CHAPTER 2—DESCRIPTION OF THE ALTERNATIVES

2.1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter describes four alternatives for management of the planning area. Alternative 1 (No Action Alternative) includes Resource Management Plan (RMP) maintenance and updates to the direction provided by the Record of Decision (ROD) and RMP for the Pinedale Resource Area (1988) and new direction and policy that subsequently have been implemented. Alternatives were developed to establish a framework for measuring the impacts that might result from management decisions. The alternatives represent reasonable approaches to managing land and activities consistent with law, regulation, and policy.

Section 2.2 presents an overview of the alternatives development process. Section 2.3 presents the management actions common to all alternatives. Section 2.4 contains summaries of each alternative. Section 2.5 contains detailed descriptions of each alternative, including management actions to be implemented by BLM (see Table 2-25 for a summary comparison of alternatives). Appendix 3 contains the mitigation guidelines and operating standards that would apply to oil and gas development and other surface disturbing or disruptive activities for Alternatives 2, 3, and 4.

2.2 DEVELOPMENT OF ALTERNATIVES

2.2.1 Alternatives Development Process

BLM complied with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA) and the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) implementing regulations at 40 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) §1500 in developing alternatives for this final environmental impact statement (EIS), including seeking public input and analyzing reasonable alternatives. Where necessary to meet the planning criteria, to address issues and comments from cooperating agencies and the public, or to provide a reasonable range of alternatives, the alternatives include management options for the planning area that would modify or amend decisions made in the 1988 ROD and RMP for the Pinedale Field Office (PFO). Some decisions from the 1988 ROD and RMP are acceptable and reasonable; in these instances, there is limited need to develop alternative management prescriptions. In some cases, management prescriptions are the same across all alternatives or may reflect only a decision to implement or not implement an action.

Public input received during the scoping process and the 120-day public comment period for the draft EIS was considered to ensure that all issues and concerns would be addressed, as appropriate, in developing the alternatives. Appendix 27 contains the full comments and responses and is included on a compact disc (CD) on the back cover of Volume 2 of the hard copy document. The scoping and public comment processes, as well as opportunities for future public and agency involvement, are summarized in Section 5.2.

Comments received during and after the formal scoping period cover a wide range of issues. The pace and scale of oil and gas development in the planning area, and how this activity affects BLM's multiple-use mandate and ability to manage other resources and resource uses in the area are of particular concern. Many comments address management of oil and gas development and other resources. Table 2-1 lists some of these comments along with short descriptions of how they are addressed in this final EIS.

Table 2-1. Public Comments and Their Treatment in the Final EIS

Public Comment	How/Where It Is Addressed in the Final EIS
ACEC nominations	Numerous areas were nominated for consideration as Areas of Critical Environmental Concern (ACEC). These areas are addressed either in the Special Designations and Management Areas sections of this chapter or in Section 2.2.2, Alternatives and Management Options Considered But Eliminated From Detailed Analysis. See Appendix 4 and the *Evaluation of Relevance and Importance Criteria for Existing and Proposed ACECs* for evaluation of whether each proposed area meets the relevance and importance criteria for ACECs.
Areas recommended for closure to oil and gas leasing or No Surface Occupancy (NSO) restriction	Many comments were received regarding closing certain areas to oil and gas leasing and development. A range of alternatives in areas available and unavailable for oil and gas leasing are presented in this chapter (Maps 2-1 through 2-4).
Clustered development and directional drilling	Directional drilling is taking place in the planning area and is discussed in the minerals sections of Chapters 3 and 4. Mitigations for impacts to sagebrush ecosystems and important wildlife habitats in Alternatives 3 and 4 could necessitate directional drilling in some areas.
Phased development	Phased development strategies are included in Alternatives 3 and 4. The planning area would be divided into three areas for management of oil and gas leasing and development, with some areas unavailable for leasing. Having areas unavailable for leasing provides a balance of land uses on a landscape scale and would provide for phased development of the planning area.
Split estate issues	The management of split estate (for example, areas where surface lands are privately owned with the underlying mineral estate publicly owned) is conducted according to United States and Wyoming laws. The working relationship between private landowners and oil and gas companies is determined according to these laws. The Wyoming Congress passed legislation in early 2005 concerning this issue.
Specific drilling requirements for soil, water, and vegetation protection	Drilling practices, well pad-size limitations, drilling materials and fluids, and reclamation requirements are determined on a site-specific basis at the Application for Permit to Drill (APD) or field development EIS stage. The RMP establishes the desired outcomes of land management and management actions and operating standards designed to meet those goals. Decisions or requirements regarding drilling of wells are found in the alternatives and in Appendix 3 (operating standards).
Air quality protection standards	Regulation of air quality is the responsibility of the EPA, with many of these responsibilities delegated to the Wyoming Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ). Air quality is addressed to the extent of BLM's authority in the alternatives.
Wildlife habitat, watershed, and fishery protection	Most practices suggested for maintaining the functionality of wildlife habitats are included in Appendix 3 and Appendix 5. Numerous management actions and operating standards for protecting watersheds and habitats are included in the alternatives.
Public participation	The level of public participation in the RMP and EIS as well as subsequent actions will be consistent with program direction, NEPA, and Federal Land Policy and Management Act (FLPMA).
Adaptive management	The outcome-based standards presented in Appendix 3 are a form of adaptive management. Adaptive management is further addressed at the gas field development level in the Pinedale Anticline and Jonah EISs and will be addressed in future development projects.
Reduction of road density and habitat fragmentation	Management actions included in the wildlife sections of Alternatives 3 and 4 are intended to address habitat fragmentation and density of roads and other developments and disturbances.

Many of the decisions from the existing Pinedale RMP have been implemented. In some cases, implementation of these decisions established valid existing rights or other obligations that are important considerations in preparing the revised Pinedale RMP. For example, many of the oil and gas resources in

the planning area are leased. The presence of these valid existing rights influences, and sometimes limits, management choices. Specific to the oil and gas program, the alternatives in this final EIS address the availability and allocation of lands for future oil and gas leasing, potential lease stipulations, and additional mitigation to be considered and applied during the Application for Permit to Drill (APD) process.

The development of alternatives began with compiling and analyzing Alternative 1. Alternatives 2 and 3 were then developed and analyzed. Cooperating agencies reviewed the draft alternatives to solicit input before development of Alternative 4. Alternative 4 was developed last.

2.2.2 Alternatives and Management Options Considered But Eliminated From Detailed Analysis

Several alternatives and management options were considered as possible methods of resolving resource management issues and conflicts. Some of the alternatives and options considered were received during public scoping. The alternatives and options listed below were eliminated from detailed analysis because they were considered unreasonable and/or were not found to be necessary to achieve the management goals of the alternatives.

Closure to Livestock Grazing

The elimination of livestock grazing from all public lands in the planning area was considered as a method for resolving some of the planning issues related to vegetation resources. This option was, however, eliminated from detailed analysis.

Resource conditions on BLM-administered public lands in the planning area, including range vegetation, watershed, and wildlife habitat, do not warrant prohibition of livestock grazing throughout the planning area. One hundred and twenty-two allotments meet the Wyoming Standards for Rangeland Health. However, reduction or elimination of livestock grazing could become necessary in specific situations where livestock grazing causes or contributes to conflicts with the protection and/or management of other resource values or uses. Such determinations would be made during site-specific activity planning and associated environmental analysis. These determinations would be based on several factors, including monitoring studies, reviewing current range management science, obtaining input from livestock operators and interested parties, and assessing the ability to meet the Wyoming Standards for Rangeland Health.

Closure to Oil and Gas Leasing

Closing the planning area to new leasing of federal minerals, specifically oil and gas, was considered as a method for resolving conflicts with other resource values and uses. The federal mineral estate in much of the planning area has already been leased (653,880 acres), and large portions of the area (176,000 acres) are developed. This proposal was eliminated from further analysis. Closing the entire planning area to new oil and gas leasing would eliminate development and production activities in areas where conflicts can be mitigated or where conflicts do not exist. This action is, therefore, not reasonable in light of the nation's dependence on oil and gas to meet energy demands. In addition, such closure contradicts BLM policy that, except for congressional withdrawals, public lands remain open and available for mineral exploration, unless doing otherwise is clearly in the national interest.

Public scoping comments indicate a growing level of concern with the rate and scale of oil and gas leasing and development in the planning area. Making portions of the planning area unavailable for oil

and gas leasing in response to other identified resource needs is addressed in the alternatives analyzed in detail.

Proposed Enlarged Off-Highway Vehicle Open Area at Mount Airy

A larger off-highway vehicle (OHV) open area (approximately 11,000 acres) was proposed in the Mount Airy/Stewart Point area of the Mesa. The proposed area would extend from the East Green River Road to the outskirts of Pinedale and from the Industrial Site to the top of the Mesa. The Mesa Road passes through the middle of the proposed area.

Parts of the area would overlap with intensive oil and gas development of the Pinedale Anticline gas field, creating many hazards to cross-country OHV users. In addition, it is not prudent to add the impacts of unregulated OHV use in an area already being impacted by oil and gas development. BLM is proposing to manage portions of the larger OHV open area not contained within the Pinedale Anticline development to preserve big game migration routes, crucial winter range, sage-grouse habitats, and visual integrity from the town of Pinedale. For these reasons, BLM has determined that it is not reasonable to establish an area of unregulated OHV use in this area at this time.

Reduced Pace of Oil and Gas Drilling

Public scoping comments, and comments on the draft EIS, indicate a growing level of concern with the rate and scale of oil and gas leasing and development in the planning area. The pace of leasing is controlled through the 431,175 acres that would be unavailable for leasing. BLM considered an alternative to set or control the pace of oil and gas development but determined through a review of the federal regulations that the holders of federal oil and gas leases have the right to develop those leases; consequently, it was dropped from detailed analysis. 43 CFR §3160.1-2 states, "the lessee shall have the right to use so much of the leased lands as is necessary to explore for, drill for, mine, extract, and dispose of all the leased resource in a leasehold . . ." The 43 CFR §3160 regulations also require lessees to attain maximum economic recovery of the leased resource. The regulations also require leaseholders to conduct their operations in a manner that prevents undue and unnecessary impact. It is not possible at the RMP stage or even at the leasing stage to determine whether a lease would actually be developed, and if it is, what well spacing or level of development would be necessary to achieve the requisite maximum economic recovery of the oil and gas resource. Well spacing can vary from development area to development area. Some well fields can be efficiently developed on 1 well per square mile where other fields may require up to 128 wells per square mile. The pace of development would vary significantly between these scenarios. Pace of development, including reduced or limited rates of development, would be more appropriately projected and analyzed in project/field specific NEPA documents.

Increases in seasonal restrictions for wildlife habitat protection would result in a slower development pace and are considered in Alternative 3.

ACEC Proposals Not Considered for ACEC Status

All decisions on ACEC proposals were based on the criteria found in Appendix 4. Refer to the *Evaluation of Relevance and Importance Criteria for Existing and Proposed ACECs* for details on all ACEC proposals. The identification of a potential ACEC does not, of itself, change or prevent change of the management or use of public lands.

BLM reviewed the following ACEC proposals per existing criteria and determined that they would be better managed on a planning area-wide basis through specific mitigation and management actions. In

some cases, more prescriptive mitigation would be appropriate. Management actions to protect the values described are included in the alternatives analyzed in detail.

Beaver Creek Expansion Area, Rock Creek Expansion Area, North Cottonwood Creek, South Cottonwood Creek

The Beaver Creek expansion area, including Trail Ridge, North Beaver, and South Beaver Creeks; the Rock Creek expansion area, including LaBarge Creek above the Rock Creek confluence; and the North and South Cottonwood Creek ACECs were proposed by cooperating agencies during the alternative development process. The proposal was intended to protect Colorado River cutthroat trout (CRCT) and their habitat. The planning area's only native trout species, CRCT, were once common in streams throughout the planning area and western Wyoming. These proposals met the relevance criteria for fish resources but did not meet the importance criteria to be considered as ACECs.

LaBarge Elk Winter Range

The LaBarge Elk Winter Range Area, which was proposed in scoping comments, was intended to limit the spread of disease in elk that winter on native range south of LaBarge Creek and as a control for the study of the spread of disease on elk feedgrounds in other parts of the planning area and elsewhere in western Wyoming. This proposal fails to meet the relevance and importance criteria (Appendix 4) to be considered as an ACEC. Management actions to protect elk winter range are included in the alternatives.

The Mesa

The Mesa area, approximately 340,000 acres, was proposed for ACEC consideration by cooperating agencies during the alternative formulation process. This area provides crucial winter range for a large population of mule deer and is the migration route to crucial winter ranges further south for pronghorn. The big game migrations that pass through this area twice annually are some of the largest and longest in the world. The Mesa provides lekking, nesting, and brood-rearing habitat for the greater sage-grouse. Western Wyoming encompasses the largest remaining populations and most intact habitat for the greater sage-grouse in the western United States. The Mesa meets the relevance criteria for fish and wildlife values but fails to meet the importance criteria for consideration for ACEC status (Appendix 4).

Miller Mountain

Miller Mountain was identified by the BLM planning team for ACEC consideration. The Miller Mountain area meets the relevance criteria for fish and wildlife resources, rare plants and plant communities, cultural resources in select locales within Miller Mountain and Fort Hill, and unstable soils prone to landslides. The area failed to meet the importance criteria. Its characteristics can be managed without ACEC status (Appendix 4).

Muddy Creek

The Muddy Creek area was identified by the BLM planning team as a potential ACEC. Although the area has a high density of archeological sites, it is not eligible for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP). The Muddy Creek area possesses unique riparian habitat, with a concentration of springs and a large area of subirrigated desert riparian habitat not typical in the planning area. The area also provides crucial elk winter range to one of two elk populations in the planning area that winter on native range; however, these elk have access to the Bench Corral feedground and are not dependent on this winter range. Muddy Creek was determined not to meet the relevance and importance criteria for ACEC establishment (Appendix 4) because similar habitats and values can be found in other areas of Wyoming and the West.

Wind River Front

The Wind River Front area (243,040 acres) was identified by the BLM planning team and was also proposed by cooperating agencies for ACEC consideration during the alternative formulation process. The area provides winter and transitional ranges and migration routes; contains migration bottlenecks for mule deer, pronghorn, elk, and moose; and has a lek, nesting, and brood-rearing habitat for greater sage-grouse. The big game migrations that pass through this area twice annually are some of the largest and longest in the world. A well-defined mule deer migration route follows the base of the Wind River Mountains from the upper Green River area to crucial winter range in the Big Sandy area of the Rock Springs Field Office. The Wind River Front area meets the relevance criteria for historic, geologic/geomorphic, recreational, fish and wildlife, and natural processes values but fails to meet the importance criteria for consideration for ACEC status (Appendix 4). The Wind River Front area is considered as a management area in Alternatives 3 and 4.

Wyoming Range Front

The Wyoming Range Front area was proposed for ACEC consideration by cooperating agencies during the alternative formulation process. The area provides transitional range for elk, mule deer, and pronghorn, as well as lek, nesting, and brood-rearing habitat for greater sage-grouse. The Wyoming Range Front area meets the relevance criteria for fish and wildlife values but fails to meet the importance criteria for consideration for ACEC status (Appendix 4). Management actions to protect resources in the Wyoming Range, as well as the remainder of the planning area, are included in the alternatives.

5 Miles Either Side of the Green River

A proposal to establish an ACEC within 5 miles either side of the Green River was received as a public comment on the draft EIS. A large portion of this area is part of the Upper Green River Special Recreation Management Area (SRMA) and was considered for ACEC status in Alternative 3. The proposal was unclear whether areas south of Warren Bridge should be included in the proposed ACEC. The planning team assessed resource values in the general area of the river. This area does not meet the importance criteria for ACEC establishment.

Boulder Lake

The Boulder Lake ACEC was proposed in public comments on the draft EIS. No boundary was proposed for the area. Values in the Boulder Lake area are being addressed with a Cultural Resource Management Plan and designation as a SRMA. The area does not meet the importance criteria for ACEC establishment.

Sage-Grouse Winter Concentration Areas

An ACEC in sage-grouse winter concentration areas was proposed in public comments on the draft EIS. Winter concentration areas are an important link in sage-grouse habitats for year-round survival. Some scientists feel that winter habitats might be a limiting factor in sage-grouse populations. Mapping of sage-grouse winter concentration areas is ongoing. Protections for sage-grouse winter concentration areas are provided in management actions, including seasonal restrictions and limits on surface disturbance in these areas.

Soap Holes

The Soap Holes contain a rare combination of hydrology, soils and geomorphology, leading to an area with sinkholes and quicksand-type areas that are hazardous to people and animals. The Soap Holes ACEC

was proposed in a public comment on the draft EIS. It is not necessary to establish an ACEC to provide appropriate management of the area. The Soap Holes area will be managed through OHV restrictions in subsequent travel management planning to limit public access to designated roads. Some areas could be seasonally closed due to poor road conditions and public hazard.

Tip Top Watershed

An ACEC in the Tip Top watershed was proposed in a public comment on the draft EIS. This is one of the few areas in the planning area containing Cretaceous limestone outcroppings with paleontological resource potential. Steep slopes and soils of the Wasatch formation make the area susceptible to slumping and landslides. Soil erosion that was occurring in the 1980s was addressed with site stabilization and reclamation. The Tip Top area fails to meet the importance criteria for establishment as an ACEC.

Critical Watersheds and Recharge Areas for the Towns of Big Piney, Marbleton, and LaBarge

A member of the public proposed establishing an ACEC to cover critical watersheds and recharge areas for the towns of Big Piney, Marbleton, and LaBarge. Groundwater recharge is important in maintaining aquifers and water availability for municipal and other uses. It would not be appropriate to protect only certain watersheds and groundwater recharge areas. Neither would it be appropriate to establish ACECs for protecting watersheds and groundwater recharge throughout the entire planning area. Watersheds and groundwater resources are protected in the RMP with surface management restrictions and development requirements, including use of surface casing, handling of hazardous materials, and other restrictions.

2.3 MANAGEMENT GUIDANCE COMMON TO ALL ALTERNATIVES

This section describes proposed management guidance that would apply to all alternatives. Management actions might not vary by alternative for several reasons. In some cases, the decisions from the existing RMP are still appropriate to meet the goals for management of the public lands, and were not raised as issues during the scoping process or analysis of the management situation. Where management actions from the existing RMP are meeting management goals without causing undue environmental impacts, alternatives to acceptable management actions or direction are unnecessary. Specific limitations on management of resources and land use programs also guided 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 (Section 1.4.2) to ensure that management actions in all alternatives comply with nondiscretionary laws and regulations. In some cases, these laws and regulations limit management options to either implementing or not implementing an action.

As conditions, law, and policy change over time or new data are collected, the RMP would be updated through maintenance actions or amendments, as appropriate, to ensure management decisions reflect those changes.

An implementation plan will be developed after approval of the ROD for this RMP. The implementation plan will address monitoring, mitigation, projects, and activities to achieve the goals and objectives of the RMP.

2.3.1 Air Quality Management

The State of Wyoming has primacy with regard to air quality. Adhering to Wyoming Department of Environmental Quality (WDEQ) standards is required by law. Air quality standards are maintained by the State of Wyoming, which determines the necessity of regulating emissions. When necessary, the state regulates emissions through its State Implementation Plan (SIP) for air quality by promulgating the appropriate rule.

BLM would cooperate with the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and the State of Wyoming and collaborate with the United States Forest Service (USFS) in monitoring for atmospheric deposition (acid rain) and its impacts on the Class I airsheds of the Bridger and Fitzpatrick Wilderness Areas.

BLM would collaborate in the operation of the National Atmospheric Deposition Program (NADP)/National Trends Network acid rain monitoring site. Data collected from the NADP/National Trends Monitoring site would be used to determine actual or potential impacts from air pollutant emissions and to provide information on proposed emission sources.

BLM would cooperate in the collection of basic climate and meteorological data from remote automatic weather stations.

Special requirements to alleviate air quality impacts would be included on a case-by-case basis in use authorizations (including lease stipulations) within the scope of BLM's authority.

In all cases, however, BLM would take those actions necessary to ensure that violation of the Clean Air Act does not occur.

2.3.2 Cultural Resources Management

Sites and trails would be allocated to uses based on their natural and relative preservation value. The allocation process would include collaborating with state and local governments and government-to-government consultation with Native American tribes, where appropriate.

Potential effects on cultural resources would be managed, to the extent possible, through avoidance and confidentiality of location (Appendix 1). Where avoidance is not feasible or prudent, mitigation through data recovery, monitoring, or other data collection would be required. Before allowing for or permitting any surface disturbing activities, the appropriate level of cultural resource inventory would be performed to identify presence of cultural resources. Should a significant (NRHP eligible) cultural property is discovered, the area would be avoided if possible. Where avoidance is not possible, data recovery activities would be pursued as necessary.

Sites or locales considered sacred, sensitive, or of interest to modern Native Americans would be identified. If actions were proposed that would impact these properties or Native American use of them, consultation with affected tribal interests would occur. The input received from affected tribal groups would be considered before any irretrievable or irrevocable decisions are made.

Programmatic agreements (PA) for managing cultural resources, such as the Lander Trail PA and the Jonah PA, would continue to apply. As per the NHPA (in Section 106), BLM would consider the potential effects of agency actions on properties listed on or eligible for the NRHP.

BLM, in consultation with the State Historic Preservation Officer and other Historic Trail partners, would identify contributing segments of national historic trails that are appropriate for preservation of their historic values, including setting. Appropriateness would be determined by factors such as existing intrusions to setting, landownership along the contributing segment, other resource values present, and any factors that would constrain BLM's ability to manage a segment of National Historic Trail for preservation. The State Protocol would be modified by an addendum describing the agreed-upon process and mitigation measures.

2.3.3 Forestry

The guidance of the Healthy Forests Restoration Act of 2003 (HFRA) would be followed for all old growth stands (Appendix 6), improvement and treatment of forest stands, and collaboration with local governments for fire suppression as identified by the Act. All forest and woodland stands would be analyzed for old growth characteristics prior to entry. Stands meeting old growth standards for their vegetation type would be managed to maintain and/or restore old growth characteristics of pre-suppression composition, structure, and function on a landscape scale.

Public demand sales for firewood, Christmas trees, posts and poles, and other forest products would continue. The actual number of permits issued and estimated volumes would vary yearly based on public demand, which is increasing as the population of the area grows, but would not exceed the capability of the resource to maintain healthy forests and sustained yield. Should demand exceed historical use levels, a NEPA analysis would be prepared to analyze impacts to other resources.

All SRMAs, ACECs, and wilderness study areas (WSA) would be unavailable for commercial or personal use forest products removal (incidental use as defined by 43 CFR, Subpart 5400, Section 5400.0-5 is excepted). The only forest/woodland treatments allowed would be to reduce fire or safety hazards in designated campgrounds or to address serious forest health issues in accordance with management direction.

2.3.4 Lands and Realty Management

Withdrawals

Public lands within active livestock driveways that serve their designated purpose would continue to be segregated from all forms of disposal under the public land laws. Withdrawals for stock driveways that are not serving their designated purpose would be terminated. Mineral location on stock driveways would be processed under 43 CFR §3815.

Existing land withdrawals currently encumbering public lands would be reviewed to determine the need for continuation, modification, revocation, or termination of the withdrawals. Unneeded withdrawals would not be continued. These include power site, oil shale, and other miscellaneous withdrawals.

Rights of Way

Areas not identified as avoidance, exclusion, or restriction areas would be open to rights of way (ROW).

ROW facilities would not be placed adjacent to each other if issues with safety or incompatibility are identified. All utilities would be placed so as to meet reliability and safety standards.

ROWs would be issued for the minimum size necessary to complete the intended use and would be clustered or corridored as much as possible.

ROW activities that would typically require an exception during seasonal closure periods would be road construction or improvement, and pipeline, powerline, and communication site construction. Activities that would be permissible during seasonal closure periods without requiring an exception would include daily operations, emergency, or nonstandard maintenance. These activities would be permissible if operations are confined to an existing ROW, require no longer than 72 hours to complete, are conducted during daylight hours only, and involve no new surface disturbance.

Classification of Lands for Disposal

Lands identified for disposal under Sections 203 and 206 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (FLPMA) and identified as such in this plan are hereby classified for disposal under Section 7 of the Taylor Gazing Act of 1934, as amended (43 USC 315f) under Executive Order (EO) 6910 and under 43 CFR §2400.

2.3.5 Livestock Grazing Management

The Wyoming Standards for Rangeland Health would apply to all resource management decisions and activities, and Guidelines for Livestock Grazing Management would apply to all livestock grazing activities on public lands. BLM would consult, cooperate, and coordinate with operators and interested members of the public to determine the most appropriate guidelines to implement.

Grazing Preference. Forage would be made available for livestock grazing use.

Stock Trails. Adequate stock trails would be maintained to support livestock trailing needs.

Allotment Management Plans and Categorization. All allotments are currently categorized. As resource conditions change, and following consultation with the affected parties, an allotment could

change from one category to another. Current allotment categorization is 40 I allotments, 147 M allotments, and 26 C allotments.

Combining and Splitting Allotments. Any combining or splitting of allotments to meet management objectives would be consistent with RMP direction. Such actions would include consultation and coordination with the affected parties.

Rangeland Monitoring and Evaluation. Monitoring of the range and the vegetation resource would be conducted at a level sufficient to detect changes in grazing use, trend, and range conditions. Monitoring would be tied to land health standards and indicators that help determine change in status and progress toward meeting objectives. Data would be used to direct and support grazing management decisions consistent with national policy.

Conversions in Kind. Conversions from one type of livestock to another would be evaluated on a case-by-case basis, including an environmental analysis, and would be authorized in conformance with the goals and objectives of the RMP.

2.3.6 Minerals Management

Mineral resources include fluid and solid minerals leased for development under the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920 and amendments, locatable minerals that may be claimed and patented under the 1872 Mining Law, and common variety mineral materials that may be purchased by private parties or used for free by public agencies and nonprofit groups under the Materials Act of 1947 (as amended). The preceding laws only apply to federal minerals and are not intended to suggest or give BLM jurisdiction over state- or privately-owned minerals. Drilling proposals are initiated by oil and gas leaseholders. Parcels are nominated for leasing by oil and gas companies, not by BLM or other agencies.

Leasable Minerals

Oil and Gas. Existing oil and gas or other mineral lease rights would be honored. When an oil and gas lease is issued, it constitutes a valid existing right; BLM cannot unilaterally change the terms and conditions of the lease. Existing leases would not be affected by new closures and/or areas administratively unavailable for lease, and restrictions could not be added to existing leases. Surface use and timing restrictions resulting from this RMP cannot be applied to existing leases. Existing leases would not be terminated until the lease expires. However, based on site- or project-specific environmental analysis, conditions of approval (COA) could be applied at the APD and Sundry Notice stage, and at subsequent development stages, to mitigate potential impacts from oil and gas operations within existing lease areas, providing the leaseholder's right to develop the lease remains intact.

Nondiscretionary closures to oil and gas leasing, exploration, and development would apply to incorporated municipalities and WSAs. As provided by regulation, existing pre-FLPMA oil and gas leases are exempt from this restriction.

BLM-permitted actions on split estate lands would be subject to the same stipulations as leased federal mineral estate on federal surface lands (Appendix 7) provided the stipulations do not adversely affect the surface owner's land use or actions. Exceptions to surface development restrictions could be granted if requested or agreed to by the surface owner.

The oil and gas resource inventory data of the Energy Policy Conservation Act (EPCA) is integrated into the Reasonably Foreseeable Development (RFD) scenario, prepared by BLM's Wyoming State Office Reservoir Management Group (RMG). The RFD predicts future mineral development within the planning

area. The RFD is a projection of the number of wells and well pads that could potentially be developed under the various alternatives. It is included in the RMP EIS for analysis purposes and is not a cap on the number of wells that would ultimately be developed. The actual number of wells could exceed the RFD if the associated surface disturbance and impacts to other resources did not exceed the analysis thresholds.

In compliance with EPCA, restrictions and impediments to mineral resource development have been analyzed throughout the planning process with the intent to:

1. Clearly present mitigation requirements necessary to reduce impacts of oil and gas operations on other resources.

2. Ensure that such mitigation is either statutorily required or scientifically justifiable and is the least restrictive measure necessary to accomplish the desired level of resource protection. The mitigation requirements will be monitored to determine whether more or less restrictive measures may be required to accomplish the same goal.

