignitions and not just those that resulted in wildland fires greater than 10 acres.

National and State BLM fire policy requires current and desired resource conditions related to fire management to be described in terms of three condition classes. These condition classes are collectively referred to as Fire Regime Condition Classes (FRCC) and are delineated as FRCC 1, FRCC 2, and FRCC 3 (Barrett et al., 2010). FRCC is a classification of the amount of departure from the historic fire regime (HFR) and the associated historical vegetation. FRCC 1 (low departure) is considered to be within the historic range of variability of a given HFR, while FRCC 2 (moderate departure) and FRCC 3 (high departure) are outside the historic range of variability.

HFR I has a 0-35 year fire return interval and generally low-severity and mixed-severity fires. HFR II has a 0-35 year fire return interval and high-severity fires. HFR III has a 35-200 year fire return interval and generally low-severity and mixed-severity fires. HFR IV has a 35-200 years fire return interval and high-severity fires. HFR V has a fire return interval of 200+ years and generally replacement-severity fires. FRCC and historic fire regime in the planning area were determined based on potential natural vegetation groups.

Table ES-2 displays for each Vegetation Management Area (VMA) the acres, the HFR, and the FRCC rating for each potential natural vegetation groups.

Table ES-2. Acres, Historic Fire Regime, and Fire Regime Condition Class Ratings for Potential Natural Vegetation Groups by Vegetation Management Area

Potential Natural Vegetation Group	Acres	Historic Fire Regime	FRCC Rating
VMA A			
Basin Big Sagebrush	600	IV	3
Mountain Shrubland with Tree	< 100	I	3
Salt Desert Shrub	2,000	V	3
Wyoming Big Sagebrush Steppe	213,000	IV	3
VMA B			
Basin Big Sagebrush	200	IV	3
Black and Low Sagebrush	300	III	2
Mountain Shrubland with Tree	400	I	3
Salt Desert Shrub	4,000	V	2
Wyoming Big Sagebrush Steppe	603,000	IV	2
VMA C			
Basin Big Sagebrush	9,000	IV	3
Black and Low Sagebrush	10,000	III	3

Potential Natural Vegetation Group	Acres	Historic Fire Regime	FRCC Rating
VMA C			
Mountain Big Sagebrush	800	IV	2
Mountain Shrubland with Tree	< 100	I	3
Stable Aspen	< 100	I	3
Wyoming Big Sagebrush Steppe	285,000	IV	2
VMA D			
Basin Big Sagebrush	18,000	IV	3
Black and Low Sagebrush	101,000	III	2
Curlleaf Mountain Mahogany	3,000	III	3
Mountain Big Sagebrush	35,000	IV	1
Mountain Shrubland with Tree	6,000	I	3
Stable Aspen	3,000	I	2
Wyoming Big Sagebrush Steppe	28,000	IV	2

Analysis was based on 2016 projected vegetation, used as the baseline vegetation composition for the RMP.

Fuel models are used to describe fuel characteristics based on quantity, type, and spatial arrangement of vegetation. Fuel models are used to estimate or predict potential fire behavior and effects, such as flame length and rate of spread under various environmental parameters. Flame length corresponds to fire line intensity, while rate of spread relates to fire size. Fuel models designed for this purpose do not account for fire return interval, changes in landscape patterns, or length of fire season. Fuel models were assigned to each potential natural vegetation group successional class using Standard Fire Behavior Fuel Models (Scott and Burgan, 2005).

Because the size of wildland fire is a concern in the planning area, changes to rate of spread are an important characteristic in evaluating fire size. Each fuel model has an associated adjective rating to represent the rate of spread. Table ES-3 shows the acres of vegetation within each rating. Approximately 76% of the planning area has fuels with a rate of spread rating of high or very high.

Table ES-3. Fire Rate of Spread Rating by Vegetation Management Area (Acres)

Rate of Spread Rating	VMA A	VMA B	VMA C	VMA D
Extreme	0	0	0	0
Very High	80,000	39,000	2,000	6,000
High	132,000	473,000	255,000	52,000
Moderate	0	< 100	5,000	57,000
Low	3,000	89,000	34,000	34,000
Very Low	0	3,000	5,000	45,000
Non-Burnable	5,000	26,000	12,000	14,000

Every wildland fire is managed to protect firefighters and the public, protect values as defined in a land use plan, and minimize cost, in priority order. While human life is the single overriding priority, other values could include communities, property and improvements, and natural and cultural resources. Suppression strategy on wildland fires is in accordance with management objectives and based on fire location and current and expected conditions for weather, fuels, and fire behavior. The strategy can vary from monitoring when fire spread and values are predicted to be very low to responding with all available suppression resources when spread and values are predicted to be high. Wildland Fire Use is a management action which accomplishes resource objectives through the use of fire; however, fire must occur naturally (lightning) and the area analyzed to allow the action. Currently, the 1987 Jarbidge RMP does not identify areas which allow this action.

Habitat for Fish, Wildlife, and Special Status Plants and Animals

Vegetation communities in the planning area are diverse and are primarily influenced by soils, precipitation, wildland fires, post-fire vegetation treatments, weather, livestock grazing, invasive plant

introduction and spread, and cross-country motorized vehicle use. For management and analysis purposes, the 53 vegetation communities in the planning area were grouped into seven vegetation sub-groups (VSGs). Vegetation communities were grouped into VSGs based on dominant vegetation and community structure, since communities with similar dominant vegetation and community structure were expected to have similar management objectives:

- **Annual communities** – dominated by cheatgrass, Russian thistle, tumble mustard, or a combination of the three non-native species; shrubs, such as rabbitbrush and Wyoming big sagebrush, may be present, but occur at less than 10% canopy cover.
- **Non-native Perennial communities** – dominated or co-dominated by seeded non-native perennial species, including crested wheatgrass and intermediate wheatgrass; native or seeded shrubs (e.g., four-wing saltbush) might occur in these communities at less than 10% canopy cover.
- **Non-native Understory communities** – dominated by native shrubs in the overstory and non-native species in the understory; overstory species include Wyoming big sagebrush, basin big sagebrush, black sagebrush, and low sagebrush; understory species are non-native perennial grasses, including crested wheatgrass and intermediate wheatgrass.
- **Native Grassland communities** – dominated by native grasses such as basin wildrye, bluebunch wheatgrass, Sandberg bluegrass, Idaho fescue, Indian ricegrass, needle-and-thread, Thurber's needlegrass, western wheatgrass, and, in the semi-wet meadow community, herbaceous wetland species.
- **Native Shrubland communities** – dominated by low and tall shrub-dominated communities, as well as woodland communities; typically evergreen and either dominated or co-dominated by basin big sagebrush, mountain big sagebrush, Wyoming big sagebrush, subalpine sagebrush, low sagebrush, black sagebrush, early sagebrush, shadscale, mountain mahogany, ceanothus, bud sage, bitterbush, rabbitbrush, and four-wing saltbush.
- **Unvegetated areas** – include breaks, barren areas, sand dunes, and Recent Burn vegetation communities, which may be present for up to two years following a fire.

Large wildland fires occurred in 2007 and 2010 following completion of a vegetation mapping effort in 2006, resulting in over 500,000 acres of burned vegetation that were re-mapped as the Recent Burn VSG. In order to facilitate analysis of proposed management on upland vegetation communities, resource staff evaluated pre-burn vegetation conditions, impacts to vegetation resulting from fire and vegetation treatments, and created a map projecting VSG composition in areas mapped as the Recent Burn VSG to 2016 (Map 10). Vegetation composition following wildland fires through 2011 (post-fire) and the 2016 projected vegetation composition (baseline) of the planning area by VSG are presented in Table ES-4.

