UNCOMPAHGRE BASIN RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PLAN AMENDMENT

DECISION RECORD
FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT
CO-034-94-23

Decision: It is my decision to amend the existing land disposal decision in the Uncompahgre Basin Resource Management Plan (RMP) to classify public lands in the planning area, excluding special management retention areas, into one of two categories for disposal or multiple use management purposes.

The public lands in special management areas within the planning area, aggregating 45,549 acres, will remain unavailable for disposal because of their particular status. These lands include the recommended Gunnison Gorge Wilderness Area, Adobe Badlands Wilderness Study Area (WSA), Camel Back WSA, Escalante Canyon Area of Critical Environmental Concern (ACEC), Fairview Research Natural Area/Area of Critical Environmental Concern (RNA/ACEC), and Needle Rock Outstanding Natural Area/Area of Critical Environmental Concern (ONA/ACEC).

The remaining public lands in the planning area are classified into the following two categories:

Category I lands are the tracts of public land which meet one or more of the criteria for disposal through public sale as set forth in Section 203 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act (FLPMA). Category I lands are primarily those lands currently identified as potential disposal tracts in the RMP. A total of 128 tracts of public land totalling approximately 10,353 acres are classified as Category I.

Category II lands consist of the remaining 427,888 acres of public lands in the planning area. Category II lands do not meet the Section 203 FLPMA sale criteria, and therefore will not be considered for disposal by sale. These lands could, however, be considered for disposal on a case-by-case basis through exchange, boundary adjustments, state indemnity selection, R&PP Act applications, or other appropriate statute or authority, if the disposal serves the public interest.

Alternative: In 1993, the County of Delta (County) identified and filed an application under the provisions of the Recreation and Public Purposes (R&PP) Act, as amended, for 440 acres of public land as a potential location for a new solid waste disposal facility (landfill). Disposal of the site in the County's application would not be in conformance with the existing RMP land disposal decision as the subject lands are not presently identified for disposal. This landfill alternative considered amending the

RMP to classify only those 440 acres of lands under application by the County as Category II lands, but did not address the larger issue of management flexibility regarding the potential disposal of any of the remaining lands within the planning area. While this EA/DR would classify the 440 acres identified in the County's application as Category II lands (available for disposal by means other than FLPMA sale), this EA/DR does not analyze or make a decision regarding the County's proposed application. That application will be further analyzed in accordance with NEPA and Bureau land disposal regulations to determine if it is in the public interest to make the land available to the County for use as a landfill.

Mitigation: The decision to approve the plan amendment will replace the current land disposal decision in the RMP. This decision to modify the RMP is a "paper change" only and does not authorize any surface disturbing activities, therefore mitigation measures have not been identified. Any future proposed land disposal action will be analyzed in a site specific EA, and necessary mitigation measures will be identified at that time.

Rationale: Amending the land disposal decision in the RMP will bring it into conformance with current land use planning guidance. It will also provide BLM with flexibility to complete individual disposal actions that are in the public interest without repeating the plan amendment process for each action.

Finding of No Significant Impact: Based on the analysis of environmental impacts contained in the attached EA, I have determined that the impacts are not considered to be significant and the preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement is not required.

This decision on the plan amendment will become final at the end of the 30 day protest period and after the Governor's consistency review period which ends September 26, 1994, provided no inconsistencies are found or protests received.

Approved by:

Bob Moore, State Director — Date 9/20/94

Attachment (1)
EA - CO-034-94-23

UNCOMPAHGRE BASIN RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PLAN AMENDMENT

ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT
CO-034-94-23

I. PURPOSE AND NEED:

In accordance with the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (FLPMA), the public lands managed by the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) are to be retained in Federal ownership unless the land use planning process determines that disposal of a particular tract will serve the national interest. Disposal can be accomplished through sale, exchange, Recreation and Public Purpose Act sale, state indemnity selection, or other applicable statute or authority. Section 203 of FLPMA (43 USC 1713) identifies specific criteria that must be met before a tract of public land can be sold:

* such tract because of its location or other characteristics is difficult and uneconomic to manage as part of the public lands, and is not suitable for management by another Federal department or agency; or

* such tract was acquired for a specific purpose and the tract is no longer required for that or any other Federal purpose; or

* disposal of such tract will serve important public objectives, including but not limited to, expansion of communities and economic development, which cannot be achieved prudently or feasibly on land other than public land, and which outweigh other public objectives and values, including, but not limited to, recreation and scenic values, which would be served by maintaining such tract in Federal ownership.

The BLM's land use planning process utilizes Resource Management Plans (RMPs) to establish resource condition objectives, allocate land uses, and identify management direction and actions.

The purpose of the proposed action in this Environmental Assessment is to amend the land disposal decision in the Uncompahgre Basin RMP. The proposed amendment evolved from an application filed under the provisions of the Recreation and Public Purposes (R&PP) Act, as amended, by the County of Delta (County). In 1993, the County identified 440 acres of public land in Sections 15 and 16, Township 14 South, Range 95 West, 6th Principal Meridian, as a potential location for a new solid waste disposal facility (landfill).

The Uncompahgre Basin RMP, which was approved in 1989 and encompasses a planning area of approximately 483,790 acres of public land, identified 143 tracts of public land totalling 11,026

acres for further consideration for disposal by sale or exchange. The disposal tracts were identified using two criteria: first, individual tracts could not exceed 500 acres in size, and second, each tract had to meet at least one of the three sale criteria identified in FLPMA.

