

CHAPTER 2—DESCRIPTIONS OF THE ALTERNATIVES

2.1 INTRODUCTION

Chapter 2 describes four alternative Resource Management Plans (RMP) for managing the public lands and federal minerals within the Resource Management Plan Planning Area (RMPPA). These alternatives are divided into one no action alternative and three action alternatives as follows: Alternative 1 (No Action—Continuation of Existing Management Direction), Alternative 2 (Emphasis on the Development of Resources), Alternative 3 (Emphasis on Protection of Resources), and Alternative 4 (Proposed Plan). Alternative 1 includes direction provided by the Great Divide RMP (USDI, BLM 1990a) and any new direction and policy that have been subsequently developed and documented through plan maintenance or amendment actions. The three action alternatives were developed to present a range of management options to guide decision-making for managing uses and activities within the RMPPA. Each alternative management plan is intended to minimize adverse impacts on cultural and natural resources while providing for compatible resource use and development opportunities, consistent with current laws, regulations, and policies.

Alternatives were developed to establish a framework for measuring the impacts on the RMPPA that might occur as a result of future management. The alternatives themselves do not constitute management decisions, but instead represent reasonable approaches to managing public land and activities consistent with laws, regulations, and policies. The Bureau of Land Management (BLM) exercised its discretion to combine aspects of the various alternatives presented in the Rawlins RMP draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) (USDI, BLM 2004) to develop the proposed RMP and final EIS (FEIS). The National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) requires the development and analysis of several alternatives, including a no action alternative, to measure the impacts that a set of actions could have on the RMPPA. According to NEPA, BLM must consider these impacts in developing the RMP for the RMPPA, as described in Chapter 1.

Section 2.3 presents an overview of the alternatives development process, including alternatives and management options considered but eliminated from detailed analysis. Section 2.4 presents introductory text for management guidance and actions that are applicable or common to all alternatives, including Alternative 1, that are found under each resource or program heading in Table 2-1, Detailed Comparison of Alternatives. Management alternatives considered in the FEIS are summarized in Section 2.5.1 through Section 2.5.4. Section 2.6 presents a summary comparison of impacts from management actions proposed for the four management alternatives addressed in Chapter 4 of the FEIS. Section 2.7 describes the monitoring strategy to be applied to the management of all land and resource management programs. The formation of Activity Plan Working Groups (APWG) is also described in Section 2.7.

2.2 CHANGES BETWEEN THE RMP/DRAFT EIS AND THE PROPOSED RMP/FINAL EIS

Chapter 2 has been reformatted to meet current BLM direction (BLM-H-1601-1, 2005). The changes in document format are most easily noted by comparing the DEIS Table of Contents with the FEIS Table of Contents. Some of the original text has been reformatted either by creating a new section or moving the information to a more appropriate location in the FEIS. The location of where more detailed information may be found is usually referenced within the section.

In Chapter 2, narrative descriptions of the alternatives considered have been expanded (Section 2.5.1 – Section 2.5.3) and a narrative description of the Proposed Plan (Section 2.5.4) provided.

The justification for not analyzing the Western Heritage Alternative (WHA) in detail has been expanded.

Additional text has been added to Section 2.7.2, Activity Plan Working Groups, to expand the purpose, intent and opportunities for APWGs to assist in BLM activity level planning.

2.2.1 Changes Specific to Table 2-1—Detailed Comparison of Alternatives

General

Management actions common to all alternatives were moved from Section 2.4 into Table 2-1, Detailed Comparison of Alternatives.

Management goals for many resources and programs were modified and new objective statements were developed for each resource or program.

Management actions under various resources or programs were modified to remove reference to BLM compliance with law, regulation, and policy. This requirement is well established in Chapter 1.

A management action has been added to all resources and programs that states that the Standards for Healthy Rangelands, as identified in Appendix 8, apply.

2.2.2 Resource or Program-Specific Management Action Changes

The following sections include the major resource or program-specific changes that have occurred between the draft RMP/EIS and the final RMP/EIS. This is not an exhaustive list of all management action changes, but does include those changes that either modified the Proposed Plan or influenced the impact analysis in Chapter 4.

Cultural Resources

Management action added to protect threatened sites identified through Section 110 inventory and monitoring.

Management action added to protect sacred sites identified through consultation with Native American tribes.

Management action added that would require cultural monitoring during surface disturbing activities in sensitive areas.

Forest Management

Forested acres, including acres of commercial forest available for commercial timber harvest, were revised.

Lands and Realty

The management action for wind energy development has been modified to be consistent with the management action for Utility/Transportation Systems, thereby increasing management flexibility. Existing major transportation and utility right-of-way (ROW) routes designated as corridors have been revised (Map 2-2).

Livestock Grazing

A management objective to mitigate, where opportunities exist, impacts to livestock operational capabilities, was included.

Management actions related to vacant grazing allotments have been removed from consideration.

Management actions related to herding to control domestic sheep where BLM fence standards are not sufficient to control domestic sheep have been removed from consideration.

Minerals

Management action under General Protection Requirements has been modified to include reclamation to more clearly outline the role of reclamation.

Management actions regarding vehicular use for necessary tasks were modified to remove the compliance with off-highway vehicle (OHV) designations.

Oil and gas classification acreage was adjusted as a result of changes to surface use restrictions, mitigation measures, and special designations/management areas in other programs.

A management action common to all alternatives for oil shale was added.

Off-Highway Vehicle Management

Management actions related to consideration of road densities during activity planning were moved to the Transportation and Access Section.

Paleontology

Management actions for the development of interpretive facilities and hobby collection areas for common invertebrate and plant fossils were added. Management actions for avoidance of resource-bearing strata were added.

Recreation and Visitor Services

All management actions related to management of the West Ferris Mountains and Adobe Town Wilderness Study Area (WSA) fringe areas were removed. An Adobe Town Dispersed Recreation Use Area action was added.

Lands within ¼ mile of developed and undeveloped recreation sites in the Proposed Plan were closed to locatable mineral entry, mineral material disposal, and operation of the public land laws, including sale.

Special Recreation Management Areas

The Shirley Mountain Special Recreation Management Area (SRMA) was retained and expanded in the Proposed Plan.

The Continental Divide National Scenic Trail SRMA corridor was expanded, and the oil and gas leasing was changed from intensive management to no surface occupancy (NSO). The management action that closed the Continental Divide National Scenic Trail SRMA to locatable mineral entry was removed from the Proposed Plan. A management action was added to close the SRMA to mineral material disposal in Alternative 3 and the Proposed Plan.

A management action was added to manage OHV use in the North Platte SRMA, limiting it to designated roads and vehicle routes in Alternative 3 and the Proposed Plan. The management action that closed the North Platte River SRMA to locatable mineral entry was removed from the Proposed Plan.

The Rawlins OHV Area SRMA was dropped from consideration and a more generalized OHV SRMA was added to provide for future consideration of specific OHV use areas.

Four new SRMAs were added: Jelm Mountain, Pedro Mountains, Laramie Plains Lakes, and Rawlins Fishing SRMAs.

Special Designations and Management Areas

Areas of Critical Environmental Concern/Wildlife Habitat Management Areas

Management actions were changed slightly throughout the document to clarify actions and make them consistent with other resources and resource uses.

The Sand Hills Area of Critical Environmental Concern (ACEC) and potential JO Ranch expansion in the Proposed Plan would be closed to mineral material sales. All existing fences would be modified to current standards in the Proposed Plan. Management actions were added regarding the JO Ranch setting in accordance with the State of Wyoming cultural program protocol and best management practices (BMP).

Surface disturbing and disruptive activities in aspen communities within the Jep Canyon ACEC/Wildlife Habitat Management Area (WHMA) would be avoided in the Proposed Plan.

A management action common to all alternatives was added to the Laramie Peak Potential ACEC that addresses consideration of recommendations of the Wyoming Bighorn/Domestic Sheep Interaction Working Group.

A management action common to all alternatives was added to the Red Rim-Daley Potential ACEC to intensively manage surface disturbing activities to maintain raptor nesting habitat.

Management actions for the Laramie Plains Lakes potential ACEC were changed in the Proposed Plan to make them consistent with the newly formed Laramie Plains Lakes SRMA in the same area. These changes mostly involved mineral actions (NSO for oil and gas, closed to locatable mineral entry and mineral material disposal). Public lands would be open to land tenure adjustments to meet the objectives of the management area.

The Shirley Mountain Bat Cave potential ACEC name was changed to the Cave Creek Cave potential ACEC.

The acreage within the Blowout Penstemon potential ACEC has been expanded. The management action that closed the Blowout Penstemon ACEC to locatable mineral entry was removed from the Proposed Plan.

The management action that closed the Wick-Beumee WHMA to land tenure adjustments was removed from the Proposed Plan.

The size of the Upper Muddy Creek Watershed/Grizzly potential ACEC was reduced to encompass only lands within the watershed. A change was made to Alternative 3 and the Proposed Plan that closes the area to new oil and gas leasing and provides for intensive management of existing leases. The Proposed Plan closes the area to mineral material disposal. A management action was added to manage for no net gain of roads and vehicle routes in the area in Alternative 3. The management action for aspen was modified to avoid surface disturbing and disruptive activities in aspen communities.

The Cow Butte/Wild Cow potential WHMA was added to address crucial elk winter range and mountain shrub and aspen community management opportunities.

Wild and Scenic Rivers

The Wild and Scenic River (WSR) section was revised. The entire table has been revised as per BLM IM-2004-196 to reflect consideration of suitability and associated management actions for all eligible river segments in one alternative (in this case Alternative 3) and finding none of the segments suitable in one alternative (in this case Alternative 2) in the following manner:

- **Alternative 1**—Suitability determination not made; continue protective management for all nine eligible river segments.
- **Alternative 2**—No river segments recommended suitable for designation.
- **Alternative 3**—All nine river segments recommended suitable for designation.
- **Proposed Plan**—Encampment River segment managed as suitable and recommended to Congress for inclusion in the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System (NWSRS).

The Proposed Plan carries forward the finding that only the Encampment River is suitable for WSR recommendation.

Vegetation

A management action was added for the application of conservation measures identified in the 2007 Rawlins Resource Management Plan Biological Assessment and the Programmatic Biological Opinion for the Wyoming Bureau of Land Management's Rawlins Resource Management Plan. In addition, conservation measures and reasonable and prudent measures and terms and conditions identified in any Biological Assessment or Biological Opinion would be applied. These actions are common to all alternatives.

The consideration of different priorities for control of noxious and invasive species was added. Also, the consideration of certain activities, such as oil and gas leasing and lands and realty actions, was modified to target occupied habitat for certain Special Status Species, rather than known or identified habitat.

Visual Resources

The acreage in each visual resource management (VRM) class has been updated based on management action changes for other resources and programs.

Water Quality, Watershed, and Soils Management

A new management action common to all alternatives was added that provides BLM opportunities to rehabilitate or reclaim reservoirs that are functionally compromised and to provide new water sources to support the goals for livestock grazing and wildlife habitat management.

The management action that addressed surface discharge of produced water in the Colorado River System was changed to provide for surface discharge that meets state standards.

Wild Horses

A management action was added for the identification of metapopulations and the selective removal of horses during gathers to increase the occurrence of New World Iberian genotypes and phenotypes above current levels.

Wildlife and Fisheries

A management action common to all related to application of BMPs was removed to reduce redundancy with specific management actions by alternative.

A management action was added for the management of projects through consideration of facility placement and minimization of construction disturbance to maintain block size and connectivity between large contiguous blocks of federal land.

A management action that would allow consideration of year-long surface disturbing and disruptive activities to occur in big game crucial winter range, greater sage-grouse seasonal use areas, and other seasonally sensitive habitats and areas was removed in the Proposed Plan.

2.3 DEVELOPMENT OF ALTERNATIVES

The following sections describe the alternative development process, including management goals and objectives.

2.3.1 Alternatives Development Process

BLM complied with NEPA requirements in the development of alternatives for this RMP FEIS, including seeking public input and analyzing an adequate range of reasonable alternatives, including a No Action Alternative (Alternative 1). Alternative formulation took into consideration existing decisions in the Great Divide RMP, the 2001 Great Divide RMP evaluation (the results of which were presented in Chapter 1), and issues and concerns developed internally and solicited from the public during scoping and review of the Rawlins RMP DEIS.

The existing Great Divide RMP (1990 Great Divide Resource Area Record of Decision [ROD] and Approved RMP [BLM 1990a]) served as the point of departure for Alternative 1. Many of the management actions occurring in the 1990 RMP were found to be acceptable and reasonable; thus, there

was limited need to develop alternative management prescriptions under the three action alternatives. In many cases, management prescriptions are the same across all alternatives or in some cases reflect only a decision to implement or not implement an action. Actions that are the same across all four alternatives are presented under each resource or program heading in Table 2-1.

Public input received during the scoping process and during public review of the Rawlins RMP DEIS was considered to ensure that all issues and concerns were addressed, as appropriate, in developing the Proposed Plan and alternatives. The scoping process, RMP DEIS review and comment, cooperating agency involvement, and the results are summarized in Section 5.2.

Where necessary to meet the planning criteria for the RMPPA, to address comments from cooperating agencies, and to provide a reasonable range of alternatives, the alternatives include management options for the RMPPA that would modify or amend decisions in the Great Divide RMP. Finally, all alternatives meet the management goals for each BLM resource and land management program.

Development of alternatives began with the identification of management actions and the analysis of the environmental effects of Alternative 1. Other alternatives were then developed to address resource issues and concerns identified through the analysis of Alternative 1.

Review of the alternatives included cooperating agency involvement to ensure consistency with other agency goals and objectives prior to the development of the Proposed Plan (Alternative 4). In addition, the Proposed Plan was developed following a review of the management actions and environmental effects of the other three alternatives.

An adequate range of alternatives was developed for a comparative analysis. Management alternatives considered in the FEIS are summarized in Section 2.5.1 through Section 2.5.4 and are presented in detail in Table 2-1.

2.3.2 Management Goals and Objectives

Management goals and objectives were defined for each resource management category and land use program that BLM must address in the planning process. The management goals and objectives for each resource management category and land use program are presented in Table 2-1.

2.3.3 Alternatives and Management Options Considered But Eliminated From Detailed Analysis

The alternatives and management options that follow were considered as possible ways of resolving resource management issues and conflicts but were eliminated from detailed analysis because they were unreasonable or not practical for technical, legal, or policy reasons.

Wild Horses and Burros

In developing the wild horse management alternatives that were considered in detail, the following two alternatives were considered but eliminated from detailed analysis:

Establish Herd Management Areas in Herd Areas Not Supporting Wild Horses

The three herd areas (HA) within the Rawlins RMPPA (Checkerboard South, Doty Mountain/Cherokee, and Bolton Ranch) that do not contain established herd management areas (HMA) were reviewed to determine if the conditions precluding HMA designation were still valid. Previous planning efforts

determined these HAs failed to meet criteria for suitably maintaining a healthy population of wild horses in accordance with the intent of the Act. Those criteria failures included the following:

- The area was composed of more than 50 percent privately controlled land and the private landowners did not express an interest in having their lands included in an HMA.
- The area contained numerous barriers that prevented wild horse access to adequate year-long habitat.
- Most of the horses in these areas were privately owned and had been removed.

It was determined that the conditions within these HAs have not changed significantly since the HAs were originally evaluated. In addition, establishing HMAs within these HAs would require allocation of sufficient forage to sustain a population of wild horses on public lands, thereby removing some or all of the permitted livestock from the HAs. Therefore, an alternative to establish wild horse HMAs in any of these three HAs will not be considered further.

Elimination of All Wild Horses from the Rawlins RMPPA

This alternative would be viable only if the management of wild horses were not possible in any HAs located in the RMPPA. Because this is not the case, this alternative would contravene the intent and letter of the Wild Horse and Burro Act of 1971, which states "... they [wild horses] are considered in the area where presently found as an integral part of the natural system of the public lands" and should be "protected and managed as components of the public lands." This alternative was not considered further.

Reintroduction of a Wild Bison Population

Public comment received during scoping suggested that a wild, free-roaming population of bison should be returned to the Red Desert Basin within the RMPPA. The alternative was not considered in detail because of the following issues identified during alternative formulation: (1) Wyoming law does not currently provide for the presence of free-ranging bison outside the Yellowstone ecosystem; (2) big game (antelope, deer, and elk) would be adversely affected by the construction and maintenance of fences that would be required to confine a bison population to any area equaling or approximating the Great Divide Basin; and (3) BLM lacks the statutory authority to manage any species of animal on the public lands except wild horses, which already exist in significant numbers in the Great Divide Basin and areas adjacent to it.

Elimination of Livestock Grazing

The elimination of livestock grazing from all public lands in the RMPPA was considered as one management option to resolve range and watershed management issues in the current Great Divide RMP. However, after reviewing vegetation data, the rangeland health assessment, and public scoping comments, BLM concluded that eliminating livestock grazing from all public lands continues not to be a viable or necessary management option.

Western Heritage Alternative

The WHA was developed or endorsed by a number of state and national conservation organizations and was provided to BLM during public scoping. The WHA, as presented, incorporated issues and concerns that would be required of any balanced approach to managing the public lands. Much of the information provided was a description of past and present condition of resources similar to the existing environment discussion provided in Chapter 3 of the RMP FEIS. In addition, the WHA included frequent literature

citations in support of the positions of the Biodiversity Conservation Alliance (BCA) and others. The WHA was updated and amended by comments provided by BCA and others during the public comment period on the Rawlins RMP DEIS.

The WHA listed the following sensitive areas that would be leased under NSO stipulations and that would be withdrawn year round from surface disturbing activities, with *no waiver available*:

- Lands with overlap of three or more types of wildlife crucial winter ranges, crucial winter relief areas, and elk calving areas as defined by the Wyoming Game and Fish Department (WGFD). (Note: the comments of the BCA and others on the RMP DEIS modify the WHA to include all big game crucial winter range in this category)
- Areas of critical environmental concern as outlined in the WHA
- Areas within 1 mile of active raptor nests
- Areas within 3 miles of active sage-grouse or 1 mile of sharp-tailed grouse leks
- Large prairie dog colonies and complexes, or those associated with BLM Sensitive Species such as the black-footed ferret, burrowing owl, mountain plover, or swift fox, plus a ½-mile buffer zone around these colonies
- Critical habitats of endangered and threatened species
- Areas within the 100-year floodplain of permanent or intermittent streams or within 500 feet of natural water sources or riparian vegetation
- Lands within 5 miles of the Overland Trail and Cherokee historic trails, the Continental Divide National Scenic Trail, Native American trails, a site eligible for the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP)—the WHA allows for waiver for surface disturbances and developments if they are completely invisible by line-of-sight from the site eligible for the NRHP—or lands within Native American religious or cultural sites as identified by the tribes. (BLM completed a viewshed analysis out to 5 miles for all properties eligible or yet unevaluated for the NRHP.)

To its credit, the WHA did provide or develop issues and concerns regarding management recommendations for many of the resource issues it presented that assisted BLM in alternative formulation for many of the resources in the RMP/FEIS. Ultimately, however, the WHA proposed that NSO be considered for surface disturbing and disruptive activities on more than 90 percent of the RMPPA.

Calculations conducted by BCA and others and supported with Geographic Information System (GIS) mapping show the acreage of federal surface under NSO that BCA contends could be reached by directional drilling 1 mile or less from either federal surface (without an NSO requirement) or nonfederal surface (primarily private or State of Wyoming surface ownership) (individual comment letters, in their entirety, are available for review at the Rawlins Field Office). The WHA protects and preserves the public land surface acreage from surface disturbing and disruptive activities by forcing the development onto private and state surfaces. BCA points out that a 1-mile horizontal displacement for directional drilling would be considered routine and would pose no undue challenges or expenses to industry. BCA concludes that only 8.9 percent of the minerals managed under the new RMP would be under NSO stipulations and farther than 1 mile from an area where surface disturbance and the siting of a well would be permissible. The BCA analysis shows that more than 90 percent of federal minerals would be accessed from private surface.

BLM's own GIS mapping analysis of the WHA-proposed NSO areas resulted in 3,117,000 acres of public land surface estate out of a total 3,425,030 acres of public land surface estate (91 percent of the public land surface) identified for NSO under the WHA.

For an organization, group, or individual to prepare the amount and detail of information presented is admirable. It must be pointed out, however, that BLM multiple use mandate is supported by numerous environmental laws, policy statements, regulations, and procedures that govern the day-to-day management of the public lands. All of the laws, regulations, and policies must be considered for an alternative to be considered reasonable (i.e., Mineral Leasing Act of 1920, as amended). BLM believes that the developers of the WHA have failed in that regard when considering the effect of WHA management actions on mineral development.

Oil and Gas Development Allowable to Limits of Existing RMP Only

An alternative was considered that would have limited oil and gas exploration and development activity to levels analyzed in the existing Great Divide RMP. However, following further analysis and discussion, this alternative was considered to be unrealistic and unreasonable. Reasonably foreseeable exploration levels established in 1986 in the Great Divide RMP have almost been achieved. The Rawlins Field Office (RFO) evaluation of the Great Divide RMP in 2001 identified the fluid mineral reasonable foreseeable development (RFD) at an analysis level that would be exceeded in the near future. This alternative would have effectively limited oil and gas exploration and development to that which has already been approved on existing leases and, in many cases, would preclude the maximum recovery of fluid mineral resources from existing leases. In addition, public comments received during scoping and issue identification indicated a general acceptance of continued mineral development, provided it is properly managed.

Expanded Wilderness Study Area Alternative

Several citizens' proposals for WSA designation were received and reviewed by the RFO. These included proposals in the Adobe Town, Kinney Rim, Wild Cow, and Ferris Mountains areas, including approximately 316,000 acres of public land. In response to these proposals, the RFO reviewed the current policy and guidance on wilderness inventory, identification, management, and protection of lands with wilderness characteristics. A WSA expansion alternative will not be analyzed in detail for the following reasons:

- The authority set forth in Section 603(a) of the Federal Land Policy Management Act (FLPMA) to complete the three-part wilderness review process (inventory, study, and report to Congress) expired on October 21, 1993; Section 202 of FLPMA does not apply to new WSA proposals; and consideration of new WSA proposals on BLM-administered public lands is no longer valid.
- An April 2003 settlement of a lawsuit concerning establishment of new WSAs on BLM-administered public lands in Utah (State of Utah vs. Department of the Interior – 2003) resulted in a change of policy. The settlement resulted in the issuance of BLM Washington Office Instruction Memorandum No. 2003-195 (Rescission of National Level Guidance on Wilderness Review and Land Use Planning) which rescinded the BLM Wilderness Inventory and Study Procedures Handbook (H-6310-1).
- From time to time in the past few years citizens groups have brought proposals to the BLM to provide protective management for lands in addition to the existing WSAs. These lands were located around the fringes of the Adobe Town WSA, the Ferris Mountains WSA and elsewhere in the RMPPA.

- BLM responded to these initiatives by conducting inventories of the subject lands to determine whether they did indeed possess the wilderness characteristics of size, naturalness, or outstanding opportunities for primitive, unconfined recreation or solitude. Our inventories determined that some of the lands did indeed possess one or more of the above wilderness characteristics. We then evaluated the lands to determine whether they were manageable as wilderness. We found that the majority of the areas under consideration were leased for oil and gas development, in which case we do not have the means to prevent impairment of any wilderness character that may be present.
- Because we found the lands to be unmanageable as wilderness because of preexisting oil and gas leases, we elected to drop them from further consideration. Accordingly, measures to provide protection for any wilderness characteristics of lands in addition to the previously established WSAs will not be considered in the alternatives of this RMP.

Consideration of Additional Areas as Areas of Critical Environmental Concern

Public comment received during scoping suggested that a number of areas be considered for designation as ACECs. Designation of Shirley Mountains, Chain Lakes, Ferris Dunes, and white-tailed prairie dog complexes as ACECs has been considered in the alternatives analyzed. However, the designations of plover concentration areas, the Bates Hole/Chalk Mountain cushion plant community, grouse winter habitat, and Powder Rim juniper woodland have not been considered in any of the alternatives analyzed. BLM is required to determine if areas proposed for ACEC designation meet the relevance and importance criteria (as defined in BLM Manual Section 1613) prior to inclusion in the RMP process. Areas that did not meet the relevance and importance criteria were dropped from further consideration for ACEC designation (USDI, BLM 2004a). Areas that met the relevance and importance criteria are discussed in Chapter 3, and management of these areas is presented in Table 2-1.

2.4 MANAGEMENT ACTIONS COMMON TO ALL ALTERNATIVES

Management actions common to all alternatives can result because of specific limitations on management of resources and land use programs that guided the development of the management alternatives. These limitations are defined in various laws and regulations that govern BLM management decisions. They are also set forth in the planning criteria to ensure that management actions within all alternatives are compliant with nondiscretionary laws and regulations. In many cases, these limitations preclude the development of alternatives to a given action. In some cases, these laws and regulations limit management to either implementing or not implementing the action.

In other cases, management actions are consistent across all alternatives because actions have been carried forward from the existing Great Divide RMP. Where management actions from the existing Great Divide RMP were found to meet BLM's current goals, alternatives to acceptable management actions or direction were found to be unnecessary. In many cases, the decisions from the existing RMP are still appropriate to meet the goals and objectives for management of the public lands.

Management actions common to all alternatives are found in Table 2-1.

2.5 ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED IN DETAIL

This section summarizes the four alternatives (1 through 4) considered in detail. A complete narrative description of the alternatives considered would require (1) a description of the goals, objectives, and

management decisions in each alternative, and (2) maps to show where each decision would occur. This would be a lengthy and potentially confusing discussion. To reduce the narrative length and avoid confusion, the four alternatives analyzed in detail in Table 2-1, Detailed Comparison of Alternatives, are summarized in this section.

The four alternatives were developed to offer a range of management options. Each alternative is intended to be consistent with law, regulation, and policy while providing for varying levels of compatible resource use and development opportunities.

2.5.1 Alternative 1 (No Action Alternative)

Overview of the Alternative

Resources on lands administered by the BLM within the RMPPA are currently managed under the existing plan (USDI 1990a), as amended. Management under Alternative 1 continues that management plan, and balances the use and development of resources.

Special Designations and Management Areas

Currently, special designations in the RMPPA include Como Bluffs ACEC (1,690 acres) for paleontological resources; Sand Hills (7,960 acres), Jep Canyon (13,810 acres) and Shamrock Hills ACEC (18,400 acres) for unique, sensitive vegetation complexes and/or wildlife habitat; and the Stratton Sagebrush Steppe Research Management Area (5,530 acres) for long-term research history. These designations continue and no additional special designations are established under Alternative 1.

In addition to the ACECs listed above, there are seven WHMAs in this Alternative, including Chain Lakes (30,560 acres), Laramie Peaks (18,940 acres), Red Rim-Daley (11,100 acres), Pennock Mountain (7,770 acres), Wick-Beumee (280 acres), Laramie Plains Lakes (1,600 acres), and Upper Muddy Creek (16,340 acres). Each of these areas are currently managed to emphasize wildlife habitat.

Existing management actions for Alternative 1 are presented in Table 2-1.

2.5.2 Alternative 2

Overview of the Alternative

Alternative 2 emphasizes resource uses (e.g., energy and mineral development, and other commodity uses). Relative to all alternatives, Alternative 2 proposes the least restrictive management actions for energy and commodity development and the least protective management actions for physical, biological, and heritage resources while maintaining protections required by laws and regulations.

Special Designations and Management Areas

Alternative 2 designates the lowest number of ACECs (none), while changing the management designation for the four ACECs in Alternative 1. Sand Hills (7,960 acres), Jep Canyon (13,810 acres), Shamrock Hills (18,400 acres), designated as ACECs in Alternative 1, are designated Wildlife Habitat Management Areas in Alternative 2. The Como Bluffs ACEC/National Natural Landmark (NNL) (1,690 acres) ACEC designation is terminated in Alternative 2 (the National Park Service (NPS) NNL designation is unchanged).

In addition to the three WHMAs described above, six additional WHMAs are either designated or continued as WHMAs. These are the Chain Lakes (30,560 acres), Laramie Peak (18,940 acres), Red Rim-Daley (11,100 acres), Wick-Beumee (280 acres), Laramie Plains Lakes (1,600 acres), and Upper Muddy Creek (59,720 acres).

The Stratton Sagebrush Steppe Research Management Area (5,530 acres) designation is retained.

Management actions for Alternative 2 are presented in Table 2-1.

2.5.3 Alternative 3

Overview of the Alternative

Alternative 3 emphasizes conservation of physical, biological, and heritage resources with constraints on resource uses. Relative to all alternatives, Alternative 3 conserves the most land area for physical, biological, and heritage resources. The Alternative emphasizes the improvement and protection of habitat for wildlife and sensitive plant and animal species, improvement of riparian areas, and implementation of management actions that improve water quality and enhance protection of historic and cultural sites.

Development and use of resources within the RMPPA would occur with intensive management of surface disturbing and disruptive activities.

Special Designations and Management Areas

Compared to Alternatives 1 and 2, Alternative 3 designates additional areas as ACECs while changing the Jep Canyon (13,810 acres) and Shamrock Hills areas (18,400 acres), which were designated as ACECs in Alternative 1, to a WHMA and Raptor Concentration Area (RCA), respectively. Stratton Sagebrush Steppe area (5,530 acres), designated as a Research Management Area in all other alternatives, is designated as an ACEC for protection of historic and scientific values.

The designated ACECs in Alternative 3 include Como Bluffs (1,690 acres), Sand Hills/JO Ranch (12,680 acres), Stratton Sagebrush Steppe Research Area (5,530 acres), Chain Lakes (30,560 acres), Laramie Peak (18,940 acres), Red Rim-Daley (11,100 acres), Cave Creek (520 acres), Laramie Plains Lakes (1,600 acres), Historic Trails (66,370 acres), Blowout Penstemon (17,050 acres), Upper Muddy Creek Watershed/Grizzly (59,720 acres), White-tailed Prairie Dog (109,650 acres) and High Savery Dam (530 acres). ACECs proposed in this Alternative represent areas of locally unique/sensitive habitats (Sand Hills/JO Ranch and Blowout Penstemon), other sensitive environmental areas, unique paleontological resources (Como Bluffs), or areas designated for protection because of a unique combination of natural resources, limitations, and habitat (Upper Muddy Creek Watershed/Grizzly and Red Rim-Daley).

Management actions for Alternative 3 are presented in Table 2-1.

2.5.4 Alternative 4 (Agency Proposed Plan)

Overview of the Alternative

Alternative 4 increases conservation of physical, biological, and heritage resources compared to current management, including restrictions against habitat fragmentation and designation of five new Special Designations and Management Areas (SD/MA). Alternative 4 also emphasizes moderate constraints on leasing for oil and gas and other (leasable) solid minerals.

The Proposed Plan strives for a balance of opportunities to use and develop resources within the RMPPA while promoting environmental conservation. This Proposed Plan best addresses the issues and concerns raised during scoping, resolves planning issues within the RMPPA, and promotes balanced multiple use goals and objectives.

This alternative is discussed in more detail below. A complete discussion of the goals, objectives, and management actions for the Proposed Plan and all alternatives is presented in Table 2-1.

Physical, Biological, and Heritage Resources

Under the Proposed Plan, 24,251 acres of federal coal land (seven existing leases) are exempt from the coal screening process (i.e., coal areas currently leased do not require further environmental review). Approximately 4,990 acres are identified as unsuitable for further consideration for coal leasing and 6,693 acres are identified as acceptable for further consideration for coal leasing under the Proposed Plan. The remaining acres in the RMPPA (51,250 acres with coal development potential) are unevaluated for coal leasing, and would be evaluated on a case-by-case basis pending receipt of a lease-by-application.

Areas open to leasing for oil and gas with major, moderate, or standard stipulations are 605,860 acres, 3,070,180 acres, and 803,070 acres, respectively, under this Alternative. In addition, 73,230 acres in the RMPPA would be closed to oil and gas leasing. Approximately 999,200 acres would be closed to locatable mineral entry because of existing or proposed withdrawals under the Proposed Plan. Also, plans of operation would be required for locatable mineral activities that would cause surface disturbance (except casual use) regardless of the size of the disturbance within the Sand Hills/JO Ranch ACEC and the Blowout Penstemon ACEC.

Alternative 4 specifies the avoidance of surface disturbance on slopes greater than 25 percent and in areas of highly erodible soils. Within those portions of the Muddy Creek and Sage Creek watersheds where erosion contributes to the degradation of streams listed on the State of Wyoming 303d list, surface disturbance, livestock grazing, and vegetation treatments would be intensively managed with the goal of removing degraded stream reaches from the impaired category. The Encampment River watershed would be managed for municipal drinking water sources, WSR values, and recreation. Surface disturbing activities would be managed to meet these objectives.

Wildlife habitat in the RMPPA would be managed to protect, promote, and maintain quality habitat for all Special Status, native, and desirable non-native fish and wildlife species in coordination with other state, federal, and local agencies and landowners. The objective is to promote the restoration or enhancement of sufficient habitat, consistent with resource capacity, to the extent that wildlife and Special Status Species would be maintained and/or delisted if management actions were taken in all special habitats. Specific limitations on surface disturbing activities for raptors and other Special Status Species are presented in Table 2-1 and seasonal restrictions for surface disturbing and disruptive activities for wildlife in Table 2-10.

The Proposed Plan manages vegetation to maintain proper ecosystem function and to maintain or enhance vegetation health, composition, and diversity consistent with the site potential. Invasive and noxious weeds are controlled. Aspen communities are managed for a healthy mix of successional stages within the natural range of variation under Alternative 4. Specific management actions include the use of mechanical, chemical, biological, and prescribed fire to meet the standards for rangeland health and watershed function and to achieve the desired plant community (DPC) while considering wildlife habitat.

Resource Uses

Livestock grazing is allowed on the majority of the RMPPA and is managed to maintain or increase animal unit month (AUM) levels when consistent with the Wyoming Standards for Healthy Rangelands. BLM would work closely with the livestock operators and others to determine the best way for achieving DPC in addition to meeting the Standards for Healthy Rangelands. Range improvements would be designed to achieve allotment objectives.

Wild horse populations would be managed to maintain and control healthy herds, retain their free roaming nature, and provide adequate habitat. In the Lost Creek HMA, management practices would be implemented to preserve the New World Iberian genotype.

Forests and woodlands in the RMPPA would be managed using natural processes; prescribed fire; and chemical, mechanical, and biological treatments with the goal of achieving health, composition, and diversity objectives for forest stands. Under the Proposed Plan, 21,813 acres of commercial forest would be available for commercial timber harvest while also managing for multiple uses (i.e., watershed health and stability, wildlife, recreation, livestock grazing). About 6,700 acres of commercial timber on steep slopes and riparian areas would not be available for harvest.

Under the Proposed Plan, the BLM would maintain the four SRMAs described in Alternative 1, and add four additional SRMAs—the Jelm Mountain SRMA, Pedro Mountains SRMA, Laramie Plains Lakes SRMA, and Rawlins Fishing SRMA. The remainder of the RMPPA is managed as an extensive recreation management area (ERMA). Finally, the Adobe Town Dispersed Recreation Use Area is established (238,970 acres).

For BLM-administered surface land in the RMPPA, approximately 46,370 acres would be closed to OHV use. On 1,283,930 acres within intermixed land ownership areas, OHV use is limited to existing roads and vehicle routes. Another 2,190,690 acres within the RMPPA would be limited to designated or existing roads and vehicle routes. One open OHV use area (3,730 acres) would be maintained. Additional open OHV use areas (potential SRMAs) would be considered on a case-by-case basis as proposals are received under this alternative.

Special Designations and Management Areas

Compared to Alternative 3, Alternative 4 designates fewer areas as ACECs. Jep Canyon (13,810 acres) and Shamrock Hills (18,400 acres)—designated as ACECs under current management (Alternative 1)—would be changed to a WHMA and RCA, respectively. Stratton Sagebrush Steppe area (5,530 acres) is designated as a Research Management Area in Alternative 4. The Como Bluffs ACEC (1,690 acres) under current management is terminated in Alternative 4 (the NPS NNL designation is unchanged).

Additional ACECs in Alternative 4—Cave Creek Cave (240 acres) and Blowout Penstemon (17,050 acres)—are designated for the reasons stated in other alternatives.

Laramie Plains Lakes (1,600 acres), Upper Muddy Creek Watershed/Grizzly (59,720 acres), Red Rim-Daley (11,100 acres), and Cow Butte/Wild Cow (49,570 acres) are designated in this Alternative as WHMAs and represent areas of locally unique and sensitive habitats, other sensitive environmental areas, or areas designated for protection because of a unique combination of natural uses, limitations, and habitat (Upper Muddy Creek Watershed/Grizzly and Red Rim-Daley). Sand Hills (12,680 acres), Chain Lakes (30,560 acres), and Laramie Peak (18,940 acres) are also designated in this Alternative as WHMAs.

Historic Trails (66,370 acres), White-tailed Prairie Dog (109, 650 acres), and High Savery Dam (530 acres) are not designated for special management in this Alternative.

2.6 COMPARATIVE SUMMARY OF IMPACTS

Table 2-4 at the end of this chapter, provides a summary of the impacts of management actions proposed under each alternative, organized by resource or resource management program. The environmental consequences of the management actions proposed under each alternative are analyzed in Chapter 4.

2.7 MONITORING AND EVALUATION PLAN AND ACTIVITY PLAN WORKING GROUPS

2.7.1 Monitoring and Evaluation Plan

Management actions identified for the Rawlins RMPPA are based on studies and the best scientific and commercial information available. However, conditions may change over time. Experience has shown that implemented management actions can be improved as new technology and new information become available. It is also possible that changes in land use will require a different management action to protect the resources. To address the changing conditions and provide management flexibility using BMPs, the RFO will monitor and evaluate the approved plan using a process that provides the optimum means of checking the effectiveness of management actions. This process will measure the effectiveness of existing actions by monitoring these actions and applying the results of new scientific research. To do this, the process will analyze the current resource conditions resulting from implemented actions and identify and recommend alternatives or modified actions, as necessary, to reach established objectives and goals. Because capability to conduct the process at the optimum level can vary from year to year, the actions to be monitored will be prioritized.

Appendix 17 presents a description of the monitoring and evaluation plan to be implemented.

2.7.2 Activity Plan Working Groups

RMP-level decisions establish goals, objectives, and management actions that provide the framework for management of natural resources and land use activities under BLM authority. Land use allocations, standard or typical management actions, mitigation measures, and BMPs are identified in land use plans. Activity planning or implementation-level actions include activity plans and analyses such as allotment or habitat management plans, oil and gas field development plans, recreation management plans, and coordinated activity plans. These activity-level plans address management of specific programs or resources and select or apply standard practices and BMPs from the land use plan. Activity plans analyze the need to modify existing decisions and practices in light of proposed or projected resource use or activity.

BLM supports the formation of APWGs when circumstances dictate. Potential cooperating agencies in these working groups could assist BLM in preparing environmental analyses for activity-level actions or modifications to current plans. BLM or potential cooperating agencies may identify the need for activity planning and the associated APWG formation. This approach is similar to the process used by BLM and its cooperating agencies to develop this RMP.

Chapter 4 of the Rawlins RMP analyzes the impacts associated with each of the Alternatives considered. This analysis includes an estimate of the social and economic impacts that are anticipated as a result of the Alternatives considered. It may also provide a suitable starting point for local governments to use in local planning efforts.

Further, BLM anticipates that site specific implementation or project analysis will occur in accordance with governing law and regulations as the RMP allocation decisions are implemented. This analysis process will provide an opportunity for the BLM, State of Wyoming and the affected counties and communities to collaborate in disclosing the socio-economic impacts associated with the site specific action being analyzed.

BLM, RFO acknowledges that state and local governments may collect or develop more refined social and economic data and that local plans may be developed by the impacted counties, municipalities or communities that attempt to address social and economic matters affecting them. This planning effort by local governments may address some or all of the social and governmental services within its purview, and may contain the detailed budgetary requirements necessary to carry the plan forward.

After issuing the Approved Plan and ROD, an implementation strategy will be developed. The implementation strategy will include an annual coordination meeting between BLM and the Cooperating Agencies in the RMP revision. The annual coordination meeting will include an update on implementation of the plan, foreseeable activities for the upcoming year, and opportunities for continued collaboration with the RMP cooperators. Additional coordination meetings could be held as needed.

APWG activities are subject to existing regulatory and policy mandates. The BLM exercises final approval authority for any recommendations received through or as a result of APWG activities.

The objectives of APWGs are to—

- Minimize controversy by being proactive rather than reactive to public land use and resource conflicts
- Provide effective and cost-efficient recommendations to BLM for consideration
- Improve resource conditions by recommending practices and mitigation measures appropriate to special situations
- Streamline public land authorizations, increase implementation flexibility, and notify public land users of required practices.

The recommendation to establish an APWG commits BLM to meet with potential cooperating agencies prior to scoping for major activity plans or RMP amendments to establish the level and extent of the involvement of APWGs. Recommendations from the APWG concerning changes in management prescriptions needed to resolve resource conflicts will be considered for adoption. Any proposed changes will be subject to existing legal and policy mandates, including the Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA); BLM has final approval authority for implementing any proposed changes. Examples of issues (Section 1.3.1, Planning Issues) potentially requiring formation of an APGW include—

- OHV use escalating to a significant issue
- Activity level approaching that contained in the impact analyses made from reasonable foreseeable actions in an RMP or previous activity plan analysis

- Proposals for oil and gas surface location densities or acres disturbed above a certain amount per unit area
- Where land ownership patterns create management difficulty (e.g., Union Pacific Railroad [UPRR] checkerboard land pattern)
- Wildland urban interfaces
- Identification of the need to prepare a recreation management activity plan
- Significant change to assumptions used for impact analysis in an RMP.

Examples of resource locations or management in which activity or use may trigger working group formation include the following:

- Where crucial or important wildlife habitats overlap with areas of high potential for surface disturbance (e.g., where WGFD has identified crucial deer winter range or other important habitats and high-intensity oil and gas development areas overlap)
- Where potential resource uses conflict with special management designations
- Where two or more resources of interest to cooperating agencies are in conflict (e.g., significant surface disturbance in identified habitat for threatened and endangered or state sensitive species).

When an APWG is convened, objectives include the following:

- Establishing working group membership and organization in accordance with existing policy and regulation
- Identifying issues, practices, and management actions the working group should address
- Establishing mechanisms and processes for communicating recommendations to BLM
- Identifying public notification needs associated with working group activities.

Other attributes and functions of APWGs include the following:

- APWGs will be specific to the activity plan.
- APWGs will provide suggestions and recommendations to BLM for evaluating mitigation, reclamation, and habitat management practices (e.g., compensatory mitigation and mitigation accounts, in addition to specific practices [Appendix 18]). Compensatory mitigation is entirely voluntary on the part of the project proponent.

Table 2-1 Table of Contents

AIR QUALITY	2-20
CULTURAL RESOURCES	2-22
FIRE AND FUELS MANAGEMENT	2-24
FOREST MANAGEMENT.....	2-26
LANDS AND REALTY	2-28
LIVESTOCK GRAZING	2-32
MINERALS.....	2-34
OFF-HIGHWAY VEHICLE USE	2-38
PALEONTOLOGY	2-40
RECREATION AND VISITOR SERVICES	2-42
SOCIOECONOMICS.....	2-53
SPECIAL DESIGNATIONS AND MANAGEMENT AREAS.....	2-54
TRANSPORTATION AND ACCESS MANAGEMENT	2-91
VEGETATION.....	2-93
VISUAL RESOURCE MANAGEMENT	2-97
WATER QUALITY, WATERSHED, AND SOILS MANAGEMENT.....	2-98
WILD HORSES	2-101
WILDLIFE AND FISHERIES	2-103

1

Table 2-1. Detailed Comparison of Alternatives

AIR QUALITY			
Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4 (Proposed Plan)
Management Goals			
Maintain or enhance air quality levels and, within the scope of BLM's authority, minimize emissions that may add to acid rain, cause violations of air quality standards, or degrade visibility.			
Protect public health and safety and the well-being of sensitive natural resources.			
Minimize the impact of management actions in the RMPPA on air quality by complying with all applicable air quality laws, rules, and regulations.			
Implement management actions in the RMPPA to improve air quality as practicable.			
Management Objectives			
Maintain concentrations of criteria pollutants associated with management actions in compliance with applicable state and federal ambient air quality standards.			
Maintain concentrations of PSD pollutants associated with management actions in compliance with the applicable increment.			
Reduce visibility-impairing pollutants in accordance with the reasonable progress goals and time frames established within the State of Wyoming's Regional Haze State Implementation Plan (SIP).			
Reduce atmospheric deposition pollutants to levels below generally accepted Levels of Concern and Limits of Acceptable Change.			
Management Actions Common to All Alternatives			
Air quality standards are maintained by the State of Wyoming, which determines whether it is necessary to regulate emissions. When necessary, the state would regulate emissions through its SIP for air quality by promulgating the appropriate rule. Objectives of the State of Wyoming SIP would include the protection of public health and safety and the well-being of sensitive natural resources. Thus, BLM would minimize, within the scope of its authority, any emissions that may add to atmospheric deposition, cause violations of air quality standards, or degrade visibility. The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) would provide oversight responsibility during this process and would approve the State of Wyoming SIP.			
Air quality standards are enforced by the Wyoming Department of Environmental Quality, Air Quality Division (WDEQ-AQD) with EPA oversight. Special requirements to alleviate air quality impacts would be considered on a case-by-case basis in processing land use authorizations.			
BLM would cooperate with the operation of the National Atmospheric Deposition Program (NADP)/National Trends Network atmospheric deposition monitoring site, as well as in the collection of basic climate and meteorological data from remote automatic weather stations. The NADP sites included in this analysis are Snowy Range, Brooklyn Lake, and South Pass City.			
BLM would follow the specific guidance for the application of air quality protection measures (presented in Appendix 4).			
Manage air quality to meet the Wyoming Standards and Guidelines for Healthy Rangelands.			
BLM will work cooperatively to develop an air quality assessment protocol to estimate potential future air quality.			
BLM will manage prescribed burns to comply with WDEQ-AQD smoke management rules and regulations.			

AIR QUALITY			
Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4 (Proposed Plan)
Within 1 year of approval of the RMP Record of Decision, cooperatively establish an air quality strategy to define the background air quality associated with federal actions approved under this RMP.			
Within 1 year of establishment of the air quality strategy, cooperatively establish and maintain a monitoring system to establish the air quality change over time related to federal actions.			
BLM will work cooperatively to encourage industry to adopt measures to reduce emissions.			
BLM will work cooperatively to estimate potential impacts from potential emissions reduction.			
Utilize BMPs to reduce air quality impacts from federal actions.			
Management Actions by Alternative			
None.			