3. Provide means for evaluating and processing exceptions, modifications, and/or waivers to lease stipulations and COA attached to post-leasing authorizations, such as APDs and Sundry Notices. Modifications would be processed when there is a need for a fundamental change to the provisions of a lease stipulation or COA, either temporarily or for the term of the lease or use authorization. For example, a seasonal use restriction prohibits activity in October, but the protected resource period has shifted to August. Waivers (permanent exemption from the lease stipulation) would be processed when the condition warranting the stipulation or COA no longer exists anywhere within the leasehold or within the area of authorization for a COA. For example, an elk feedground is protected by a no surface occupancy (NSO) stipulation, but elk no longer come to that feedground. Modifications and waivers to lease stipulations may require RMP maintenance or an RMP amendment. An exception is a case-by-case, site-specific exemption from a lease stipulation or COA. See Appendix 8 for a discussion of the exception process.

4. Onshore Order No. 1 and 43 CFR §3162 3-2 (a) (b) & (c) provide for subsequent well operations and when filing of a Sundry Notice (BLM form 3150-6) is required. 43 CFR §3161.2 directs the BLM to ensure that "all operations are conducted in a manner which protects other natural resources and the environmental quality." 43 CFR §3162.2 (a) and §3162.5 require operators to "conduct all operations in a manner which protects other natural resources and the environmental quality." Consistent with the regulatory requirement to protect other natural resources, the following actions would be permissible during seasonal closure periods without requiring an exception: (1) daily production operations, including pumper visit and pumper maintenance actions; (2) road maintenance and snow removal; (3) remedial workover operations immediately essential to maintaining well production; (4) workover, well logging, and operations that do not alter the well bore or casing providing the operations would be conducted during daylight hours and would not take more than 3 work days to complete; and (5) regularly required production facility and pipeline maintenance (e.g., monthly, every 2 months, every 3 months) providing the operations would be conducted during daylight hours and would not take more than 3 workdays to complete. These activities would be restricted to existing well pads, access roads and/or pipeline ROWs, and involve no new surface disturbance.

5. Evaluate the impacts of the COA and other mitigation on the economics of energy development and the access to domestic sources of energy to ensure that they are the minimum necessary.

Clarifying changes could be made in the future to the wording of oil and gas lease stipulations as long as there is no substantial change to the protection provided by mitigation and the clarification does not place additional restrictions on the leaseholder.

Locatable Minerals

According to 43 CFR §3809.11 and §3809.21, only exploration activities of 5 acres or less would be allowed with only a notice. Exploration over 5 acres, all activities in ACECs regardless of acreage, and all mining operations regardless of acreage would require approved Plans of Operation.

Salable Minerals

Regular field monitoring of salable mineral permit areas would occur to ensure permit compliance.

Oil Shale

All decisions related to oil shale leasing in this RMP are being deferred to the forthcoming Programmatic EIS (PEIS) on Oil Shale and Tar Sands Leasing being prepared by BLM (project website: ostseis.anl.gov). The ROD on the final PEIS will amend this RMP by making decisions on whether to allow leasing and future development of oil shale on public lands where the resource is present. Additional opportunities for public comment have occurred throughout the PEIS process. The public comment period for the draft PEIS was open through April 21, 2008.

2.3.7 Paleontology and Natural History

Paleontological sites would be protected by using surface and subsurface protection stipulations and discretionary management authority. Any actions to close or restrict areas for fossil protection would be evaluated on a case-by-case basis. Permits are required for collecting all vertebrate fossils, tracks, and traces, and any invertebrate and plant fossils that are determined to be significant.

2.3.8 Recreation and Visitor Services Management

Recreation facilities would be developed, where needed, to accommodate anticipated recreation uses and use levels and to provide for adequate public health and safety and resource protection according to subsequent SRMA activity plans.

The order of priority for recreation management would be (1) congressionally designated areas; (2) major rivers and lakes where BLM has clear jurisdiction; (3) areas with outstanding recreation resource values not already provided in the area; and (4) areas where the recreation capacity is regularly exceeded, threatening other important resource values.

A temporary, no overnight camping stipulation could be imposed anywhere in the planning area in an emergency.

Where applicable, recreation facilities development and management would maintain or improve riparian values.

Recreational use would be directed through the use of signs and publications to address trespass issues. BLM would work cooperatively with private property owners to sign common boundaries.

Commercial, competitive, or organized group activity or event special recreation permits (SRP) would not be authorized for prairie dog hunts, contests, derbies, or other organized prairie dog hunting events.

BLM would enter into partnerships with interested parties to further the goals of the recreation and visitor services program.

2.3.9 Vegetation Management

Endangered, Threatened, Proposed, and Candidate Species. The appropriate type and level of Endangered Species Act (ESA) Section 7 consultation with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) would occur for agency actions that may affect endangered, threatened, and proposed species or their designated or proposed critical habitat. USFWS technical advice would be sought on candidate species. The Statewide Programmatic Biological Assessments and Biological Opinions for each species, including reasonable and prudent measures and terms and conditions, would be implemented. Surveys for endangered, threatened, proposed, and candidate species on BLM-administered public lands and mineral estate would occur before any federally authorized project or activity is approved. If threatened and endangered (T&E) or proposed species or their habitats are found in the area, consultation with the USFWS would be initiated, and activities would be curtailed until concurrence is reached between BLM, USFWS, and the operator on what activities can be authorized under what terms and conditions.

Federal oil and gas leases or other areas could now, or hereafter, contain plants, animals, or their habitats determined to be threatened, endangered, or proposed or candidates for listing as threatened or endangered. The BLM would recommend modifications to exploration and development proposals to change BLM-approved activities that contribute to the need to list a species or its habitat. The BLM could require modifications to or disapprove a proposed activity that is likely to result in jeopardy to the continued existence of a proposed or listed threatened or endangered species or that results in the destruction or adverse modification of a designated or proposed critical habitat. The BLM would not approve any activity (ground-disturbing or otherwise) that may affect any such species or critical habitat until it completes its obligations under applicable requirements of the ESA as amended, 16 USC §1531 et seq., including completing any required procedure for conference or consultation.

BLM would comply with the terms of the biological assessments and biological opinions for management of threatened, endangered, proposed, and candidate species.

Deviation from the restrictions listed in this section for any listed species would require additional site-specific consultation with the USFWS.

2.3.10 Visual Resources Management

Projects of all types within established visual resource management (VRM) class areas would be required to conform to the objectives and characteristics of the VRM classification.

BLM would work with project applicants to minimize project visual contrast regardless of VRM class.

2.3.11 Watershed and Water Quality (Surface Water and Groundwater) Management

The State of Wyoming has primacy with regard to water quality. Adhering to WDEQ standards is required by law. Water quality standards, enforcement, and remediation are the primacy of and administered by the State of Wyoming.

All actions would comply with EO 11988, Floodplain Management, and EO 11990, Protection of Wetlands, and the WDEQ water quality standards, applicable regulations, and permitting requirements, including stormwater and other Wyoming Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (WYPDES) permits. BLM actions and authorizations would conform to WDEQ requirements. In all cases, however, BLM would take those actions necessary to ensure that violation of the Clean Water Act does not occur.

Consistent with WDEQ and EPA requirements, Hazardous Spill Response Plans would be required for all projects involving hazardous materials. Spills and releases of chemicals, petroleum products, and produced water would be reported to WDEQ.

Water injection wells for the disposal of produced water would be permitted on a case-by-case basis.

Class 1 waters of the state would be protected under state antidegradation regulations.

2.3.12 Wild Horses Management

Management actions were implemented in the 1988 Pinedale RMP to resolve conflicts for water and forage between wild horses and other consumptive users. The decision was made to not manage the Desert and LaBarge herd areas (HA) as herd management areas (HMA). These wild horse HAs (Map 2-5) would not be used by wild horses but would be retained in accordance with the Wild Free-Roaming Horse and Burro Act of 1971.

Consistent with the consent decree in *State of Wyoming* v. *Department of the Interior*, removal of horses that reenter the Desert and LaBarge HAs would be conducted.

2.3.13 Wildland Fire and Fuels Management

Fire and fuels management actions would comply with Wyoming Air Quality State Regulations Chapter 10, Smoke Management requirements.

The 2004 Southwestern Wyoming BLM Fire Plan would support and implement the wildland fire and fuels management objectives of this plan.

2.3.14 Wildlife and Fish Habitat Management

Special Status Species Management

The purpose of BLM Manual 6840, Special Status Species Management, is to provide policy and guidance, consistent with appropriate laws, for the conservation of Special Status Species of plants and animals, and the ecosystem upon which they depend. These species are proposed for listing, officially listed as threatened or endangered, or are candidates for listing as threatened or endangered under the provisions of the ESA; those listed by a state in a category such as threatened or endangered implying potential endangerment or extinction; and those designated by each State Director as sensitive. Conservation of Special Status Species means using all methods and procedures that are necessary to improve the condition of Special Status Species and their habitats to a point where their special status recognition is no longer warranted. The objectives of the Special Status Species policy are to (A) conserve listed species and the ecosystems on which they depend and (B) ensure that actions requiring BLM authorization or approval are consistent with the conservation needs of Special Status Species and do not contribute to the need to list any Special Status Species, either under provisions of the ESA or other provisions of this policy.

Endangered, Threatened, Proposed, and Candidate Species. The appropriate type and level of ESA Section 7 consultation with the USFWS would occur for agency actions that may affect endangered, threatened, and proposed species or their designated or proposed critical habitat (Appendix 9). USFWS technical advice would be sought on candidate species.. The Statewide Programmatic Biological Assessments and Biological Opinions for each species, including reasonable and prudent measures and

terms and conditions, would be implemented. Surveys for endangered, threatened, proposed, and candidate species on BLM-administered public lands and mineral estate would occur before any federally authorized project or activity is approved. If T&E or proposed species or their habitat are found in the area, consultation with the USFWS would be initiated, and activities would be curtailed until concurrence is reached between BLM, USFWS, and the operator on what activities can be authorized.

Federal oil and gas leases or other areas could now, or hereafter, contain plants, animals, or their habitats determined to be threatened, endangered, or proposed, or candidates for listing as threatened or endangered. The BLM would recommend modifications to exploration and development proposals to change BLM-approved activities that contribute to the need to list a species or its habitat. The BLM could require modifications to or disapprove a proposed activity that is likely to result in jeopardy to the continued existence of a proposed or listed threatened or endangered species or result in the destruction or adverse modification of a designated or proposed critical habitat. The BLM would not approve any activity (ground-disturbing or otherwise) that may affect any such species or critical habitat until it completes its obligations under applicable requirements of the ESA as amended, 16 USC 1531 et seq., including completion of any required procedure for conference or consultation.

BLM would comply with the terms of the biological assessments and biological opinions for management of threatened, endangered, proposed, and candidate species.

Deviation from the restrictions listed in this section for any listed species would require additional site-specific consultation with the USFWS.

2.3.15 Special Designations and Management Areas

SRMAs are discussed under the Recreation and Visitor Services sections.

Management plans would be written for all ACECs as needed.

Wilderness Study Areas

The Lake Mountain (13,490 acres) and Scab Creek (7,710 acres) WSAs would be retained. WSAs would be managed under the "Interim Management Policy and Guidelines for Lands under Wilderness Review" (United States Department of Interior [USDI] 1995). Congressional decisions on the Lake Mountain and Scab Creek WSAs would be incorporated into the Pinedale RMP when made. In accordance with the Interim Management Policy, WSAs would be closed to mineral leasing.

Discretionary uses within or adjacent to WSAs would be reviewed to ensure they do not create conflicts with management and preservation of wilderness values.

The Scab Creek WSA would be closed to OHV use.

If necessary, in the course of incorporating Congress' wilderness designation decisions into the RMP, the RMP would be amended.

2.3.16 Offsite Mitigation

Offsite mitigation proposed by oil and gas or other operators could be considered and analyzed in future environmental documents as possible mitigation for proposed activities within the planning area. Proposed offsite mitigation would be described and analyzed for effectiveness in detail on a project-specific basis. Planning for offsite mitigation would be performed in coordination with local government

agencies. The need for offsite mitigation will be determined in conformance with current BLM policy, as updated.

An example of an instance where offsite mitigation could be used would be oil and gas field developments where offsite mitigation activities to address loss of habitat effectiveness would help BLM achieve the goals and objectives of the applicable RMP, given the impacts to wildlife habitats at the site of development and the anticipated effects of reclamation, best management practices (BMP), and onsite mitigation measures. Offsite mitigation could also include the implementation of mitigation measures for socioeconomic impacts, or impacts to livestock grazing permittees due to industrial development of grazing allotments.

The order of use of mitigation methods from most to least preferred would be as follows:

- Onsite mitigation directly resolving impacts created by the action
- Offsite mitigation to the resources affected by the action that cannot be resolved onsite
- Offsite mitigation to similar or related resources affected by the action that cannot be resolved onsite.

The following stipulations would apply to offsite mitigation measures:

- Offsite mitigation would be used as a last choice when developing mitigation measures.
- Offsite mitigation proposals would describe the replacement or substitution activities or methods that would be used to address potential impacts to specific resources or environments or both.
- Offsite mitigation must be as close to "in-kind" in replacement or substitution of resources, habitat function, or environments as practicable (e.g., elk habitat for elk habitat, historical properties for historical properties).
- Offsite mitigation practices must last as long as the impacts are expected to occur.
- Offsite mitigation practices are to be developed, conducted, or performed, and funded by the project proponent.
- Offsite mitigation activities must be conducted subject to BLM review and approval that the mitigation will actually address the impacts occurring on the public lands.

The priority order for mitigating resource impacts onsite or offsite will be—

- Onsite Mitigation – Onsite (avoid, minimize, rectify, or reduce in time)
- Offsite Mitigation – Local (unless greater resource benefits can be achieved through Regional or Interstate mitigation)
- Offsite Mitigation – Regional (unless greater resource benefits can be achieved through Interstate mitigation)
- Offsite Mitigation – Interstate
- The preferred area for conducting offsite mitigation would be as near (local offsite mitigation) to the project or impacted area as possible or as scientific information and impact analysis suggests.

2.3.17 Monitoring and Evaluation Plan and Activity Plan Working Groups

Management actions identified for the Pinedale RMP planning area are based on studies and the best scientific information currently available. However, conditions could change during the life of the RMP. Implemented management actions could be improved as new technology and new information become available. It is also possible that changes in land use would require a different management action to protect the resources. To address changing conditions and provide management flexibility that uses BMPs, PFO would use a monitoring and evaluation strategy.

A monitoring and evaluation strategy would apply to all activities that occur throughout the planning area. Reasons for adopting a monitoring and evaluation strategy approach to decisionmaking include (1) enhancing the ability to achieve plan goals; (2) getting the most out of the NEPA/planning process; (3) providing plan flexibility; and (4) validating impact predictions, ensuring mitigation is effective, and being able to adapt for unintended consequences. Monitoring and evaluation management policies and procedures should enhance the ability to achieve management goals.

This process measures the effectiveness of existing actions through monitoring and application of new scientific research. It analyzes current resource conditions resulting from implemented actions and identifies and recommends alternatives or modified actions as necessary to reach established goals. This process provides the optimum means to check the effectiveness of management actions. Because the capability to conduct the process at the optimum level can vary from year to year, monitoring would be prioritized**.** Appendix 11 presents a description of the monitoring and evaluation strategy to be implemented.

Activity Plan Working Groups

RMP decisions establish goals, objectives, and management actions for activities on public lands. Standards or BMPs are identified in land use plans. Activity-level actions include implementation 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 analyze the need to modify existing decisions and practices in light of proposed or projected resource use or activity.

Activity Plan Working Groups (APWG) consisting of local, state, and federal governments would be formed when circumstances dictate. APWGs would be formed only for new projects. Cooperating agencies in these working groups would assist BLM in preparing environmental analyses for activity-level actions or modifications to current plans. BLM or potential cooperating agencies could 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 land use plan.

Chapter 4 of the Pinedale RMP EIS 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 socioeconomic impacts associated with the site-specific action being analyzed.

BLM PFO 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.

The objectives of APWGs would include—

- Minimizing analysis and decisionmaking controversy by being proactive rather than reactive to public land use and resource conflicts
- Providing effective and cost-efficient, collaboratively based mitigation of resource conflicts
- Improving resource conditions by recommending practices and mitigation measures appropriate to special situations
- Streamlining public land authorizations, increasing implementation flexibility, and notifying public land users of required practices.

BLM would meet with potential cooperating agencies before scoping for major activity plans or RMP amendments to establish the level and extent of the APWGs' activity. Examples would include—

- OHV use escalating to a significant issue
- Impact level approaching that documented in the impact analyses made from reasonably 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
- Identification of the need to prepare a recreation area management plan (RAMP)
- A need to prepare a wildlife habitat management plan and habitat mitigation plan
- Formulation of a travel management plan
- Resolution of resource use conflicts, such as for livestock grazing and other uses.

Examples of resource locations or management situations where activity or use could trigger working group formation include—

- Instances where crucial or important wildlife habitats overlap areas of high potential for surface disturbance. For example, where crucial deer winter range or other important habitats and high intensity oil and gas development areas overlap.
- Wildland urban interfaces (WUI).
- Instances where two or more resources of interest to cooperating agencies are in conflict. For example, significant surface disturbance in identified habitats for T&E or State Sensitive Species or livestock grazing allotment.

When an APWG is convened, objectives for the first meeting would include—

- Establishing working group membership and organization. Existing examples that may be used include the Continental Divide/Wamsutter II Wildlife Protection Plan (ROD, page 15, and

Appendix D, May 2000) or the Powder River Basin Interagency Work Groups (ROD, page 11, April 2003).

- Identifying issues, practices, and management actions the working group will address.
- Establishing mechanisms and processes for communicating recommendations to the BLM.
- Identifying public involvement and notification needs associated with working group activities.

Other attributes and functions of APWGs would include—

- APWGs will be specific to the activity plan.
- APWGs will provide suggestions and recommendations for studies and development of monitoring protocols to evaluate mitigation, reclamation, and habitat management practices to the BLM. Examples of these topics would include offsite mitigation and a mitigation account, in addition to specific practices.
- APWGs will serve in an advisory capacity only. BLM cannot relinquish its decisionmaking authority or responsibility.

2.3.18 Requirements for Further Environmental Analysis

This EIS is a programmatic statement describing the impacts of implementing the proposed land use plan decisions and associated management actions described for the planning area.

Land use plan decisions that are implemented upon approval of the RMP do not require any further environmental analysis or documentation until modified through an RMP amendment or revision. Whenever implementation level plans (e.g., ACEC Management Plans) are prepared, additional environmental analysis and documentation would be required. Individual management actions or projects requiring additional site-specific project planning, as funding becomes available, would require further environmental analysis.

Site-specific environmental analyses and documentation (including the use of categorical exclusions and determinations of NEPA adequacy where appropriate) may be prepared for one or more individual projects in accordance with management objectives and decisions established in the approved land use plan. In addition, BLM would ensure that the environmental review process includes evaluation of all critical elements, including cultural resources and threatened and endangered species, and completes required USFWS Section 7 consultations and coordination with the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) in accordance with the BLM Cultural Resources National Programmatic Agreement and Wyoming BLM-SHPO protocols.

Interdisciplinary impact analysis will be based on this EIS and other applicable EISs. If the analysis prepared for site-specific projects finds potential for significant impacts not already described in an existing EIS, another EIS or a supplement to an existing EIS may be warranted.

Upon providing public notice of a decision, supporting environmental documentation would be sent to all affected interests and made available to other publics on request. Decisions to approve implementation-level plans or to implement site-specific projects are subject to administrative review at the time such decisions are made.

The BLM would require project-specific analysis of environmental impacts associated with future energy development projects.

2.4 SUMMARIES OF THE ALTERNATIVES

2.4.1 Alternative 1, Continuation of Existing Management

Alternative 1 maintains the current management goals, objectives, and direction, as specified in the 1988 Pinedale RMP ROD.

Minerals

Alternative 1 would make available approximately 1,026,780 acres for oil and gas leasing and development (Table 2-32 shows the number of acres of BLM mineral estate that is subject to leasing restrictions for conventional oil and gas exploration and development. The acreage values provided in the table are organized by the type and level of restriction and mineral potential.

Table 2-32, p. 2-169). No areas would be administratively unavailable for oil and gas leasing for protection of wildlife habitats. Timing and distance mitigation would be applied to protect sage-grouse (Map 2-6), raptors, and big game and their habitats. Additionally, 14,540 acres would be proposed for withdrawal from locatable mineral entry and land disposal.

Other Resources

The current permitted animal unit months (AUM) for livestock grazing (107,907 AUMs) would be maintained unless monitoring indicates a need for adjustment. The Desert General Use area (237,360 acres) would be open to OHV use without restrictions. The Upper Green River, Boulder Lake, and Scab Creek SRMAs would be retained. No coordinated, area-wide transportation planning would be conducted. Access across private lands would be pursued, as needed, through a variety of methods, including but not limited to the purchase of ROW or easements, land exchange, reciprocal ROW, and other statutory authorities.

Under Alternative 1, approximately 641,140 acres would be managed as VRM Class IV; 187,070 acres would be managed as VRM Class III; 73,430 acres would be managed as VRM Class II; and 21,290 acres would be managed as VRM Class I. Management actions would emphasize the reduction of soil erosion and sediment and salinity contributions to the Green River Basin water system. An activity plan for reducing erosion and channel degradation would be prepared for the Tip Top watershed. A watershed/recreation plan would be prepared for the Stewart Point-Mount Airy area to reduce sedimentation while still allowing OHV use. T&E species and their habitats would be protected. Actions determined to degrade habitats to a point of jeopardizing the continued existence of a T&E species would not be allowed. Mule deer, elk, pronghorn, and sage-grouse use patterns would be monitored. High priority would be given to improving wildlife habitat through vegetation manipulation.

Surface disturbance restrictions included in the 1988 RMP ROD for protecting cultural, visual, vegetation, wildlife, soils, and other resources would continue to be implemented. Examples are restrictions on development on steep slopes, protections for significant cultural sites, and restrictions on disturbance on or near sage-grouse and raptor nesting areas.

Special Designations and Management Areas

The Rock Creek and Beaver Creek ACECs (8,860 acres) would be retained under their current management.

The Lake Mountain (13,490 acres) and Scab Creek (7,710 acres) WSAs would be retained. WSAs would be managed under the "Interim Management Policy and Guidelines for Lands under Wilderness Review" (USDI 1995).

2.4.2 Alternative 2

Alternative 2 is designed to evaluate the impacts of maximizing the production of oil and gas resources while providing an adequate level of environmental protection for other resources. Objectives and standards would provide the minimum protection for all natural resources from impacts of oil and gas activities. Appendix 3 presents the mitigation guidelines and standards that provide requirements, consultation, guidance, and limitations on all aspects of oil and gas related activities.

Minerals

Alternative 2 would make available approximately 1,177,530 acres for oil and gas leasing and development Table 2-32, p. 2-169). The entire planning area would be open to oil and gas leasing and development except for WSAs (21,200 acres) and the Trapper's Point ACEC (550 acres). The planning area would be divided into three areas for management of oil and gas leasing and development (Map 2-7). Intensively Developed Fields would be managed for intensive oil and gas activities while protecting wildlife habitats to the extent practicable. Traditional Leasing Areas would be managed for protection of important values during oil and gas exploration, but would provide opportunity for oil and gas development activities. Unavailable Areas would be managed for protection of wildlife habitats through indefinitely postponing the availability of lands for oil and gas leasing. The planning area would be open to geophysical exploration and operations except where prohibited by law. Specific timing and distance mitigation would be applied for wildlife habitat protection only to the extent required by law (for example, for T&E species protection) (Appendix 12). Transportation planning would facilitate and designate access to the public lands. Sensitive aquatic species habitats would be maintained.

Other Resources

In Alternative 2, the integrity of the visual setting of national historic trails would be protected by prohibiting surface occupancy within one-quarter mile of the trails. Permitted AUMs for livestock grazing would be increased from 107,907 to 157,308 by activating suspended nonuse AUMs (Table A20-1). Alternative 2 would limit OHV use in the Desert General Use area to existing roads and trails. No RAMPs would be completed and no new SRMAs would be established in this alternative. Vegetation would be managed to support wildlife habitat and livestock grazing needs, control soil erosion and provide riparian stability, control noxious weeds, and protect Special Status Species. Under Alternative 2, the number of acres in VRM Class IV would be increased to 717,390 acres; the number of acres in Class II would be increased to 87,150; and the area in Class III would be reduced to 118,390 acres. There would be no VRM Class I areas. Discharge of produced waters to streams or other non-isolated surface features would be allowed if permitted by the WDEQ. Alternative energy development proposals would be considered on a case-by-case basis and would be permitted throughout the planning area except in WSAs and where prohibited by law.

Special Designations and Management Areas

The Rock Creek and Beaver Creek ACECs would be eliminated. A new ACEC would be designated in the Trapper's Point area (550 acres).

The Lake Mountain (13,490 acres) and Scab Creek (7,710 acres) WSAs would be retained. WSAs would be managed under the "Interim Management Policy and Guidelines for Lands under Wilderness Review" (USDI 1995).

2.4.3 Alternative 3

Alternative 3 is designed to analyze the impacts of providing the maximum level of environmental protection for surface resources while allowing for the production of oil and gas. Management actions, mitigation guidelines, and standards would provide the highest level of protection for all natural resources from impacts of oil and gas activities. Appendix 3 presents the mitigation guidelines and standards that provide requirements, consultation, guidance, and limitations on all aspects of oil and gas related activities. In addition, land allocations and areas unavailable for oil and gas leasing would be implemented.

Additional goals of Alternative 3 are to protect and sustain resources and land uses, such as livestock grazing and recreation, in the planning area. To meet these additional goals, BLM would implement objectives and management actions that include restrictions and protective mitigation for each resource and land use. Special designations and management areas (SD/MA) would be emphasized under Alternative 3.

Minerals

Alternative 3 would make available approximately 476,080 acres for oil and gas leasing and development (Table 2-32 shows the number of acres of BLM mineral estate that is subject to leasing restrictions for conventional oil and gas exploration and development. The acreage values provided in the table are organized by the type and level of restriction and mineral potential.

Table 2-32, p. 2-169). The planning area would be divided into three areas for management of oil and gas leasing and development (Map 2-8). Intensively Developed Fields would be managed for intensive oil and gas activities while protecting wildlife habitats to the extent practicable. Traditional Leasing Areas would be managed for protection of important values during oil and gas exploration, but would provide opportunity for oil and gas development activities. Unavailable Areas would be managed for protection of wildlife habitats through indefinitely postponing the availability of lands for oil and gas leasing. NSO would be allowed on big game crucial winter ranges (227,980 acres), migration routes and bottlenecks (32,170 acres), and parturition areas (35,360 acres) unless other restrictions are applied through ACEC or other SD/MAs. Timing and distance mitigations would be applied to protect sage-grouse, raptors, big game, and their habitats. Transportation planning would be required in all areas to reduce road density, duplication of routes, and unnecessary routes. Sensitive aquatic species habitats would be maintained or improved. Furthermore, 65,750 acres (New Fork Potholes, Trapper's Point, Upper Green River, and CCC Ponds ACECs; Boulder Lake and Scab Creek SRMAs; East Fork River Unit Wild and Scenic Rivers (WSR); the Upper Green big game migration bottleneck; the Sublette Cutoff historical trail; and several sensitive cultural sites) would be withdrawn from locatable mineral entry and land disposal.

Other Resources

The integrity of the visual setting of national historic trails would be protected from surface disturbing activities by relocating or redesigning projects within 3 miles from either side of the trail to conform to a VRM Class II designation. Alternative 3 would provide for prescribed and natural wildfire management to emulate historic natural fire regimes. Permitted use for livestock grazing would be reduced to 84,000 AUMs. OHV use in the Desert General Use area would be limited to existing roads and trails. BLM would complete RAMPs, and an array of outdoor recreation activities, settings, and experiences on public

lands for local residents and visitors would be provided. The Green and New Fork Rivers SRMA would be established. Vegetation would be managed to support wildlife habitat and livestock grazing needs, control soil erosion, provide riparian stability, control noxious weeds, and protect Special Status Species. The number of acres in VRM Class IV would be reduced to 282,300; the number of acres in Class III would be increased to 225,830 acres; and the area in Class II would be increased to 393,260 acres. Alternative 3 would limit soil erosion and impacts to riparian areas by working with the state to prohibit the discharge of produced waters to streams or other non-isolated surface features. As described in Appendix 3, allowing the use of surface water that WDEQ has approved for discharge for limited reclamation applications could help improve post-disturbance vegetative communities. Proposals for alternative energy development would be considered on a case-by-case basis and would not be approved in sensitive areas.