In accordance with FLPMA, the remaining 472,764 acres of public lands in the planning area, including the 440 acres identified in the County's application, are not available for disposal unless the Uncompahgre Basin RMP is amended.

This action is needed for three reasons; first, to make the land disposal decision in the Uncompahgre Basin RMP consistent with current land use planning guidance; second, to improve BLM's ability to respond in a timely manner to exchange proposals, R&PP applications, and other disposal initiatives; and third, to consider the County's R&PP application.

The current RMP land disposal decision is not consistent with current resource management planning guidance. Under the supplemental program guidance for land resources (BLM Manual 1623.2), public lands designated as available for disposal must be identified as Category I lands (those lands meeting the Section 203 FLPMA criteria for sale) or Category II lands (those lands available for disposal by means other than sale). The proposed plan amendment would bring the RMP land disposal decision into conformance with current planning guidance.

At present, BLM must prepare and approve a plan amendment before it can dispose of any tract of public land not currently identified for disposal in the RMP. The proposed plan amendment would provide the flexibility needed to analyze individual disposal actions, base BLM land tenure decisions on sound resource management goals, and eliminate the need to repeat the plan amendment process to respond to individual proposals.

The public lands identified in the County's R&PP application are not currently identified for disposal. If the land disposal decision in the Uncompahgre Basin RMP is amended to include these lands in either Category I or Category II, the County's application can be further analyzed in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and Bureau land disposal regulations to determine if it is in the public interest to make the land available to the County for use as a solid waste disposal facility.

II. CONFORMANCE WITH LAND USE PLANS

The land use plan relating to the area covered by this Environmental Assessment is the Uncompahgre Basin RMP. As explained above, the proposed action and the County alternative would amend the RMP to bring those actions into conformance with the RMP.

III. PROPOSED ACTION AND ALTERNATIVES

A. Proposed Action

The proposed action is to amend the existing land use disposal decision in the Uncompahgre Basin RMP, except for public lands, aggregating 45,549 acres, in special management areas, which include the recommended Gunnison Gorge Wilderness Area, Adobe Badlands Wilderness Study Area (WSA), Camel Back WSA, Escalante Canyon Area of Critical Environmental Concern (ACEC), Fairview Research Natural Area/Area of Critical Environmental Concern (RNA/ACEC), and Needle Rock Outstanding Natural Area/Area of Critical Environmental Concern (ONA/ACEC). Public lands in these management areas would remain unavailable for disposal because of their particular status. See Appendix A for a description of these lands.

The remaining public lands in the planning area would be classified into one of two categories for disposal or multiple use management purposes:

Category I lands are the tracts of public land which meet one or more of the criteria for disposal through public sale as set forth in Section 203 of FLPMA. Lands that are proposed for Category I are primarily those lands currently identified as potential disposal tracts in the RMP. A total of 128 tracts of public land totalling approximately 10,353 acres would be classified as Category I. Individual disposal determinations would be subject to site-specific NEPA analysis and other statutory requirements. Federal mineral estate could be conveyed with surface estate where feasible and determined to be in the public interest. See Appendix B for descriptions of the tracts and applicable sale criteria. Although Category I lands meet the public sale criteria of FLPMA, other means of title transfer, such as exchange or R&PP conveyance, would not be precluded.

Category II lands would consist of the remaining 427,888 acres of public lands in the planning area. These lands comprise the land base to be managed by BLM for multiple use and ecosystem management purposes. Category II lands do not meet the Section 203 FLPMA sale criteria, and therefore would not be considered for disposal by sale. These lands could, however, be considered for disposal on a case-by-case basis through exchange, boundary adjustments, state indemnity selection, R&PP Act applications, or other appropriate statute or authority, if the disposal serves the public interest. These lands could be available for consideration for disposal through exchange if the exchange would result in improved manageability of lands and resources, consolidated land patterns or if the exchange would otherwise be in the public interest, pursuant to Section 206 of FLPMA. Individual disposals would be subject to site-specific NEPA analysis. The 440 acre parcel of public land under application by Delta County for landfill purposes is included in this category and would be available for conveyance subject to the results of the site-specific NEPA analysis.

The Uncompahgre Basin RMP contains 16 (sixteen) Management Units. A management unit is a geographically defined area which will be managed for a stated objective. The RMP identifies the management objective for each unit and describes the management actions which will be allowed, limited, or excluded to meet the stated objective.

The special management units and areas as previously described would not be modified as a result of this plan amendment. Public lands would not be identified for disposal, by sale or exchange, in these areas which total approximately 45,549 acres. These areas are further described as follows.

Management Unit (MU)	Area	Acres
4,6 *	Recommended Gunnison Gorge Wilderness Area	22,416
12	Escalante Canyon ACEC	1,895
13	Fairview RNA/ACEC	377
14	Needle Rock ONA/ACEC	80
2,5,15 *	Adobe Badlands WSA	10,282
1,2,3,9 *	Camel Back WSA	10,499
		45,549

* - denotes portion of the Management Unit

Public lands within the recommended Gunnison Gorge Wilderness Area and the Adobe Badlands and Camel Back WSAs would automatically become Category II lands if Congress determines that these lands, or portions thereof, are not suitable for wilderness and releases those lands from further wilderness review.