Table ES-4. Post-Fire and Baseline Vegetation Composition in the Planning Area by Vegetation Sub-Group

VSG	Post-Fire Vegetation % Composition	Baseline Vegetation % Composition
Annual	9	9
Non-Native Perennial	25	26
Non-Native Understory	5	4
Native Grassland	33	35
Native Shrubland	23	22
Unvegetated Areas	5	4
No Data	< 1	< 1

Data include vegetation as of Fall 2011 and projected vegetation in areas burned through 2011 (baseline).

Within the planning area, riparian areas and wetlands are generally associated with streams, rivers, and springs or seeps. There are approximately 316 miles of perennial streams and rivers, 512 miles of intermittent streams, and 3,192 miles of ephemeral streams within the planning area. Proper Functioning Condition assessments were conducted on 225 miles of riparian areas crossing BLM-managed lands within the planning area. Approximately 85 miles of riparian areas in the planning area are at Proper Functioning Condition; 128 miles are functioning-at-risk, and 12 miles are non-functioning. The functioning-at-risk ratings include functioning-at-risk with an upward trend (51 miles), functioning-at-risk

with a downward trend (30 miles, and functioning-at-risk with no apparent trend (47 miles). The condition of 20 miles of the streams assessed was unknown.[1]

Livestock Forage

Currently, approximately 189,000 animal unit months (AUMs) of active use are authorized on the allotments within the planning area (Appendix J), including 12,154 AUMs in the US Air Force Saylor Creek Training Range; 96% of the AUMs are allocated to cattle, 4% to domestic sheep, and less than 1% to domestic horses. Interim grazing measures pursuant to stipulated settlement agreements govern 112,620 of these AUMs. Interim measures vary by agreement but generally affect seasons-of-use, utilization limits, and stocking rates to address special status species habitat requirements. The interim measures are to be in effect until the grazing permits could be reissued under updated environmental analysis.

Actual use (grazing use that actually occurred) has varied annually based on factors such as forage production, resource conditions, wildland fire, court decisions, and individual livestock grazing operations. Actual grazing use since the 1987 Jarbidge RMP has been as high as approximately 217,000 AUMs in 1997 and as low as approximately 109,000 AUMs in 1988. Between 2002 and 2011, the average actual use was approximately 173,000 AUMs.

Livestock Grazing

The planning area is divided into 93 grazing allotments on 1,371,000 acres of BLM-managed lands with 64 permit holders (permittees). Additionally, livestock grazing on 92,000 acres of military withdrawal lands is managed by the BLM in accordance with Public Land Order (PLO) 1027 as amended by PLO 4902.

Salmon Falls Creek Canyon was identified in the 1987 Jarbidge RMP as unavailable to livestock grazing. The Bruneau and Jarbidge Canyons are not contained within grazing allotments administered by the Jarbidge Field Office. However, portions of the planning area within the Bruneau River Canyon are currently being grazed within the Bruneau Canyon Allotment administered by the Bruneau Field Office, Boise District.

Recreation

Recreation

There are six developed recreation sites within the planning area. Currently, these six sites do not meet the Federal Lands Recreation Enhancement Act of 2004 criteria for charging fees. None of the sites have potable water or trash service in the form of trashcans or dumpsters. The following list outlines these sites and their amenities:

- **Bruneau Canyon Overlook** - Parking area, interpretive kiosks, and protective fence structures;
- **Bruneau River Launch Site, East** - Parking and information kiosk;
- **Bruneau River Take-out** - Information kiosk;
- **Cedar Creek Reservoir (Roseworth Reservoir)** - Parking area, vault restrooms, and docks;
- **East Fork Jarbidge River Recreation Sites (four sites)** - Vault restrooms, picnic tables, and fire rings with grills; and
- **Jarbidge River Recreation Site** - Parking area, launch facilities for whitewater boating, vault restrooms, and information kiosk.

Hunting is the major dispersed recreation use across the entire planning area. The average number of hunter-days in pursuit of mule deer and pronghorn in the planning area was 7,220 between 2007 and 2011 (IDFG, 2012d). In 2011, elk hunting units 46 and 47 were separated from a larger geographic hunting unit, and the total for the season was 598 hunter-days, with anticipation of increased participation in the future (IDFG, 2012d).

[1] Data for areas where PFC data contained discrepancies were classified as “unknown.”

Sport fishing in the Snake River along the northern boundary of the planning area and on the Salmon Falls Creek and Cedar Creek Reservoirs are also popular dispersed recreation activities. Salmon Falls Reservoir is one of the most heavily used fisheries in south-central Idaho. In 2010, a Salmon Falls Creek Reservoir angler effort survey was conducted by the Idaho Department of Fish and Game (IDFG, 2012a). Out of a total of 215 days in the survey period, the angler survey was completed on the reservoir on 75 of those days, or 35% of the time. Estimated angler effort in the surveyed sections and time period was 89,046, ± 1,617 hours. Average angler catch rates on trout during the surveyed period in all intervals were 1.02 fish, ± 0.03 fish per hour. Peak months of fishing activity typically are April through October.

Only two recognized trails exist within the planning area. The Idaho Centennial Trail is used for both hiking and motorized vehicles; use of the segment within the planning area is generally low because much of the trail is in remote terrain with difficult access. The Roberson Trail is located in the Bruneau-Jarbidge Rivers Wilderness which dictates a no mechanized or motorized use. This trail is used in the spring and early summer by whitewater boaters accessing the Five Mile Rapids, a series of Class IV rapids on the Bruneau Wild and Scenic River.

Whitewater recreation continues to be a popular activity locally, regionally, and nationally. The Jarbidge and Bruneau rivers have a growing national reputation for those attracted to remote, wild, and spectacular canyons and a challenging whitewater boating experience. The float season lasts approximately one month, with the peak use occurring during the latter part of May. Water runoff from snowpack in the Jarbidge Mountains usually dictates the optimum flows for this activity. In 1983, the Jarbidge Field Office implemented a mandatory registration system for private boaters on the Jarbidge and Bruneau Rivers, which provides some use data. While the Jarbidge Field Office administers outfitting on the Jarbidge and Bruneau Rivers, maintenance of facilities and accountability for visitor use are currently shared with the Bruneau Field Office, Boise District.

Transportation and Travel Management

There are approximately 4,300 miles of mapped transportation routes (i.e., roads, primitive roads, and trails) in the planning area (Map 71). Based on field observations and recent aerial photography, the actual amount of transportation routes could be twice as high as the amount mapped. The transportation system includes BLM and county system roads and primitive roads. Some BLM and county system roads receive regular maintenance. County roads are usually constructed and maintained to higher standards than BLM roads and provide access to and through BLM lands, supporting a higher volume of traffic than other roads in the planning area. These county roads are maintained by the six local highway districts and, in some areas, by the US Air Force if higher standards are required for operations connected with training ranges.

In addition to main and local routes, numerous primitive roads are laced throughout the planning area connecting more remote locations to main roads. These primitive roads are used for administrative access (i.e., range monitoring), recreational purposes, access to private land inholdings, and access to livestock management infrastructure. Some of these routes are maintained as needed and are of native surface: dirt, gravel, or sand.

The growth of off-highway vehicle (OHV) use has become an issue because of the number of users who participate in this recreation opportunity with limited designated OHV areas and routes, as well as concerns related to the potential resource degradation resulting from high levels of unmanaged motorized use in and near sensitive areas. During public scoping, more than 31% of comments received on resource uses related to transportation and access and OHV use.