Special Designations and Management Areas

The Rock Creek and Beaver Creek ACECs would be retained. New ACECs would be designated in the Trapper's Point, New Fork Potholes, Upper Green River, White-tailed Prairie Dog Habitats, Ross Butte, and CCC Ponds areas (65,340 acres). The Trapper's Point ACEC would be larger under this alternative (9,540 acres). The Miller Mountain and Wind River Front Management Areas would be established (424,840 acres). Four river units would be managed as suitable for inclusion in the WSR System: East Fork, Scab Creek, Silver Creek, and the upper Green River (10,440 acres). The Lake Mountain (13,490 acres) and Scab Creek (7,710 acres) WSAs would be retained. WSAs would be managed under the "Interim Management Policy and Guidelines for Lands under Wilderness Review" (USDI 1995).

2.4.4 Alternative 4

Alternative 4 (Proposed RMP) is designed to evaluate the impacts of optimizing production of oil and gas resources while providing the appropriate level of environmental protection for surface resources. Appendix 3 presents the mitigation guidelines and standards that provide setbacks, consultation, guidance, and limitations on all aspects of oil and gas related activities. In addition, land allocations and areas unavailable for oil and gas leasing would be implemented.

Additional goals of Alternative 4 are to protect and sustain resources and land uses, such as livestock grazing and recreation, in the planning area. To meet these additional goals, BLM would implement objectives and management actions that include restrictions and protective mitigation for each resource and land use.

Oil and gas leaseholders have rights that BLM is legally bound to honor. Alternative 4 attempts to provide balance on a planning-area scale through implementation of areas unavailable for oil and gas leasing, along with restrictions on other activities in those areas. High gas prices, combined with improving technology in gas production and unique gas reservoir geology in the Pinedale area, have led to an increase in drilling activity in recent years.

Minerals

Alternative 4 would make available approximately 758,180 acres for oil and gas leasing and development (Table 2-32 shows the number of acres of BLM mineral estate that is subject to leasing restrictions for conventional oil and gas exploration and development. The acreage values provided in the table are organized by the type and level of restriction and mineral potential.

Table 2-32, p. 2-169). The planning area would be divided into four areas for management of oil and gas leasing and development (Map 2-9). Intensively Developed Fields would be managed for intensive oil

and gas activities while protecting wildlife habitats to the extent practicable. Traditional Leasing Areas would be managed for protection of important values during oil and gas exploration, but would provide opportunity for oil and gas development activities. Unavailable Areas would be managed for protection of wildlife habitats through indefinitely postponing the availability of lands for oil and gas leasing. Transportation planning would be required in all areas to reduce road density, duplication of routes, and unnecessary routes. Sensitive aquatic species habitats would be maintained or improved. Furthermore, 13,770 acres (New Fork Potholes and Trapper's Point ACECs, CCC Ponds SRMA, East Fork River Unit WSR, and several sensitive cultural sites) would be withdrawn from locatable mineral entry and land disposal.

Other Resources

The integrity of the visual setting on contributing segments of national historic trails would be protected from surface disturbing activities by relocating or redesigning projects within 3 miles of either side of the trail to conform to a VRM Class II designation. The Proposed RMP would also provide for prescribed and natural wildfire management to emulate historic natural fire regimes. The current permitted AUMs for livestock grazing would be maintained unless monitoring indicates a need for adjustment. The Proposed RMP would limit OHV use in the Desert General Use area to existing roads and trails. BLM would complete RAMPs to provide an array of outdoor recreation activities, settings, and experiences on public lands for local residents and visitors. The Green and New Fork Rivers and CCC Ponds SRMAs would be established. Transportation planning would be conducted to provide access to and across public lands and to control the density and distribution of roads. Vegetation would be managed to support wildlife habitat and livestock grazing needs, control soil erosion and provide riparian stability, control noxious weeds, and protect Special Status Species. The number of acres in VRM Class IV would be reduced to 242,660; the number of acres in Class III would be increased to 419,410 acres; and the area in Class II would be increased to 239,520 acres. Soil erosion and impacts to riparian areas would be limited by working with the state to prohibit the discharge of produced waters to streams or other non-isolated surface features. Use of high-quality produced waters to assist in reclamation could be considered on a case-by-case basis, would be limited in scope, and would be governed by a number of operating standards (Appendix 3). Proposals for alternative energy development would be considered on a case-by-case basis.

Special Designations and Management Areas

The Rock Creek and Beaver Creek ACECs would be retained. New ACECs would be designated in the Trapper's Point and New Fork Potholes areas (5,980 acres). The Miller Mountain, Ross Butte, and Wind River Front Management Areas would be established (303,350 acres). Four river units would be managed as suitable for inclusion in the WSR System: East Fork, Scab Creek, Silver Creek, and the upper Green River (10,440 acres). The Lake Mountain (13,490 acres) and Scab Creek (7,710 acres) WSAs would be retained. WSAs would be managed under the "Interim Management Policy and Guidelines for Lands under Wilderness Review" (USDI 1995).

2.5 DETAILED ALTERNATIVE DESCRIPTIONS BY RESOURCE

In all cases, the management actions described in Section 2.3, Management Guidance Common to All Alternatives, should be considered an integral part of the management goals, objectives, and actions for the alternatives.

2.5.1 Alternative 1

Alternative 1 follows the 1988 Pinedale RMP ROD.

Air Quality Management

Air quality management is conducted through cooperation with the EPA, the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA), USFS, and WDEQ.

Management Goals/Objectives

Maintain air quality within or above required standards through cooperative management of emissions with industry, the State of Wyoming, and other federal regulatory agencies; protect public health and safety and the well-being of sensitive natural resources; and within the scope of BLM's authority, minimize emissions that could add to acid rain, cause violations of air quality standards, or degrade visibility.

Management Actions

See Section 2.3.1, Air Quality, Management Guidance Common to All Alternatives.

Cultural Resources Management

Management Goals/Objectives

Resolve conflicts between cultural resources and other resource uses, provide appropriate levels of protection for significant cultural resources, design cultural resource management actions to maintain the value of cultural resources, and provide for the scientific and educational use of cultural resources.

Management Actions

Eligible sites would be listed in the NRHP.

As necessary, withdrawal from exploration and development of locatable minerals on significant cultural resource sites would be pursued.

Cooperative agreements would be pursued with local historical and archeological societies and other interested parties for attaining mutual historic preservation goals.

Lands actions (for example, exchanges) in support of cultural resource management objectives would be pursued, as appropriate.

Compliance with the cultural resource management decisions and other requirements would be monitored regarding (1) the performance of cultural resource use permittees and (2) stipulations on BLM leases and other use authorizations and selected sensitive sites.

Forest Management

Management Goals/Objectives

Provide a supply of forest products to the various segments of the public (individual and commercial vendors) and maintain or enhance other resource management objectives.

Management Actions

Consistent with Management Guidance Common to All Alternatives, forest management, and other resource management objectives, the forested lands would be classified into four management categories:

- Category 1, Intensive Management, would include areas where the forested lands would be managed for multiple use but with emphasis placed on forest product utilization and forest management activities.
- Category 2, Restricted Management, would include forested lands where wildlife, watershed, and recreation resource values would be emphasized, and actions such as partial cutting, extended forest crop rotations, etc., or other restrictions to forest management would be applied.
- Category 3, Management to Enhance or Maintain Other Resources, would only allow forest management activities (for example, harvesting or thinning) on lands in this category when such activities would benefit resources or values other than forestry or would promote public safety. All forest lands included in the category are not included in the forest management base or in timber harvest calculations.
- Category 4, No Forest Management, includes all areas where forest management is excluded.

Approximately 24,223 acres of commercial conifer would be available for production of forest products. Of this total, approximately 20,836 acres would be subject to harvest method/equipment use and minimum cover level restrictions (Category 2). The remaining 3,387 acres would be unrestricted, except for general forest management guidelines applicable to all forest management activities (Category 1). Approximately 13,506 acres of woodland (Categories 1 and 2) would be available for forest product disposals on a demand basis. An additional 3,113 commercial conifer and woodland acres would be removed from the forest base (Categories 3 and 4). The 1,611 acres in Category 3 would be available for forest management activities when such activities are deemed necessary to maintain the integrity of the resource being protected (for example, wildlife or watershed) or to promote public safety. All forest lands in Categories 1, 2, and 3 would be available for emergency salvage of timber damaged or killed through insects, disease, wildfire, or other such events.

Forested lands in Categories 1 and 2 would be managed to harvest an estimated 18.2 million board feet (MMBF) of timber over a 20-year period. The average annual harvest level would involve approximately 137 acres but could vary to meet individual sale area objectives, depending on proposed harvest methods and individual sale conditions.

Forest products (e.g., saw timber, firewood, Christmas trees, posts, poles, and wildlings) would be sold to individuals and to commercial vendors. Forest product sales would be conducted on all forest areas, except where specifically excluded (for example, the Rock Creek drainage and 7,626 acres in the Scab Creek area).

In addition to harvest, approximately 1,200 acres of precommercial thinning would occur during the 20-year period. Precommercial thinning projects would generally be designed to achieve an 8-foot spacing (i.e., roughly 680 trees per acre would be left uncut) and should not significantly affect cover levels.

Specific harvest and thinning sequences would be established in a forest management plan, which would establish a 20-year harvest schedule. Any forest management plans developed would be coordinated with adjacent landowners, the USFS, Wyoming Game and Fish Department (WGFD), and other interested parties.

Specific items to be addressed in any individual timber sale plan and in environmental assessments would include (1) approximate harvest units and proposed harvest methods, (2) existing road locations, (3) proposed new roads, (4) roads to be closed, (5) harvest acreages, (6) environmental mitigations, and (7) coordination with other resource programs and interests.

All forest management activities authorized under this plan would adhere to the following restrictions. Exceptions would require supporting environmental analysis.

- No clearcutting or tracked or wheel-type equipment operations would be allowed within a 100-foot buffer of riparian areas.
- Logging operations on slopes steeper than 45% would be limited to technologically, environmentally, and economically acceptable methods such as cable yarding and/or horse skidding.
- No logging activities would be allowed from November 15 through April 30 in crucial elk winter ranges and feedgrounds, and from May 1 through June 30 in elk calving areas.
- Generally, individual clearcut units would not exceed 25 acres.

Regeneration in harvest units and burned areas must provide elk-hiding cover (i.e., vegetation capable of hiding 90% of an adult elk at a distance equal to or less than 200 feet), or must achieve preharvest stocking levels (i.e., numbers of trees per acre) with 12- to 15-foot tall trees, before timber harvesting would be allowed in adjacent stands. Exceptions would be allowed for emergency salvage of insect- or disease-infested timber and weather- or fire-damaged timber.

Slash disposal would be tailored to the individual harvest unit to promote reforestation, minimize erosion, and allow big game movement. Methods that would be employed include broadcast burning, piling and burning, lopping and scattering, chipping, and roller chopping.

Timber harvesting practices would be consistent with accepted silvicultural guidelines for each species but would also reflect individual stand conditions or other resource and environmental concerns.

Artificial reforestation would be conducted to the extent necessary to eliminate the reforestation backlog and to ensure that minimum stocking levels on new clearcuts were achieved within 15 years after harvesting.

Individual timber sale and general forest management plans would evaluate areas for possible management as old growth timber.

Aspen stands would be managed to maintain or enhance wildlife values; however, they would also be used to produce wood products on a demand basis.

Within the general forest management objectives and guidelines, each of the following four management units would have separate sub-objectives and planned actions.

Deadline-Pinegrove Unit. The Deadline-Pinegrove unit would be managed to give full protection to the CRCT in the Rock Creek drainage and to maintain October 1985 levels of forest cover for wildlife in the remainder of the unit. Approximately 953 acres would be available for harvest over a 20-year period.

All forest management activities would be excluded in the Rock Creek drainage.

A minimum of 90% of the conifer acreage in the Graphite and Riley Ridge crucial elk winter ranges would be maintained. Annual cover-level fluctuations would not be allowed except for emergency salvage.

No clearcutting or road construction would be allowed within 1,000 feet of Beaver Creek. Exceptions would be granted only if additional site-specific analysis verified that such actions would not adversely affect crucial CRCT habitat.

North Piney Unit. The North Piney unit would be managed to give full protection to the elk feedgrounds and to maintain October 1985 levels of forest cover for wildlife, primarily elk.

All forest management activities would be excluded from the Finnegan and North Piney elk feedgrounds, except when such management would be necessary to maintain the integrity of the feedground environment.

Approximately 680 acres would be harvested for forest products over a 20-year period.

Miller Mountain Unit. The Miller Mountain unit would be managed to provide full protection to forested portions of the Fort Hill-Fontenelle elk winter range and to maintain in cover for wildlife approximately 90% of the conifer acreage in the remainder of the unit.

Forest management activities would be excluded from the Fort Hill elk winter range. Exceptions would be allowed for emergency salvage when the wildlife would benefit.

Approximately 396 acres or 10% of the conifer base, excluding the Fort Hill winter range, would be harvested over a 20-year period.

Eastside-Hoback Unit. The Eastside-Hoback unit would be managed to give full protection to the forested portions of the elk feedgrounds and to manage the remaining forested lands for forest products on an allowable harvest/sustained yield basis.

Approximately 781 acres would be harvested for forest products over the next 20 years.

Forest management activities would be excluded from the Franz and Scab Creek elk feedgrounds, except for salvage and sanitation harvests when necessary to maintain the integrity of the feedground environment to benefit the elk.

Other than for emergency salvage of damaged or dead trees and for public protection, no forest product harvesting would be allowed in the Scab Creek campground. Campers would be allowed to obtain firewood from designated areas.

Table 2-2 displays the timber harvest objectives for each management unit. The "Proposed Maximum Percent Out of Cover" column reflects the maximum yearly out-of-cover objective for the Deadline-Pinegrove, North Piney, and Miller Mountain units. The Eastside-Hoback unit shows a harvest projection based on the sustained yield for the unit (not a harvest objective).

Table 2-2. Timber Harvest Levels by Management Unit, Alternative 1

Unit	Conifer/ Cover Acreage[1]	Present Acres Out of Cover[2]	Percent Out of Cover	Proposed Harvest Acres	Proposed Maximum Percent Out of Cover	Expected Volume (millions of board feet)
Deadline-Pinegrove	12,126	953	8	953	8	6.2
North Piney	4,450	680	15	680	15	4.4
Miller Mountain	3,964	209	5	396	10	2.6
Eastside-Hoback	3,683	23	1	781	21	5.0
TOTAL	**24,223**	**1,865**	**8**	**2,810**	**12**	**18.2**

[1]Excludes forest acres where forest management activities would be prohibited.
[2]Source: USDI 1985.

Lands and Realty Management

Management Goals/Objectives

Provide land use authorizations in support of public needs—to be done in consideration of and in compliance with the various management decisions, goals, objectives, and resource restrictions required to protect or maintain the multiple uses and resource values. The right to occupy or acquire public lands would be authorized under the appropriate realty actions within a multiple use management concept and within the objectives and guidance provided under all resources.

Management Actions

Land Tenure Adjustment. Proposals for the disposal of public lands would be considered on a case-by-case basis (for example, transfer from the administration of BLM to other federal agencies or local or state governments; or disposal through methods such as Desert Land Entry [DLE], public sale, exchange, state indemnity selection, or Recreation and Public Purposes leases or patents). Generally, the preferred method of disposal would be exchange; however, any of the available methods could be used as appropriate to individual situations. Prior to taking any disposal action, an environmental analysis would be conducted on the proposal, and the involved lands would be evaluated for compliance with the disposal criteria listed in Appendix 13 and for consistency with objectives of the RMP. The mineral development potential of the land being considered for sale or exchange must be evaluated according to Sections 209 and 206 of FLPMA.

Approximately 6,400 acres were identified as suitable for future consideration for disposal, and another 14,500 acres were identified as suitable for consideration for disposal only by exchange (Appendix 14; Map 2-10). Proposals to dispose of any other BLM-administered public lands would be considered and evaluated on a case-by-base basis.

Special attention would be given to retaining enough public lands at the Cora Y highway crossing, at the south end of Fremont Lake, and at other important wildlife migration routes to provide for free movement of migrating big game animals.

Acquisition of nonfederal lands would be pursued by BLM, if needed, to accomplish management objectives of the RMP. Such acquisition would by considered primarily in areas of predominantly federal ownership, when other management options such as cooperative agreements were not available, and then primarily through exchange. Lands needed for wildlife habitat enhancement are identified in Appendix 14. Other areas could be identified in the future.

Lands actions (for example, exchanges) would be pursued to enhance and maintain key wildlife habitats. Land exchanges to acquire state and private lands in crucial habitats in important and predominantly federal management areas (for example, Rock Creek ACEC, New Fork Potholes, key riparian areas) would be pursued.

DLE petition applications would be disqualified when the public lands were identified as—

1. Lands within the capability classes that the USDA Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service (now the National Resource Conservation Service [NRCS]) was seeking to remove from cultivation under the Conservation Reserve Program.
2. Lands that the USDA Soil Conservation Service showed as being "nonirrigable."
3. Lands identified as sensitive, unique, or necessary to fulfill the RMP management objectives.
4. DLE petition applications would also be disqualified when the public lands would be used for the growth of government price-supported crops or when use of water supplies would deplete an undergroundwater supply beyond its annual recharge capability, thus threatening existing water users.

Withdrawals and Classifications. Whenever necessary, withdrawals in support of other resource management objectives and actions would be pursued.

Classification and Multiple Use Act retention and disposal classifications (Orders W-19140, W-25810, and W-12668) in Sublette and Lincoln counties would be terminated. In areas covered by these orders, discretionary management under the provisions of FLPMA would be consistent with the provisions of the RMP.

ROWs. Applications for ROWs and other land use authorizations would be considered on a case-by-case basis. They would be processed consistent with the objectives of the RMP and would include any necessary mitigation requirements, offset retrogression, or displacement of natural resource and economic values.

Areas closed to mineral leasing, having an NSO restriction, or otherwise identified as unsuitable for surface disturbance or occupancy in other sections of the RMP would be managed as avoidance or exclusion areas for ROWs (Map 2-11). Such areas include, but are not limited to, recreation and cultural sites, the Rock Creek ACEC, and the Deadline Ridge-Graphite evaluation area. However, following a supporting environmental analysis, some types of ROW projects could be allowed in such areas if they were located in areas with a high potential for reclamation, would have impacts that would be temporary in nature, and would be compatible with the resource values being protected.

Areas requiring mitigations and restrictions for surface-disturbing activities would be managed as restricted areas for ROWs. Restrictions would include, but would not limited to, seasonal restrictions for

wildlife, sensitive watersheds, steep slopes, off-road vehicle (ORV) designations, and other measures necessary to prevent degradation of cultural, historical, and recreational sites. Restricted areas for ROWs would include wildlife crucial winter ranges, the Beaver Creek ACEC, the Upper Green River SRMA, and the Soap Holes area.

Two transportation/transmission corridors would be designated (Map 3-10). Actual corridor widths would be flexible within the constraints provided in the various resource objectives of the RMP.

Corridors are preferred routes for transportation and transmission facilities. Identification of corridors would not preclude location of transportation and transmission facilities in other areas if environmental analysis indicated that the facilities would be compatible with other resource values and objectives. Further identification of corridors would not mandate that transportation and transmission facilities would be located there if they were not compatible with other resource uses, values, and objectives in and near the corridors or if the corridors were saturated. Each ROW application would be reviewed and analyzed using the environmental data that existed for the area as a basis to determine compatibility with existing uses and resource values.

Livestock Grazing Management

Management Goals/Objectives

Maintain or improve ecological range condition and maintain or increase forage for livestock grazing, while providing for the maintenance or improvement of wildlife habitat, watershed values, and riparian areas.

For riparian areas, maintain, restore, and improve riparian values where livestock grazing has contributed to riparian management problems.

Management Actions

Grazing Preference. The current seasons of use, kinds of livestock, and amount of grazing use would continue until monitoring indicated a modification could be accommodated or was necessary. The current grazing preference objective of 107,907 AUMs would be maintained or increased through implementation of allotment management plans (AMP), range improvements, and vegetation manipulation. If these measures failed to achieve the grazing preference objective, while providing for protection of other resource values as established in the plan, livestock reductions could become necessary.

Reductions in permitted grazing use may be enacted if other mitigation measures are impracticable or unsuccessful. Any adjustments in livestock grazing use will be made as a result of monitoring of and in consultation with grazing permittees and other affected interests.

All developed and semi-developed recreation sites would be closed to livestock grazing.

Unallocated Public Lands. The 20,991 acres of unallocated forage on public lands would be considered for allocation on a case-by-case basis in accordance with RMP goals and objectives. The number of AUMs to be allocated would be determined after the lands had been evaluated.

Elk Winter Range. Adequate forage for wintering elk would be provided to the extent possible in the Bench Corral, Miller Mountain-Fort Hill, Riley Ridge, and Graphite elk winter ranges.

In cases where adequate forage for wintering elk was not available, adequate forage could be provided through a combination of management practices, including livestock grazing systems, grazing adjustments, and vegetation manipulation.

Livestock water developments on crucial elk winter ranges would be allowed only if they did not result in adverse impacts on the crucial range.

Allotment Management Plans. New AMPs would be written and implemented on I category allotments. Existing AMPs on I allotments would be modified to meet livestock objectives and incorporate wildlife and watershed objectives to be attained through livestock management. Existing AMPs on M category allotments would not be modified unless monitoring and evaluation indicated a change in management was needed. New AMPs or activity plans would require environmental analyses.

All grazing systems would be designed to maintain or improve plant diversity. Specific objectives would be determined during AMP preparation to provide forage diversity for pronghorn, mule deer, and sage-grouse as well as livestock. Grazing systems would be designed to limit forage competition for forbs and other desirable plants, particularly in the spring of the year.

Interagency Cooperative Management Plans. Any cooperative AMPs prepared with other agencies, such as USFS and the Soil Conservation Service, would be consistent with this land use plan.

Range Improvements. New range improvements would be implemented on I category allotments as first priority. The range improvements on M and C category allotments would be funded as priorities allowed, or they could be implemented with other funds from permittees, other agencies, or grazing boards. First priority within M and C allotments would be given to projects that had contributed funds. New range improvements (for example, vegetation manipulation, water developments, and fencing) would be designed, to the extent possible, to meet multiple use objectives for all resources. The maintenance responsibility for range improvements would be assigned to the benefiting users. The maintenance and reconstruction of range improvements would be accomplished as needed.

Approximately 98,552 acres were identified as suitable for vegetation manipulation to increase forage production in the I and M allotments. Brush control guidelines would be applied to acreages determined suitable for vegetation manipulation. The acreages are considered target figures for potential range improvements. Development of AMPs and other activity plans will further refine the acreages according to livestock grazing, wildlife, and other resource objectives. Some allotments have very small acreages available for treatment. Because of the high cost of treating such small areas, they are not likely to be treated. Other allotments containing large acreages may not receive the total projected treatment because of resource considerations (for example, sage-grouse nesting, and erodible soils). Acreage of brush control could increase or decrease on certain allotments depending on rangeland management needs addressed in AMPs and other activity plans.

All brush control projects would involve site-specific environmental analysis and coordination with affected livestock operators and the WGFD; and would include multiple use objectives for other resource uses, including livestock, wildlife, and watershed.

Vegetation manipulations in I allotments would be financed by BLM monies and other monies, if available. BLM range improvement monies would generally not be used to finance vegetation manipulations in M allotments until all the range improvements were accomplished in I category allotments. The vegetation manipulations in M category allotments could be financed by other sources such as permittees, other agencies, or grazing boards.

Prescribed fire would generally be the preferred method of vegetation manipulation for the conversion of brushland to grassland. Wildfires occurring in areas with a fire prescription would be allowed to burn as long as they remained within the prescriptions and met land use objectives. Other vegetation manipulation methods would be considered on a case-by-case basis.

All new project development would be required to meet the criteria provided in Appendix 15. Range improvements would be made in accordance with RMP and activity plan objectives and priorities. Total project needs would be considered for each allotment before public funds were spent. A cost/benefit analysis would be completed on an allotment basis before range improvements were constructed with government funding.

To reduce streambank degradation, salt blocks for livestock and wildlife use would not be placed within 500 feet of live water, wetland, or riparian areas, unless activity plans showed that it was necessary to meet management objectives.

Forage Increases. Any forage increases realized from management prescriptions and range improvement practices would be allocated to wildlife, watershed, and livestock. Site-specific objectives for wildlife, watershed, and livestock grazing would be developed to identify each resource use that would receive a forage allocation.

Actual forage allocation from forage increases would be based on site-specific analysis and would conform to the multiple use objectives of the activity plans. The allocation for forage resulting from treatments financed by permittees, as in M category allotments that did not have crucial wildlife ranges, would be evaluated on a case-by-case basis. More forage could be allocated to livestock grazing than to other resource uses, if done in accordance with the current federal grazing regulations, including consistency with the multiple use management objectives set forth in the RMP.

Consultation with the affected parties would be necessary at the outset of planning for the project allocating increased forage to ensure satisfactory proportioning of the additional range.

Rangeland Monitoring and Evaluation. Ecological range site condition mapping would be completed.

Conversions in Kind. Conversions from cattle to sheep would generally not be allowed on the crucial pronghorn and deer winter ranges.

Noxious Weeds. Noxious weeds would be controlled by continuing the existing noxious weed program within the resource area. The authorization of and guidelines for noxious weed control are documented in the *Northwest Area Weed Control Program EIS* (USDI 1987).

Minerals Management

Management Goals/Objectives

The public lands and federal mineral estate will be made available for orderly and efficient development of mineral resources. All minerals actions will comply with goals, objectives, and resource restrictions (mitigations) required to protect the other resource values in the Pinedale planning area.

Management Actions

Leasable Minerals

Generally, the planning area would be open to consideration for exploration, leasing, and development for all leasable minerals, which include oil, gas, coal, oil shale, trona, and geothermal steam, in accordance with all applicable provisions (restrictions and prohibitions). All activities would be conducted in accordance with the guidance for mitigation of surface disturbing activities provided in Appendices 2 and 5.

Oil and Gas. The 7,636-acre Scab Creek area would be closed to oil and gas leasing. The remainder of the planning area would be open to consideration for leasing, exploration, and development of oil and gas.

BLM would evaluate industry-proposed measures to protect health and safety through the drilling permit process. Of particular concern would be the requirements of approved contingency plans for hydrogen sulfuric acid (H_2S) release. Requirements of operators could include conducting dispersion analyses to determine ambient H_2S concentrations during well blowouts, collecting onsite meteorological data, preparing detailed evacuation plans, and placing offsite warning signs.

The Riley Ridge Project Monitoring Program would be continued. Further monitoring would include gathering geological data in the Deadline Ridge-Graphite Hollow crucial elk winter range to aid in preparation of the proposed activity plan. Monitoring would be coordinated with other resource monitoring programs such as wildlife, surface water and groundwater quality, grazing, and cultural resources, as appropriate.

Geophysical Exploration. Geophysical notices of intent would be evaluated on a case-by-case basis. All acreage in the planning area would be subject to various appropriate limitations (for example, vehicle use restrictions), including approximately 517,170 acres subject to seasonal limitations. In addition, the use of explosive charges would not be allowed in any area if analysis determined that unacceptable adverse impacts would occur.

Generally, all authorizations would be issued with appropriate application of surface disturbance mitigation requirements as presented in Appendix 2.

Specific limitations include—

- Approximately 7,640 acres in the Scab Creek area would be closed to geophysical activities.
- Areas closed to ORV use would also be closed to vehicle use for geophysical activities.
- In the Beaver Creek ACEC, geophysical activities would be restricted to existing roads and trails.
- Geophysical vehicle travel through developed and semi-developed recreation sites would be restricted to established roads and trails.
- Geophysical activities in the remaining NSO areas (mostly cultural sites and elk feedgrounds) would be evaluated on a case-by-case basis and could be restricted if unacceptable impacts would occur on other resources (for example, water quality, cultural, wildlife, recreation, and visual resource values).

Oil and Gas Leasing and Geophysical Activities in the Rock Creek ACEC and Surrounding Area. The Rock Creek ACEC and surrounding area (approximately 17,000 acres) would be available for

consideration for oil and gas leasing with appropriate stipulations, following the completion of an activity plan and associated environmental analysis.

That portion of the Rock Creek ACEC within the Rock Creek watershed boundary would be leased with an NSO stipulation for protection of the pure strain of CRCT in Rock Creek.