B. Delta County Landfill Alternative

On October 9, 1991, The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) published new regulations under Subtitle D, 40 CFR Part 258, which established criteria for municipal solid waste landfills. The regulations are comprehensive and provide specific guidelines for the management of all new and existing landfills and apply to landfills that receive waste on or after October 9, 1993. This date was subsequently extended to April 9, 1994. While these regulations provide nationwide standards for protecting the human health and the environment, the actual planning and direct implementation of solid waste programs remain largely State and local functions.

Delta County has operated three landfills; Delta Landfill, Tongue Creek Landfill and the North Fork Landfill. The Tongue Creek Landfill is on public land and is leased from BLM under the R&PP Act to the County. Because of Federal liabilities associated with leased sites, it is the BLM's policy to work with the local communities to patent (deed) new disposal sites to them. Existing leased sites are to be closed.

Since the new EPA regulations, Delta County has tried to identify potential sites suitable for the eventual development of a single

landfill for the county and to comply with Subtitle D. The County has since closed the Tongue Creek and Delta landfills. The County's Integrated Solid Waste Advisory Committee has been researching potential landfill sites on both private lands and the BLM administered public lands that were identified for disposal in the present RMP. The County has determined that none of these lands are suitable for a landfill because they either have drainage problems, are situated too near to major rivers or creeks, are legally or physically inaccessible because of topography or surrounding land ownership or are inconveniently located to serve the general public in Delta County.

In July 1992, the County filed a formal request with BLM for 440 acres of public land they have identified as a potential location for a solid waste disposal facility. In January 1993, the County filed an application under the provisions of the R&PP Act for the public land tract. The County is currently evaluating the site to determine if it meets the established criteria for solid waste disposal purposes as set forth by EPA and the Colorado Department of Health (CDH). These lands have been examined and found suitable for classification for conveyance to the County under the R&PP Act if the site meets EPA and CDH requirements.

Presently, disposal of the site in the County's application is not in conformance with the RMP as the lands are not identified for disposal. This landfill alternative would amend the RMP to classify only those 440 acres of lands under application by the County as Category II lands. This would make these lands available for consideration to allow for disposal under Category II and the remaining land disposal decisions in the RMP would remain unchanged. This is not the final EA for the landfill. The County's application will be further analyzed in accordance with NEPA and Bureau land disposal regulations to determine if it is in the public interest to make the land available to the County for use as a landfill.

C. No Action

The No Action alternative would maintain the status quo. Existing land disposal decisions in the RMP would not be modified, and disposal of the lands in the County's application would not conform to the RMP and could not be approved.

IV. AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT

The RMP planning area is in west-central Colorado in portions of Delta, Gunnison, Mesa, Montrose and Ouray counties. It encompasses approximately 1.38 million acres of which BLM has the administrative responsibility for the public lands and resources on 483,790 surface acres and 755,923 acres of subsurface federal mineral estate.

The planning area is predominantly a broad river valley surrounded by rolling hills, high plateaus, deep canyons and rugged mountains.

The elevation varies from 5,000 feet in the Gunnison River valley northeast of Delta to just over 11,000 feet on Cimarron Ridge southeast of Montrose. The area has a dry high valley/mountainous continental climate characterized by low humidity, sunny days, clear nights, low to moderate precipitation and evaporation, and wide-ranging diurnal temperature changes. Nine broad vegetation types occur within the planning area. The mountain shrub, pinyon-juniper woodland, sagebrush, and desert shrub types comprise 97 percent of the area. A more extensive description of the affected environment is included in the Draft Uncompahgre Basin RMP/EIS dated July 1989. This EA is tiered to that document by reference.

V. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

A. Proposed Action

If the proposed action is adopted and implemented, 128 tracts of public lands containing approximately 10,353 acres would continue to be identified for disposal under Category I. Identification of these tracts as Category I lands does not mean that the lands must be sold, but only that the lands meet the criteria for sale under Section 203 of FLPMA and therefore, may be sold. Disposal determinations would be made on a case-by-case basis and would be subject to site-specific NEPA analysis and other statutory requirements. Specific disposal actions would reduce the public land acreage in the planning area, but the estimated disposal acreage is expected to be insignificant. During the past 15 years, approximately 220 acres have been sold in the planning area. On an annual basis, no public lands were sold in 11 of those years. Based on this historical data, it would be reasonable to estimate that approximately 150 acres would be sold during the next 10 years. Because no other Federal agencies are expected to sell any of their lands within the RMP area during this time frame, the cumulative impact to the non-private land base is expected to be insignificant.

The balance of the public lands in the planning area, excluding the special management areas previously identified (see Appendix A), would be identified as Category II lands. Although future demand is unknown at this time, the disposal of Category II lands would be expected to have a net beneficial impact to the human environment; more public lands would become available for R&PP conveyance, exchanges, state indemnity selections, and boundary adjustments. In exchanges, sensitive or critical habitats, areas with high public recreation potential, and areas providing access to more public lands would be acquired. Individual disposal actions (e.g., exchanges, R&PP conveyances, etc.) would be analyzed in site-specific NEPA documents.

Exchanges in particular are expected to have a positive impact on public lands and resources through the acquisition of sensitive or critical habitats, areas with high public recreation potential, and areas providing access to other public lands. Exchanges are generally "no net-loss" situations where the respective acreage of

the lands exchanged are approximately equal. In those situations where the acreages are not equal, the resource values on the lands returned to Federal ownership would off set the loss of public land and associated resources.