Areas are designated during the planning process in accordance with BLM regulations and include the following three management categories:

- **Open to Cross-Country Motorized Vehicle Use** - An area where all types of vehicle use are permitted at all times, anywhere within the designated “open” area. This refers to cross-country travel both on and off roads.

- **Limited to Designated Routes** - Areas where vehicle use is restricted at certain times, in certain areas, and/or to certain vehicular uses in order to meet specific resource management objectives. These limitations may include: limiting the number or types of vehicles; limiting the time or season of use; permitted, administrative, or licensed use only; use on existing roads and trails; and limiting use to designated roads and trails.
- **Closed to Motorized Vehicle Use** - Motorized vehicles are permanently or temporarily prohibited. The use of motorized vehicles in closed areas may be allowed for certain reasons (e.g., emergency services); such use shall be made only with the approval of the BLM authorized officer (43 CFR 8340.0-5).

The Omnibus Public Lands Management Act (OPLMA; Public Law 111-11) was signed by the President on March 30, 2009. OPLMA directed the Secretary of the Interior to prepare a travel management plan for motorized and mechanized OHV recreation on BLM-managed lands in Owyhee County. In general, the plan would limit recreational motorized and mechanized OHV use to a system of designated roads and trails; this limitation would not apply to snowmobiles. Until the plan is completed, all recreational motorized and mechanized OHV use (excluding snowmobiles) shall be limited to roads and trails lawfully in existence on the day before the enactment of the act.

OPLMA changed all open areas in Owyhee County to “limited to designated routes”, with a “limited to existing routes” in effect until a transportation plan is completed. Inventoried ways, within the released Wilderness Study Area (32,080 acres) are also “limited to designated routes”, with a “limited to existing routes” in effect until a transportation plan is completed. All acres within the Bruneau-Jarbidge Rivers Wilderness are closed to motorized and mechanized vehicle use under OPLMA.

Energy Development

Land Use Authorizations

Renewable energy includes geothermal[2], wind, hydroelectric, and solar power. There are no renewable energy developments on public lands within the planning area; however, the Jarbidge Field Office has had several inquiries for wind energy-related interests on public land within the past several years. The only authorized use granted to date is the 2007 Renewable Energy Systems (RES) right-of-way (ROW) for wind velocity test towers on China Mountain. The authorization allowed RES to construct four meteorological (MET) towers within a 13,000-acre ROW area. The ROW was amended in 2009 to authorize the installation of two additional MET towers and was renewed for a three year period in 2010. In 2011 and 2012, RES removed the MET towers and provided a decommissioning plan. RES has requested a relinquishment for the MET tower ROW.

In May 2007, RES submitted an application to construct a commercial wind energy project in portions of the Jarbidge and Wells Field Offices. The proposed wind development was to produce 425 megawatts on approximately 30,700 acres; 4,700 acres would be managed by the Wells Field Office, 2,000 acres would be managed by the State of Idaho, 15,300 acres would be managed by the Jarbidge Field Office, and approximately 8,700 acres on private land. The processing of RES’s project level EIS has been deferred pending the decision of the Greater Sage-Grouse Western Regional Land-Use Plan Revision and Jarbidge RMP Record of Decision. The Jarbidge Field Office has also received one more renewable energy application for wind development in the Bell Rapids area; however, the processing for this application was also placed on hold pending the Jarbidge RMP Record of Decision.

Additional ROW applications are being submitted for ancillary uses to energy-related facilities on private and public land. The Jarbidge Field Office received an application for an upgrade on a road that would support a wind farm on private land in the Bell Rapids area.

Under current conditions and technology, Idaho does not have significant potential for commercial solar energy development. Solar resources in the planning area do not exceed 6 kWh/m^2/day (NREL, 2009a);

[2] Geothermal resources are considered leasable minerals and are addressed in the *Minerals* section.

therefore, the planning area is not currently identified as a high-priority State for solar energy development (NREL, 2009b)[3].

Leasable Minerals

There is currently no leasable mineral activity within the planning area. As described in the Oil and Gas Potential Report (BLM, 2009c), three wells were drilled in 1950 for the purpose of exploring for oil and gas in the planning area, all in the extreme northwest corner; no showings of oil or gas were encountered at any interval in any of the three wells, the deepest of which was drilled to 3,808 feet. Another well approximately eight miles north of the planning area was drilled to a depth of 9,678 feet, but did not encounter oil or gas. Based on the geology of the planning area and where interest in leasing has recently been expressed, the areas with potential for oil and gas leasing include the Cedar Creek/China Mountain areas and the northwest corner of the planning area (Map 114); these areas are referred to as the potential oil and gas areas. However, even though the potential for leasing in these areas is slightly higher than the potential in the rest of the planning area, the potential for discovery and development is considered to be low. Appendix K contains the Reasonably Foreseeable Development Scenario (RFDS) for oil and gas resources in the planning area.

There are no wells in the planning area for geothermal power, only wells on private land for direct use for aquaculture, recreation, and heating. Other wells within the planning area that encountered geothermal water were drilled for other purposes, such as irrigation. As described in the Geothermal Potential Report (BLM, 2009b), the area near Bruneau Hot Springs, determined to have high potential for geothermal resources, has high potential for leasing. There is also potential for leasing in the northern third of the planning area, determined to have medium potential for geothermal resources (Map 115); these areas with high and medium potential are referred to as potential geothermal areas. The probability of full geothermal resource development and production occurring in the planning area during the next 20 years is higher than for oil and gas development but still considered low. Appendix L contains the RFDS for geothermal resources in the planning area.

Areas of Critical Environmental Concern (ACECs)

The Jarbidge Field Office contains three ACECs:

- **The Bruneau-Jarbidge ACEC** contains 85,000 acres of BLM-managed land in the Bruneau and Jarbidge Canyons and the surrounding uplands. The ACEC is located along the Bruneau River from near Crowbar Gulch upstream to the planning area boundary, along the Jarbidge River from the Bruneau River confluence to the Buck Creek confluence, and along the East Fork of the Jarbidge River from the Jarbidge River confluence to the planning area boundary. Portions of Clover, Deep, Cougar, Dorsey, Columbet, and Dave Creeks are within the ACEC. Values meeting relevance and importance criteria include cultural values, scenic values, fish and wildlife resources (bighorn sheep, bull trout, and redband trout), and natural systems or processes (Bruneau River phlox, Davis peppergrass, and riparian systems).
- **The Salmon Falls Creek ACEC** encompasses 6,000 acres of BLM-managed land. The ACEC is located within the Salmon Falls Creek Canyon (rim to rim), extending from Balanced Rock Crossing Park south to the private land near Salmon Falls Creek Dam. The Salmon Falls Creek ACEC is located in both the Jarbidge and Burley Field Offices. The west side of the ACEC is managed by the Jarbidge Field Office while the east-side of the ACEC is managed by the Burley Field Office; Salmon Falls Creek is the dividing line. While the ACEC encompasses 6,000 acres, only 3,000 acres are within the Jarbidge Field Office. Values meeting relevance and importance criteria include scenic values, fish resources (redband trout), and natural systems or processes (upland vegetation).
- **The Sand Point ACEC** encompasses 800 acres of BLM-managed lands south of the Snake River near Hammett, Idaho. The ACEC extends from the high water mark along the Snake River about 0.5 to 0.75 miles south into the upland plateau. Values meeting relevance and importance criteria include historic and cultural values and natural systems or processes (paleontological and geological resources).