Leasing guidelines and objectives in the remaining parts of the Rock Creek ACEC and portions of the adjacent Deadline Ridge-Graphite Hollow crucial elk winter range would be established in a site-specific minerals and wildlife management plan (activity plan) and environmental analysis. This plan would include an evaluation of the ongoing elk habitat use study and compilation of geologic data.

The plan would also include the following direction:

- Oil and gas leasing direction, regarding related activities in the evaluation area east of the Rock Creek ACEC, would be designed to ensure continued elk winter use in the Deadline Ridge-Graphite Hollow area. Oil and gas development would be allowed if determined to be compatible with continued elk use of the crucial winter range. No substantial adverse impacts on this elk habitat would be allowed.
- Oil and gas leasing direction, regarding related activities in the evaluation area west of the Rock Creek ACEC, would be guided by the RMP multiple use guidelines and objectives. Evaluation could allow for some development on this portion of the crucial elk winter range, as long as RMP planning objectives are met.
- The Deadline Ridge-Graphite Hollow wildlife/leasing study and activity plan would identify any suitable areas for surface occupancy based on the previously mentioned mineral leasing guidelines and objectives. Any requests for relief from leasing restrictions that are in conflict with these guidelines and objectives would be analyzed on an individual basis. Based on the analysis, either the conflicting actions would be denied or a plan amendment would be initiated to modify the plan objectives.

Upon completion of the Deadline Ridge-Graphite Hollow activity plan, large contiguous areas may be offered for lease with the NSO stipulation. These areas could only be accessed through directional drilling. The NSO stipulation would be used, rather than a no lease provision, under the assumption that industry is the best judge of whether technology would enable access to the oil and gas resources in compliance with the terms of the lease.

Leasing with the NSO stipulation could become necessary if the area were characterized by steep, and in many cases unstable slopes, with stream/riparian zones “filling” the valley bottoms. Any disturbance on the steep slopes or in the riparian zone would threaten the crucial elk and cutthroat trout habitats directly.

Leasing with the NSO stipulation could also become necessary if deep gas were of primary interest in the evaluation area. Drilling to these reserves has required more than a year’s time, which appears to make seasonal restrictions inadequate mitigation to protect the wildlife values. The objective of the evaluation would be to find potential areas for deep drilling access while still protecting wildlife values. Input from industry, as well as from concerned public groups or individuals, would be sought for this evaluation.

Leasing with an NSO restriction could occur prior to completion of the evaluation in those areas where drainage of federal oil or gas is occurring.

That portion of the Rock Creek watershed boundary within the Rock Creek ACEC (4,200 acres) would be open only to portable geophysical activities. Activities in the remainder of the Rock Creek ACEC (outside

the drainage, approximately 1,000 acres) would be evaluated on a case-by-base basis and could be restricted if analysis determined that restrictions were necessary.

Other Leasable Minerals. Should interest in other leasable minerals materialize in the future, leasing would be considered on a case-by-case basis, and the RMP would be amended as appropriate and necessary. The same surface disturbance restrictions would be used in analyzing leasing proposals and determining the issuance of any leases (for example, geothermal steam, coal, sodium, oil shale, and phosphate). In the event of a coal lease application, the coal planning screening process in 43 CFR §3420.1-4 would be applied.

The existing withdrawals for phosphate, coal, and oil shale would be revoked. These mineral resources no longer need such protection because under the Multiple Mineral Use Act of 1954 (Public Law [P.L.] 585), any claims posted on a preexisting lease must allow the lease to be developed, and both locatable and leasable development can occur on the same land. Mineral leases, other than oil and gas, would be subject to the same resource constraints as established for other surface disturbing activities.

Locatable Minerals

With the exception of withdrawn lands, the planning area would be open to mineral location. Areas identified in the future as needing total protection from locatable mineral activities would be withdrawn from mineral location (Map 2-12).

Salable Minerals

Applications for mineral sales and free use permits (for example, sand or gravel) would be analyzed and processed on a case-by-case basis, and appropriate surface disturbance mitigation requirements would be included in permits.

Paleontology and Natural History

Management Goals/Objectives

Protect and preserve representative samples of the natural history and paleontological values that are present in the planning area.

Management Actions

As areas of unique natural history or particular natural interest are identified, they would be nominated for designation as National Natural Landmarks (NNL), Research Natural Areas (RNA), or ACECs and managed for protection of the unique values. Interpretation of the natural features and public use would be emphasized.

The Pinedale-Boulder Glacial area has been proposed for designation as an NNL. The area would be studied in cooperation with the USFS to determine applicability of the designation. Should the designation occur, the site would be managed to protect the unique geological and ecological features and provide for public interpretation of these features.

Recreation Management

Management Goals/Objectives

Accommodate existing uses, prevent or mitigate environmental degradation resulting from recreation and other uses, and provide for the anticipated recreation uses and use levels in the resource area.

Management Actions

Management emphasis would be placed on the current recreation management areas, including Scab Creek, the Green and New Fork rivers, Oregon Trail routes, and Boulder Lake.

A maximum 16-day camping limit would be implemented throughout the planning area. Areas requiring shorter limits would be posted. Written authorizations would be required for longer periods.

Cooperative recreation projects and those with contributed funding could be given priority for development in conformance with established recreation objectives and priorities.

Withdrawals from exploration and development of locatable minerals would be pursued, as necessary, on developed and semi-developed recreation sites (approximately 590 acres).

Recreation management for the Scab Creek area, the Green and New Fork rivers, and the Oregon Trail routes would emphasize maintaining or improving the quality of the sites and the recreation experience.

Public lands along the Green and New Fork rivers would be managed to provide fishing and float-boating opportunities. Necessary facilities would be developed to improve public access and use opportunities.

Special recreation permits, commercial recreation uses, and major competitive recreation events would include mitigations developed to ensure the protection of other resources in accordance with objectives of all resource values involved.

Boulder Lake SRMA Management Actions. Boulder Lake would be established as an SRMA, and related recreation facilities would be developed to improve public access and use opportunities.

Scab Creek SRMA Management Actions. The Scab Creek SRMA is shown on a map in the 1988 ROD and RMP but is not explicitly mentioned in the text of the decision.

Upper Green River SRMA Management Actions. The Upper Green River segment (above Warren Bridge) would be managed as an SRMA.

Soils and Watershed Management

Management Goals/Objectives

Maintain or enhance the quality of surface water and groundwater, maintain or improve channel stability and overall watershed conditions, provide soils conservation through managing for maintenance of soil productivity and stability, and allow water infiltration to provide for optimal plant growth.

Management Actions

Management actions would emphasize the reduction of soil erosion and sediment and salinity contributions to the Green River Basin water system. Practices applied to surface disturbing activities to help achieve this are found in Appendix 2. Of particular importance would be those areas with highly saline soils such as the Soap Holes Basin and crucial watersheds where surface disturbance would be minimized. These crucial watersheds are generally found within the boundaries of the groundwater recharge zones.

Corrective measures to be applied wherever unsatisfactory watershed conditions were identified would be developed and implemented through activity plans (for example, watershed, habitat, allotment, or timber

management plans). Such measures would also be implemented through stipulations attached to permits, leases, and other authorizations.

The Wyoming BLM *Standard Mitigation Guidelines for Surface Disturbing Activities* (Appendix 2) and the standard practices applied to surface disturbing activities (Appendix 5) would be used to control nonpoint sources of water pollution. These are examples of BMPs relative to the Clean Water Act of 1972, as amended. As other BMPs for nonpoint sources of water pollution are developed, they would be incorporated into the guidance for this plan where they conform to the RMP objectives.

Projects proposed on BLM-administered lands would be evaluated on a case-by-case basis for effects on soil and water resources. Soil management practices would be applied on a site-specific basis using soil survey data and would be related to the soil characteristics such as the steepness of slopes, the length of slope, and soil chemistry and composition. Watershed management practices would follow similar guidelines.

Examples of management practices to be applied throughout the planning area would include seasonal closures imposed because of saturated soil conditions and the standard practices applied to surface disturbing activities (Appendices 2 and 5). (At certain times of year, use would be precluded until soil moisture was such that the use or activity would not result in degradation of the soil resource and watershed condition. The closures would occur predominantly in the spring and autumn.)

A monitoring program for specific surface waters would be continued to identify trends in water quality. Public drinking water at recreation sites would also be protected and monitored to be in compliance with EPA safe drinking water standards.

A Level II groundwater study of the Riley Ridge/LaBarge area would be completed to define the groundwater resource and to determine what additional groundwater monitoring and protective measures would be necessary with regard to subsurface activities conducted in the area (such as oil and gas drilling activities).

Groundwater protection would continue to be provided by applying the procedures described in Appendix 5. Special precautions would be taken to ensure protection of groundwater quality when surface disturbance was to occur on groundwater recharge zones. Criteria for determining depth of fresh water are found in Appendices 2 and 5.

An activity plan for reducing erosion and channel degradation would be prepared for the Tip Top watershed. Specific actions could include road maintenance, recontouring, and reseeding of disturbed sites to help achieve soil stabilization.

A watershed and recreation plan would be prepared on the Stewart Point-Mount Airy area for reducing sedimentation while still allowing ORV use. A more detailed description of this area can be found in the ORV section.

Off-Road Vehicle Management

Management Goals/Objectives

Allow the legitimate use of ORVs where possible and provide adequate protection for identified sensitive resources.

Management Actions

The ORV designations for the entire planning area would be as described in Table 2-28, p. 2-162.

The entire planning area would be designated as open, closed, or limited to ORV uses. The majority of the area would be designated as limited (i.e., travel limited to existing roads and trails, except for over-the-snow vehicles) (Map 2-13).

The Bench Corral elk winter range would be closed to all ORV use, including over-the-snow vehicles, from November 15 through April 30. Lands around the Franz, Finnegan, Scab Creek, Fall Creek, and North Piney feedgrounds would also be closed to ORV use and unauthorized human presence from November 15 through April 30.

The Deer Hills, Oil Field, and Mesa deer and pronghorn winter ranges would have a winter travel limitation restricting vehicle travel from November 15 through April 30 on an as-needed basis. These seasonal limitations would be implemented in cooperation with WGFD during severe winters or periods of disturbance of the wildlife wintering in these areas of concern.

Approximately 120 acres in the Holden Hill area would be closed to all ORV use.

ORV open use areas would be provided to allow for recreational ORV uses. The two initial areas (Mount Airy and Big Piney) would be established adjacent to the towns of Pinedale and Big Piney. These areas would be established to provide intensive use areas for ORVs after a site-specific environmental analysis was considered and an activity plan was prepared. Precise boundaries for the areas would be determined in the course of preparing and analyzing the activity plan.

The Desert General Use area would remain open to generalized ORV uses. This area has more than 237,000 contiguous acres of public land (Map 2-13). The Desert Open Area would be monitored to determine whether unacceptable impact levels were occurring or being approached, which would require that ORV use be reevaluated and limited accordingly.

In general, ORV use would be monitored periodically to determine actual use and public demands. Monitoring of high-density roaded areas would be conducted as described in the Access Management section.

Access Management

Management Goals/Objectives

Provide suitable public access to BLM-administered public lands. This could include acquiring new access where needed, maintaining existing access, and expanding existing access facilities or abandoning and closing access where it was not compatible with resource values and objectives.

Management Actions

Access across private lands would be pursued as needed through a variety of methods, including, but not limited to, purchase of ROWs or easements, land exchange, reciprocal ROWs, and other statutory authorities. Refer to USDI 1985 for a description of specific access acquisition procedures. Map 3-10 shows general locations of possible access routes or areas where legal access is needed. Specific routes and acquisition procedures for securing access would be determined through route analyses and environmental analyses as part of specific project and activity planning. Where appropriate, land exchanges or cooperative agreements would be considered to provide access needs.

A detailed evaluation of high-density roaded areas in the planning area would be completed to determine needs for specific road closures and (or) rehabilitation. Priority evaluation areas would include the Red Canyon, Red Castle Creek, and Fish Creek areas, as well as oil and gas fields in the southwestern portion of the resource area. Some existing roads could be closed except for administrative purposes. Specific mitigation measures and design requirements for roads would be developed through environmental analyses as part of specific project or activity planning.

Access closure, abandonment, and acquisition would be considered and established through activity planning and environmental analysis processes. Road or trail closure and abandonment would be based on desired road or trail densities; demands for new roads; closure methods (for example, abandonment and rehabilitation, closures by signing, and temporary or seasonal closures); type of access needed; resource development or protection needs; and existing uses.

Vegetation Management

Management Goals/Objectives (Riparian Areas)

Maintain, improve, or restore riparian values to provide enhanced forage, habitat, and stream quality.

Riparian Area Management Actions

Priority for riparian management would be given to those areas identified as CRCT habitat. Management actions could include reductions in livestock numbers, adjustments in grazing distribution patterns, fencing, herding, livestock conversions, etc. Unallocated public lands containing riparian areas would be managed according to the same objective, with emphasis on wildlife and watershed objectives, but not necessarily to the exclusion of livestock uses.

Refer to management actions described under all other programs for accomplishing riparian objectives. Riparian management is an integral part of all resources and related management programs. Those activities that affect or are affected by riparian values would take into account the riparian objectives and direction. Resource values and uses that affect or are affected by riparian values include wildlife and fisheries habitat, forest resources, livestock grazing, ORV use, visual resources, cultural and historical resources, minerals exploration and development activities, lands and realty activities, watershed and soils resources, recreation uses, fire management, and access.

Visual Resources Management

Management Goals/Objectives

Maintain overall integrity of visual resources while allowing for modification and changes to occur to meet other resource objectives.

Management Actions

VRM classes have been established in line with overall resource management objectives of the RMP. Table 2-29, p. 2-164, shows the classification acreages, and Map 2-14 shows the classification area boundaries. These areas would be subject to change and further definition as more inventories and evaluations are conducted.

A program would be initiated to improve the visual quality of oil fields in the planning area by working with the companies to reduce the visual impact of existing facilities.

The VRM class areas would be monitored periodically for cumulative impacts that could potentially conflict with their classifications.

Wildland Fire and Fuels Management

Management Goals/Objectives

Protect public safety, life, and property while providing the maximum benefits of both prescribed fire and wildfire to overall resource management.

Management Actions

Fire would be considered a management option for vegetation manipulation to (1) convert brush to other desired species; (2) rejuvenate desired species; (3) increase forage; (4) increase vegetation nutrient value and palatability; (5) promote wildlife habitat diversity; (6) improve vegetation cover on areas with insufficient protective ground cover; and (7) maintain or improve range, wildlife habitat, and watershed condition.

Fire would also be considered a management option for disposal of timber slash, seed bed preparation, hazard reduction, control of disease or insects, thinning, or species manipulation in support of forest management objectives.

In preparing activity plans, consideration would be given to fire applications in meeting resource management objectives.

A fire management action plan would be written for the planning area. Specific boundaries and fire management prescriptions would be consistent with or in support of the other identified resource values and management objectives.

Areas would be identified where a prescribed set of conditions would be acceptable in the event of an ignition. Prescribed fires would generally be confined to 200 acres or less in areas where current vegetation stages are desirable.

Fire protection on public lands would be managed by taking appropriate suppression actions through the fire management plan. Resource and operational support for pre-suppression and suppression planning would be coordinated with the USFS, Sublette County Sheriff's Office, Wyoming State Forestry Division, and local fire protection districts.

Wilderness areas would be managed as prescribed fire areas. Fire suppression in wilderness areas requires restraint in suppression methods. In any designated wilderness areas, the fire management objective would be to manage fire in ways that would cause the least degradation of wilderness values.

Prescribed burning would be conducted in a manner that would (1) not violate ambient air quality standards, (2) avoid visibility impairment (3) minimize public nuisance, and (4) minimize smoke intrusions into sensitive areas.

Wildlife and Fish Habitat Management

Management Goals/Objectives

To the extent practicable, wildlife habitat management would be oriented toward the maintenance of fish and wildlife habitats to support populations at 1987 WGFD planning objective levels. Activity planning

would emphasize habitat enhancement and protection. Changes within WGFD planning objective levels would be considered based on habitat capability and availability. Wildlife habitat activity planning would include other species as well as federally listed T&E species and the CRCT.

Management Actions

In the Deadline-Graphite area, management emphasis would be placed on maintaining crucial elk winter habitat.

In elk feedgrounds, management emphasis would be on maintenance of habitat quality and continued use of the areas as elk feedgrounds. To maintain the integrity of the elk feedgrounds, certain activities would be constrained on lands near them. The NSO restriction would be imposed on the elk feedgrounds for all activities except those that would have impacts that were temporary in nature or that were compatible with elk habitat management.

T&E species and their habitats would be protected. Actions that would degrade habitat to a point of jeopardizing the continued existence of a T&E species would not be allowed.

USFWS would be consulted on any action with reasonable potential to affect endangered species or their habitats. A biological assessment would be prepared on all proposals that would or could affect T&E species habitat, and a biological opinion would be requested from the USFWS.

All actions would include consideration for T&E plant and animal species. The Pinedale Resource Area would continue to be inventoried to identify potential habitat and occurrence of T&E species. Identification of habitat occupied by T&E species and habitat with potential to help support these species would be managed in accordance with the national recovery plans. Potential habitat includes high-density prairie dog towns for black-footed ferrets; wetlands for whooping cranes; high cliffs over riparian zones for peregrine falcons; and cottonwood stands along the Green, New Fork, and East Fork rivers for bald eagles. Management prescriptions for potential habitat would include consideration for future occupancy by T&E species. Key habitat characteristics would be identified to help ensure maintenance of high-quality areas for natural reoccupation. Proposals for introductions of plant and/or animal T&E species on BLM-administered lands would be evaluated and analyzed, considering the impact of other activities.

Habitat occupied by federally listed T&E plant and animal species would be monitored to ensure compliance with the ESA. The CRCT would be monitored in cooperation with the WGFD.

Areas with habitat having the potential to support transplanted or introduced wildlife species (other than T&E species) would be identified in the development of activity plans and managed in accordance with RMP objectives. Proposals for introductions or species transplants to BLM-administered public lands would be evaluated and analyzed, and the impact on and of other resources would be considered. Cooperative agreements would be developed, if necessary, to facilitate species transplants and habitat management.

Mule deer, elk, pronghorn, and sage-grouse use patterns would be monitored. Habitat trends for the species would be interpreted through survey data collected in cooperation with livestock and watershed studies and monitoring activities. Interdisciplinary selection of key areas and plant species would ensure that crucial habitats were monitored.

The East Front Aquatic Habitat Management Plan (HMP) would be implemented to promote riparian habitat management and protect the CRCT. In addition, this HMP and the Upper Green River HMP

would include consideration of habitat improvement and related projects for enhancing habitat for waterfowl and aquatic species.

Riparian area maintenance, improvement, and restoration would help promote quality fish habitat on streams and lakes. Coordination with WGFD would continue on the Tri-State Conservation Agreement and Strategy 2005 and with local multi-agency management plans for CRCT. Coordination with WGFD would continue on management of the three species and implementation of the three Species Conservation Agreement and Strategy. Efforts to control siltation into the East Fork, New Fork, and Green Rivers would be pursued to improve the water quality of these fisheries. Water quality standards for other fishing streams and lakes would be coordinated with WGFD and the WDEQ. Adherence to these standards would help maintain existing fish habitat.

High priority would be given to improvement of wildlife habitat through vegetation manipulation. Table 2-3 presents identified opportunities by vegetation type and animal species seasonal habitat. Any areas identified in the future as suitable for treatment to benefit wildlife would be considered.

Table 2-3. Vegetative Manipulation Opportunities (by Prescribed Burn)

Vegetation Type	Species Benefited	Treatment Objectives
Sagebrush/Grass	Elk	Increase volume of grass forage on winter range
	Mule Deer	Increase early green forage on spring/fall range
	Pronghorn	Increase plant diversity and forb component on summer range
	Sage-Grouse	Same as pronghorn
Aspen-Aspen/Fir Complex	Elk	Stimulate aspen regeneration and set back subalpine fir invasion to perpetuate aspen stands in spring/summer range
	Mule Deer	Same as elk
Willow Bottoms	Moose	Increase willow regeneration in critical moose habitat

Vegetation treatments for livestock grazing and other resource objectives would include consideration of wildlife objectives and related restrictions. Table 2-4 describes restrictions for vegetation manipulation necessary to provide protection for wildlife in sagebrush types.

Table 2-4. Habitat Guidelines for Brush Control

Habitat Classification	Guideline
Sage-grouse breeding complex (that area within a 2-mile radius of an active strutting ground). Percentage restriction to be applied on each individual lek or complex of leks within contiguous buffer areas.	Maximum of 20% of sagebrush type treated at any time.
Crucial pronghorn, mule deer, and sage-grouse winter and winter yearlong range.[1]	No treatment unless beneficial to pronghorn, mule deer, and sage-grouse.
Crucial elk winter range and winter yearlong range.[1]	Maximum of 40% of sagebrush type treated at any time.
Pronghorn, elk, moose, mule deer, and sage-grouse winter, winter/yearlong, and summer habitat.[1]	Maximum of 20% of sagebrush type treated at any time.

[1]Percentage restrictions would be applied to individual fire management units as designated on Map 2-15. Restricted wildlife ranges are depicted in Chapter 3 on Maps 3-19 and 3-20.

Basic Assumptions for Table 2-4:

1. If new information indicates that wildlife would benefit from sagebrush treatment at higher levels than indicated through this process, upper levels would be adjusted accordingly.
2. In cases of seasonal range overlap, the most restrictive constraint would be applied.
3. When previously treated sagebrush areas return to a sagebrush canopy cover of 25% or greater, they would be considered untreated and would be added to the base acreage available for future treatment proposals.
4. Specific project design and mitigation would be developed during the activity planning phase.
5. Although only game species habitat is specified, consideration for other species associated with the sagebrush communities is built into the treatment constraints.
6. The maximum acreage available for treatment encompasses the entire vegetation type acreage in the area.

Habitat would also be enhanced by other improvements, such as development of water facilities. During development and implementation of activity plans (for example, allotment, timber, watershed, or wildlife habitat management plans), consideration for habitat improvement needs and locations would be included. Waterfowl habitat would be considered for enhancement through improvements. Specifically the Upper Green River HMP and East Front Aquatic HMP update would provide waterfowl and fisheries habitat improvement projects. Road closures could be imposed to protect fisheries and elk habitat. The WGFD conducted a study of big game response to oil and gas development on the Riley Ridge natural gas project area. Findings and recommendations from this study are used in considering future development of minerals on big game ranges.

Predator control programs would be coordinated with the USDA and conducted in accordance with the Rock Springs District Animal Damage Control Plan.

Areas of Critical Environmental Concern

Rock Creek ACEC Management Goal/Objective

Protect the Rock Creek drainage to assure quality aquatic habitat for the sensitive CRCT and to provide crucial winter range for a portion of the Piney elk herd.

Beaver Creek ACEC Management Goal/Objective

Assure quality aquatic habitat for the sensitive CRCT and protect elk calving habitat.

Rock Creek ACEC Management Actions

The entire ACEC area (Map 2-16) and the Deadline-Graphite elk winter range area (approximately 17,100 acres) would be deferred from mineral leasing until a mineral and wildlife evaluation was completed.

The entire ACEC would be managed as a ROW avoidance or exclusion area, where ROW would not be allowed unless a supporting environmental analysis indicated that the action met the objective for the ACEC, minimal impacts would occur, and/or the action would benefit the CRCT or elk habitat.

Management Actions within the Rock Creek Watershed (Drainage) Area of the ACEC

Geophysical exploration activities in this area would be restricted to portable methods only. The use of explosive charges would be prohibited if analysis determined that unacceptable adverse resource impacts would result.

If analysis indicates this level of protection is necessary, a withdrawal from mineral location and surface entry would be pursued.

Livestock grazing and related improvements would continue to be allowed if no adverse effects occur to the Rock Creek drainage.

No forest management activities would be allowed within the drainage.

The drainage would be managed as a Class I VRM area and would be closed to ORV use, including over-the-snow vehicles.

Management Actions in the Remainder of the Rock Creek ACEC (Outside the Rock Creek Watershed)

Approximately 1,000 acres of the ACEC (that portion outside the drainage) would be evaluated to identify any locations where surface occupancy could be allowed. Geophysical exploration activities in this area would be evaluated on a case-by-case basis and would be restricted if analysis determines that unacceptable adverse impacts would occur to the water quality, fisheries, wildlife, recreation, or visual values in the area.

This portion of the ACEC would be open to exploration and development of locatable minerals. A plan of operations would be required for any locatable minerals activities in the area.

This portion of the ACEC would be managed as a Class II VRM area, and ORV use would be limited to existing roads and trails with seasonal restrictions to protect wintering wildlife (Appendix 12).

Beaver Creek ACEC Management Actions

The area (Map 2-16) would be open for consideration of mineral leasing and related activities.

All vehicle use, including geophysical exploration vehicles, would be limited to existing roads and trails.

The area would be closed to the use of explosive charges if analysis determined that unacceptable adverse impacts would occur to the water quality, fisheries, wildlife recreation, or visual values in the area.

The Beaver Creek ACEC would be managed to maintain, improve, or restore riparian habitat conditions.

The ACEC would be managed as a Class III VRM area.

A detailed activity plan would be prepared to establish guidelines for uses that could affect or jeopardize habitat quality for the CRCT and elk calving. Management prescriptions in the activity plan would include identifying specific transportation routes to reduce the potential for spills of toxic materials and needs for seasonal use or other types of restrictions, in compliance with the decisions stated above.

Surface disturbance within 1,000 feet of streams and on slopes of 25% or greater would be prohibited.

Partial timber cutting would be allowed provided that no adverse impacts would occur to the CRCT. Clearcutting or road construction within 1,000 feet of Beaver Creek would not be allowed. Exceptions would be granted only if additional site-specific analysis verified that such actions would not adversely affect crucial CRCT habitat.

Roads and ROWs would follow existing alignments unless their design criteria would preclude adverse impacts on the trout and elk calving habitat.

Wilderness

Management Goal/Objective

Proposed wilderness areas would be managed for wilderness values in accordance with the decision of Congress.

Management Actions

See Section 2.3.15 for WSA management actions common to all alternatives.

Surface Disturbance Restriction

The surface disturbance restrictions are necessary to protect certain sensitive resources and areas from adverse effects of surface disturbing activities and human presence. The restrictions include the various management actions developed in and analyzed for the RMP. These restrictions would apply to all types of activities involving surface disturbance or human presence impacts and would be applied in accordance with the guidelines described in Appendix 2. The guidelines include, where applicable, proposals for waiver, exception, or modification, based on analysis for individual actions. This would allow for situations where a surface disturbing activity could actually benefit sensitive resources and for those occasions when analysis determined that an activity would not adversely affect those resources. The Wyoming Standards for Rangeland Health would apply.

Appendix 2 would be used, as appropriate, to condition development activities in all programs where surface disturbing activities would occur and where the objectives of the RMP include the protection of important resource values. On a case-by-case basis, activities would be conditioned by any one or more of the mitigations in Appendix 2 to avoid or minimize impacts on other important resource values and sensitive areas. Use restrictions (for examples, dates or distances) could be made more or less stringent depending on the needs of specific situations. The restrictions identified under the various resource programs are complementary to the standards in Appendix 2 and are not all-inclusive. They represent both actual requirements applicable to specific circumstances and examples of requirements that would be considered and that could be applied, if necessary. Additional restrictions could be placed on surface disturbing activities as necessary.

The mitigations identified in the RMP would serve to provide a degree of protection for affected resources, not to unnecessarily restrict activities. The RMP would provide the flexibility for modifications or exceptions to restrictions in specific circumstances where a restriction is determined not to apply or is not needed to achieve a desired objective.

Surface disturbance is characterized by the removal of vegetative cover and soil materials. Where actual excavation did not occur, activities could be allowed to occur with less stringent limitations if the objectives and purpose for the surface disturbance restrictions were met. Timber harvesting within 500 feet of streams or riparian areas and on slopes greater than 25% are examples of situations for which less

stringent application of the standards mitigation guidelines (Appendix 2) would apply. These less stringent guidelines would apply to those timber harvest activities, such as tree cutting, skidding, and slash disposal, that did not fully remove vegetative cover and soil materials. In the past, allowing these activities within a 100-foot streamside buffer distance and on slopes greater than 25% have proven effective. However, road construction or staging/loading areas for logging equipment would not meet the less stringent definition and would be subject to the standard requirements of 500 feet and 25% slope.

The mitigations prescribed for federal mineral development on split estate lands would apply only to the development of the federal minerals. These mitigations would not dictate the surface owners' management of their lands. The mitigations present restrictions on only those surface activities conducted for purposes of developing the federal minerals and that are permitted, licensed, or otherwise approved by BLM.