During the past 15 years, seven (7) exchanges have been completed in the Montrose District, resulting in the conveyance of 3,028.50 acres and the acquisition of 4,353.11 acres. Of these exchanges, one (1) exchange has been completed in this planning area resulting in 480 acres conveyed and 540 acres acquired. This exchange was completed in 1982, prior to the completion of the RMP in 1989. The existing RMP decision has proved to be restrictive in that it limits BLM's flexibility to favorably consider exchange proposals which would benefit natural resource management and the public in general.

Although the historical record indicates that it is unlikely that any exchanges would occur in the planning area in the next 10 years, amending the RMP to increase the flexibility to consider exchange proposals may provide better opportunities for beneficial land tenure adjustment through exchange.

The cumulative effect resulting from the disposal of Category II lands is expected to be insignificant because of the small amount of net gain/loss of public land acreage and the limited demand for R&PP conveyances. Although other Federal land management agencies have exchange and acquisition programs, they do not have outright disposal authority and therefore any gain/loss of federally managed lands would amount to an insignificant amount for the same reasons as apply to BLM managed lands. Cumulative impacts on the private property tax base would also be expected to be insignificant for the same reasons as explained above.

B. Delta County Landfill Alternative

The environmental impacts associated with the proposed R&PP application from the County cannot be fully analyzed within the scope of this environmental assessment because the site-specific information being gathered by Delta County and its contractors is not yet available. Under this alternative, BLM would classify 440 acres of public lands as Category II lands, so potentially the public land base in the planning area could be reduced by 440 acres if the County's request is finally approved. A site-specific environmental assessment would be required to analyze the environmental impacts of the proposed solid waste disposal facility prior to any land conveyance to the County.

C. No Action

Under the no action alternative, the RMP would not be amended and the current decision regarding land disposal would remain in effect. Only those tracts currently identified in the RMP would be available for disposal without case-by-case plan amendments. The no action alternative would leave BLM unable to effectively manage

public land resources by restricting our ability to respond favorably to proposals that would improve land status patterns and manageability.

VI. CONSULTATION AND COORDINATION

A Notice of Intent to amend the RMP was published in the Federal Register on April 8, 1993. Approximately 75 letters were mailed to interested parties, and a news release was issued to four (4) newspapers in the planning area. Four public scoping meetings were held, two each in Montrose and Delta. Participation consisted of seven (7) people attending the public meeting in Montrose and twenty (20) people in Delta.

List of preparers:
Allan Belt, Area Manager, Uncompahgre Basin Resource Area (UBRA),
Teresa Pfifer, Realty Specialist, UBRA
Jim Sazama, Range Conservationist, UBRA
Bob Welch, Wildlife Biologist, UBRA
Karen Tucker, Recreation Planner, UBRA
Lynn Lewis, Geologist, UBRA
Ron Huntley, Environmental Coordinator, UBRA
Tom Hurshman, Realty Specialist, Montrose District Office (MDO)
Roger Alexander, Planning and Environmental Coordinator, MDO

APPENDIX A

SPECIAL MANAGEMENT AREAS

The recommended Gunnison Gorge Wilderness Area (Gorge) is comprised of portions of Management Units (MUs) 4 and 6, as defined in the RMP, and is located approximately 10 miles east of Delta, Colorado. The proposed area contains 22,416 acres and has been recommended as suitable for wilderness designation. Until a final Congressional decision on wilderness designation or non-designation is made, the Gorge will be managed according to the Wilderness Interim Management Policy and the Gunnison Gorge Recreation Area Management Plan (RAMP). If designated as wilderness, it would provide long-term protection for the area's wilderness values. Wilderness designation would complement and enhance the adjacent Black Canyon of the Gunnison National Monument.

Management Unit (MU) 12 is designated as the Escalante Canyon Area of Critical Environmental Concern (ACEC). This MU comprises 1,895 acres of public land in Escalante Canyon approximately sixteen miles southwest of Delta, Colorado. Several listed plant species and two unique plant associations occur in the MU. The area also receives significant recreational use due to its scenic qualities and the presence of eroded potholes in Escalante Creek. This designation will enhance management and protection of the listed plant species and unique plant associations, and will improve the public's awareness of the recreational hazards of the Escalante potholes.

Management Unit 13 is designated as the Fairview Research Natural Area/Area of Critical Environmental Concern (RNA/ACEC). This MU consists of two tracts totalling 377 acres of public land eight miles east of Montrose, Colorado. These tracts contain the largest population of the endangered clay-loving wild buckwheat in the planning area and also have significant populations of Montrose penstemon, a candidate species.

Management Unit 14 is designated as the Needle Rock Outstanding Natural Area/Area of Critical Environmental Concern (ONA/ACEC). This MU is an 80-acre site of public land three miles northeast of Crawford, Colorado and consists of a volcanic structure with high-value scientific, interpretive, and scenic characteristics. Needle Rock is part of the Colorado Natural Areas Program and is one of the significant public land geologic features in Colorado as identified by the BLM's Geologic Advisory Group.

The Adobe Badlands Wilderness Study Area (WSA) is comprised of portions of MUs 2, 5 and 15 and contains 10,282 acres of public land located approximately three miles northwest of Delta, Colorado. This area, commonly known as "the adobes", consists of Mancos shale hills and flats which, through wind and water erosion, have formed unique scenic formations. This area has been proposed

as a WSA as it meets the criteria for potential wilderness designation, although this WSA has been recommended as nonsuitable for wilderness designation.