[3] See also BLM IM 2011-003.

Several ACECs were nominated for the revised Jarbidge RMP and were found to meet criteria for relevance and importance:

- **Bruneau-Jarbidge ACEC (Expanded Boundary)** – The proposed extensions to the existing Bruneau-Jarbidge ACEC would encompass about 38,000 acres of BLM-managed land; if added to the existing ACEC, the new ACEC would total 123,000 acres of BLM-managed land. The extensions include the remainder of the Jarbidge River and additional upland areas in the Diamond A and Inside Desert areas not already within the existing ACEC, as well as bull trout habitat along the Jarbidge River south of the Jarbidge Forks, Dave Creek, Jack Creek, and Buck Creek. The eastern boundary of the existing ACEC south of Three Creek Highway would be modified to follow a road. The same values meet relevance and importance criteria in the extensions as in the existing ACEC.
- **Bruneau-Jarbidge ACEC (Reduced Boundary)** – The proposed reduced boundary of the Bruneau-Jarbidge ACEC would encompass 57,000 acres of BLM-managed land. The majority of the ACEC lies within the Bruneau and Jarbidge Canyons; some of the adjacent uplands are included within the boundary as well. Portions of the existing ACEC that would not be included within this boundary include areas south of the Bruneau-Jarbidge Rivers Wilderness boundary on the Bruneau River, Jarbidge River and its East Fork, as well as areas north of Sheepshead Draw. The same values meet relevance and importance criteria in the reduced boundary as in the existing ACEC.
- **Inside Desert ACEC (Large Boundary)** – The proposed large boundary of the Inside Desert ACEC would encompass 73,000 acres of BLM-managed land. The large ACEC boundary would be located between Clover Creek and the Jarbidge River and from Clover Butte south to approximately Poison Butte and would be adjacent to the Juniper Butte Training Range. The ACEC boundary was drawn along existing pasture fences to make the nominated ACEC manageable. Values meeting relevance and importance criteria include natural systems or processes (slickspot peppergrass).
- **Inside Desert ACEC (Small Boundary)** – The proposed small boundary of the Inside Desert ACEC would encompass 41,000 acres of BLM-managed land. The small ACEC boundary would be located from Clover Butte south to approximately Middle Butte in several pastures near the Juniper Butte Training Range. The slickspot peppergrass values within the small boundary of the ACEC are the same as those documented for the large boundary of the Inside Desert ACEC; however, the small boundary would contain 83% of the acres supporting slickspot peppergrass on BLM-managed lands in the planning area.
- **Jarbidge Foothills ACEC (Large Boundary)** – The proposed large boundary of the Jarbidge Foothills ACEC would encompass 134,000 acres of BLM-managed land in the southern third of the planning area. The boundary would run from the canyon of the East Fork of the Jarbidge River to Salmon Falls Creek and from Three Creek Highway to the southern boundary of the planning area. Values meeting relevance and importance criteria include cultural values, fish or wildlife resources (redband trout, spotted frog, sage-grouse), and natural systems or processes (upland vegetation).
- **Jarbidge Foothills ACEC (Small Boundary)** – The proposed small boundary of the Jarbidge Foothills ACEC would encompass 64,000 acres of BLM-managed land and would be located in the southeast corner of the planning area. The boundary would run from Salmon Falls Creek west to the House Creek Allotment, and from Three Creek Highway south to the southern boundary of the planning area. This boundary for the Jarbidge Foothills ACEC would focus management on a block of primarily BLM-managed lands and would reduce the amount of private land that would be in the ACEC boundary. The same values meet relevance and importance criteria in the small boundary of the Jarbidge Foothills ACEC as in the large boundary; however redband trout did not meet importance criteria and spotted frogs would no longer occur within the ACEC boundary.
- **Lower Bruneau Canyon ACEC (Large Boundary)** – The proposed Lower Bruneau Canyon ACEC would encompass 1,000 acres of BLM-managed land. The ACEC would be located along the east side of the lower Bruneau River, southeast of Indian Bathtub. Values meeting relevance and importance criteria include fish or wildlife resources (Bruneau hot springsnail) and natural systems or processes (paleontological resources, special status plant assemblages, thermal seeps and springs).
- **Lower Bruneau Canyon ACEC (Small Boundary)** – The proposed Lower Bruneau Canyon ACEC would encompass 900 acres of BLM-managed land. The small ACEC boundary, southeast of Indian Bathtub does not include areas contained within the Bruneau-Jarbidge Rivers Wilderness and the designated Wild and Scenic River corridor. The same values meet relevance and importance criteria in the small boundary of the Lower Bruneau Canyon ACEC as in the large boundary, except thermal

seeps and springs which support the Bruneau hot springsnail would not be included within the ACEC boundary. However, they are within the Bruneau-Jarbidge Rivers Wilderness boundary and the designated Wild and Scenic River corridor.

- **Middle Snake ACEC** – The proposed Middle Snake ACEC would encompass 7,000 acres of BLM-managed lands; these lands are separated in several areas by blocks of private land. The ACEC would be located in an area southeast of King Hill to the Hagerman Fossil Beds National Monument. The ACEC would extend from the planning area boundary in the Snake River to the canyon rim or to existing fences on the adjacent uplands. Values meeting relevance and importance criteria include fish or wildlife resources (Snake River snails and white sturgeon) and natural systems or processes (special status plant assemblages).
- **Sagebrush Sea ACEC** – The proposed Sagebrush Sea ACEC would encompass 956,000 acres of BLM-managed land, roughly the southern two-thirds of the planning area. It would extend from the Bruneau River on the west to Salmon Falls Creek on the east. Its southern boundary would follow the southern boundary of the planning area. The northern boundary would follow the road that runs from Balanced Rock to Crows Nest to Clover Crossing, then follow Clover Creek along its east and north canyon rims to Clover Creek's confluence with the Bruneau River. Values meeting relevance and importance criteria include cultural values, fish or wildlife resources (bull trout, redband trout, spotted frog, sage-grouse, and bighorn sheep), and natural systems or processes (slickspot peppergrass, Davis' peppergrass, and Bruneau River phlox).
- **Sand Point ACEC (Expanded Boundary)** – One additional boundary configuration of the Sand Point ACEC was nominated. The proposed expanded boundary of the Sand Point ACEC would include the 800 acres of the existing Sand Point ACEC as well as the Morgan property, an additional 200 acres between the existing ACEC and the Snake River; totaling 1,000 acres. The Morgan property was acquired by BLM in 2002 to protect the relevant and important values of the existing ACEC that extended onto this property. The same values meet relevance and importance criteria in the expanded boundary of the Sand Point ACEC as in the existing ACEC.
- **Upper Bruneau Canyon ACEC** – The proposed Upper Bruneau Canyon ACEC would encompass 18,000 acres of BLM-managed land. The ACEC would be located along the upper Bruneau River and the surrounding uplands within the southern-most portion of the planning area. The ACEC includes the Bruneau Canyon and adjacent uplands from the planning area boundary to the south extending to the Bruneau-Jarbidge Rivers Wilderness boundary to the north. Values meeting relevance and importance criteria include cultural values, scenic values, fish or wildlife resources (bighorn sheep, redband trout), and natural systems or processes (Davis peppergrass and riparian system).

Environmental Consequences

Table ES-5 provides a summary of the impacts, as related to the planning issues, on the human and natural environment that are proposed to occur from implementing Alternative VI (Proposed RMP) and the six other alternatives presented in Chapter 2.