Necessary protection from surface disturbing activities would be provided for wintering wildlife on approximately 636,390 acres of crucial and noncrucial winter range (Table 2-31, p. 2-166; Map 3-20). Seasonal restrictions would be incorporated into all land use authorizations where appropriate. This would include approximately 13,440 acres of noncrucial elk winter range in the Bench Corral area, approximately 3,400 acres of noncrucial elk winter range in the Miller Mountain area, and approximately 12,800 acres of noncrucial deer winter range in the Mesa area.

No surface occupancy would be allowed on elk feedgrounds. Exceptions could be allowed if analysis indicated that proposed activities would either benefit or cause no adverse impacts on the elk. Further public input would be required for exceptions that were not designed to specifically benefit elk.

No activity or surface disturbance would be allowed in elk calving areas during periods of use, usually between May 1 and June 30.

Sage-grouse nesting areas would be protected in accordance with the Wyoming BLM mitigation guidelines (Appendix 2). Surface occupancy or use, including, but not limited to, the drilling of wells; the construction of well pads, roads, pipelines, or other types of ROWs; and/or the installation of permanent or high-profile structures (i.e., buildings, storage tanks, overhead power lines, etc.) within one-quarter mile of a sage-grouse lek (strutting ground) would be restricted or prohibited unless the operator and Authorized Officer arrived at an acceptable plan to mitigate anticipated impacts. Activity would generally be restricted to existing roads and trails. Other activities could be allowed if environmental analysis indicated that nesting sage-grouse concentrations would not be adversely affected. Activity between the hours of 8:00 p.m. and 8:00 a.m. would not be allowed within approximately one-quarter mile of leks (during strutting season). No surface disturbance or occupancy would be allowed within one-quarter mile of leks.

Seasonal restrictions would be applied to active raptor nests. Priority for further inventory of raptor nest locations would be given to areas where activities and surface disturbance were proposed.

No surface disturbance would be allowed within 500 feet of riparian habitat, wetland, and/or live water unless a high potential for successful rehabilitation existed and/or impacts would be temporary in nature. Guidance is supplied in Appendix 2.

No surface disturbance would be allowed on the Upper Green River SRMA, except as identified in a management plan for that area.

No surface disturbance would be allowed within one-quarter mile or the visual horizon (whichever is closer) of contributing segments of the historic trails (Map 2-1).

Waste disposal facilities (for example, drilling fluid pits, solid waste, and sanitary facilities) would not be authorized on flood plains, wetlands, and related riparian zones.

Surface disturbance would be minimized in crucial watersheds, such as Soap Holes Basin and Tip Top, with emphasis on reducing soil erosion and sediment and salinity contributions to the Green River Basin water system. Surface disturbing activities would be appropriately restricted in accordance with the *Standard Mitigation Guidelines for Surface Disturbing Activities* and standard practices applied to surface disturbing activities (Appendices 2 and 5).

No surface occupancy would be allowed on cultural sites 48SU301, 48SU350, and 48LN300 or on developed and semi-developed recreation sites. No exceptions would be allowed without further public input. This limitation is not intended to prohibit surface occupancy in those portions of the NSO areas that occur outside the viewshed of the cultural property and that contain no cultural properties.

Surface disturbances would not be allowed within one-quarter mile of developed and semi-developed recreation sites unless activities were determined to be compatible with recreation objectives for the area.

No surface occupancy would be allowed in the Rock Creek drainage within the Rock Creek ACEC (approximately 4,200 acres). The only exceptions would be activities proposed to benefit the CRCT. No exceptions would be allowed without further public input.

Surface disturbance would not be allowed within 1,000 feet of streams or on slopes of 25% or greater within the Beaver Creek ACEC.

2.5.2 Oil and Gas Management Areas for Alternatives 2, 3, and 4

Alternatives 2, 3, and 4 would assign lands to one of the three designations described in this section.

Intensively Developed Oil and Gas Fields

Emphasis in these areas would be placed on efficient and complete development and production of the oil and gas resource. Any new leases issued would have lease terms in accordance with management objectives and stipulations as determined in the environmental document authorizing the field (Environmental Assessment [EA] Decision Record or EIS ROD). Management objectives and actions described in the Pinedale RMP for each alternative would apply. Mitigation of impacts through stipulations and BMPs would be applied, and operations would be conducted in a way that would facilitate ultimate reclamation of the field. Specific mitigations, conditions of approval, BMPs, and reclamation requirements for each Intensively Developed Field would vary depending on the resources affected and the characteristics of the proposed field development. As gas or oil fields expand or exploration reaches beyond the delineated area, Intensively Developed Fields could be enlarged as appropriate. To enlarge an Intensively Developed Field, the expansion area would have to be adjacent to the field and under valid oil and gas lease with stipulations allowing surface occupancy and development. Intensively Developed Fields would only be considered for expansion when surface development reaches four surface locations per 640-acre section, with additional well density required to efficiently and adequately produce the gas or oil resource.

Traditional Leasing Areas

Emphasis in these areas would be on traditional multiple use management, and accommodating all approved uses to the extent possible. New oil and gas leases would be issued with lease terms and stipulations designed to minimize the impact of oil and gas exploration activities on the environment and wildlife habitats. Oil and gas operators would have the right to explore *existing* and *new* leases. COAs could be applied to individual APDs where necessary to minimize the impacts of exploration. Oil and gas operations in these areas would conform to the management objectives and actions described in the RMP for each alternative, including timing and distance limitations, noise restrictions, human presence limitations, restrictions on placement of permanent or tall structures, and spacing of exploratory wells.

Exploration of new and existing leases could result in a discovery. When exploration/development of an oil or gas reservoir reaches a down-hole well density of one well every 160 acres and a surface density of four well pads per 640-acre section, new areas could be considered for conversion to Intensively Developed Field. Consideration for conversion would depend on (1) a geology and reservoir analysis determination that additional well density is needed to efficiently and adequately produce the gas or oil resource; (2) that surface resources can be satisfactorily mitigated; and (3) that a project-specific environmental documentation is prepared to analyze impacts and to determine operating methods, mitigation, and BMPs to be used in the efficient and comprehensive development of the field.

As gas or oil fields expand or exploration delineates a larger area, the Intensively Developed Field could be enlarged as appropriate. To enlarge an Intensively Developed Field, the expansion would have to be adjacent to the field and under valid oil and gas lease with stipulations allowing surface occupancy and development. Intensively Developed Fields would only be considered for expansion area when surface development reaches four surface locations per 640-acre section, when a geology and reservoir evaluation determines that additional well density is required to efficiently and adequately produce the gas or oil resource, and when impacts to surface resources can be satisfactorily mitigated.

Unavailable Areas

Emphasis in these areas would be on providing contiguous wildlife habitat, providing wildlife refuge areas and migration routes, public land recreation opportunities, opportunities for appropriate non-surface-disturbing activities, and maintenance and improvement of current resource conditions. These areas are comprised of WSAs, which are nondiscretionary closure areas for oil and gas leasing, and other areas that would be administratively unavailable for oil and gas leasing. No new leases would be offered. As existing oil and gas leases expire in Unavailable Areas, they would not be re-offered for lease.

A one-half mile NSO area would be established in some areas where the Unavailable Areas abut lands or mineral estate not managed by BLM. This one-half mile NSO "buffer" area would provide a means for dealing with drainage of resources from BLM mineral estate. The one-half mile NSO area should make leasing within the Unavailable Areas unnecessary.

Oil and gas operators would have the right to explore *existing* leases. Exploration of existing leases could result in a discovery. When exploration/development of a newly discovered oil or gas resource reaches a down-hole well density of one well every 160 acres and a surface density of four well pads per 640-acre section, new areas could be considered for conversion to Intensively Developed Field. Consideration for conversion would depend on (1) a geology and reservoir analysis determination that additional well density is needed to efficiently and adequately produce the gas or oil resource; (2) that surface resources can be satisfactorily mitigated; and (3) that a project-specific environmental documentation is prepared to analyze impacts and to determine operating methods, mitigation, and BMPs to be used in comprehensive development of the field.

As gas or oil fields expand or exploration reaches beyond the delineated area, the Intensively Developed Field could be enlarged when appropriate. To enlarge an Intensively Developed Field, the expansion area would have to be adjacent to the field and under valid oil and gas lease with stipulations allowing surface occupancy and development. Intensively Developed Fields would only be considered for expansion when surface development reaches four surface locations per 640-acre section when a geology and reservoir evaluation determines that additional well density required to efficiently and adequately produce the gas or oil resource, and when impacts to surface resource can be satisfactorily mitigated.

Existing oil and gas leases would remain in effect until they expire. Upon lease expiration, areas in the Intensively Developed Fields and Traditional Leasing Areas could be nominated for lease again, and new leases could be issued. In the Unavailable Areas, no nominations for new leases would be considered.

2.5.3 Alternative 2

Air Quality Management

Management Goal

Minimize the impact of management actions in the planning area on air quality by complying with all applicable air quality laws, rules, and regulations. Implement management actions in the planning area to improve air quality as practicable.

Management Objectives and Actions

Objective 1 Maintain concentrations of criteria pollutants associated with management actions in compliance with applicable state and federal Ambient Air Quality Standards (AAQS).

Objective 2 Maintain concentrations of Prevention of Significant Deterioration (PSD) pollutants associated with management actions in compliance with the applicable increment.

Objective 3 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).

Objective 4 Reduce atmospheric deposition pollutants to levels below generally accepted levels of concern (LOC) and levels of acceptable change (LAC).

Actions (these actions apply to all four objectives)

a. BLM would cooperate in the collection of basic climate and meteorological data from remote automatic weather stations.

b. BLM would cooperate with the EPA and State of Wyoming and collaborate with the USFS in monitoring for atmospheric deposition (acid rain) and its impacts on the Class I airsheds of the Bridger and Fitzpatrick Wilderness Areas.

c. Special requirements such as dust abatement, alternative power sources, and BMPs to alleviate air quality impacts would be included on a case-by-case basis in use authorizations within the scope of BLM's authority.

d. Prescribed burns would be managed to comply with WDEQ-Air Quality Division (AQD) smoke management rules and regulations.

e. BLM would continue to participate in State of the Atmosphere modeling to assess cumulative changes to air quality over time.

Cultural Resources Management

Management Goal

Protect and preserve significant cultural resources and ensure that they are available for appropriate use by present and future generations.

Management Objective and Actions

Objective 1 Protect NRHP-eligible cultural sites and national historic trails.

Actions

a. Surface occupancy would be prohibited on selected communal big game kill sites (Trapper's Point), Oregon Trail inscription sites, rock shelters, Native American burial locales, and Native American traditional cultural properties (TCP).

b. Surface disturbing activities would be prohibited within one-quarter mile or the visual horizon (whichever is nearer) of the Lander and Sublette Cutoff Trails.

c. Surface occupancy would be prohibited within one-quarter mile of contributing segments of the Lander Trail and the Sublette Cutoff (Map 3-1).

Forestry

Management Goal

Manage forest and woodland stands (except stands identified in the Management Common to All Alternatives) to achieve a sustainable flow of commercial forest products to the community.

Management Objectives and Actions

Objective 1 Provide an average annual allowable sale quantity in forestlands (Douglas fir, subalpine fir, spruce, and lodgepole pine; 31,590 total acres) of 2,400 hundred cubic feet (CCF) (1.2 MMBF).

Actions

a. An average of approximately 300 acres of forest would be treated per year.

b. Tree thinning would be conducted on approximately 50 acres per year of young stands of trees to meet forest health and forest growth objectives.

Objective 2 Manage woodland ecosystem areas (aspen, aspen/conifer, cottonwood, and other woodland ecosystems; 15,280 acres) to support commercial activities and resource objectives of the vegetation and wildlife programs.

Actions

a. Sale of forest products would be emphasized while meeting the objectives of HFRA and wildlife habitat and livestock management objectives.

b. An average of 250 acres of woodlands could undergo vegetation treatment per year.

Objective 3 Restore or emulate natural/historic forest cycles on the forested lands and woodlands within the Scab Creek and Lake Mountain WSAs.

Action

a. Prescribed or wildland fire could be used to achieve vegetation alteration in the WSAs. Mechanical surface disturbing activities would be prohibited, and no forest products would be removed from WSAs.

Objective 4 Using HFRA guidelines, maintain and/or restore identified old growth stands.

Action

a. All stands would be analyzed for old growth characteristics prior to entry by using existing or new inventory methods and analysis of previous forest management activities. Stands meeting old growth standards for their vegetation type would be managed to maintain old growth characteristics on a landscape scale. Connectivity of existing old growth areas would be maintained at appropriate locations and distribution levels. Old growth stands would be maintained using appropriate mechanical and prescribed fire tools to maintain pre-suppression composition, structure, and function.

Lands and Realty Management

Management Goal

Provide for use of public lands in accordance with federal regulations where compatible with other resources.

Management Objectives and Actions

Objective 1 Process land tenure adjustments that would benefit or achieve the goals of other resource programs.

Action

a. Of the 6,300 acres that meet FLPMA disposal criteria for sale, 5,000 acres would be available (Appendix 14 and Map 2-17).

Objective 2 Respond to community needs for expansion and economic development.

Actions

a. Proposals for land tenure adjustments (Map 2-17) would be considered on a case-by-case basis and according to the criteria in Appendix 13. Before any land tenure adjustments were made, the appropriate level of environmental analysis would be conducted on the proposal. Riparian, wetland, and aquatic resources would be considered for sale or exchange.

b. Acquisition of nonfederal lands could be considered if proposed by willing parties.

c. DLE petition applications would be processed and patents authorized in irrigable, arid areas suitable for agricultural use for the purpose of reclamation, irrigation, and cultivation.

d. Trespass within the planning area would be resolved. BLM would pursue the resolution of occupancy, mineral, or other trespass to the benefit of BLM and the public.

Objective 3 Process ROW applications in a timely manner, with priority given to large energy-related ROWs.

Actions

a. Linear ROW (for example, pipelines, power lines, and roads) would be routed to avoid undue and unnecessary degradation, taking into account point of origin, point of destination, and purpose and need of the project.

b. Common ROW routes (“corridors”) would be designated where appropriate (Map 3-10).

c. Utility facilities would be restricted to existing routes and designated corridors where practicable. New corridors could be established as new oil and gas fields are developed.

d. Linear ROW crossings in 100-year flood plains, wetlands, and riparian areas would be allowed (Map 3-14).

e. Exceptions to ROW avoidance and exclusion areas (Map 2-18; Table 2-27, p. 2-160) would be allowed if impacts could be adequately mitigated.

f. ROW for communication sites would be considered on a case-by-case basis. Emphasis would be on development on already-existing multiple use sites rather than establishing new sites.

g. Alternative energy development proposals would be permitted throughout the field office where not prohibited by law or in conflict with Land Use Plan decisions.

h. Proposals for water disposal pits would be considered on a case-by-case basis and would be subject to the following requirements:

1. Pits would meet the requirements of Onshore Oil and Gas Order No. 7, the Wyoming Oil and Gas Commission, and the WDEQ.

2. Disposal pits would be restricted to VRM Class IV areas.

3. Disposal pits would be bonded to an amount determined by an Authorized Officer.

Livestock Grazing Management

Management Goals

To the extent possible while maximizing energy and mineral production, maintain livestock grazing; maintain forage production and ecological conditions to benefit livestock, wildlife habitat, watershed values, and riparian areas; and achieve proper functioning condition as a minimum standard of stability on all riparian areas.

Management Objectives and Actions

Objective 1 Meet the Wyoming Standards for Rangeland Health.

Actions

a. Suspended AUMs (55,175 AUMs; Table A20-1) would be activated. The total active AUMs for the field office would be 157,308. Increases would occur where they would not contribute to non-achievement of land health standards, consistent with 43 CFR §4180.

b. Grazing systems would emphasize livestock production.

c. Livestock water developments would be allowed wherever necessary to facilitate livestock operations.

d. Approximately 21,000 acres of unallocated public lands would be allocated for livestock grazing in accordance with RMP goals and objectives.

e. Developed recreation sites (100 acres) and exclosures (approximately 75 acres) would be open to livestock grazing.

f. Livestock grazing and related improvements would be allowed in the Rock Creek ACEC Watershed.

g. Mineral supplement blocks for livestock and wildlife use would be placed where necessary to meet management objectives.

Minerals Management

Management Goal

Provide opportunities for mineral extraction and energy exploration and development to provide resources to meet national and local needs.

Management Objectives and Actions

Objective 1 (Intensively Developed Fields) Make federal lands and minerals within the existing Jonah, Pinedale Anticline, Big Piney-LaBarge, Deer Hills, Castle Creek, Riley Ridge, and South Piney oil and gas fields available for intensive oil and gas leasing, exploration, development, and production (Map 2-7).

Actions

a. Issue new oil and gas leases with the standard lease stipulations and appropriate NSO and controlled surface use (CSU) stipulations as specifically prescribed in the Cultural Resources, Wildlife, and Recreation sections of this alternative. Timing Limitation Stipulations (TLS) would not be applied.

b. A blanket exception would be issued for all existing leases (173,200 acres) in the Jonah, Pinedale Anticline, Big Piney-LaBarge, Deer Hills, Castle Creek, Riley Ridge, and South Piney oil and gas fields to allow year-round drilling and development operations until these fields are fully developed. This exception would not be applied to seasonal (timing limitation) protection measures for T&E species and migratory bird species unless analysis demonstrates that these species would not be affected or that anticipated impacts are mitigated per USFWS requirements.

c. BMPs and operating standards would be applied to mitigate impacts to sensitive habitats and other resources (Appendices 3 and 5) to the extent possible and practicable.

d. Accelerated reclamation would be implemented to reestablish impacted habitats.

e. On-lease water disposal pits would be considered case by case, provided the proposal meets the water disposal pit requirements in other sections of this alternative.

Objective 2 (Traditional Leasing Areas) Make federal lands and minerals outside the Jonah, Pinedale Anticline, Big Piney-LaBarge, Deer Hills, Castle Creek, Riley Ridge, and South Piney oil and gas fields and outside the WSAs available for oil and gas leasing exploration, development, and production (Map 2-7).

Actions

a. Mineral leases, including those for minerals other than oil and gas, would be subject to the same resource constraints as established for other surface disturbing and disruptive activities in this alternative.

b. Existing oil and gas leases (475,590 acres) would be managed under their existing lease terms and stipulations.

1. Oil and gas activities would be regulated to mitigate impacts to important wildlife habitats, including big game crucial winter ranges and greater sage-grouse habitats.

2. BMPs and operating standards would be applied to mitigate impacts to sensitive habitats and other resources (Appendices 3 and 5).

c. Post-lease actions (APDs, Sundry Notices) would be managed under restrictions and COAs developed through the appropriate level of additional environmental analysis.

d. Lands in these areas could convert to Intensively Developed Fields when bottom-hole well density exceeds one well per 160 acres and a surface density of four well pads per 640-acre section. Consideration for conversion would depend on (1) a geology and reservoir analysis determination that additional well density is needed to efficiently and adequately produce the gas or oil resource; (2) that surface resources can be satisfactorily mitigated; and (3) that a project-specific environmental documentation is prepared to analyze impacts and to determine operating methods, mitigation, and BMPs to be used in the efficient and comprehensive development of the field.

e. On-lease water disposal pits would be considered case by case provided the proposal meets the water disposal pit requirements in other sections of this alternative.

Objective 3 (Unavailable Areas) Comply with nondiscretionary closures to mineral leasing in the established WSAs (Map 2-7).

Actions

a. No new oil and gas leases would be available in these areas.

b. Existing oil and gas leases (1,670 acres) would be managed under their existing lease terms and stipulations.

1. Oil and gas activities would be regulated to mitigate impacts to important wildlife habitats, including big game crucial winter ranges and greater sage-grouse habitats.

2. BMPs and operating standards would be applied to mitigate impacts to sensitive habitats and other resources (Appendices 3 and 5).

3. Post-lease actions (APDs, Sundry Notices) would be managed under restrictions and COAs developed through the appropriate level of additional environmental analysis.

4. On-lease water disposal pits would not be allowed.

Objective 4 Provide opportunities for geophysical and geologic data acquisition while mitigating impacts to important resource values.

Actions

a. Geophysical data gathering methods that involve only casual use of the surface (as defined by 43 CFR §3150) would be permitted throughout the planning area.

b. The use of surface and/or above-ground (Poulter shot) explosive charges for geophysical exploration would be analyzed and mitigation developed case by case.

c. Geophysical activities in designated NSO areas would be evaluated on a case-by-case basis.

d. Geophysical operations on BLM-administered surface within Native American TCP areas and within one-quarter mile of rock art sites would be restricted to designated roads and trails or non-vehicle-based methods and would be subject to Native American consultation.

e. Geophysical operations on post-FLPMA leased or unleased BLM-administered surface within the Scab Creek and Lake Mountain WSAs would be considered on a case-by-case basis, provided the operations meet the requirements of the Interim Management Policy for Land under Wilderness Review (BLM Handbook H-8550-1). Geophysical operations on pre-FLPMA leased BLM-administered surface within the Lake Mountain WSA would be allowed pursuant to site-specific NEPA analysis and to pre-FLPMA requirements in H-8550-1.

f. Geophysical operations would be allowed on BLM-administered surface within the Trapper's Point ACEC and within the established SRMAs, provided the operations are conducted via non-vehicle-based methods or on designated roads and trails.

g. Geophysical activities would be allowed in developed recreation sites, provided the recreation site is not occupied and operations are conducted on existing roads and trails.

Objective 5 Make coal resources available for leasing and development.

Action

a. Decisions on lands acceptable for leasing consideration for coal development would be made after an application is received and the coal screening process is conducted.

Objective 6 Make lands not withdrawn or segregated from mineral entry available for locatable mineral exploration and development (1,199,280 acres).

Action

a. Locatable mineral activities would be subject to regulatory requirements; resource constraints would be based on the undue and unnecessary degradation standard.

Objective 7 Make salable mineral resources available for development.

Actions

a. Salable mineral activities would be evaluated on a case-by-case basis.

b. The planning area would be open to mineral material disposals with the exception of WSAs (21,200 acres) (Map 2-19).

Objective 8 Make other leasable minerals (phosphate, sodium [trona], and geothermal steam) available for exploration and development.

Actions

a. Geothermal leasing and development would be considered and managed under the same objectives, management actions, and restrictions, and in the same areas identified as being available for Intensive Development and Traditional Leasing Areas for oil and gas leasing and development in this alternative.

b. Management of phosphate, sodium, oil shale, and geothermal steam would be the same as for Alternative 1.

c. Should interest in other leasable minerals materialize in the future, leasing would be considered on a case-by-case basis, and the RMP would be amended as appropriate and necessary.

Paleontology and Natural History

Management Goals

Protect significant fossils and known paleontological resources from damage or destruction and facilitate suitable scientific, educational, and recreational uses of fossils.

Management Objective and Action

Objective 1 Known and newly discovered paleontological resources would be managed to maintain current condition.

Action

a. Paleontological resources would be managed without designating any area for special designation

or management based on paleontological resources, unless required for protection of paleontological values.

Recreation and Visitor Services Management

Management Goal

Provide substantial personal, community, economic, and environmental benefits to local residents and visitors through recreational uses of the public lands.

Management Objectives and Actions

Objective 1 Manage recreation use to limit resource damage.

Actions

a. A 16-day campsite occupancy limit would apply throughout the planning area. This occupancy limit applies to a 5-mile radius of the campsite.

b. Surface occupancy within one-quarter mile of developed recreation sites would be prohibited.

Objective 2 Promote commercial, competitive events and organized group activities where appropriate and compatible with natural resource management objectives.

Action

a. Additional SRPs with no restrictions on use levels for commercial river use on the Green and New Fork Rivers would be available.

Objective 3 Manage Special Recreation Management Areas to provide for current and future recreation opportunities. Refer to Recreation Management Zone (RMZ) specific objectives below. The Recreation Opportunity Spectrum would be used for each SRMA as a guide to maintain, promote, or modify recreation activities, settings, and experiences (Appendix 16).

b. **Scab Creek SRMA**—The Scab Creek SRMA would be retained at (18,460 acres) and would contain two RMZs . The Rural Country Zone would include the BLM access road with trailhead and other visitor facilities. The Back Country Zone would include the Scab Creek WSA and other areas at least one-half mile from any roads or constructed facilities.

1. Recreation/Tourism Market: The market for the Rural Country Zone would be *Destination* and the Back Country would be *Community* consisting of residents, national and international visitors.

2. The Market Segment for the Rural Country Zone would be for improved access and full service camping/recreational vehicle (RV) amenities and expanded area day-use activities. The Back Country Zone would provide nonmotorized backcountry recreation activities such as backpacking and other adventure activities that require a degree of self-reliance.

3. The Management Objective for the Scab Creek SRMA would be to manage each Zone to provide opportunities for the public to achieve targeted, high-quality recreation activities and experiences in a substantially natural setting, which would produce significant benefits for the visiting public. The SRMA would be managed with a focus on accommodating tourism and expected growth in the local area. Emphasis would be placed on structured recreation opportunities with expanded recreation facility development that promotes expanded use and provides visitor amenities commensurate

with the Rural setting (Table 2-5 and Table 2-6).

4. Recreation Management: A RAMP would be prepared. Appropriate use levels for permitted and non-permitted recreation activities would be established in the RAMP. All developed facilities would conform to Rural Country Setting Character. Facility Guidelines: Facilities would provide for long-term, day-use, and back-country staging activities. Management of the Back Country Zone would be commensurate with wilderness values.

5. Market Strategy: For the Rural Country Zone, onsite market strategy would be to use standard BLM venues for disseminating recreational user information and regulations such as informational, directional, and regulatory signs at the trailhead/staging area. Brochures and publications would be used for greater information distribution, regional BLM publications, and Internet technologies to promote private sector advertisement of area opportunities and user information. The Market Strategy for the Back Country Zone would be to provide basic user information at trailheads relative to access, regulations, and resource protection. The provision of onsite information and directional signs would be prohibited unless such facilities complied with the BLM Interim Management Policy for Lands Under Wilderness Review (within the WSA).

6. Recreation Monitoring: BLM personnel and volunteers would occasionally monitor both zones. Visitor use surveys would be implemented to determine whether targeted outcomes are being achieved.

7. Recreation Administration: Cost recovery would be implemented to maintain visitor services and facilities through management as a U.S. Fee Area as appropriate; no limit would apply on issuance of SRPs for commercial competitive and group activities pending completion of the RAMP. Camping would be limited to a 16-day length of stay. The WSA would be closed to motorized vehicles. Outside the WSA, OHV use would be limited to designated roads and trails; VRM Class II objectives would apply for the entire SRMA. The WSA would be administratively unavailable for fluid mineral leasing. The SRMA outside of the WSA would be available for fluid mineral leasing.

Table 2-5. Targeted Outcomes—Scab Creek SRMA

Activities	Experiences	Benefits
RURAL COUNTRY ZONE		
Camping/day use Horse packing/equestrian Hunting	Viewing wildlife and natural scenery Hunting Relaxing physically Engaging in preferred activities in preferred settings with family and friends	Personal: • Nature and aesthetic appreciation • Personal health and fitness Community: • Improved perceived quality of life • Family bonding/better family life Environmental: • Better care and stewardship of • Wind River Front Economic: • Contribution to tourism and local economy • Recognition of area as a tourist destination

Activities	Experiences	Benefits
BACK COUNTRY ZONE		
Viewing wildlife and natural scenery Backpacking Pack stock oriented recreation and wilderness camping Hunting Rock climbing	Viewing wildlife/natural scenery Engaging in preferred activities with family and friends Developing physically challenging back country skills Wilderness experience	Personal: • Nature/aesthetic appreciation • Social bonding/cohesion/ cooperation • Personal health and fitness • Self-reliance Community: • Improved perceived quality of life • Family bonding/better family life Environmental: • Better care of Wind River Front and enhancement of wilderness experience Economic: • Contribution to tourism and local economy • Increased attractiveness of region as a place to live

Table 2-6. Prescribed Setting Character—Scab Creek SRMA

Physical	Social	Administrative
RURAL COUNTRY ZONE		
Remoteness: Rural Country Naturalness: Rural Country Facilities: Rural Country	Contacts: Rural Country Group Size: Rural Country Evidence of Use: Rural Country Types of Encounters: Rural Country	Mechanized Use: Rural Country Visitor Services: Rural Country User Fees: Rural Country Management Controls: Rural Country Domestic Animals: Rural Country
BACK COUNTRY ZONE		
Remoteness: Back Country Naturalness: Back Country Facilities: Back Country	Contacts: Front Country Group Size: Middle Country Evidence of Use: Back Country Types of Encounters: Back Country	Mechanized Use: Back Country Visitor Services: Middle to Back Country User Fees: Back Country Management Controls: Back Country Domestic Animals: Back Country

c. **The Upper Green River SRMA**, would be retained at (5,160 acres) and managed as a Rural Country Zone consisting of the Warren Bridge Campground and adjoining Warren Bridge River Access complex (9-mile river segment above the campground).