The Camel Back WSA comprises 10,499 acres of public land and is located approximately eleven miles west of Olathe, Colorado. This WSA contains portions of MUs 1, 2, 3 and 9. This area has been proposed as a WSA as it meets the criteria for potential wilderness designation, although this WSA has been recommended as nonsuitable for wilderness designation.

APPENDIX B

UNCOMPAHGRE BASIN RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PLAN
CATEGORY I DISPOSAL TRACTS

North Half of Planning Area

1. T. 11 S., R. 89 W., Sec. 19: Lots 8, 11; Sec. 30: Lot 6 - 39.73 acre isolated parcel, difficult and uneconomic to manage.

2. T. 13 S., R. 89 W., Sec. 7: SE¼SW¼, Lot 4 - 76.09 acre isolated parcel, difficult and uneconomic to manage.

3. T. 13 S., R. 89 W., Sec. 9: Lot 10; Sec. 10: Lots 11-14 - 156.45 acre isolated parcel, difficult and uneconomic to manage.

4. T. 13 S., R. 89 W., Sec. 10: Lots 6, 7 - 51.91 acre isolated parcel, difficult and uneconomic to manage.

5. T. 13 S., R. 89 W., Sec. 11: Lot 3 - 25.06 acre isolated parcel, difficult and uneconomic to manage.

6. T. 12 S., R. 90 W., Sec. 7: NE¼NE¼ - 40 acre isolated parcel, difficult and uneconomic to manage.

7. T. 12 S., R. 90 W., Sec. 11: SW¼NW¼ - 40 acre isolated parcel, difficult and uneconomic to manage.

8. T. 12 S., R. 90 W., Sec. 12: SE¼SW¼ - 40 acre isolated parcel, difficult and uneconomic to manage.

9. T. 12 S., R. 91 W., Sec. 2: Lot 7, 8; Sec. 3: Lot 5 - 42.93 acre isolated parcel, difficult and uneconomic to manage.

10. T. 12 S., R. 91 W., Sec. 12: NE¼NE¼ - 40 acre isolated parcel, difficult and uneconomic to manage.

11. T. 13 S., R. 91 W., Sec. 21: Lot 7; Sec. 22: Lot 10 - 75.25 acre isolated parcel, difficult and uneconomic to manage.

12. T. 13 S., R. 91 W., Sec. 22: Lots 2, 3 - 84.03 acre isolated parcel, difficult and uneconomic to manage.

13. T. 15 S., R. 91 W., Sec. 21: W½NE¼ - 80 acre isolated parcel, difficult and uneconomic to manage.

14. T. 15 S., R. 91 W., Sec. 21: NW¼SW¼ - 40 acre isolated parcel, difficult and uneconomic to manage.

15. T. 15 S., R. 91 W., Sec. 22: NW¼NE¼, NE¼NW¼ - 80 acre isolated parcel, difficult and uneconomic to manage.

16. T. 15 S., R. 91 W., Sec. 23: NW¼NW¼ - 40 acre isolated parcel, difficult and uneconomic to manage.

17. T. 15 S., R. 91 W., Sec. 26: E½NW¼, SW¼ - 240 acre isolated parcel, difficult and uneconomic to manage.

18. T. 13 S., R. 92 W., Sec. 34: Lots 7, 8; T. 14 S., R. 92 W., Sec. 3: Lot 4 - 121.34 acre isolated parcel, difficult and uneconomic to manage.

19. T. 14 S., R. 92 W., Sec. 3: NE¼SE¼ - 40 acre isolated parcel, difficult and uneconomic to manage.

20. T. 14 S., R. 92 W., Sec. 17: SW¼NW¼ - 40 acre isolated parcel, difficult and uneconomic to manage.

21. T. 14 S., R. 92 W., Sec. 32: NW¼SW¼ - 40 acre isolated parcel, difficult and uneconomic to manage.

22. T. 14 S., R. 92 W., Sec. 32: SE¼SE¼; Sec. 33: SW¼SW¼; T. 15 S., R. 92 W., Sec. 4: Lot 4, SW¼NW¼; Sec. 5: Lots 1, 2, SW¼NE¼, SE¼SW¼ - 309.17 acre isolated parcel, difficult and uneconomic to manage.

23. T. 15 S., R. 92 W., Sec. 23: SE¼SW¼, SW¼SE¼; Sec. 26: NE¼NW¼ - 120 acre isolated parcel, difficult and uneconomic to manage.

24. T. 15 S., R. 92 W., Sec. 31: Lot 5 - 41.82 acre isolated parcel, difficult and uneconomic to manage.

25. T. 13 S., R. 93 W., Sec. 6: Lots 10-12, 19; T. 13 S., R. 94 W., Sec. 1: E½SE¼; Sec. 12: N½NE¼ - 309.12 acre isolated parcel, difficult and uneconomic to manage.

26. T. 14 S., R. 93 W., Sec. 17: SW¼SW¼; Sec. 19: NE¼NE¼; Sec. 20: NW¼ - 240 acre isolated parcel, difficult and uneconomic to manage.