CULTURAL RESOURCES			
Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4 (Proposed Plan)
<i>Note: Historic Trails and the JO Ranch are addressed in the special designations and management areas section.</i>			
Management Goals			
Preserve and protect cultural resources to ensure that they are available for appropriate uses by present and future generations.			
Reduce imminent threats from natural or human-caused deterioration or potential conflict with other resource uses.			
Promote stewardship, conservation, and appreciation of cultural resources.			
Promote and maintain a working relationship with Native American tribes.			
Management Objectives			
Develop management plans for special areas or cultural resources (e.g., Aimee Eaton site, Powder Wash, Robbers Gulch, and Muddy Creek site complex) in areas of high risk for development or at high risk for adverse effects.			
Maintain setting for those contributing portions of historic properties where setting is an aspect of integrity by utilizing viewshed management tools (e.g., sacred sites, Lincoln Highway, UPRR and associated sites).			
Monitor the condition of historic properties that are known to be under threat from development or vandalism.			
Identify cultural resources in the RMPPA by defining priority geographic areas for new field inventory, based on probability for unrecorded significant cultural resources.			
Develop a public outreach and education program to instill a conservation ethic in the public regarding cultural resources.			
Develop and maintain interpretation of cultural resources in areas of high public interest and access.			
Manage Historic Trails and other resources for long-term heritage, recreational, and educational values.			
Consult proactively with Native American tribes as appropriate to identify resource types or places that may be affected by BLM authorizations or actions.			
Seek opportunities for cooperation with tribal governments for management of cultural resources and public education.			
Maintain an inventory and evaluate historic transportation routes for contributing or noncontributing status (Appendix 5).			
Management Actions Common to All Alternatives			
Where the integrity of setting contributes to NRHP eligibility, management actions resulting in visual elements that diminish the integrity of the property's setting would be managed in accordance with the Wyoming State Protocol and BMPs (Appendix 5).			
Implement protective measures for threatened sites based on the result of Section 110 inventory and monitoring (Appendix 5).			
Cultural resources would be managed in accordance with guidance for Cultural Resource Use Allocations (Section 3.3.4 Cultural Resource Management Use Allocations and Appendix 5 – Cultural Resources Management)			
Implement protection measures for sacred or sensitive sites as determined through consultation with Native American tribes.			

CULTURAL RESOURCES			
Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4 (Proposed Plan)
Manage cultural resources to meet the Wyoming Standards for Healthy Rangelands.			
Management Actions by Alternative			
An area within ¼ mile of a cultural property or the visual horizon, whichever is closer, would be an avoidance area for surface disturbing and disruptive activities, if the setting contributes to NRHP eligibility.	Same as Alternative 1.	Surface disturbing activities would not be allowed within ¼ mile of a cultural property or the visual horizon, whichever is closer, if the setting contributes to NRHP eligibility.	Surface disturbing activities would not be allowed within ¼ mile of a cultural property or the visual horizon, whichever is closer, if the setting contributes to NRHP eligibility.
Land acquisitions would be pursued to preserve cultural resources, as appropriate (Appendix 6).	Land acquisitions would be considered to preserve cultural resources, on a case-by-case basis as opportunities arise (Appendix 6).	Same as Alternative 1.	Land acquisitions would be pursued to preserve cultural resources, as appropriate (Appendix 6).
Within sensitive areas (e.g., Chain Lakes area and dunal areas), surface disturbing activities would be subject to cultural monitoring on a case-by-case basis.	Same as Alternative 1.	Within sensitive areas (e.g., Chain Lakes area and dunal areas), all surface disturbing activities would be subject to cultural monitoring.	Within sensitive areas (e.g., Chain Lakes area and dunal areas), surface disturbing activities would be subject to cultural monitoring on a case-by-case basis.

FIRE AND FUELS MANAGEMENT			
Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4 (Proposed Plan)
Management Goals			
Protect human life, property, communities at risk, and other communities and enhance and protect the public land resources through fuels management and appropriate management response (AMR) considering values to be protected and costs of suppression.			
Complement and support state and local wildland fire actions through AMR.			
Manage fire to restore natural ecosystem functions, reduce losses from catastrophic wildland fire, and protect multiple-use values.			
Management Objectives			
BLM would first provide for firefighter and public safety.			
Obtain input from private landowners; partners; and local, state, and other federal agencies on development of the RFO Fire Management Plan (Appendix 19).			
Working with private landowners; partners; and local, state, and other federal agencies identify areas for potential wildland fire use for the improvement of vegetation communities through collaborative development of wildland fire use plans.			
Consult and cooperate with private landowners; partners; and local, state, and other federal agencies on individual treatments (such as prescribed fire and biological, mechanical, and chemical treatments) designed to reduce or modify hazardous fuels accumulations.			
Minimize disturbances resulting from fire suppression activities on public lands.			
Suppress wildland fires in identified priority areas including those in wildland-urban and industrial interface areas adjacent to private lands and in the areas of campgrounds and significant cultural sites.			
Management Actions Common to All Alternatives			
Public lands within the checkerboard or other intermixed landownership areas would be managed in association with the private, state, and other federal agency lands therein. AMR would most often result in suppression activities.			
AMRs for SD/MAs would protect or enhance the relevant and important values of the SD/MAs requiring special management attention.			
A high priority for fire management activities would be given to areas identified as communities at risk, industrial interface areas, and areas containing resource values considered high priority within the RMPPA (Appendix 19).			
Fuel treatments, including prescribed fire, mechanical, chemical, and biological treatments would be used for fuels reduction and to meet other multiple-use resource objectives, including returning fire to its natural role in the ecosystem (also see the Vegetation section). Wildland-urban interfaces (WUI) and communities at risk would receive priority for fuels reduction.			
Rehabilitation and restoration efforts specific to a fire event would be undertaken to protect and sustain ecosystems, public health and safety, and to help communities protect infrastructure.			
Manage fire to meet the Wyoming Standards and Guidelines for Healthy Rangelands.			

FIRE AND FUELS MANAGEMENT			
Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4 (Proposed Plan)
<p>Management Actions by Alternative</p> <p><i>(Note: This section of the table presents actions for the management of wildland fire. Vegetation treatment actions are located in the Vegetation section of this table.)</i></p>			
<p>Wildland fire suppression activities in the entire RMPPA would be managed for AMR. Wildland fire for resource benefit would be used to protect, maintain, and enhance resources and, as nearly as possible, allow fire to function in its natural ecological role.</p>	<p>With the exception of some SD/MAs (Map 2-1 and SD/MA section of this table), emphasis would be placed on the suppression of all wildfires, regardless of ignition source.</p>	<p>With the exception of WUIs, some ACECs, and other SD/MAs, the use of wildland fire for resource benefit would be emphasized for all natural ignitions.</p>	<p>Wildland fire suppression activities in the entire RMPPA would be managed for AMR. Wildland fire for resource benefit would be used in identified locations (shown in Map 2-1) to protect, maintain, and enhance resources and, as nearly as possible, allow fire to function in its natural ecological role.</p>

FOREST MANAGEMENT			
Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4 (Proposed Plan)
Management Goals			
Manage forest stand communities for health, composition, and diversity (considering density, basal area, canopy cover, age class, stand health, and understory) through forest management practices and to provide late successional vegetation for timber production, while providing for multiple use.			
Manage woodland communities (such as aspen, limber pine, and juniper) for a healthy mix of successional stages within the natural range of variation that incorporate diverse structure and composition into each forest stand type.			
Management Objectives			
Maintain, restore, and enhance all forest communities in accordance with Wyoming Standards for Healthy Rangelands (forestlands), the Healthy Forest Initiative, and Healthy Forest Restoration Act of 2003. Where there are adjoining private and state forestlands, work cooperatively to attain the objective.			
Maintain, restore, and enhance commercial forest communities for sustainable production and, where feasible, meet public demand for harvest of wood products (both minor and commercial; i.e., saw timber, post and poles, firewood, Christmas trees, wildlings/transplants) and improve opportunities to harvest forest products while providing for other forest values and uses. Where there are adjoining private and state forestlands, work cooperatively to attain the objective.			
Utilize inventory and monitoring data to reduce fuels overloading within forest and woodland communities within identified areas of overloading.			
Maintain, restore, and enhance forest stands to supply forest products to the public consistent with forest health, landscape restoration, and reduction of forest fuels objectives, in coordination with private, local, state, and federal plans and policies.			
Forestlands and woodlands within WSA areas would be managed to meet wilderness characteristics and healthy forest landscape objectives in accordance with management plans and Interim Management Policy.			
Maintain, restore, and enhance all old growth forest stands (Appendix 19).			
Maintain, restore, and enhance aspen communities (Section 3.15.2.3 and Appendix 19).			
Management Actions Common to All Alternatives <i>(Note: See also Vegetation section)</i>			
All forest and woodlands (196,934 acres), with the exception of WSAs, the Pedro Mountains SRMA, and developed recreation sites, would be open to commercial and noncommercial harvest of minor wood products, such as fuelwood, posts and poles, Christmas trees, and wildlings. Forest and woodlands management would also include manipulation of aspen, juniper, and other noncommercial tree species to meet forest health and/or other multiple-use objectives.			
Manage forest and woodlands to meet the Wyoming Standards for Healthy Rangelands.			

FOREST MANAGEMENT			
Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4 (Proposed Plan)
Management Actions by Alternative			
Forests and woodlands would be managed using natural processes; prescribed fire; and chemical, mechanical, and biological treatments (Appendix 19).	Forests and woodlands would be managed using prescribed fire, and chemical, mechanical, and biological treatments (Appendix 19).	Forests and woodlands would be managed with emphasis on natural processes (Appendix 19).	Forests and woodlands would be managed using natural processes; prescribed fire; and chemical, mechanical, and biological treatments (Appendix 19).
About 28,500 acres of commercial forest in the RMPPA would be available for commercial timber harvest (Section 3.5 and Map 3-1).	Same as Alternative 1.	No forestlands would be available for commercial timber harvests; management actions on 28,500 acres of commercial forestlands would be allowed to enhance forest health and meet public demand for minor wood products (Section 3.5 and Map 3-1).	About 21,813 acres of commercial forest in the RMPPA would be available for commercial timber harvest (Section 3.5 and Map 3-1).
Of the 28,500 acres, about 6,700 acres have steep slopes and riparian areas and associated buffer zones, which would require that additional restrictions and/or mitigation measures be applied to timber harvest actions in these areas.	Same as Alternative 1.	Forestlands would be available for management actions designed to promote forest health.	About 6,700 acres of steep slopes and riparian areas and their associated buffer zones would not be available for commercial timber harvest.

LANDS AND REALTY			
Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4 (Proposed Plan)
Management Goals			
Manage the acquisition, disposal, withdrawal, and use of public lands to meet the needs of internal and external customers (i.e., to respond to community needs for expansion and economic development and to preserve important resource values) (Appendices 6, 7, and 34).			
Improve management efficiency in areas of scattered or intermingled land ownerships patterns.			
Review and evaluate the need and merits of current withdrawals.			
Management Objectives			
Identify BLM-administered lands within the RMPPA available for acquisition, disposal, or withdrawal.			
Develop and maintain a land ownership pattern that will provide better access for management and protection of the public lands.			
Respond to internal and external requests for land tenure adjustments (e.g., Recreation and Public Purpose Act actions, land sales, disposals, or exchanges).			
Utilize appropriate actions (e.g., land tenure adjustments or easement acquisitions) to help solve problems related to intermixed land ownership patterns.			
Manage public lands to be consistent with goals and objectives of other resource programs.			
Respond to internal and external requests (e.g., pipelines, access roads) for land authorizations.			
Management Actions Common to All Alternatives			
The RMPPA would be open to operation of the public land laws and/or to locatable mineral entry (Mining Law of 1872) except for 935,530 acres of existing withdrawals (Section 3.6.2).			
In compliance with Section 204(1) of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act (FLPMA), reviews of withdrawn lands in the RMPPA would be completed to determine whether existing withdrawals are serving or are needed for their intended purposes. The existing withdrawals in the RMPPA would remain in place unless or until it is determined they should be terminated and, if necessary, a plan amendment to the Rawlins RMP is made. Such determination or amendment would be based on full examination of the issues associated with withdrawal terminations, including the land use, environmental, and other factors associated with opening public lands now closed to entry under the public land laws or to mineral location under the mining laws. Where appropriate and necessary to protect other resource values, new withdrawals would be pursued and implemented prior to terminating any existing withdrawals. Existing and proposed withdrawals are listed in Table 2-2.			
Coal classifications on 671,768 acres in the RMPPA are no longer necessary (Coal classifications are no longer necessary because: (1) the Federal Coal Leasing Amendments Act of 1976 requires competitive leasing on all, not just known, deposits of federal coal; and (2) the Multiple Mineral Development Act of 1954 established procedures to regulate conflicts between coal leases and mining claims). Existing withdrawals would be reviewed and terminated, as appropriate.			
When practicable, develop and maintain a land ownership pattern that will provide better access for management and protection of the public lands (Appendix 6).			

LANDS AND REALTY			
Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4 (Proposed Plan)
Proposals for alternative energy development would be considered on a case-by-case basis. No proposals for alternative energy development, other than wind power, are anticipated to occur in the foreseeable future; therefore, only wind energy potential is considered. Proposals for location of wind energy development would be considered on a case-by-case basis and subject to a site-specific NEPA analysis. Areas with important or sensitive resource values would be excluded or avoided. Exclusion or avoidance areas would vary by alternative.			
All BLM-administered public lands, except WSAs and some SD/MAs (including ACECs), would be open to consideration for placement of transportation and utility ROW systems. Each transportation system and utility ROW would be located adjacent to existing facilities, when possible. Areas with important or sensitive resource values would be avoided. Existing major transportation and utility ROW routes, identified in Chapter 3, and presented in Map 2-2, would be designated corridors. However, major transportation routes within the RMPPA that are located east of the Carbon County-Albany County line would not be considered for ROW corridor designation because of the scattered public land ownership pattern in the area. All corridors would be designated for power lines (above ground and buried), telephone lines, fiber optic lines, pipelines, and other linear type ROWs. Specific proposals would require site-specific environmental analysis and compliance with established permitting processes. Activities generally excluded from ROW corridors include mineral materials disposal, range and wildlife habitat improvements involving surface disturbance and facility construction, campgrounds, and public recreation facilities and other facilities that would attract public use. ROW facilities would not be placed adjacent to each other if issues with safety or incompatibility or resource conflicts were identified. The designated width, allowable uses, and excluded uses for each corridor may be modified during implementation of the approved RMP. All designated ROW corridors would avoid, to the extent possible, those areas identified on Map 2-2 and Table 2-3.			
Mitigation requirements would be applied to activities related to utility/transportation systems to protect important resource values (Appendix 1).			
Certain lands withdrawn for Seminole Reservoir (2,000 acres) and the Savery-Pothook area (1,205 acres), currently managed by the Bureau of Reclamation (BOR), are being considered for revocation (Appendix 7). The revocation was reviewed by BLM and a determination made that the lands are suitable for return to public domain status because they are no longer needed for the purpose for which they were withdrawn. Lands considered for revocation have been reviewed for management options and a determination made that these lands would be managed the same as adjacent public lands.			
Manage lands and realty actions to meet the Wyoming Standards for Healthy Rangelands.			
Management Actions by Alternative			
Withdrawals			
Proposed withdrawals of about 63,670 acres would be pursued. These areas would be closed to operation of the public land laws, including disposal, and/or to mineral location under the mining laws (Table 2-2).	Proposed withdrawals of about 6,400 acres would be pursued. These areas would be closed to operation of the public land laws, including disposal, and/or to mineral location under the mining laws (Table 2-2).	Proposed withdrawals of about 271,110 acres would be pursued. These areas would be closed to operation of the public land laws, including disposal, and/or to mineral location under the mining laws (Table 2-2).	Proposed withdrawals of about 16,980 acres would be pursued. These areas would be closed to operation of the public land laws, including disposal, and/or to mineral location under the mining laws (Table 2-2).

LANDS AND REALTY			
Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4 (Proposed Plan)
Land Tenure Adjustment			
About 61,010 acres of BLM-administered public lands would meet the FLPMA disposal criteria and would be available for consideration for disposal (Maps 2-22 through 2-25 and Appendix 6).	About 46,230 acres of BLM-administered public lands meet the FLPMA disposal criteria and would be available for consideration for disposal (Maps 2-26 through 2-29 and Appendix 6).	No specific tracts would be considered for disposal.	About 46,230 acres of BLM-administered public lands meet the FLPMA disposal criteria and would be available for consideration for disposal (Maps 2-26 through 2-29 and Appendix 6).
Before taking any disposal action, consideration would be given to each individual tract and would include public involvement (Appendix 6).	Same as Alternative 1.	No specific tracts would be considered for disposal.	Before taking any disposal action, consideration would be given to each individual tract and would include public involvement (Appendix 6).
The preferred method of disposal, consolidation, or acquisition of lands by BLM would be through exchange (Appendix 6).	There would be no preferred method of disposal.	No specific tracts would be considered for disposal.	The preferred method of disposal, consolidation, or acquisition of lands by BLM would be through exchange (Appendix 6).
Energy Development and Exploration Management Actions			
The area within ¼ mile of the incorporated boundaries of all cities/towns (1,500 total acres) would be open to oil and gas leasing with intensive management.	Same as Alternative 1.	The area within ½ mile of the incorporated boundaries of all cities/towns (4,500 total acres) would be open to oil and gas leasing with an NSO stipulation.	The area within ¼ mile of the incorporated boundaries of all cities/towns (1,500 acres) would be open to oil and gas leasing with an NSO stipulation. Existing oil and gas leases would be intensively managed.
The area within ¼ mile of the incorporated boundaries of all cities/towns (1,500 total acres) would be open to locatable mineral entry, mineral material disposals, and operation of the applicable public land laws, including sale, with intensive surface management.	Same as Alternative 1.	The area within ½ mile of the incorporated boundaries of all cities/towns (4,500 total acres) would be closed to locatable mineral entry and mineral material disposals. Withdrawals would be pursued.	The area within ¼ mile of the incorporated boundaries of all cities/towns (1,500 acres) would be closed to locatable mineral entry and mineral material disposals. Withdrawals would be pursued.

LANDS AND REALTY			
Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4 (Proposed Plan)
Alternative Energy Development—Wind Energy Resources Management Actions			
Areas with important resource values would be avoided (518,300 acres) or excluded (111,770 acres) in planning for new wind energy facility placement. If it becomes necessary for facilities to be placed within avoidance areas, effects would be intensively managed (Table 2-5). Avoidance and exclusion areas are identified on Map 2-30.	Areas with important resource values would be avoided (421,710 acres) or excluded (66,720 acres) in planning for new wind energy facility placement. If it becomes necessary for facilities to be placed within avoidance areas, effects would be intensively managed (Table 2-5). Avoidance and exclusion areas are identified on Map 2-31.	Areas with important resource values would be closed (497,080 acres) or excluded (384,030 acres) in planning for new wind energy facility placement. Closure and exclusion areas are identified on Map 2-32.	Areas with important resource values would be avoided (634,650 acres) or excluded (98,440 acres) in planning for new wind energy facility placement. If it becomes necessary for facilities to be placed within avoidance areas, effects would be intensively managed (Table 2-5). Avoidance and exclusion areas are identified on Map 2-33.
Utility/Transportation Systems Management Actions			
Areas with important resource values would be avoided where possible in planning for new facility placement (518,300 acres). If it becomes necessary for facilities (i.e., linear ROWs) to be placed within avoidance areas, effects would be intensively managed (Table 2-5). Avoidance and exclusion areas are identified on Map 2-30.	Areas with important resource values would be avoided where possible in planning for new facility placement (421,710 acres). If it becomes necessary for facilities (i.e., linear ROWs) to be placed within avoidance areas, effects would be intensively managed (Table 2-5). Avoidance and exclusion areas are identified on Map 2-31.	Areas with important resource values would be closed to new facility placement and routes (384,030 acres) (Table 2-5). Closure and exclusion areas are identified on Map 2-32.	Areas with important resource values would be avoided where possible in planning for new facility placement (634,650 acres). If it becomes necessary for facilities (i.e., linear ROWs) to be placed within avoidance areas, effects would be intensively managed (Table 2-5). Avoidance and exclusion areas are identified on Map 2-33.
Communication Sites Management Actions			
Location of new communication sites would be evaluated on a case-by-case basis.	Same as Alternative 1.	BLM would require co-location of communication sites and would restrict new cell towers or communication sites to existing, designated communication sites.	Location of new communication sites would be evaluated on a case-by-case basis.
Areas with important resource values would be avoided where possible in planning for new facility placement and routes (518,300 acres). If it becomes necessary for facilities to be placed within avoidance areas, effects would be intensively managed (Table 2-5). Avoidance and exclusion areas are identified on Map 2-30.	Areas with important resource values would be avoided where possible in planning for new facility placement and routes (421,710 acres). If it becomes necessary for facilities to be placed within avoidance areas, effects would be intensively managed (Table 2-5). Avoidance and exclusion areas are identified on Map 2-31.	Areas with important resource values would be closed to new facility placement and routes (384,030 acres) (Table 2-5). Closure and exclusion areas are identified on Map 2-32.	Areas with important resource values would be avoided where possible in planning for new facility placement and routes (634,650 acres). If it becomes necessary for facilities to be placed within avoidance areas, effects would be intensively managed (Table 2-5). Avoidance and exclusion areas are identified on Map 2-33.

LIVESTOCK GRAZING			
Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4 (Proposed Plan)
Management Goals			
Maintain and/or enhance livestock grazing opportunities and rangeland health.			
Management Objectives			
Maintain, restore, and enhance livestock grazing to meet Wyoming Standards for Healthy Rangelands (Appendix 8) and achieve allotment objectives.			
Encourage grazing permittees and the interested public to participate with BLM to monitor and evaluate rangeland health to determine appropriate management actions.			
Utilize livestock grazing management techniques (Appendix 19) to maintain vegetation communities and ecosystem functions, in consultation and coordination with the grazing permittees and with participation by the interested public. Utilize data collected from scientifically based inventory and monitoring techniques to support decisions that authorize livestock grazing levels and management.			
When feasible and providing that Wyoming Standards for Healthy Rangelands are met, maintain and/or increase AUM levels in the RMPPA for livestock grazing.			
Identify opportunities and implement range and vegetation improvement projects to sustain and enhance livestock grazing and meet Wyoming Standards for Healthy Rangelands in cooperation, consultation, and coordination with the grazing permittees and the interested public (Appendix 19).			
Mitigate direct, indirect, and cumulative livestock forage losses and impacts to livestock grazing (including impacts on livestock grazing operational capabilities and production performance) where opportunities exist.			
Management Actions Common to All Alternatives			
The entire RMPPA would be available for livestock grazing. Areas such as developed recreation areas, wetland/riparian spring enclosures, and sensitive plant species enclosures would be excluded from grazing.			
The current amounts, kinds, and seasons of livestock grazing use would be authorized until monitoring, field observations, ecological site inventory, or other data acceptable to BLM indicates a grazing use adjustment is needed, as appropriate. Requests for changes in season-of-use or kind-of-livestock would be considered on a case-by-case basis. Any decision regarding changes in grazing use would include cooperation, consultation and coordination with the grazing permittees, and the interested public.			
Management of domestic sheep and goats would be in accordance with national BLM policy and would recognize and use to the extent possible the recommendations of the Wyoming Bighorn/Domestic Sheep Interaction Working Group. Domestic sheep avoidance areas are shown on Map 2-3.			
Manage livestock grazing to meet the Wyoming Standards for Healthy Rangelands.			

LIVESTOCK GRAZING			
Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4 (Proposed Plan)
Management Actions by Alternative			
General			
BLM would work closely with operators and others to determine the most appropriate methods for achieving the Standards for Healthy Rangelands (Appendix 8).	Same as Alternative 1.	BLM would work closely with operators and others to determine the most appropriate methods for achieving the desired plant community (DPC), in addition to meeting Standards for Healthy Rangelands (Appendices 8 and 19).	BLM would work closely with operators and others to determine the most appropriate methods for achieving the DPC, in addition to meeting Standards for Healthy Rangelands (Appendices 8 and 19).
Grazing systems and range improvements would be designed to achieve the management goals for livestock grazing, and would serve as the primary means of improving or maintaining desired range conditions (Appendix 19).	Grazing systems and range improvements would be implemented to maximize livestock production while maintaining other resource values (Appendix 19).	Grazing systems and range improvements would be implemented to enhance wildlife, watershed, and riparian values while reducing livestock conflicts with other resources (Appendix 19).	Grazing systems and range improvements would be designed to achieve the management goals for livestock grazing, and to achieve and maintain healthy rangelands.
Changes in class of livestock within HMAs would be considered.	Same as Alternative 1.	Changes in class of livestock within HMAs would be considered where the change in class of livestock would benefit the management of wild horses.	Changes in class of livestock within HMAs that would not impair management of wild horses would be considered.
Conversions from cattle or sheep to domestic bison would be considered in all areas.	Same as Alternative 1.	Conversions from cattle or sheep to domestic bison would not be allowed in areas of blocked federal surface land ownership (Map 2-34).	Conversions from cattle or sheep to domestic bison would not be allowed in areas of blocked federal surface land ownership (Map 2-34).
Fences			
New fence construction would be authorized according to BLM standards. Existing fences would be modified according to current BLM standards as older fences are maintained or reconstructed (Appendix 19).	Same as Alternative 1.	New fence construction would be authorized according to BLM standards. All existing fences would be modified according to current BLM standards (Appendix 19).	New fence construction would be authorized according to BLM standards unless modified following consultation with affected parties. Existing fences would be modified according to current BLM standards and according to wildlife and livestock management needs.

MINERALS			
Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4 (Proposed Plan)
Management Goals			
Manage mineral resources from available BLM-administered public lands and federal minerals while minimizing the impacts to the environment, public health and safety, and other resource values and uses.			
Management Objectives			
Provide for exploration and development of locatable minerals, except in withdrawn areas.			
Provide opportunities for exploration and development of conventional and unconventional oil and gas, coal, and other leasable minerals.			
Provide opportunities for exploration and development of salable minerals.			
Management Actions Common to All Alternatives			
Existing oil and gas or other mineral rights would be honored. When an oil and gas lease is issued, it constitutes a valid existing right and BLM cannot unilaterally change the terms and conditions of a lease (Appendix 20).			
The lessee is subject to stipulations attached to the lease; restrictions deriving from specific, nondiscretionary statutes; and such reasonable measures needed to minimize impacts to other resources and resource users. Oil and gas lease stipulations may be modified or eliminated using the exception, modification, or waiver criteria (Appendix 9). BLM may impose reasonable measures (conditions of approval) to operational aspects of oil and gas development to control the manner and pace of development including modification of siting or design of facilities, timing of operations, and specifying interim or final reclamation measures.			
All lands open to oil and gas leasing consideration would also be open to geophysical exploration, subject to appropriate resource surveys, surface protection measures, adequate bonding, and adherence to State of Wyoming standards for geophysical operations.			

MINERALS			
Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4 (Proposed Plan)
<p>Coal activity analyzed in the RMP FEIS includes: coal reclamation activity on existing leases in the Hanna Basin; and, coal mining activity on an existing lease in Carbon Basin (<i>Note: This is mining activity on an existing Carbon Basin lease that is exempt from the BLM’s coal screening/planning process because of a prior plan amendment and coal EIS for the Carbon Basin completed under the Great Divide RMP in 1998 (Appendix 2 Introduction). Because this existing lease decision has already been made, impacts to and from this existing lease are addressed only in Section 4.20, Cumulative Impacts, as part of the reasonably foreseeable future actions</i>).</p> <p>Only the first two steps of the coal screening process (coal development potential and unsuitability criteria – see Appendix 2) have been conducted on the areas containing federal coal outside of the Carbon Basin (see also Section 1.3.2). Completion of the first two steps resulted in a determination that approximately 4,990 acres (containing an estimated 70.1 million tons of surface minable coal) were unsuitable for surface coal mining. Approximately 51,250 acres (containing an estimated 2,318.7 million tons of surface minable coal) (Map A2-1) were identified as suitable for further leasing consideration pending application of the remaining coal screens (i.e., multiple-use conflicts and surface owner consultation). The unsuitable coal areas are depicted in Appendix 2, Maps A2-2, A2-3, and A2-4. The remaining steps of the coal screening process described in 43 CFR 3420.1-4 would be completed upon receipt of a lease-by-application.</p> <p>Per regulations found at 43 CFR 3461.3-2, the unsuitability criteria are not applied to lands currently leased for coal. Within the RMPPA, seven existing coal leases are exempt from the coal screening process: Hanna Basin (six leases—19,016 acres of federal coal land—are in final reclamation status, and no new mining will occur on these leases); and Carbon Basin (one lease—5,235 acres of federal coal land—is currently undergoing only minor mining activity).</p> <p>In Carbon Basin, in addition to the existing lease acreage described above, an additional 6,693 acres and 163,300,000 tons of federal coal are acceptable for further leasing consideration as a result of the 1998 Carbon Basin RMP Amendment to the Great Divide RMP, which applied all four planning screens. This acreage could be leased without further planning decisions beyond updating the screens. Of the 6,693 acres of federal coal lands, 120 acres are acceptable for leasing consideration by subsurface mining methods only.</p> <p>On federal coal lands with development potential outside of Carbon Basin where only the unsuitability criteria were applied, new decisions to identify lands acceptable for further consideration for leasing would be deferred until after a lease application is received. Coal leases would be considered on a case-by-case basis only, as lease applications are received. The first two steps of the coal screening process would be updated, and coal screening would be completed (including the multiple-use screen and the surface owner consultation screen). If lands are determined to be acceptable for further consideration for coal leasing, a plan amendment would be required.</p> <p>Federal coal lease applications would be accepted only on those federal coal lands with development potential identified as suitable for further leasing consideration after application of the coal unsuitability criteria (the above-mentioned approximately 51,250 acres and 2,318.7 million tons of surface minable federal coal). See Map A2-1, Coal Development Potential, and Maps A2-2, A2-3, and A2-4 Unsuitable Lands with Coal Development Potential, and Appendix 2.</p>			
<p>Vehicular use for “necessary tasks” (as defined in the Glossary), such as geophysical exploration including project survey and layout, would be permitted except where specifically prohibited (e.g., some SD/MAs).</p>			
<p>With the exception of WSAs and some other SD/MAs, the remainder of the RMPPA would be open to consideration for leasing of geothermal resources and nonenergy leasable minerals.</p>			
<p>Lands within the RMPPA that have potential for oil shale would be leased only for conventional oil and gas and coalbed natural gas exploration and development (Appendix 20). Oil shale would be specifically excluded from any oil and gas lease. This RMP will be amended upon completion of the Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement for leasing of oil shale and tar sands on lands administered by the BLM in Utah, Colorado, and Wyoming.</p>			

MINERALS			
Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4 (Proposed Plan)
<p>Approximately 935,530 acres would be subject to continued public land withdrawals precluding locatable mineral entry (Map 2-4). An area is closed to mineral location through a mineral segregation for 2 years by issuing a <i>Federal Register</i> notice. A mineral report and withdrawal actions are pursued during that 2-year period. If the withdrawal is approved, the area is withdrawn from locatable mineral entry. If the withdrawal is not approved, the area reverts to open to mineral location. The withdrawal affects only new claims not existing rights.</p>			
<p>Mineral material disposals are discretionary actions. Disposal would be considered on a case-by-case basis.</p>			
<p>Manage minerals to meet the Wyoming Standards for Healthy Rangelands.</p>			
Management Actions by Alternative			
Oil and Gas			
General Protection Requirements			
<p>Surface disturbing activities would be intensively managed (as defined in the Glossary) and would be subject to reclamation practices (Appendix 36). Leases would be issued with stipulations to protect resource values. Oil and gas stipulations for each oil and gas classification are presented in Table 2-6, Map 2-35, and Appendix 20.</p>	<p>Surface disturbing activities would be intensively managed (as defined in the Glossary) and would be subject to reclamation practices (Appendix 36). Leases would be issued with stipulations to protect resource values. Oil and gas stipulations for each oil and gas classification are presented in Table 2-6, Map 2-36, and Appendix 20.</p>	<p>Surface disturbing activities would be intensively managed (as defined in the Glossary) and would be subject to reclamation practices (Appendix 36). Leases would be issued with stipulations to protect resource values. Oil and gas stipulations for each oil and gas classification are presented in Table 2-6, Map 2-37, and Appendix 20.</p>	<p>Surface disturbing activities would be intensively managed (as defined in the Glossary) and would be subject to reclamation practices (Appendix 36). Leases would be issued with stipulations to protect resource values. Oil and gas stipulations for each oil and gas classification are presented in Table 2-6, Map 2-38, and Appendix 20.</p>
<p><i>Oil and Gas Classification A.</i> Areas open to leasing, subject to the terms and conditions of the standard lease form.</p>			
<p>731,870 acres of federal oil and gas leasable lands, presented on Map 2-35, would be open to leasing and subject to standard lease stipulations (Appendix 20).</p>	<p>2,067,880 acres of federal oil and gas leasable lands, presented in Map 2-36, would be open to leasing and subject to standard lease stipulations (Appendix 20).</p>	<p>473,200 acres of federal oil and gas leasable lands, presented in Map 2-37, would be open to leasing and subject to standard lease stipulations (Appendix 20).</p>	<p>803,070 acres of federal oil and gas leasable lands, presented on Map 2-38, would be open to leasing and subject to standard lease stipulations (Appendix 20).</p>
<p><i>Oil and Gas Classification B.</i> Areas open to leasing, subject to moderate constraints such as seasonal restrictions. These are areas where it has been determined that moderately restrictive lease stipulations may be required to mitigate impacts on other land uses or resource values.</p>			
<p>3,277,890 acres of federal oil and gas leasable lands, presented in Map 2-35, would be open to leasing and subject to lease stipulations, such as seasonal restrictions.</p>	<p>2,235,840 acres of federal oil and gas leasable lands, presented in Map 2-36, would be open to leasing and subject to lease stipulations, such as seasonal restrictions (i.e., Endangered Species Act and Migratory Bird Treaty Act species).</p>	<p>3,272,220 acres of federal oil and gas leasable lands, presented in Map 2-37, would be open to leasing and subject to lease stipulations, such as seasonal restrictions.</p>	<p>3,070,180 acres of federal oil and gas leasable lands, presented in Map 2-38, would be open to leasing and subject to lease stipulations, such as seasonal restrictions.</p>

MINERALS			
Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4 (Proposed Plan)
<p><i>Oil and Gas Classification C.</i> Areas open to leasing, subject to major constraints such as NSO stipulations on an area more than 40 acres or more than ¼- mile wide. In these areas, it has been determined that highly restrictive lease stipulations are required to mitigate impacts on other lands or resource values. This classification also includes areas where overlapping moderate constraints would severely limit development of fluid mineral resources.</p>			
<p>512,180 acres of federal oil and gas leasable lands, presented in Map 2-35, would be open to leasing and subject to lease stipulations such as NSO.</p>	<p>218,060 acres of federal oil and gas leasable lands, presented in Map 2-36, would be open to leasing and subject to lease stipulations such as NSO.</p>	<p>714,800 acres of federal oil and gas leasable lands, presented in Map 2-37, would be open to leasing and subject to lease stipulations such as NSO.</p>	<p>605,860 acres of federal oil and gas leasable lands, presented in Map 2-38, would be open to leasing and subject to lease stipulations such as NSO.</p>
<p><i>Oil and Gas Classification D.</i> Areas closed to leasing. These are areas where it has been determined that other land uses or resource values cannot be adequately protected with even the most restrictive lease stipulations; appropriate protection can be ensured only by closing the lands to leasing.</p>			
<p>65,600 acres of federal oil and gas leasable lands, presented in Map 2-35, would be closed to leasing.</p>	<p>64,150 acres of federal oil and gas leasable lands, presented in Map 2-36, would be closed to leasing.</p>	<p>86,210 acres of federal oil and gas leasable lands, presented in Map 2-37, would be closed to leasing.</p>	<p>73,230 acres of federal oil and gas leasable lands, presented in Map 2-38, would be closed to leasing.</p>
Locatable Minerals			
<p>About 63,670 acres would be withdrawn from locatable mineral entry under proposed withdrawals (Table 2-2 and Map 2-4).</p>	<p>About 6,400 acres would be withdrawn from locatable mineral entry under proposed withdrawals (Table 2-2 and Map 2-39).</p>	<p>About 271,110 acres would be withdrawn from locatable mineral entry under proposed withdrawals (Table 2-2 and Map 2-40).</p>	<p>About 16,980 acres would be withdrawn from locatable mineral entry under proposed withdrawals (Table 2-2 and Map 2-41).</p>
<p>Plans of operation would be required for locatable minerals activities that would cause surface disturbance (except casual use) regardless of the size of the disturbance for the following ACECs (Map 2-7): Como Bluff ACEC (1,690 acres) Sand Hills ACEC (7,960 acres) Jep Canyon ACEC (13,810 acres) Shamrock Hills ACEC (18,400 acres)</p>	<p>No similar action.</p>	<p>Plans of operation would be required for locatable minerals activities that would cause surface disturbance (except casual use) regardless of the size of the disturbance for the following ACECs (Map 2-8): Historic Trails (66,370 acres)</p>	<p>Plans of operation would be required for locatable minerals activities that would cause surface disturbance (except casual use) regardless of the size of the disturbance for the following ACECs (Map 2-9): Sand Hills ACEC (12,680 acres) Blowout Penstemon ACEC (17,050)</p>

OFF-HIGHWAY VEHICLE USE			
Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4 (Proposed Plan)
Management Goals			
Manage OHV use and ensure the continued availability of OHV opportunities.			
Management Objectives			
Provide for the health and safety of visitors.			
Locate and manage OHV use to prevent or mitigate resource damage resulting from OHV uses.			
Coordinate with other programs to minimize conflicts and adverse impacts on OHV opportunities.			
Provide public education regarding appropriate use of BLM lands.			
Provide an adequate/safe OHV network.			
Management Actions Common to All Alternatives			
With some exceptions, the RMPPA would be open to use of motorized over-the-snow vehicles provided they do not adversely affect wildlife or vegetation (see the SD/MA section of Table 2-1 for specific OHV exceptions).			
The RMPPA will be divided into areas that are open, limited, or closed to OHV travel (Appendix 21 and Map 2-5). Those areas that are designated limited may have seasonal restrictions or travel limitations to either existing or designated roads and vehicle routes, or any combination of these. Until the designation process is completed, travel in Limited to Designated Areas would remain limited to existing roads and vehicle routes. Travel on parcels of public land not having legal public access would remain limited to existing roads and vehicle routes. Travel management areas (TMA) within the RMPPA are defined as those areas identified as OHV areas as "Limited to Designated Roads and Trails", "Closed" or "Open" (Map 2-5) and defined as those areas selected in the alternatives as "Limited to Designated Roads and Trails", "Closed" or "Open" (Map 2-42, Map 2-43, Map 2-44).			
Off-road motor vehicle use would be allowed for necessary tasks except in WSAs and specific SD/MAs (see SD/MA section of Table 2-1).			
The Encampment River Canyon Area (about 4,500 acres) would be closed to motorized vehicle use, including over-the-snow vehicles, December 1 to April 30, to reduce stress on wildlife that may winter in the canyon area. The Encampment River Trail would be closed to all types of motorized vehicle use year round.			
In localized areas, temporary, seasonal, or permanent closures to motorized vehicle use may occur for public health and safety concerns or for the protection of resources.			
Manage OHV use to meet the Wyoming Standards for Healthy Rangelands.			
Management Actions by Alternative			
Motorized Vehicle Use			
Motorized vehicle use in the Dune Ponds Cooperative Management Area (3,730 acres) would be limited to existing roads and vehicle routes	Same as Alternative 1.	The entire Dune Ponds Cooperative Management Area (3,730 acres) would be closed to OHV use (Map 2-43).	Motorized vehicle use in the Dune Ponds Cooperative Management Area (3,730 acres) would be limited to existing roads and vehicle routes

OFF-HIGHWAY VEHICLE USE			
Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4 (Proposed Plan)
on vegetated portions of the area. The nonvegetated sand areas of the active dunes would be open to OHV use (Map 2-5).			on vegetated portions of the area. The nonvegetated sand areas of the active dunes would be open to OHV use (Map 2-44).
OHV use to retrieve big game kills would be allowed off existing roads and vehicle routes.	Same as Alternative 1.	OHV use to retrieve big game kills would be prohibited off roads and vehicle routes.	OHV use to retrieve big game kills would be allowed within 300 feet of existing roads and vehicle routes, except where roads and vehicle routes are closed and in WSAs and specific SD/MAs.
OHV use to access camping sites would be allowed off existing roads and vehicle routes.	Same as Alternative 1.	OHV use to access camping sites would be prohibited off roads and vehicle routes.	OHV use to access camping sites would be limited to within 300 feet of existing roads and vehicle routes, except where roads and vehicle routes are closed and in WSAs and specific SD/MAs.
3,730 acres would be open to OHV use (Map 2-5 and Appendix 21). 2,222,890 acres would be limited to either designated or existing roads and vehicle routes. 1,283,930 acres would be limited to existing roads and vehicle routes (within the checkerboard or other intermixed landownership areas). 23,020 acres would be closed to OHV use.	3,730 acres would be open to OHV use (Map 2-42 and Appendix 21). 2,223,020 acres would be limited to either designated or existing roads and vehicle routes. 1,284,410 acres would be limited to existing roads and vehicle routes (within the checkerboard or other intermixed landownership areas). 22,410 acres would be closed to OHV use.	No areas would be designated as open to OHV use (Map 2-43 and Appendix 21). 2,168,330 acres would be limited to either designated or existing roads and vehicle routes. 1,284,410 acres would be limited to existing roads and vehicle routes (within the checkerboard or other intermixed landownership areas). 71,980 acres would be closed to OHV use.	3,730 acres would be open to OHV use (Map 2-44 and Appendix 21). 2,190,690 acres would be limited to either designated or existing roads and vehicle routes. 1,283,930 acres would be limited to existing roads and vehicle routes (within the checkerboard or other intermixed landownership areas). 46,370 acres would be closed to OHV use.
No similar action.	No similar action.	12,700 acres would be limited to designated roads and vehicle routes and closed to over-the-snow vehicles (Map 2-43 and Appendix 21).	12,700 acres would be limited to designated roads and vehicle routes and closed to over-the-snow vehicles (Map 2-44 and Appendix 21).
17,910 acres would be seasonally closed to OHV use (Map 2-5 and Appendix 21).	Same as Alternative 1 (Map 2-42 and Appendix 21).	14,060 acres would be seasonally closed to OHV use (Map 2-43 and Appendix 21).	14,060 acres would be seasonally closed to OHV use (Map 2-44 and Appendix 21).

PALEONTOLOGY			
Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4 (Proposed Plan)
Management Goals			
To maintain the integrity of the scientific value of paleontological resources.			
To reduce imminent threats from natural or human caused deterioration, or potential conflict with other resource uses.			
To promote stewardship, conservation, and appreciation of paleontological resources.			
Management Objectives			
Identify paleontological resources by defining priority inventory areas based on probability of occurrence of high-value resources.			
Assess the need for project or site-specific treatment plans or other protective measures in areas of high risk for development or at high risk for adverse effects.			
Develop, maintain, and encourage opportunities for scientific research of paleontological resources.			
Provide educational opportunities and public outreach programs.			
Develop and maintain interpretation of paleontological resources in areas of high public interest and access.			
Management Actions Common to All Alternatives			
<i>(Note: This section of the table presents actions for the management of paleontological resources. Management actions for the Como Bluff ACEC are located in the SD/MA section of this table.)</i>			
Paleontological resources would be managed to protect their important scientific values. Area closures, restrictions, or other mitigation requirements for the protection of paleontological values would be determined on a case-by-case basis.			
Collecting of scientifically significant vertebrate fossils by qualified paleontologists would be allowed by permit only.			
Manage paleontological resources to meet the Wyoming Standards for Healthy Rangelands.			
Management Actions by Alternatives			
No similar action.	No similar action.	Develop interpretive facilities (such as signs, kiosks, and developed areas) at specific localities with high paleontological values on a case-by-case basis.	Develop interpretive facilities (such as signs, kiosks, and developed areas) at specific localities with high paleontological values on a case-by-case basis.

PALEONTOLOGY			
Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4 (Proposed Plan)
Collection of fossils from public lands is allowed with some restrictions, depending on the significance of the fossils. Hobby collection of common invertebrate or plant fossils by the public would be allowed in reasonable quantities using hand tools.	Same as Alternative 1.	Designate hobby collection areas (i.e., areas pre-identified for containing concentrations of common invertebrate and plant fossils and where public fossil collection activities pose no significant threats to paleontological or other resources) for collection of common invertebrate or plant fossils by the public. Manage these areas by restricting all surface use as necessary and restricting fossil collection as necessary.	Collection of fossils from public lands is allowed with some restrictions, depending on the significance of the fossils. Hobby collection of common invertebrate or plant fossils by the public would be allowed in reasonable quantities using hand tools.
Apply appropriate mitigation measures for all surface disturbing activities in known paleontological resource bearing strata.	Utilize on-the-ground survey prior to approval of surface disturbing activities or land disposal actions to avoid resource bearing strata for Class 4 and Class 5 formations.	Utilize on-the-ground survey prior to approval of surface disturbing activities or land disposal actions and monitor during surface disturbing activities to avoid resource bearing strata for Class 4 and Class 5 formations.	Utilize on-the-ground survey prior to approval of surface disturbing activities or land disposal actions for Class 4 and Class 5 formations to avoid resource bearing strata on a case-by-case basis. Monitor during surface disturbing activities in potential resource bearing strata on a case-by-case basis. Survey and monitor on a case-by-case basis following discovery for Class 3 formations.