1. Recreation/Tourism Markets: The Upper Green River SRMA would be a *Destination Market.* Users would be residents, national, and international visitors.

2. The Market Segment for the Rural Country Zone would be easy and contiguous river access where visitors of nearly all abilities can enjoy a myriad of river- and upland-based recreation activities such as float and wade fishing, camping, float boating, hunting, hiking, equestrian use, wildlife observation, scenery, and motorized activities.

3. Management Objective: The Upper Green River SRMA would be managed to provide opportunities for the public to achieve targeted recreation activities and experiences, which produce significant benefits for the visiting public (see below).

The RMZ would be managed to provide a 50% or better realization of targeted benefits. The SRMA would be managed with a focus on accommodating tourism and expected regional growth. Emphasis would be placed on structured recreation opportunities with expanded recreation facility development that promotes expanded use and provides visitor amenities commensurate with the Rural setting (Table 2-7 and Table 2-8).

4. Recreation Management: A RAMP would be developed. Use limits on commercial SRPs would apply until appropriate use levels for permitted and non-permitted recreation activities are established in the RAMP. Facility Guidelines: Rural Country Setting Characteristics would apply.

5. Market Strategy: Standard BLM venues would be utilized to disseminate recreation user information. Information would be distributed both onsite and offsite using regional BLM publications and Internet technologies to promote private sector advertisement of area amenities and user information. Information would be directional, regulatory, and interpretive. Emphasis would be placed on encouraging and enhancing tourism.

6. Recreation Monitoring: BLM personnel would occasionally monitor both zones. Visitor use surveys would be administered to determine whether targeted outcomes are being achieved.

7. Recreation Administration: There would be no limit on commercial river guide SRPs. Camping would be limited to all other activities subject to the issuance of SRPs would be considered. Camping would be limited to a 16-day length of stay. Motorized vehicles would be limited to existing roads and trails. VRM Class II objectives would apply (Map 2-20). The SRMA would be open for fluid mineral leasing and development. The Warren Bridge Campground would remain a U.S. Fee Site. To maintain visitor services and protect resources, the Warren Bridge River Access area would be recommended for authorization as a U.S. Fee Site.

Table 2-7. Targeted Outcomes—Upper Green River SRMA

Primary Activities	Experiences	Benefits
Float and wade fishing Camping Hunting	Being with family and friends Relaxing physically Enjoying participation in desired activities in preferred settings	Personal: • Nature/aesthetic appreciation • Stronger ties with family and friends • Improved physical and mental health and well being Community/Social: • Family bonding Environmental: • Better appreciation of Green River Economic: • Contributions to local economy • Increased job opportunities • Recognition of area as a tourist destination

Table 2-8. Prescribed Setting Character—Upper Green River SRMA

Physical	Social	Administrative
Remoteness: Rural Country Naturalness: Rural Country Facilities: Rural Country	Contacts: Rural Country Group Size: Rural Country Types of Encounters: Rural Country Personal Gear/Equipment: Rural Country Evidence of Use: Rural Country	Mechanized Use: Rural Country Visitor Services: Rural Country Management Controls: Rural Country Domestic Animals: Front Country Individual User Fees: Rural Country

d. The **Boulder Lake SRMA** would be retained (5,790 acres) and managed as a Rural Country Recreation Management Zone. The Rural Country Zone developments would consist of the BLM access road, boat launch area, restrooms, parking area, two non-fee campgrounds, public information facilities, and undeveloped primitive roads and trails.

1. Recreation/Tourism Market: The market would be *Destination,* consisting of regional, national, and international visitors.

2. The Market Segment for the Rural Country Zone would be a natural appearing landscape that provides substantial opportunities to experience lake- and upland-based recreation activities such as lake fishing and river wade fishing, boating, hunting, camping, equestrian use, cycling, motorized activities, wildlife viewing, and exemplary glacial lake viewing.

3. The Management Objective: Provide a 50% or better realization of targeted benefits. The area would be managed with a focus on accommodating tourism and expected regional growth. Emphasis would be placed on structured recreation opportunities with expanded recreation facility development that promotes expanded use and provides visitor amenities commensurate with the rural setting (Table 2-9 and Table 2-10).

4. Recreation Management: A RAMP would be prepared. Appropriate use levels for permitted and non-permitted recreation activities would be established in the RAMP. All developed facilities would conform to Rural Country Setting Character. Facility Guidelines: Facilities would provide for day and overnight use.

5. The Market Strategy would be to use standard BLM venues for disseminating recreation user information both onsite and offsite, using regional BLM publications and Internet technologies. Additional offsite market strategy would be to promote private sector advertisement of area opportunities and user information. Information would be directional, regulatory, and interpretive. Emphasis would be placed on encouraging and enhancing tourism.

6. Recreation Monitoring: BLM personnel and volunteers would occasionally monitor both zones. Visitor use surveys would be implemented to determine whether targeted outcomes are being achieved.

7. Recreation Administration: Cost recovery would be implemented to maintain visitor services and facilities through management as a U.S. Fee Area, as appropriate. Pending completion of the RAMP, no limit would apply on issuance of SRPs for commercial event and group activities. Camping would be limited to a 16-day length of stay. OHV use would be limited to existing roads and trails. VRM Class II objectives would apply to the SRMA. The entire SRMA would be available for fluid mineral leasing and development.

Table 2-9. Targeted Outcomes—Boulder Lake SRMA

Primary Activities	Experiences	Benefits
Boating Lake and River Fishing Hunting Camping Viewing Wildlife and Scenery Adventure Floating	Being with family and friends Relaxing physically Enjoying participation in desired activities in preferred settings Practicing outdoor skills	Personal: • Nature/aesthetic appreciation • Stronger ties with family and friends • Improved skills for outdoor enjoyment Community/Social: • Improved perceived quality of life • Family bonding Environmental: • Better environmental stewardship • Increased awareness of protection and management of natural landscapes Economic • Contributions to local economy • Recognition of area as a tourist destination

Table 2-10. Prescribed Setting Character—Boulder Lake SRMA

Physical	Social	Administrative
Remoteness: Rural Country Naturalness: Rural Country Facilities: Rural Country	Contacts: Rural Country Group Size: Rural Country Contacts: Rural Country Types of Encounters: Rural Country Personal Gear/Equipment: Rural Country Evidence of Use: Rural Country	Mechanized Use: Rural Country Visitor Services: Rural Country Management Controls: Rural Country Domestic Animals: Front Country Individual User Fees: Front Country

Objective 4 **Extensive Recreation Management Area** (remainder of the Pinedale Planning Area) Provide an array of resource-dependent, dispersed recreation opportunities such as hunting, fishing, motorized use and open space. Management would be extensive rather than intensive. Management actions would be custodial in nature and focus on:

a. The development of new recreation facilities only when necessary to protect human health, safety, and natural resource values

b. The maintenance and enhancement of important public access

c. The resolution of resource and social conflicts.

Soils Management

Management Goal

Prevent or mitigate impacts on soil stability, productivity, and water infiltration to prevent accelerated erosion and provide for optimal plant growth.

Management Objectives and Actions

Objective 1 Reclaim or mitigate impacts of erosion from past surface disturbing activities within 5 years of RMP implementation.

Action

a. Work with state and local communities, bonding companies, and operators to achieve the objective.

Objective 2 Ensure that all newly disturbed areas are successfully reclaimed.

Action

a. Mitigation would be applied in all areas to limit soil erosion and related undesirable conditions.

Transportation, Access, and Travel Management

Management Goals

Provide access for approved public land uses consistent with public health and safety and other resource value concerns.

Provide public use opportunities where compatible with other resource values.

Management Objectives and Actions

Objective 1 Provide needed and appropriate ingress, egress, and access routes to and across public lands for authorized uses.

Actions

a. Transportation planning would be completed within 5 years of implementation of the RMP (Appendix 17, Map A17-1).

b. Reasonable access would be provided across public lands to landlocked private and state lands, consistent with BLM Manual 2801.49 and other resource uses and needs.

c. Access routes would be designed to minimize resource impacts while providing reasonable access.

d. OHV designations for restrictions to existing roads and trails would remain in effect until travel management planning is completed and designated roads and trails are identified.

Objective 2 Reclaim or mitigate erosion impacts on transportation corridors.

Actions

a. BLM's roads, trails, and bridges would be maintained in fair or better condition.

b. Land users would be required to use BMPs and operating standards for road maintenance (Appendices 3 and 5).

Objective 3 Make public lands available for responsible OHV use where appropriate.

Actions

a. OHV designations would be established for all lands within the PFO. Periodic adjustments and use constraints could be necessary to ensure that identified sensitive resources are appropriately protected from excessive disturbance, road/route/trail proliferation, and human encroachment.

b. Except for over-the-snow equipment, recreational motorized vehicle use would be limited to existing roads and trails unless otherwise specified.

c. OHV open areas would be established in the Mt. Airy, Big Piney, Burma, and LaBarge areas (Map 2-21). Operation plans would be developed for each area prior to a change in designation.

d. Oregon Trail inscription sites would be closed to OHV use.

e. Except for over-the-snow equipment, motorized vehicle use would be limited to designated roads and trails in the following areas (Map 2-21):

- Scab Creek SRMA (outside the WSA)
- Lake Mountain WSA
- Trapper's Point ACEC
- Native American burial sites.

f. Motorized vehicle use would be allowed on the Pinedale Pathway.

g. The planning area would be open to the use of motorized over-the-snow vehicles, except in WSAs and areas subject to seasonal closures.

h. OHV closures and seasonal restrictions would be effective immediately upon signature of the ROD for the RMP.

Vegetation Management

Management Goals

Maintain or enhance vegetation community health, composition, and diversity. Reclaim disturbed areas to desired plant communities.

Management Objectives and Actions

Objective 1 Manage permitted actions to prevent the spread of noxious weeds and reduce the total area impacted by noxious weeds.

Actions

a. BLM would collaborate with Sublette County in the treatment of noxious weeds or invasive species.

b. Mitigation would be applied to all activities to control noxious weeds (Appendices 3 and 5).

c. Weed control would be achieved through chemical, mechanical, and biological methods.

d. Before a method is selected, all vegetation treatments would be assessed for the potential to introduce invasive species.

e. BLM would support and cooperate with local efforts to manage and control invasive plant species or noxious weeds, including local plans and control efforts.

Objective 2 Ensure Special Status Plant Species habitats are maintained at a level sufficient for long-term species sustainability.

Actions

a. Special status plant species surveys would be required on potential habitats before any project or activity would be approved. If species are found, avoidance measures would be taken if possible. For listed species, protective measures would be developed and implemented in consultation with the USFWS.

b. Known locations of Wyoming BLM sensitive plant species would be avoidance areas for surface disturbing activities.

Visual Resources Management

Management Goal

Manage the visual quality of the public lands.

Management Objective and Actions

Objective 1 Manage the public lands in a manner that protects the quality of the scenic values of those lands.

Actions

a. VRM classifications would be managed according to Map 2-20 (Table 2-29, p. 2-164). No areas would be managed as VRM Class I; 87,150 acres would be managed as VRM Class II; 118,390 acres would be managed as VRM Class III; and 717,390 acres would be managed as VRM Class IV.

b. Manage VRM Class II areas to retain the existing character of the landscape. The level of change to the characteristic landscape should be low. Management activities may be seen but should not attract the attention of the casual observer. Any changes must repeat the basic elements of form, line, color, and texture found in the predominant natural features of the characteristic landscape.

c. Manage VRM Class III areas to partially retain the existing character of the landscape. The level of change to the characteristic landscape should be moderate. Management activities may attract attention but should not dominate the view of the casual observer. Changes should repeat the basic elements found in the predominant natural features of the characteristic landscape.

d. Manage VRM Class IV areas to provide for management activities that require major modification of the existing character of the landscape. The level of change to the characteristic landscape can be high. These management activities may dominate the view and be the major focus of viewer attention. However, every attempt should be made to minimize the impact of these activities through careful location, minimal disturbance, and repeat of the basic elements.

Watershed and Water Quality (Surface Water and Groundwater) Management

Management Goal

Minimize adverse impacts to surface water and groundwater resources and recharge areas from public land uses.

Management Objectives and Actions

Objective 1 Collaborate with the state to achieve the uses and water quality standards specified by the WDEQ, reduce the number of streams listed as impaired, and prevent listing of additional streams under the Clean Water Act, Section 303(d).

Actions

a. Prevent, minimize, and/or remediate sources of stream impairment that occur on public lands.

b. The discharge of produced waters would be in compliance with WDEQ standards. Point source discharge of produced waters to streams or other non-isolated surface features would be allowed if permitted by WDEQ National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program and following the guidelines provided by the BMPs in Appendix 3.

c. Oil and gas operators would be encouraged to develop and implement methods that treat produced water and enable its productive use.

d. Use of produced waters to assist in reclamation could be considered on a case-by-case basis and would be governed by operating standards and appropriate irrigation water quality standards (Appendix 3).

e. Produced water from coalbed natural gas (CBNG) wells would be handled using the same methods used for treatment of produced water from traditional gas and oil wells.

Objective 2 Meet the Wyoming Standards for Rangeland Health on riparian/wetland areas and uplands.

Action

a. Achieve and/or maintain proper functioning condition as a minimum standard on all riparian and wetland areas to control nonpoint source pollution to the extent possible.

Objective 3 Control water runoff from developed sites and maintain soil erosion at appropriate rates for natural conditions.

Actions

a. Apply BMPs and operating standards to mitigate surface disturbance and control nonpoint source erosion (Appendices 3 and 5).

b. Surface disturbance from construction activities greater than one (1) acre in size would be regulated under the WDEQ NPDES Stormwater program.

c. Construction activities would not be restricted in floodplains, wetlands, and riparian areas, provided they meet the requirements of EOs 11988 and 11990 and Wyoming Water Quality Standards and Regulations.

d. Salt loading in the Colorado River system would be controlled by applying BMPs on all highly erodible saline soils potentially affected by management activities.

Objective 4 Point source pollution would be addressed under the guidance of appropriate Wyoming State and federal agencies including, but not limited to WDEQ, Wyoming State Engineers Office (WSEO), and EPA.

Action

a. Cooperate with the state as it develops source water and wellhead protection plans to protect drinking water sources.

Wildland Fire and Fuels Management

Management Goal

Protect firefighters, public safety, and private property.

Management Objectives and Actions

Objective 1 No loss of life or improved property losses would occur from wildland fire.

Actions

a. Wildland fire mitigation and fuels activities would be managed to provide for firefighter and public safety as a first priority. Public lands within intermixed landownership areas would be managed in association with the adjoining and nearby private and state lands.

b. Areas of mixed landownership; communities at risk as identified in the *Federal Register*, Volume 66, Number 160, 2001 (Antelope Run, Beaver Creek area, Boulder, Cottonwood Creek, Daniel, Forty Rod, Hoback Ranches, New Fork, Pinedale, Pocket Creek, and Upper Green); urban and industrial interface areas; and areas containing high-priority resource values would have high priority for response to wildland fires and/or for fuels reduction and mitigation. Wildland fire suppression activities would be based on the Appropriate Management Response (AMR) (see Glossary).

Objective 2 Use prescribed fire to provide for diverse plant communities and successional stages.

Actions

a. Prescribed fire and mechanical fuels treatments would be used to reduce hazardous fuels within the urban and industrial interface and achieve the objectives of the wildlife habitat, livestock forage, visual quality, fuels management, vegetation, watershed quality, and weed control programs.

b. Rehabilitation efforts would be undertaken to protect and sustain ecosystems, protect public health and safety, and help communities protect infrastructure. Actions such as erosion controls, fencing, reseeding, and temporary use restrictions could be taken.

Objective 3 Manage wildfire with minimal damage to other resources.

Actions

a. Off-road travel of firefighting vehicles and equipment would be allowed throughout the planning area with approval of the Resource Advisor on the fire.

b. Use of fire suppression chemicals would be allowed throughout the planning area.

c. Movement of waters from whirling-disease-positive to whirling-disease-negative waters would be avoided if possible.

Wildlife and Fish Habitat Management

Management Goal

Maintain or enhance aquatic and wildlife habitat.

Management Objectives and Actions

Objective 1 Maintain fish and wildlife habitat to the extent possible while providing for multiple use management, including oil and gas leasing, exploration, and development.

Action

a. The planning area would be delineated into three distinct, noncontiguous, wildlife management zones for the purpose of oil and gas activities (Map 2-7) as follows:

Intensively Developed Fields (Map 2-7) would be managed for intensive oil and gas activities.

Traditional Leasing Areas (Map 2-7) would be managed for conservation of important values during oil and gas exploration but would provide opportunity for intensive oil and gas development. Should a discovery be made and proceed to development, these lands could be moved to Developed Areas status.

Unavailable Areas (Map 2-7) would be managed for protection of wildlife habitats and values other than oil and gas development.

Objective 2 Maintain fish and wildlife habitats to the extent possible.

Actions

Intensively Developed Fields

Greater sage-grouse

a. In suitable greater sage-grouse habitats (including nesting, early brood rearing, and winter concentration areas), vehicular activities would be restricted to existing roads and trails in accordance with dates established for each stage of greater sage-grouse activity.

b. BMPs or other appropriate mitigation would be applied to surface disturbance and occupancy within one-quarter mile of the perimeter of greater sage-grouse leks, including human activity during lekking periods.

c. No seasonal restrictions would be applied to development in greater sage-grouse lekking, nesting, early brood rearing, or winter habitats.

Big Game

d. Elk feedgrounds would be eliminated on public lands. Former feedground areas would be available for oil and gas leasing.

e. No seasonal restrictions would be applied for activities in big game parturition areas, crucial winter ranges, and migration routes and bottlenecks.

Special Status Species

f. Surveys for Special Status Species would be conducted on BLM-administered public lands and mineral estate before any federal project or federal activity would be approved.

g. Surface disturbing activities would be allowed subject to mitigation to minimize cumulative impacts.

Raptors

h. Activities would be designed and mitigated to prevent take of raptors. Proposals would be examined case by case to determine potential effects and appropriate mitigation.

Traditional Leasing Areas

Greater sage-grouse

a. In suitable greater sage-grouse habitats (including nesting, early brood rearing, and winter concentration areas), vehicular activities would be restricted to existing roads and trails in accordance with dates established for each stage of greater sage-grouse activity.

b. New proposed surface disturbing and disruptive activities would be designed to limit impacts in suitable nesting and early brood-rearing habitat within 2 miles of occupied greater sage-grouse leks or in identified sage-grouse nesting and early brood-rearing habitat from March 15 through July 15.

c. BMPs or other appropriate mitigation would be applied to surface disturbing and disruptive activities in greater sage-grouse winter concentration areas to limit the effects of oil and gas exploration and development or other proposed land use activities from November 15 through March 15.

d. BMPs or other appropriate mitigation would be applied to surface disturbance and occupancy within one-quarter mile of the perimeter of greater sage-grouse leks, including human activity during lekking periods.

Big Game

e. Elk feedgrounds would be eliminated on public lands. Former feedground areas would be available for oil and gas leasing.

f. No seasonal restrictions would be applied for activities in big game parturition areas, crucial winter ranges, and migration routes and bottlenecks.

Special Status Species

g. Surveys for Special Status Species would be conducted on BLM-administered public lands and mineral estate before any federal project or federal activity would be approved.

h. Surface disturbing activities would be allowed subject to mitigation to minimize cumulative impacts.

Raptors

i. Activities would be designed and mitigated to prevent take of raptors. Proposals would be examined case by case to determine potential effects and appropriate mitigation.

Unavailable Areas

Greater sage-grouse

a. In suitable greater sage-grouse habitats (including nesting, early brood rearing, and winter concentration areas), vehicular activities would be restricted to existing roads and trails in accordance with dates established for each stage of greater sage-grouse activity.

b. New proposed surface disturbing and disruptive activities would be designed to limit impacts in suitable nesting and early brood-rearing habitat within 2 miles of occupied greater sage-grouse leks or in identified sage-grouse nesting and early brood-rearing habitat from March 15 through July 15.

c. BMPs or other appropriate mitigation would be applied to surface disturbing and disruptive activities in greater sage-grouse winter concentration areas to limit the effects of oil and gas exploration and development or other proposed land use activities from November 15 through March 15.

d. BMPs or other appropriate mitigation would be applied to surface disturbance and occupancy, including human activity within one-quarter mile of the perimeter of greater sage-grouse leks during lekking periods.

Big Game

e. No seasonal restrictions would be applied for activities in big game parturition areas, crucial winter ranges, and migration routes and bottlenecks.

Special Status Species

f. Surveys for Special Status Species would be conducted on BLM-administered public lands and mineral estate before any federal project or federal activity would be approved.

g. Surface disturbing activities would be allowed subject to mitigation to minimize cumulative impacts.

Raptors

h. Activities would be designed and mitigated to prevent take of raptors. Proposals would be examined case by case to determine potential effects and appropriate mitigation.

Objective 3 Provide suitable habitat to support the Conservation Agreement and Strategy (CAS) for CRCT in the States of Colorado, Utah, and Wyoming.

Actions

a. Instream activities such as construction of stream crossings would be designed to protect spawning CRCT, redds, and fry.

b. Chemical use for the purpose of fisheries management to enhance native fish populations or to remove unwanted fish species in streams or lakes would be allowed.

Objective 4 Water developments would be constructed to avoid inadvertent injury to wildlife.

Action

a. Water developments would be designed to protect animals from injury, and water would be made accessible for wildlife use with sufficient protective cover to the extent available.

Special Designations and Management Areas

Management Goals

Trapper's Point ACEC Management Goals. Preserve cultural and historic resources, viability of the big game migration bottleneck, and important livestock trailing use.

WSA Management Goal. Protect wilderness values in all WSAs.

Management Objectives and Actions

Objective 1 Ensure that no obstruction to the big game migration bottleneck within the Trapper's Point ACEC would occur; facilitate livestock trailing and gathering; and provide interpretation of cultural sites for the public.

Actions

a. The Trapper's Point ACEC (550 acres) would be designated (Map 2-19; Table 2-30, p. 2-164). Surface disturbing activities would be prohibited except those that enhance the viability of the big game migration, operations of the Green River Drift, or activities to interpret or enhance understanding of the cultural site.

b. The ACEC would be unavailable for oil and gas leasing.

c. OHV use would be limited to designated roads and trails and would be closed from November 15 to April 30.

2.5.4 Alternative 3

Air Quality Management

Management Goal

Minimize the impact of management actions in the planning area on air quality by complying with all applicable air quality laws, rules, and regulations. Implement management actions in the planning area to improve air quality as practicable.

Management Objectives and Actions

Objective 1 Maintain concentrations of criteria pollutants associated with management actions in compliance with applicable state and federal AAQS.

Objective 2 Maintain concentrations of PSD pollutants associated with management actions in compliance with the applicable increment.

Objective 3 Reduce visibility-impairing pollutants in accordance with the reasonable progress goals and time frames established within the State of Wyoming's Regional Haze SIP.

Objective 4 Reduce atmospheric deposition pollutants to levels below generally accepted LOCs and LACs.

Actions (these actions apply to all four objectives)

a. BLM would cooperate in the collection of basic climate and meteorological data from remote automatic weather stations.

b. BLM would cooperate with the EPA and the State of Wyoming and collaborate with the USFS in monitoring for atmospheric deposition (acid rain) and its impacts on the Class I airsheds of the Bridger and Fitzpatrick Wilderness Areas.

c. Special requirements such as dust abatement, alternative power sources, and BMPs to alleviate air quality impacts would be included on a case-by-case basis in use authorizations within the scope of BLM's authority.

d. Prescribed burns would be managed to comply with WDEQ-AQD smoke management rules and regulations.

e. BLM would continue to participate in State of the Atmosphere modeling to assess cumulative changes to air quality over time.

Cultural Resources Management

Management Goals

Protect and preserve significant cultural resources for appropriate use by present and future generations.

Promote stewardship, conservation, and appreciation of cultural resources.

Provide opportunities for scientific, educational, recreational, and traditional uses of cultural resources.

Reduce imminent threats to eligible and unevaluated cultural resources from natural or human-caused impacts or potential conflict with other resource uses.

Develop a public outreach and education program to instill a preservation ethic in the public regarding archeological and historic resources.

Management Objective and Actions

Objective 1 Protect NRHP-eligible cultural sites and national historic trails.

Actions

a. Cultural resource management activity plans would be completed and implemented to identify, record, preserve, and protect archeological and historic sites. Activity plans would be prepared for any current or future sites listed in, or determined eligible for listing in, the NRHP. Site-specific management prescriptions, including data recovery if warranted, would be included in the activity plans.

b. Select NRHP-eligible sites would be protected from inappropriate use, erosion, trampling, or other damage through monitoring and development of mitigations.

c. Important cultural areas would be identified and inventoried to protect cultural resources before other management actions are proposed.

d. Surface disturbance or occupancy would be prohibited on communal big game kill sites, Oregon Trail inscription sites, rock shelters, select rock alignments, Native American burial locales, modern day Native American TCPs, and rock art sites.

e. Communal big game kill sites, Oregon Trail inscription sites, rock shelters, select rock alignments, Native American burial locales, modern day Native American TCPs, and rock art sites would be unavailable for oil and gas leasing.

f. Withdrawals from exploration and development of locatable minerals to protect NRHP eligible sites and sensitive Native American properties would be pursued as needed.

g. The Lander Trail and its visual historic setting would be protected through establishment of a VRM Class II designation for approximately 169,570 acres of public land within 3 miles of the trail (Map 2-22).

h. If a proposed action would diminish the integrity of a cultural property's setting, and the integrity of the setting contributes to NRHP eligibility, appropriate mitigation would be applied (Appendices 1, 3, and 5).

i. The area within 1 mile of the Lander and Sublette Cutoff Trails would be unavailable for oil and gas leasing.

j. Surface occupancy would be prohibited within 1 mile of the Lander and Sublette Cutoff Trails.

k. Land acquisitions/exchanges would be pursued to preserve cultural resources, as appropriate.

l. Section 110 inventory acreage would be determined annually based on budget, workload, and threats from development, vandalism, and/or erosion.

Forestry

Management Goal

All forest and woodland stands will be managed for restoration to pre-suppression composition, structure, and function, with generally widely scattered, more fire resilient larger trees and lower numbers of smaller trees.

Management Objectives and Actions

Objective 1 Return mixed conifer and lodgepole pine stands (approximately 22,000 acres) to their historic range of variability (HRV) on a landscape scale, based on the established Fire Regime Condition Class (FRCC) Biophysical Settings, which establishes baseline composition and structure Condition Class 1.

Actions

a. Existing old growth stands and their FRCC would be identified, and the stands would be managed to maintain pre-suppression composition, structure, and function on a landscape scale.

b. Other stands would be managed to move them toward old growth composition, structure, and function as appropriate.

c. Forest health concerns would be identified and stands aggressively managed to improve forest health within the guidelines of HFRA.

d. Forest commodity production and stand improvement activities would be focused on small diameter trees as consistent with making the stand fire resilient. Approximately 1,600 CCF/800 thousand board feet (MBF) of forest products would annually be available for sale. Up to 200 acres of forest land could be treated annually by commercial and precommercial thinning activities.

e. In stands (Fire Regime IV and V) where stand replacement fires are the norm, even age management could be practiced consistent within the disturbance ecology framework of the vegetation type.

Objective 2 Return woodland ecosystems to their historic spatial distribution on a landscape scale, based on the established FRCC biophysical settings that establish baseline composition and structure Condition Class 1.

Actions

a. Forest products would be available as a secondary product of management consistent with forest health, landscape restoration, and reduction of forest fuels objectives.

b. Restoration of aspen stands would be emphasized through removing/reducing conifer and/or sagebrush invasion. Prescribed fire and overstory removal of dead and dying aspen would be used to rejuvenate and expand these stands so that watershed and wildlife habitat would be improved, and natural fire breaks would be created within the landscape.

c. Up to 700 acres of woodlands could undergo vegetation treatment per year.

d. Spatial position of juniper and limber pine woodlands would be determined by age class structure of the stands. Any stand with few or no trees within the 120-150+ year age class would be considered to have invaded the sagebrush/grass biophysical setting or to have greatly increased in density and are out of appropriate spatial distribution.

e. Aspen stands would be managed to maintain an average age of the mature stems of 60 to 100 years per clone, with healthy sapling stands having approximately 2,000+ stems per acre.