27. T. 14 S., R. 93 W., Sec. 22: SW¼NE¼, E½NW¼ - 120 acre isolated parcel, difficult and uneconomic to manage.

28. T. 14 S., R. 93 W., Sec. 31: Lot 8 - 37.33 acre isolated parcel, difficult and uneconomic to manage.

29. T. 15 S., R. 93 W., Sec. 25: Lots 5-8 - 164.55 acre isolated parcel, difficult and uneconomic to manage.

30. T. 15 S., R. 93 W., Sec. 36: Lot 1 - 41.61 acre isolated parcel, difficult and uneconomic to manage.

31. T. 12 S., R. 94 W., Sec. 32: Lot 14 - 10.91 acre isolated parcel, difficult and uneconomic to manage.

32. T. 12 S., R. 94 W., Sec. 34: TR 81 - 1.60 acre isolated parcel, difficult and uneconomic to manage.

33. T. 12 S., R. 94 W., Sec. 34: TR 86 - 14.52 acre isolated parcel, difficult and uneconomic to manage.

34. T. 12 S., R. 94 W., Sec. 35: Lot 4; TR 83 - 24.47 acre isolated parcel, difficult and uneconomic to manage.

35. T. 14 S., R. 94 W., Sec. 20: SE¼SE¼; Sec. 21: W½SW¼ - 120 acre isolated parcel, difficult and uneconomic to manage.

36. T. 14 S., R. 94 W., Sec. 36: W½SW¼, NE¼SW¼, NW¼SE¼ - 160 acre isolated parcel, difficult and uneconomic to manage.

37. T. 15 S., R. 94 W., Sec. 1: Lots 22, 28, 29 - 69.94 acre isolated parcel, difficult and uneconomic to manage.

38. T. 15 S., R. 94 W., Sec. 19: NE¼SE¼ - 40 acre isolated parcel, difficult and uneconomic to manage.

39. T. 15 S., R. 94 W., Sec. 32: W½NW¼ - 80 acre isolated parcel, difficult and uneconomic to manage.

40. T. 15 S., R. 94 W., Sec. 32: SW¼SE¼ - 40 acre isolated parcel, difficult and uneconomic to manage.

41. T. 12 S., R. 95 W., Sec. 25: Lot 6, SW¼SW¼; Sec. 36: Lot 3 - 120.68 acre isolated parcel, difficult and uneconomic to manage.

42. T. 12 S., R. 95 W., Sec. 36: Lot 9; T. 13 S., R. 95 W., Sec. 1: Lot 6 - 79.23 acre isolated parcel, difficult and uneconomic to manage.

43. T. 13 S., R. 95 W., Sec. 24: Lot 5 - 41.87 acre isolated parcel, difficult and uneconomic to manage.

44. T. 13 S., R. 95 W., Sec. 26: Lot 8 - 43.01 acre isolated parcel, difficult and uneconomic to manage.

45. T. 13 S., R. 95 W., Sec. 28: Lot 2 - 40.86 acre isolated parcel, difficult and uneconomic to manage.

46. T. 14 S., R. 95 W., Sec. 4: SW¼SW¼ - 40 acre isolated parcel, difficult and uneconomic to manage.

47. T. 15 S., R. 95 W., Sec. 13: NE¼NE¼SE¼ - 10 acre isolated parcel, difficult and uneconomic to manage.

48. T. 15 S., R. 95 W., Sec. 13: SW¼SE¼ - 40 acre isolated parcel, difficult and uneconomic to manage.

49. T. 15 S., R. 95 W., Sec. 33: N½NW¼NE¼NE¼SE¼, N½NW¼NE¼SE¼ - 6.25 acre isolated parcel, difficult and uneconomic to manage.

50. T. 15 S., R. 95 W., Sec. 36: SE¼SE¼NE¼SW¼, NE¼NE¼SE¼SW¼, SW¼SW¼NW¼SE¼, NW¼NW¼SW¼SE¼ - 10 acre isolated parcel, difficult and uneconomic to manage.

51. T. 14 S., R. 96 W., Sec. 2: SE¼SE¼ - 40 acre isolated parcel, difficult and uneconomic to manage.

52. T. 14 S., R. 96 W., Sec. 31: Lot 6 - 43.74 acre isolated parcel, difficult and uneconomic to manage.

53. T. 15 S., R. 96 W., Sec. 1: Lots 3, 4 - 78.49 acre isolated parcel, difficult and uneconomic to manage.

54. T. 15 S., R. 96 W., Sec. 30: N½SE¼ - 80 acre isolated parcel, difficult and uneconomic to manage.

<u>South Half of Planning Area</u>

55. T. 50 N., R. 5½ W., Sec. 35: Tract 38; Sec. 36: Tracts 37C and 38D - 91.45 acre isolated parcel, difficult and uneconomic to manage.

56. T. 47 N., R. 6 W., Sec. 30: Lot 2 - 40.38 acre isolated parcel, difficult and uneconomic to manage.

57. T. 48 N., R. 6 W., Sec. 8: SE¼SW¼ - 40 acre isolated parcel, difficult and uneconomic to manage.

58. T. 48 N., R. 6 W., Sec. 29: NE¼SW¼ - 40 acre isolated parcel, difficult and uneconomic to manage.

59. T. 49 N., R. 6 W., Sec. 7: Lot 4, SE¼SW¼, SW¼SE¼ - 132.10 acre isolated parcel, difficult and uneconomic to manage.

60. T. 50 N., R. 6 W., Sec. 3: SE¼SW¼, SW¼SE¼ - 80 acre isolated parcel, difficult and uneconomic to manage.

61. T. 50 N., R. 6 W., Sec. 5: W½SE¼, SE¼SE¼; Sec. 8: N½NE¼ - 200 acre isolated parcel, difficult and uneconomic to manage.