RECREATION AND VISITOR SERVICES			
Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4 (Proposed Plan)
Management Goals			
Ensure the continued availability and accessibility of outdoor recreational opportunities.			
Manage recreation resources to accommodate existing and future uses.			
Management Objectives			
Provide for the health and safety of visitors.			
Prevent or mitigate resource damage resulting from recreation uses.			
Coordinate with other programs to minimize conflicts and adverse impacts on recreational opportunities.			
In the Western ERMA (Map 2-16 and Map 2-17), consider the above recreation objectives during development involving surface disturbing or disruptive activity. Consider the Adobe Town Dispersed Recreation Management Area desired future condition during development involving surface disturbing or disruptive activity.			
In the Eastern ERMA (Map 2-16 and Map 2-17), retain the quality of dispersed recreation opportunities and settings (with the exception of isolated development areas, such as coal mines or wind generation facilities) while meeting the above recreation objectives.			
Provide public education regarding appropriate use of BLM lands.			
Provide opportunities for public use, interpretation, education, and appreciation of natural and cultural resources.			
Management Actions Common to All Alternatives			
Existing recreation sites would be maintained or improved to assure continued availability to the recreating public. Additional recreation sites would be considered for development based on need or demand, site suitability, and legal public access (Map 3-7).			
The entire RMPPA would be open to dispersed recreation with the exception of specific areas that must be excluded to protect public health and safety or special resource values.			
Manage recreation to meet the Wyoming Standards for Healthy Rangelands.			
Management Actions by Alternative			
Developed and undeveloped recreation sites (9,660 acres) would be open to oil and gas leasing with an NSO stipulation. Surface disturbance would be intensively managed in the ¼-mile area surrounding these sites (an additional 7,930 acres).	Same as Alternative 1.	Developed and undeveloped recreation sites (with the exception of those sites located in the North Platte River SRMA; 5,060 acres) and the surrounding ½-mile area would be open to oil and gas leasing with an NSO stipulation (Map 3-7).	Developed and undeveloped recreation sites (9,660 acres) and the surrounding ¼-mile area (an additional 7,930 acres) would be open to oil and gas leasing with an NSO stipulation (Map 3-7).

RECREATION AND VISITOR SERVICES			
Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4 (Proposed Plan)
Developed recreation sites (5,560 acres) would be closed to locatable mineral entry, mineral material disposals, and operation of the public land laws, including sale (Map 3-7). Withdrawals would be pursued.	Same as Alternative 1.	Lands within ½ mile of developed and undeveloped recreation sites (22,410 acres) would be closed to locatable mineral entry, mineral material disposals, and operation of the public land laws, including sale (Map 3-7). Withdrawals would be pursued. Buried utilities would be allowed with adequate reclamation of the surface. Above-ground facilities would be avoided unless adequately mitigated to protect the recreation site viewshed.	Lands within ¼ mile of developed and undeveloped recreation sites (17,590 acres) would be closed to locatable mineral entry, mineral material disposals, and operation of the public land laws, including sale (Map 3-7). Withdrawals would be pursued. Buried utilities would be allowed with adequate reclamation of the surface. Above-ground facilities would be avoided unless adequately mitigated to protect the recreation site viewshed.
No similar action.	No similar action.	The Adobe Town Dispersed Recreation Use Area (238,970 acres) (Map 2-16) would be a priority for reclamation after oil and gas development ceases (Appendix 37).	The Adobe Town Dispersed Recreation Use Area (238,970 acres) (Map 2-17) would be a priority for reclamation after oil and gas development ceases (Appendix 37).
No similar action.	No similar action.	No similar action.	Special Recreation Permits will not be issued for prairie dog hunting.
Special Recreation Management Areas			
Continental Divide National Scenic Trail SRMA			
Management Goals			
Manage to emphasize interpretive and educational opportunities.			
Ensure the continued availability of outdoor recreation opportunities associated with the Continental Divide National Scenic Trail (CDNST).			
Management Objectives			
Comply with the CDNST Comprehensive Plan.			
Locate the trail so users may experience available examples of the great diversity of topographic, geologic, vegetation, and scenic phenomenon in proximity to the Continental Divide.			
Provide users with opportunities to view, experience, and appreciate examples of prehistoric and historic human use of the resources along the Continental Divide, and examples of the ways these resources on public lands are being managed in harmony with the environment, as an asset to the existing character of the Continental Divide, and which will not detract from the overall experience of the trail.			

RECREATION AND VISITOR SERVICES			
Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4 (Proposed Plan)
Provide a route that will have a minimum adverse effect on adjacent natural and cultural environments and harmonize with the management objectives of land and resource uses which are now or may be occurring on the lands through which the trail passes.			
Maintain and enhance recreation opportunities for residents and visitors to the area to accommodate camping, wildlife viewing, and other compatible uses in prescribed settings so visitors are able to realize experiences and benefits. (Table 2-11).			
Pursue opportunities for partnership and cooperative management with adjacent property owners.			
Maintain, restore, and enhance areas within CDNST to meet Wyoming Standards for Healthy Rangelands.			
Management Actions Common to All Alternatives			
The Continental Divide National Scenic Trail (600 acres; the federal portion of the trail is about 82 miles long and is located within a ¼-mile wide corridor) would be managed to provide opportunities for trail users to view the diverse topographic, geographic, vegetation, wildlife, and scenic phenomena that characterize the Continental Divide and to observe examples of human use of the natural resources. The prescribed setting for the CDNST would be middle country.			
The SRMA would be managed to protect the corridor. Land exchanges and easement acquisitions would be pursued to improve the continuity of the trail where opportunities arise (Appendix 6). Kiosks would be erected at each end of the RMPPA portion of the trail to provide information on access to the trail.			
Implementation of the Continental Divide National Scenic Trail Comprehensive Plan would potentially result in a significant rerouting of the trail and/or trail corridor. Pursue agreements with private landowners to facilitate routing of the trail and to improve the quality of recreational experiences.			
The area would be open to oil and gas leasing with an NSO stipulation. Existing oil and gas leases would be intensively managed.			
Reclaim unnecessary or undesirable vehicle routes.			
Manage the CDNST to meet the Wyoming Standards for Healthy Rangelands.			
Management Actions by Alternative			
Public lands (600 acres) would be open to locatable mineral entry.	Same as Alternative 1.	Public lands (600 acres) would be closed to locatable mineral entry. Withdrawals from locatable mineral entry would be pursued.	Public lands (600 acres) would be open to locatable mineral entry.
Public lands (600 acres) would be open to mineral material disposal.	Same as Alternative 1.	Public lands (600 acres) would be closed to mineral material disposal.	Public lands (600 acres) would be closed to mineral material disposal.
Public lands (600 acres) would be open to the operation of the public land laws.	Same as Alternative 1.	Public lands (600 acres) would be closed to land tenure adjustments, including sales. Withdrawals would be pursued.	Public lands (600 acres) would be open to the operation of the public land laws.

RECREATION AND VISITOR SERVICES			
Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4 (Proposed Plan)
North Platte River SRMA			
Management Goals			
Manage to ensure the continued availability of outdoor recreation opportunities associated with the North Platte and Encampment Rivers.			
Management Objectives			
Maintain or enhance recreation opportunities to accommodate existing niche activities including hunting, fishing, camping, wildlife viewing, OHV touring, and other uses appropriate to the prescribed setting.			
Mitigate conflicts with other resource values and uses as appropriate, in coordination and cooperation with affected interests.			
Maintain or improve the quality of river-related recreational experience along the North Platte and Encampment Rivers to continue to provide high-quality recreational experiences and benefits to local residents and visitors to the area (Table 2-11).			
Maintain, restore, and enhance areas within the North Platte River area to meet Wyoming Standards for Healthy Rangelands.			
Management Actions Common to All Alternatives			
Access opportunities to the North Platte River would be identified and pursued.			
Manage commercial outfitting to disperse river usage.			
Manage the river parcels to meet middle country guidelines and reclaim unnecessary or undesirable vehicle routes.			
Manage the North Platte River area to meet the Wyoming Standards for Healthy Rangelands.			
Management Actions by Alternative			
The SRMA would be managed to provide high-quality recreational opportunities, especially for floating, fishing, camping, and sightseeing. Current public facilities and access would be maintained to support the values of the SRMA (Map 2-14).	This area would not be managed as a SRMA.	Same as Alternative 1.	The SRMA would be managed to provide high-quality recreational opportunities, especially for floating, fishing, camping, and sightseeing. Current public facilities and access would be maintained to support the values of the SRMA (Map 2-17).
Manage OHV use as limited to existing roads or vehicle routes.	Same as Alternative 1.	Manage OHV use as limited to designated roads or vehicle routes.	Manage OHV use as limited to designated roads or vehicle routes.
No similar action.	No similar action.	The area would be closed to oil and gas leasing. Surface disturbing activities on existing leases would be intensively managed (Map 2-16).	the area would be open to oil and gas leasing with an NSO stipulation Existing oil and gas leases would be intensively managed (Map 2-17).

RECREATION AND VISITOR SERVICES			
Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4 (Proposed Plan)
The SRMA (5,060 acres, including the ¼-mile area on either side of the river) would be open to locatable mineral entry and mineral material disposals, with surface disturbing and disruptive activities restricted to maintain the quality of the visual resource.	The area would be open to locatable mineral entry and mineral material disposals, with surface disturbing and disruptive activities restricted to maintain the quality of the visual resource.	The SRMA (12,740 acres, including the ½-mile area on either side of the river) would be closed to locatable mineral entry, mineral material disposals, and operation of the public land laws, including sale. Withdrawals would be pursued.	The SRMA (5,060 acres, including the ¼-mile area on either side of the river) would be open to locatable mineral entry and closed to mineral material disposals. Surface disturbing and disruptive activities would be restricted to maintain the quality of the visual resource.
Surface disturbing activities on public lands within ¼ mile on either side of the river would be intensively managed to maintain the quality of the visual resource.	Surface disturbing activities on public lands within ¼ mile on either side of the river would be managed using standard mitigation measures (Appendix 1).	Surface disturbing activities on public lands within ½ mile on either side of the river would be intensively managed to maintain the quality of the visual resource.	Surface disturbing activities on public lands within ¼ mile on either side of the river would be intensively managed to maintain the quality of the visual resource.
OHV SRMA			
Management Goals			
Provide opportunities for a safe OHV riding opportunity and OHV use education for local residents and visitors to the area.			
Management Objectives			
Communicate riding ethics and regulations, and designate open areas for OHV practice and skill development.			
Maintain, restore, and enhance areas within the OHV SRMA to meet Wyoming Standards for Healthy Rangelands; manage the area to maintain a front country setting.			
Maintain or enhance a diversity of recreational and OHV experiences and benefits (Table 2-11).			
Management Actions Common to All Alternatives			
Manage the OHV SRMAs to meet the Wyoming Standards for Healthy Rangelands.			
Management Actions by Alternative			
No similar action.	Develop OHV areas when needs are identified to promote educational programs in cooperation with partners on riding ethics and regulations.	No similar action.	Develop OHV areas when needs are identified to promote educational programs in cooperation with partners on riding ethics and regulations.

RECREATION AND VISITOR SERVICES			
Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4 (Proposed Plan)
Jelm Mountain SRMA			
Management Goals			
Ensure the continued availability of outdoor recreation opportunities associated with Jelm Mountain.			
Management Objectives			
Maintain, restore, or enhance recreation opportunities as an undeveloped SRMA to accommodate niche activities including hunting, fishing, camping, wildlife viewing, and other compatible uses.			
Maintain or enhance a diversity of recreational opportunities and benefits (Table 2-11).			
Manage conflicts with other resource values and uses in coordination and cooperation with affected interests.			
Maintain, restore, and enhance areas within Jelm Mountain area to meet Wyoming Standards for Healthy Rangelands.			
Management Actions Common to All Alternatives			
Reclaim unnecessary or undesirable vehicle routes so as to manage the area to meet middle country setting guidelines.			
Control recreation impacts where necessary to protect resources (including the Wyoming Infrared Observatory).			
Pursue land tenure adjustments to improve recreation opportunities.			
Manage the Jelm Mountain area to meet the Wyoming Standards for Healthy Rangelands.			
Management Actions by Alternative			
No similar action.	No similar action.	The SRMA would be managed to provide high-quality recreational opportunities (Map 2-16).	The SRMA would be managed to provide high-quality recreational opportunities (Map 2-17).
Manage OHV use as limited to existing roads or vehicle routes.	Same as Alternative 1.	Manage OHV use as limited to designated roads or vehicle routes.	Manage OHV use as limited to designated roads or vehicle routes.
The area would be open to oil and gas leasing with intensive management of surface disturbing and disruptive activities.	Same as Alternative 1	The area would be open to oil and gas leasing with an NSO stipulation. Existing oil and gas leases would be intensively managed.	The area would be open to oil and gas leasing with an NSO stipulation. Existing oil and gas leases would be intensively managed.
Public lands would be open to locatable mineral entry.	Same as Alternative 1.	Public lands would be closed to locatable mineral entry. Withdrawals from locatable mineral entry would be pursued.	Public lands would be open to locatable mineral entry.

RECREATION AND VISITOR SERVICES			
Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4 (Proposed Plan)
Public lands would be open to mineral material disposal.	Same as Alternative 1.	Public lands would be closed to mineral material disposal.	Public lands would be closed to mineral material disposal.
Public lands would be open to the operation of the public land laws.	Same as Alternative 1.	Public lands would be closed to land tenure adjustments, including sales. Withdrawals would be pursued.	Public lands would be open to the operation of the public land laws.
Pedro Mountains SRMA			
Management Goals			
Ensure the continued availability of outdoor recreation opportunities and benefits to local residents and visitors to the Pedro Mountains.			
Management Objectives			
Manage the SRMA primarily for the existing niche activities of rock climbing and other non-motorized recreational activities. Maintain, restore, or enhance additional recreation opportunities to accommodate existing and future uses, including backpacking, hunting, camping, wildlife viewing, and other uses appropriate for back to middle country settings.			
Maintain or enhance a diversity of recreational opportunities and benefits (Table 2-11).			
Manage conflicts with other resource values and uses in coordination and cooperation with affected interests.			
Reclaim unnecessary or undesirable vehicle routes.			
Maintain, restore, and enhance areas within the Pedro Mountains area to meet Wyoming Standards for Healthy Rangelands (1997).			
Management Actions Common to All Alternatives			
Manage the Pedro Mountains area to meet the Wyoming Standards for Healthy Rangelands and to protect Ponderosa pine stands.			
Ponderosa pine stands in the Pedro Mountains would be managed to meet the Wyoming Standards for Healthy Rangelands (1997). Commercial and noncommercial forest product removal would be prohibited to protect VRM and recreational values.			
Management Actions by Alternative			
No similar action.	No similar action.	The Pedro Mountains SRMA (18,650 acres) would be managed to provide high-quality recreational opportunities, especially rock climbing and other non-motorized recreational activities (Map 2-16).	The Pedro Mountains SRMA (18,650 acres) would be managed to provide high-quality recreational opportunities, especially rock climbing and other non-motorized recreational activities (Map 2-17).
Manage OHV use as limited to existing roads or vehicle routes.	Same as Alternative 1.	Manage OHV use as limited to designated roads or vehicle routes.	Manage OHV use as limited to designated roads or vehicle routes.

RECREATION AND VISITOR SERVICES			
Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4 (Proposed Plan)
The area would be open to oil and gas leasing with intensive management of surface disturbing and disruptive activities.	Same as Alternative 1.	The area would be open to oil and gas leasing with an NSO stipulation. Existing oil and gas leases would be intensively managed.	The area would be open to oil and gas leasing with an NSO stipulation. Existing oil and gas leases would be intensively managed.
Public lands would be open to locatable mineral entry.	Same as Alternative 1.	Public lands would be closed to locatable mineral entry. Withdrawals from locatable mineral entry would be pursued.	Public lands would be open to locatable mineral entry.
Public lands would be open to mineral material disposal.	Same as Alternative 1.	Public lands would be closed to mineral material disposal.	Public lands would be closed to mineral material disposal.
Public lands would be open to the operation of the public land laws.	Same as Alternative 1.	Public lands would be closed to land tenure adjustments, including sales. Withdrawals would be pursued.	Public lands would be open to the operation of the public land laws.
Laramie Plains Lakes SRMA (Lake Hattie Reservoir and Twin Buttes Lake)			
Management Goals			
Manage to ensure the continued availability of outdoor recreation opportunities associated with the Laramie Plains Lakes (Lake Hattie Reservoir and Twin Buttes Lake).			
Management Objectives			
Maintain, restore, or enhance the area for water-related recreation activities, fisheries, wildlife viewing, and existing multiple uses for local residents (Table 2-11).			
Manage conflicts with other resource values and uses in coordination and cooperation with affected interests.			
Maintain, restore, and enhance areas within the Laramie Plains Lakes area to meet Wyoming Standards for Healthy Rangelands.			
Management Actions Common to All Alternatives			
Reconstruct the Lake Hattie campground to meet front country setting guidelines.			
Pursue land tenure adjustments to improve recreation opportunities.			
Pursue future opportunities for recreation development as demand arises.			
Reclaim unnecessary or undesirable vehicle routes.			
Manage the Laramie Plains Lakes area to meet the Wyoming Standards for Healthy Rangelands.			

RECREATION AND VISITOR SERVICES			
Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4 (Proposed Plan)
Management Actions by Alternative			
No similar action.	No similar action.	The Laramie Plains SRMA (1,600 acres) would be managed to provide high-quality water-related recreational opportunities (Map 2-16).	The Laramie Plains SRMA (1,600 acres) would be managed to provide high-quality water-related recreational opportunities (Map 2-17).
Manage OHV use as limited to existing roads or vehicle routes.	Same as Alternative 1.	Manage OHV use as limited to designated roads or vehicle routes.	Manage OHV use as limited to designated roads or vehicle routes.
The area would be open to oil and gas leasing with intensive management of surface disturbing and disruptive activities.	Same as Alternative 1.	The area would be open to oil and gas leasing with an NSO stipulation. Existing oil and gas leases would be intensively managed.	The area would be open to oil and gas leasing with an NSO stipulation. Existing oil and gas leases would be intensively managed.
Public lands would be open to locatable mineral entry.	Same as Alternative 1.	Public lands would be closed to locatable mineral entry. Withdrawals from locatable mineral entry would be pursued.	Public lands would be closed to locatable mineral entry. Withdrawals from locatable mineral entry would be pursued.
Public lands would be open to mineral material disposal.	Same as Alternative 1.	Public lands would be closed to mineral material disposal.	Public lands would be closed to mineral material disposal.
Public lands would be open to the operation of the public land laws.	Same as Alternative 1.	Public lands would be closed to land tenure adjustments, including sales. Withdrawals would be pursued.	Public lands would be open to land tenure adjustments, including sales. Withdrawals would be pursued.
Rawlins Fishing SRMA (Rim Lake and Teton Reservoir Recreation Sites)			
Management Goals			
Manage to ensure the continued availability of outdoor recreation opportunities associated with Rim Lake and Teton Reservoir recreation sites for residents of the local area.			
Management Objectives			
Maintain, restore, or enhance the area for niche activities that include water-related outdoor activities, fisheries, wildlife values, and existing multiple uses (Table 2-11).			
Manage conflicts with other resource values and uses in coordination and cooperation with affected interests.			
Maintain, restore, and enhance areas within Rawlins Fishing SRMA areas to meet Wyoming Standards for Healthy Rangelands.			
Management Actions Common to All Alternatives			
Reconstruction of Teton Reservoir recreation sites to improve accessibility and aesthetics and improve soil/shore stability.			

RECREATION AND VISITOR SERVICES			
Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4 (Proposed Plan)
Dredge and deepen the reservoir basin as opportunities arise to maintain the fishery.			
The Teton Reservoir would be closed to livestock grazing.			
Reclaim unnecessary or undesirable vehicle routes.			
Manage the Rawlins Fishing SRMA areas to meet the Wyoming Standards for Healthy Rangelands.			
Management Actions by Alternative			
No similar action.	No similar action.	The SRMA would be managed to provide water-related recreational opportunities (Map 2-16).	The SRMA would be managed to provide water-related recreational opportunities (Map 2-17).
Manage OHV use as limited to existing roads or vehicle routes.	Same as Alternative 1.	Manage OHV use as limited to designated roads or vehicle routes.	Manage OHV use as limited to designated roads or vehicle routes.
The area would be open to oil and gas leasing with intensive management of surface disturbing and disruptive activities.	Same as Alternative 1.	The area would be open to oil and gas leasing with an NSO stipulation. Existing oil and gas leases would be intensively managed.	The area would be open to oil and gas leasing with an NSO stipulation. Existing oil and gas leases would be intensively managed.
Public lands would be open to locatable mineral entry.	Same as Alternative 1.	Public lands would be closed to locatable mineral entry. Withdrawals from locatable mineral entry would be pursued.	Public lands would be closed to locatable mineral entry. Withdrawals from locatable mineral entry would be pursued.
Public lands would be open to mineral material disposal.	Same as Alternative 1.	Public lands would be closed to mineral material disposal.	Public lands would be closed to mineral material disposal.
Public lands would be open to the operation of the public land laws.	Same as Alternative 1.	Public lands would be closed to land tenure adjustments, including sales. Withdrawals would be pursued.	Public lands would be closed to land tenure adjustments, including sales. Withdrawals would be pursued.
Shirley Mountain SRMA			
Management Goals			
Ensure the continued availability and diversity of outdoor recreation opportunities in the Shirley Mountains.			
Management Objectives			
Maintain or enhance a diversity of recreational opportunities, benefits, and niche activities including camping, hunting, and dispersed recreational use (Table 2-11).			
Manage conflicts with other resource values and uses in coordination and cooperation with affected interests.			

RECREATION AND VISITOR SERVICES			
Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4 (Proposed Plan)
Manage the area to meet middle country setting guidelines.			
Stop road proliferation and reduce the number of two-track roads.			
Reclaim unnecessary or undesirable vehicle routes.			
Maintain, restore, and enhance areas within Shirley Mountain area to meet Wyoming Standards for Healthy Rangelands.			
Management Actions Common to All Alternatives			
Develop primitive camping sites to disperse camping, ensuring compatibility with a middle country setting.			
Improve travel management to facilitate public access (Appendix 21).			
Pursue land tenure adjustments to reduce trespass on private property.			
Manage OHV use as limited to designated roads or vehicle routes.			
Manage the Shirley Mountain area to meet the Wyoming Standards for Healthy Rangelands.			
Management Actions by Alternative			
The Shirley Mountain SRMA (24,440 acres) (Map 2-14) would be retained.	The Shirley Mountain area would not be managed as an SRMA.	The Shirley Mountain SRMA (37,820 acres) (Map 2-16) would be retained and expanded.	The Shirley Mountain SRMA (37,820 acres) (Map 2-17) would be retained and expanded.
The area would be open to oil and gas leasing with intensive management of surface disturbing and disruptive activities.	Same as Alternative 1.	The SRMA would be open to oil and gas leasing with an NSO stipulation. Existing oil and gas leases would be intensively managed (Map 2-16).	The SRMA would be open to oil and gas leasing with an NSO stipulation. Existing oil and gas leases would be intensively managed (Map 2-17).

SOCIOECONOMICS			
Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4 (Proposed Plan)
Management Goals			
Provide opportunities to develop national energy resources on BLM-administered lands within the RMPPA.			
Provide opportunities to develop resources other than those related to energy (e.g., grazing, recreation, wildlife, fisheries, tourism, and others) on BLM-administered lands within the RMPPA.			
Provide opportunities to sustain the cultural, social, and economic viability of local and regional communities by using decision review processes that include considerations of various potential impacts of BLM decisions including housing, employment, population, fiscal impacts, social services, cultural character, and municipal utilities.			
Management Objectives			
Work cooperatively with private and community groups and local government to provide for customary uses consistent with other resource objectives and to sustain or improve local, regional, and national economies.			
Maintain and promote the cultural, economic, ecological, and social health within the RMPPA.			
Management Actions Common to All Alternatives			
None.			
Management Actions by Alternative			
None.			

SPECIAL DESIGNATIONS AND MANAGEMENT AREAS			
Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4 (Proposed Plan)
<p><i>Note: A summary of special management designations and the associated acreages by alternative is presented in Table 2-7. Not all special designations and other management areas include actions that address all other resource programs. Where resource-specific actions are not included for a specific Special Designation, refer to the management actions under each resource heading that apply to the entire RMPPA. The acreages presented in the Special Designations and Management Areas section below apply only to public land acres.</i></p>			
Wilderness Study Areas			
Management Goal			
Ensure the WSAs retain their suitability for preservation as wilderness.			
Management Objectives			
Maintain the nonimpairment standard.			
Prevent unnecessary or undue degradation.			
Where possible, enhance wilderness values.			
Management Actions Common to All Alternatives			
All WSAs (Adobe Town, Prospect Mountain, Bennett Mountain, Encampment River Canyon, and Ferris Mountain) (Map 2-6) would be managed according to the Interim Management Policy for Lands Under Wilderness Review until Congress either designates each WSA as “wilderness” or releases it from consideration and the land reverts to multiple-use management. Management direction for WSAs, should they be released from wilderness consideration by Congress, would be evaluated through the planning process, which may result in a future plan amendment.			
Management Actions by Alternative			
Motorized vehicle use in the Adobe Town WSA (32,650 acres) would be limited to designated roads and vehicle routes (Map 2-6).	Same as Alternative 1.	The Adobe Town WSA would be closed to OHV use (32,650 acres) (Map 2-6).	The Adobe Town WSA would be closed to OHV use (32,650 acres) (Map 2-6).
The Prospect Mountain WSA (1,140 acres) would be open to all types of motorized use on existing roads and vehicle routes that were present before 1980 (Map 2-6).	Same as Alternative 1.	The Prospect Mountain WSA (about 1,140 acres) would be closed to all types of motorized vehicle use (Map 2-6).	The Prospect Mountain WSA (about 1,140 acres) would be closed to all types of motorized vehicle use (Map 2-6).
The Bennett Mountains WSA (5,950 acres) would be open to all types of motorized use on existing roads and vehicle routes that were present before 1980 (Map 2-6).	Same as Alternative 1.	The Bennett Mountains WSA (about 5,950 acres) would be closed to all types of motorized vehicle use (Map 2-6).	The Bennett Mountains WSA (about 5,950 acres) would be closed to all types of motorized vehicle use (Map 2-6).

SPECIAL DESIGNATIONS AND MANAGEMENT AREAS			
Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4 (Proposed Plan)
The Encampment River Canyon WSA (4,500 acres) would be open to all types of motorized use from May 1 to November 30 on existing roads and vehicle routes that were present before the establishment of the WSA. The WSA would be closed to all motorized vehicles from December 1 to April 30 (Map 2-6).	Same as Alternative 1.	The Encampment River Canyon WSA (about 4,500 acres) would be closed to all types of motorized vehicle use (Map 2-6).	The Encampment River Canyon WSA (about 4,500 acres) would be closed to all types of motorized vehicle use (Map 2-6).
The Ferris Mountains WSA (21,880 acres) would be open to all types of motorized vehicles on existing roads and vehicles routes that were present before 1980 (Map 2-6).	Same as Alternative 1.	The Ferris Mountains WSA (21,880 acres) would be closed to all types of motorized vehicles (Map 2-6).	The Ferris Mountains WSA (21,880 acres) would be open to all types of motorized vehicles on designated roads and vehicle routes (Map 2-6).
Areas of Critical Environmental Concern (ACEC)			
<i>Appendix 22 summarizes the BLM’s ACEC designation process. Appendix 22 includes the relevance and importance evaluations for those proposed ACECs that were considered in the alternatives below.</i>			
Management Goal (Overall) for ACECs			
Protect the integrity of unique resource values, preserve historic significance, and provide opportunity for other uses where appropriate.			
Management Objective (Overall) for ACECs			
Maintain, restore, and enhance areas within current and potential ACECs to meet Wyoming Standards for Healthy Rangelands, as applicable.			
Management Actions Common to All Alternatives (Overall) for ACECs			
Manage ACECs to meet the Wyoming Standards for Healthy Rangelands.			
Como Bluff ACEC/NNL			
Management Goals			
Protect the integrity of paleontological resource values, preserve historic significance, and provide opportunity for other uses where appropriate.			
Management Objectives			
Provide for permitted research and protect the historical significance of the site.			
Management Actions Common to All Alternatives			
Case-by-case examination of any proposed surface disturbing and disruptive activities would be made to determine potential adverse effects and appropriate mitigation would be applied to minimize those effects.			

SPECIAL DESIGNATIONS AND MANAGEMENT AREAS			
Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4 (Proposed Plan)
Management Actions by Alternative			
The Como Bluff NNL/ACEC designation (1,690 acres) (Map 2-7) would be retained.	The Como Bluff ACEC designation would be terminated, and would be managed as an NNL.	Same as Alternative 1.	The Como Bluff ACEC designation would be terminated, and would be managed as an NNL.
The Como Bluff NNL would be open to oil and gas leasing with intensive management of surface disturbing and disruptive activities within ¼ mile of exposures of the Morrison Formation.	The Como Bluff NNL would be open to oil and gas leasing.	The Como Bluff ACEC would be open to oil and gas leasing with an NSO stipulation on new leases. Surface disturbing activities on existing leases would be intensively managed.	The Como Bluff NNL would be open to oil and gas leasing with intensive management of surface disturbing and disruptive activities within ¼ mile of exposures of the Morrison Formation.
Plans of operations would be required for locatable mineral exploration and development (except casual use), regardless of the number of acres that may be disturbed.	Lands would be managed in accordance with 43 CFR Surface Management Regulations. Plans of operations would be required for locatable mineral exploration and development (except casual use) for surface disturbances of 5 acres or more.	Public lands would be closed to locatable mineral entry and operation of the public land laws, including sale. Withdrawals would be pursued.	Lands would be managed in accordance with 43 CFR Surface Management Regulations. Plans of operations would be required for locatable mineral exploration and development (except casual use) for surface disturbances of 5 acres or more.
Those areas open to locatable mineral entry would also be open to mineral material disposals.	Same as Alternative 1.	Those areas closed to locatable mineral entry would also be closed to mineral material disposals.	The area would be open to mineral material disposals.
No similar action.	No similar action.	As opportunities arise, acquisition of adjacent lands or easements to obtain public access would be considered and evaluated (Appendix 6).	As opportunities arise, acquisition of adjacent lands or easements to obtain public access would be considered and evaluated (Appendix 6).
Off-road motor vehicle use for “necessary tasks” (as defined in the Glossary) would be allowed.	Same as Alternative 1.	Off-road motor vehicle use for “necessary tasks” (as defined in the Glossary) would not be allowed. Exceptions would be considered on a case-by-case basis.	Off-road motor vehicle use for “necessary tasks” (as defined in the Glossary) would be allowed.
Sand Hills ACEC and Potential JO Ranch Expansion			
Management Goals			
To manage the resources in the Sand Hills ACEC to protect the unique vegetation community complex, to maintain wildlife habitat values, to minimize soil erosion, and to promote recreational opportunities.			

SPECIAL DESIGNATIONS AND MANAGEMENT AREAS			
Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4 (Proposed Plan)
No similar action.	No similar action.	To manage and protect the JO Ranch for historical and cultural values.	To manage and protect the JO Ranch for historical and cultural values.
Management Objectives			
No similar action.	No similar action.	Preserve the JO Ranch as an example of ranching culture, including public interpretation and education.	Preserve the JO Ranch as an example of ranching culture, including public interpretation and education.
Provide recreational access while maintaining vegetation community and wildlife values.			
Maintain, restore, or enhance the unique vegetation community and wildlife and livestock use.			
Management Actions Common to All Alternatives			
No surface occupancy would be allowed on the 18 acres around the JO Ranch buildings. Developments, uses, and facilities would be managed spatially to avoid damage to vegetation.			
The ACEC is designated an AMR area with emphasis on fire suppression.			
Management Actions by Alternative			
The Sand Hills ACEC (Map 2-7, 7,960 acres) designation would be retained.	The Sand Hills ACEC designation would be terminated, and the area would be managed as a wildlife habitat management area.	Same as Alternative 1.	The Sand Hills ACEC (Map 2-9, 7,960 acres) designation would be retained.
No similar action.	No similar action.	The existing ACEC boundaries would be expanded to include the JO Ranch acquisition (4,740 acres in expansion, for 12,680 total acres) (Map 2-8).	The existing ACEC boundaries would be expanded to include the JO Ranch acquisition (4,740 acres in expansion, for 12,680 total acres) (Map 2-9).
The area would be open to federal oil and gas leasing with intensive management of surface disturbing and disruptive activities.	Same as Alternative 1.	The area would be closed to new federal oil and gas leasing. Surface disturbing activities on existing leases would be intensively managed to meet the objectives of the ACEC.	The area would be open to federal oil and gas leasing. Surface disturbing activities on oil and gas leases would be intensively managed to meet the objectives of the ACEC.

SPECIAL DESIGNATIONS AND MANAGEMENT AREAS			
Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4 (Proposed Plan)
Plans of operations would be required for locatable federal mineral exploration and development (except casual use), regardless of the number of acres that may be disturbed.	Lands would be managed in accordance with 43 CFR Surface Management Regulations. Plans of operations would be required for locatable federal mineral exploration and development (except casual use), for surface disturbances of 5 acres or more.	Public lands would be closed to locatable mineral entry and operation of the public land laws, including sale. Withdrawals would be pursued.	Plans of operations would be required for locatable federal mineral exploration and development (except casual use), regardless of the number of acres that may be disturbed.
Those areas open to locatable mineral entry would also be open to mineral material disposals.	Same as Alternative 1.	Those areas closed to locatable mineral entry would also be closed to mineral material disposals.	The area would be closed to mineral material disposals.
No similar action.	No similar action.	Big game seasonal closures to motor vehicle use would be implemented as needed.	Big game seasonal closures to motor vehicle use would be implemented as needed.
Off-road motor vehicle use for “necessary tasks” (as defined in the Glossary) would be allowed.	Same as Alternative 1.	Off-road motor vehicle use for “necessary tasks” (as defined in the Glossary) would not be allowed. Exceptions would be considered on a case-by-case basis.	Off-road motor vehicle use for “necessary tasks” (as defined in the Glossary) would be allowed.
OHV use in the Sand Hills ACEC would be limited to designated roads and vehicle routes and open to over-the-snow vehicles.	Same as Alternative 1.	OHV use in the Sand Hills/JO Ranch ACEC (12,680 acres) would be limited to designated roads and vehicle routes and closed to over-the-snow vehicles.	OHV use in the Sand Hills/JO Ranch ACEC (12,680 acres) would be limited to designated roads and vehicle routes and closed to over-the-snow vehicles.
The unique vegetation complex of the Sand Hills ACEC would be protected from sources of disturbance through intensive management of surface disturbing activities. Case-by-case examination of any proposed surface disturbing and disruptive activity would be made to determine potential adverse effects and appropriate mitigation to minimize those effects.	Same as Alternative 1.	Surface disturbing activities would be prohibited to protect the vegetation complex of the Sand Hills ACEC, subject to valid existing rights.	The unique vegetation complex of the Sand Hills ACEC would be protected from sources of disturbance through intensive management of surface disturbing activities. Case-by-case examination of any proposed surface disturbing and disruptive activity would be made to determine potential adverse effects and appropriate mitigation to minimize those effects.

SPECIAL DESIGNATIONS AND MANAGEMENT AREAS			
Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4 (Proposed Plan)
New fence construction would be authorized to BLM standards. Existing fences would be modified to current BLM standards at specific locations (according to wildlife and livestock needs) and as older fences are reconstructed (Appendix 19).	Same as Alternative 1.	To protect big game seasonal migration, no new fences would be authorized. Existing fences would be modified to current BLM standards.	New fence construction would be authorized to BLM standards. Existing fences would be modified to current BLM standards.
No similar action.	No similar action.	Management actions resulting in visual elements that diminish the integrity of the JO Ranch setting would be managed in accordance with the Wyoming State Protocol and BMPs (Appendix 5).	Management actions resulting in visual elements that diminish the integrity of the JO Ranch setting would be managed in accordance with the Wyoming State Protocol and BMPs (Appendix 5).
No similar action.	No similar action.	The 18 acres that include the JO Ranch buildings and a 2-mile transition zone or the visual horizon, whichever is closer, would be designated as VRM Class II.	The 18 acres that include the JO Ranch buildings and a 2-mile transition zone or the visual horizon, whichever is closer, would be designated as VRM Class II.
No similar action.	The JO Ranch buildings and related facilities would not be stabilized. Signs would be placed to allow for the protection of public health and safety.	The JO Ranch buildings and related facilities would be stabilized to protect the integrity of the site and provide for public health and safety.	The JO Ranch buildings and related facilities would be stabilized to protect the integrity of the site and provide for public health and safety.
No similar action.	No similar action.	Turn the historic ranch into an interpretive site exhibiting late 19th century ranching in the area, and the roles of historic roads and vehicle routes throughout the area.	Develop an interpretive program for the JO Ranch.
Jep Canyon ACEC/Jep Canyon Wildlife Habitat Management Area			
Management Goals			
Manage the resources in the Jep Canyon ACEC/WHMA to protect crucial winter habitat for elk and nesting habitat for raptors.			
Seek the cooperation of owners of adjacent property in management of the habitat.			
Management Objectives			
Maintain, restore, and enhance crucial winter habitat for elk.			

SPECIAL DESIGNATIONS AND MANAGEMENT AREAS			
Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4 (Proposed Plan)
Maintain, restore, and enhance raptor nesting habitat and the productivity of nesting raptor pairs.			
Pursue opportunities for partnership and cooperative management with adjacent property owners.			
Management Actions Common to All Alternatives			
Surface disturbing and disruptive activities would be intensively managed to prevent loss of significant habitat. Management would be applied on a case-by-case basis. Developments, uses, and facilities would be managed to avoid damage to vegetation and wildlife habitat.			
Management Actions by Alternative			
The Jep Canyon ACEC (Map 2-7, 13,810 acres) would be maintained.	The ACEC designation would not be maintained, and would be managed as a wildlife habitat management area.	Same as Alternative 2.	The ACEC designation would not be maintained, and would be managed as a wildlife habitat management area.
The area would be open to oil and gas leasing with intensive management of surface disturbing and disruptive activities.	Same as Alternative 1.	The area would be closed to new federal oil and gas leasing. Surface disturbing and disruptive activities on existing leases would be intensively managed to meet the objectives of the wildlife habitat management area.	The area would be open to oil and gas leasing. Surface disturbing activities on oil and gas leases would be intensively managed to meet the objectives of the wildlife habitat management area.
Public lands would be open to locatable mineral entry. Plans of operations would be required for locatable mineral exploration and development (except casual use), regardless of the number of acres that would be disturbed.	Public lands would be open to locatable mineral entry. Plans of operations would be required for locatable mineral exploration and development (except casual use), for surface disturbance of 5 acres or more.	Public lands would be closed to locatable mineral entry and operation of the public land laws, including sale. Withdrawals would be pursued.	Public lands would be open to locatable mineral entry. Plans of operations would be required for locatable mineral exploration and development (except casual use), for surface disturbance of 5 acres or more.
Those areas open to locatable mineral entry would also be open to mineral material disposals.	Same as Alternative 1.	Those areas closed to locatable mineral entry would also be closed to mineral material disposals.	Those areas open to locatable mineral entry would also be open to mineral material disposal.
No similar action.	No similar action.	As opportunities arise, acquisition of adjacent lands or easements to improve public access would be considered and evaluated (Appendix 6).	As opportunities arise, acquisition of adjacent lands or easements to improve public access would be considered and evaluated (Appendix 6).

SPECIAL DESIGNATIONS AND MANAGEMENT AREAS			
Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4 (Proposed Plan)
Off-road motor vehicle use for “necessary tasks” (as defined in the Glossary) would be allowed.	Same as Alternative 1.	Off-road motor vehicle use for “necessary tasks” (as defined in the Glossary) would not be allowed. Exceptions would be considered on a case-by-case basis.	Off-road motor vehicle use for “necessary tasks” (as defined in the Glossary) would be allowed.
In the Jep Canyon ACEC, OHV use would be limited to designated roads and vehicle routes and open to over-the-snow vehicles.	No similar action.	OHV use would be limited to designated roads and vehicle routes and closed to over-the-snow vehicles.	OHV use would be limited to designated roads and vehicle routes and closed to over-the-snow vehicles.
Surface disturbance in the aspen communities would be intensively managed. Case-by-case examination of any proposed surface disturbing and disruptive activities would be made to determine potential adverse effects and appropriate mitigation to minimize and or reduce these effects.	No similar action.	Surface disturbing and disruptive activities in aspen communities would be restricted or prohibited. Aspen stands would be managed to increase distribution and improve seral structure.	Surface disturbing and disruptive activities in aspen communities would be avoided. Aspen stands would be managed to increase distribution and improve seral structure.
The ACEC is designated an AMR fire suppression area.	The area is designated an AMR fire suppression area.	Same as Alternative 2.	Public lands within the checkerboard or other intermixed landownership areas would be managed in association with the private and state lands therein. AMR would most often result in suppression activities (Map 2-9).
Shamrock Hills ACEC <i>(Note: Raptor nest locations are not mapped in the RMP in order to protect these sensitive areas.)</i>			
Management Goals			
Manage resources in the Shamrock Hills ACEC to protect the concentration of breeding and nesting ferruginous hawk species, as well as other bird species, including the mountain plover, sage sparrow, and greater sage-grouse and crucial winter/year-long range for pronghorn.	Manage resources in the Shamrock Hills WHMA to protect the concentration of breeding and nesting ferruginous hawk species, as well as other bird species, including the mountain plover, sage sparrow, and greater sage-grouse and crucial winter/year-long range for pronghorn.	Manage to maintain or improve habitat and protect the concentration of breeding and nesting ferruginous hawk species, as well as other bird species, including the mountain plover, sage sparrow, and greater sage-grouse and crucial winter/year-long range for pronghorn.	Manage to maintain or improve habitat and protect the concentration of breeding and nesting ferruginous hawk species, as well as other bird species, including the mountain plover, sage sparrow, and greater sage-grouse and crucial winter/year-long range for pronghorn.
Seek the cooperation of owners of adjacent property in management of the habitat.			

SPECIAL DESIGNATIONS AND MANAGEMENT AREAS			
Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4 (Proposed Plan)
Management Objectives			
Maintain, restore, and enhance crucial winter/year-long range for pronghorn.			
Maintain, restore, and enhance habitat and the productivity of ferruginous hawk species, as well as other bird species, including the mountain plover, sage sparrow, and greater sage-grouse.			
Pursue opportunities for partnership and cooperative management with adjacent property owners.			
Management Actions Common to All Alternatives			
Surface disturbing and disruptive activities would be intensively managed on a case-by-case basis to maintain raptor nesting habitat. Developments, uses, and facilities would be managed to avoid damage to vegetation and wildlife habitat.			
The area would be open to oil and gas leasing with intensive management of surface disturbing and disruptive activities.			
Management Actions by Alternative			
The Shamrock Hills ACEC (Map 2-7, 18,400 acres) would be maintained.	The ACEC designation would not be maintained, and the area would be managed as a wildlife habitat management area.	The ACEC designation would not be maintained, and the area would be managed as a raptor concentration area (see Wildlife section in Table 2-1).	The ACEC designation would not be maintained, and the area would be managed as a raptor concentration area (see Wildlife section in Table 2-1).
Public lands would be open to locatable mineral entry. Plans of operations would be required for locatable mineral exploration and development (except casual use), regardless of the number of acres that may be disturbed.	Public lands would be open to locatable mineral entry. Lands would be managed in accordance with 43 CFR Surface Management Regulations. Plans of operations would be required for locatable mineral exploration and development (except casual use), for surface disturbance of 5 acres or more.	Public lands would be closed to locatable mineral entry and operation of the public land laws, including sale. Withdrawals would be pursued.	Public lands would be open to locatable mineral entry. Lands would be managed in accordance with 43 CFR Surface Management Regulations. Plans of operations would be required for locatable mineral exploration and development (except casual use), for surface disturbance of 5 acres or more.
Those areas open to locatable mineral entry would also be open to mineral material disposals.	Same as Alternative 1.	Those areas closed to locatable mineral entry would also be closed to mineral material disposals.	The area would be open to mineral material disposals.
Off-road motor vehicle use for "necessary tasks" (as defined in the Glossary) would be allowed.	Same as Alternative 1.	Off-road motor vehicle use for "necessary tasks" (as defined in the Glossary) would not be allowed. Exceptions would be considered on a case-by-case basis.	Off-road motor vehicle use for "necessary tasks" (as defined in the Glossary) would be allowed.

SPECIAL DESIGNATIONS AND MANAGEMENT AREAS			
Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4 (Proposed Plan)
The area is designated an AMR fire suppression area.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Public lands within the checkerboard or other intermixed landownership areas would be managed in association with the private and state lands therein. AMR would most often result in suppression activities (Map 2-9).
Stratton Sagebrush Steppe Research Area Potential ACEC			
Management Goals			
Manage the historic and scientific values in the study area.			
Management Objectives			
Provide opportunities for cooperative research, while protecting the long-term research value.			
Management Actions Common to All Alternatives			
The entire area (5,530 acres) would be closed to mineral material disposal.			
Motorized vehicle use would be limited to designated roads and vehicle routes.			
Management Actions by Alternative			
The Stratton Sagebrush Steppe Research Area Potential ACEC (5,530 acres) (Map 2-7) would continue to be managed to meet demands for research.	The proposed area would be managed as a research area and would not be designated as an ACEC.	The proposed area would be designated an ACEC.	The proposed area would be managed as a research area and would not be designated as an ACEC.
The area would be open to oil and gas leasing with a NSO stipulation. Surface disturbing activities on existing leases would be intensively managed.	The area would be open to oil and gas leasing. Operators would be required to submit a management plan to describe how activities would affect research objectives. Mitigation would be required, where necessary, to protect the research area.	The area would be closed to oil and gas leasing. Surface disturbing activities on existing leases would be intensively managed to meet the objectives of the ACEC.	The area would be closed to oil and gas leasing. Surface disturbing activities on existing leases would be intensively managed to meet the objectives of the research area.
Livestock grazing would be managed to meet multiple-use objectives.	Same as Alternative 1.	Livestock grazing would be managed to meet research objectives of the ACEC.	Livestock grazing would be managed to meet objectives of the research area.