Chapter 4 analyzes in detail the environmental consequences, also referred to as "impacts" or "effects," predicted to occur as result of implementing the proposed management actions and allocations for each alternative in Chapter 2. They are presented by identifying the likely direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts on resources, resource uses, special designations, and social and economic conditions. Management actions expected to impact a specific resource, resource use, special designation, or social or economic feature are analyzed. Where data are limited, professional judgment is used to project environmental impacts. Professional judgment is based on observation, experience, analysis of conditions, and responses in similar areas.

Table ES-5. Summary Comparison of Effects.

No Action Alternative	Alternative I	Alternative II	Alternative III	Alternative IV	Alternative V	Alternative VI
Vegetation (Upland and Riparian)						
Upland Vegetation						
Acres of Vegetation Sub-Groups (VSGs) in the Planning Area Following Vegetation Treatments:						
Annual 120,000 Non-Native Perennial 402,000 Non-Native Understory 40,000 Native Grassland 476,000 Native Shrubland 285,000	Annual 78,500 Non-Native Perennial 308,000 Non-Native Understory 35,000 Native Grassland 243,000 Native Shrubland 659,000	Annual 45,500 Non-Native Perennial 455,000 Non-Native Understory 41,000 Native Grassland 476,000 Native Shrubland 306,000	Annual 54,250 Non-Native Perennial 425,000 Non-Native Understory 59,000 Native Grassland 259,000 Native Shrubland 507,000	Annual 45,500 Non-Native Perennial 161,000 Non-Native Understory 132,000 Native Grassland 169,000 Native Shrubland 816,000	Annual 84,500 Non-Native Perennial 157,000 Non-Native Understory 259,000 Native Grassland 278,000 Native Shrubland 545,000	Annual 68,25 Non-Native Perennial 199,000 Non-Native Understory 101,000 Native Grassland 226,000 Native Shrubland 729,000
Acres of Seral Stages in the Planning Area Following Vegetation Treatments:						
Early 476,000 Mid 52,000 Late 224,000 Uncharacteristic 569,000	Early 242,000 Mid 442,000 Late 216,000 Uncharacteristic 421,000	Early 477,000 Mid 88,000 Late 216,000 Uncharacteristic 540,000	Early 260,000 Mid 292,000 Late 212,000 Uncharacteristic 538,000	Early 170,000 Mid 597,000 Late 216,000 Uncharacteristic 338,000	Early 279,000 Mid 327,000 Late 216,000 Uncharacteristic 499,000	Early 227,000 Mid 508,000 Late 216,000 Uncharacteristic 370,000
The No Action Alternative would increase the relative proportion of acreage occupied by non-native perennial communities while maintaining proportions of annual, native grassland, and native shrubland communities and reducing proportions of non-native understory communities.	Alternative I would create a landscape with greater species diversity and structural complexity compared to the No Action Alternative and Alternatives II and III.	Alternative II would create a relatively homogeneous landscape dominated by early-seral and uncharacteristic vegetation in Vegetation Management Areas (VMAs) A, B, and C. Limited species and structural diversity in areas dominated by non-native perennial vegetation would decrease water and nutrient cycling compared to shrubland communities.	Alternative III would create a landscape with more species diversity and structural complexity than would be created under either the No Action Alternative or Alternative II. Native communities, particularly shrublands, would be less continuous than in Alternatives I, IV, V, or VI.	Alternative IV would create a landscape dominated by native communities in a variety of seral stages and the lowest proportion of uncharacteristic vegetation of all the alternatives. This would improve landscape functions, including water infiltration, nutrient cycling, and soil stabilization.	Alternative V would create a landscape with large patches of native communities in a variety of seral stages interspersed with non-native perennial and non-native understory communities. This would improve landscape functions, including water infiltration, nutrient cycling, and soil stabilization.	Alternative VI would create a landscape dominated by native communities in a variety of seral stages and a lower proportion of uncharacteristic vegetation than Alternatives II, III, V, and the No Action. This would improve landscape functions, including water infiltration, nutrient cycling, and soil stabilization.
Riparian Vegetation						
The No Action Alternative has no objectives to maintain or improve proper	PFC objectives include: • 145 miles at PFC and	PFC objectives include: • 85 miles at PFC and	PFC objectives include: • 183 miles at PFC and	PFC objectives include: • 183 miles at PFC and	PFC objectives include: • 183 miles at PFC and	PFC objectives include: • 183 miles at PFC and

No Action Alternative	Alternative I	Alternative II	Alternative III	Alternative IV	Alternative V	Alternative VI
functioning condition (PFC).	• 80 miles toward PFC.	• 140 miles toward PFC.	• 42 miles toward PFC.	• 42 miles toward PFC.	• 42 miles toward PFC.	• 42 miles toward PFC.
The No Action Alternative would result in the greatest potential to reduce habitat condition and PFC ratings of all alternatives and is the least likely to attain habitat condition and riparian objectives over the life of the plan.	Alternative I is the third most likely to attain habitat condition and riparian objectives over the life of the plan.	Alternative II is the fifth most likely to attain habitat condition and riparian objectives and would result in the fewest miles of riparian area at PFC over the life of the plan.	Alternative III is the fourth most likely to attain habitat condition and riparian objectives over the life of the plan. The attainment of the riparian objectives is less likely due to the increased resource uses in addition to the enhanced wildland fire suppression infrastructure.	Alternative IV is most likely to attain habitat condition and riparian objectives over the life of the plan. Alternative IV would have fewer areas available for authorized uses and less wildland fire infrastructure. Active restoration is more likely to achieve restoration objectives and in a shorter timeframe than passive restoration.	Alternative V is the second most likely to attain habitat condition and riparian objectives over the life of the plan. Alternative V would have the fewest areas available for land uses of all alternatives. Passive restoration would have fewer short-term impacts, but longer timeframes for riparian objectives to be met.	Alternative VI is the fourth most likely to attain habitat condition and riparian objectives over the life of the plan. The attainment of the riparian objectives is less likely due to the increased wildland fire suppression infrastructure and authorized uses.
Fuels Treatments, Fire Rehabilitation, and Fire Suppression						
The lack of prioritization for wildland fire suppression would perpetuate the current trend of native shrubland loss.	Fire management priorities would promote protection of existing and restored native shrubland communities; however, suppression priorities would likely result in continued loss of native shrublands.	Fire management priorities would promote protection of native grassland and non-native perennial communities with no prioritization for shrubland communities. Continued loss of native shrublands is likely.	Fire management priorities would promote protection of native shrubland, as well as native grassland and non-native perennial communities and would reduce the potential for loss of existing shrubland patches.	Fire management priorities would promote the protection of existing and restored native shrubland communities. Suppression priorities would not be adequate to retain all native communities; however, native grasslands would be relatively resilient if burned.	Fire management priorities would promote protection of existing and restored native shrubland communities. In VMAs B, C, and D, opportunities would be limited for post wildland fire treatments; therefore, Alternative V would require more use of prescribed fire in these VMAs as part of vegetation treatments.	Fire management priorities would promote the protection of existing and restored native shrubland communities. Suppression priorities would not be adequate to retain all native communities; however, native grasslands would be relatively resilient if burned.
No vegetation treatments are identified that would move vegetation toward fuels with a lower rate of spread.	If vegetation objectives are met, this alternative could reduce the rate of spread on 3% of the planning area.	If vegetation objectives are met, this alternative could reduce the rate of spread on 6% of the planning area.	If vegetation objectives are met, this alternative could reduce the rate of spread on 5% of the planning area.	If vegetation objectives are met, this alternative could reduce the rate of spread on 6% of the planning area.	If vegetation objectives are met, this alternative could reduce the rate of spread on 3% of the planning area.	If vegetation objectives are met, this alternative could reduce the rate of spread on 4% of the planning area.