Objective 3 Restore or emulate natural/historic forest cycles on the forested lands and woodlands within the Scab Creek and Lake Mountain WSAs.

Action

a. Prescribed or wildland fire could be used to achieve vegetation alteration in the WSAs. Mechanical surface disturbing activities would be prohibited, and no forest products would be removed from WSAs.

Objective 4 Using HFRA guidelines, maintain and/or restore identified old growth stands.

Action

a. All stands would be analyzed for old growth characteristics prior to entry by using existing or new inventory methods and analysis of previous forest management activities. Stands meeting old growth standards for their vegetation type would be managed to maintain old growth composition, structure, and function on a landscape scale as defined by the appropriate biophysical setting. Connectivity of existing old growth areas would be maintained at appropriate locations and distribution levels. Old growth stands would be maintained using appropriate mechanical and prescribed fire tools to maintain pre-suppression composition, structure, and function.

Lands and Realty Management

Management Goals

Provide for use of public lands in accordance with federal regulations where compatible with other resources. Pursue land tenure adjustments that are in the public interest.

Management Objectives and Actions

Objective 1 Process land tenure adjustments that would benefit or achieve the goals of other resource programs.

Actions

a. Of the 6,300 acres that meet the FLPMA disposal criteria for sale, 790 would be available (Appendix 14 and Map 2-23).

b. Emphasis would be placed on actions that accommodate and enhance wildlife migration routes within the planning area.

Objective 2 Respond to community needs for expansion and economic development.

Actions

a. Proposals for land tenure adjustments (Map 2-23) would be considered on a case-by-case basis and according to the criteria outlined in Appendix 13. Before any land tenure adjustments were made, additional NEPA analysis would be conducted on the proposal. Riparian, wetland, and aquatic resources would not be available for disposal.

b. Acquisition of nonfederal lands from willing parties would be considered to meet the goals of the various resource management programs. Land exchanges would be considered if they would enhance other resource values, provide public benefit, or improve management efficiency in areas of scattered or intermingled landownership patterns (Appendix 13).

c. No lands would be determined suitable for DLE.

d. Trespass within the planning area would be resolved. BLM would pursue the resolution of occupancy, mineral, or other trespass to the benefit of BLM and the public.

e. Realty actions that would accommodate and enhance wildlife migration routes would be actively pursued. Public lands would be retained to provide for free movement of migrating big game animals at—

- Trapper's Point
- The south end of Fremont Lake
- Other important wildlife migration routes as identified.

Objective 3 Process ROW applications in a timely manner, applying appropriate mitigation to protect resource values.

Actions

a. Existing routes ("corridors") for large utility facilities would be maintained (Map 3-10). No new routes would be identified. New development would be limited to existing routes.

b. Linear ROW crossings in 100-year flood plains, wetlands, and riparian areas would be considered on a case-by-case basis (Map 3-14).

c. No exceptions would be permitted for activities in ROW exclusion areas (Map 2-24; Table 2-27, p. 2-160).

d. ROW for communication sites would be processed on a case-by-case basis with the following criteria:

1. Development would be limited to already-existing multiple use sites; no new sites would be established.

2. Towers on all sites would be restricted to heights that do not require lighting, in accordance with Federal Aviation Administration regulations.

3. All new and replacement towers would be self-supporting and non-guyed.

4. New users on all sites would be responsible for notifying existing users of frequencies and for resolving any interference problems with existing facilities.

e. Proposals for alternative energy development (for example, wind or solar) would be considered on a case-by-case basis.

1. Alternative energy development would not be allowed in sensitive areas, including but not limited to—

- Raptor concentration areas
- Neotropical bird migration routes
- Within 3 miles of sage-grouse leks
- Sage-grouse winter concentration areas
- VRM Class I or II areas
- WSAs, SRMAs, ACECs, and other SD/MAs
- Lander Trail, Sublette Cutoff Trail, and sensitive Native American and cultural sites identified for no lease or NSO
- T&E species habitats
- BLM Sensitive Species habitats
- Big game crucial winter ranges and parturition areas.

f. No water disposal pits would be permitted.

Objective 4 Approximately 65,750 acres of new withdrawals from locatable mineral entry and land disposal would be pursued to protect wildlife habitat, visual and recreational values, and cultural sites (Table 2-26, p 2-159, Map 2-25).

Livestock Grazing Management

Management Goals

Enhance forage production; maintain a balance between commodity production and the enhancement of wildlife habitat, watershed, and riparian areas; maintain range condition at, or improve range condition toward, the potential for the ecological site; improve forage production and ecological conditions; maintain or improve riparian habitat to enhance forage conditions, wildlife habitat, and stream quality; and achieve proper functioning condition as a minimum standard of stability on all riparian areas.

Management Objective and Actions

Objective 1 Meet the Wyoming Standards for Rangeland Health.

Actions

a. Permitted active AUMS would be reduced to approximately 84,000 AUMs, a 22% reduction. Reductions would be analyzed and implemented on an individual permit basis.

b. Areas open to grazing and available AUMs would be reduced where industrial activity conflicts with grazing operations and rangeland management objectives. Conflicts could include loss of forage, unsuccessful rehabilitation of disturbed areas, invasive species, safety hazards, improper livestock distribution, or other circumstances. Affected allotments would include Stud Horse Butte, Desert Sand Draw, Mesa Common, North LaBarge, Deer Hills, Mount Airy Common, NW Square Top, Blue Rim Individual, Clark-Bloom, Blue Rim Desert, South Desert, Square Top Common, and New Fork Individual allotments (122,091 acres; 12,229 AUMs). AUMs in other allotments within the planning area could be reduced or allotments closed if industrial activity increases to a level where the two activities are incompatible.

c. Permanent reductions in grazing preference in other areas could be implemented if other mitigation measures are impractical or unsuccessful as shown by monitoring and other data. Adjustments in livestock grazing use would be made as a result of monitoring and in consultation, coordination, and cooperation with grazing permittees, other affected interests, and state agencies.

d. Grazing systems would be designed to enhance wildlife habitat, vegetation condition, recreation values, and watershed health.

e. Livestock grazing in areas of crucial big game winter ranges would be managed to enhance vegetation condition and forage availability for wildlife.

f. Livestock water developments on crucial big game winter ranges would be allowed only if they would not adversely impact the crucial range or wintering big game.

g. Water developments in important wildlife habitats would be made available to wildlife season long.

h. Grazing seasons in allotments containing elk parturition areas would be adjusted to begin after June 1 to reduce the potential for brucellosis transmission. This action would only occur after, and in conjunction with, development of a herd management plan through coordination and cooperation with the affected grazing permittee and the WGFD.

i. Approximately 21,000 unallocated acres would be allocated to other resources such as wildlife and

recreation and would not be permitted for livestock grazing.

j. Developed recreation sites (approximately 100 acres) and vegetation exclosures (approximately 75 acres or up to 150 AUMs) would be closed to livestock grazing.

k. New forest regeneration areas would be protected from concentrations of livestock where necessary to facilitate tree establishment.

l. The Rock Creek ACEC Watershed Area (4,660 acres) would be closed to livestock grazing.

m. Forage reserves could be established as opportunities arise to provide management flexibility to rest other allotments during drought years, habitat improvements, wildfire, prescribed burns, and other circumstances as necessary. Use of allotments as forage reserves would not exceed the allotment's livestock grazing capacity.

n. In allotments with riparian habitat, grazing management actions would be designed to maintain or achieve proper functioning condition.

o. Mineral supplement blocks for livestock and wildlife use would not be placed within one-quarter mile of occupied sage-grouse leks, live water, wetland, or riparian areas, unless activity plans show that it is necessary to meet management objectives and any impacts are mitigated.

Minerals Management

Management Goal

Provide opportunities for mineral extraction and energy exploration and development while emphasizing protection and enhancement of soils, water, vegetation, wildlife, fish, and other renewable resources.

Management Objectives and Actions

Objective 1 (Intensively Developed Fields) Make federal lands and minerals within the existing Jonah and Pinedale Anticline oil and gas fields available for intensive oil and gas leasing, exploration, development, and production (67,210 acres) (Map 2-8).

Actions

a. Mineral leases, including those for minerals other than oil and gas, would be subject to the same restrictions established for other surface disturbing and disruptive activities under this alternative.

b. Existing oil and gas leases (66,020 acres) would be managed under their existing lease terms and stipulations.

1. Oil and gas development would be regulated to conserve important wildlife habitats, including big game crucial winter ranges and greater sage-grouse habitats.

2. Surface disturbances for exploration purposes would be subject to additional limitations, including BMPs applied to protect sensitive habitats and other resources.

3. On-lease water disposal pits would not be allowed.

c. Exceptions would be considered to allow year-round drilling and development operations on those existing leases in the Jonah and Pinedale Anticline oil and gas fields that are currently encumbered by seasonal restrictions. Such exceptions would be subject to additional environmental analysis and to the leaseholder/operator implementing offsetting mitigation, including but not limited to, habitat replacement or enhancement; development of a liquids (condensate and produced water) gathering system to reduce truck traffic; remote telemetry; drilling multiple wells from new and existing pads; directional drilling; noise reduction for drilling and completion operations; flareless completion; and

tier 4 or better emission equipment.

This exception would not be applied to seasonal (timing limitation) protection measures for T&E and migratory bird species unless analysis demonstrates that these species would not be affected or that anticipated impacts would be mitigated per USFWS requirements.

d. BMPs and operating standards would be applied to protect sensitive habitats and other resources (Appendices 3 and 5).

e. Accelerated reclamation would be implemented.

f. BLM-permitted actions on split estate lands (private or state surface with underlying federal minerals) would be subject to the same stipulations as federal leases on federal surface. For example, if a split estate lease contains crucial big game winter habitat, the lease would be offered with the crucial big game winter range seasonal restriction. These restrictions would not constrain actions of the surface landowner. Exceptions to surface development restrictions could be granted if requested or agreed to by the surface landowner.

Objective 2 (Traditional Leasing Areas) Make federal lands and minerals as depicted on Map 2-8 (420,780 acres) available for oil and gas leasing and exploration, with emphasis on minimizing or mitigating impacts to non-oil and gas resource values.

Actions

a. Mineral leases, including those for minerals other than oil and gas, would be subject to timing limitation, CSU, and NSO stipulations and COA, as well as additional restrictions established for other surface disturbing and disruptive activities in this alternative.

b. Existing oil and gas leases (373,230 acres) would be managed under their existing lease terms and stipulations.

1. Oil and gas activities would be regulated to mitigate impacts to important wildlife habitats, including big game crucial winter ranges and greater sage-grouse habitats.

2. BMPs and operating standards would be applied to mitigate impacts to sensitive habitats and other resources (Appendices 3 and 5).

c. Post-lease actions (APDs, Sundry Notices) would be managed under restrictions and COAs developed through the appropriate level of environmental analysis.

d. On-lease water disposal pits would not be allowed.

e. Lands in these areas could convert to Intensively Developed Fields when bottom-hole well density exceeds one well per 160 acres and a surface density of four well pads per 640-acre section. Consideration for conversion would depend on (1) a geology and reservoir analysis determination that additional well density is needed to efficiently and adequately produce the gas or oil resource; (2) that surface resources can be satisfactorily mitigated; and (3) that a project-specific environmental documentation is prepared to analyze impacts and to determine operating methods, mitigation, and BMPs to be used in the efficient and comprehensive development of the field.

Objective 3 (Unavailable Areas) Make federal lands and minerals as depicted on Map 2-8 (641,820 acres) unavailable for future oil and gas leasing.

Actions

a. Existing oil and gas leases in these areas (200,330 acres) would be managed under their existing lease terms and stipulations.

1. Oil and gas activities would be regulated to mitigate impacts to important wildlife

habitats, including big game crucial winter ranges and greater sage-grouse habitats.

2. BMPs and operating standards would be applied to mitigate impacts to sensitive habitats and other resources (Appendices 3 and 5).

3. Post-lease actions (APDs, Sundry Notices) would be managed under restrictions and COAs developed through the appropriate level of additional environmental analysis.

b. Lands in these areas could convert to the Intensively Developed Fields category when bottom-hole well density on preexisting leases exceeds one well per 160 acres and a surface density of four well pads per 640-acre section. Consideration for conversion would depend on (1) a geology and reservoir analysis determination that additional well density is needed to efficiently and adequately produce the gas or oil resource; (2) that surface resources can be satisfactorily mitigated; and (3) that a project-specific environmental documentation is prepared to analyze impacts and to determine operating methods, mitigation, and BMPs to be used in the efficient and comprehensive development of the field.

c. Lands and mineral estate in these areas would be unavailable for lease.

d. The unavailable designation could be lifted, and specific areas (excluding WSAs and other areas withheld from leasing by law) could be leased under the following circumstances:

1. Development on adjacent state or private mineral estate is determined to be draining federal oil and/or gas resources to the extent that drilling an off-setting federal well(s) is needed to address the drainage situation.

2. Drainage determinations would be made by RMG. When RMG determines that a drainage situation exists in an Unavailable Area, a recommendation would be made to the Wyoming BLM State Office, in consultation with the PFO, to offer the area being drained for competitive leasing.

3. The area offered for leasing would be the minimum needed to resolve the drainage issue.

4. Impacts to wildlife habitat, cultural resources, vegetation, and visual and recreational values would be adequately mitigated.

e. On-lease water disposal pits would not be allowed.

f. Oil and gas operators would have the right to explore, develop, and produce existing leases. As prescribed in 43 CFR §3101.1-2, post-lease actions, such as APDs and Sundry Notices, could be subject to reasonable restrictions as determined necessary by the Authorized Officer.

Objective 4 Provide opportunities for geophysical and geologic data acquisition while protecting important resource values from impacts.

Actions

a. Geophysical activity proposals would be considered on a case-by-case basis. Geophysical exploration would be approved by the Authorized Officer.

b. Geophysical data gathering methods that involve only casual use of the surface (as defined by 43 CFR §3150) would be permitted throughout the planning area.

c. The use of surface and/or above-ground (Poulter shot) explosive charges for seismic exploration would be prohibited.

d. The use of vibroseis energy generating (shaking) operations would be prohibited within 50 feet of active pygmy rabbit and white-tailed prairie dog burrows.

e. Vehicle use for geophysical activities would be subject to OHV designations.

f. Vehicle-based geophysical activities would be restricted to designated roads and trails within the Ross Butte, Miller Mountain, and Wind River Front Management Areas; Rock Creek, Beaver Creek, New Fork Potholes and Trapper's Point ACECs; on the Oregon Trail; and within the Long Island watershed (Hydrologic Unit Code [HUC] 1404010108) where slopes are greater than 15%.

g. Geophysical vehicle travel would be prohibited within one-quarter mile of developed recreation sites.

h. Geophysical activities would be prohibited on communal big game kill sites, Oregon Trail inscription sites, rock shelters, select rock alignments, Native American burial locales, modern day Native American TCPs, and rock art sites.

i. Geophysical activities would be prohibited in NSO areas.

j. Geophysical operations on post-FLPMA leased or unleased BLM-administered surface within the Scab Creek and Lake Mountain WSAs would be considered on a case-by-case basis, provided the operations meet the requirements of the Interim Management Policy for Lands under Wilderness Review (BLM Handbook H-8550-1). Geophysical operations on pre-FLPMA leased, BLM-administered surface within the Lake Mountain WSA would be allowed pursuant to site-specific NEPA analysis and the pre-FLPMA requirements in H-8550-1.

k. Geophysical activities would be designed and implemented to minimize impacts to wildlife habitats through means such as the imposition of surface-use, seasonal, and/or other appropriate mitigation developed through project-specific NEPA analysis.

Objective 5 Make coal resources unavailable for leasing and development.

Action

a. The planning area would be closed to coal leasing.

Objective 6 Make lands not withdrawn or segregated from mineral entry available for locatable mineral exploration and development (1,133,530 acres).

Actions

a. Locatable mineral activities would be subject to regulatory requirements; resource constraints would be based on the undue and unnecessary degradation standard.

b. New mineral withdrawals (65,750 acres) would be pursued to protect wildlife habitats, visual and recreational values, and cultural sites (Table 2-26, p. 2-159; Map 2-25).

Objective 7 Salable mineral resources would be available for development.

Actions

a. Salable mineral activities would be evaluated on a case-by-case basis.

b. The planning area would be open to mineral material disposals with the exception of WSAs (21,200 acres) (Map 2-26; Table 2-30, p. 2-164).

Objective 8 Make other leasable minerals (phosphate, sodium [trona], and geothermal steam) available for exploration and development.

Actions

a. Geothermal leasing and development would be considered and managed under the same objectives,

management actions, and restrictions, and in the same areas identified as being available for Intensive Development and Traditional Leasing Areas for oil and gas leasing and development in this alternative.

b. Management of phosphate, sodium, oil shale, and geothermal steam would be the same as for Alternative 1.

c. Should interest in other leasable minerals materialize in the future, leasing would be considered on a case-by-case basis, and the RMP would be amended as appropriate and necessary.

Paleontology and Natural History

Management Goal

Protect significant fossils and known paleontological resources from damage or destruction and facilitate suitable scientific, educational, and recreational uses of fossils.

Management Objective and Action

Objective 1 Known and newly discovered paleontological resources would be managed to maintain or improve current condition.

Action

a. Areas of unique natural history, important paleontological resources, or particular natural interest, including the Pinedale Glacial Area, would be nominated for designation as NNLs, RNAs, or ACECs, and managed for protection of their unique values.

Recreation and Visitor Services Management

Management Goal

Provide substantial personal, community, economic, and environmental benefits to local residents and visitors through recreational uses of the public lands.

Management Objectives and Actions

Objective 1 Maintain or enhance the health and viability of recreation dependent natural resources and settings within the planning area.

Actions

a. A 14-day campsite occupancy limit would apply throughout the planning area. This occupancy limit applies to a 5-mile radius of the campsite.

b. Dispersed camping and authorized commercial camps would be prohibited within 500 feet of springs and seeps.

c. Surface occupancy within one-half mile of developed recreation sites would be prohibited.

Objective 2 Promote commercial competitive events and organized group activities where appropriate and compatible with natural resource management objectives.

Action

a. Additional SRPs, except through the transfer of an existing SRP, would not be available for commercial river guiding activities on the Green and New Fork Rivers until determined otherwise through completion of a RAMP.

Objective 3 Manage SRMAs to provide for current and future recreation opportunities.

Actions

a. Refer to RMZ specific objectives and management below. The Recreation Opportunity Spectrum would be used for each SRMA as a guide to maintain, promote, or modify recreation activities, settings, and experiences (Appendix 16).

b. **Scab Creek SRMA**—The Scab Creek SRMA would be retained at (18,460 acres) and would be managed as two RMZs. The Middle Country Zone would consist of the BLM access road with trailhead and other visitor facilities. The Back Country Zone would consist of the Scab Creek WSA and other areas at least one-half mile from any roads or constructed facilities.

1. Recreation Tourism Market: The Middle Country Zone would be a *Community Market*, and the Back Country Zone would be an *Undeveloped Market.* Users would be local area residents and regional visitors.

2. The Recreation Segment for the Middle Country Zone would be for developed access and trailhead facilities for backcountry and area day use activities and experiences. The Back Country Zone would provide non-motorized backcountry recreational activities such as backpacking and other adventure activities that require a high degree of self-reliance.

3. The Management Objective for the Scab Creek SRMA would be to manage each zone to provide opportunities for the public to achieve targeted, high-quality recreation activities and experiences in a substantially natural setting, which produce significant benefits for the visiting public (Table 2-11 and Table 2-12).

4. Recreation Management: A RAMP would be developed. Use limits on commercial SRPs would apply until appropriate use levels for permitted and non-permitted recreation activities are established in the RAMP. Facility Guidelines: Rural Country Setting Characteristics would apply.

A RAMP would be developed. Use limits on commercial SRPs would apply until appropriate use levels for permitted and non-permitted recreation activities are established in the RAMP. All developed facilities would conform to Middle Country Setting Character.

5. Marketing: Informational signs, directional signs, and regulatory signs would be used at the trailhead/staging area, and word of mouth dissemination of information passed along by users and agency personnel.

6. Recreation Monitoring: BLM personnel and volunteers would regularly monitor both zones. Visitor use surveys would be implemented to determine whether targeted outcomes are being achieved.

7. Recreation Administration: The issuance of additional SRPs would not be considered. Camping would be limited to a 14-day length of stay. The WSA would be closed to

motorized vehicles. Outside the WSA, OHV use would be limited to designated roads and trails. VRM Class I objectives would apply to the Scab Creek WSA, and VRM Class II objectives would apply to the remainder of the SRMA. The SRMA would be administratively unavailable for fluid mineral leasing. The SRMA outside the WSA would be withdrawn from entry for locatable minerals.

Table 2-11. Targeted Outcomes—Scab Creek SRMA

Primary Activities	Experiences	Benefits
MIDDLE COUNTRY ZONE		
Backpacking, hiking, equestrian Camping Viewing wildlife and scenery	Enjoy viewing natural scenery Relaxing physically Engaging in preferred activities in preferred settings with family and friends	Personal: • Nature and aesthetic appreciation • Social bonding/cohesion cooperation • Personal health and fitness Community: • Family bonding/better family life • Improved image of land management agencies Environmental: • Public learns environmental stewardship • Better care and stewardship of Wind River Front Economic: • Increased attractiveness of region as a place to live
BACK COUNTRY ZONE		
Backpacking Pack stock-oriented recreation Wilderness camping Hunting Viewing wildlife and natural scenery	Enjoying viewing natural scenery Engaging in preferred activities with family and friends Wilderness experience	Personal: • Nature/aesthetic appreciation • Social bonding/cooperation • Personal health and fitness • Self-reliance Community: • Improved perceived quality of life • Family bonding/better family life • Improved image of BLM Environmental: • Public learns environmental stewardship • Better care of Wind River Front and enhancement of wilderness experience Economic: • Increased attractiveness of region as a place to live

Table 2-12. Prescribed Setting Character—Scab Creek SRMA

Physical	Social	Administrative
MIDDLE COUNTRY ZONE		
Remoteness: Middle Country Naturalness: Middle Country Facilities: Middle Country	Contacts: Middle Country Group Size: Back Country Evidence of Use: Middle Country Types of Encounters: Middle Country	Mechanized Use: Middle Country Visitor Services: Middle Country Management Controls: Middle Country Domestic Animals: Middle Country
BACK COUNTRY ZONE		
Remoteness: Back Country Naturalness: Back Country Facilities: Back Country	Contacts: Back Country Group Size: Middle Country Evidence of Use: Back Country Types of Encounters: Back Country	Mechanized Use: Back Country Visitor Services: Middle to Back Country Management Controls: Back Country Use Fees: Primitive Domestic Animals: Back Country

c. **Green and New Fork Rivers SRMA.** The Green and New Fork Rivers SRMA (118,550 acres), would be managed as a Middle Country RMZ. The SRMA would be comprised of BLM-administered land within 1 mile of each side of the Green and New Fork Rivers from U.S. Highway 191 to Fontenelle Reservoir.

1. Recreation Tourism Market: The Green and New Fork Rivers SRMA would be *Community Market*. Users would be local area residents and regional visitors.

2. Recreation Segment: Recreation management would focus on river-related recreation activities.

3. Management Objective: The Green and New Fork Rivers SRMA would be managed to provide opportunities for the public to achieve targeted recreation activities and experiences, which produce significant benefits for the visiting public. The SRMA would provide a 90% or better realization of targeted benefits (Table 2-13 and Table 2-14).

4. Recreation Management: A RAMP would be prepared to guide management of recreation use while enhancing the area's natural setting. Management direction would be to maintain a Middle Country Setting.

5. Marketing: Standard BLM venues would be used for disseminating recreation user information onsite and offsite using regional BLM publications and Internet technologies.

6. Recreation Monitoring: Monitoring would be conducted regularly by BLM personnel and volunteers. Visitor use surveys would be implemented to determine if targeted outcomes are being achieved.

7. Recreation Administration: Commercial river guide SRPs would be limited to existing SRPs. SRPs that expire would not be reissued. Camping would be limited to a 14-day length of stay. Motorized vehicles would be limited to designated roads and trails. VRM Class II objectives would apply to the entire river corridor within the SRMA boundary. The SRMA would be administratively unavailable for fluid mineral leasing. The SRMA would be withdrawn from entry for locatable minerals.

Table 2-13. Targeted Outcomes—Green and New Fork Rivers SRMA

Primary Activities	Experiences	Benefits
Float and wade fishing Float camping Hunting Viewing wildlife and scenery	Float and wade fishing Float camping Hunting Viewing wildlife and scenery	Personal: • Nature/aesthetic appreciation • Greater self-reliance • Stronger ties with family and friends • Improved physical andmental health and well being Community/Social: • Improved image of land management agencies • Improved perceived quality of life • Family bonding Environmental: • Better environmental stewardship Economic • Support local economy

Table 2-14. Prescribed Setting Character—Green and New Fork Rivers

Physical	Social	Administrative
Remoteness: Front Country and Rural Naturalness: Front Country and Rural Facilities: Middle Country	Group Size: Back Country and Middle Country Contacts: Middle Country Types of Encounters: Middle Country Personal Gear/Equipment: Middle Country Evidence of Use: Middle Country	Visitor Services: Middle Country Management Controls: Middle Country Domestic Animals: Middle Country Individual User Fees: Primitive Mechanized Use: Middle Country

d. **Boulder Lake SRMA**—The Boulder Lake SRMA would be retained (5,790 acres), managed as a Middle Country RMZ. The SRMA developments consist of the BLM access road, boat launch area, restrooms, parking area, two non-fee campgrounds, public information facilities and undeveloped primitive roads and trails.

1. The Recreation Market for the Boulder Lake SRMA would be *Community Market.* Users would be local area residents and regional visitors.

2. The Recreation Segment for the Boulder Lake SRMA would be a natural-appearing landscape that provides easy lake and river access and provides substantial opportunities to experience lake and upland-based recreation activities such as lake fishing, boating, river wade fishing, hunting, camping, equestrian use, cycling, motorized activities, wildlife viewing, and glacial lake scenery.

3. The Management Objective for the Boulder Lake SRMA would be to provide opportunities for the public to achieve targeted, high-quality recreation activities and experiences, which produce significant benefits for the visiting public. Opportunities

would be provided for visitors to engage in targeted activities, providing a 90% or better realization of targeted benefits (Table 2-15 and Table 2-16). Emphasis would be placed on less structured recreation opportunities. Facility development would be commensurate with a Middle Country Setting.

4. Recreation Management: A RAMP would be prepared to guide management of recreation use while enhancing the area's natural setting.

5. The Market Strategy is to use standard BLM venues for disseminating recreational user information and regulations onsite. Informational signs, directional signs, and regulatory signs would be used. Users and agency personnel would spread information by word of mouth.

6. Recreation Monitoring: BLM personnel and volunteers would regularly conduct recreation monitoring. Visitor use surveys would be implemented to determine whether targeted outcomes are being achieved.

7. Recreation Administration: Commercial lake and river guide SRPs would be limited to existing SRPs. Expired SRPs would not be reissued. Camping would be limited to a 14-day length of stay. Motorized vehicles would be limited to designated roads and trails. VRM Class II objectives would apply. The SRMA would be administratively unavailable for fluid mineral leasing. The SRMA would be withdrawn from entry for locatable minerals.

Table 2-15. Targeted Outcomes—Boulder Lake SRMA

Activities	Experiences	Benefits
Lake and river fishing Boating Camping Hunting	Relaxing physically Engaging in preferred activities with family and friends	Personal: • Nature and aesthetic appreciation • Social bonding/cohesion • Personal health and fitness Community: • Improved perceived quality of life • Family bonding/better family life • Improved image of land management agencies Environmental: • Public learns environmental stewardship • Better care of Wind River Front Economic: • Increased attractiveness of region as a place to live

Table 2-16. Prescribed Setting Character—Boulder Lake SRMA

Physical	Social	Administrative
Remoteness: Middle Country Naturalness: Middle Country Facilities: Middle Country	Contacts: Middle Country Group Size: Middle Country Evidence of Use: Middle Country	Mechanized Use: Middle Country Visitor Services: Middle Country Management Controls: Middle

Physical	Social	Administrative
	Types of Encounters: Middle Country	Country User Fees: Primitive Domestic Animals: Middle Country

Objective 4 **Extensive Recreation Management Area** (remainder of the Pinedale Planning Area) Provide an array of resource-dependent dispersed recreation opportunities such as hunting, fishing, motorized use, and open space. Management would be extensive rather than intensive. Management actions would be custodial in nature and focus on the following:

a. The development of new recreation facilities only when necessary to protect human health, safety, and natural resource values

b. The maintenance and enhancement of important public access

c. The resolution of resource and social conflicts.