SPECIAL DESIGNATIONS AND MANAGEMENT AREAS			
Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4 (Proposed Plan)
The area is designated an AMR fire suppression area.	Same as Alternative 1.	The area is designated an AMR fire suppression area to meet the research objectives of the ACEC.	The area is designated an AMR fire suppression area to meet the research objectives of the research area.
Off-road motor vehicle use for “necessary tasks” (as defined in the Glossary) would be allowed.	Same as Alternative 1.	Off-road motor vehicle use for “necessary tasks” (as defined in the Glossary) would not be allowed. Exceptions would be considered on a case-by-case basis.	Off-road motor vehicle use for “necessary tasks” (as defined in the Glossary) would not be allowed. Exceptions would be considered on a case-by-case basis.
Chain Lakes Potential ACEC			
Management Goals			
Manage the unique, fragile, and rare alkaline desert lake system and wildlife habitat values associated with the lake system.			
Manage pronghorn winter habitat and other wildlife habitat values.			
Seek the cooperation of owners of adjacent property in management of the habitat.			
Management Objectives			
Maintain, restore, and protect the unique, fragile, and rare alkaline desert lake system.			
Maintain, restore, and protect habitat for pronghorn and other wildlife.			
Identify components of the unique, fragile, and rare alkaline desert lake system.			
Implement the Chain Lakes Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with WGFD.			
Utilize inventory and monitoring data to support the goals of the SD/MA.			
Management Actions by Alternative			
The Chain Lakes area (Map 2-7, 30,560 acres) would be managed as a wildlife habitat management area.	Same as Alternative 1.	The Chain Lakes area (Map 2-8, 30,560 acres) would be managed as an ACEC.	The Chain Lakes area (Map 2-9, 30,560 acres) would be managed as a wildlife habitat management area.
Public lands would be open to locatable mineral entry and open to operation of public land laws, including sale.	Same as Alternative as 1.	Public lands would be closed to locatable mineral entry and operation of the public land laws, including sale. Withdrawals would be pursued.	Public lands would be open to locatable mineral entry and open to operation of public land laws, including sale.

SPECIAL DESIGNATIONS AND MANAGEMENT AREAS			
Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4 (Proposed Plan)
Public lands would be open to mineral materials disposals.	Same as Alternative 1.	Public lands within the ACEC would be closed to mineral material disposals.	Public lands would be open to mineral materials disposals.
The area would be open to oil and gas leasing with intensive management of surface disturbing and disruptive activities.	Same as Alternative 1.	The area would be closed to oil and gas leasing. Surface disturbing activities on existing leases would be intensively managed to meet the objectives of the ACEC.	The area would be open to oil and gas leasing with intensive management of surface disturbing and disruptive activities.
The area is designated an AMR fire suppression area.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	AMR for wildland fire on public lands within the checkerboard or other intermixed landownership areas would be managed in association with the private and state lands therein.
Off-road motor vehicle use for “necessary tasks” (as defined in the Glossary) would be allowed.	Same as Alternative 1.	Off-road motor vehicle use for “necessary tasks” (as defined in the Glossary) would not be allowed. Exceptions would be considered on a case-by-case basis.	Off-road motor vehicle use for “necessary tasks” (as defined in the Glossary) would be allowed.
No similar action.	No similar action.	Surface disturbing activities within the unique alkaline desert wetland communities would be intensively managed.	Surface disturbing activities within the unique alkaline desert wetland communities would be intensively managed.
Laramie Peak Potential ACEC			
Management Goals			
Manage the resources in the Laramie Peak Potential ACEC/WHMA to protect habitat for bighorn sheep, elk, and mule deer.			
Seek the cooperation of owners of adjacent property in management of the habitat.			
Management Objectives			
Maintain, restore, or enhance crucial winter habitat for bighorn sheep, elk, and mule deer and seasonal habitats for bighorn sheep.			
Utilize inventory and monitoring data to support vegetation management.			
Utilize an integrated management approach (e.g., mechanical, chemical, biological, and prescribed fire) to enhance vegetation communities to achieve objectives of the area.			

SPECIAL DESIGNATIONS AND MANAGEMENT AREAS			
Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4 (Proposed Plan)
Implement the Laramie Peak Bighorn Sheep Habitat Management Plan.			
Management Actions Common to All Alternatives			
Management of domestic sheep and goats would be in accordance with national policy and consider the recommendations of the Wyoming Bighorn/Domestic Sheep Interaction Working Group. Domestic sheep avoidance areas are shown on Map 2-3.			
The area would be open to oil and gas leasing with intensive management of surface disturbing and disruptive activities. Plans of operations would be required for locatable mineral exploration and development (except casual use) for disturbances of 5 acres or more.			
Management Actions by Alternative			
The Laramie Peak area (Map 2-7) (18,940 acres) would be managed as a wildlife habitat management area.	The area would not be designated as an ACEC, and would be managed as a wildlife habitat management area.	The Laramie Peak area (Map 2-8) (18,940 acres) would be managed as an ACEC.	The Laramie Peak area (Map 2-9) (18,940 acres) would be managed as a wildlife habitat management area.
Public lands would be open to locatable mineral entry.	Same as Alternative 1.	Public lands would be closed to locatable mineral entry. Withdrawals from locatable mineral entry would be pursued.	Public lands would be open to locatable mineral entry.
Public lands within the area would be open to mineral material disposals.	Same as Alternative 1.	Public lands within the ACEC would be closed to mineral material disposals.	Public lands within the area would be open to mineral material disposals.
Where opportunities arise, land tenure adjustments, including acquisition of lands, easements, or exchange, would be considered to meet the multiple-use objectives (Appendix 6).	No similar action.	As opportunities arise, acquisition of adjacent lands or easements to improve public access would be considered and evaluated to meet the objective of the ACEC (Appendix 6).	Actively pursue land tenure adjustments, including acquisition of lands, easements, or exchange, to meet the management objective of the wildlife habitat management area (Appendix 6).
The area is designated an AMR fire suppression area.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	AMR on the public lands within the intermixed landownership areas would be managed in association with the private and state lands therein.
Off-road motor vehicle use for “necessary tasks” (as defined in the Glossary) would be allowed.	Same as Alternative 1.	Off-road motor vehicle use for “necessary tasks” (as defined in the Glossary) would not be allowed. Exceptions would be considered on a case-by-case basis.	Off-road motor vehicle use for “necessary tasks” (as defined in the Glossary) would not be allowed. Exceptions would be considered on a case-by-case basis.

SPECIAL DESIGNATIONS AND MANAGEMENT AREAS			
Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4 (Proposed Plan)
OHV use would be limited to designated roads and vehicle routes.	OHV use would be limited to existing roads and vehicle routes.	Same as Alternative 1.	OHV use would be limited to designated roads and vehicle routes.
Red Rim-Daley Potential ACEC			
Management Goals			
Manage the resources in the Red Rim-Daley Potential ACEC/WHMA to protect crucial winter habitat for pronghorn and nesting habitat for raptors.			
Seek the cooperation of owners of adjacent property in management of the habitat.			
Management Objectives			
Maintain, restore, and enhance crucial winter habitat for pronghorn.			
Maintain, restore, and enhance nesting raptor habitat and the productivity of nesting raptor pairs.			
Implement the MOU with WGFD.			
Utilize inventory and monitoring data to support habitat management.			
Utilize an integrated management approach (e.g., mechanical, chemical, biological, prescribed fire, wildlife, and livestock grazing) to enhance vegetation communities to achieve objectives of the area.			
Management Actions Common to All Alternatives			
The area would be open to oil and gas leasing with intensive management of surface disturbing and disruptive activities.			
Surface disturbing and disruptive activities would be intensively managed to maintain raptor-nesting habitat.			
Management Actions by Alternative			
The Red Rim-Daley area (Map 2-7, 11,100 acres) would be managed as a wildlife habitat management area.	Same as Alternative 1.	The Red Rim-Daley area (Map 2-8, 11,100 acres) would be managed as an ACEC.	The Red Rim-Daley area (Map 2-9, 11,100 acres) would be managed as a wildlife habitat management area.
Public lands would be open to locatable mineral entry.	Same as Alternative 1.	Public lands would be closed to locatable mineral entry. Withdrawals from locatable mineral entry would be pursued.	Public lands would be open to locatable mineral entry.
Plans of operations would be required for locatable mineral exploration and development (except casual use), for disturbance of 5 acres or more.	Same as Alternative 1.	No similar action.	Plans of operations would be required for locatable mineral exploration and development (except casual use), for disturbance of 5 acres or more.

SPECIAL DESIGNATIONS AND MANAGEMENT AREAS			
Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4 (Proposed Plan)
Public lands would be open to the operation of public land laws.	Same as Alternative 1.	Public lands would be closed to land tenure adjustments, including sale. Withdrawals would be pursued.	Public lands would be open to the operation of public land laws.
Those areas open to locatable mineral entry would also be open to mineral material disposal.	Same as Alternative 1.	Those areas closed to locatable mineral entry would also be closed to mineral material disposals.	Those areas open to locatable mineral entry would also be open to mineral material disposal.
No similar action.	No similar action.	As opportunities arise, acquisition of adjacent lands or easements to improve public access would be considered (Appendix 6).	No similar action.
Off-road motor vehicle use for “necessary tasks” (as defined in the Glossary) would be allowed.	Same as Alternative 1.	Off-road motor vehicle use for “necessary tasks” (as defined in the Glossary) would not be allowed. Exceptions would be considered on a case-by-case basis.	Off-road motor vehicle use for “necessary tasks” (as defined in the Glossary) would be allowed.
The area is designated an AMR fire suppression area.	Same as Alternative 1.	The ACEC is designated an AMR fire suppression area.	AMR for fire on public lands within the checkerboard or other intermixed landownership areas would be managed in association with the private and state lands therein.
Pennock Mountain Wildlife Habitat Management Area			
Management Goals			
Manage the resources in the Pennock Mountain WHMA to protect crucial winter habitat for elk and mule deer.			
Seek the cooperation of owners of adjacent property in management of the habitat.			
Management Objectives			
Maintain, restore, and enhance crucial winter habitat for elk and mule deer.			
Implement the MOU with WGFD.			
Utilize inventory and monitoring data to support habitat management.			
Utilize an integrated management approach (e.g., mechanical, chemical, biological, prescribed fire, wildlife, and livestock grazing) to enhance vegetation communities to achieve objectives of the area.			

SPECIAL DESIGNATIONS AND MANAGEMENT AREAS			
Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4 (Proposed Plan)
Management Actions Common to All Alternatives			
The Pennock Mountain wildlife habitat management area (7,770 acres) would be closed to motorized vehicle use, including over-the-snow vehicles, from November 15 to April 30.			
Management Actions by Alternative			
The Pennock Mountain wildlife habitat management area (7,770 acres) (Map 2-10) would be managed as a wildlife habitat management area.	The area would not be designated as an ACEC or a wildlife habitat management area.	Same as Alternative 1.	The Pennock Mountain wildlife habitat management area (7,770 acres) (Map 2-13) would be managed as a wildlife habitat management area.
Actively pursue land tenure adjustments including acquisition of lands, easements, or exchange, to meet multiple-use management objectives (Appendix 6).	No similar action.	Same as Alternative 1.	Actively pursue land tenure adjustments including acquisition of lands, easements, or exchange, to meet multiple-use management objectives (Appendix 6).
Public lands would be open to locatable mineral entry.	Same as Alternative 1.	Public lands would be closed to locatable mineral entry. Withdrawals from locatable mineral entry would be pursued.	Public lands would be open to locatable mineral entry.
Public lands would be open to mineral material disposals.	Same as Alternative 1.	Those areas closed to locatable mineral entry would also be closed to mineral material disposals.	Public lands would be open to mineral material disposals.
Off-road motor vehicle use for “necessary tasks” (as defined in the Glossary) would be allowed.	Same as Alternative 1.	Off-road motor vehicle use for “necessary tasks” (as defined in the Glossary) would not be allowed. Exceptions would be considered on a case-by-case basis.	Off-road motor vehicle use for “necessary tasks” (as defined in the Glossary) would be allowed.
Wick-Beumee Wildlife Habitat Management Area			
Management Goals			
Manage the resources in the Wick-Beumee WHMA to protect crucial winter habitat for elk and year-round habitat for wildlife.			
Seek the cooperation of owners of adjacent property in management of the habitat.			
Management Objectives			
Maintain, restore, and enhance crucial winter habitat for elk and year-round habitat for wildlife.			

SPECIAL DESIGNATIONS AND MANAGEMENT AREAS			
Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4 (Proposed Plan)
Implement the MOU with WGFD.			
Utilize inventory and monitoring data to support habitat management.			
Utilize an integrated management approach (e.g., mechanical, chemical, biological, prescribed fire, wildlife, and livestock grazing) to enhance vegetation communities to achieve objectives of the area.			
Management Actions Common to All Alternatives			
The public land within the Wick-Beumee Wildlife Habitat Management Area (280 acres) (Map 2-10) would be managed as a wildlife habitat management area. The Wick-Beumee crucial elk winter range (280 acres) would be closed to motorized vehicle use, including over-the-snow vehicles, from November 15 to April 30.			
Management Actions by Alternative			
Public lands would be open to operation of the public land laws, including sale.	Same as Alternative 1.	Public lands would be closed to operation of the public land laws, including sale. Withdrawals would be pursued.	Public lands would be open to operation of the public land laws, including sale.
Public lands would be open to locatable mineral entry.	Same as Alternative 1.	Public lands would be closed to locatable mineral entry. Withdrawals from locatable mineral entry would be pursued.	Public lands would be open to locatable mineral entry.
Public lands would be open to mineral material disposals.	Same as Alternative 1.	Those areas closed to operation of the public land laws would also be closed to mineral material disposals.	Public lands would be open to mineral material disposals.
The area would be open to oil and gas leasing with intensive management of surface disturbing and disruptive activities.	Same as Alternative 1.	The area would be closed to oil and gas leasing. Surface disturbing and disruptive activities on existing leases would be intensively managed to meet the objectives of the wildlife habitat area.	The area would be open to oil and gas leasing with intensive management of surface disturbing and disruptive activities.
Off-road motor vehicle use for “necessary tasks” (as defined in the Glossary) would be allowed.	Same as Alternative 1.	Off-road motor vehicle use for “necessary tasks” (as defined in the Glossary) would not be allowed. Exceptions would be considered on a case-by-case basis.	Off-road motor vehicle use for “necessary tasks” (as defined in the Glossary) would be allowed.

SPECIAL DESIGNATIONS AND MANAGEMENT AREAS			
Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4 (Proposed Plan)
Surface disturbing and disruptive activities in aspen communities would be intensively managed.	Same as Alternative 1.	Surface disturbing and disruptive activities in aspen communities would be avoided or prohibited.	Surface disturbing and disruptive activities in aspen communities would be intensively managed.
Cave Creek Cave Potential ACEC (NAME CHANGE FROM SHIRLEY MOUNTAIN BAT CAVE)			
Management Goals			
Protect the hibernaculum and maternity roost for several bat species located within Cave Creek Cave.			
Maintain back country setting conditions in the cave and provide recreational opportunities consistent with protecting hibernaculum and maternity roost.			
Management Objectives			
Maintain and protect the cave ecosystem for wildlife species, especially bats.			
Accommodate recreation demand for caving while protecting sensitive cave resources.			
Acquire legal public vehicle access to cave entrance.			
Management Actions Common to All Alternatives			
Manage sales of minor wood products to assure that forest product removal in the area does not affect the temperature of water entering the cave.			
Management Actions by Alternative			
Cave Creek Cave area (240 acres) (Map 2-14) would be managed to provide for protection and enjoyment of the cave system while other resource uses would be allowed above ground.	The Cave Creek Cave area would not be managed as an ACEC.	Cave Creek Cave area (520 acres) (Map 2-8) would be managed as an ACEC.	Cave Creek Cave area (240 acres) (Map 2-9) would be managed as an ACEC.
Timber harvesting would be allowed to meet Healthy Forest Initiative objectives (see the Forest Management section of this table).	Timber harvesting would be intensively managed within ¼ mile of the cave complex to meet bat cave management and Healthy Forest Initiative objectives.	Timber harvesting would not be allowed within ½ mile of the bat cave complex (Cave Creek).	Timber harvesting would not be allowed within ¼ mile of the bat cave complex (Cave Creek).
Public lands would be open to operation of the public land laws, including sale.	Same as Alternative 1.	Public lands would be closed to operation of the public land laws, including sale. Withdrawals would be pursued.	Public lands would be closed to land tenure adjustments, including sale. Withdrawals would be pursued.

SPECIAL DESIGNATIONS AND MANAGEMENT AREAS			
Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4 (Proposed Plan)
Public lands would be open to locatable mineral entry.	Public lands would be closed to locatable mineral entry (240 acres). Withdrawals from locatable mineral entry would be pursued.	Public lands would be closed to locatable mineral entry (520 acres). Withdrawals from locatable mineral entry would be pursued.	Public lands would be closed to locatable mineral entry (240 acres). Withdrawals from locatable mineral entry would be pursued.
Public lands would be open to mineral material disposals.	Those areas closed to locatable mineral entry (240 acres) would also be closed to mineral material disposals.	Those areas closed to locatable mineral entry (520 acres) would also be closed to mineral material disposals.	Those areas closed to locatable mineral entry (240 acres) would also be closed to mineral material disposals.
The area would be open to oil and gas leasing with intensive management of surface disturbing and disruptive activities.	Same as Alternative 1.	The area would be closed to oil and gas leasing. Surface disturbing activities on existing leases would be intensively managed to meet the objectives of the ACEC.	The area would be open to oil and gas leasing. Surface disturbing activities would be intensively managed to meet the objectives of the ACEC.
Seasonal closure of the Cave Creek cave gate to human occupancy from November 1 through March 31 for the protection of the bat hibernaculum.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Seasonal closure of the Cave Creek cave gate to human occupancy from October 15 through April 30 for the protection of the bat hibernaculum.
Off-road motor vehicle use for “necessary tasks” (as defined in the Glossary) would be allowed.	Same as Alternative 1.	Off-road motor vehicle use for “necessary tasks” (as defined in the Glossary) would not be allowed. Exceptions would be considered on a case-by-case basis.	Off-road motor vehicle use for “necessary tasks” (as defined in the Glossary) would be allowed.
The area is designated an AMR fire suppression area.	The area is designated an AMR fire suppression area. Heavy equipment use would be limited in this area.	Same as Alternative 2.	The ACEC is designated an AMR fire suppression area. Heavy equipment use would be limited in this area.
Laramie Plains Lakes Potential ACEC			
Management Goals			
Manage potential habitat for the endangered Wyoming toad.			
Seek the cooperation of owners of adjacent property in management of the habitat.			
Management Objectives			
Maintain, restore, or protect potential habitat for the endangered Wyoming toad.			
Pursue opportunities for partnership and cooperative management with adjacent property owners.			

SPECIAL DESIGNATIONS AND MANAGEMENT AREAS			
Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4 (Proposed Plan)
Utilize inventory and monitoring data to support habitat management.			
Management Actions by Alternative			
The Laramie Plains Lakes area (1,600 acres) would not be designated as an ACEC, and would be managed as a wildlife habitat management area.	Same as Alternative 1.	The Laramie Plains Lakes area (Map 2-8, 1,600 acres) would be managed as an ACEC.	The Laramie Plains Lakes area (Map 2-13, 1,600 acres) would be managed as a wildlife habitat management area.
Public lands would be open to operation of the public land laws, including sale.	Same as Alternative 1.	Public lands would be closed to operation of the public land laws, including sale. Withdrawals would be pursued.	Public lands would be open to land tenure adjustments, including sale. Withdrawals would be pursued.
Actively pursue acquisition of lands or easements to enhance access to public lands and/or expand habitat to meet the objectives of the management area (Appendix 6).	Acquisition of lands or easements to enhance access to public lands and/or expand habitat would not be pursued.	Actively pursue acquisition of lands or easements to enhance access to public lands and/or expand habitat to meet the objectives of the ACEC (Appendix 6).	Actively pursue acquisition of lands or easements to enhance access to public lands and/or expand habitat to meet the objectives of the management area (Appendix 6).
Public lands would be open to locatable mineral entry.	Same as Alternative 1.	Public lands would be closed to locatable mineral entry. Withdrawals from locatable mineral entry would be pursued.	Public lands would be closed to locatable mineral entry. Withdrawals from locatable mineral entry would be pursued.
Public lands would be open to mineral material disposals.	Same as Alternative 1.	Public lands would be closed to mineral material disposals.	Public lands would be closed to mineral material disposals.
The area would be open to oil and gas leasing with intensive management of surface disturbing and disruptive activities.	Same as Alternative 1.	The area would be closed to oil and gas leasing. Surface disturbing activities on existing leases would be intensively managed to meet the objectives of the wildlife habitat area.	The area would be open to oil and gas leasing with an NSO stipulation. Existing oil and gas leases would be intensively managed.
The area is designated an AMR fire suppression area.	Same as Alternative 1.	The ACEC is designated an AMR fire suppression area.	The area is designated an AMR fire suppression area.
Off-road motor vehicle use for “necessary tasks” (as defined in the Glossary) would be allowed.	Same as Alternative 1.	Off-road motor vehicle use for “necessary tasks” (as defined in the Glossary) would not be allowed. Exceptions would be considered on a case-by-case basis.	Off-road motor vehicle use for “necessary tasks” (as defined in the Glossary) would not be allowed. Exceptions would be considered on a case-by-case basis.

SPECIAL DESIGNATIONS AND MANAGEMENT AREAS			
Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4 (Proposed Plan)
Livestock grazing use would be managed to meet multiple-use objectives.	Same as Alternative 1.	Livestock grazing use would be managed to meet the objectives of the ACEC.	Livestock grazing use would be managed to meet multiple-use objectives.
Historic Trails (Cherokee, Overland, Rawlins to Baggs, and Rawlins to Fort Washakie) Potential ACEC <i>(Note: The JO Ranch is covered under the Sand Hills Area.)</i>			
Management Goals			
Preserve and protect the historic trails to ensure that they are available for appropriate uses by present and future generations.			
Reduce imminent threats from natural or human-caused deterioration or potential conflict with other resource uses.			
Promote stewardship, conservation, and appreciation of historic trails.			
Management Objectives			
Develop management plans for special areas or cultural resources in areas of high risk for development or at high risk for adverse effects.			
Maintain setting for those contributing portions of historic trails where setting is an important aspect of integrity by utilizing viewshed management tools.			
Monitor the condition of contributing portions of historic trails that are known to be under threat from development.			
Maintain an inventory and evaluate trail segments and associated sites for contributing or non-contributing status.			
Provide educational opportunities and public outreach programs.			
Develop and maintain interpretation of historic trails in areas of high public interest and access.			
Manage historic trails and other resources for long-term heritage, recreational, and educational values.			
Management Actions Common to All Alternatives			
Sections of the historic trails with intact trail traces would be preserved in their present condition. Historic trail use that would result in adverse effects to the trail trace (Appendix 5) would be evaluated on a case-by-case basis.			
Actions resulting in linear crossings of the trails would occur in previously disturbed areas and be managed in accordance with BMPs (Appendix 5).			
Where the integrity of historic trails setting contributes to NRHP eligibility, management actions resulting in visual elements that diminish the integrity of the property's setting would be managed in accordance with the Wyoming State Protocol and BMPs (Appendix 5).			

SPECIAL DESIGNATIONS AND MANAGEMENT AREAS			
Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4 (Proposed Plan)
Management Actions by Alternative			
The Cherokee Trail, Overland Trail, the Rawlins to Baggs Road, and Rawlins to Fort Washakie Road (contributing segments within 66,370 acres of federal lands) would be managed for the preservation of historic values.	Same as Alternative 1.	The area within ¼ mile from the Overland Trail, Cherokee Trail, Rawlins to Baggs Road, and Rawlins to Fort Washakie Road (66,370 acres) would be designated an ACEC (Map 2-8).	The Cherokee Trail, Overland Trail, the Rawlins to Baggs Road, and Rawlins to Fort Washakie Road (contributing segments within 66,370 acres of federal lands) would be managed for the preservation of historic values.
An area within ¼ mile or the visual horizon of the trail, whichever is closer, would be an avoidance area for surface disturbing and disruptive activities (Map 2-46).	Same as Alternative 1.	Surface disturbing activities would not be allowed within the ACEC (Map 2-47).	Surface disturbing and disruptive activities would not be allowed within ¼ mile or the visual horizon, whichever is closer, of the historic trails (Map 2-48).
An area within ¼ mile or the visual horizon of the trails, whichever is closer, would be open to oil and gas leasing and would be an avoidance area for surface disturbing and disruptive activities.	Same as Alternative 1.	The ACEC would be open to oil and gas leasing with an NSO stipulation. Surface disturbing activities on existing leases would be managed according to BMPs (Appendix 5).	An area within ¼ mile or the visual horizon of the trails, whichever is closer, would be open to oil and gas leasing with an NSO stipulation. Surface disturbing and disruptive activities on existing leases would be managed according to BMPs (Appendix 5).
Public lands within ¼ mile of historic trails would be open to locatable mineral entry.	Same as Alternative 1.	Public lands within the ACEC would be closed to locatable mineral entry and operation of the public land laws, including sale. Withdrawals would be pursued.	Public lands within ¼ mile or the visual horizon of the trails, whichever is closer, would be closed to operation of the public land laws only within contributing portions of the trails. Public lands within ¼ mile or the visual horizon of the trails, whichever is closer, would be open to operation of the public land laws within noncontributing segments of the trails. Unevaluated portions of the trails would be managed as contributing until cultural resource inventories are conducted and an evaluation is made

SPECIAL DESIGNATIONS AND MANAGEMENT AREAS			
Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4 (Proposed Plan)
			as to their contributing/noncontributing status (Appendix 5).
Public lands within ¼ mile of the historic trails would be open to mineral material disposals.	Same as Alternative 1.	Public lands within the ACEC would be closed to mineral material disposals.	Public lands within ¼ mile or the visual horizon, whichever is closer, would be closed to mineral material sales only within contributing portions of the trails. Public lands within ¼ mile of the visual horizon of the trails, whichever is closer, would be open to mineral material sales within the noncontributing portions of the trails. Unevaluated portions of the trails would be managed as contributing until cultural resource inventories are conducted and an evaluation is made as to their contributing/noncontributing status (Appendix 5).
Blowout Penstemon Potential ACEC <i>(Note: Management actions presented in the Vegetation section also apply to this Potential ACEC.)</i>			
Management Goals			
Manage the endangered blowout penstemon plant and its habitat.			
Management Objectives			
Maintain, restore, and enhance the unique parabolic dune complex.			
Protect the area to assure the continued existence of the plant and to allow for continued research.			
Management Actions Common to All Alternatives			
None.			

SPECIAL DESIGNATIONS AND MANAGEMENT AREAS			
Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4 (Proposed Plan)
Management Actions by Alternative			
The Blowout Penstemon area (17,050 acres) would not be designated as an ACEC.	Same as Alternative 1.	The proposed area would be designated as an ACEC and managed as an endangered plant habitat area (Map 2-8).	The proposed area would be designated as an ACEC and managed as an endangered plant habitat area (Map 2-9).
The area would be open to locatable mineral entry and mineral material disposals.	Same as Alternative 1.	The ACEC would be closed to locatable mineral entry and mineral material disposals. Withdrawal would be pursued.	The ACEC would be open to locatable mineral entry and closed to mineral material disposals.
Lands would be managed in accordance with 43 CFR Surface Management Regulations. Plans of operations would be required for locatable federal mineral exploration and development (except casual use), for surface disturbances of 5 acres or more.	Same as Alternative 1.	No similar action.	Plans of operations would be required for locatable federal mineral exploration and development (except casual use), regardless of the number of acres that may be disturbed.
The area is designated an AMR fire suppression area.	Same as Alternative 1.	Fire suppression activities would be utilized to maintain early succession plant communities.	Fire suppression activities would be utilized to maintain early succession plant communities.
Actively pursue land tenure adjustments, including acquisition of lands, easements, or exchange, to meet the resource management objectives (Appendix 6).	No similar action.	Actively pursue land tenure adjustments, including acquisition of lands, easements, or exchange, to meet the ACEC management goals (Appendix 6).	Actively pursue land tenure adjustments, including acquisition of lands, easements, or exchange, to meet the ACEC management goals (Appendix 6).
Off-road motor vehicle use for “necessary tasks” (as defined in the Glossary) would be allowed.	Same as Alternative 1.	Off-road motor vehicle use for “necessary tasks” (as defined in the Glossary) would not be allowed. Exceptions would be considered on a case-by-case basis.	Off-road motor vehicle use for “necessary tasks” (as defined in the Glossary) would not be allowed. Exceptions would be considered on a case-by-case basis.

SPECIAL DESIGNATIONS AND MANAGEMENT AREAS			
Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4 (Proposed Plan)
Motorized vehicle use would be limited to existing roads and vehicle routes.	Same as Alternative 1.	Motorized vehicle use would be limited to designated roads and vehicle routes. Closures of specific areas to motorized vehicle routes would be considered on a case-by-case basis to meet the objectives of the ACEC.	Motorized vehicle use would be limited to designated roads and vehicle routes. Closures of specific areas to motorized vehicle routes would be considered on a case-by-case basis to meet the objectives of the ACEC.
OHV use to retrieve big game kills would be allowed off existing roads and vehicle routes.	Same as Alternative 1.	OHV use to retrieve big game kills or access camp sites would be prohibited off designated roads and vehicle routes.	OHV use to retrieve big game kills or access camp sites would be prohibited off designated roads and vehicle routes.
<p>Upper Muddy Creek Watershed/Grizzly Potential ACEC <i>(Note: Additional management actions for the Muddy Creek Watershed are presented in the Water Quality, Watershed, and Soils Management section of this table.)</i></p>			
Management Goals			
Manage habitat for the Colorado River fish species unique to the Muddy Creek watershed.			
Manage crucial winter habitat for elk and mule deer.			
Seek the cooperation of owners of adjacent property in management of the habitat.			
Management Objectives			
Maintain, restore, and enhance crucial winter habitat for elk and mule deer.			
Maintain, restore, and enhance habitat for the Colorado River fish species unique to the Muddy Creek watershed.			
Implement an MOU with appropriate state or local agency having jurisdiction or ownership of state lands and pursue opportunities for partnership and cooperative management with adjacent property owners.			
Utilize inventory and monitoring data to support habitat management.			
Utilize an integrated management approach (e.g., mechanical, chemical, biological, prescribed fire, wildlife, and livestock grazing) to enhance vegetation communities to achieve objectives of the area.			
Management Actions Common to All Alternatives			
To protect the Colorado River cutthroat trout reintroduction area, 4,520 acres of public lands and 69,770,000 tons of federal coal would be unsuitable for further leasing consideration (based on Coal Development Suitability Report; also, see Map A2-4 in Appendix 2). For additional coal management discussion, see Section 2.4 and the minerals section of Table 2-1.			

SPECIAL DESIGNATIONS AND MANAGEMENT AREAS			
Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4 (Proposed Plan)
Rehabilitation of degraded stream reaches would be carried out in specific problem areas. Livestock grazing use would be managed for the protection or enhancement of resource values for which the WHMA was designated.			
Management Actions by Alternative			
The Grizzly Allotment portion of the Upper Muddy Creek Watershed/Grizzly area (16,340 acres) would be managed as a wildlife habitat management area (Map 2-10).	The Upper Muddy Creek Watershed/Grizzly area (59,720 acres) would be managed as a wildlife habitat management area (Map 2-11).	The proposed area (59,720 acres) would be designated as an ACEC (Map 2-8).	The area would not be designated as an ACEC and would be managed as a wildlife habitat management area (59,720 acres) (Map 2-13).
The area would be open to oil and gas leasing with intensive management of surface disturbing and disruptive activities.	Same as Alternative 1.	The area would be closed to new leasing. Surface disturbing activities on existing leases would be intensively managed.	The area would be closed to new leasing. Surface disturbing activities on existing leases would be intensively managed.
Public lands would be open to locatable mineral entry.	Same as Alternative 1.	Public lands would be closed to locatable mineral entry. Withdrawals from locatable mineral entry would be pursued.	Public lands would be open to locatable mineral entry.
Plans of operation would be required for locatable mineral exploration and development (except casual use), for disturbances of 5 acres or more.	Same as Alternative 1.	Lands would be managed in accordance with 43 CFR Surface Management Regulations. Plans of operation would be required for existing locatable mineral exploration and development (except casual use) regardless of acreage.	Lands would be managed in accordance with 43 CFR Surface Management Regulations. Plans of operation would be required for locatable mineral exploration and development (except casual use), for disturbances of 5 acres or more.
Those areas open to locatable mineral entry would also be open to mineral material disposals.	Same as Alternative 1.	Those areas closed to locatable mineral entry would also be closed to mineral material disposals.	Public lands would be closed to mineral material disposals.
Public lands would be open to the operation of the public land laws.	Same as Alternative 1.	Public lands would be closed to land tenure adjustments, including sale. Withdrawals would be pursued.	Public lands would be open to the operation of the public land laws.
No similar action.	No similar action.	The transportation network would be managed to result in no net gain or the reduction in road density.	No similar action.

SPECIAL DESIGNATIONS AND MANAGEMENT AREAS			
Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4 (Proposed Plan)
Off-road motor vehicle use for “necessary tasks” (as defined in the Glossary) would be allowed.	Same as Alternative 1.	Off-road motor vehicle use for “necessary tasks” (as defined in the Glossary) would not be allowed. Exceptions would be considered on a case-by-case basis.	Off-road motor vehicle use for “necessary tasks” (as defined in the Glossary) would be allowed.
Motorized vehicle use would be limited to existing roads and vehicle routes.	Same as Alternative 1.	Motorized vehicle use would be limited to designated roads and vehicle routes. Closures of specific roads and vehicle routes, including seasonal closures, would be considered on a case-by-case basis to meet the objectives of the ACEC.	Motorized vehicle use would be limited to designated roads and vehicle routes. Closures of specific roads and vehicle routes, including seasonal closures, would be considered on a case-by-case basis to meet the objectives of Upper Muddy Creek/Grizzly Area.
OHV use to retrieve big game kills would be allowed off existing roads and vehicle routes.	Same as Alternative 1.	OHV use to retrieve big game kills or access camp sites would be prohibited off designated roads and vehicle routes.	OHV use to retrieve big game kills or access camp sites would be prohibited off designated roads and vehicle routes.
Surface disturbing activities would avoid identified 100-year floodplains, 500 feet from perennial surface water and/or wetland and riparian areas, and 100 feet from ephemeral channels. Exceptions to this would be granted by the BLM based on an environmental analysis and site-specific engineering and mitigation plans. Only those actions within areas that cannot be avoided and that provide protection for the aquatic resources in the Muddy Upper Muddy Creek Watershed/Grizzly would be approved.	Same as Alternative 1.	Areas within ¼ mile of ephemeral and perennial streams would be avoidance areas for developments, uses, and facilities. Where disturbance from linear features could not be avoided, intensive management would be applied.	Surface disturbing activities would avoid identified 100-year floodplains, 500 feet from perennial surface water and/or wetland and riparian areas, and 100 feet from ephemeral channels. Exceptions to this would be granted by the BLM based on an environmental analysis and site-specific engineering and mitigation plans. Only those actions within areas that cannot be avoided and that provide protection for the aquatic resources in the Muddy Upper Muddy Creek Watershed/Grizzly would be approved.

SPECIAL DESIGNATIONS AND MANAGEMENT AREAS			
Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4 (Proposed Plan)
New fence construction would be authorized according to BLM standards. Existing fences would be modified according to current BLM standards at specific locations (according to wildlife and livestock needs) or as older fences are reconstructed (Appendix 19).	Same as Alternative 1.	New fence construction would be authorized according to BLM standards. All existing fences would be modified according to current BLM standards (Appendix 19).	New fence construction would be authorized according to BLM standards. Modification of exiting fences to current BLM standards would be actively pursued (Appendix 19). Specific locations would be modified according to wildlife and livestock needs.
In-stream structures that interfere with the movement of native fishes among habitats would be removed, reconstructed, or retrofitted to allow fish passage. Barriers built to facilitate reintroduction efforts would be maintained until they have completed their purpose.	No similar action.	Same as Alternative 1.	In-stream structures that interfere with the movement of native fishes among habitats would be removed, reconstructed, or retrofitted to allow fish passage. Barriers built to facilitate reintroduction efforts would be maintained until they have completed their purpose.
Implement management actions to reintroduce the Colorado River cutthroat trout (CRCT) and other native fishes within those portions of the Muddy Creek watershed above the confluence with McKinney Creek.	Same as Alternative 1.	Actively pursue, in cooperation with WGFD, USFS, and private landowners, opportunities to expand reintroduction efforts for CRCT and other native cold and warm water fishes into adjacent habitats within the Upper Muddy Creek watershed.	Actively pursue, in cooperation with WGFD, USFS, and private landowners, opportunities to expand reintroduction efforts for CRCT and other native cold and warm water fishes into adjacent habitats within the Upper Muddy Creek watershed.
Surface disturbing activities in aspen communities would be intensively managed.	No similar action.	Surface disturbing and disruptive activities in aspen communities would be restricted or prohibited. Aspen stands would be managed to increase distribution and improve seral structure.	Surface disturbing and disruptive activities in aspen communities would be avoided. Aspen stands would be managed to increase distribution and improve seral structure.
The area is designated an AMR fire suppression area.	Same as Alternative 1.	The ACEC is designated an AMR fire suppression area.	The area is designated an AMR fire suppression area.
Cow Butte/Wild Cow Potential WHMA			
Management Goals			
Manage to protect crucial winter habitat for elk, mule deer, and important habitat for Columbian sharp-tailed grouse.			
Manage to maintain or enhance the aspen and mountain shrub complexes.			

SPECIAL DESIGNATIONS AND MANAGEMENT AREAS			
Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4 (Proposed Plan)
Management Objectives			
Maintain, restore, and enhance crucial winter habitat for elk and mule deer.			
Utilize vegetation inventory and monitoring data to support management for improved seral stage and class structure.			
Utilize an integrated management approach (e.g., mechanical, chemical, biological, and prescribed fire) to enhance vegetation communities to achieve objectives of the area.			
Management Actions Common to All Alternatives			
Surface disturbing and disruptive activities would be intensively managed on a case-by-case basis to prevent loss of significant habitat or loss of habitat effectiveness. Development, uses, and facilities would be located to minimize damage to vegetation and wildlife habitat.			
The area is designated an AMR fire suppression area.			
Management Actions by Alternative			
The Cow Butte/Wild Cow area (49,570 acres) would not be designated as a WHMA (Map 2-10).	Same as Alternative 1.	The Cow Butte/Wild Cow area (49,570 acres) would be designated as a WHMA (Map 2-12).	The Cow Butte/Wild Cow area (49,570 acres) would be designated as a WHMA (Map 2-13).
Surface disturbing activities in aspen communities would be intensively managed.	No similar action.	Surface disturbing and disruptive activities in aspen communities would be restricted or prohibited. Aspen stands would be managed to increase distribution and improve seral structure.	Surface disturbing and disruptive activities in aspen communities would be avoided. Aspen stands would be managed to increase distribution and improve seral structure.
Surface disturbing activities in mountain shrub communities would be intensively managed.	No similar action.	Surface disturbing and disruptive activities in mountain shrub communities would be restricted or prohibited. Aspen stands would be managed to increase distribution and improve seral structure.	Surface disturbing and disruptive activities in mountain shrub communities would be avoided. Aspen stands would be managed to increase distribution and improve seral structure.
New fence construction would be authorized to BLM standards. Existing fences would be modified to current BLM standards at specific locations (according to wildlife and livestock needs) and as older fences are reconstructed (Appendix 19).	Same as Alternative 1.	To protect big game seasonal migration, no new fences would be authorized. Existing fences would be modified to current BLM standards.	New fence construction would be authorized to BLM standards. Existing fences would be modified to current BLM standards.

SPECIAL DESIGNATIONS AND MANAGEMENT AREAS			
Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4 (Proposed Plan)
The area would be open to oil and gas leasing with intensive management of surface disturbing and disruptive activities.	Same as Alternative 1.	The area would be closed to new oil and gas leasing. Surface disturbing and disruptive activities on existing leases would be intensively managed.	The area would be closed to new oil and gas leasing. Surface disturbing and disruptive activities on existing leases would be intensively managed.
Public lands would be open to the operation of the public land laws.	Same as Alternative 1.	Public lands would be closed to land tenure adjustments, including sale. Withdrawals would be pursued.	Public lands would be open to the operation of the public land laws.
Public lands would be open to locatable mineral entry.	Same as Alternative 1.	Public lands would be closed to locatable mineral entry. Withdrawals from locatable mineral entry would be pursued.	Public lands would be open to locatable mineral entry.
Plans of operation would be required for locatable mineral exploration and development (except casual use), for disturbances of 5 acres or more.	Same as Alternative 1.	Lands would be managed in accordance with 43 CFR Surface Management Regulations. Plans of operation would be required for existing locatable mineral exploration and development (except casual use), for disturbances of 5 acres or more.	Lands would be managed in accordance with 43 CFR Surface Management Regulations. Plans of operation would be required for locatable mineral exploration and development (except casual use), for disturbances of 5 acres or more.
Those areas open to locatable mineral entry would also be open to mineral material disposals.	Same as Alternative 1.	Those areas closed to locatable mineral entry would also be closed to mineral material disposals.	Public lands would be closed to mineral material disposals.
Motorized vehicle use would be limited to existing roads and vehicle routes.	Same as Alternative 1.	Motorized vehicle use would be limited to designated roads and vehicle routes. Closures of specific roads and vehicle routes, including seasonal closures, would be considered on a case-by-case basis to meet the objectives of the WHMA.	Motorized vehicle use would be limited to designated roads and vehicle routes. Closures of specific roads and vehicle routes, including seasonal closures, would be considered on a case-by-case basis to meet the objectives of the WHMA.
No similar action.	No similar action.	The transportation network would be managed to result in no net gain or the reduction in road density.	No similar action.

SPECIAL DESIGNATIONS AND MANAGEMENT AREAS			
Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4 (Proposed Plan)
Off-road motor vehicle use for “necessary tasks” (as defined in the Glossary) would be allowed.	Same as Alternative 1.	Off-road motor vehicle use for “necessary tasks” (as defined in the Glossary) would not be allowed. Exceptions would be considered on a case-by-case basis.	Off-road motor vehicle use for “necessary tasks” (as defined in the Glossary) would be allowed.
White-Tailed Prairie Dog Potential ACEC			
Management Goals			
Manage to protect white-tailed prairie dog habitat, a keystone species.			
Management Objectives			
Maintain, restore, and enhance white-tailed prairie dog habitat.			
Management Actions by Alternative			
The white-tailed prairie dog areas would not be designated as an ACEC.	Same as Alternative 1.	The white-tailed prairie dog areas (Map 2-8) would be managed as an ACEC for protection of prairie dog habitat.	The white-tailed prairie dog areas would not be designated as an ACEC.
Surface disturbing or disruptive activities within white-tailed prairie dog towns would be avoided.	Surface disturbing and disruptive activities would be allowed to occur in white-tailed prairie dog towns.	Surface disturbing or disruptive activities within white-tailed prairie dog ACEC would be prohibited within 164 feet (50 meters).	Surface disturbing or disruptive activities within white-tailed prairie dog towns would be avoided.
Public lands would be open to locatable mineral entry.	Same as Alternative 1.	Public lands would be closed to locatable mineral entry. Withdrawal from locatable mineral entry would be pursued.	Public lands would be open to locatable mineral entry.
Public lands would be open to mineral material disposals.	Same as Alternative 1.	Those areas closed to locatable mineral entry would be closed to mineral material disposals.	Public lands would be open to mineral material disposals.
Above-ground facilities (with the exception of power lines) within ¼ mile of white-tailed prairie dog towns would not be equipped with anti-raptor perching devices.	Same as Alternative 1.	No above-ground facilities would be allowed within ¼ mile of white-tailed prairie dog towns, unless the facilities are equipped with anti-raptor perching devices.	Above-ground facilities (with the exception of power lines) within ¼ mile of white-tailed prairie dog towns would not be equipped with anti-raptor perching devices.

SPECIAL DESIGNATIONS AND MANAGEMENT AREAS			
Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4 (Proposed Plan)
Land tenure adjustments to benefit white-tailed prairie dogs would not be pursued.	Same as Alternative 1.	As opportunities arise, land tenure adjustments, including acquisition of lands, easements, or exchange, would be pursued to meet the ACEC objectives (Appendix 6).	Land tenure adjustments to benefit white-tailed prairie dogs would not be pursued.
Motorized vehicle use would be limited to existing roads and vehicle routes.	Same as Alternative 1.	Motorized vehicle use would be limited to designated roads and vehicle routes. Closures of specific roads and vehicle routes would be considered on a case-by-case basis to meet the objectives of the ACEC. New road construction would be assessed on a case-by-case basis.	Motorized vehicle use would be limited to either designated roads and vehicle routes or existing roads and vehicle routes depending on the land ownership pattern in the area of specific white-tailed prairie dog complexes.
Prairie dog poisoning would be allowed in white-tailed prairie dog towns/complexes in accordance with existing, local annual predator damage management plans.	Same as Alternative 1.	Prairie dog poisoning by Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service (APHIS) would not be allowed in white-tailed prairie dog towns and complexes, except for demonstrated reasons of human health and safety.	Prairie dog poisoning by Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service (APHIS) would not be allowed in white-tailed prairie dog towns and complexes, except for demonstrated reasons of human health and safety.
High Savery Dam Potential ACEC			
Management Goals			
Manage to protect the High Savery Dam and Reservoir site.			
Manage to support development of a fishery for CRCT.			
Manage the area for recreation purposes.			
Management Objectives			
Implement an MOU with the appropriate state or local agency having jurisdiction or ownership of state lands and pursue opportunities for partnership and cooperative management with adjacent property owners.			
Maintain and enhance riparian and upland habitat to sustain fisheries values, with emphasis on CRCT.			
Maintain or enhance recreational opportunities and benefits.			
Management Actions Common to All Alternatives			
The area would be cooperatively managed for recreational and multiple-use objectives and irrigation water, consistent with the June 2003 MOU between Wyoming Water Development Commission (WWDC) and BLM (Appendix 23). The area would be open to mineral leasing with a NSO stipulation.			

SPECIAL DESIGNATIONS AND MANAGEMENT AREAS			
Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4 (Proposed Plan)
For public safety and protection of structures and facilities, public access would be closed to vehicular travel. Public access would be restricted to foot travel only.			
The WWDC would be responsible for water, wetland, and riparian management on the subject public lands, as required by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (COE) Section 404 permit for the High Savery Dam and Reservoir Project. Management of these resources would be coordinated with the BLM.			
The High Savery allotment would be open to livestock grazing to meet vegetation management goals and the objectives for the High Savery Dam and Reservoir Project area. Grazing use would be authorized on a temporary, nonrenewable basis.			
Management Actions by Alternative			
The High Savery Dam and Reservoir area (530 acres) would be managed jointly with WWDC according to the MOU dated June 2, 2003 (Appendix 23).	Same as Alternative 1.	The High Savery Dam would be managed as an ACEC (Map 2-8).	The High Savery Dam and Reservoir area (530 acres) would be managed jointly with WWDC according to the MOU dated June 2, 2003 (Appendix 23).
Public lands would be open to locatable mineral entry.	Same as Alternative 1.	Public lands would be closed to locatable mineral entry. Withdrawals would be pursued.	Public lands would be closed to locatable mineral entry. Withdrawals would be pursued.
Public lands would be open to mineral material disposals.	Same as Alternative 1.	Those areas closed to locatable mineral entry would also be closed to mineral material disposals.	Those areas closed to locatable mineral entry would also be closed to mineral material disposals.
Public lands would be open to operation of public land laws, including sale, where consistent with the intent and purpose of the MOU.	Same as Alternative 1.	Public lands would be closed to land tenure adjustment, including sale. Withdrawals from lands disposal would be pursued.	Public lands would be open to operation of public land laws, including sale, where consistent with the intent and purpose of the MOU.
National Natural Landmarks Management			
Management Goals			
Manage to preserve the integrity of existing and proposed NNLs.			
Management Objectives			
Protect the geological significance of the sites.			
Maintain, restore, and enhance areas within NNL areas to meet Wyoming Standards for Healthy Rangelands.			
Management Actions Common to All Alternatives			
Lands totaling 800 acres in the Big Hollow NNL and 160 acres in the Sand Creek NNL would be considered for disposal to individuals, organizations, agencies, or institutions that would manage these areas in accordance with their NNL status (Map 2-18).			