62. T. 50 N., R. 6 W., Sec. 9: NE¼NE¼ - 40 acre isolated parcel, difficult and uneconomic to manage.

63. T. 50 N., R. 6 W., Sec. 9: E½SE¼; Sec. 16: NE¼, NE¼NW¼ - 280 acre isolated parcel, difficult and uneconomic to manage.

64. T. 50 N., R. 6 W., Sec. 19: SE¼NE¼ - 40 acre isolated parcel, difficult and uneconomic to manage.

65. T. 51 N., R. 6 W., Sec. 9: S½SW¼; Sec. 16: N½NW¼ - 160 acre isolated parcel, difficult and uneconomic to manage.

66. T. 51 N., R. 6 W., Sec. 10: Lots 1, 2; Sec. 11: Lot 2 - 57.90 acre isolated parcel, difficult and uneconomic to manage.

67. T. 51 N., R. 6 W., Sec. 27: SW¼NE¼, S½NW¼, N½SW¼, SE¼SW¼, SE¼ - 400 acre isolated parcel, difficult and uneconomic to manage.

68. T. 46 N., R. 7 W., Sec. 32: NW¼SE¼ - 40 acre isolated parcel, difficult and uneconomic to manage.

69. T. 49 N., R. 7 W., Sec. 7: NE¼NE¼ - 40 acre isolated parcel, difficult and uneconomic to manage.

70. T. 49 N., R. 7 W., Sec. 9: SW¼SW¼ - 40 acre isolated parcel, difficult and uneconomic to manage.

71. T. 49 N., R. 7 W., Sec. 17: S½NE¼, SE¼; Sec. 20: E½NE¼ - 320 acre isolated parcel, difficult and uneconomic to manage.

72. T. 49 N., R. 7 W., Sec. 19: NE¼NW¼ - 40 acre isolated parcel, difficult and uneconomic to manage.

73. T. 51 N., R. 7 W., Sec. 16: SW¼NW¼, NW¼SW¼ - 80 acre isolated parcel, difficult and uneconomic to manage.

74. T. 44 N., R. 8 W., Sec. 11: Lots 12-14 - 120 acre isolated parcel, difficult and uneconomic to manage.

75. T. 44 N., R. 8 W., Sec. 13: Lots 17, 31 - 63.60 acre isolated parcel, difficult and uneconomic to manage.

76. T. 44 N., R. 8 W., Sec. 13: Lots 28, 30 - 32.99 acre isolated parcel, difficult and uneconomic to manage.

77. T. 44 N., R. 8 W., Sec. 14: E½SE¼ - 80 acre isolated parcel, difficult and uneconomic to manage.

78. T. 46 N., R. 8 W., Sec. 15: N½NE¼, NE¼NW¼ - 120 acre isolated parcel, difficult and uneconomic to manage.

79. T. 46 N., R. 8 W., Sec. 24: NW¼NW¼ - 40 acre isolated parcel, difficult and uneconomic to manage.

80. T. 47 N., R. 8 W., Sec. 14: NW¼SW¼ - 40 acre isolated parcel, difficult and uneconomic to manage.

81. T. 47 N., R. 8 W., Sec. 15: NE¼SW¼, W½SE¼ - 120 acre isolated parcel, difficult and uneconomic to manage.

82. T. 47 N., R. 8 W., Sec. 19: NE¼SE¼ - 40 acre isolated parcel, difficult and uneconomic to manage.

83. T. 48 N., R. 8 W., Sec. 2: S½SW¼, SW¼SE¼; Sec. 11: NW¼NW¼ - 160 acre isolated parcel, difficult and uneconomic to manage.

84. T. 48 N., R. 8 W., Sec. 9: SW¼SE¼ - 40 acre isolated parcel, difficult and uneconomic to manage.

85. T. 48 N., R. 8 W., Sec. 15: NW¼NE¼, S½NE¼, NW¼SW¼, E½SW¼, SE¼ - 400 acre isolated parcel, difficult and uneconomic to manage.

86. T. 48 N., R. 8 W., Sec. 26: S½SW¼ - 80 acre isolated parcel, difficult and uneconomic to manage.

87. T. 49 N., R. 8 W., Sec. 11: E½NW¼, NE¼SW¼, W½SE¼; Sec. 14: N½NE¼ - 280 acre isolated parcel, difficult and uneconomic to manage.