No Action Alternative	Alternative I	Alternative II	Alternative III	Alternative IV	Alternative V	Alternative VI
Fire Regime Condition Class (FRCC) by Vegetation Type by Vegetation Management Area (VMA) Following Full Implementation of the Plan						
<u>VMA A:</u> • WY sagebrush steppe: Remains at FRCC 3. ***<u>VMA B:</u>*** • WY sagebrush steppe: Declines from FRCC 2 to FRCC 3. ***<u>VMA C:</u>*** • WY sagebrush steppe: Declines from FRCC 2 to FRCC 3, • Basin big sagebrush: Remains at FRCC 3, and • Black/low sagebrush: Remains at FRCC 3. ***<u>VMA D:</u>*** • WY sagebrush steppe: Declines from FRCC 2 to FRCC 3, • Basin big sagebrush: Remains at FRCC 3, • Black/low sagebrush: Declines from FRCC 2 to FRCC 3, and • Mtn. big sagebrush: Declines from FRCC 1 to FRCC 3.	***<u>VMA A:</u>*** • WY sagebrush steppe: Remains at FRCC 3. ***<u>VMA B:</u>*** • WY sagebrush steppe: Declines from FRCC 2 to FRCC 3. ***<u>VMA C:</u>*** • WY sagebrush steppe: Declines from FRCC 2 to FRCC 3, • Basin big sagebrush: Remains at FRCC 3, and • Black/low sagebrush: Remains at FRCC 3. ***<u>VMA D:</u>*** • WY sagebrush steppe: Declines from FRCC 2 to FRCC 3, • Basin big sagebrush: Remains at FRCC 3, • Black/low sagebrush: Declines from FRCC 2 to FRCC 3, and • Mtn. big sagebrush: Declines from FRCC 1 to FRCC 3.	***<u>VMA A:</u>*** • WY sagebrush steppe: Remains at FRCC 3. ***<u>VMA B:</u>*** • WY sagebrush steppe: Declines from FRCC 2 to FRCC 3. ***<u>VMA C:</u>*** • WY sagebrush steppe: Declines from FRCC 2 to FRCC 3, • Basin big sagebrush: Remains at FRCC 3, and • Black/low sagebrush: Remains at FRCC 3. ***<u>VMA D:</u>*** • WY sagebrush steppe: Declines from FRCC 2 to FRCC 3, • Basin big sagebrush: Remains at FRCC 3, • Black/low sagebrush: Declines from FRCC 2 to FRCC 3, and • Mtn. big sagebrush: Declines from FRCC 1 to FRCC 3.	***<u>VMA A:</u>*** • WY sagebrush steppe: Remains at FRCC 3. ***<u>VMA B:</u>*** • WY sagebrush steppe: Declines from FRCC 2 to FRCC 3. ***<u>VMA C:</u>*** • WY sagebrush steppe: Declines from FRCC 2 to FRCC 3, • Basin big sagebrush: Remains at FRCC 3, and • Black/low sagebrush: Remains at FRCC 3. ***<u>VMA D:</u>*** • WY sagebrush steppe: Declines from FRCC 2 to FRCC 3, • Basin big sagebrush: Remains at FRCC 3, • Black/low sagebrush: Declines from FRCC 2 to FRCC 3, and • Mtn. big sagebrush: Declines from FRCC 1 to FRCC 3.	***<u>VMA A:</u>*** • WY sagebrush steppe: Remains at FRCC 3. ***<u>VMA B:</u>*** • WY sagebrush steppe: Declines from FRCC 2 to FRCC 3. ***<u>VMA C:</u>*** • WY sagebrush steppe: Declines from FRCC 2 to FRCC 3, • Basin big sagebrush: Remains at FRCC 3, and • Black/low sagebrush: Remains at FRCC 3. ***<u>VMA D:</u>*** • WY sagebrush steppe: Declines from FRCC 2 to FRCC 3, • Basin big sagebrush: Remains at FRCC 3, • Black/low sagebrush: Declines from FRCC 2 to FRCC 3, and • Mtn. big sagebrush: Declines from FRCC 1 to FRCC 3.	***<u>VMA A:</u>*** • WY sagebrush steppe: Remains at FRCC 3. ***<u>VMA B:</u>*** • WY sagebrush steppe: Declines from FRCC 2 to FRCC 3. ***<u>VMA C:</u>*** • WY sagebrush steppe: Declines from FRCC 2 to FRCC 3, • Basin big sagebrush: Remains at FRCC 3, and • Black/low sagebrush: Remains at FRCC 3. ***<u>VMA D:</u>*** • WY sagebrush steppe: Declines from FRCC 2 to FRCC 3, • Basin big sagebrush: Remains at FRCC 3, • Black/low sagebrush: Declines from FRCC 2 to FRCC 3, and • Mtn. big sagebrush: Declines from FRCC 1 to FRCC 3.	***<u>VMA A:</u>*** • WY sagebrush steppe: Remains at FRCC 3. ***<u>VMA B:</u>*** • WY sagebrush steppe: Declines from FRCC 2 to FRCC 3. ***<u>VMA C:</u>*** • WY sagebrush steppe: Declines from FRCC 2 to FRCC 3, • Basin big sagebrush: Remains at FRCC 3, and • Black/low sagebrush: Remains at FRCC 3. ***<u>VMA D:</u>*** • WY sagebrush steppe: Declines from FRCC 2 to FRCC 3, • Basin big sagebrush: Remains at FRCC 3, • Black/low sagebrush: Declines from FRCC 2 to FRCC 3, and • Mtn. big sagebrush: Declines from FRCC 1 to FRCC 3.