SPECIAL DESIGNATIONS AND MANAGEMENT AREAS			
Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4 (Proposed Plan)
Manage the NNL areas to meet the Wyoming Standards for Healthy Rangelands.			
Wild and Scenic Rivers			
Management Goals			
Manage to protect and enhance the outstandingly remarkable values contributing to the inclusion in the National Wild and Scenic River System.			
Management Objectives			
Protect the outstandingly remarkable values of river segments that have been determined to be eligible or suitable.			
Provide river-related outdoor recreation opportunities in a primitive setting.			
Maintain, restore, and enhance areas within Wild and Scenic River areas to meet Wyoming Standards for Healthy Rangelands.			
Management Actions Common to All Alternatives			
Manage Wild and Scenic Rivers to meet the Wyoming Standards for Healthy Rangelands.			
Management Actions by Alternative			
<p>Existing land use plans contain no decisions regarding Wild and Scenic Rivers.</p> <p>As directed by BLM IM-2004-196, BLM would manage all <i>eligible</i> river segments (approximately 140 miles) to protect their outstandingly remarkable values, free-flowing nature, and tentative classification. River segments determined to be eligible are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (1) Big Creek (7.71 miles; recreational) • (2) Bunker Draw (1.5 miles; recreational) • (3) Cherry Creek (5.4 miles; scenic) • (4) Duck Creek (3.25 miles; wild) • (5) Encampment River (2.51 miles; wild) • (6) Littlefield Creek (1.14 miles; 	<p>All segments would be determined as non-suitable for inclusion in the National Wild and Scenic River System and released from further consideration for WSR. No special protections would be applied to these segments.</p>	<p>BLM would determine and manage all eligible segments and tentative classifications (listed below) as suitable for inclusion in the National Wild and Scenic River System:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (1) Big Creek (7.71 miles, recreational) • (2) Bunker Draw (1.5 miles, recreational) • (3) Cherry Creek (5.4 miles, scenic) • (4) Duck Creek (3.25 miles, wild) • (5) Encampment River (2.51 miles, wild) • (6) Littlefield Creek (1.14 miles, scenic) • (7) Muddy Creek (87.5 miles, recreational) • (8) North Platte River (5.22 miles, recreational) • (9) Skull Creek unit (24.75 miles, 	<p>BLM would determine and manage the Encampment River segment (2.51 miles) as suitable for inclusion in the National Wild and Scenic River System with the tentative classification of Wild.</p> <p>Management prescriptions applied within ¼ mile of the high-water line on each side of the Encampment River eligible river segment tentatively would include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Closed to OHV • Closed to oil and gas leasing • Closed to locatable mineral entry and operation of public land laws including sale; withdrawals would be pursued • Temporary cultural and paleontological activities would be allowed • Closed to recreational dredging

SPECIAL DESIGNATIONS AND MANAGEMENT AREAS			
Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4 (Proposed Plan)
<p>scenic)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (7) Muddy Creek (87.5 miles; recreational) • (8) North Platte River (5.22 miles; recreational) • (9) Skull Creek unit (24.75 miles; wild) <p>In keeping with BLM Manual 8351, .32C and .33 C, suitability determinations would not be made for any of the eligible river segments. They would remain eligible and would be managed to protect their outstandingly remarkable values, free-flowing nature, and tentative classification to the degree that BLM has authority (i.e., BLM lands within the corridor) and within the parameters of decisions made in the previous planning documents until such time as suitability determinations are made.</p> <p>Management prescriptions applied within ¼ mile of the high-water line on each side of eligible river segments tentatively classified as “Wild” would include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Closed to OHV • Closed to oil and gas leasing • Closed to locatable mineral entry and operation of public land laws, including sale; withdrawals would be pursued • Temporary cultural and paleontological activities would be allowed • Closed to recreational dredging 		<p>wild)</p> <p>Under this alternative, management prescriptions applied within ¼ mile of the high-water line on each side of eligible river segments tentatively classified as “Wild” would include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Closed to OHV • Closed to oil and gas leasing • Closed to locatable mineral entry and operation of public land laws including sale; withdrawals would be pursued • Temporary cultural and paleontological activities would be allowed • Closed to recreational dredging and to surface disturbing and disruptive activities, such as major recreational developments and ROWs; some minor recreational developments, such as hiking trail and signs, would be allowed • Closed to development of water impoundments, diversions, or hydroelectric power facilities • Closed to commercial timber harvest • Range improvements would be allowed within the guidelines of BLM Manual 8351, with the exception of increases in grazing preference • Managed as VRM Class I • Designated as an AMR fire suppression area • Surface disturbing activities would not be allowed within ¼ mile of the high-water line on each side of the 	<p>and to surface disturbing and disruptive activities, such as major recreational developments and ROWs; some minor recreational developments, such as hiking trail and signs, would be allowed</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Closed to development of water impoundments, diversions, or hydroelectric power facilities • Closed to commercial timber harvest • Range improvements would be allowed within the guidelines of BLM Manual 8351, with the exception of increases in grazing preference • Managed as VRM Class I • Designated as an AMR fire suppression area • Surface disturbing activities would not be allowed within ¼ mile of the high-water line on each side of the eligible river segment • Geophysical exploration would be limited to foot access and the use of surfaced cables on public lands; surface charges may be allowed following site-specific analysis • Vegetation treatments would be restricted to hand or aerial application.

SPECIAL DESIGNATIONS AND MANAGEMENT AREAS			
Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4 (Proposed Plan)
<p>and to surface disturbing and disruptive activities such as major recreational developments and ROWs; some minor recreational developments, such as hiking trail and signs, would be allowed</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Closed to development of water impoundments, diversions, or hydroelectric power facilities • Closed to commercial timber harvest • Range improvements would be allowed within the guidelines of BLM Manual 8351, with the exception of increases in grazing preference • Managed as VRM Class I • Designated as an AMR fire suppression area • Surface disturbing activities would not be allowed within ¼ mile of the high-water line on each side of the eligible river segment • Geophysical exploration would be limited to foot access and the use of surfaced cables on public lands; surface charges may be allowed following site-specific analysis • Vegetation treatments would be restricted to hand or aerial application <p>Management prescriptions applied within ¼ mile of the high-water line on each side of eligible river segments tentatively classified as “scenic” would include:</p>		<p>eligible river segment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Geophysical exploration would be limited to foot access and the use of surfaced cables on public lands; surface charges may be allowed following site-specific analysis • Vegetation treatments would be restricted to hand or aerial application <p>Management prescriptions applied within ¼ mile of the high-water line on each side of eligible river segments tentatively classified as “scenic” would include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Closed to oil and gas leasing • Recommended for withdrawal from mineral entry • Closed to operation of public land law, including sale • Closed to surface disturbing and disruptive activities <p>Management prescriptions applied within ¼ mile of the high-water line on each side of eligible river segments tentatively classified as “recreational” would include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Closed to oil and gas leasing • Recommended for withdrawal from mineral entry 	

SPECIAL DESIGNATIONS AND MANAGEMENT AREAS			
Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4 (Proposed Plan)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Closed to oil and gas leasing • Recommended for withdrawal from mineral entry • Closed to operation of public land law, including sale • Closed to surface disturbing and disruptive activities <p>Management prescriptions applied within ¼ mile of the high-water line on each side of eligible river segments tentatively classified as “recreational” would include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Closed to oil and gas leasing • Recommended for withdrawal from mineral entry 			

TRANSPORTATION AND ACCESS MANAGEMENT			
Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4 (Proposed Plan)
Management Goals			
Develop and maintain a transportation management system to accommodate public demand for legal access through and across public land and to meet resource management needs and objectives (e.g., wildlife objectives). <i>(Note: Recreation and OHV access is addressed under the OHV and Recreation sections.)</i>			
Management Objectives			
Existing access would be maintained or expanded, as determined necessary, including the right of access by an in-holder.			
Redundant or un-needed access roads would be abandoned or closed and reclaimed after consultation with local government and interested parties.			
Conduct transportation planning to manage existing and new access in a manner that assures compatibility with resource values and management objectives.			
Incorporate existing state and county road systems into BLM transportation system to accurately show existing access. Coordinate access issues with state and local governments.			
Management Actions Common to All Alternatives			
The public land transportation system would be maintained or modified to provide for public health and safety and adequate access to public lands.			
Routing and construction standards would be adjusted based on route analysis and engineering design.			
When roads constructed under other initiatives are no longer needed for the original purposes, and prior to termination and obliteration of the road, BLM would assess its utility for addition to the BLM transportation system.			
In close coordination with state and county governments, inventory all roads on public land and determine which roads are owned by the state and the respective counties. Based on the inventory and road determinations, develop a transportation plan to identify roads or trails under the jurisdiction of the BLM for closure, modification, or maintenance within the life of the plan. The plan would include goals, objectives, and maintenance standards for roads or trails to be retained for public use, and specific measures to accomplish road closure. Roads or trails that are eroding beyond a reasonable level will be fixed or closed.			
Manage transportation and access to meet the Wyoming Standards for Healthy Rangelands.			
Management Actions by Alternative			
Consistent with Wyoming BLM access policy, opportunities to acquire or maintain legal access to the areas listed in Table 2-8 (in order of priority) would be pursued. Additional access needs would be identified on a case by case basis.	Consistent with Wyoming BLM access policy, opportunities to acquire or maintain legal access to public lands would be pursued as opportunities arise.	Consistent with Wyoming BLM access policy, opportunities to acquire or maintain legal access to the areas listed in Table 2-8 (in order of priority) would be pursued. Additional access needs would be identified on a case-by-case basis.	Consistent with Wyoming BLM access policy, opportunities to acquire or maintain legal access to the areas listed in Table 2-8 (in order of priority) would be pursued. Additional access needs would be identified on a case-by-case basis.

TRANSPORTATION AND ACCESS MANAGEMENT			
Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4 (Proposed Plan)
Consolidation of public lands would be pursued to increase recreational opportunities on the public land (Table 2-8).	Consolidation of public lands would be pursued, when opportunities arise, to meet recreational demand (Table 2-8). The criteria for which lands would be acquired include in-holdings within WSAs, some SD/MAs, and HMAs (Appendix 6).	Same as Alternative 1.	Consolidation of public lands would be pursued, when opportunities arise, to meet recreational demand (Table 2-8). The criteria for which lands would be acquired include in-holdings within WSAs, some SD/MAs, and HMAs (Appendix 6).
Road densities would not be restricted.	Same as Alternative 1.	Road densities would not be allowed to exceed levels that diminish or adversely affect other resources or resource values.	Road density would be considered during the analysis process and during authorization of surface disturbing and disruptive activities (Appendix 26).

VEGETATION			
Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4 (Proposed Plan)
Management Goals			
Manage vegetation to achieve and maintain proper ecosystem function.			
Manage vegetation communities to restore, maintain, or enhance vegetation community health, composition, and diversity to benefit multiple resources and their uses, consistent with site potential.			
Manage to protect, preserve, or enhance threatened and endangered (T&E) plant species, BLM State Sensitive Species (Special Status Plant Species), and unique plant communities.			
Manage to control noxious and invasive species.			
Manage aspen communities for a healthy mix of successional stages within a natural range of variation.			
Management Objectives			
Maintain, restore, and enhance vegetation communities to facilitate a healthy mix of successional stages (identified in activity plans) that incorporate age class, structure, and species composition into each vegetation type, consistent with site potential.			
Control the introduction and proliferation of noxious and invasive species and reduce established populations to acceptable levels determined through cooperation, consultation, and coordination with local, state, other federal plans, policies, and agency agreements.			
Maintain, restore, and enhance the health and diversity of plant communities through the use of management prescriptions (such as prescribed natural fire, burning, plantings, seedings, and chemical, mechanical, biological, and grazing treatments or other treatments) in coordination with local, state, and federal management plans and policies.			
Maintain, restore, and enhance riparian, wetland, and upland vegetation to meet the Wyoming Standards for Healthy Rangelands.			
Maintain, restore, and enhance aspen communities (Section 3.15.4 and Appendix 19).			
Maintain, restore, and enhance T&E plant species, BLM State Sensitive Species (Special Status Plant Species), and unique plant communities (Sections 3.15.7, 3.15.8, and 3.15.9).			
Utilize inventory and monitoring data to support vegetation management.			
Maintain connectivity between large contiguous blocks of federal land by minimizing fragmentation of vegetative communities.			
Management Actions Common to All Alternatives			
Forage allocation on acquired lands would be consistent with the purpose of the acquisition and multiple-use objectives for the area.			
All forms of control for noxious and invasive species would be allowed in the RMPPA on a case-by-case basis (Appendix 19).			
Minimize disturbance to vegetation through application of BMPs, mitigation, as appropriate and practical (Appendices 13, 14, 15, and 19), and reclamation practices (Appendix 36).			
Manage riparian, wetland, and upland vegetation to meet the Wyoming Standards for Healthy Rangelands.			

VEGETATION			
Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4 (Proposed Plan)
Special Status Plant Species and Habitat			
Populations of Special Status Species would be fenced to protect them from grazing, trailing, or other disturbance where needed. Known populations of Special Status Plant Species would be closed to locatable mineral entry and operation of the public land laws, including sale. Withdrawals would be pursued.			
Known habitat for BLM Wyoming State Sensitive Plant Species would be open to oil and gas leasing with intensive management of surface disturbing and disruptive activities.			
The fenced Gibben’s beardtongue (<i>Penstemon gibbensii</i>) site (approximately 15 acres) would be maintained to protect the population from disturbance.			
In unique plant communities, such as the Muddy Gap Cushion Plant Community area, notices would be required for locatable mineral exploration and development (except casual use) consistent with regulations. Intensive management actions would be taken to protect the unique plant communities where necessary. Unique plant communities would be closed to mineral material disposals.			
Threatened and endangered, candidate, and proposed species and habitat conservation measures identified in the biological assessment (USDI, BLM 2007a) will be adhered to for compliance with the ESA (Appendix 14). These measures would be applied to all surface disturbing activities, as appropriate, to ensure compliance with Section 9 of the ESA. In addition, conservation measures and reasonable and prudent measures and terms and conditions identified in any biological assessment and opinion would be implemented within the RMPPA.			
Management Actions by Alternative			
Rangeland Desired Plant Community			
Vegetation treatments (mechanical, biological, chemical, and prescribed fire) would be applied to meet management objectives and standards for rangeland health and watershed function.	Vegetation treatments would be applied to increase forage for livestock and to meet standards for rangeland health and watershed function.	Vegetation treatments (biological and prescribed fire) would be applied to meet standards for rangeland health and watershed function, and to achieve DPC with an emphasis on habitat improvement for wildlife, including Special Status Species.	Vegetation treatments (mechanical, biological, chemical, and prescribed fire) would be applied to meet standards for rangeland health and watershed function, and to achieve DPC while considering habitat for wildlife, including Special Status Species.
Rangeland areas would be managed to meet rangeland standards (Appendix 8).	Same as Alternative 1.	Rangeland areas would be managed to achieve DPC (Appendix 8).	Rangeland areas would be managed to achieve DPC (Appendix 8).
Priority for control of noxious and invasive species would be to reduce and eliminate, where possible, small new infestations and to control large infestations.	Priority for control of noxious and invasive species would be placed on areas where commodity benefits would be enhanced.	Priority for control of noxious and invasive species would be maintenance and attainment of native, weed-free communities.	Priority for control of noxious and invasive species would be to reduce and eliminate, where possible, small new infestations and to control large infestations.

VEGETATION			
Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4 (Proposed Plan)
Special Status Plant Species and Habitat			
Management practices identified on a case-by-case basis would be applied to surface disturbing activities to maintain or enhance Special Status Plant Species and their habitat (Appendix 24).	Management practices identified on a case-by-case basis would not be applied to surface disturbing activities to maintain or enhance BLM State Sensitive Plant Species and unique plant communities.	Same as Alternative 1.	Management practices identified on a case-by-case basis would be applied to surface disturbing activities to maintain or enhance Special Status Plant Species and their habitat (Appendix 24).
Occupied habitat for threatened and endangered and proposed and candidate species would be open to oil and gas leasing with intensive management of surface disturbing and disruptive activities.	Same as Alternative 1.	Occupied habitat for threatened and endangered and proposed and candidate species would be open to oil and gas leasing with an NSO stipulation.	Occupied habitat for threatened and endangered and proposed and candidate species would be open to oil and gas leasing with an NSO stipulation.
Surface disturbing activities would be intensively managed, in areas that contain habitat for the blowout penstemon, to maintain or enhance habitat for the plant.	Same as Alternative 1.	Surface disturbing activities would not be allowed in areas that contain habitat for the blowout penstemon.	Surface disturbing activities would be intensively managed, in areas that contain habitat for the blowout penstemon, to maintain or enhance habitat for the plant.
Occupied habitat for the blowout penstemon plant would be open to locatable mineral entry and mineral material disposals.	Same as Alternative 1.	Occupied habitat for the blowout penstemon plant would be closed to locatable mineral entry and mineral material disposals. Withdrawals would be pursued.	Occupied habitat for the blowout penstemon plant would be closed to mineral material disposals.
BLM-administered public lands that contain occupied habitat for the blowout penstemon plant would not be exchanged or sold, when possible.	Same as Alternative 1.	BLM-administered public lands that contain occupied habitat for the blowout penstemon plant would not be exchanged or sold.	BLM-administered public lands that contain occupied habitat for the blowout penstemon plant would not be exchanged or sold.
Offroad vehicle travel for “necessary tasks” (as defined in the Glossary) in occupied habitat for the blowout penstemon plant would be allowed.	Same as Alternative 1.	Off-road vehicle travel for “necessary tasks” (as defined in the Glossary) in occupied habitat for the blowout penstemon plant would not be allowed in order to protect the plant. Exceptions may be authorized on a case-by-case basis following environmental assessment.	Off-road vehicle travel for “necessary tasks” (as defined in the Glossary) in occupied habitat for the blowout penstemon plant would not be allowed in order to protect the plant. Exceptions may be authorized on a case-by-case basis following environmental assessment.

VEGETATION			
Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4 (Proposed Plan)
No similar action.	No similar action.	Offroad travel to access camping sites would be prohibited.	Offroad travel to access camping sites would be prohibited.
No similar action.	No similar action.	Offroad travel to retrieve big game kills would be prohibited.	Offroad travel to retrieve big game kills would be prohibited.
BLM-administered public lands that contain occupied habitat for the Colorado butterfly plant would not be exchanged or sold, when possible.	Same as Alternative 1.	BLM-administered public lands that contain occupied habitat for the Colorado butterfly plant would not be exchanged or sold.	BLM-administered public lands that contain occupied habitat for the Colorado butterfly plant would not be exchanged or sold.
Recreational site development would not be authorized in known Colorado butterfly plant habitat, when possible.	Same as Alternative 1.	Recreational site development would not be authorized in known Colorado butterfly plant habitat.	Recreational site development would not be authorized in known Colorado butterfly plant habitat.
BLM-administered public lands that contain occupied habitat for the Ute ladies'-tresses plant would not be exchanged or sold, when possible.	Same as Alternative 1.	BLM-administered public lands that contain occupied habitat for the Ute ladies'-tresses plant would not be exchanged or sold.	BLM-administered public lands that contain occupied habitat for the Ute ladies'-tresses plant would not be exchanged or sold.
Recreational site development would not be authorized in occupied Ute ladies'-tresses plant habitat, when possible.	Same as Alternative 1.	Recreational site development would not be authorized in occupied Ute ladies'-tresses plant habitat.	Recreational site development would not be authorized in occupied Ute ladies'-tresses plant habitat.

VISUAL RESOURCE MANAGEMENT			
Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4 (Proposed Plan)
Management Goals			
Manage public lands according to VRM classes that are determined based on land use allocation decisions made in this RMP.			
Management Objectives			
Establish VRM classes for the RMPPA.			
Maintain the overall integrity of visual resource classes while allowing for development of existing and future uses.			
Management Actions Common to All Alternatives			
Manage visual resources to meet the Wyoming Standards for Healthy Rangelands.			
Management Actions by Alternative			
VRM classes would be designated as shown in Map 2-51 (Table 2-9 and Appendix 25).	VRM classes would be designated as shown in Map 2-52 (Table 2-9 and Appendix 25).	VRM classes would be designated as shown in Map 2-49 (Table 2-9 and Appendix 25).	VRM classes would be designated as shown in Map 2-50 (Table 2-9 and Appendix 25).

WATER QUALITY, WATERSHED, AND SOILS MANAGEMENT			
Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4 (Proposed Plan)
Management Goals			
Maintain or improve surface and groundwater quantity and quality consistent with applicable state and federal standards and regulations.			
Control or remediate sources and causes of pollution on federal lands in cooperation with other federal, local, and state agencies and private entities.			
Maintain or reestablish proper watershed, wetland, aquifer, riparian, and stream functions to support natural or desired surface flow regimes that meet state water quality standards.			
Minimize or control contributions of non-point source pollution from federal lands to all receiving waters (Appendices 11 and 13).			
Minimize or control elevated levels of salt contribution from federal lands to the Colorado River system consistent with WDEQ water quality regulations.			
Provide for availability of water to support uses authorized on federal lands where appropriate.			
Management Objectives			
Maintain or improve water quality by managing surface land use and groundwater resources, where practical and within the scope of the BLM's authority, according to the State of Wyoming Water Quality Rules and Regulations (Appendix 11).			
Maintain the hydrologic and water quality conditions needed to support riparian/wetland areas; minimize flood and sediment damage to water resources from human and natural causes; analyze and, where possible, minimize levels of salt loading in watersheds; and protect water resources used by the public (including impoundments, reservoirs, pipelines, and irrigation ditches) and by federal, state, and local agencies for fisheries, wildlife, livestock, agricultural, recreational, municipal, and industrial uses.			
All accidental spills of environmental pollutants on federal lands will be addressed according to Appendix 32.			
Implement intensive management of surface disturbing activities (Appendix 13) in watersheds contributing to waterbodies listed on the Wyoming 303d list of waterbodies with water quality impairments or threats, within the BLM's authority.			
Maintain or improve wetland/riparian areas as required by the Wyoming Standards for Healthy Rangelands (USDI BLM 1997).			
Activities that would cause a water depletion within the Colorado River system or North Platte River system would comply with existing agreements, decrees, rules, and regulations (Appendix 11).			
Management Actions Common to All Alternatives			
Intensive management of surface disturbing activities would be implemented in watersheds contributing to waterbodies listed on the State's 303d list of impaired waterbodies in consultation and cooperation with affected interests.			
Rehabilitate or reclaim reservoirs and other water sources within BLM's authority that are functionally compromised and provide new water sources designed in support of resource management goals. Coordinate with local entities during planning and implementation of water source improvements when appropriate.			
Manage water and soil resources to meet the Wyoming Standards for Healthy Rangelands.			
Surface disturbing activities would be avoided on unstable areas, such as landslides, slopes of greater than 25 percent, slumps, and areas exhibiting soil creep. Reclamation practices and BMPs would be applied as appropriate for surface disturbing activities (Appendix 13).			

WATER QUALITY, WATERSHED, AND SOILS MANAGEMENT			
Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4 (Proposed Plan)
Surface disturbing activities would be avoided in the following areas: (1) identified 100-year floodplains, (2) areas within 500 feet of perennial waters, springs, and wetland and riparian areas, and (3) areas within 100 feet of the inner gorge of ephemeral channels. Exceptions to this would be granted by the BLM based on an environmental analysis and site-specific engineering and mitigation plans. Only those actions within areas that cannot be avoided and that provide protection for the resource identified would be approved.			
Muddy Creek Watershed (U.S. Geological Survey Hydrologic Unit Code 14050004)			
Surface disturbing activities would be intensively managed within those portions of the Muddy Creek drainage that contribute to degradation of reaches previously or currently listed on the 303d list (Map 2-20 and Appendix 11).			
Sage Creek Watershed (U.S. Geological Survey Hydrologic Unit Code 101800209)			
Surface disturbing activities, vegetation treatments, and grazing management actions would be intensively managed within those portions of Sage Creek drainage that contribute to its listing on the 303d list (Map 2-20 and Appendix 11).			
Water Quality for Class 1 Waters and Waters with Threats or Impairments			
Manage surface land use and groundwater resources within its jurisdiction to maintain or improve water quality according to the uses and numerical standards specified by the State of Wyoming’s classification of water resources in the RFO. Proposed projects above Class 1 waters and impaired bodies on the State’s 303d list will receive special consideration during the NEPA process to ensure that project actions will not degrade these waterbodies beyond the uses specified. Intensive management of surface disturbing activities approved by the BLM would be implemented in watersheds contributing to waterbodies listed on the State’s 303d list.			
Management Actions by Alternative			
Produced Water from Fluid Mineral Development			
Surface discharge of produced water that meets Wyoming surface water standards would be allowed in the Colorado River Basin. Individual projects would be considered on a site-specific basis.	Same as Alternative 1.	Surface discharge of produced water would not be allowed in the Colorado River Basin. Injection of produced water from federal oil and gas leases would be required in the Colorado River Basin.	Surface discharge of produced water that meets Wyoming surface water standards would be allowed in the Colorado River Basin. Individual projects would be considered on a site-specific basis.
Surface discharge of produced water that meets state standards and beneficial use for water quality would be allowed in the North Platte River Basin and Great Divide Basin.	Same as Alternative 1.	Only State of Wyoming-authorized water discharges of produced water that meet specific BLM land use objectives (e.g., providing water sources to meet livestock and wildlife management goals and/or water use for the protection or enhancement of wetland and riparian areas) would be allowed in the North Platte River Basin and Great Divide Basin.	Surface discharge of produced water that meets Wyoming surface water standards would be allowed in the Great Divide Basin and North Platte River Basin. Individual projects would be considered on a site-specific basis.

WATER QUALITY, WATERSHED, AND SOILS MANAGEMENT			
Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4 (Proposed Plan)
Muddy Creek Watershed (U.S. Geological Survey Hydrologic Unit Code 14050004)			
Water impoundments in the Muddy Creek Watershed that result in an annual water loss and/or storage of greater than 1 acre-foot per project in Muddy Creek would be allowed (Appendix 11).	Same as Alternative 1.	Water impoundments in the Muddy Creek Watershed (Map 2-20) that result in an annual water loss and/or storage of greater than 1 acre-foot per project in Muddy Creek would not be allowed.	Water impoundments in the Upper Muddy Creek/Grizzly SD/MA (Map 2-13) that would result in an annual water loss and/or storage of greater than 1 acre-foot per project in Muddy Creek would not be allowed.
Encampment River Watershed (U.S. Geological Survey Hydrologic Unit Code 1018000205)			
Portions of the Encampment River watershed would be protected by interim management prescriptions for the Encampment Wild and Scenic River (WSR) and the Interim Management Policy for wilderness study areas (WSA) (Map 2-20).	Same as Alternative 1.	The Encampment River watershed (U.S. Geological Survey [USGS] Hydrologic Unit Code [HUC] 1018000205) would be protected for municipal drinking water sources, wild and scenic values, and recreation. New permanent roads or structures would not be allowed. Surface disturbing activities, grazing management, and Forest Management actions would be intensively managed to meet watershed objectives (Map 2-20).	The Encampment River watershed (USGS HUC 1018000205) would be protected for municipal drinking water sources, wild and scenic values, and recreation. Surface disturbing activities such as new roads and facilities as well as grazing management and Forest Management actions would be intensively managed to meet watershed objectives (Map 2-20).

WILD HORSES			
Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4 (Proposed Plan)
Management Goals			
Manage to protect, maintain, and control viable, healthy herds of wild horses while retaining their free-roaming nature and to provide adequate habitat for free-roaming wild horses, while maintaining the multiple-use relationships and thriving natural ecological balance, and to provide opportunities for public viewing of wild horses (Appendix 12).			
Manage to preserve and maintain existing genotypes.			
Management Objectives			
Maintain wild horse populations within the appropriate management levels (AML) of the herd management areas (HMA).			
Manage wild horses to meet the Wyoming Standards for Healthy Rangelands.			
Identify existing genotypes and phenotypes through recognized means of genetic evaluation and maintain genetic integrity.			
Maintain the health of wild horse herds at a level that prevents adverse affects to domestic horse populations.			
Maintain habitat for existing AMLs.			
Conduct all activities in compliance with relevant court orders and agreements, including the Consent Decree (August 2003).			
Management Actions Common to All Alternatives			
Conduct regular, periodic gathers when necessary to maintain AMLs.			
Utilize monitoring and evaluation data to maintain habitat within HMAs.			
Conduct animal health monitoring.			
Employ selective removal criteria during periodic gathers to increase the recognized occurrence of the New World Iberian genotype and associated phenotype above current levels.			
The AML for the Adobe Town HMA would remain at 700 adults; the AML for the Stewart Creek HMA would remain at 150 adults. These AMLs could change based on future monitoring (Appendix 12).			
Manage wild horses to meet the Wyoming Standards for Healthy Rangelands.			

WILD HORSES			
Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4 (Proposed Plan)
Management Actions by Alternative			
The AML for the Lost Creek HMA would remain at 70 adults. The AML was established in 1994 by extensive monitoring and evaluation (Map 2-21 and Appendix 12) and could change based on future monitoring.	Same as Alternative 1.	An interim population objective of 165 would be established for Lost Creek in order to preserve and enhance the New World Iberian genotype and associated phenotype. This interim population objective would be evaluated through genetic testing and habitat monitoring within 5 years to determine its effectiveness in achieving the objective.	Utilizing accepted means of genetic testing and analysis, in cooperation with the Lander and Rock Springs Field Offices, the total extent of the New World Iberian genotype within the metapopulation that includes the Lost creek HMA (current AML of 70 adults) would be documented. Management practices would be implemented to accomplish the goal of preserving the New World Iberian genotype.
No similar action.	No similar action.	Identify and designate the total extent of the metapopulation that includes the Lost Creek HMA.	Identify and designate the total extent of the metapopulation that includes the Lost Creek HMA.

WILDLIFE AND FISHERIES			
Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4 (Proposed Plan)
Management Goals			
Manage for the biological integrity and habitat function of terrestrial and aquatic ecosystems to sustain and optimize distribution and abundance of all native, desirable non-native, and Special Status fish and wildlife species.			
Manage or restore habitat to conserve, recover, and maintain populations of native, desirable non-native, and Special Status Species (e.g., BLM State Sensitive Species, Wyoming Game and Fish Department (WGFD) Species of Greatest Conservation Need, Native Species Status (NSS) 1-2 species, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) listed/proposed/candidate species) consistent with appropriate local, state, and federal management plans and policies.			
Manage for quality habitat to support the introduction, reestablishment, augmentation, transplant, stocking, and expansion of identified high-priority fish and wildlife species, in consultation and coordination with appropriate local, state, and federal agencies and adjacent landowners.			
Manage wildlife and fish habitat to support recreational and educational benefits and opportunities for the public.			
Management Objectives			
Maintain, restore, or enhance wildlife habitat in coordination and consultation with other local, state, and federal agencies and consistent with other agency plans, policies, and agreements. A full range of mitigation options will be considered when developing mitigation for project-level activities for wildlife and Special Status Species habitats.			
Maintain, restore, or enhance T&E species habitat, in coordination and consultation with the USFWS and other local, state, and federal agencies and consistent with other agency plans, policies, and agreements.			
Maintain, restore, or enhance designated BLM State Sensitive Species habitat in order to prevent listing under the ESA, in coordination and consultation with other local, state, and federal agencies and consistent with other agency plans, policies, and agreements.			
Maintain, restore, or enhance habitat function in crucial winter range.			
Management Actions			
General Wildlife			
Management Actions Common to All Alternatives			
BLM would work cooperatively with other agencies and affected landowners for the introduction, transplant, reestablishment, augmentation, and/or stocking of wildlife and fish species.			
Surface disturbing and disruptive activities would be intensively managed in all raptor concentration areas (RCA) to reduce physical disturbance of raptor habitat and disturbance to the birds. This would entail a case-by-case examination of proposals.			
Wildlife habitat objectives would be considered in all reclamation activity.			
Manage projects through facility placement and minimization of construction disturbance to maintain connectivity between large contiguous blocks of undisturbed habitat.			
Manage wildlife and fisheries habitat to meet the Wyoming Standards for Healthy Rangelands.			

WILDLIFE AND FISHERIES			
Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4 (Proposed Plan)
Management Actions by Alternative			
<i>Note: See Table 2-10 for seasonal restrictions for wildlife on surface disturbing and disruptive activities.</i>			
Priority would be given to meeting the Wyoming Standards for Healthy Rangelands (USDI, BLM 1997) (Appendix 8 and Appendix 26).	Same as Alternative 1.	Priority would be given to achieving the DPC, in addition to meeting the Wyoming Standards for Healthy Rangelands (Appendices 8 and 19).	Priority would be given to achieving the DPC, in addition to meeting the Wyoming Standards for Healthy Rangelands (Appendices 8 and 19).
As proposals are submitted, animal damage control activities in the RMPPA, including the use of lethal poisons, would be considered. These activities are subject to established policies, including NEPA requirements. These activities are also subject to the RFO Annual Predator Damage Management Plan, which is maintained current and consistent with those procedures and policies.	Same as Alternative 1.	Animal damage control activities would not be allowed unless there were concerns for human health and safety.	As proposals are submitted, animal damage control activities in the RMPPA, including the use of lethal poisons, would be considered. These activities are subject to established policies, including NEPA requirements. These activities are also subject to the RFO Annual Predator Damage Management Plan, which is maintained current and consistent with those procedures and policies.
Surface disturbing and disruptive activities potentially disruptive to nesting raptors are prohibited within the following distances during the following time periods: 1-mile buffer: Golden eagle, ferruginous hawk ¾-mile buffer: Barn owl, red-tailed hawk, great-horned owl, osprey, merlin, sharp-shinned hawk, kestrel, prairie falcon, northern harrier, Swainson’s hawk, Cooper’s hawk, short-eared owl, long-eared owl, peregrine falcon, screech owl, burrowing owl, northern goshawk, other raptors Feb. 1–July 31: All raptor species	Surface disturbing and disruptive activities potentially disruptive to nesting raptors are prohibited within ½ mile of a raptor nest during the following time periods for the protection of raptor nesting areas: Feb. 1–July 15: Golden eagle, barn owl, red-tailed hawk, great-horned owl, other raptors April 1–July 31: Osprey, merlin, sharp-shinned hawk, kestrel, prairie falcon, northern harrier, Swainson’s hawk, Cooper’s hawk March 1–July 31: Short-eared owl, long-eared owl, ferruginous hawk, peregrine falcon, screech owl April 15–Sept. 15: Burrowing owl April 1–Aug. 31: Goshawk	Surface disturbing and disruptive activities potentially disruptive to nesting raptors are prohibited within 1½ miles of a raptor nest during the following time periods for the protection of raptor nesting areas: Feb. 1–July 15: Golden eagle, barn owl, red-tailed hawk, great-horned owl, other raptors April 1–July 31: Osprey, merlin, sharp-shinned hawk, kestrel, prairie falcon, northern harrier, Swainson’s hawk, Cooper’s hawk March 1–July 31: Short-eared owl, long-eared owl, ferruginous hawk, peregrine falcon, screech owl April 15–Sept. 15: Burrowing owl April 1–Aug. 31: Goshawk	Surface disturbing and disruptive activities potentially disruptive to nesting raptors are prohibited within the following distances during the following time periods: 1-mile buffer: Golden eagle, ferruginous hawk ¾-mile buffer: All others Feb. 1–July 15: Golden eagle, barn owl, red-tailed hawk, great-horned owl, other raptors April 1–July 31: Osprey, merlin, sharp-shinned hawk, kestrel, prairie falcon, northern harrier, Swainson’s hawk, Cooper’s hawk March 1–July 31: Short-eared owl, long-eared owl, ferruginous hawk, peregrine falcon, screech owl

WILDLIFE AND FISHERIES			
Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4 (Proposed Plan)
			April 15–Sept. 15: Burrowing owl April 1–Aug. 31: Goshawk
Well locations, roads, ancillary facilities, and other surface structures requiring a repeated human presence would not be allowed within 825 feet of active raptor nests (ferruginous hawks, 1,200 feet). Distance may vary depending on factors such as nest activity, species, natural topographic barriers, and line-of-sight distances.	Well locations, roads, ancillary facilities, and other surface structures requiring a repeated human presence would be allowed.	Well locations, roads, ancillary facilities, and other surface structures requiring a repeated human presence would not be allowed within ¼ mile (1,320 feet) of active raptor nests.	Well locations, roads, ancillary facilities, and other surface structures requiring a repeated human presence would not be allowed within 825 feet of active raptor nests (ferruginous hawks, 1,200 feet). Distance may vary depending on factors such as nest activity, species, natural topographic barriers, and line-of-sight distances.
RCAs would be open to oil and gas leasing (raptor nest locations are not mapped in the RMP in order to protect these sensitive areas). Surface disturbing and disruptive activities would be intensively managed through the use of appropriate BMPs (Appendices 14 and 15).	RCAs would be open to oil and gas leasing (raptor nest locations are not mapped in the RMP in order to protect these sensitive areas).	RCAs would be closed to oil and gas leasing (raptor nest locations are not mapped in the RMP in order to protect these sensitive areas). Surface disturbing and disruptive activities in existing leases would be intensively managed through the use of appropriate BMPs (Appendices 14 and 15).	RCAs would be open to oil and gas leasing (raptor nest locations are not mapped in the RMP in order to protect these sensitive areas). Surface disturbing and disruptive activities would be intensively managed through the use of appropriate BMPs (Appendices 14 and 15).
Important waterfowl production areas, as they are identified, would be managed for proper functioning condition (PFC) of aquatic habitat and associated wetlands.	Same as Alternative 1.	Important waterfowl production areas, as they are identified, would be managed for DPC of aquatic habitat and associated wetlands.	Important waterfowl production areas, as they are identified, would be managed for DPC of aquatic habitat and associated wetlands.
Surface disturbing activities and disruptive activities would be intensively managed. BMPs (Appendices 14 and 15) would be applied to surface disturbing and disruptive activities to maintain or enhance neotropical and other migratory bird species and their habitats.	No similar action.	Same as Alternative 1.	Surface disturbing activities and disruptive activities would be intensively managed. BMPs (Appendices 14 and 15) would be applied to surface disturbing and disruptive activities to maintain or enhance neotropical and other migratory bird species and their habitats.

WILDLIFE AND FISHERIES			
Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4 (Proposed Plan)
Surface disturbing activities and disruptive activities would be intensively managed. BMPs (Appendices 14 and 15) would be applied to surface disturbing and disruptive activities to maintain or enhance upland game bird species and their habitats.	No similar action.	Same as Alternative 1.	Surface disturbing activities and disruptive activities would be intensively managed. BMPs (Appendix 14 and 15) would be applied to surface disturbing and disruptive activities to maintain or enhance upland game bird species and their habitats.
Surface disturbing and disruptive activities within big game crucial winter range would not be allowed during the period of November 15 to April 30 (Maps 2-53, 2-54, and 2-55).	Surface disturbing and disruptive activities within big game crucial winter range would be allowed during the period of November 15 to April 30.	Same as Alternative 1.	Surface disturbing and disruptive activities within big game crucial winter range would not be allowed during the period of November 15 to April 30. (Maps 2-53, 2-54, and 2-55)
No similar action.	No similar action.	Disruptive activities within big game crucial winter range would require the use of BMPs designed to reduce the amount of human presence and activity during the winter months (Appendix 15).	Disruptive activities within big game crucial winter range would require the use of BMPs designed to reduce the amount of human presence and activity during the winter months (Appendix 15).
Surface disturbing and disruptive activities within identified big game parturition areas would not be allowed during the period of May 1 to June 30 (Maps 2-55 and 2-56).	Surface disturbing and disruptive activities within identified big game parturition areas would be allowed during the period of May 1 to June 30 (Maps 2-55 and 2-56).	Surface disturbing and disruptive activities would be prohibited within identified big game parturition areas (Maps 2-55 and 2-56).	Surface disturbing and disruptive activities within identified big game parturition areas would not be allowed during the period of May 1 to June 30 (Maps 2-55 and 2-56).
No similar action.	Surface disturbing and disruptive activities would be allowed in big game migration and transitional ranges.	Surface disturbing and disruptive activities would be managed, on a case-by-case basis, in identified big game migration and transitional ranges to maintain their integrity and function for big game species in these areas.	Surface disturbing and disruptive activities would be managed, on a case-by-case basis, in identified big game migration and transitional ranges to maintain their integrity and function for big game species in these areas.

WILDLIFE AND FISHERIES			
Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4 (Proposed Plan)
Fences identified to be a problem to big game migration would be modified to meet BLM fence standards. New fences would be allowed in big game migration corridors and would meet BLM fence standards.	Fences would not be modified in big game migration areas. New fences would be allowed in big game migration corridors and would meet current BLM fence standards.	All existing fences would be modified to meet BLM fence standards. New fences would not be allowed in big game migration corridors.	Fences identified to be a problem to big game migration would be modified to meet BLM fence standards. New fences would be allowed in big game migration corridors and would meet BLM fence standards.
Water developments for livestock and wild horse use would be allowed in crucial winter range when they are consistent with wildlife habitat needs.	Water developments for livestock and wild horse use would be allowed in crucial winter range.	Water developments for livestock and wild horse use would not be allowed in crucial winter range.	Water developments for livestock and wild horse use would be allowed in crucial winter range when they are consistent with wildlife habitat needs.
Surface disturbing and disruptive activities would be intensively managed (BMPs) (Appendices 14 and 15) to maintain or enhance amphibian species and their habitats.	No similar action.	Same as Alternative 1.	Surface disturbing and disruptive activities would be intensively managed (BMPs) (Appendices 14 and 15) to maintain or enhance amphibian species and their habitats.
For the protection of amphibian species and their habitats, surface disturbing and disruptive activities would be avoided in the following areas: (1) identified 100-year floodplains, (2) areas within 500 feet of perennial waters, springs, wells, and wetlands, and (3) areas within 100 feet of the inner gorge of ephemeral channels.	Same as Alternative 1.	For the protection of amphibian species and their habitats, surface disturbing and disruptive activities would not be allowed in the following areas: (1) identified 100-year floodplains, (2) areas within 500 feet of perennial waters, springs, wells, and wetlands, and (3) areas within 100 feet of the inner gorge of ephemeral channels.	For the protection of amphibian species and their habitats, surface disturbing and disruptive activities would be avoided in the following areas: (1) identified 100-year floodplains, (2) areas within 500 feet of perennial waters, springs, wells, and wetlands, and (3) areas within 100 feet of the inner gorge of ephemeral channels.
Surface disturbing and disruptive activities would be intensively managed (BMPs) (Appendices 14 and 15) to maintain or enhance reptile species and their habitats.	No similar action.	Same as Alternative 1.	Surface disturbing and disruptive activities would be intensively managed (BMPs) (Appendices 14 and 15) to maintain or enhance reptile species and their habitats.
Fish habitats would be managed to achieve PFC.	Same as Alternative 1.	Fish habitats would be managed to achieve their potential natural condition.	Fish habitats would be managed to achieve DFC.

WILDLIFE AND FISHERIES			
Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4 (Proposed Plan)
Where possible, impoundments and instream structures would be designed to reduce impacts on Special Status fish species and their habitats.	Same as Alternative 1.	Impoundments and instream structures would not be allowed where negative effects on habitat quality, habitat quantity, or the life-cycle requirements of populations of Special Status fish species would occur.	Impoundments and instream structures would be designed to minimize impacts on Special Status fish species and their habitats.
Road crossings of waterbodies that potentially support fish would be designed to allow fish passage.	Same as Alternative 1.	Road crossings of waterbodies that potentially support fish for a portion of the year would be designed to simulate natural stream processes.	Road crossings of waterbodies that potentially support fish for a portion of the year would be designed to simulate natural stream processes.
Endangered, Threatened, Proposed, and Candidate Species			
Management Actions Common to All Alternatives			
Informal conferencing and consultation with the USFWS would occur for authorized activities that would potentially affect the habitat for endangered, threatened, proposed, and candidate species within the RMPPA (Appendix 10).			
Habitat and species conservation measures for threatened, endangered, candidate, and proposed species are identified in the biological assessment (USDI, BLM 2007a) and the biological opinion (USDI, BLM 2007b). Both documents would be adhered to for compliance with the ESA and the BLM Wyoming State Director’s Sensitive Species List (BLM Manual 6840). Conservation measures would be applied to all surface disturbing and disruptive activities, as appropriate. Appendix 14 lists all reasonable and prudent measures and terms and conditions for threatened and endangered species and conservation measures for proposed and candidate species.			
Management Actions by Alternative			
If prairie dog towns/complexes suitable as black-footed ferret habitat are present, attempts would be made to avoid locating surface disturbing activities within towns/complexes, or a black-footed ferret survey would be required (Appendix 14).	Same as Alternative 1.	If prairie dog towns/complexes suitable as black-footed ferret habitat are present, then surface disturbing and disruptive activities would be prohibited within 164 feet (50 meters) of the identified prairie dog towns.	If prairie dog towns/complexes suitable as black-footed ferret habitat are present, attempts would be made to avoid locating surface disturbing activities within 164 feet (50 meters) of a town. If a black-footed ferret non-block cleared town/complex cannot be avoided, then a black-footed ferret survey is required (Appendix 14).
Boat and raft landing areas would not be developed and outfitting camps would be avoided in Western yellow-billed cuckoo habitat, when possible.	Same as Alternative 1.	Boat and raft landing areas would not be developed and outfitting camps would be prohibited in Western yellow-billed cuckoo habitat.	Boat and raft landing areas would not be developed and outfitting camps would be prohibited in Western yellow-billed cuckoo habitat.