88. T. 49 N., R. 8 W., Sec. 13: SW¼NW¼ - 40 acre isolated parcel, difficult and uneconomic to manage.

89. T. 49 N., R. 8 W., Sec. 13: NW¼SE¼ - 40 acre isolated parcel, difficult and uneconomic to manage.

90. T. 49 N., R. 8 W., Sec. 23: NE¼SE¼ - 40 acre isolated parcel, difficult and uneconomic to manage.

91. T. 49 N., R. 8 W., Sec. 26: SE¼NW¼ - 40 acre isolated parcel, difficult and uneconomic to manage.

92. T. 49 N., R. 8 W., Sec. 29: E½E½SW¼SW¼ - 10 acre isolated parcel, difficult and uneconomic to manage.

93. T. 49 N., R. 8 W., Sec. 31: N½NW¼NW¼NE¼, E½NE¼NE¼NW¼ - 10 acre isolated parcel, difficult and uneconomic to manage.

94. T. 49 N., R. 8 W., Sec. 31: SE¼SW¼NE¼ - 10 acre isolated parcel, difficult and uneconomic to manage.

95. T. 49 N., R. 8 W., Sec. 32: SE¼NE¼SW¼NW¼ - 2.5 acre isolated parcel, difficult and uneconomic to manage.

96. T. 49 N., R. 8 W., Sec. 32: SE¼SW¼SW¼NW¼ - 2.5 acre isolated parcel, difficult and uneconomic to manage.

97. T. 51 N., R. 8 W., Sec. 14: NE¼NE¼ - 40 acre isolated parcel, difficult and uneconomic to manage.

98. T. 44 N., R. 9 W., Sec. 9: SW¼SE¼ - 40 acre isolated parcel, difficult and uneconomic to manage.

99. T. 45 N., R. 9 W., Sec. 14: SW¼SE¼ - 40 acre isolated parcel, difficult and uneconomic to manage.

100. T. 45 N., R. 9 W., Sec. 23: E½NW¼ - 80 acre isolated parcel, difficult and uneconomic to manage.

101. T. 45 N., R. 9 W., Sec. 24: NE¼SW¼, NW¼SE¼ - 80 acre isolated parcel, difficult and uneconomic to manage.

102. T. 45 N., R. 9 W., Sec. 27: SE¼NE¼ - 40 acre isolated parcel, difficult and uneconomic to manage.

103. T. 46 N., R. 9 W., Sec. 15: NE¼NE¼ - 40 acre isolated parcel, difficult and uneconomic to manage.

104. T. 46 N., R. 9 W., Sec. 23: SE¼NW¼ - 40 acre isolated parcel, difficult and uneconomic to manage.

105. T. 47 N., R. 9 W., Sec. 2: Lot 12 - 38.04 acre isolated parcel, difficult and uneconomic to manage.

106. T. 47 N., R. 9 W., Sec. 22: SW¼NW¼ - 40 acre isolated parcel, difficult and uneconomic to manage.

107. T. 47 N., R. 9 W., Sec. 24: NE¼SE¼ - 40 acre isolated parcel, difficult and uneconomic to manage.

108. T. 47 N., R. 9 W., Sec. 36: NW¼SW¼ - 40 acre isolated parcel, difficult and uneconomic to manage.

109. T. 48 N., R. 9 W., Sec. 14: Lot 11, W½NE¼, NW¼SE¼ - 160.84 acre isolated parcel, difficult and uneconomic to manage.

110. T. 48 N., R. 9 W., Sec. 14: Lots 2, 7 - 39.70 acre isolated parcel, difficult and uneconomic to manage.

111. T. 48 N., R. 9 W., Sec. 35: SE¼SE¼ - 40 acre isolated parcel, difficult and uneconomic to manage.

112. T. 50 N., R. 9 W., Sec. 7: E½E½NE¼SW¼NW¼, E½SE¼SW¼NW¼ - 7.5 acre isolated parcel, difficult and uneconomic to manage.

113. T. 47 N., R. 10 W., Sec. 1: Lot 3, SE¼NW¼ - 80.20 acre isolated parcel, difficult and uneconomic to manage.

114. T. 47 N., R. 10 W., Sec. 2: Lot 3 - 40.42 acre isolated parcel, difficult and uneconomic to manage.

115. T. 48 N., R. 10 W., Sec. 11: NW¼NW¼ - 40 acre isolated parcel, difficult and uneconomic to manage.

116. T. 48 N., R. 10 W., Sec. 11: SW¼SW¼; Sec. 14: W½NW¼; Sec. 15: E½NE¼, SW¼NE¼, NE¼SE¼ - 280 acre isolated parcel, difficult and uneconomic to manage.

117. T. 48 N., R. 10 W., Sec. 25: S½SW¼; Sec. 36: N½NW¼, SE¼NW¼, N½SW¼, SW¼SW¼ - 320 acre isolated parcel, difficult and uneconomic to manage.

118. T. 49 N., R. 10 W., Sec. 21: E½SW¼SW¼ - 20 acre isolated parcel, difficult and uneconomic to manage.

119. T. 51 N., R. 10 W., Sec. 16: SW¼SE¼; Sec. 21: W½NE¼ - 120 acre isolated parcel, difficult and uneconomic to manage.

120. T. 51 N., R. 10 W., Sec. 21: NE¼SE¼ - 40 acre isolated parcel, difficult and uneconomic to manage.

121. T. 51 N., R. 10 W., Sec. 22: SE¼SW¼ - 40 acre isolated parcel, difficult and uneconomic to manage.

122. T. 48 N., R. 11 W., Sec. 20: S½SE¼; Sec. 29: NW¼NE¼, NE¼NW¼ - 160 acre isolated parcel, difficult and uneconomic to manage.

123. T. 48 N., R. 11 W., Sec. 27: SE¼SW¼; Sec. 34: E½NW¼, NE¼SW¼ - 160 acre isolated parcel, difficult and uneconomic to manage.

124. T. 48 N., R. 11 W., Sec. 28: N½NW¼ - 80 acre isolated parcel, difficult and uneconomic to manage.

125. T. 48 N., R. 11 W., Sec. 34: SW¼SW¼ - 40 acre isolated parcel, difficult and uneconomic to manage.

126. T. 49 N., R. 11 W., Sec. 29: SE¼NE¼ - 40 acre isolated parcel, difficult and uneconomic to manage.

127. T. 50 N., R. 11 W., Sec. 36: E½NE¼SW¼ - 20 acre isolated parcel, difficult and uneconomic to manage.

128. T. 48 N., R. 12 W., Sec. 14: Lot 1 - 40.58 acre isolated parcel, difficult and uneconomic to manage.