No Action Alternative	Alternative I	Alternative II	Alternative III	Alternative IV	Alternative V	Alternative VI
Habitat for Fish, Wildlife, and Special Status Plants and Animals						
The No Action Alternative would result in the least improvement in habitat and proper functioning condition (PFC) ratings of all alternatives and is the least likely to attain habitat condition and riparian objectives over the life of the plan.	Alternative I is the third most likely to attain habitat condition and riparian objectives over the life of the plan.	Alternative II is the second least likely to attain habitat condition and riparian objectives over the life of the plan. Increased commercial uses, combined with fewer miles achieving PFC and habitat condition objectives, would result in the most miles of special status aquatic species habitat in a reduced condition.	Alternative III is fourth most likely to attain habitat condition and riparian objectives over the life of the plan. The attainment of the riparian and habitat condition objectives is less likely due to the increased resource uses, in addition to the enhanced wildland fire suppression infrastructure.	Alternative IV is the most likely to attain habitat condition and riparian objectives over the life of the plan. Active restoration is more likely to achieve restoration objectives and in a shorter timeframe than passive restoration.	Alternative V is the second most likely to attain habitat condition and riparian objectives over the life of the plan. Passive restoration would have fewer short-term impacts, but longer timeframes for habitat and riparian objectives to be met.	Alternative VI is the most likely to attain habitat condition and riparian objectives over the life of the plan. Active restoration is more likely to achieve restoration objectives and in a shorter timeframe than passive restoration.
The No Action Alternative would not restore habitat for wildlife in the mountain mahogany/mountain shrub and sagebrush steppe groups, but would maintain the highest amount of habitat for wildlife in the grassland group.	Alternative I would restore 328,000 acres of shrubland for wildlife in the mountain mahogany/mountain shrub and sagebrush steppe groups and would have the fourth largest reduction in the amount of habitat for wildlife in the grassland group.	Alternative II would not restore habitat for wildlife in the mountain mahogany/mountain shrub and sagebrush steppe groups, but would maintain the second highest amount of habitat for wildlife in the grassland group.	Alternative III would restore 241,000 acres of shrubland for wildlife in the mountain mahogany/mountain shrub and sagebrush steppe groups and would maintain the fifth largest reduction in the amount of habitat for wildlife in the grassland group.	Alternative IV would restore 582,000 acres of shrubland for wildlife in the mountain mahogany/mountain shrub and sagebrush steppe groups and would have the largest reduction in the amount of habitat for wildlife in the grassland group.	Alternative V would restore 438,000 acres of shrubland for wildlife in the mountain mahogany/mountain shrub and sagebrush steppe groups and would have the third largest reduction in the amount of habitat for wildlife in the grassland group.	Alternative VI would restore 464,000 acres of shrubland for wildlife in the mountain mahogany/mountain shrub and sagebrush steppe groups and would have the second largest reduction in the amount of habitat for wildlife in the grassland group.
The No Action Alternative would provide the fourth highest amount of residual cover for wildlife, as it would make the fewest acres unavailable for livestock grazing and allocate the fourth highest amount of vegetation for livestock.	Alternative I would provide the third highest amount of residual cover for wildlife, as it would make the fifth smallest acreage unavailable for livestock grazing and allocate the fifth highest amount of vegetation for livestock.	Alternative II would provide the least residual cover for wildlife, as it would make the second smallest acreage unavailable for to livestock grazing and allocate the highest amount of vegetation for livestock.	Alternative III would provide the second lowest amount of residual cover for wildlife, as it would make the third smallest acreage unavailable for livestock grazing and allocate the second highest amount of vegetation for livestock.	Alternative IV would provide the second highest amount of residual cover for wildlife, as it would make the second largest acreage unavailable for livestock grazing and allocate the second lowest amount of vegetation for livestock.	Alternative V would provide the most residual cover for wildlife, as it would make the largest acreage unavailable for livestock grazing and allocate the lowest amount of vegetation for livestock.	Alternative VI would provide the fifth highest amount of residual cover for wildlife, as it would make the forth smallest acreage unavailable for livestock grazing and allocate the third highest amount of vegetation for livestock.
The No Action Alternative ranks seventh for	Alternative I ranks fifth for management of special status plants,	Alternative II would do the least to manage for special status plants	Alternative III ranks sixth for management of special status plants	Alternative IV-A ranks first while Alternative IV-B ranks third in	Alternative V ranks second for management of special	Alternative VI ranks fourth in maintaining existing special status

No Action Alternative	Alternative I	Alternative II	Alternative III	Alternative IV	Alternative V	Alternative VI
management of special status plants and their habitats as it would do little to restore potential habitat.	due primarily to intermediate levels of habitat restoration and management that would reduce fire-related impacts to special status plants and their habitats and prevent impacts due to cross-country motorized use and route densities.	and their habitats, due to low levels of habitat restoration combined with the highest amount and intensity of livestock use and impacts due to route densities. Critical fire suppression priorities would do little to protect special status plants and their habitats.	and their habitats due primarily to relatively high levels of habitat fragmentation from actions intended to reduce large wildland fires. Vegetated and unvegetated fuel breaks, combined with increased fire suppression infrastructure, would break up contiguous blocks of special status plant habitats. Critical fire suppression priorities would not fully protect occupied and potential habitats for special status plants.	maintaining existing special status plant populations and maintaining or increasing occupied and potential habitats due primarily to actions that actively restore habitats. Management is included in Alternative IV to reduce fire-related impacts to special status plants and their habitats and to prevent impacts due to cross-country motorized vehicle use and route densities.	status plants, due primarily to the passive restoration and noxious weeds and invasive plant treatments, reducing acreage and increasing the time required for restoration. Alternative V would provide the greatest amount of active management to reduce fire-related impacts to special status plants and to prevent impacts due to cross-country motorized vehicle use and route densities.	plant populations and maintaining or increasing occupied and potential habitats. This is due primarily to actions that actively restore habitats, including diversification of plant community composition to support pollinator species and management that would reduce fire-related impacts to special status plants and their habitats and prevent impacts due to cross-country motorized use and route densities.
The No Action Alternative would restore the lowest amount of habitat for sage-grouse and other special status species in the sagebrush group.	Alternative I would restore the third highest amount of habitat for sage-grouse and other special status species in the sagebrush group.	Alternative II would restore the second lowest amount of habitat for sage-grouse and other special status species in the sagebrush group.	Alternative III would restore the fifth highest amount of habitat for sage-grouse and other special status species in the sagebrush group.	Alternative IV would restore the highest amount of habitat for sage-grouse and other special status species in the sagebrush group.	Alternative V would restore the fourth highest amount of habitat for sage-grouse and other special status species in the sagebrush group.	Alternative VI would restore the second highest amount of habitat for sage-grouse and other special status species in the sagebrush group.
This alternative would provide the fourth highest amount of residual cover for sage-grouse and other special status species in the sagebrush group.	This alternative would provide the third highest amount of residual cover for sage-grouse and other special status species in the sagebrush group.	This alternative would provide the least residual cover for sage-grouse and other special status species in the sagebrush group.	This alternative would provide the second lowest amount of residual cover for sage-grouse and other special status species in the sagebrush group.	This alternative would provide the second highest amount of residual cover for sage-grouse and other special status species in the sagebrush group.	This alternative would provide the most residual cover for sage-grouse and other special status species in the sagebrush group.	This alternative would provide the fifth highest amount of residual cover for sage-grouse and other special status species in the sagebrush group.
Livestock Forage						
Livestock management actions would promote uniform use of perennial grass and dominance by non-native perennial and	Livestock management actions would result in moderate, uniform use that would tend to reduce structural complexity for	Livestock management actions would promote uniform use of perennial grass and long-term dominance by non-native	Livestock management actions would result in moderate, uniform use that would tend to reduce structural complexity for	Livestock management actions coupled with vegetation treatments would result in greater structural complexity for both woody and	Livestock management actions coupled with vegetation treatments would result in the greatest potential for species diversity and	Livestock management actions coupled with vegetation treatments would result in greater structural complexity for both woody and