WILDLIFE AND FISHERIES			
Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4 (Proposed Plan)
Surface disturbing and disruptive activities potentially disruptive to Western yellow-billed cuckoos would not be prohibited within ½ mile of identified habitat from April 15 to August 15 for the protection of nesting Western yellow-billed cuckoos.	Same as Alternative 1.	Surface disturbing and disruptive activities potentially disruptive to Western yellow-billed cuckoos would be prohibited within ½ mile of identified habitat from April 15 to August 15 for the protection of nesting Western yellow-billed cuckoos.	Surface disturbing and disruptive activities potentially disruptive to Western yellow-billed cuckoos would be prohibited within ½ mile of identified habitat from April 15 to August 15 for the protection of nesting Western yellow-billed cuckoos.
Species Listed on the BLM Wyoming State Director’s Sensitive Species List			
Management Actions Common to All Alternatives			
Surface disturbing and disruptive activities that would potentially affect the habitat of Special Status Species would be intensively managed on a case-by-case basis (Appendices 1, 10, and 15).			
Surface disturbing and disruptive activities located in potential mountain plover habitat are prohibited during the reproductive period of April 10 to July 10 for the protection of breeding and nesting mountain plover. Additional protection measures would be applied if this area were later determined to be within occupied habitat (Appendix 16). Occupied habitat is defined as areas where broods and adults have been found.			
Management Actions by Alternative			
Surface disturbing and disruptive activities would be intensively managed to minimize impacts on identified crucial habitat for sensitive species for the purpose of protecting these species and their associated habitats (Appendices 1 and 15).	Surface disturbing and disruptive activities would be allowed in identified crucial habitat for sensitive species.	Surface disturbing and disruptive activities would be prohibited in identified crucial habitat for sensitive species for the purpose of protecting these species and their associated habitats (Appendices 1 and 15).	Surface disturbing and disruptive activities would be intensively managed to minimize impacts on identified crucial habitat for sensitive species for the purpose of protecting these species and their associated habitats (Appendices 1 and 15).
Surface disturbing and disruptive activities in white-tailed and black-tailed prairie dog towns would be avoided.	Surface disturbing and disruptive activities would be allowed to occur in white-tailed and black-tailed prairie dog towns.	Surface disturbing and disruptive activities would be prohibited within 50 meters (164 feet) of identified white-tailed and black-tailed prairie dog towns.	Surface disturbing and disruptive activities in white-tailed and black-tailed prairie dog towns would be avoided.
Prairie dog poisoning would be allowed in white-tailed and black-tailed prairie dog towns and complexes in accordance with existing, local Annual Predator Damage Management Plans.	Same as Alternative 1.	Prairie dog poisoning would be prohibited in white-tailed and black-tailed prairie dog towns/complexes, except for demonstrated reasons of human health and safety.	Prairie dog poisoning would be prohibited in white-tailed and black-tailed prairie dog towns/complexes, except for demonstrated reasons of human health and safety.

WILDLIFE AND FISHERIES			
Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4 (Proposed Plan)
Above-ground facilities within ¼ mile of prairie dog towns would not be equipped with anti-raptor perching devices.	Same as Alternative 1.	No above-ground facilities would be allowed within ¼ mile of prairie dog towns, unless the facilities are equipped with anti-raptor perching devices.	Anti-raptor perching devices would be considered, on a case-by-case basis, for any above-ground facilities within ¼ mile of prairie dog towns.
Power poles within prairie dog towns would be equipped with raptor anti-perch devices.	Same as Alternative 1.	Power poles would not be allowed within prairie dog towns.	Placement of power poles within prairie dog towns would be avoided; however, in the event that power poles are required to be placed within these towns, raptor anti-perch devices would be required.
<p>Surface disturbing and disruptive activities located within ¼ mile of an occupied greater sage-grouse or sharp-tailed grouse lek would be allowed only in extremely rare instances, and on a case-by-case basis. Such projects would be located in the least disruptive location from the lek.</p> <p>Surface disturbing and disruptive activities potentially disruptive to breeding and nesting greater sage-grouse or sharp-tailed grouse would be prohibited within 2 miles of the perimeter of a greater sage-grouse lek, and within 1 mile of the perimeter of a sharp-tailed grouse lek, or within identified nesting and early brood rearing habitat outside of these lek buffers, from March 1 to July 15.</p>	<p>Surface disturbing and disruptive activities located within ¼ mile of an occupied greater sage-grouse or sharp-tailed grouse lek would be allowed only in extremely rare instances, and on a case-by-case basis. Such projects would be located in the least disruptive location from the lek.</p> <p>Surface disturbing and disruptive activities potentially disruptive to breeding and nesting greater sage-grouse or sharp-tailed grouse would be allowed within a 2-mile radius of the center of a greater sage-grouse lek, and within a 1-mile radius of the center of a sharp-tailed grouse lek, and within identified nesting and early brood rearing habitat outside of these lek buffers, from March 1 to July 15.</p>	<p>Surface disturbing activities or occupancy would be prohibited on, and within ¼ mile of the perimeter of an occupied greater sage-grouse or sharp-tailed grouse lek (Map 3-13).</p> <p>Disruptive activities would be prohibited between 6 p.m. and 9 a.m. from March 1 to May 20 on, and within ¼ mile of the perimeter of an occupied greater sage-grouse or sharp-tailed grouse lek.</p> <p>Nesting/early brood rearing habitat: Avoid surface disturbing and disruptive activities, geophysical surveys, and organized recreational activities (events) that require a special use permit in suitable greater sage-grouse and sharp-tailed grouse nesting and early brood rearing habitat within 2 miles of the perimeter of an occupied greater sage-grouse lek, and within 1 mile of the perimeter of a sharp-tailed grouse lek, or in identified greater sage-grouse and sharp-tailed grouse nesting and early brood rearing habitat, from March 1</p>	<p>Surface disturbing activities or occupancy would be prohibited on, and within ¼ mile of the perimeter of an occupied greater sage-grouse or sharp-tailed grouse lek (Map 3-13).</p> <p>Disruptive activities would be prohibited between 6 p.m. and 9 a.m. from March 1 to May 20 on, and within ¼ mile of the perimeter of an occupied greater sage-grouse or sharp-tailed grouse lek.</p> <p>Nesting/early brood-rearing habitat: Avoid surface disturbing and disruptive activities, geophysical surveys, and organized recreational activities (events) that require a special use permit in suitable greater sage-grouse and sharp-tailed grouse nesting and early brood rearing habitat within 2 miles of the perimeter of an occupied greater sage-grouse lek, and within 1 mile of the perimeter of a sharp-tailed grouse lek, or in identified greater sage-grouse and sharp-tailed grouse nesting and early brood rearing habitat, from March 1</p>

WILDLIFE AND FISHERIES			
Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4 (Proposed Plan)
		to July 15.	to July 15.
<p>In the area east of State Highway 789, south of Interstate 80, west of State Highway 71 and Carbon County Road 401, and north of State Highway 70, surface disturbing and disruptive activities potentially disruptive to breeding and nesting greater sage-grouse or sharp-tailed grouse are prohibited within 2 miles of the perimeter of a greater sage-grouse lek, and within 1 mile of the perimeter of a sharp-tailed grouse lek, or within identified nesting and early brood rearing habitat outside of these lek buffers, from March 1 to July 15.</p>	<p>In the area east of State Highway 789, south of Interstate 80, west of State Highway 71 and Carbon County Road 401, and north of State Highway 70, surface disturbing and disruptive activities potentially disruptive to breeding and nesting greater sage-grouse and sharp-tailed grouse are not prohibited within a 2-mile radius of the center of a greater sage-grouse lek, and within a 1-mile radius of the center of a sharp-tailed grouse lek, from March 1 to July 15.</p>	<p>In the area east of State Highway 789, south of Interstate 80, west of State Highway 71 and Carbon County Road 401, and north of State Highway 70, the following would occur around greater sage-grouse and sharp-tailed grouse leks:</p> <p>(1) Surface disturbing activities or occupancy would be prohibited on, and within ¼ mile of the perimeter of an occupied greater sage-grouse or sharp-tailed grouse lek (Map 3-13).</p> <p>(2) Disruptive activities would be prohibited between 6 p.m. and 9 a.m. from March 1 through May 20 on, and within ¼ mile of the perimeter of an occupied greater sage-grouse or sharp-tailed grouse lek.</p> <p>Greater sage-grouse and sharp-tailed grouse nesting/early brood rearing habitat: Avoid surface disturbing and disruptive activities, geophysical surveys, and organized recreational activities (events) that require a special use permit in suitable greater sage-grouse and sharp-tailed grouse nesting and early brood rearing habitat within 4 miles of the perimeter of an occupied greater sage-grouse lek or within 2 miles of the perimeter of an occupied sharp-tailed grouse lek or in identified greater sage-grouse and sharp-tailed grouse nesting and early brood rearing habitat from March 1 to July 15.</p>	<p>In the area east of State Highway 789, south of Interstate 80, west of State Highway 71 and Carbon County Road 401, and north of State Highway 70, the following would occur around greater sage-grouse and sharp-tailed grouse leks:</p> <p>(1) Surface disturbing activities or occupancy would be prohibited on, and within ¼ mile of the perimeter of an occupied greater sage-grouse or sharp-tailed grouse lek (Map 3-13).</p> <p>(2) Disruptive activities would be prohibited between 6 p.m. and 9 a.m. from March 1 through May 20 on, and within ¼ mile of the perimeter of an occupied greater sage-grouse or sharp-tailed grouse lek.</p> <p>Greater sage-grouse and sharp-tailed grouse nesting/early brood rearing habitat: Avoid surface disturbing and disruptive activities, geophysical surveys, and organized recreational activities (events) that require a special use permit in suitable greater sage-grouse and sharp-tailed grouse nesting and early brood rearing habitat within 2 miles of the perimeter of an occupied greater sage-grouse lek, or within 1 mile of the perimeter of an occupied sharp-tailed grouse lek, or in identified greater sage-grouse and sharp-tailed grouse nesting and early brood rearing habitat from March 1 to July 15.</p>

WILDLIFE AND FISHERIES			
Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4 (Proposed Plan)
No similar action.	No similar action.	Surface disturbing or disruptive activities within greater sage-grouse breeding or nesting habitat would require the use of BMPs designed to reduce both the direct loss of habitat and disturbance to the birds during the critical breeding and nesting seasons (Appendix 15).	Surface disturbing or disruptive activities within greater sage-grouse breeding or nesting habitat would require the use of BMPs designed to reduce both the direct loss of habitat and disturbance to the birds during the critical breeding and nesting seasons (Appendix 15).
High-profile structures (e.g., buildings, storage tanks, overhead power lines, wind turbines, towers, windmills) would be authorized within 1 mile of an occupied greater sage-grouse and sharp-tailed grouse lek.	Same as Alternative 1.	High-profile structures (e.g., buildings, storage tanks, overhead power lines, wind turbines, towers, windmills) would be prohibited within 1 mile of an occupied greater sage-grouse and sharp-tailed grouse lek.	High-profile structures (e.g., buildings, storage tanks, overhead power lines, wind turbines, towers, windmills) would be authorized on a case-by-case basis from ¼ mile to 1 mile of an occupied greater sage-grouse and sharp-tailed grouse lek.
Surface disturbing and disruptive activities potentially disruptive to delineated greater sage-grouse and sharp-tailed grouse winter concentration areas are avoided during the period of November 15 to March 14 for the protection of greater sage-grouse and sharp-tailed grouse winter concentration areas.	No similar action.	Surface disturbing and disruptive activities potentially disruptive to delineated greater sage-grouse and sharp-tailed grouse winter concentration areas are prohibited during the period of November 15 to March 14 for the protection of greater sage-grouse and sharp-tailed grouse winter concentration areas.	Surface disturbing and disruptive activities potentially disruptive to delineated greater sage-grouse and sharp-tailed grouse winter concentration areas are prohibited during the period of November 15 to March 14 for the protection of greater sage-grouse and sharp-tailed grouse winter concentration areas.
Any action that would result in stream channel instability, erosion, and sedimentation within known Western boreal toad habitat would be avoided.	Same as Alternative 1.	Any action that could result in stream channel instability, erosion, and sedimentation within known Western boreal toad habitat would not be authorized, unless there is a benefit to the species.	Any action that would result in stream channel instability, erosion, and sedimentation within known Western boreal toad habitat would be avoided.

Table 2-2. Continued and Proposed Withdrawals

Continued or Proposed Withdrawal	Alternative 1 ^a (Acres)	Alternative 2 (Acres)	Alternative 3 (Acres)	Alternative 4 (Acres)
Total Existing Withdrawals				
Total Existing Withdrawals ^b	935,530	935,530	935,530	935,530
Proposed Withdrawals				
Developed and Undeveloped Recreation Sites^c				
Encampment River Campground	11	11	510	250
Corral Creek Recreation Site	10	10	530	180
Bennett Peak Recreation Site	15	15	580	230
Teton Reservoir Recreation Site	353	353	870	620
Prior Flats Campground	82	82	360	210
Dugway Recreation Site	43	43	420	200
Nine Mile Hill Recreation Site	126	126	670	440
Big Creek Recreation Site	30	30	450	220
Rim Lake Recreation Site	N/A	N/A	540	N/A
First Ranch Creek Proposed Recreation Site	140	N/A	N/A	N/A
Dune Ponds Recreation Site	2,750	N/A	N/A	N/A
Shirley Basin Reservoir Recreation Site	88	N/A	1,010	N/A
Wheatland Reservoir #3 Recreation Site	777	777	1,880	1,520
East Allen Lake Recreation Site	97	97	310	160
Little Sage Reservoir Recreation Site	24	24	420	160
Little Robber Reservoir Recreation Site	240	240	1,710	880
Laramie River Access	1,290	1,290	2,150	1,680
Special Designations and Management Areas				
Historic Trails Potential ACEC ^d	11,770	N/A	66,370	N/A
Como Bluff ACEC	N/A	N/A	1,690	N/A
Sand Hills ACEC and Potential JO Ranch Expansion	N/A	N/A	12,680	N/A
Chain Lakes Potential ACEC	N/A	N/A	30,560	N/A
Laramie Peak Potential ACEC	N/A	N/A	18,940	N/A
Red Rim-Daley Potential ACEC	N/A	N/A	11,100	N/A
Pennock Mountain WHMA	N/A	N/A	7,770	N/A
Wick-Beumee WHMA	N/A	N/A	280	N/A
Cave Creek Cave Potential ACEC	N/A	N/A	520	240
Laramie Plains Lakes Potential ACEC	N/A	N/A	1,600	1,600
Blowout Penstemon Potential ACEC	N/A	N/A	17,050	N/A
Upper Muddy Creek Watershed/Grizzly Potential ACEC	N/A	N/A	59,720	N/A

Continued or Proposed Withdrawal	Alternative 1 ^a (Acres)	Alternative 2 (Acres)	Alternative 3 (Acres)	Alternative 4 (Acres)
Cow Butte/Wild Cow Potential WHMA	N/A	N/A	49,570	N/A
White-Tailed Prairie Dog Potential ACEC	N/A	N/A	ND ^d	N/A
High Savery Dam Potential ACEC	N/A	N/A	530	530
Continental Divide National Scenic Trail SRMA	N/A	N/A	600	N/A
North Platte River SRMA	N/A	N/A	12,740	N/A
Jelm Mountain SRMA	18,100	N/A	18,100	N/A
Pedro Mountain SRMA	N/A	N/A	18,650	N/A
Laramie Plains Lakes SRMA (includes Lake Hattie Reservoir and Twin Buttes Lake recreation sites)	1,330	N/A	1,330	1,330
Rawlins Fishing SRMA	N/A	N/A	330	330
Jep Canyon ACEC	N/A	N/A	13,810	N/A
Shamrock Hills ACEC	N/A	N/A	18,400	N/A
Encampment River WSR	620	N/A	620	620
Big Creek Eligible WSR Segment	690	N/A	690	N/A
Bunker Draw Eligible WSR Segment	530	N/A	530	N/A
Duck Creek Eligible WSR Segment	510	N/A	510	N/A
Cherry Creek Eligible WSR Segment	1,750	N/A	1,750	N/A
Littlefield Eligible WSR Segment	350	N/A	350	N/A
Muddy Creek Eligible WSR Segment	10,430	N/A	10,430	N/A
North Platte Eligible WSR Segment	1,460	N/A	1,460	N/A
Skull Creek Eligible WSR Segment	7,430	N/A	7,430	N/A
Other Proposed Withdrawals				
Gibben's beardtongue site	15	15	15	15
Other Special Status plants sites ^e	ND	ND	ND	ND
Area within ½ mile of incorporated boundaries of all cities and towns	N/A	N/A	4,500	NA
Area within ¼ mile of incorporated boundaries of all cities and towns	N/A	N/A	N/A	1,500
Estimated Total Withdrawals^f	999,200	941,930	1,206,640	952,510

^a Acreages were calculated using both surface and subsurface lands administered by BLM.

^b Existing withdrawals are also listed in Table 3-4.

^c Buffers of ½ mile and ¼ mile are included for Alternatives 3 and 4, respectively.

^d The Historic Trails Potential ACEC includes the Cherokee, Overland, Rawlins to Baggs, and Rawlins to Fort Washakie Trails/Roads and the Fort Washakie, Sage Creek, and Midway Stage Stations.

^e Additional closures and withdrawals would be pursued as conditions and plant status warrant.

^f Because of land surface overlaps, acreage figures for individual areas do not add up to the total acreage value.

N/A No similar action; not applicable.

ND No data.

Table 2-3. Current Right-of-Way Corridors

Current Right-of-Way Corridors¹	Total Nominal Width
Exxon/Frontier Natural Gas Pipelines (multiple)	600 feet
Spence-Bairoil-Jim Bridger 230 kV Transmission Line	600 feet
CIG Natural Gas Pipeline	2 miles
Lost Creek Natural Gas Pipeline	600 feet
Sinclair Natural Gas Pipelines (multiple)	600 feet
WAPA Power Line	600 feet
Interstate 80 Corridor (pipelines, public utilities, roads)	4 miles

Table 2-4. Summary Comparison of Impacts

Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4 (Proposed Plan)
Impacts on Air Quality			
<p>There would be an increase in emissions of carbon monoxide (CO), nitrogen oxides (NO_x), sulfur dioxide (SO₂), PM₁₀, and PM_{2.5}, volatile organic compounds (VOC), and hazardous air pollutants (HAP), but none of these increases would cause any exceedance of state or federal ambient air quality standards.</p> <p>Qualitative emissions projections show that the total emissions would increase over time from 12,912 tons per year of pollutants in the base year to 37,924 tons per year by 2023.</p>	<p>Impacts under this alternative would be the same as under Alternative 1.</p> <p>Qualitative emissions projections show that the total emissions would increase over time from 12,912 tons per year of pollutants in the base year to 39,974 tons per year by 2023—the highest of any alternative.</p>	<p>Impacts under this alternative would be similar to those under Alternative 1.</p> <p>Qualitative emissions projections show that the total emissions would increase over time from 12,912 tons per year of pollutants in the base year to 31,875 tons per year by 2023—the lowest of any alternative.</p>	<p>Impacts under this alternative would be similar to those under Alternative 1.</p> <p>Qualitative emissions projections show that the total emissions would increase over time from 12,912 tons per year of pollutants in the base year to 36,982 tons per year by 2023.</p>
Impacts on Cultural Resources			
<p>Disturbance of approximately 13,694 acres (from forest, lands and realty, and livestock management actions) would potentially impact an estimated 472 cultural properties.</p> <p>It is anticipated that 8,945 oil and gas wells would be drilled, disturbing approximately 62,000 acres of land and an estimated 1,771 cultural properties. Those wells proposed on nonfederal lands where there is no federal involvement would adversely affect both the physical remains of the historic trails and the integrity of the setting where it contributes to NRHP eligibility, causing a significant impact.</p> <p>VRM Class I areas, SD/MAs, and NSO stipulations would protect 319,410 acres from surface disturbing activities, providing indirect</p>	<p>Disturbance of approximately 13,934 acres (from forest, lands and realty, and livestock management actions) would potentially impact an estimated 480 cultural properties.</p> <p>It is anticipated that 9,198 oil and gas wells would be drilled, disturbing approximately 64,000 acres of land and an estimated 1,829 cultural properties. Those wells proposed on nonfederal lands where there is no federal involvement would adversely affect both the physical remains of the historic trails and the integrity of the setting where it contributes to NRHP eligibility, causing a significant impact.</p> <p>VRM Class I areas, SD/MAs, and NSO stipulations would protect 224,420 acres from surface disturbing activities, providing indirect</p>	<p>Disturbance of approximately 13,214 acres (from forest, lands and realty, and livestock management actions) would potentially impact an estimated 456 cultural properties.</p> <p>It is anticipated that 8,632 oil and gas wells would be drilled, disturbing approximately 56,000 acres of land and an estimated 1,600 cultural properties. Those wells proposed on nonfederal lands where there is no federal involvement would adversely affect both the physical remains of the historic trails and the integrity of the setting where it contributes to NRHP eligibility, causing a significant impact.</p> <p>VRM Class I areas, SD/MAs, and NSO stipulations would protect 415,840 acres from surface disturbing activities, providing indirect</p>	<p>Disturbance of approximately 13,694 acres (from forest, lands and realty, and livestock management actions) would potentially impact an estimated 472 cultural properties.</p> <p>It is anticipated that 8,822 oil and gas wells would be drilled, disturbing approximately 58,000 acres of land and an estimated 1,657 cultural properties. Those wells proposed on nonfederal lands where there is no federal involvement would adversely affect both the physical remains of the historic trails and the integrity of the setting where it contributes to NRHP eligibility, causing a significant impact.</p> <p>VRM Class I areas, SD/MAs, and NSO stipulations would protect 336,700 acres from surface disturbing activities, providing indirect</p>

Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4 (Proposed Plan)
<p>protection to cultural resources. VRM Class II designations of 359,610 acres would provide indirect protection to the setting of Native American sacred sites, traditional cultural properties, and other cultural properties where the setting contributes to their NRHP eligibility. It is anticipated that significant impacts to cultural resources would occur as a result of unanticipated discoveries that would result from surface disturbing activities.</p>	<p>protection to cultural resources. VRM Class II designations of 232,830 acres would provide indirect protection to the setting of Native American sacred sites, traditional cultural properties, and other cultural properties where the setting contributes to their NRHP eligibility. It is anticipated that significant impacts to cultural resources would occur as a result of unanticipated discoveries that would result from surface disturbing activities.</p>	<p>protection to cultural resources. VRM Class II designations of 351,050 acres would provide indirect protection to the setting of Native American sacred sites, traditional cultural properties, and other cultural properties where the setting contributes to their NRHP eligibility. It is anticipated that significant impacts to cultural resources would occur as a result of unanticipated discoveries that would result from surface disturbing activities.</p>	<p>protection to cultural resources. VRM Class II designations of 346,670 acres would provide indirect protection to the setting of Native American sacred sites, traditional cultural properties, and other cultural properties where the setting contributes to their NRHP eligibility. It is anticipated that significant impacts to cultural resources would occur as a result of unanticipated discoveries that would result from surface disturbing activities.</p>
Impacts on Wildland Fire and Fuels			
<p>Vegetation treatments (2,500 acres/year) would not be adequate to create the diversity of seral stages necessary to decrease the potential for wildland fires. Using wildland fire for resource benefit would reintroduce fire, reducing large fire suppression efforts over the long term.</p>	<p>The increase in vegetation and weed treatments (24,400 acres/year) would reduce the annual size of wildland fires to an estimated 2,000 acres. Emphasis on fire suppression of all wildland fires would limit the reintroduction of wildland fire, increasing the need for and complexity of rehabilitation and restoration.</p>	<p>A large number of smaller vegetation treatments (11,800 acres/year) would increase the mosaic vegetation patterns but would not be adequate to slow the spread of wildland fires, or to reduce potential fire size and intensity. Emphasis on the use of wildland fire for resource benefit could achieve the goal of reintroduction of the role of wildland fire into fire-dependent ecosystems.</p>	<p>Vegetation treatments (an estimated 16,400 acres/year) would create more diverse vegetation communities in treated areas and reduce the size and intensity of wildland fires. Emphasis on the use of wildland fire for resource benefit would result in an increase in fuels treatments, creating more diverse vegetation communities in treated areas and reducing the size and intensity of wildland fires.</p>
Impacts on Forest Resources			
<p>There would be little to no impact to forest health management from air quality, minerals, paleontology, SD/MA, transportation and access, OHV, socioeconomics, and wild horse management actions. Forest health management actions would have some potential modifications of projects and treatments from stipulations and restrictions associated with management actions to protect cultural; recreation; VRM;</p>	<p>Impacts under this alternative would be similar to those under Alternative 1, except that the suppression of fire would eliminate or highly limit the presence of fire in fire-dependent forest ecosystems and the use of wildland fire as a resource management tool. Such suppressions would contribute to the buildup of hazardous fire fuels as well as stand stagnation and overstocking in woodland areas, but would protect</p>	<p>Impacts under this alternative would be similar to those under Alternative 1, except that there would be no commercial timber offered for sale, and forest management actions would have stricter guidelines, restrictions, closures, and timing stipulations from cultural and wildlife management actions. There would be some loss of harvestable or treatable acres because of these increased stipulations and/or restrictions. The</p>	<p>Impacts under this alternative associated with air quality, fire and fuels, lands and realty, livestock grazing, OHV, minerals, paleontology, recreation, transportation and access, vegetation, VRM, and wild horse management would be the same as those impacts in Alternative 1. Wildlife and fish management actions would be similar to those in Alternative 1, except that timing</p>

Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4 (Proposed Plan)
<p>water quality, watershed, and soils; and wildlife resources; however, impacts would be low. Impacts from livestock grazing would be moderate to low. The reintroduction of fire into fire-dependent forest ecosystems as well as the use of fire to reduce fuel loading and promote stand vigor; the acquisition of legal access to Shirley Mountain, Elk Mountain, Arlington, and Little Medicine areas through easements, ROWs, and/or land exchange; and the promoting of good rangeland and aspen stand health through vegetation management actions all would have moderate to low impacts on the overall accomplishment of forest health management goals.</p>	<p>forest areas considered to be of commercial value. Actions from fire and fuels management would have a moderate impact on forest management actions. SD/MA management actions would have little or no impact. VRM would place less restriction on the makeup, design, and placement of commercial forest product harvest and forest health treatment projects as compared to Alternative 1. Implementation of fewer wildlife stipulations and restrictions would allow for more flexibility in implementing forest health actions. The lack of pursuit of access to Shirley Mountain, Elk Mountain, Arlington, and Little Medicine areas through easements, ROWs, and/or land exchanges would have moderate impacts on the overall accomplishment of forest management actions for development.</p>	<p>use of wildland fire for resource benefit to reduce heavy fuel loading on forest floors, reintroduce fire into stands that are fire-dependent, and create fire breaks between healthy and unhealthy forest stands as well as the promotion of good rangeland and aspen stand health through vegetation management actions would have a positive impact on the overall improvement of forest health and the overall accomplishment of forest health management goals.</p>	<p>stipulations associated with raptors would be applied to individual nesting species. This would allow for greater flexibility in the application of forest health management actions.</p> <p>Impacts associated with cultural; water quality, watershed, and soils; and SD/MA management would be the same as those impacts in Alternative 3.</p>
<p>Impacts on Lands and Realty</p>			
<p>Impacts under Alternative 1 would have no reduction in right-of-way (ROW) authorizations and development activities, although there would be the need to protect other sensitive resources and habitats, which would influence the location, opportunity, and timing of ROWs and other land and realty authorized facilities. Protection of sensitive resources would have minimal influence on the ability to sell or exchange public lands to meet community expansion needs. Therefore, no significant impacts would occur to the lands and realty</p>	<p>Impacts under this alternative would have no reduction in ROW authorizations and development activities. The potential exists that there would be an increase in ROW authorizations and development activities because of fewer restrictions. Protection of sensitive resources would have minimal influence on the ability to sell or exchange public lands to meet community expansion needs. No significant impacts would occur to lands and realty management activities under this alternative. Withdrawals of approximately 6,400</p>	<p>A slight reduction in ROW authorizations and development activities would occur under this alternative. The presence of various Special Status and Sensitive wildlife species and habitats would preclude land disposal. Also, the additional VRM Class II areas would restrict or, in some cases, preclude lands and realty actions such as higher profile structures (e.g., power lines, communication sites, wind energy development). Withdrawals of approximately 271,110 acres would be pursued.</p>	<p>It is anticipated that there would be little reduction in capability to site ROWs and facilities, except that the type, location, route, height, and color of ROWs and facilities in more areas would be influenced by BMPs, mitigation measures, etc., to protect various sensitive resources and special areas. Withdrawals of approximately 16,980 acres would be pursued.</p>

Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4 (Proposed Plan)
<p>program under this alternative. Withdrawals of approximately 63,670 acres would be pursued.</p>	<p>acres would be pursued.</p>		
Impacts on Livestock Grazing			
<p>The introduction and proliferation of noxious and invasive weeds within individual allotments or localized areas would result in a significant loss of animal unit months (AUM). Compounding this problem is the lack of sufficient weed treatments. Similarly, insufficient vegetation treatments are contributing to the continued trend in mature to decadent shrubland and woodland communities, which would result in lower herbaceous production over the long term and ultimately in reduced management flexibility.</p> <p>Surface disturbing activities primarily associated with minerals development would result in the short-term reduction of 7,020 AUMs that would return following reclamation and the long-term loss of approximately 1,860 AUMs of livestock forage.</p>	<p>Over the long term, forage quality and quantity would be improved overall as a result of substantial increases in both vegetation and weed treatments. The reduction and elimination of wildlife mitigation measures affecting range improvements would increase flexibility in livestock management.</p> <p>Surface disturbing activities primarily associated with minerals development would result in the short-term reduction of 7,070 AUMs that would return following reclamation and the long-term loss of approximately 1,880 AUMs of livestock forage.</p>	<p>The inability to use up to 20,000 to 30,000 AUMs for sheep as a result of lack of predator control would be a significant impact on up to 17 grazing allotments.</p> <p>Long-term forage production and availability would be improved overall, as a result of substantial increases in both vegetation and weed treatments. Vegetation would be managed to meet DPC objectives, which would require livestock operations to incur additional management complexity.</p> <p>Surface disturbing activities primarily associated with minerals development would result in the short-term reduction of 6,220 AUMs that would return following reclamation and the long-term loss of approximately 1,730 AUMs of livestock forage.</p> <p>More restrictive wildlife stipulations would result in less flexibility in the season of work, design and location of projects, increased fence maintenance, and increased livestock herding and would prevent some proposed improvements from being implemented.</p>	<p>Long-term forage production, quality, and availability would be improved overall, as a result of substantial increases in both vegetation and weed treatments. Treatment of 25,023 acres of weeds annually with an emphasis on outbreaks in native, weed-free areas would reduce competition with native plants. Treatments would increase production and availability of forage, improve distribution of use, and potentially increase weight gains and conception rates in livestock. In addition, to meet DPC objectives, more intensive management would potentially be required.</p> <p>Surface disturbing activities primarily associated with minerals development would result in the short-term reduction of 6,430 AUMs that would return following reclamation and the long-term loss of approximately 1,730 AUMs of livestock forage.</p>
Impacts on Minerals			
<p>Restrictions on oil and gas activities would limit production and development. Restrictions are based primarily on management actions</p>	<p>Restrictions on oil and gas activities would limit production and development. Restrictions are based primarily on management actions</p>	<p>Restrictions on oil and gas activities would limit production and development. Restrictions are based primarily on management actions</p>	<p>Restrictions on oil and gas activities would limit production and development. Restrictions are based primarily on management actions</p>

Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4 (Proposed Plan)
<p>involving SD/MAs and wildlife. 65,600 acres would be closed to future leasing, and 185,130 acres would be subject to NSO requirements, which would make use of directional drilling mandatory. VRM Class II requirements, which preserve the existing character of the landscape, would potentially affect the placement of facilities and would apply to 359,610 acres. 5,111 nonfederal wells would disturb 35,000 acres. Approximately 3,834 federal wells would disturb 26,500 acres. From baseline (no restrictions) conditions, oil production would decrease by 24.7 percent and gas production would decrease by 11.5 percent. Withdrawal of an additional 63,670 acres from locatable mineral entry would preclude mineral development in these areas. A minimal level of exploration and development activity is expected. Removal of 11,090 acres from consideration as a source of salable minerals would preclude the ability to use mineral materials from these areas for construction and maintenance of roads and other infrastructure projects.</p>	<p>involving SD/MAs and wildlife. 64,150 acres would be closed to future leasing, and 92,180 acres would be subject to NSO requirements, which would make use of directional drilling mandatory. VRM Class II requirements would apply to 232,830 acres and would potentially affect placement of facilities. 5,111 nonfederal wells would disturb 35,000 acres. Approximately 4,087 federal wells would disturb 28,300 acres. From baseline (no restrictions) conditions, oil production would decrease by 15.1 percent and gas production would decrease by 6 percent. Withdrawal of an additional 6,400 acres from locatable mineral entry would preclude mineral development in these areas. A minimal level of exploration and development activity is expected. Removal of 12,230 acres from consideration as a source of salable minerals would preclude the ability to use mineral materials from these areas for construction and maintenance of roads and other infrastructure projects.</p>	<p>involving SD/MAs and wildlife. 86,210 acres would be closed to future leasing, and 281,560 acres would be subject to NSO requirements, which would make use of directional drilling mandatory. VRM Class II requirements would apply to 351,050 acres and would potentially affect placement of facilities. 5,111 nonfederal wells would disturb 35,000 acres. Approximately 3,521 federal wells would disturb 21,000 acres. From baseline (no restrictions) conditions, oil production would decrease by 45.3 percent and gas production would decrease by 21.5 percent. Withdrawal of an additional 271,110 acres from locatable mineral entry, primarily in SD/MAs, would preclude mineral resource development in these areas. A minimal level of exploration and development activity is expected. Removal of 586,326 acres from consideration as a source of salable minerals would preclude the ability to use mineral materials from these areas for construction and maintenance of roads and other infrastructure projects.</p>	<p>involving SD/MAs and wildlife. 73,230 acres would be closed to future leasing, and 218,750 acres would be subject to NSO requirements, which would make use of directional drilling mandatory. VRM Class II requirements would apply to 346,670 acres and would potentially affect placement of facilities. 5,111 nonfederal wells would disturb 35,000 acres. Approximately 3,711 federal wells would disturb 22,100 acres. From baseline (no restrictions) conditions, oil production would decrease by 25.1 percent and gas production would decrease by 12.7 percent. Withdrawal of an additional 16,980 acres from locatable mineral entry, primarily in SD/MAs, would preclude mineral resource development in these areas. A minimal level of exploration and development activity is expected. Removal of 287,916 acres from consideration as a source of salable minerals would preclude the ability to use mineral materials from these areas for construction and maintenance of roads and other infrastructure projects.</p>
Impacts on Off-Highway Vehicle Management			
<p>OHV closures would limit OHV opportunities. Long-term impacts on OHV use would likely occur in sensitive resource areas as a result of road</p>	<p>Impacts would be similar to those in Alternative 1, except that an increase in energy development with less restrictive protective measures would continue to create undesirable</p>	<p>Minerals management impacts would be reduced by protections that would reduce the acreage made undesirable for OHV users. Exclusion of offroad travel for</p>	<p>To preserve some important resource values, some areas would limit or preclude OHV use. However, based on the anticipated amounts of roads and vehicle routes that would</p>

Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4 (Proposed Plan)
<p>closures and restrictions. Allowing offroad travel for camp site access and big game retrieval and “necessary tasks” would alter the OHV setting as well as increase access opportunities for OHV use.</p>	<p>settings for some OHV users.</p>	<p>camping and big game retrieval and closure of WSAs to vehicles would restrict or preclude OHV use, which would displace users seeking open, unconfined opportunities.</p>	<p>remain available to OHV use, these impacts would remain negligible. Impacts under this alternative would be similar to those under Alternative 1, except that access to the Ferris Mountain WSA would be limited to designated roads and vehicle routes.</p>
Impacts on Paleontology			
<p>98,339 acres of surface disturbing activities could damage and/or dislocate resources through unanticipated discoveries.</p>	<p>Impacts under this alternative would be similar to those under Alternative 1, except that 98,793 acres would be disturbed.</p>	<p>Impacts under this alternative would be similar to those under Alternative 1, except that 92,719 acres would be disturbed.</p>	<p>Impacts under this alternative would be similar to those under Alternative 1, except that 87,583 acres would be disturbed.</p>
Impacts on Recreation Resources			
<p>Energy development would alter the quality of recreational settings and opportunities, potentially displacing recreational use. Promotion of shorter duration of livestock use and manipulation of the season of use would incorporate timing of recreation in order to reduce conflicts. Allowing offroad OHV use for big game retrieval, primitive camping site access, and “necessary tasks” for most areas would impact the recreational setting, alter recreational use, and increase conflicts.</p>	<p>Impacts on wildlife and fish would potentially reduce recreation opportunities. Recreationists would be displaced from oil and gas development areas because of the loss of natural recreational settings.</p>	<p>Minimal impacts would occur to recreation management under this alternative. Recreation resources and opportunities would benefit from the addition of four new SRMAs, the expansion of the Shirley Mountain SRMA acreage, the addition of the JO Ranch to the Sand Hills ACEC, and potential consolidation by exchange of inholdings within the SRMAs. All 140 miles of eligible segments would potentially increase the recreational opportunities. Prohibiting offroad OHV use for big game retrieval, primitive camping site access, and “necessary tasks” would benefit the recreational setting, but would potentially alter recreational use and opportunities.</p>	<p>Most programs, with the exception of minerals, would have a positive impact on recreational settings in the RMPPA. Oil and gas development would result in long-term reduction of recreation use in areas of high or moderate oil and gas potential, which would have significant impacts to recreation.</p>

Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4 (Proposed Plan)
Continental Divide National Scenic Trail SRMA			
<p>The ¼-mile corridor would have minimized disturbance, and Continental Divide National Scenic Trail visitors would be able to observe both man-made and natural multiple-uses of natural resources on public lands.</p>	<p>Impacts under this alternative would be the similar as those under Alternative 1.</p> <p>Vegetation treatments would enhance the recreational settings and experiences.</p>	<p>The ¼-mile corridor would be closed to mineral development and land tenure adjustments, along with increased vegetation treatments, which would preserve the quality of recreational settings.</p>	<p>Impacts under this alternative would be the similar as those under Alternative 3, except the SRMA would not be closed to locatable mineral entry or land tenure adjustments, which would allow for the development of locatable minerals in this area and thereby detract from the rustic experience many recreationists are seeking along the trail.</p>
North Platte River SRMA			
<p>The North Platte River would be managed as an SRMA.</p> <p>Mineral development activities in the Seminole Road Coalbed Natural Gas Project would reduce the desirability of recreation settings in the SRMA.</p> <p>Vegetative treatments would enhance the recreational experience by improving the naturalness of the experience and the quality of wildlife viewing opportunities.</p> <p>The focus of weed treatments to eliminate small patches and control large infestations would allow large patches of weeds to remain in the SRMA.</p>	<p>The North Platte River would not be managed as an SRMA.</p> <p>The area would not be an avoidance area for wind energy development and utility/transportation corridors, which would alter the naturalness of the area and impact the recreational setting and experiences.</p> <p>No recommendations would be made for WSR suitability, and no segments would be managed to retain their eligibility, which would potentially diminish the recreation settings and experiences.</p>	<p>The North Platte River would be managed as an SRMA and would include ½ mile of either side of the river.</p> <p>Two segments of the North Platte River would be determined to be and would be managed as suitable for inclusion in the WSR system, which would preserve scenic waterway-related recreational settings and opportunities.</p> <p>The North Platte River SRMA would be managed as VRM Class II south of the Saratoga area and as an avoidance area for utility/transportation systems and wind energy. This would protect the upper river from visual intrusions that would reduce the quality of the recreational settings in the SRMA.</p> <p>Water quality, watershed, and soils management actions would preclude new permanent roads or structures within the Encampment River</p>	<p>The North Platte River would be managed as an SRMA and would include ¼ mile of either side of the river.</p> <p>The SRMA would be open to oil and gas leasing with an NSO stipulation, which would protect the scenic quality and the recreational values and experiences.</p>

Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4 (Proposed Plan)
		watershed, which would preclude the creation of new access roads or recreation facilities within the SRMA.	
Off-Highway Vehicle SRMA			
The OHV SRMA would not be created.	OHV SRMAs would potentially be created. Public safety, proximity to population centers, and other programs' actions or concerns would limit and influence potential OHV riding area locations. The presence of OHV riding and training areas and the opportunity to promote safe riding skills and natural resource ethics and awareness would contribute to reductions in violations of public land laws and regulations and reductions in resource damage from improper use.	The OHV SRMA would not be created.	Impacts under this alternative would be the same as those under Alternative 2.
Jelm Mountain SRMA			
Jelm Mountain would not be managed as an SRMA. Jelm Mountain would not be managed as an avoidance area and open to the operation of the public land laws, which would detract from the recreation settings and experiences. OHV activity would diminish the recreational experience for other recreationists who seek solitude and natural settings. Vegetation treatments would enhance recreational settings and experiences.	Impacts under this alternative would be the same as those under Alternative 1.	Jelm Mountain would be managed as an SRMA. The SRMA would be open to oil and gas leasing with an NSO restriction and intensive management of existing oil and gas leases. The SRMA would be closed to locatable mineral entry, mineral material disposal, and land tenure adjustments, which would protect the quality of recreation resources on Jelm Mountain. The Jelm Mountain SRMA would be an avoidance area for utility and transportation systems and wind energy development. This would help prevent the creation of new visual intrusions that would degrade the quality of the recreational setting on Jelm Mountain.	Impacts under this alternative would be similar to those under Alternative 3, except that OHV management actions would allow OHV use 300 feet off of designated roads and vehicle routes for big game retrieval and to access primitive camping sites. The impacts would be localized to the areas surrounding the designated roads, which impact the scenic qualities and the recreation setting in the immediate areas. Additionally, the SRMA would not be closed to locatable mineral entry or land tenure adjustments, which would reduce the level of protection to recreation resources.

Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4 (Proposed Plan)
		<p>OHV travel would be allowed on designated roads and vehicle routes within the area, which would allow unnecessary or undesirable routes to be closed and reduce associated resource damage that detracts from the recreational setting. This would potentially reduce the number of access routes open to motorized travel, which would diminish the recreational experience for some users.</p>	
Pedro Mountains SRMA			
<p>The Pedro Mountains would not be managed as an SRMA.</p> <p>The recreation setting in the Pedro Mountains would potentially be altered by management developments, which would make it a less desirable place for dispersed primitive recreation.</p> <p>Western portions of the Pedro Mountains, in proximity to Pathfinder Reservoir, would be VRM Class II. The rest of the Pedro Mountains would be VRM Class III. Recreational settings would be preserved in the VRM Class II areas, whereas the settings would be altered in the VRM Class III areas.</p>	<p>Impacts under this alternative would be the similar as those under Alternative 1, except that VRM Class II acreage would be reduced along the eastern side of the Pedro Mountains, which would allow more visual intrusion to the setting from development.</p> <p>OHV management actions would allow offroad OHV use for “necessary tasks,” big game retrieval, and camping site access. This action would potentially allow for a degradation of scenic quality and increase recreational conflicts.</p>	<p>The Pedro Mountains would be managed as an SRMA.</p> <p>SRMA actions would open areas to oil and gas leases with an NSO stipulation, result in extensive management of existing oil and gas leases, and close public lands to locatable mineral entry and mineral material disposal. These actions would allow a higher level of recreation management for the area to preserve or improve the quality of the available recreational settings and reduce conflicts between mineral exploration and development activities and recreational activities.</p> <p>Prohibiting offroad OHV use for big game retrieval, primitive camp site access, and “necessary tasks” would benefit the recreational setting, but would potentially alter recreational use and opportunities.</p>	<p>Impacts under this alternative would be the similar as those under Alternative 3, except that OHV management actions would allow OHV use 300 feet off of designated roads and vehicle routes for big game retrieval and to access primitive camping sites. The impacts would be localized to the areas surrounding the designated roads, which affect the scenic qualities and the recreation setting in the immediate areas. Additionally, the SRMA would not be closed to locatable mineral entry, which would reduce the level of protection to recreation resources.</p>
Laramie Plains Lakes SRMA			
<p>Lake Hattie Reservoir and Twin Buttes Lake would not be managed as an SRMA.</p>	<p>Impacts under this alternative would be the same as those under Alternative 1.</p>	<p>Lake Hattie Reservoir and Twin Buttes Lake would be managed as the Laramie Plains Lakes SRMA.</p>	<p>Lake Hattie Reservoir and Twin Buttes Lake would be managed as the Laramie Plains Lakes SRMA.</p>

Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4 (Proposed Plan)
<p>Grazing systems and range improvements would potentially create conflicts between livestock and recreationists and detract from the quality of the lakeside recreation experience.</p> <p>Recreation resource actions would protect Lake Hattie Reservoir and Twin Buttes Lake, and the ¼ mile surrounding them, from mineral development that would otherwise potentially impair the quality of the recreation setting and detract from the recreation experience at the lakes.</p> <p>The Laramie Plains Lakes WHMA management actions to pursue acquisition of lands or easements to enhance access to public lands and/or expand habitat would enhance recreation opportunities by expanding the acreage available to the recreating public.</p>		<p>Livestock would likely be fenced out of the recreation sites to reduce conflicts with recreationists and impacts to water quality in the lakes.</p> <p>The SRMA and lands within ½ mile would be protected by an NSO restriction on surface disturbing and disruptive activities and closures to locatable mineral entry, mineral material disposal, and land tenure adjustments. This would maintain or enhance the recreational settings and experiences at the SRMA.</p>	<p>The SRMA and lands within ¼ mile would be protected by an NSO restriction on surface disturbing and disruptive activities and closures to locatable mineral entry, mineral material disposal, and land tenure adjustments. This would maintain or enhance the recreational settings and experiences at the SRMA.</p> <p>Recreation resources and SRMA and WHMA restrictions on surface disturbing activities would maintain public access and prevent or minimize industrialization of the recreation setting and would also locate the development activities far enough away to protect the recreation experience and rural setting at the sites.</p>
Rawlins Fishing SRMA			
<p>Rim Lake and Teton Reservoir Recreation Sites would not be managed as an SRMA.</p> <p>Grazing systems and range improvements would potentially create conflicts between livestock and recreationists and detract from the quality of the lakeside recreation experience at Rim Lake.</p>	<p>Impacts under this alternative would be the same as those under Alternative 1.</p>	<p>Rim Lake and Teton Reservoir Recreation Sites would be managed as an SRMA.</p> <p>The SRMA and lands within ½ mile would be protected by an NSO restriction on surface disturbing and disruptive activities as well as closures to locatable mineral entry, mineral material disposal, and land tenure adjustments. Above-ground facilities and linear utilities would be avoided unless adequately mitigated to protect recreation site viewsheds. These actions would prevent a loss of public access and industrialization of the recreation setting, maintaining the</p>	<p>Impacts under this alternative would be the similar as those under Alternative 3, except that the SRMA and lands within ¼ mile would be protected by an NSO restriction on surface disturbing and disruptive activities as well as closures to locatable mineral entry, mineral material disposal, and land tenure adjustments.</p>

Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4 (Proposed Plan)
		naturalness and experiences.	
Shirley Mountain SRMA			
<p>The Shirley Mountains would be managed as an SRMA.</p> <p>The SRMA would be managed as an avoidance area for wind energy. This would maintain the naturalness of the recreational settings and experiences.</p> <p>Forest management actions and wind energy development, when allowed, would alter the quality of recreational opportunities available. Some recreationists would be displaced from harvested and developed areas because these would potentially be less desirable recreation settings.</p>	<p>The Shirley Mountains would not be managed as an SRMA.</p> <p>Control of noxious and invasive species would improve the aesthetics of the recreational setting.</p> <p>The Shirley Mountains would be managed for VRM Class III objectives, which would potentially alter the scenic qualities of the area and impact the recreational settings and experiences.</p>	<p>The Shirley Mountains would be managed as an SRMA and would be expanded to include 13,380 additional acres.</p> <p>Short term impacts associated with closing the SRMA to commercial timber harvesting would help preserve the recreational setting. As the forest declines in health, detrimental impacts to huntable wildlife populations could result, which would negatively impact the recreational experiences in the SRMA. Declining forest health would also negatively impact visual resources, further negatively impacting the value and the settings of the SRMA.</p> <p>The Shirley Mountains would be managed for VRM Class III objectives, which would potentially alter the scenic qualities of the area and impact the recreational settings and experiences.</p>	<p>The Shirley Mountains would be managed as an SRMA and would be expanded to include 13,380 additional acres.</p> <p>Forest management actions would potentially reduce the quality of available recreational opportunities.</p> <p>The Shirley Mountains would be managed for VRM Class III objectives, which would potentially alter the scenic qualities of the area and impact the recreational settings and experiences.</p>
Impacts on Socioeconomics			
<p>Continued management actions within the RMPPA are expected to provide opportunities for oil and gas development while also balancing that development with environmental safeguards. Oil and gas development under this alternative would still provide jobs and earnings that would stimulate the study area’s economy, with most of the opportunities occurring in western portions of the RMPPA. Growth in earnings and</p>	<p>Increased oil and gas development is expected to increase employment opportunities in the oil and gas sector, which will also produce increased earnings and employment in other sectors within the study region (Albany, Carbon, Laramie, and Sweetwater Counties). Even though the pace of oil and gas development will likely increase and produce a booming economy fueled by a rapid expansion in the oil and gas sector,</p>	<p>An emphasis on the protection of resources that would restrict the rapid expansion of the oil and gas sector will reduce the anticipated mineral tax revenues that could have occurred in an environment more favorable to rapid oil and gas development. It will also reduce the demand for government services that would be expected in a “boom” fueled by oil and gas development. The “bust” likely to follow a “boom” driven by a</p>	<p>Impacts under this alternative would fall in between Alternatives 1 and 2. The extent of the impact would be a function of pace. If the pace of oil and gas development is closer to Alternative 2, then the impacts would be similar to that Alternative. On the other hand, if the pace turns out to be similar to Alternative 1, the impact would more closely resemble the anticipated impacts described under Alternative 1.</p>

Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4 (Proposed Plan)
<p>employment in the oil and gas industry would be less than in an environment that is more restrictive to oil and gas development. When compared to Alternative 2 and Alternative 4, the anticipated increase in employment and earnings in other sectors would be less. This may be somewhat offset by anticipated increased growth in other sectors that would benefit from restrictions in the oil and gas industry. Also, a slower and steadier pace of oil and gas development would lessen the “boom and bust” cycle that has historically been associated with rapid development in the oil and gas sector. Annual mineral tax revenues would be less than those generated under an environment more favorable to rapid oil and gas development. But even though the tax revenues are expected to decline under this Alternative, the demand for government services that would be expected in a “boom” fueled by rapid oil and gas development would also go down. Compared to Alternatives 2 and 4, the demand for social services is anticipated to be less, as is the demand for housing, infrastructure, law enforcement, etc. The same can be said of crime, substance abuse, and all of the other issues associated with substance abuse, which will also not likely increase at a pace observed in areas experiencing rapid oil and gas development. Also, the “bust” likely to follow the “boom” driven by a rapidly expanding economy primarily dependent on an extractive industry such as oil and gas is not expected to</p>	<p>the “boom” is likely to be followed by a “bust” based on similar cycles that have historically occurred throughout the West. In conjunction with the “boom,” mineral tax revenues are expected to show a substantial increase that will offset, to some degree, the anticipated increase in demand for government services. Based on other, similarly booming areas in the West that are dominated by a rapid expansion of the oil and gas industry, it is anticipated the demand for social services will also show a notable increase along with the demand for housing, infrastructure, education, law enforcement, etc. Crime is also likely to increase as is substance abuse and all of the other issues associated with substance abuse.</p>	<p>rapidly expanding economy principally dependent on an extractive industry such as the oil and gas industry is not likely to occur. Also, based on other, similarly booming oil and gas areas in the West, it is anticipated the demand for social services will not likely increase at a pace found in areas experiencing a rapid “boom” driven by oil and gas activity. Moreover, the demand for housing, infrastructure, law enforcement, etc., will likewise not increase at a pace found in areas in the West that are being heavily influenced by rapid oil and gas development. Crime, substance abuse, and all of the issues associated with substance abuse also will not likely increase at a pace observed in areas experiencing rapid oil and gas development. Growth in earnings and employment in the oil and gas industry would be lessened compared to areas that operate in an environment that favors rapid development of oil and gas reserves. Also, the anticipated increase in employment and earnings in other sectors would likewise be reduced. But this would be somewhat offset by anticipated increases in other sectors that would benefit from restrictions in the oil and gas industry.</p>	

Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4 (Proposed Plan)
be as pronounced as it would be under Alternatives 2 and 4.			
Impacts on Special Designations and Management Areas			
Wilderness Study Areas			
<p>Fire and fuels management and vegetation management actions would potentially improve vegetative resources in WSAs.</p> <p>The Ferris Mountain WSA would be closed to all types of motorized use. The Encampment River Canyon, Prospect Mountains, and Bennett Mountains WSAs would allow OHV use on existing roads and vehicle routes. The Adobe Town WSA would allow OHV use on designated roads and vehicle routes.</p>	<p>Impacts under this alternative would be similar to those of Alternative 1.</p>	<p>Management actions proposed under Alternative 3 would afford more protection of wilderness characteristics than other alternatives. WSAs would be closed to OHV use, and the areas adjacent to the Adobe Town, Bennett Mountains, and Ferris Mountains WSAs would be managed as VRM Class II.</p>	<p>The Encampment River Canyon, Bennett Mountains, Prospect Mountains, and Adobe Town WSAs would be closed to motorized use. The Ferris Mountains WSA would allow OHV use on designated roads and vehicle routes.</p> <p>Areas adjacent to the Bennett Mountains and Ferris Mountains WSAs would be managed as VRM Class II.</p>
Como Bluff ACEC/National Natural Landmark			
<p>Significant impacts would not be expected to occur because the level of development and activity that would occur in the ACEC/National Natural Landmark (NNL) would be compatible with the objectives and management prescriptions for the area.</p>	<p>The area would be managed as a WHMA.</p> <p>Impacts under this alternative would be the same as under Alternative 1.</p>	<p>The area would be managed as an ACEC.</p> <p>Although additional protections are afforded, impacts under this alternative would be the same as under Alternative 1.</p>	<p>The area would be managed as a national natural landmark (NNL).</p> <p>Impacts under this alternative would be the same as under Alternative 1.</p>
Sand Hills ACEC and Potential JO Ranch Expansion			
<p>Surface disturbing activities would impact the area by removing and degrading portions of the unique bitterbrush/big sagebrush vegetation community.</p> <p>The values of the area would be protected only within the existing ACEC boundaries.</p>	<p>Managing the area for multiple-use would result in significant loss of relevant and important values.</p>	<p>Impacts under this alternative would be similar to those under Alternative 1, except that implementation of intensive restrictions on surface disturbing and other disruptive activities would result in the greatest level of protection to the unique vegetation community.</p> <p>Incorporating the JO Ranch Expansion into the ACEC would provide additional protection to the</p>	<p>Impacts under this alternative would be similar to those under Alternative 1, except that implementation of additional restrictions on surface disturbing and other disruptive activities would reduce impacts.</p> <p>Also, similar to Alternative 3, incorporating the JO Ranch Expansion into the ACEC would provide additional protection to the</p>

Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4 (Proposed Plan)
		unique values of the area.	unique values of the area.
Jep Canyon ACEC/WHMA			
<p>The Jep Canyon ACEC would be maintained.</p> <p>Most management actions would not be detrimental to the crucial elk winter range and the productivity of raptor nesting pairs. Oil and gas exploration and development activities would potentially result in significant impacts to big game and raptor populations.</p>	<p>The ACEC designation would not be maintained, and the area would be managed as a WHMA.</p> <p>Reduction in restrictions would decrease protection of aspen habitat and crucial elk winter habitat as well as the productivity of raptor nesting pairs.</p>	<p>The ACEC designation would not be maintained, and the area would be managed as a WHMA.</p> <p>Increased restrictions would increase protection of aspen stands and crucial elk winter range as well as the productivity of raptor nesting pairs. Aspen woodlands would be expanded and diversified to provide additional habitat for nesting raptors and other wildlife. Public access would be pursued that would increase disturbance and related human impacts to wildlife and their habitats.</p>	<p>The ACEC designation would not be maintained, and the area would be managed as a WHMA.</p> <p>Increased restrictions would increase protection of aspen stands and crucial elk winter range as well as the productivity of raptor nesting pairs. Wildlife management actions identified under this alternative would reduce impacts to big game species, raptors, and other species and improve their habitat.</p>
Shamrock Hills ACEC/WHMA			
<p>The Shamrock Hills ACEC would be maintained.</p> <p>Timing and distance restrictions on lands and realty management and minerals management would potentially remove and degrade portions of the vegetation communities that support wildlife.</p> <p>Some aspects of livestock grazing, vegetation, and wildlife management would help preserve some of the vegetation communities that support the abundance of wildlife in the area for which the area was originally designated as an ACEC.</p>	<p>The area would be managed as a WHMA.</p> <p>Impacts from lands and realty management and minerals management would increase, as compared with Alternative 1 from less restrictive wildlife protection measures.</p> <p>The actions proposed in this alternative would result in a loss of the values that would qualify the Shamrock Hills area as a WHMA.</p>	<p>The Shamrock Hills ACEC would not be maintained. The area would be managed as an RCA.</p> <p>Vegetation management, wildlife and fisheries management, and some aspects of livestock grazing management would help maintain the vegetation communities that support the diversity of wildlife within the RCA.</p> <p>More restrictive spatial and temporal timing stipulations and BMPs would be implemented to minimize impacts to raptors, big game, greater sage-grouse, and their associated habitats as compared to Alternative 1.</p>	<p>The Shamrock Hills area would be managed as an RCA.</p> <p>Surface disturbing activities resulting from lands and realty, minerals, and OHV management would remove and degrade portions of the vegetation communities that support numerous raptor pairs, pronghorn during critical times, and grouse.</p> <p>Intensive management of these activities would reduce, but would not eliminate, these impacts, resulting in impacts similar to those in Alternative 1.</p>
Stratton Sagebrush Steppe Research Area Potential ACEC			
<p>The area would be managed as a research area. The research potential of the area could be compromised.</p>	<p>Impacts under this alternative would be the same as under Alternative 1.</p>	<p>The area would be designated as an ACEC.</p> <p>A lower level of surface disturbance</p>	<p>The area would be managed as a research area.</p> <p>A lower level of surface disturbance</p>

Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4 (Proposed Plan)
<p>Impacts would be significant because grazing and vegetation treatment actions may not be compatible with the research objectives and management prescriptions for the area.</p>		<p>from grazing and vegetation treatment actions under this alternative would reduce related impacts. Significant impacts would not be expected to occur because the level of development and activity that would occur in the area would be compatible with the objectives and management prescriptions for the area.</p>	<p>grazing and vegetation treatment actions under this alternative would reduce related impacts. Significant impacts would not be expected to occur because the types of disturbances from BLM-approved activities would be compatible with the research goals for the area.</p>
Chain Lakes Potential ACEC/WHMA			
<p>The area would be managed for multiple-use activities while maintaining natural resources. Mineral development activities, including surface discharge of produced water, and associated infrastructure would potentially alter the relevant and important values, including wildlife habitat and the unique alkaline wetland system, of the WHMA.</p>	<p>The area would be managed for multiple-use activities while maintaining natural resources. Mineral development activities, including surface discharge of produced water, and associated infrastructure would potentially alter the relevant and important values, including wildlife habitat and the unique alkaline wetland system, of the WHMA.</p> <p>There would be more impacts under this alternative, as compared with Alternative 1, with the removal of some wildlife stipulations.</p>	<p>The Chain Lakes area would be designated as an ACEC.</p> <p>The ACEC management would limit lands and realty actions; new mineral activity, except on existing leases; surface discharge of produced water; and OHV use for “necessary tasks,” big game retrieval, and camp site access, which would reduce new surface disturbance and maintain wildlife habitat values and protect the unique alkaline desert wetland system.</p> <p>Intensive management of existing oil and gas leases would provide protections to the vegetation communities.</p>	<p>Impacts would be similar to those described in Alternative 1.</p> <p>Management actions from the Chain Lakes WHMA would include intensive management of surface disturbing and disruptive activities. This would result in reduced impacts to pronghorn and other wildlife, along with their associated habitats, as well as to the unique alkaline wetland system.</p>
Laramie Peak Potential ACEC/WHMA			
<p>The area would be managed as a WHMA, and surface disturbing and disruptive activities would be restricted or intensively managed to protect habitat conditions. The proliferation of cheatgrass would result in a reduction in the quantity and nutritional value of herbaceous species, which would reduce overall habitat quality. The natural</p>	<p>Increased vegetation and weed treatments would maintain and/or enhance forage and habitat for wildlife and livestock. Reduced restrictions on surface disturbing activities would increase the potential for forage loss, human-induced stress to wildlife species, and habitat fragmentation.</p>	<p>Laramie Peak would be designated as an ACEC. Crucial habitat for bighorn sheep, elk, and mule deer would be afforded the greatest protection because of restrictions on surface disturbing activities. Relevant and important values would be preserved through management actions of other resource programs.</p> <p>Water developments would not be</p>	<p>Management of the Laramie Peak WHMA would result in protection of big game crucial winter range and allowance of multiple-use. Vegetation treatments designed to achieve DPC, restrictions on surface disturbing activities, and restrictions on offroad motorized vehicle use would benefit wildlife and livestock species through enhanced forage, reduction in habitat</p>

Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4 (Proposed Plan)
<p>topography and low mineral potential would limit development and minimize overall impacts.</p>		<p>allowed in crucial winter range, which would reduce the potential modification of these habitats used by elk, mule deer, and bighorn sheep during critical time periods. All existing fences would be modified to current BLM standards, and new fences would not be allowed in migration corridors, which would reduce stress, entanglement of, and death to big game species.</p>	<p>loss, and decreases in human-induced stress.</p>
Red Rim-Daley Potential ACEC/WHMA			
<p>The area would be managed as a WHMA. Most management actions would not be detrimental to the antelope elk winter range and the productivity of raptor nesting pairs. Oil and gas exploration and development activities would potentially result in significant impacts to big game and raptor populations.</p>	<p>The area would be managed as a WHMA. Reduction in restrictions would decrease protection of crucial antelope winter habitat and the productivity of raptor nesting pairs. Impacts from surface disturbing activities would include habitat loss, degradation, fragmentation, and displacement of wildlife. A reduction in the timing stipulations would increase human-induced stress to wildlife species, potentially resulting in displacement.</p>	<p>The Red Rim-Daley Area would be designated as an ACEC. Increased restrictions would increase protection of crucial antelope winter habitat and the productivity of raptor nesting pairs within the ACEC. Pursuing land acquisitions would continue to ensure the ability to improve or maintain antelope crucial winter and raptor nesting habitats.</p>	<p>The area would be managed as a WHMA. Increased restrictions would increase protection of crucial antelope winter habitat and the productivity of raptor nesting pairs within the WHMA. Wildlife management actions identified under this Alternative would reduce impacts to big game species, raptors, and other species and improve their habitats.</p>
Pennock Mountain WHMA			
<p>The area would be managed as a WHMA with an emphasis on elk and mule deer crucial winter range. Seasonal restrictions would protect the area from surface disturbing activities during winter. Management would be guided by a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between BLM and WGFD.</p>	<p>The area would not be managed as a WHMA. Reduced restrictions on surface disturbing activities would increase the potential for forage loss, stress to wildlife species, and habitat fragmentation. Seasonal restrictions would protect the area from surface disturbing activities during winter. Management would be guided by an MOU between BLM and WGFD.</p>	<p>The area would be managed as a WHMA with an emphasis on elk and mule deer crucial winter range, including achieving DPC objectives. Closing the area to locatable mineral entry and mineral material sales, in addition to prohibiting OHV use, would reduce the potential for forage loss and stress to elk and mule deer populations. Avoiding placement of utility/transportation systems and wind energy facilities would also protect wildlife habitat and populations. Management would be</p>	<p>The area would be managed as a WHMA with an emphasis on elk and mule deer crucial winter range, including achieving DPC objectives. Avoiding placement of utility/transportation systems and wind energy facilities would also protect wildlife habitat and populations. Seasonal restrictions would protect the area from surface disturbing activities during winter. Management would be guided by an MOU between BLM and WGFD.</p>

Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4 (Proposed Plan)
		guided by an MOU between BLM and WGFD.	
Wick-Beumee WHMA			
<p>There would be negligible impacts from any BLM program on the unit, and the area would continue to be managed in accordance with the MOU with WGFD. The Wick-Beumee WHMA would be managed for wildlife habitat, primarily elk habitat.</p> <p>Livestock grazing is used as a tool to improve forage quality for wildlife, primarily elk, and to increase the numbers of elk using the area.</p>	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.
Cave Creek Cave Potential ACEC			
<p>The Cave Creek Cave area would be managed to provide adequate protection to most wildlife resources in the area. However, because timber harvesting would be allowed in the watershed above the caves and would alter the hydrology, the climatic and ecological conditions required for the bat species within the cave system would not be protected. The area would be open to the operation of public land laws, locatable mineral entry, mineral material disposals, and oil and gas leasing with intensive management that could negatively affect the hydrology of Cave Creek and the cave system.</p> <p>The seasonal closure for the cave would be from November 1 to March 31, which would protect bats during hibernation.</p>	<p>The Cave Creek Cave area would not be managed as an ACEC. Intensive management of timber harvesting within ¼ mile of the cave complex would help maintain the hydrology that creates the climatic and ecological conditions required for bat species to maintain a viable population within the cave system. The area would be open to the operation of public land laws and oil and gas leasing with intensive management that would potentially negatively affect the hydrology of Cave Creek and the cave system. The seasonal closure for the cave would be from November 1 to March 31, which would protect bats during hibernation.</p>	<p>The Cave Creek Cave area would be managed as an ACEC (520 acres). Not allowing timber harvesting within ½ mile of the cave complex would maintain the hydrology that creates the climatic and ecological conditions required for bat species to maintain a viable population within the cave system. The area would be closed to the operation of public land laws, locatable mineral entry, mineral material disposals, and oil and gas leasing with intensive management that would protect the hydrology of Cave Creek and the cave system. The seasonal closure for the cave would be from November 1 to March 31, which would protect bats during hibernation.</p>	<p>The Cave Creek Cave area would be managed as an ACEC (240 acres). Not allowing timber harvesting within ¼ mile of the cave complex would maintain the hydrology that creates the climatic and ecological conditions required for bat species to maintain a viable population within the cave system. Increasing the seasonal closure under this alternative would afford additional protection of the bat species. The area would be closed to land tenure adjustments, locatable mineral entry, and mineral material disposals and would be open to oil and gas leasing with intensive management that would potentially protect the hydrology of Cave Creek and the cave system. The seasonal closure for the cave would be from October 15 to April 30, which would protect bats during hibernation for a longer period of time and reduce disturbance to early and late</p>

Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4 (Proposed Plan)
			hibernators.
Laramie Plains Lakes Potential ACEC/WHMA			
<p>The area would be managed as a WHMA.</p> <p>Pursuit of public land acquisitions could increase the potential for expansion of the Wyoming toad habitat. However, increased access associated with acquisitions could increase impacts from surface disturbing and other disruptive activities.</p> <p>The area would be open to the operation of public land laws, locatable mineral entry, mineral material disposals, and oil and gas leasing with intensive management that could negatively affect the hydrology of the Laramie Plains Lakes wetland/riparian system and wildlife species that depend on aquatic habitat types.</p>	<p>The area would be managed as a WHMA.</p> <p>Public land acquisitions would not be pursued within the Laramie Plains Lakes area, potentially limiting management opportunities for the benefit of Wyoming toad habitat.</p> <p>The area would be open to the operation of public land laws, locatable mineral entry, mineral material disposals, and oil and gas leasing with intensive management that could negatively affect the hydrology of the Laramie Plains Lakes wetland/riparian system and wildlife species that depend on aquatic habitat types.</p>	<p>The Laramie Plains Lakes area would be designated as an ACEC.</p> <p>Management actions from other resource programs would protect the potential habitat for the endangered Wyoming toad.</p> <p>The area would be closed to the operation of public land laws, locatable mineral entry, mineral material disposals, and new oil and gas leasing with intensive management on existing leases that would protect the hydrology of the Laramie Plains Lakes wetland/riparian system and wildlife species that depend on aquatic habitat types.</p>	<p>The area would be managed as a WHMA.</p> <p>Impacts would be similar to those under Alternative 1. However, limiting offroad vehicle use for necessary tasks and mineral entry activity would also help to maintain habitat for the endangered Wyoming toad.</p> <p>The area would be open to land tenure adjustments and oil and gas leasing with an NSO stipulation and with intensive management on existing leases. The area would be closed to locatable mineral entry and mineral material disposals, which would potentially protect the hydrology of the Laramie Plains Lakes wetland/riparian system and wildlife species that depend on aquatic habitat types.</p>
Historic Trails Potential ACEC			
<p>Development activities where disturbance could not be mitigated through the use of avoidance or other BMPs would result in significant impacts to the historic trails.</p> <p>Development activities associated with wind energy, utility/transportation systems, and communication sites would significantly impact the historic trails where the setting contributes to the properties' NRHP eligibility.</p> <p>Approximately 174 miles of the historic trails overlap high and moderate oil and gas potential areas. It is anticipated that 8,945 oil and gas wells would be drilled, disturbing</p>	<p>Development activities where disturbance could not be mitigated through the use of avoidance or other BMPs would result in significant impacts to the historic trails.</p> <p>Development activities associated with wind energy, utility/transportation systems, and communication sites would significantly impact the historic trails where the setting contributes to the properties' NRHP eligibility.</p> <p>Approximately 174 miles of the historic trails overlap high and moderate oil and gas potential areas. It is anticipated that 9,198 oil and gas wells would be drilled, disturbing</p>	<p>Development activities where disturbance could not be mitigated through the use of avoidance or other BMPs would result in significant impacts to the historic trails.</p> <p>Development activities associated with wind energy, utility/transportation systems, and communication sites would significantly impact the historic trails where the setting contributes to the properties' NRHP eligibility.</p> <p>Approximately 174 miles of the historic trails overlap high and moderate oil and gas potential areas. It is anticipated that 8,632 oil and gas wells would be drilled, disturbing</p>	<p>Development activities where disturbance could not be mitigated through the use of avoidance or other BMPs would result in significant impacts to the historic trails.</p> <p>Development activities associated with wind energy, utility/transportation systems, and communication sites would significantly impact the historic trails where the setting contributes to the properties' NRHP eligibility.</p> <p>Approximately 174 miles of the historic trails overlap high and moderate oil and gas potential areas.</p>

Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4 (Proposed Plan)
<p>approximately 62,000 acres of land. Those wells proposed on nonfederal lands where there is no federal involvement would adversely affect both the physical remains of the historic trails and the integrity of the setting where it contributes to NRHP eligibility, causing a significant impact.</p> <p>Restrictions on surface disturbing activities from other resource management would indirectly protect the historic trails in these areas by limiting the potential for impacts to the trail remains or the integrity of the associated setting. Approximately 512,180 acres would be subject to major constraints such as NSO, and 65,600 acres would be closed to leasing. Approximately 65.6 miles of the historic trails occur within VRM Class II areas.</p> <p>The area within ¼ mile or the visual horizon, whichever is closer, of the historic trails would be an avoidance area for surface disturbing and other disruptive activities. Significant impacts to the trails would still be anticipated in those areas where impacts could not be adequately avoided or mitigated.</p>	<p>approximately 64,000 acres of land. Those wells proposed on nonfederal lands where there is no federal involvement would adversely affect both the physical remains of the historic trails and the integrity of the setting where it contributes to NRHP eligibility, causing a significant impact.</p> <p>Restrictions on surface disturbing activities from other resource management would indirectly protect the historic trails in these areas by limiting the potential for impacts to the trail remains or the integrity of the associated setting. Approximately 218,060 acres would be subject to major constraints such as NSO, and 64,150 acres would be closed to leasing. Approximately 42.9 miles of the historic trails occur within VRM Class II areas.</p> <p>The area within ¼ mile or the visual horizon, whichever is closer, of the historic trails would be an avoidance area for surface disturbing and other disruptive activities. Significant impacts to the trails would still be anticipated in those areas where impacts could not be adequately avoided or mitigated.</p>	<p>approximately 56,000 acres of land. Those wells proposed on nonfederal lands where there is no federal involvement would adversely affect both the physical remains of the historic trails and the integrity of the setting where it contributes to NRHP eligibility, causing a significant impact.</p> <p>Restrictions on surface disturbing activities from other resource management would indirectly protect the historic trails in these areas by limiting the potential for impacts to the trail remains or the integrity of the associated setting. Approximately 714,800 acres would be subject to major constraints such as NSO, and 86,210 acres would be closed to leasing. Approximately 42.9 miles of the historic trails occur within VRM Class II areas.</p> <p>Surface disturbing activities would be prohibited within the Historic Trails ACEC, ensuring the protection of the physical remains of the trails from new disturbance. The trail segments where the setting contributes to NRHP eligibility would also benefit because management actions would require structures to blend into the landscape, thus minimizing the occurrence of adverse effects to the setting.</p>	<p>It is anticipated that 8,822 oil and gas wells would be drilled, disturbing approximately 58,000 acres of land. Those wells proposed on nonfederal lands where there is no federal involvement would adversely affect both the physical remains of the historic trails and the integrity of the setting where it contributes to NRHP eligibility, causing a significant impact.</p> <p>Restrictions on surface disturbing activities from other resource management would indirectly protect the historic trails in these areas by limiting the potential for impacts to the trail remains or the integrity of the associated setting. Approximately 605,860 acres would be subject to major constraints such as NSO, and 73,230 acres would be closed to leasing. Approximately 49.4 miles of the historic trails occur within VRM Class II areas.</p> <p>The Historic Trails area would be open to oil and gas leasing with an NSO stipulation and closed to mineral material sales, which would preclude surface disturbing and disruptive activities that could adversely affect the trails. The historic trails would be protected from other surface disturbing activities not associated with minerals development within ¼ mile or the visual horizon, whichever is closer, of the trails.</p>
Blowout Penstemon Potential ACEC			
<p>Activities within areas adjacent to occupied habitat would potentially increase the amount of potential</p>	<p>Impacts under this alternative would be similar to those in Alternative 1.</p>	<p>Designation of the area as an ACEC would help to maintain and enhance blowout penstemon habitat by limiting</p>	<p>Establishment of an ACEC would provide protection measures to</p>

Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4 (Proposed Plan)
<p>habitat through destabilization of dune areas.</p> <p>Allowance of surface disturbing activities within potential blowout penstemon habitat would alter the distribution of the plant.</p> <p>Conservation measure (Appendix 14) restrictions on surface disturbing activities within occupied habitat would limit development and provide protection for the plant.</p> <p>Land tenure adjustments, including acquisition, would be pursued to reduce the effects of potential surface disturbance through the application of BMPs on activities such as linear facilities, wind farms, fences, and water developments.</p>	<p>Land tenure adjustments would not be pursued, potentially limiting management opportunities to manage larger blocks of land under federal ownership for the benefit of blowout penstemon habitat.</p> <p>Blowout penstemon habitat and plants would have a greater likelihood of being damaged because there are no penalties for the removal or destruction of plants on private or state lands under ESA.</p>	<p>surface disturbing activities within potential habitat and sand dune complex.</p> <p>Fire and fuels management and vegetation treatments would emphasize achieving DPC, which would manage the area for early succession plant communities and active sand dunes, the required habitat for the blowout penstemon.</p> <p>Motorized vehicle use would be limited to designated roads and vehicle routes and would not be allowed for “necessary tasks,” big game retrieval, and access to camp sites.</p> <p>Priority for invasive weed control would be on creating a native, weed-free plant community, which would maintain blowout penstemon habitat.</p> <p>Oil and gas leasing would be open within the ACEC. However, an NSO stipulation would be required within occupied blowout penstemon habitat. This would minimize disturbance to potential habitat and maintain occupied habitat.</p> <p>Achieving the objectives of the Blowout Penstemon Recovery Plan and the establishment of an ACEC would promote the expansion of the plant and potentially lead to downlisting or delisting of blowout penstemon as an endangered plant.</p>	<p>occupied habitat.</p> <p>Additional protection measures would limit surface disturbing activities within potential habitat and sand dune complex.</p> <p>Fire and fuels management and vegetation treatments would emphasize achieving DPC, which would manage the area for early succession plant communities and active sand dunes, the required habitat for the blowout penstemon.</p> <p>Motorized vehicle use would be limited to designated roads and vehicle routes and not allowed for “necessary tasks” big game retrieval and access to campsites.</p> <p>Priority for invasive weed control would be on creating a native weedfree plant community which would maintain blowout penstemon habitat.</p> <p>Establishment of an ACEC would provide additional protection measures to potential habitat while minimizing the potential spread of weeds into occupied habitat.</p> <p>Oil and gas leasing would be open within the ACEC. However, a NSO stipulation would be required within occupied blowout penstemon habitat. This would minimize disturbance to potential habitat and maintain occupied habitat.</p> <p>Achieving the objectives of the Blowout Penstemon Recovery Plan and the establishment of an ACEC would promote the expansion of the plant and potentially lead to downlisting or delisting of blowout</p>

Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4 (Proposed Plan)
penstemon as an endangered plant			
Upper Muddy Creek Watershed/Grizzly Potential ACEC/WHMA			
<p>The Grizzly allotment portion of the Upper Muddy Creek watershed would be managed as a WHMA (16,340 acres). Management would not specifically address the conservation of Colorado River fish fauna and terrestrial wildlife species. The combined impact of surface disturbing activities and surface discharge of produced water would potentially have significant impacts on native fishes and their habitat (e.g., altering hydrologic function and reducing instream habitat from sedimentation) and potentially cause loss of big game crucial winter range.</p>	<p>The area would be managed as a WHMA (59,720 acres). Impacts under this alternative would be similar to those under Alternative 1.</p> <p>The potential for significant impacts is most likely under Alternative 2 because of more oil and gas development.</p>	<p>The area would be designated as an ACEC (59,720 acres). Management would emphasize the conservation of Colorado River fish fauna and terrestrial wildlife species.</p> <p>Increased wildlife protection measures would result in proportionally fewer impacts.</p> <p>Surface discharge of produced water from oil and gas development would not be allowed in the Colorado River Basin. Therefore, potential impacts (e.g., altering hydrologic functions important to native fish) from surface discharge of produced water would not occur.</p>	<p>The area would be managed as a WHMA (59,720 acres). Impacts under this alternative would be similar to those under Alternative 1, except that management would actively pursue the conservation of Colorado River fish fauna and terrestrial wildlife species.</p>
Cow Butte/Wild Cow Potential WHMA			
<p>The Cow Butte/Wild Cow area would not be managed as a WHMA. Surface disturbing activities would result in the loss of vegetation, increased soil erosion, human-induced stress to wildlife species, and habitat fragmentation. The Grizzly allotment portion would be guided by the MOU between BLM and WGFD. Surface discharge of produced water would remove and degrade portions of the vegetation communities.</p>	<p>The Cow Butte/Wild Cow area would not be managed as a WHMA. Surface disturbing activities and reduced restrictions would result in the loss of vegetation, increased soil erosion, human-induced stress to wildlife species, and habitat fragmentation. The Grizzly allotment portion would be guided by the MOU between BLM and WGFD. Surface discharge of produced water would remove and degrade portions of the vegetation communities.</p>	<p>The Cow Butte/Wild Cow area would be managed as a WHMA. The WHMA would be an avoidance area for utility/transportation systems and wind energy development. Closure to new federal oil and gas leasing, locatable mineral entry and mineral material disposals, pursuit of withdrawals from locatable mineral entry, prohibition on OHV travel and new fences in migration routes, limitations on reservoirs, conversion of all fences to BLM standards, use of designated roads, and seasonal closures would add further protections against the potential loss or disturbance of wildlife habitat and/or the displacement of and other impacts to big game using this habitat. Aspen and mountain shrub</p>	<p>The Cow Butte/Wild Cow area would be managed as a WHMA. The WHMA would be an avoidance area for utility/transportation systems and wind energy development. Closure to new federal oil and gas leasing and mineral material disposals, fence conversion to BLM standards according to wildlife and livestock needs, use of designated roads, and seasonal closures would add further protections against the potential loss or disturbance of wildlife habitat and/or the displacement of and other impacts to big game using this habitat. Aspen and mountain shrub plant communities would be protected and vegetation treatments would achieve DPC objectives for both vegetation health and to</p>

Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4 (Proposed Plan)
		<p>plant communities would be protected and vegetation treatments would achieve DPC objectives for both vegetation health and to enhance wildlife habitat and populations. The Grizzly allotment portion would be guided by the MOU between BLM and WGFD.</p>	<p>enhance wildlife habitat and populations. The Grizzly allotment portion would be guided by the MOU between BLM and WGFD.</p>
White-Tailed Prairie Dog Potential ACEC			
<p>The area would not be designated as an ACEC. Surface disturbing and other disruptive activities would be avoided near white-tailed prairie dog towns or complexes. Intensive management and continuation of existing management practices would meet the needs of the white-tailed prairie dog populations and protect the area by relocating activities outside of white-tailed prairie dog towns.</p>	<p>The area would not be designated as an ACEC. Not avoiding surface disturbance would degrade white-tailed prairie dog habitat. Increased predation and stress of white-tailed prairie dogs would occur.</p>	<p>The area would be designated as an ACEC. Surface disturbing and other disruptive activities would be prohibited within white-tailed prairie dog towns or complexes. Intensive management would meet the needs of the white-tailed prairie dog populations and protect the area by relocating activities outside of white-tailed prairie dog towns.</p>	<p>The area would not be designated as an ACEC. Impacts under this alternative would be the same as under Alternative 1.</p>
High Savery Dam Potential ACEC			
<p>The area would be managed as a WHMA with an emphasis on fisheries and recreation. Management would be guided by MOU between BLM and the Wyoming Water Development Commission (WWDC).</p>	<p>The area would be managed as a WHMA with an emphasis on fisheries and recreation. Reduced restrictions on surface disturbing activities would increase the potential for habitat loss and stress to wildlife populations. Management would be guided by MOU between BLM and WWDC.</p>	<p>The area would be designated as an ACEC with an emphasis on Colorado River cutthroat trout (CRCT) enhancement and the achievement of DPC objectives. Closing the area to locatable mineral entry and mineral material sales would reduce the potential for habitat loss and stress to wildlife populations. Management would be guided by MOU between BLM and WWDC.</p>	<p>The area would be managed as a WHMA with an emphasis on fisheries and recreation and the achievement of DPC objectives. Surface disturbing and disruptive activities would be restricted to protect recreation, watershed values, and fish and wildlife habitat. Management would be guided by MOU between BLM and WWDC.</p>
National Natural Landmarks			
<p>There would be negligible impacts on the NNLs from any management action.</p>	<p>Impacts under this alternative would be the same as under Alternative 1.</p>	<p>Impacts under this alternative would be the same as under Alternative 1.</p>	<p>Impacts under this alternative would be the same as under Alternative 1.</p>

Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4 (Proposed Plan)
Wild and Scenic Rivers			
<p>Mineral development in areas of high and moderate oil and gas potential would potentially impair the eligibility of the segments for designation as WSRs.</p> <p>Management prescriptions would prevent degradation of the outstandingly remarkable values along eligible waterway segments until suitability determinations can be made.</p>	<p>None of the eligible segments would be found suitable for WSR designation or be managed to retain their eligibility for WSR designation.</p>	<p>Mineral development in proximity to Littlefield Creek, Muddy Creek, and Skull Creek would potentially impair the suitability of the segments for designation as WSRs.</p> <p>Prohibition of offroad travel for dispersed camping and big game retrieval would protect lands in proximity to the suitable waterway segments from route proliferation that would degrade the quality of the scenery.</p> <p>WSR actions would close new oil and gas leasing, locatable mineral entry, and operation of public land laws in the ½-mile-wide corridor along the North Platte River SRMA.</p> <p>All eligible waterway segments would be determined to be and would be managed as suitable for inclusion in the national WSR system.</p>	<p>The Encampment River eligible waterway segment would be determined to be and would be managed as suitable for WSR designation.</p>
Impacts on Transportation and Access			
<p>The protection of the setting of cultural properties would be achieved through avoidance or other mitigation measures. Minerals actions would increase the amount of maintenance on existing BLM-designated roads within high and moderate oil and gas development areas. WSA management under the IMP would preclude the construction of any new roads. Protection measures for historic trails generally include avoidance of the trail. Easement acquisitions for forestry, recreation, Laramie Peak Potential ACEC, Pennock Mountain WHMA, and Laramie Plains Lakes Potential</p>	<p>Impacts would be the same as in Alternative 1. However, there would be fewer timing and distance restrictions for wildlife and fisheries, which would increase opportunities for transportation and access actions and allow construction and/or maintenance for longer periods throughout the year. There would be a reduction in the VRM Class II acreage, which would potentially increase activity on roads for recreation, transportation, construction, etc. Forestry and recreation would only increase transportation and access actions if opportunities arise for the acquisition</p>	<p>Reduced mineral development would decrease transportation and access opportunities as well as limit the locations of transportation and access actions because of the increase in the VRM Class II acreage.</p>	<p>Impacts would be the same as those described in Alternative 1 for forestry, lands and realty, minerals, recreation, WSAs, Chain Lakes WHMA, Laramie Peak WHMA, Red Rim-Daley WHMA, Pennock Mountain WHMA, Continental Divide National Scenic Trail SRMA, Historic Trails, White-Tailed Prairie Dog area and wildlife and fisheries, Jep Canyon WHMA, Wick-Beumee WHMA.</p> <p>Impacts would be the same as those described in Alternative 3 for cultural resource management, water quality, watershed, and soils management,</p>

Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4 (Proposed Plan)
<p>ACEC would improve access. Lands and realty and minerals management would temporarily increase the number of roads within the transportation system. Seasonal closures within the Cave Creek Cave SD/MA would limit vehicle access. VRM classes would potentially restrict projects within VRM Class II areas. Management actions related to water quality, watershed, and soils would influence road locations and method of construction. Seasonal restrictions to protect wildlife resources, threatened and endangered species, and critical habitats would restrict the timing of surface disturbing and other disruptive activities. These stipulations would also restrict the location of roads to avoid sensitive habitats.</p>	<p>of land or easements.</p>		<p>Como Bluff NNL, Stratton Sagebrush Steppe Research Area, Shirley Mountain SRMA, and Rawlins Fishing SRMA.</p> <p>Impacts would be the same as those described in Alternative 2 for the Shamrock Hills RCA.</p> <p>Impacts would be the same as those described in Alternative 1 for operation of the public land laws for Cow Butte/Wild Cow Potential WHMA and High Savery Dam Potential ACEC.</p> <p>Impacts would be the same as those described in Alternative 3 for everything except the operation of the public land laws for High Savery Dam Potential ACEC.</p> <p>North Platte River SRMA would preclude surface disturbance for new oil and gas leases, and existing leases would be intensively managed.</p> <p>Closure of public land to the operation of the public land laws decreases to approximately 14,950 acres. In addition, the potential disposal of BLM-administered lands would decrease to approximately 46,230 acres of (Maps 2-26 through 2-29 and Appendix 7).</p>
Impacts on Vegetation			
<p>Vegetation management actions would promote achievement of the Wyoming Standards for Healthy Rangelands (USDI, BLM 1997). Surface disturbing activities would result in removal of vegetation and increased susceptibility to weed</p>	<p>Vegetation management actions would promote achievement of the Wyoming Standards for Healthy Rangelands (USDI, BLM 1997). Increased surface disturbance would result in increased removal of vegetation and acres susceptible to</p>	<p>Vegetation management actions would meet DPC objectives in addition to achieving the Wyoming Standards for Healthy Rangelands (USDI, BLM 1997). Decreased surface disturbance would reduce removal of vegetation and</p>	<p>Vegetation management would meet DPC objectives in addition to achieving the Wyoming Standards for Healthy Rangelands (USDI, BLM 1997). A decrease in surface disturbance would reduce removal of vegetation</p>

Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4 (Proposed Plan)
<p>invasion. Reclamation would return vegetation cover and forage production. Insufficient vegetation treatment would result in an increase in late successional plant communities. Fires improve plant vigor, production, and diversity. However, this would occur on relatively small acreages, and plant communities would generally remain in late seral condition. Wildland fire and suppression efforts would create opportunities for weed invasion and expansion. Limited weed treatments would result in continued weed proliferation. Avoidance or mitigation of Special Status plants or unique plant communities would be required for surface disturbing activities. This would result in no significant impacts.</p>	<p>weed invasion, as compared to Alternative 1. Large vegetation treatments would increase the proportion of early and mid-seral plant communities. This would potentially improve the vigor, diversity, and productivity of treated plant communities. Acres affected by wildland fire would be reduced, which would also decrease opportunities for weed invasion and expansion. Weed treatments would control the introduction and proliferation of weeds and poisonous plants. Occupied habitat for threatened, endangered, proposed, or candidate plant species would be protected under ESA. Potential habitat would not be protected, which would potentially reduce opportunities for population expansion. BLM State Sensitive Species and unique plant communities would not be protected, which would potentially increase disturbance in these habitats.</p>	<p>acres susceptible to weed invasion, as compared to Alternative 1. Vegetation treatment, emphasizing smaller and more numerous projects combined with the use of fire for resource benefit, would help increase the proportion of early and mid-seral plant communities. This would improve the vigor, diversity, and productivity of treated plant communities. Increased acres affected by wildland fire would potentially increase opportunities for weed invasion and expansion. Treatments would slow the proliferation of existing weed species and the introduction of new weed species into new areas until all areas received treatments. Avoidance or mitigation of Special Status plants or unique plant communities would be required for surface disturbing activities. This would result in no significant impacts.</p>	<p>and acres susceptible to weed invasion, as compared to Alternative 1. Various vegetation treatments and sizes would increase the proportion of early and mid-seral plant communities. This would result in vigorous, diverse, and productive plant communities. Increased acres affected by wildland fire would potentially increase opportunities for weed invasion and expansion. Treatments would slow the proliferation of existing weed species and the introduction of new weed species into new areas until all areas received treatments. Avoidance or mitigation of Special Status plants or unique plant communities would be required for surface disturbing activities. This would result in no significant impacts.</p>
Impacts on Visual Resources			
<p>Energy developments would create large areas of contrasting visual elements against the natural landscape. Other surface disturbing activities designed to be consistent with the VRM class would maintain VRM classifications.</p>	<p>Minerals impacts would be similar to those of Alternative 1, except that the magnitude of impacts from oil and gas development would be increased, which would result in more visual degradation in the RMPPA. A total of 125,680 acres of VRM Class II acreage would be converted to Class III around the Pathfinder and Seminole Reservoirs, in the Shirley Mountains, and in the checkerboard</p>	<p>Impacts to visual resources would be reduced under this alternative as compared to the other alternatives. Visual resources would benefit from the addition of four new SRMAs, the expansion of the Shirley Mountain SRMA acreage, and potential land consolidation by exchange of inholdings within the SRMAs. All 140 miles of eligible segments would be determined to be and would</p>	<p>Energy developments would create large areas with contrasting visual elements of form, line, color, and texture against the natural landscape, which would alter the existing visual qualities. Visual resources would benefit from the addition of four new SRMAs, the expansion of the Shirley Mountain SRMA acreage, potential consolidation of inholdings within the</p>

Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4 (Proposed Plan)
	land ownership pattern.	be managed as suitable for inclusion in the WSR system, which would preserve the visual quality of these waterway corridors.	SRMAs, mineral closures, and increased avoidance acreages.
Impacts on Water Quality, Watershed, and Soils			
<p>The combined impact of surface disturbing activities and surface discharge of produced water would potentially have significant impacts on water quality and watersheds in the Colorado River Basin and the North Platte River above Seminole Reservoir.</p> <p>Surface disturbing activities would impact soil resources in localized areas, resulting in soil loss above natural levels.</p>	<p>The combined impact of surface disturbing activities and surface discharge of produced water would potentially have significant impacts on water quality and watersheds in the Colorado River Basin and the North Platte River above Seminole Reservoir.</p> <p>Surface disturbing activities would impact soil resources in localized areas, resulting in soil loss above natural levels.</p> <p>The potential for significant impacts is most likely under Alternative 2 because of more oil and gas development.</p>	<p>Similar to Alternative 1, the combined impact of surface disturbing activities would potentially have significant impacts on water quality and watersheds in localized areas.</p> <p>Surface discharge of produced water from oil and gas development would not have significant impacts under Alternative 3 because it would not be allowed in the Colorado River Basin and would be severely restricted in the North Platte and Great Divide Basins.</p> <p>Surface disturbing activities would impact soil resources in localized areas, resulting in soil loss above natural levels.</p> <p>The potential for significant impacts is least likely under Alternative 3 because of less oil and gas development and no impacts from surface discharge of produced water.</p>	<p>The combined impact of surface disturbing activities and surface discharge of produced water would potentially have significant impacts on water quality and watersheds in the Colorado River Basin and the North Platte River above Seminole Reservoir.</p> <p>Surface disturbing activities would impact soil resources in localized areas, resulting in soil loss above natural levels.</p> <p>The potential for significant impacts is less likely under Alternative 4 because of less oil and gas development.</p>
Impacts on Wild Horses			
<p>Wild horses would be temporarily displaced from preferred locations by human presence and activities such as oil and gas development or dispersed recreation. Habitat components, such as forage and water, would be stable or improve in quality and quantity. The wild, free-roaming nature of the horses would decrease in areas of moderate and high oil and gas activity. Genetic</p>	<p>Increased development would increase the short-term displacement of wild horses, leading to a greater loss in terms of their wild, free-roaming nature than in any other alternative. Habitat components, such as forage and water, would be stable or improve as in Alternative 1. Similar to Alternative 1, genetic viability of wild horses in all HMAs would be maintained. Preservation of the New</p>	<p>Increased restrictions on surface disturbing and other disruptive activities would reduce human activity, thereby preserving the wild and free-roaming nature of wild horses. Habitat components, such as forage and water, would increase and improve in quality and quantity. Genetic viability in all HMAs would be similar to Alternative 1 with the exception of ensuring the genetically</p>	<p>Similar to Alternative 1, wild horses would be temporarily displaced by human presence and activities. Habitat components, such as forage and water, would be stable or improve in quality and quantity. The wild, free-roaming nature of the horses would decrease in areas of moderate and high oil and gas activity. Similar to Alternative 1, genetic viability of wild horses in all</p>

Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4 (Proposed Plan)
<p>viability of wild horses in all HMAs would be maintained. Preservation of the New World Iberian genotype in the Lost Creek HMA would not be guaranteed.</p>	<p>World Iberian genotype in the Lost Creek HMA would not be guaranteed.</p>	<p>significant New World Iberian genotype in the Lost Creek HMA.</p>	<p>HMAs would be maintained. Preservation of the New World Iberian genotype in the Lost Creek HMA would be guaranteed.</p>
<p>Impacts on Wildlife and Fish</p>			
<p>Livestock management actions would create new water sources, which, in dry seasonal ranges, would expand available habitat for wildlife. Continuation of fence conversions at the current rate would still contribute to large die-offs of antelope and other big game species during severe winters. Minerals development would continue to impact wildlife and fish through loss, alteration, and fragmentation of habitats and displacement of wildlife. Over time, this would lead to increased competition for forage, reduced carrying capacity, and reduced recruitment.</p>	<p>Significant impacts would result from lands and realty management and minerals management. Increased impacts to wildlife species would result from decreased habitat uses, reduction in wildlife numbers, reduction in health and productivity of species, increased loss of important vegetation communities to support a diversity of wildlife, and inability to manage wildlife habitat sufficiently to support a diversity of species.</p>	<p>Fire and fuels management would decrease suppression activities and allow wildfire to influence the natural ecological process. Vegetation treatments would be more frequent and designed to achieve DPC. Permitted activities such as oil and gas development would continue to result in habitat loss, degradation, and fragmentation within these areas. More restrictive spatial and temporal timing stipulations and BMPs would be implemented to minimize impacts to greater sage-grouse, raptors, big game, and their associated habitats as compared to Alternative 1.</p>	<p>Fire and fuels management would displace wildlife for the short term but provide natural disturbance regimes to maintain habitat diversity for the long term. Vegetation management in riparian and wetland areas to meet DPC would potentially result in long-term benefits to wildlife. The use of seasonal and distance restrictions on surface disturbing and disruptive activities would decrease impacts to wildlife species during critical time periods essential to maintaining populations in different habitat types.</p>

**Table 2-5. Utility/Transportation Systems, Communication Sites, and Wind Energy^a
Exclusion and Avoidance Areas**

Area	Alternative 1 (acres)	Alternative 2 (acres)	Alternative 3 (acres)	Alternative 4 (acres)
Exclusion Areas				
Special Designations and Management Areas				
Wilderness Study Areas				
WSAs/VRM Class I ^b	68,160	66,120	68,160	66,120
Areas of Critical Environmental Concern^c				
Blowout Penstemon Potential ACEC	N/A	N/A	17,050	17,050
Cave Creek Cave Potential ACEC	N/A	N/A	520	240
Chain Lakes Potential ACEC	N/A	N/A	30,560	N/A
Como Bluffs ACEC/NNL	1,690	N/A	1,690	N/A
High Savery Dam Potential ACEC	N/A	N/A	530	N/A
Historic Trails Potential ACEC	N/A	N/A	66,370	N/A
Jep Canyon ACEC	13,810	N/A	13,810	N/A
Laramie Peak Potential ACEC	N/A	N/A	18,940	N/A
Laramie Plains Lakes Potential ACEC	N/A	N/A	1,600	N/A
Upper Muddy Creek Watershed/Grizzly Potential ACEC	N/A	N/A	59,720	N/A
Red Rim-Daley Potential ACEC	N/A	N/A	11,100	N/A
Sand Hills ACEC and Potential JO Ranch Expansion	7,960	N/A	12,680	12,680
Shamrock Hills ACEC	18,400	N/A	N/A	N/A
Stratton Sagebrush Steppe Research Area Potential ACEC	N/A	N/A	5,530	N/A
White-Tailed Prairie Dog Potential ACEC ^d	N/A	N/A	109,650	N/A
Wild and Scenic Rivers^c				
Big Creek Eligible WSR Segment	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Bunker Draw Eligible WSR Segment	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Cherry Creek Eligible WSR Segment	1,750	N/A	1,750	N/A
Duck Creek Eligible WSR Segment	510	N/A	510	N/A
Encampment River WSR	620	N/A	620	620
Littlefield Eligible WSR Segment	350	N/A	350	N/A
Muddy Creek Eligible WSR Segment	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
North Platte Eligible WSR Segment	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Skull Creek Eligible WSR Segment	7,430	N/A	7,430	N/A
Other Exclusion Areas				
Areas within ¼ mile of a cultural property	N/A	N/A	350	350

Area	Alternative 1 (acres)	Alternative 2 (acres)	Alternative 3 (acres)	Alternative 4 (acres)
or the visual horizon, whichever is closer, if the setting contributes to NRHP eligibility				
Continental Divide National Scenic Trail	600	600	600	600
Total Exclusion Acres^e	111,770	66,720	384,030	98,440
Avoidance/Closure Areas^f				
Special Designations and Management Areas				
Areas of Critical Environmental Concern				
Blowout Penstemon Potential ACEC	N/A	130	17,050	17,050
Cave Creek Cave Potential ACEC	N/A	240	520	240
Como Bluffs ACEC/NNL	1,690	1,690	1,690	1,690
High Savery Dam Potential ACEC	530	530	530	530
Historic Trails Potential ACEC	66,370	66,370	66,370	66,370
Jep Canyon ACEC	13,810	N/A	13,810	13,810
Upper Muddy Creek Watershed/Grizzly Potential ACEC	N/A	N/A	59,720	59,720
Sand Hills ACEC and Potential JO Ranch Expansion	7,960	7,960	12,680	12,680
Shamrock Hills ACEC	18,400	18,400	18,400	18,400
Stratton Sagebrush Steppe Research Area Potential ACEC	5,530	5,530	5,530	5,530
White-Tailed Prairie Dog Potential ACEC ^d	N/A	N/A	109,650	N/A
Wild and Scenic Rivers^c				
Big Creek Eligible WSR Segment	690	N/A	690	N/A
Bunker Draw Eligible WSR Segment	530	N/A	530	N/A
Cherry Creek Eligible WSR Segment	1,750	N/A	1,750	N/A
Duck Creek Eligible WSR Segment	510	N/A	510	N/A
Encampment River WSR	620	620	620	620
Littlefield Eligible WSR Segment	350	N/A	350	N/A
Muddy Creek Eligible WSR Segment	10,430	N/A	10,430	N/A
North Platte Eligible WSR Segment	1,460	N/A	1,460	N/A
Skull Creek Eligible WSR Segment	7,430	N/A	7,430	N/A
Special Recreation Management Areas				
Continental Divide National Scenic Trail SRMA	600	600	600	600
Jelm Mountain SRMA	N/A	N/A	18,100	18,100
Laramie Plains Lakes SRMA (includes Lake Hattie Reservoir and Twin Buttes Lake recreation sites)	N/A	N/A	1,600	1,600

Area	Alternative 1 (acres)	Alternative 2 (acres)	Alternative 3 (acres)	Alternative 4 (acres)
North Platte River SRMA	5,060	N/A	12,740	5,060
OHV SRMA	ND	ND	ND	ND
Pedro Mountains SRMA	N/A	N/A	18,650	18,650
Rawlins Fishing SRMA	N/A	N/A	330	330
Shirley Mountain SRMA	24,440	N/A	37,820	37,820
Wildlife Habitat Management Area				
Cow Butte/Wild Cow Potential WHMA	N/A	N/A	49,570	49,570
Pennock Mountain WHMA	7,770	N/A	7,770	7,770
Wick-Beumee WHMA	280	N/A	280	N/A
Other Avoidance Areas				
Areas within ¼ mile of a cultural property or the visual horizon, whichever is closer, if the setting contributes to NRHP eligibility	350	350	350	350
Existing and proposed recreation sites	9,960	9,960	24,310	9,960
Gibben's beardtongue site	15	15	15	15
Greater sage-grouse and sharp-tailed grouse leks (¼ mile)	46,360	46,360	46,360	46,360
Identified 100-year floodplains; 500 feet from perennial surface waters, wells, springs, and wetland/riparian areas; 100 feet from the inner gorge of ephemeral channels ^g	61,040	61,040	61,040	61,040
Other Special Status plant sites ^h	ND	ND	ND	ND
VRM Class II areas	359,610	232,830	346,670	346,670
Total Avoidance Acres^e	518,300	421,710	497,080	634,650

^a The RMP reflects the adoption of the programmatic policies and best management practices identified in the "Final Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement on Wind Power Development on BLM-Administered Lands in the Western United States" (June 2005). Exclusion areas only apply to wind power development. Additional areas of land may be excluded from wind energy development on the basis of findings of resource impacts that cannot be mitigated and/or conflict with existing and planned multiple-use activities.

^b WSAs are classified as VRM Class I, and thus are exclusion areas. In addition, programmatic policies presented in "Final Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement on Wind Power Development" (June 2005) identify WSAs as exclusion areas.

^c Per the programmatic policies presented in "Final Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement on Wind Power Development" (June 2005), ACECs, WSRs, and linear features within National Scenic Trails are exclusion areas for wind power development.

^d Areas not mapped because of sensitivity of resource; estimated total area covers 109,650 acres of RMPPA.

^e Because of land surface overlaps, acreage figures for individual areas do not add up to the total acreage value.

^f Closure only applies to the acres under Alternative 3.

^g Acreage reflects area within 500 feet from perennial surface waters, wells, springs, and wetland/riparian areas.

^h Additional areas could be avoided if conditions and plant status warrant avoidance.

Table 2-6. Areas of Fluid Mineral Lease Conditional Requirements by Hydrocarbon Potential (Approximate Federal Subsurface Acres)¹

Area	Hydrocarbon Potential (Federal Subsurface Acres)			Total
	High	Moderate	Low	
ALTERNATIVE 1:				
NO LEASE²				
WSAs	0	27,050	37,100	64,150
WSR Segments	0	4,770	4,820	9,590
Total Affected Area (In Acres)⁵	0	27,150	38,450	65,600
NO SURFACE OCCUPANCY^{3,4}				
Blowout penstemon habitat	0	0	150	150
Cemeteries	0	0	120	120
Continental Divide National Scenic Trail (not leased)	0	0	50	50
High Savery Dam and Reservoir area	0	0	1,070	1,070
Historic Trails + ¼ mile	11,740	17,310	25,170	54,210
Non-trail cultural eligible properties + ¼ mile	0	130	110	240
Active raptor nest areas	15,880	36,900	45,170	97,950
Campgrounds and recreation sites	0	10	5,560	5,560
Greater sage-grouse and sharp-tailed grouse leks + ¼ mile	8,050	5,930	18,010	31,990
Stratton Sagebrush Steppe Research Area	0	0	0	0
Total Affected Area (In Acres)⁵	34,440	58,890	91,800	185,130
CONTROLLED SURFACE USE^{3,4}				
Continental Divide National Scenic Trail (leased)	0	5	125	130
Chain Lakes ACEC (delineated wetlands)	0	800	720	1,520
Jep Canyon—Aspen	20	80	1,400	1,500
JO Ranch site	1	0	0	1
North Platte SRMA	0	5,890	100	5,990
Preble's meadow jumping mouse potential habitat	0	0	1,340	1,340
Shirley Mountain SRMA	0	0	11,470	11,470
VRM Class II areas	12,040	18,670	439,260	469,970
White-tailed prairie dog habitat	7,670	5,320	34,290	47,280
Wyoming toad habitat	0	0	0	0
Total Affected Area (In acres)⁵	18,210	24,200	454,190	496,600
SEASONAL LIMITATIONS^{3,4}				
Bald eagle communal roosting + 2 miles	0	3,370	14,840	18,210
Bald eagle nesting habitat + 1 mile	0	600	3,680	4,280
Big game crucial winter range	100,210	208,370	518,940	827,520

Area	Hydrocarbon Potential (Federal Subsurface Acres)			Total
	High	Moderate	Low	
Big game parturition areas	0	0	15,580	15,580
Mountain plover habitat	89,940	166,420	367,500	623,860
RCAs	6,530	13,590	15,940	36,060
Raptor nests (¼ mile to 1 mile)	163,640	353,380	405,600	922,620
Greater sage-grouse nesting habitat + 2 miles	221,590	210,860	553,510	985,960
Sharp-tailed grouse nesting habitat + 1 mile	5,270	3,650	3,980	12,900
Winter sage-grouse	90	270	0	360
Total Affected Area (In Acres)⁵	338,390	601,380	1,217,980	2,157,750
ALTERNATIVE 2:				
NO LEASE²				
WSAs	0	27,050	37,100	64,150
Total Affected Area (In Acres)⁵	0	27,050	37,100	64,150
NO SURFACE OCCUPANCY^{3,4}				
Blowout penstemon habitat	0	0	150	150
Campgrounds and recreation sites	0	10	5,560	5,560
Cemeteries	0	0	120	120
Continental Divide National Scenic Trail (not leased)	0	0	50	50
Greater sage-grouse and sharp-tailed grouse leks + ¼ mile	8,050	5,930	18,010	31,990
High Savery Dam and Reservoir area	0	0	1,070	1,070
Historic Trails + ¼ mile	11,740	17,310	25,170	54,210
JO Ranch lands	1	0	0	1
Non-trail cultural eligible properties + ¼ mile	0	130	110	240
Total Affected Area (In Acres)⁵	19,450	23,140	49,590	92,180
CONTROLLED SURFACE USE^{3,4}				
Continental Divide National Scenic Trail (leased)	0	5	125	130
North Platte SRMA	0	5,890	100	5,990
Preble's meadow jumping mouse potential habitat	0	0	1,340	1,340
Stratton Sagebrush Steppe Research Area	0	0	0	0
VRM Class II areas	0	0	328,600	328,600
White-tailed prairie dog complexes	7,670	5,320	34,290	47,280
Wyoming toad habitat	0	0	0	0
Total Affected Area (In Acres)⁵	6,690	5,370	350,420	362,620
SEASONAL LIMITATIONS^{3,4}				
Bald eagle communal roosting + 2 miles	0	3,370	14,840	18,210
Bald eagle nesting habitat + ½ mile	0	70	710	780
Bald eagle winter concentration areas + 1 mile	0	600	3,680	4,280

Area	Hydrocarbon Potential (Federal Subsurface Acres)			Total
	High	Moderate	Low	
Mountain plover habitat	89,940	166,420	367,500	623,860
Raptor nests + ½ mile	72,570	167,960	192,410	432,940
Total Affected Area (In Acres)⁵	141,880	295,500	494,650	932,030
ALTERNATIVE 3:				
NO LEASE²				
Cave Creek Cave ACEC	0	0	510	510
Chain Lakes ACEC (not leased)	0	3,010	610	3,620
Cow Butte/Wild Cow WHMA—Mountain Shrub and Aspen (not leased)	210	0	0	210
Jep Canyon ACEC (not leased)	30	0	210	240
Laramie Plains Lakes	0	0	0	0
North Platte SRMA (not leased)	0	330	9,650	9,980
RCAs (not leased)	10	560	50	620
Sand Hills/JO Ranch ACEC (not leased)	510	0	80	590
Stratton Sagebrush Steppe Research ACEC	0	0	0	0
Upper Muddy Creek/Grizzly ACEC (not leased)	170	730	2,740	3,640
Wick-Beumee WHMA	0	0	1,870	1,870
WSR Segments	0	4,770	4,820	9,590
WSAs	0	27,050	37,100	64,150
Total Affected Area (In Acres)⁵	930	31,280	53,990	86,210
NO SURFACE OCCUPANCY^{3,4}				
Active raptor nest areas	23,830	58,220	65,710	147,760
Big game parturition areas	0	0	15,580	15,580
Blowout Penstemon ACEC	0	0	19,010	19,010
Campgrounds and recreation sites	0	580	12,160	12,750
Cemeteries	0	0	120	120
Como Bluff ACEC	0	0	0	0
Continental Divide National Scenic Trail (not leased)	0	0	50	0
Greater sage-grouse and sharp-tailed grouse leks + ¼ mile	8,050	5,930	18,010	31,990
High Savery Dam and Reservoir area	0	0	1,070	1,070
Historic Trails + ¼ mile	11,740	17,310	25,170	54,210
JO Ranch site	1	0	0	1
Non-trail cultural eligible properties + ¼ mile	0	130	110	240
Shirley Mountain SRMA	0	0	15,200	15,200
Towns (not leased)	240	0	510	750
Total Affected Area (In Acres)⁵	41,830	79,300	160,430	281,560

Area	Hydrocarbon Potential (Federal Subsurface Acres)			Total
	High	Moderate	Low	
CONTROLLED SURFACE USE^{3,4}				
Chain Lakes ACEC (delineated wetlands)	0	800	720	1,520
Continental Divide National Scenic Trail (leased)	0	5	125	130
Cow Butte/Wild Cow WHMA (leased)	14,670	8,460	9,690	32,820
Jep Canyon—Aspen	20	80	1,400	1,500
North Platte SRMA (leased)	0	20	4,550	4,570
Preble's meadow jumping mouse potential habitat	0	0	1,300	1,300
RCAs (leased)	6,520	13,030	15,890	35,440
VRM Class II areas	0	4,380	464,150	468,530
White-tailed prairie dog complexes	7,670	5,320	34,290	47,280
Wyoming toad habitat	0	0	0	0
Total Affected Area (In Acres)⁵	23,010	23,860	463,910	510,780
SEASONAL LIMITATIONS^{3,4}				
Bald eagle communal roosting + 2 miles	0	3,390	14,940	18,330
Bald eagle nesting habitat + 1½ miles	0	1,750	8,500	10,260
Bald eagle winter concentration areas + 1 mile	0	600	3,680	4,280
Big game crucial winter range	100,210	208,370	518,940	827,520
Big game parturition areas	0	0	15,580	15,580
East of Highway 789: Greater sage-grouse leks + 4 miles	178,230	85,000	79,800	334,030
East of Highway 789: Sharp-tailed grouse leks + 2 miles	14,380	7,770	10,160	32,310
Greater sage-grouse nesting habitat + 2 miles	221,590	210,860	553,510	985,960
Mountain plover habitat	89,940	166,420	367,500	623,860
Raptor nests + 1½ miles	275,910	545,850	689,450	1,511,220
Sharp-tailed grouse nesting habitat + 1 mile	5,270	3,650	3,980	12,900
Winter sage-grouse	90	270	0	360
Total Affected Area (In Acres)⁵	357,740	680,520	1,314,290	2,352,550
ALTERNATIVE 4:				
NO LEASE²				
Cow Butte/Wild Cow WHMA (not leased)	350	680	4,630	5,660
Upper Muddy Creek/Grizzly WHMA (not leased)	170	730	2,740	3,640
Encampment River WSR	0	0	610	610
Stratton Sagebrush Steppe Research Area (not leased)	0	0	0	0
WSAs	0	27,050	37,100	64,150
Total Affected Area (In Acres)⁵	510	28,550	44,170	73,230
NO SURFACE OCCUPANCY^{3,4}				
Active raptor nest areas	2,870	7,890	8,470	19,230

Area	Hydrocarbon Potential (Federal Subsurface Acres)			Total
	High	Moderate	Low	
Blowout penstemon habitat	0	0	150	150
Campgrounds and recreation sites	0	10	5,560	5,560
Cave Creek Cave ACEC	0	0	240	240
Cemeteries	0	0	120	120
Continental Divide National Scenic Trail (not leased)	0	0	50	0
Greater sage-grouse and sharp-tailed grouse leks + ¼ mile	8,050	5,930	18,010	31,990
High Savery Dam and Reservoir area	0	0	1,050	1,050
Historic Trails + ¼ mile	11,740	17,310	25,170	54,210
Jep Canyon—Aspen	20	80	1,400	1,500
JO Ranch site	1	0	0	1
Laramie Plains Lakes	0	0	0	0
Non-trail cultural eligible properties + ¼-mile radius	0	130	110	240
Shirley Mountain SRMA	0	0	15,200	15,200
Towns (not leased)	240	0	40	280
Total Affected Area (In Acres)⁵	34,730	59,170	124,850	218,750
CONTROLLED SURFACE USE^{3,4}				
Big game parturition areas	0	0	15,580	15,580
Blowout Penstemon ACEC	0	0	19,010	19,010
Chain Lakes ACEC (delineated wetlands)	0	800	720	1,520
Continental Divide National Scenic Trail (leased)	0	5	125	130
Cow Butte/Wild Cow WHMA (leased)	14,670	8,460	9,690	32,820
Jep Canyon ACEC	5,360	5,100	2,860	13,320
North Platte SRMA	0	5,890	100	5,990
Preble's meadow jumping mouse potential habitat	0	0	1,340	1,340
VRM Class II areas	0	0	464,980	464,980
White-tailed prairie dog complexes	7,670	5,320	34,290	47,280
Wyoming toad habitat	0	0	0	0
Total Affected Area (In Acres)⁵	10,710	9,850	478,030	498,590
SEASONAL LIMITATIONS^{3,4}				
Bald eagle communal roosting + 2 miles	0	3,390	14,940	18,330
Bald eagle nesting habitat + 1 mile	0	600	3,680	4,280
Bald eagle winter concentration areas + 1 mile	0	600	3,680	4,280
Big game crucial winter range	100,210	208,370	518,940	827,520
Greater sage-grouse nesting habitat + 2 miles	221,590	210,860	553,510	985,960
Mountain plover habitat	89,940	166,420	367,500	623,860
RCAs	6,530	13,590	15,940	36,060

Area	Hydrocarbon Potential (Federal Subsurface Acres)			Total
	High	Moderate	Low	
Raptor nests (¾ mile to 1 mile)	163,640	353,380	405,600	922,620
Sharp-tailed grouse nesting habitat + 1 mile	5,270	3,650	3,980	12,900
Winter sage-grouse	90	270	0	360
Total Affected Area (In Acres)⁵	341,220	613,360	1,226,700	2,181,280

¹ Lease parcels are designed on aliquot parts. The actual acreage for the lease may vary.

² Although closed to leasing and related oil and gas activity, any other surface disturbing or disruptive activity would follow the surface disturbance prescriptions.

³ All activities would be subject to intensive mitigation, including offsite placement of facilities, remote control monitoring, and restricted or prohibited surface use, including road construction, multiple wells from a single pad, central tank batteries/facilities, pipelines, and power lines concentrated in specific areas, etc., based on site-specific analysis.

⁴ Refer to Appendix 1 (Wyoming Standard Mitigation Guidelines). These requirements apply to all surface disturbing and disruptive activities.

⁵ Because of land surface and land restriction overlaps, acreage figures for individual areas may not add up to the total acreage value.

Table 2-7. Summary of Proposed Special Designations and Management Areas by Alternative

Special Designation/ Management Area	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4
Areas of Critical Environmental Concern				
Como Bluff ACEC	ACEC>NNL (1,690 acres)	NNL (1,690 acres)	ACEC>NNL (1,690 acres)	NNL (1,690 acres)
Sand Hills ACEC and Potential JO Ranch Expansion	ACEC (7,960 acres)	WHMA (7,960 acres)	ACEC (12,680 acres)	ACEC (12,680 acres)
Jep Canyon ACEC/Jep Canyon WHMA	ACEC (13,810 acres)	WHMA (13,810 acres)	WHMA (13,810 acres)	WHMA (13,810 acres)
Shamrock Hills ACEC	ACEC (18,400 acres)	WHMA (18,400 acres)	RCA (18,400 acres)	RCA (18,400 acres)
Stratton-Steppe Sagebrush Research Area Potential ACEC	Research Management Area (5,530 acres)	Research Management Area (5,530 acres)	ACEC (5,530 acres)	Research Management Area (5,530 acres)
Chain Lakes Potential ACEC	WHMA (30,560 acres)	WHMA (30,560 acres)	ACEC (30,560 acres)	WHMA (30,560 acres)
Laramie Peak Potential ACEC	WHMA (18,940 acres)	WHMA (18,940 acres)	ACEC (18,940 acres)	WHMA (18,940 acres)
Red Rim-Daley Potential ACEC	WHMA (11,100 acres)	WHMA (11,100 acres)	ACEC (11,100 acres)	WHMA (11,100 acres)
Pennock Mountain WHMA	WHMA (7,770 acres)	No special designation.	WHMA (7,770 acres)	WHMA (7,770 acres)
Wick-Beumee WHMA	WHMA (280 acres)	WHMA (280 acres)	WHMA (280 acres)	WHMA (280 acres)
Cave Creek Cave Potential ACEC	No special designation.	No special designation.	ACEC (cave area only) (520 acres)	ACEC (cave area only) (240 acres)
Laramie Plains Lakes Potential ACEC	WHMA (1,600 acres)	WHMA (1,600 acres)	ACEC (1,600 acres)	WHMA (1,600 acres)
Historic Trials Potential ACEC	No special designation.	No special designation.	ACEC (66,370 acres)	No special designation.
Blowout Penstemon Potential ACEC	No special designation.	No special designation.	ACEC and Endangered Plant Habitat Area (17,050 acres)	ACEC and Endangered Plant Habitat Area (17,050 acres)
Upper Muddy Creek Watershed Grizzly Potential ACEC	WHMA (allotment portion only) (16,340 acres)	WHMA (59,720 acres)	ACEC (59,720 acres)	WHMA (59,720 acres)

Special Designation/ Management Area	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4
Cow Butte/Wild Cow Potential WHMA	No special designation.	No special designation.	WHMA (49,570 acres)	WHMA (49,570 acres)
White-tailed Prairie Dog Potential ACEC	No special designation.	No special designation.	ACEC (109,650 acres)	No special designation.
High Savery Dam Potential ACEC	No special designation.	No special designation.	ACEC (530 acres)	No special designation.
Special Recreation Management Areas				
Continental Divide National Scenic Trail SRMA	SRMA (600 acres)	SRMA (600 acres)	SRMA (600 acres)	SRMA (600 acres)
North Platte River SRMA	SRMA (5,060 acres)	No special designation.	SRMA (12,740 acres)	SRMA (5,060 acres)
OHV SRMA	SRMA (ND acres)	SRMA (ND acres)	SRMA (ND acres)	SRMA (ND acres)
Shirley Mountain SRMA	SRMA (24,440 acres)	No special designation.	SRMA (37,820 acres)	SRMA (37,820 acres)
Jelm Mountain SRMA	No special designation.	No special designation.	SRMA (18,100 acres)	SRMA (18,100 acres)
Pedro Mountains SRMA	No special designation.	No special designation.	SRMA (18,650 acres)	SRMA (18,650 acres)
Laramie Plains Lakes SRMA (includes Lake Hattie Reservoir and Twin Buttes Lake recreation sites)	No special designation.	No special designation.	SRMA (1,600 acres)	SRMA (1,600 acres)
Rawlins Fishing SRMA	No special designation.	No special designation.	SRMA (330 acres)	SRMA (330 acres)
Adobe Town Dispersed Recreation Use Area	No special designation.	No special designation.	RA (238,970 acres)	RA (238,970 acres)
National Natural Landmarks				
NNLs	Retain all NNLs (2,650 combined acres).			

Special Designation/ Management Area	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4
Wild and Scenic Rivers				
Encampment River WSR	No special designation. Protected to degree that BLM has authority (i.e., BLM lands within the corridor) until suitability determinations are made (2.51 miles/620 acres).	No similar action. ^a	Managed as suitable for inclusion in the National WSR System (2.51 miles/620 acres).	Managed as suitable for inclusion in the National WSR System (2.51 miles/620 acres).
Big Creek Eligible WSR Segment	Protected to degree that BLM has authority (i.e., BLM lands within the corridor) until suitability determinations are made (7.71 miles/690 acres).	No similar action. ^a	Managed as suitable for inclusion in the National WSR System (7.71 miles/690 acres).	No similar action. ^a
Bunker Draw Eligible WSR Segment	Protected to degree that BLM has authority (i.e., BLM lands within the corridor) until suitability determinations are made (1.5 miles/530 acres).	No similar action. ^a	Managed as suitable for inclusion in the National WSR System (1.5 miles/530 acres).	No similar action. ^a
Cherry Creek Eligible WSR Segment	Protected to degree that BLM has authority (i.e., BLM lands within the corridor) until suitability determinations are made (5.4 miles/1,750 acres).	No similar action. ^a	Managed as suitable for inclusion in the National WSR System (5.4 miles/1,750 acres).	No similar action. ^a
Duck Creek Eligible WSR Segment	Protected to degree that BLM has authority (i.e., BLM lands within the corridor) until suitability determinations are made (3.25 miles/510 acres).	No similar action. ^a	Managed as suitable for inclusion in the National WSR System (3.25 miles/510 acres).	No similar action. ^a
Littlefield Eligible WSR Segment	Protected to degree that BLM has authority (i.e., BLM lands within the corridor) until suitability determinations are made (1.14 miles/350 acres).	No similar action. ^a	Managed as suitable for inclusion in the National WSR System (1.14 miles/350 acres).	No similar action. ^a

Special Designation/ Management Area	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4
Muddy Creek Eligible WSR Segment	Protected to degree that BLM has authority (i.e., BLM lands within the corridor) until suitability determinations are made (87.5 miles/10,430 acres).	No similar action. ^a	Managed as suitable for inclusion in the National WSR System (87.5 miles/10,430 acres).	No similar action. ^a
North Platte Eligible WSR Segment	Protected to degree that BLM has authority (i.e., BLM lands within the corridor) until suitability determinations are made (5.22 miles/1,460).	No similar action. ^a	Managed as suitable for inclusion in the National WSR System (5.22 miles/1,460).	No similar action. ^a
Skull Creek Eligible WSR Segment	Protected to degree that BLM has authority (i.e., BLM lands within the corridor) until suitability determinations are made (24.75 miles/7,430 acres).	No similar action. ^a	Managed as suitable for inclusion in the National WSR System (24.75 miles/7,430 acres).	No similar action. ^a
Wilderness Study Areas				
Ferris Mountains WSA	WSA (21,880 acres)	WSA (21,880 acres)	WSA (21,880 acres)	WSA (21,880 acres)
Adobe Town WSA	WSA (32,650 acres)	WSA (32,650 acres)	WSA (32,650 acres)	WSA (32,650 acres)
Prospect Mountain WSA	WSA (1,140 acres)	WSA (1,140 acres)	WSA (1,140 acres)	WSA (1,140 acres)
Encampment River Canyon WSA	WSA (4,500 acres)	WSA (4,500 acres)	WSA (4,500 acres)	WSA (4,500 acres)
Bennett Mountains WSA	WSA (5,950 acres)	WSA (5,950 acres)	WSA (5,950 acres)	WSA (5,950 acres)

^a No similar action means all segments would be determined as non-suitable for inclusion in the National Wild and Scenic River System and released from further consideration for WSR. No special protections would be applied to these segments

Table 2-8. Areas of Priority Access for Easement Acquisition

Areas of Importance ¹	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4
Areas of High Importance				
Arlington (forestry)	X	N/A	X	X
Atlantic Rim (recreation)	X	N/A	X	X
Big Creek (recreation)	X	N/A	X	X
Ferris Mountains (recreation)	X	N/A	X	X
Little Medicine (forestry)	X	N/A	X	X
Miller Hill (recreation)	X	N/A	X	X
Shirley Mountains (forestry and recreation)	X	N/A	X	X
Seminole-Pathfinder (recreation)	N/A	N/A	X	X
Continental Divide National Scenic Trail (recreation)	X	X	X	X
Rawlins Uplift (recreation)	N/A	N/A	X	X
Areas of Moderate Importance				
North Laramie River (forestry)	X	N/A	X	X
Pine Mountain-Split Rock (forestry)	X	N/A	X	X
Rawlins Uplift (recreation)	X	N/A	N/A	N/A
Seminole-Pathfinder (recreation)	X	N/A	N/A	N/A
Toltec (forestry)	X	N/A	X	X
White Rock Canyon (forestry)	X	N/A	X	X
Areas of Low Importance				
Seven Mile (forestry)	X	N/A	X	X
Sugarloaf (forestry)	X	N/A	X	X
Woodedge (forestry)	X	N/A	X	X
High Savery Dam and Reservoir Project (recreation)	N/A	N/A	X	X

¹ Alternatives 1, 3, and 4 indicate areas for opportunities to acquire or maintain legal access as listed by alternative above. Alternative 2 would pursue opportunities only as they arise; therefore, this row is not applicable.

^{N/A} Not applicable.

Table 2-9. Visual Resource Management Classifications and Acreage

VRM Classification	Acreage	Percentage of Total Land Area
Alternative 1 (Map 2-51)		
I	68,160	1.92%
II	359,610	10.13%
III	2,676,950	75.38%
IV	446,760	12.58%
Alternative 2 (Map 2-52)		
I	66,120	1.86%
II	232,830	6.56%
III	2,581,620	72.69%
IV	670,910	18.89%
Alternative 3 (Map 2-49)		
I	68,160	1.92%
II	346,670	9.88%
III	2,467,780	69.31%
IV	670,910	18.89%
Alternative 4 (Map 2-50)		
I	66,120	1.86%
II	346,670	9.76%
III	2,467,780	69.49%
IV	670,910	18.89%
TOTAL	3,551,480	100%

Source: BLM 2007.

All lands in the RMPPA were rated; however, only the BLM-administered lands are managed within the VRM system, and only BLM lands are included in the above-referenced acreages.

Table 2-10 shows seasonal stipulations for wildlife as described in Table 2-1. Seasonal stipulations for threatened and endangered/Special Status Species not included in Table 2-1 are described in Appendix 14.

Table 2-10. Seasonal Wildlife Stipulations

Affected Areas	Restriction	Restricted Area
Alternative 1		
Big game crucial winter ranges	November 15–April 30	Antelope, elk, moose, bighorn sheep, and mule deer crucial winter ranges
Parturition areas	May 1–June 30	Identified parturition areas
Greater sage-grouse and Columbian sharp-tailed grouse breeding and nesting habitat	March 1–July 15	Within 2 miles of greater sage-grouse lek and 1-mile radius of Columbian sharp-tailed grouse lek
Greater sage-grouse and Columbian sharp-tailed grouse leks	March 1–July 15	East of State Highway 789, south of Interstate 80, for all Surface Disturbing and Disruptive Activities, west of State Highway 71 and Carbon County Road 401, and north of State Highway 70. Within 2 miles of greater sage-grouse lek and 1-mile radius of Columbian sharp-tailed grouse lek
Greater sage-grouse and Columbian sharp-tailed grouse winter concentration areas	November 15–March 14	Within identified winter habitat
Mountain plover	April 10–July 10	Potential and occupied habitat
Yellow-billed cuckoo	None	None
Barn owl nest	February 1–July 31	Within ¼-mile radius
Burrowing owl nest	February 1–July 31	Within ¼-mile radius
Cooper's hawk nest	February 1–July 31	Within ¼-mile radius
Ferruginous hawk nest	February 1–July 31	Within 1-mile radius
Golden eagle nest	February 1–July 31	Within 1-mile radius
Goshawk nest	February 1–July 31	Within ¼-mile radius
Great horned owl nest	February 1–July 31	Within ¼-mile radius
Kestrel nest	February 1–July 31	Within ¼-mile radius
Long-eared owl nest	February 1–July 31	Within ¼-mile radius
Merlin nest	February 1–July 31	Within ¼-mile radius
Northern harrier nest	February 1–July 31	Within ¼-mile radius
Osprey nest	February 1–July 31	Within ¼-mile radius
Peregrine falcon nest	February 1–July 31	Within ¼-mile radius
Prairie falcon nest	February 1–July 31	Within ¼-mile radius
Red-tailed hawk nest	February 1–July 31	Within ¼-mile radius
Screech owl nest	February 1–July 31	Within ¼-mile radius
Sharp-shinned hawk nest	February 1–July 31	Within ¼-mile radius
Short-eared owl nest	February 1–July 31	Within ¼-mile radius

Affected Areas	Restriction	Restricted Area
Swainson's hawk nest	February 1–July 31	Within ¼-mile radius
Other raptor nests	February 1–July 31	Within ¼-mile radius
Active raptor nests	Year round	Within 825 feet (ferruginous hawks, 1,200 feet)
Alternative 2		
Big game crucial winter ranges	None	None
Parturition areas	None	None
Greater sage-grouse and Columbian sharp-tailed grouse breeding and nesting habitat	None	None
Greater sage-grouse and Columbian sharp-tailed grouse leks	None	None
Greater sage-grouse and Columbian sharp-tailed grouse winter concentration areas	None	None
Mountain plover	April 10–July 10	Occupied habitat
Yellow-billed cuckoo	None	None
Barn owl nest	February 1–July 15	Within ½-mile radius
Burrowing owl	April 15–September 15	Within ½-mile radius
Cooper's hawk nest	April 1–August 31	Within ½-mile radius
Ferruginous hawk nest	March 1–July 31	Within ½-mile radius
Golden eagle nest	February 1–July 15	Within ½-mile radius
Goshawk nest	April 1–August 31	Within ½-mile radius
Great horned owl nest	February 1–July 15	Within ½-mile radius
Kestrel nest	April 1–July 31	Within ½-mile radius
Long-eared owl nest	March 1–July 31	Within ½-mile radius
Merlin nest	April 1–July 31	Within ½-mile radius
Northern harrier nest	April 1–July 31	Within ½-mile radius
Osprey nest	April 1–July 31	Within ½-mile radius
Peregrine falcon nest	March 1–July 31	Within ½-mile radius
Prairie falcon nest	April 1–July 31	Within ½-mile radius
Red-tailed hawk nest	February 1–July 15	Within ½-mile radius
Screech owl nest	March 1–July 31	Within ½-mile radius
Sharp-shinned hawk nest	April 1–July 31	Within ½-mile radius
Short-eared owl nest	March 1–July 31	Within ½-mile radius
Swainson's hawk nest	April 1–July 31	Within ½-mile radius
Other raptor nests	February 1–July 15	Within ½-mile radius

Affected Areas	Restriction	Restricted Area
Active raptor nests	None	None
Alternative 3		
Big game crucial winter ranges	November 15–April 30	Antelope, elk, moose bighorn sheep, and mule deer crucial winter ranges
Parturition areas	Prohibited year round	Identified parturition areas
Greater sage-grouse and Columbian sharp-tailed grouse breeding and nesting habitat	(1) Prohibit surface disturbance/occupancy year round; March 1–May 20 avoid human activity 6:00 p.m.–9:00 a.m. (2) Avoid surface disturbing activities March 15–July 15	(1) Within ¼ mile of occupied greater sage-grouse and Columbian sharp-tailed grouse nesting habitat (2) Within 2-mile radius for greater sage-grouse and within 1-mile radius for Columbian sharp-tailed grouse identified nesting/early brood rearing habitat
Greater sage-grouse and Columbian sharp-tailed grouse leks, breeding and nesting habitat	(1) Prohibit surface disturbance/occupancy year round; March 1–May 20 avoid human activity 6:00 p.m.–9:00 a.m. (2) Avoid surface disturbance/occupancy March 1–July 15	(1) Within ¼ mile of perimeter of occupied greater sage-grouse and Columbian sharp-tailed grouse leks east of State Highway 789, south of Interstate 80, west of State Highway 71 and Carbon County Road 401, and north of State Highway 70 (2) Within 4-mile radius for greater sage-grouse and within 2-mile radius for Columbian sharp-tailed grouse lek or identified nesting/early brood-rearing habitat
Greater sage-grouse and Columbian sharp-tailed grouse winter concentration areas	November 15–March 14	Within identified winter habitat
Mountain plover	April 10–July 10	Potential and occupied habitat
Yellow-billed cuckoo	April 15–August 15	Within ½-mile radius
Barn owl nest	February 1–July 15	Within 1½-mile radius
Burrowing owl	April 15–September 15	Within 1½-mile radius
Cooper's hawk nest	April 1–August 31	Within 1½-mile radius
Ferruginous hawk nest	March 1–July 31	Within 1½-mile radius
Golden eagle nest	February 1–July 15	Within 1½-mile radius
Goshawk nest	April 1–August 31	Within 1½-mile radius
Great horned owl nest	February 1–July 15	Within 1½-mile radius
Kestrel nest	April 1–July 31	Within 1½-mile radius
Long-eared owl nest	March 1–July 31	Within 1½-mile radius
Merlin nest	April 1–July 31	Within 1½-mile radius
Northern harrier nest	April 1–July 31	Within 1½-mile radius
Osprey nest	April 1–July 31	Within 1½-mile radius
Peregrine falcon nest	March 1–July 31	Within 1½-mile radius
Prairie falcon nest	April 1–July 31	Within 1½-mile radius
Red-tailed hawk nest	February 1–July 15	Within 1½-mile radius

Affected Areas	Restriction	Restricted Area
Screech owl nest	March 1–July 31	Within 1½-mile radius
Sharp-shinned hawk nest	April 1–July 31	Within 1½-mile radius
Short-eared owl nest	March 1–July 31	Within 1½-mile radius
Swainson's hawk nest	April 1–July 31	Within 1½-mile radius
Other raptor nests	February 1–July 15	Within 1½-mile radius
Active raptor nests	Year round	Within ¼ mile (1,320 feet)
Alternative 4		
Big game crucial winter ranges	November 15–April 30	Antelope, elk, moose, bighorn sheep, and mule deer crucial winter ranges
Parturition areas	May 1–June 30	Identified parturition areas
Greater sage-grouse and Columbian sharp-tailed grouse leks, breeding and nesting habitat	(1) Prohibit surface disturbance/occupancy year round; March 1–May 20 avoid human activity 6:00 p.m.–9:00 a.m. (2) Avoid surface disturbing activities March 15–July 15	(1) Within ¼ mile of occupied greater sage-grouse and Columbian sharp-tailed grouse leks (2) Within 2-mile radius for greater sage-grouse and within 1-mile radius for Columbian sharp-tailed grouse identified nesting/early brood rearing habitat
Greater sage-grouse and Columbian sharp-tailed grouse leks, breeding and nesting habitat	(1) Prohibit surface disturbance/occupancy year round; March 1–May 20 avoid human activity 6:00 p.m.–9:00 a.m. (2) Avoid surface disturbance/occupancy March 1–July 15	(1) Within ¼ mile of perimeter of occupied greater sage-grouse and Columbian sharp-tailed grouse leks east of State Highway 789, south of Interstate 80, west of State Highway 71 and Carbon County Road 401, and north of State Highway 70 (2) Within 2-mile radius for greater sage-grouse and within 1-mile radius for Columbian sharp-tailed grouse lek or identified nesting/early brood-rearing habitat
Greater sage-grouse and Columbian sharp-tailed grouse winter concentration areas	November 15–March 14	Within identified winter habitat
Mountain plover	April 10–July 10	Potential and occupied habitat
Yellow-billed cuckoo	April 15–August 15	Within ½-mile radius
Barn owl nest	February 1–July 15	Within ¾-mile radius
Burrowing owl	April 15–September 15	Within ¾-mile radius
Cooper's hawk nest	April 1–August 31	Within ¾-mile radius
Ferruginous hawk nest	March 1–July 31	Within 1-mile radius
Golden eagle nest	February 1–July 15	Within 1-mile radius
Goshawk nest	April 1–August 31	Within ¾-mile radius
Great horned owl nest	February 1–July 15	Within ¾-mile radius
Kestrel nest	April 1–July 31	Within ¾-mile radius
Long-eared owl nest	March 1–July 31	Within ¾-mile radius
Merlin nest	April 1–July 31	Within ¾-mile radius

Affected Areas	Restriction	Restricted Area
Northern harrier nest	April 1–July 31	Within ¼-mile radius
Osprey nest	April 1–July 31	Within ¼-mile radius
Peregrine falcon nest	March 1–July 31	Within ¼-mile radius
Prairie falcon nest	April 1–July 31	Within ¼-mile radius
Red-tailed hawk nest	February 1–July 15	Within ¼-mile radius
Screech owl nest	March 1–July 31	Within ¼-mile radius
Sharp-shinned hawk nest	April 1–July 31	Within ¼-mile radius
Short-eared owl nest	March 1–July 31	Within ¼-mile radius
Swainson's hawk nest	April 1–July 31	Within ¼-mile radius
Other raptor nests	February 1–July 15	Within ¼-mile radius
Active raptor nests	Year round	Within 825 feet (ferruginous hawks, 1,200 feet)

Table 2-11. Benefits of Recreation Experiences in SRMAs

Benefits of Recreation Experiences in SRMAs
Learning and developing skills, abilities, and knowledge
Exploring on your own, having a sense of independence and adventure
Getting closer to family
Participating in group activities
Having access to natural landscapes
Relating to the land
Getting physical exercise
Escaping everyday responsibilities and urban stress
Developing a sense of stewardship for public lands
Achieving better mental and physical health
Developing and growing personally
Appreciating nature and aesthetics
Viewing wildlife in its natural habitat
Appreciating your natural heritage
Improving lifestyle
Appreciating the region in which you live
Maintaining local recreation-tourism niche
Increasing the desirability of the area as a place to live
Protecting plant, wildlife, and fisheries habitats
Reducing recreational impacts in the SRMA