No Action Alternative	Alternative I	Alternative II	Alternative III	Alternative IV	Alternative V	Alternative VI
short-stature, early- and mid-seral grasses.	perennial herbaceous plants.	perennial and short-stature, early- and mid-seral grasses.	perennial herbaceous plants.	herbaceous vegetation compared to the No Action Alternative and Alternatives I, II, and III.	structural complexity and the highest potential for landscape stability compared to all other alternatives.	herbaceous vegetation compared to the No Action Alternative and Alternatives I, II, and III.
Livestock Grazing						
Forage Available for Livestock at Initial and Full Implementation of the Plan based on Areas Available for Livestock Grazing, Vegetation Allocation and Treatments, and 2006 Vegetation Production Data (for Comparison Purposes Only)						
Initial implementation: 200,000 animal unit months (AUMs) Full implementation: 160,000-260,000 AUMs	Initial implementation: 189,000-259,000 AUMs Full implementation[4]: 179,000-245,000 AUMs	Initial implementation: 350,000-423,000 AUMs Full implementation: 362,000-440,000 AUMs	Initial implementation: 273,000-344,000 AUMs Full implementation: 276,000-348,000 AUMs	**Alternative IV-A:** Initial implementation: 94,000-147,000 AUMs Full implementation: 77,000-122,000 AUMs **Alternative IV-B:** Initial implementation: 97,000-151,000 AUMs Full implementation: 81,000-127,000 AUMs	Initial implementation: 46,000-93,000 AUMs Full implementation: 42,000-85,000 AUMs	Initial implementation: 216,000-326,000 AUMs Full implementation: 186,000-279,000 AUMs
The No Action alternative has a low level of limitation on infrastructure for livestock management.	Alternative I provides a moderate level of limitation on infrastructure for livestock management.	Same as the No Action Alternative.	Same as the No Action Alternative.	Alternative IV provides a high level of limitation on infrastructure for livestock management.	Alternative V provides the highest level of limitation on infrastructure for livestock management.	Same as Alternative I.
The level of effort required to minimize conflicts with livestock grazing would be low with regard to resources and high with regard to other uses.	The level of effort required to minimize conflicts with livestock grazing would be low with regard to resources and other uses.	Same as the No Action Alternative.	A moderate amount of effort would be required to minimize conflicts with livestock grazing with regard to resources and other uses.	Same as Alternative III.	The level of effort required to minimize conflicts with livestock grazing would be high with regard to resources and low with regard to other uses.	Same as Alternative I.
Recreation						
Areas with focused recreation management would not change (86,000 acres). However, managing the Special Recreation Management Areas	The SRMAs in Alternative I would provide the broadest range of activity type among all alternatives, maintaining or enhancing existing opportunities. Areas	The SRMAs in Alternative II would maintain or enhance some existing opportunities, while minimizing conflict with resource uses. Areas with focused recreation	The SRMAs in Alternative III would maintain or enhance existing opportunities. Areas with focused recreation management would decrease to 42,000	The SRMAs in Alternative IV would maintain or enhance existing opportunities. Areas with focused recreation management would increase to 190,000	The SRMAs in Alternative V would maintain some existing opportunities. Areas with focused recreation management would decrease to 5,000 acres.	Alternative IV would designate 20,000 acres as SRMAs. Alternative VI would be the only alternative designating Extensive Recreation Management Areas

[4] For all action alternatives, reflects the impact of vegetation treatments on forage availability.

No Action Alternative	Alternative I	Alternative II	Alternative III	Alternative IV	Alternative V	Alternative VI
(SRMAs) without clearly established boundaries does not address the existing or anticipated increase in demand of the recreational resources.	with focused recreation management would increase to 326,000 acres.	management would decrease to 7,000 acres.	acres.	acres.		(ERMAs) (304,000 acres), which would sustain the principal recreation activities, commensurate with management of other resources and resource uses, for these areas.
The type, number, and setting of motorized recreation opportunities would be maintained.	The type, number, and setting of motorized recreation opportunities would be enhanced.	The type, number, and setting of motorized recreation opportunities would be limited.	The type, number, and setting of motorized recreation opportunities would be enhanced.	The type, number, and setting of motorized recreation opportunities would be enhanced.	The type, number, and setting of motorized recreation opportunities would be limited.	The type, number, and setting of motorized recreation opportunities would be enhanced.
The type, number, and setting of non-motorized recreation opportunities would be limited.	The type, number, and setting of non-motorized recreation opportunities would be enhanced.	The type, number, and setting of non-motorized recreation opportunities would be limited.	The type, number, and setting of non-motorized recreation opportunities would be maintained.	The type, number, and setting of non-motorized recreation opportunities would be enhanced.	The type, number, and setting of non-motorized recreation opportunities would be maintained.	The type, number, and setting of non-motorized recreation opportunities would be enhanced.
Energy Development						
Forty seven percent of lands within 2 miles of areas rated fair or higher for wind resources would be available for wind energy development.	Seventeen percent of lands within 2 miles of areas rated fair or higher for wind resources would be available for wind energy development.	Fifty four percent of lands within 2 miles of areas rated fair or higher for wind resources would be available for wind energy development.	Twenty one percent of lands within 2 miles of areas rated fair or higher for wind resources would be available for wind energy development.	Sixteen percent of lands within 2 miles of areas rated fair or higher for wind resources would be available for wind energy development.	Thirteen percent of lands within 2 miles of areas rated fair or higher for wind resources would be available for wind energy development.	Same as Alternative V.
Availability of Federal Mineral Estate in Potential Oil and Gas Areas for Mineral Leasing (Acres)						
Open 188,000 Open with Constraint 101,000 Closed 18,000	Open 185,000 Open with Constraint 100,000 Closed 11,000	Open 288,000 Open with Constraint 18,000 Closed 100	Open 288,000 Open with Constraint 13,000 Closed 5,000	Open 189,000 Open with Constraint 83,000 Closed 35,000	Open 209,000 Open with Constraint 56,000 Closed 41,000	Open 189,000 Open with Constraint 113,000 Closed 5,000
Availability of Federal Mineral Estate in Potential Geothermal Areas for Mineral Leasing (Acres)						
Open 289,000 Open with Constraint 53,000 Closed 24,000	Open 327,000 Open with Constraint 25,000 Closed 14,000	Open 349,000 Open with Constraint 16,000 Closed 700	Open 349,000 Open with Constraint 12,000 Closed 5,000	Open 331,000 Open with Constraint 29,000 Closed 8,000	Open 335,000 Open with Constraint 20,000 Closed 12,000	Open 309,000 Open with Constraint 50,000 Closed 5,000
Areas of Critical Environmental Concern (ACECs)						
The No Action Alternative would have: • 3 ACECs designated,	Alternative I would have: • 5 ACECs designated,	Alternative II would have: • 0 ACECs designated,	Alternative III would have: • 3 ACECs designated,	Alternative IV would have: • 5 ACECs designated,	Alternative V would have: • 4 ACECs designated,	Alternative VI would have: • 4 ACECs designated,

No Action Alternative	Alternative I	Alternative II	Alternative III	Alternative IV	Alternative V	Alternative VI
• 89,000 acres under ACEC management, and • 25% of lands with relevant and important values would receive special management through ACEC designation.	• 97,000 acres under ACEC management, and • 44% of lands with relevant and important values would receive management through ACEC designation.	• 0 acres under ACEC management, and • 0% of lands with relevant and important values would receive management through ACEC designation.	• 61,000 acres under ACEC management, and • 19% of lands with relevant and important values would receive management through ACEC designation.	• 333,000 acres (Alternative IV-A) and 230,000 acres (Alternative IV-B) under ACEC management, and • 56% (Alternative IV-A) and 48% (Alternative IV-B) of lands with relevant and important values would receive management through ACEC designation.	• 966,000 acres under ACEC management, and • 61% of lands with relevant and important values would receive management through ACEC designation.	• 22,000 acres under ACEC management, and • 5% of lands with relevant and important values would receive management through ACEC designation.

Consultation and Coordination

The BLM planning process for the Jarbidge Proposed RMP/Final EIS was conducted in accordance with the requirements of NEPA, CEQ regulations, and Department of the Interior (DOI) and BLM policies and regulations. NEPA and the associated regulatory/policy framework require Federal agencies to involve interested publics in their decision-making processes. Title II, Section 202 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act directs BLM to coordinate planning efforts with American Indian Tribes, other Federal agencies, and State and local governments as part of its land use planning process.

Chapter 5 describes the consultation with the Shoshone-Bannock and Shoshone-Paiute Tribes, coordination with Federal, State, and local government agencies; and addition collaborative efforts by the BLM throughout the planning process, including the RMP newsletter and website, scoping, public meetings, briefings, and presentations. It also discusses public comments received on the Draft RMP/EIS.