Soils Management

Management Goal

Prevent or mitigate impacts on soil stability, productivity, and water infiltration to prevent accelerated erosion and provide for optimal plant growth.

Management Objectives and Actions

Objective 1 Reclaim or mitigate impacts of erosion from past surface disturbing activities within 5 years of RMP implementation.

Actions

a. BLM would work with state and local communities, bonding companies, and operators to achieve the reclamation objective.

b. Disturbed areas would be reclaimed to achieve natural erosion rates.

Objective 2 Ensure that all newly disturbed areas are successfully reclaimed.

Actions

a. Mitigation, including WDEQ BMPs, would be applied in all areas to limit soil erosion and related undesirable conditions with special emphasis in areas with soils that are classified as highly erodible, such as Ross Butte, Blue Rim, Milleson Draw, the Long Island Watershed, and Red Canyon (Appendices 3 and 5).

b. Surface disturbance would be prohibited on sensitive soils on slopes greater than 8%.

c. Disturbed areas would be reclaimed to achieve natural erosion rates.

Transportation, Access, and Travel Management

Management Goals

Provide access for approved public land uses consistent with public health and safety and other resource value concerns.

Provide public use opportunities where compatible with other resource values.

Management Objectives and Actions

Objective 1 Provide needed and appropriate ingress, egress, and access routes to and across public lands for authorized uses.

Actions

a. Transportation planning would be completed within 5 years of implementation of the RMP (see Appendix 17 and Map A17-1).

b. Access to county and state roads would be minimized and consolidated where practicable to enhance safety and minimize conflict points. Ingress and egress to state highways and county roads would be coordinated with the state highway department and counties, respectively.

c. Reasonable access would be provided across public lands to landlocked private and state lands, consistent with BLM Manual 2801.49.

d. Access across private lands to isolated public land parcels would be acquired from willing landowners.

e. Common ROW routes would be designated, where appropriate, to minimize environmental impacts. Road construction would be planned and implemented to avoid creating unusable islands of wildlife habitat.

f. New developments would be designed to minimize the number and miles of new roads, habitat fragmentation, and main access points to new fields.

g. OHV designations for restrictions to existing roads and trails would remain in effect until travel management planning is completed, and designated roads and trails are identified.

Objective 2 Reclaim or mitigate erosion impacts on transportation corridors.

Actions

a. Road or trail closure and abandonment would be based on desired road or trail densities, demands for new roads, closure methods, type of access needed, resource development or protection needs, and existing uses.

b. BLM's roads, trails, and bridges would be maintained in fair or better condition.

c. Land users would be required to use BMPs and operating standards for road maintenance (Appendices 3 and 5).

Objective 3 Make public lands available for responsible OHV use, where appropriate.

Actions

a. OHV designations will be established for all lands within the PFO. Periodic adjustments and use constraints could be necessary to ensure that identified sensitive resources are appropriately protected from excessive disturbance, road/route/trail proliferation, and human encroachment.

b. Recreational motorized vehicle use, except for over-the-snow equipment, would be limited to existing roads and trails unless otherwise specified.

c. No open OHV use areas would be designated.

d. The following areas would be closed to motorized access (Map 2-27):

- Lake Mountain WSA
- Red Dugway/Fish Creek area
- Oregon Trail inscription sites, Native American TCPs, rock shelters, Native American burial locales, communal big game kill sites, and select rock alignments
- East Fork WSR unit.

e. Motorized vehicle use would be prohibited on the Pinedale Pathway with the exception of maintenance and repair of the pathway.

f. Motorized vehicle use, except for over-the-snow equipment, would be limited to designated roads and trails in the following areas (Map 2-27):

- Boulder Lake, Scab Creek, and Upper Green River SRMAs
- Trapper's Point, CCC Ponds, and Ross Butte ACECs
- Miller Mountain Management Area
- East Fork River/Irish Canyon area
- Muddy Creek/Badlands area
- Red Canyon area
- Green River WSR unit.

g. The following areas would be closed to over-the-snow recreational motorized equipment:

- Big game crucial winter ranges
- WSAs
- CCC Ponds ACEC.

h. OHV use (including over-the-snow) in certain areas would be limited on a seasonal basis (Table 2-28, p. 2-162).

i. Additional restrictions for all motorized equipment would apply as follows (Map 2-27):

1. Approximately 2,500 acres between Silver Creek and Cottonwood Creek (November 15 through January 31).

j. OHV closures and seasonal restrictions would be effective immediately upon signature of the ROD for the RMP.

k. For all areas in which OHV use is limited to existing roads and trails, motor vehicle travel would be allowed up to 300 feet away from roads for camping, recovering game animals, collecting firewood, picnicking, or other uses that do not require specific authorizations or permits, provided resource damage does not occur and new routes are not created.

l. Other necessary tasks that require off-road motor vehicle travel could be allowed, provided resource damage does not occur or new routes are not created. These activities include but are not limited to geophysical exploration, maintaining range improvements, and surveying ROWs or other work-related tasks authorized by or that lead to the issuance of a permit or authorization. Necessary tasks could be allowed by the field office in advance of issuance of a formal authorization.

Vegetation Management

Management Goals

Maintain and/or enhance native vegetation community health, composition, and diversity. Reclaim disturbed areas to desired plant communities.

Management Objectives and Actions

Objective 1 Establish and maintain an accurate vegetation inventory for the planning area.

Action

a. BLM would collaborate with stakeholders (federal, state, and local agencies; operators; and landowners) to identify funding mechanisms and methods to complete vegetation inventory.

Objective 2 Manage permitted actions to control the spread of and/or eradicate noxious weed infestations.

Actions

a. BLM would collaborate with Sublette County in the treatment of noxious weeds or invasive species.

b. BMPs would be applied to all activities to control noxious weeds (Appendix 3).

c. Weed control would be limited to mechanical and biological methods.

d. Before selection of a treatment method, all vegetation treatments would be assessed for the potential to introduce invasive species.

e. BLM would support and cooperate with local efforts to manage and control invasive plant species or noxious weeds, including local plans and control efforts.

Objective 3 Ensure Special Status Plant Species habitats are maintained at a level sufficient for long-term species sustainability.

Actions

a. Special Status Plant Species surveys would be required on potential habitats before any project or activity would be approved. If such species are found, all disruptive activities would halt in the inhabited area until species-specific protective measures were developed and implemented. For listed species, protective measures would be developed and implemented in consultation with the USFWS.

b. Mitigation would be implemented on surface disturbing activities in areas of potential habitat for Special Status Plant Species.

c. Areas where Wyoming BLM sensitive plant species are known to exist would be ROW exclusion areas.

d. Known locations of Special Status Plant Species, including future discoveries, would be protected and closed to—

- Surface disturbing activities that could adversely affect the plants or their habitats
- Location of new mining claims (withdrawal from mineral location and entry under the land laws would be pursued)
- Mineral material sales
- All OHV use, including those vehicles used for geophysical exploration activities, surveying, etc.
- Use of explosives and blasting.

e. Vehicles used for fire suppression activities would be limited to existing roads and trails in Special Status Plant Species habitat.

Objective 4 Conduct vegetation treatments to achieve biodiversity of native species and age classes.

Actions

a. Prescribed fire, Wildland Fire Use for Resource Benefit (WFURB), and biological treatments could be used to achieve Desired Plant Communities (DPC).

b. Vegetation treatments would be designed to reduce erosion, protect Special Status Plant Species, and enhance vegetation community health.

c. Vegetation treatments would be designed and implemented to prevent introduction and reduce the spread of invasive species.

d. Treatments would be designed to consider the natural role of fire in ecosystem management and restore the natural range of variability in vegetation community types.

e. Treated areas would be rested from livestock grazing for a minimum of two full growing seasons after treatment.

f. Unless vegetation cover before treatment is adequate, areas proposed for treatment would be rested from livestock grazing a minimum of 1 full year before treatment.

g. Treated areas would be fenced from livestock and big game animals if necessary to provide rest from grazing use.

Visual Resources Management

Management Goal

Manage the visual quality of the public lands.

Management Objective and Actions

Objective 1 Manage the public lands in a manner that protects the quality of the scenic values of those lands.

Actions

a. VRM classifications would be managed according to Map 2-22 (Table 2-29, p. 2-164): 21,290 acres would be managed as VRM Class I; 393,260 acres as VRM Class II; 225,830 acres as VRM Class III; and 282,300 acres as VRM Class IV.

b. VRM Class I areas would be managed to preserve the existing character of the landscape. This class provides for natural ecological changes; however, it does not preclude very limited management activity. The level of change to the characteristic landscape should be very low and must not attract attention.

c. Manage VRM Class II areas to retain the existing character of the landscape. The level of change to the characteristic landscape should be low. Management activities may be seen but should not attract the attention of the casual observer. Any changes must repeat the basic elements of form, line, color, and texture found in the predominant natural features of the characteristic landscape.

d. Manage VRM Class III areas to partially retain the existing character of the landscape. The level of change to the characteristic landscape should be moderate. Management activities may attract attention but should not dominate the view of the casual observer. Changes should repeat the basic elements found in the predominant natural features of the characteristic landscape.

e. Manage VRM Class IV areas to provide for management activities that require major modification

of the existing character of the landscape. The level of change to the characteristic landscape can be high. These management activities may dominate the view and be the major focus of viewer attention. However, every attempt should be made to minimize the impact of these activities through careful location, minimal disturbance, and repeat of the basic elements.

Watershed and Water Quality (Surface Water and Groundwater) Management

Management Goals

Minimize adverse impacts to surface water and groundwater resources and recharge areas from public land uses.

Maintain or improve surface water and groundwater quantity and quality consistent with applicable state and federal standards and regulations.

Maintain or reestablish proper watershed, wetland, riparian, and stream channel functions to support natural or desired surface water flow regimes and meet state water quality standards and the Wyoming Standards for Rangeland Health.

Prevent, minimize, and/or remediate contributions of nonpoint source pollution from federal lands to all receiving waters.

Prevent, minimize, and/or remediate elevated levels of salinity contribution from federal lands to the Colorado River system.

Management Objectives and Actions

Objective 1 Collaborate with the state to achieve the uses and water quality standards specified by the WDEQ, reduce the number of streams listed as impaired, and prevent listing of additional streams under the Clean Water Act, Section 303(d).

Actions

a. BLM would prevent, minimize, and/or remediate sources of stream impairment that occur on public lands.

b. The discharge of produced water from point sources to public lands, including stream channels and uplands, as a means of disposal would be prohibited.

c. Use of produced waters to assist in reclamation could be considered on a case-by-case basis and would be governed by operating WDEQ standards and BLM operating standards (Appendix 3).

d. Oil and gas operators would be encouraged to develop and implement methods that treat produced water and enable its productive use.

e. BLM would continue cooperation with stakeholders in monitoring surface water and groundwater resources potentially affected by public land uses.

f. Produced water from CBNG wells would be handled using the same methods used for treatment of produced water from traditional gas and oil wells.

Objective 2 Meet the Wyoming Standards for Rangeland Health on riparian/wetland areas and uplands.

Actions

a. Achieve and/or maintain proper functioning condition as a minimum standard on all riparian and

wetland areas to control nonpoint source pollution to the extent possible.

b. The 100-year flood plains, wetlands, and riparian areas would be closed to new permanent facilities (for example, storage tanks, structures, and pits), except those designed and implemented to enhance wetland or riparian area condition or function. Proposals for linear crossings in these areas would be considered on a case-by-case basis.

c. Surface disturbing and construction activities (for example, mineral exploration and development activities, pipelines, power lines, roads, recreation sites, fences, and wells) that could reduce water quality or degrade wetlands or riparian habitats would avoid the area within 500 feet of or on 100-year flood plains, wetlands, or perennial streams, and within 100 feet of the edge of the inner gorge of intermittent and large ephemeral drainages. Proposals for linear crossings in these areas would be considered on a case-by-case basis.

d. Riparian areas would be maintained or improved to enhance forage conditions, provide wildlife habitat, and improve stream water quality.

e. Riparian areas providing sensitive wildlife species habitat would be managed for a seral stage appropriate for the benefit of those species, including vertical and horizontal vegetation structure and composition.

Objective 3 Control water runoff from developed sites and maintain soil erosion at appropriate rates for natural conditions.

Actions

a. BMPs and operating standards would be applied to mitigate surface disturbance and control nonpoint source erosion (Appendices 3 and 5).

b. The 100-year flood plains, wetlands, and riparian areas would be closed to new permanent facilities (for example, storage tanks, structures, and pits), except those designed and implemented to enhance wetland or riparian area condition or function. Proposals for linear crossings in these areas would be considered on a case-by-case basis.

c. Surface disturbing and construction activities (for example, mineral exploration and development activities, pipelines, power lines, roads, recreation sites, fences, and wells) that could reduce water quality or degrade wetlands or riparian habitats would avoid the area within 500 feet of or on 100-year flood plains, wetlands, or perennial streams, and within 100 feet of the edge of the inner gorge of intermittent and large ephemeral drainages. Proposals for linear crossings in these areas would be considered on a case-by-case basis.

d. Commercial outfitter camps within 500 feet of springs and seeps, streams, and in riparian areas would be considered on a case-by-case basis and could be restricted.

e. Interim reclamation standards would be developed to reduce soil erosion on a project- or site-specific basis. Emphasis would be placed on areas adjacent to waters and wetlands.

f. Where threats to Class I waters are identified from federal lands or management actions, or approved public land uses, BMPs that address the threat would be implemented on all contributing federal lands.

g. Salt loading in the Colorado River system would be controlled by applying BMPs on all highly erodible, saline soils potentially affected by management activities.

Objective 4 Point source pollution would be addressed under the guidance of appropriate Wyoming state and federal agencies, including but not limited to WDEQ, WSEO, and EPA.

Actions

a. BLM would cooperate with the state as it develops source water and wellhead protection plans to protect drinking water sources.

b. In areas of concentrated oil and gas development, a groundwater monitoring program could be established to detect pollution and ensure that the groundwater resource remains unaffected.

Wildland Fire and Fuels Management

Management Goals

Protect firefighters, public safety, and private property.

Maintain a landscape of diverse plant communities and successional stages that would have been produced by historic fire regimes.

Management Objectives and Actions

Objective 1 No loss of life or improved property losses would occur from wildland fire.

Actions

a. Wildland fire mitigation and fuels activities would be managed to provide for firefighter and public safety as a first priority. Public lands within intermixed landownership areas would be managed in association with the adjoining and nearby private and state lands.

b. Areas of mixed landownership, communities at risk as identified in the *Federal Register*, Volume 66, Number 160, 2001 (Antelope Run, Beaver Creek area, Boulder, Cottonwood Creek, Daniel, Forty Rod, Hoback Ranches, New Fork, Pinedale, Pocket Creek, and Upper Green); urban and industrial interface areas; and areas containing high-priority resource values would have high priority for response to wildland fires and/or for fuels reduction and mitigation. Wildland fire suppression activities would be based on the AMR (see Glossary).

Objective 2 Use prescribed fire and WFURB to meet vegetation goals and to return the ecosystem to pre-suppression composition, structure, and function where possible.

Actions

a. BLM would evaluate and include, when possible, all BLM lands abutting the Bridger Teton National Forest, including the Scab Creek and Lake Mountain WSAs, into WFURB areas, working in conjunction with the USFS to have a single integrated WFURB area.

b. Prescribed fire would be used, where possible, on all BLM-administered lands to emulate the return intervals of natural fire and to restore the vegetation to Condition Class I in Fire Regimes I, II, and III.

c. Where reintroduction of fire onto the landscape is not feasible due to ecological condition or industrial or urban development, mechanical and chemical methods would be used to manage the vegetation toward the DPC.

d. In the WUI or Industrial Interface, fuels reduction methods best suited to the area would be used to reduce the risk of catastrophic fire to these areas.

Objective 3 Manage wildfire with minimal damage to other resources.

Actions

a. Vehicles and equipment used for fire suppression would be subject to the OHV restrictions applicable in the area of the fire.

b. Use of fire suppression chemicals, including foaming agents and surfactants, would not be allowed within 500 feet of surface water.

c. Movement of waters from whirling-disease-positive to whirling-disease-negative waters would be prohibited.

d. Fire suppression activities in areas of known sensitive species habitat and fragile or erosive soils would avoid damage to these other resources.

Wildlife and Fish Habitat Management

Management Goals

Maintain or enhance aquatic and wildlife habitat.

Maintain functioning big game habitats and migration routes.

In elk feedgrounds, maintain or improve habitat quality and provide for continued use of the areas as elk feedgrounds. Reduce dependence of elk on feedgrounds by improving habitat quality on native winter ranges.

Sustain the sagebrush biome on a landscape scale to provide the amount, continuity, and quality of habitat necessary to maintain sustainable populations of sage-grouse and other sagebrush-obligate species.

Maintain or enhance forested habitats to support wildlife diversity and forest health.

Management Objectives and Actions

Objective 1 Maintain sufficient undisturbed or minimally disturbed habitats to protect wildlife resource values while providing for multiple use management.

Action

a. The planning area would be delineated into three distinct, noncontiguous wildlife management zones for the purpose of oil and gas activities (Map 2-8) as follows:

- Intensively Developed Fields (Map 2-8) would be managed for intensive oil and gas activities while protecting habitats and minimizing direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts to the extent practicable.
- Traditional Leasing Areas (Map 2-8) would be managed for protection of important values during oil and gas exploration but would provide opportunity for intensive oil and gas activities.
- Unavailable Areas (Map 2-8) would be managed for protection of wildlife habitats through indefinite postponement of the availability of lands for oil and gas leasing.

Objective 2 Maintain sufficient undisturbed or minimally disturbed greater sage-grouse habitats to ensure long-term species sustainability and functioning habitats within the planning area.

Actions

Intensively Developed Fields

a. All vehicle use would be limited to existing roads and trails.

b. Surface disturbing activities would be subject to mitigation to minimize direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts.

c. Surface disturbing activities would be designed and implemented to minimize impacts to greater sage-grouse winter concentration areas to the extent practicable.

d. New power lines would be buried where technologically feasible.

e. Noise-generating activities would be minimized through the application of BMPs (for example, high-efficiency mufflers).

Traditional Leasing Areas

a. In suitable greater sage-grouse habitats, including nesting, early brood rearing, and winter concentration areas, vehicular activities would be restricted to existing roads and trails yearlong.

b. No surface disturbing or disruptive activities or human presence would be allowed within 1 mile of known active leks during strutting season (March 1 through May 15).

c. NSO would be allowed in all suitable nesting habitats within 3 miles of active greater sage-grouse leks (Map 2-28).

d. Surface disturbing and disruptive activities would be prohibited in all suitable nesting habitats within 3 miles of active greater sage-grouse leks from March 15 through July 15.

e. Disruptive activities would be prohibited in all greater sage-grouse winter concentration areas.

f. No new structures more than 15 feet in height would be permitted within 2 miles of sage-grouse leks.

g. To minimize fragmentation of sage-grouse habitats, well pad densities would be limited to one pad per 640-acre section, or one per section for sections smaller than 640 acres, one per lease if the lease is smaller than 640 acres, or one per detached lease parcel segment if the segment is smaller than 640 acres. Exceptions could be granted to comply with Wyoming Oil and Gas Conservation Commission (WOGCC) spacing requirements. This restriction would not be applied to sections, partial sections, leases, or detached lease segments that already contain one or more than one existing well.

h. Noise from gas compression and other sources would be limited by imposing the best available noise control technologies.

i. New power lines would be buried where technologically feasible.

j. No exceptions to wildlife stipulations would be granted in these areas.

Unavailable Areas

a. In suitable greater sage-grouse habitats, including nesting, early brood rearing, and winter concentration areas, vehicular activities would be restricted to existing roads and trails yearlong.

b. No surface disturbing or disruptive activities or human presence would be allowed within 1 mile of known active leks during strutting season (March 1 through May 15).

c. NSO would be allowed in all suitable nesting habitats within 3 miles of active greater sage-grouse

leks (Map 2-28).

d. Surface disturbing and disruptive activities would be prohibited in all suitable nesting habitats within 3 miles of active greater sage-grouse leks from March 15 through July 15.

e. Surface disturbing and disruptive activities would be prohibited in all greater sage-grouse winter concentration areas.

f. No new structures more than 15 feet in height would be permitted within 3 miles of sage-grouse leks.

g. Noise from gas compression and other sources would be limited by imposing the best available noise control technologies.

h. New power lines would be buried where technologically feasible.

i. To minimize fragmentation of sage-grouse habitats, well pad densities would be limited to one pad per 640-acre section, or one per section for sections smaller than 640 acres, or one per lease if the lease is smaller than 640 acres, or one per detached lease parcel segment if the segment is smaller than 640 acres. Exceptions could be granted to comply with WOGCC spacing requirements. This restriction would not be applied to sections, partial sections, leases, or detached lease segments that already contain one or more than one existing well.

j. No exceptions to wildlife stipulations would be granted in these areas.

Objective 3 Manage big game habitats to protect wildlife resource values.

Actions

Intensively Developed Fields

a. Elk feedgrounds would be maintained on public lands.

b. BLM permitted activities would be designed and implemented to minimize impacts to big game during migration.

c. Permitted activities would be designed and implemented to minimize impacts in big game parturition areas from May 1 through June 30.

d. Surface activities would be designed and implemented to minimize impacts in big game crucial winter ranges from November 15 through April 30 (Map 3-20).

e. Transportation planning for oil and gas development would be designed and implemented to minimize cumulative impacts.

f. To minimize fragmentation and human presence in winter ranges, access to big game crucial winter ranges would be limited to existing developed access routes, or in areas of new development, not more than two access points open year-round.

Traditional Leasing Areas

a. Elk feedgrounds would be maintained on public lands.

b. NSO would be allowed in known and newly identified big game migration routes and bottlenecks.

c. Permitted activities would be prohibited in big game parturition areas from May 1 through June 30.

d. Surface occupancy would be prohibited on big game crucial winter ranges (293,580 acres) and parturition areas (48,740 acres).

e. To minimize fragmentation and human presence in winter ranges, access to big game crucial winter ranges would be limited to existing developed access routes (Map 3-20).

f. Transportation planning would be implemented to avoid creating unusable islands of wildlife habitat (usable patch size varies by species).

Unavailable Areas

a. Elk feedgrounds would be maintained on public lands.

b. NSO would be allowed in known and newly identified big game migration routes and bottlenecks.

c. Permitted activities would be prohibited in big game parturition areas from May 1 through June 30.

d. Surface occupancy would be prohibited on big game crucial winter ranges (349,870 acres) and parturition areas (87,030 acres).

e. To minimize fragmentation and human presence in winter ranges, access to big game crucial winter ranges would be limited to existing developed access routes (Map 3-20).

f. No new main arterial access routes would be permitted in the Wind River Front area (358,400 acres) (Map 2-26).

g. Transportation planning would be implemented to avoid creating unusable islands of wildlife habitat (usable patch size varies by species).

Objective 4 Maintain sufficient undisturbed or minimally disturbed sensitive species habitats to ensure long-term species sustainability and functioning habitats within the planning area.

Actions

Intensively Developed Fields

a. Surveys for Special Status Species would be conducted on BLM-administered public lands and mineral estate before any federal project or federal activity would be approved.

b. Surface disturbing activities for oil and gas would be allowed subject to mitigation to minimize cumulative impacts. Other surface disturbing activities would be managed on a case-by-case basis.

Traditional Leasing Areas

a. Exploration activities would be intensively mitigated. No exceptions to seasonal restrictions for exploration would be permitted.

b. Permitted activities potentially affecting the habitat of Special Status Species would be considered on a case-by-case basis.

c. Surveys for Special Status Species would be conducted on BLM-administered public lands and mineral estate before any federal project or federal activity would be approved.

1. Mountain plover: Surveys demonstrating presence could result in surface disturbing activities being prohibited from April 10 to July 10 on a case-by case-basis.

2. Pygmy rabbits: Surveys identifying pygmy rabbit burrows would require avoidance of the burrow by 50 feet. Pipeline crossings and surface disturbing activities would be minimized through ephemeral drainages and in basin, and Wyoming, big sagebrush communities.

3. White-tailed prairie dogs (WTPD): WTPD habitats would be managed to protect prairie dogs and their habitat, while allowing for compatible multiple use.

- Surface disturbing activities would be avoided in WTPD towns greater than 12.5 acres in size.

- Motorized vehicle use in all WTPD towns/complexes would be limited to designated roads and trails.
- Prairie dog poisoning would be prohibited in all WTPD towns/complexes, except for demonstrated human health and safety needs or for other demonstrated emergency reasons.
- Surveys identifying WTPD burrows would require avoidance of the burrow by 50 feet.

4. Other Sensitive Species: If life-cycle activities of sensitive species are identified during a survey in an area not protected by timing limitations, surface disturbing activities would be delayed as appropriate until wildlife activity is completed. These activities might include nesting, early brood rearing, or spawning. There would be no exceptions to this policy.

Unavailable Areas

a. Permitted activities potentially affecting the habitat of Special Status Species would be considered on a case-by-case basis.

b. Surveys for Special Status Species would be conducted on BLM-administered public lands and mineral estate before any federal project or federal activity would be approved.

1. Mountain plover: Surveys demonstrating presence could result in surface disturbing activities being prohibited from April 10 to July 10 on a case-by case-basis.

2. Pygmy rabbits: Surveys identifying pygmy rabbit burrows would require avoidance of the burrow by 50 feet. Pipeline crossings and surface disturbing activities would be minimized through ephemeral drainages and in basin, Wyoming, and big sagebrush communities.

3. WTPDs: WTPD habitats would be managed to protect prairie dogs and their habitat, while allowing for compatible multiple use.

- Surface disturbing activities would be avoided in WTPD towns greater than 12.5 acres in size.
- Motorized vehicle use in all WTPD towns/complexes would be limited to designated roads and trails.
- Prairie dog poisoning would be prohibited in all WTPD towns/complexes, except for demonstrated human health and safety needs or for other demonstrated emergency reasons.
- Surveys identifying WTPD burrows would require avoidance of the burrow by 50 feet.

4. Other Sensitive Species: If life-cycle activities of sensitive species are identified during a survey in an area not protected by timing limitations, surface disturbing activities would be delayed until wildlife activity is completed. These activities might include nesting, early brood rearing, or spawning. There would be no exceptions to this policy.

Objective 5 Provide functioning sagebrush habitats on a landscape scale sufficient to support the planning area's greater sage-grouse, pronghorn, mule deer, and other sagebrush-obligate wildlife species.

Actions

a. To minimize fragmentation and human presence in winter ranges, access to big game crucial winter

ranges would be limited to existing developed access routes. In areas of new development, one year-round access point to each field would be allowed. No new main arterial access routes would be permitted in the Wind River Front area (approximately 358,400 acres) (Map 2-26).

b. Changes in WGFD population objectives would be considered when making habitat management decisions.

c. No exceptions to wildlife habitat timing and distance stipulations would be granted in source habitats.

d. Surface disturbing activities and interim and final reclamation would be designed to maximize and increase habitat patch sizes and reduce habitat fragmentation for sagebrush-obligate species, for example:

1. Condensate and produced water would be transported from well locations by pipelines rather than trucks.

2. All surface disturbing activities would be subject to interim and final reclamation procedures to reestablish sagebrush habitat function and value.

3. Transportation planning would be required in all areas to optimize access; minimize development footprint, human presence, and habitat fragmentation; and reduce road density, duplication of routes, and unnecessary routes.

e. No new compression facilities would be permitted in the Wind River Front area (approximately 358,400 acres) (Map 2-26).

f. Common ROW routes and corridors would be designated to minimize environmental impacts.

g. To minimize predation of ground-nesting birds and intrusion of viewsheds, new power lines would be buried to the extent allowed by technology.

Objective 6 Provide suitable habitat to completely implement the CAS for CRCT to reduce or eliminate threats to CRCT populations.

Actions

a. To protect spawning CRCT, redds, and fry, instream disturbing activities would be prohibited between June 1 and August 15.

b. Projects in CRCT habitats could be approved only if they would not impact these habitats.

c. Chemical use for the purpose of fisheries management would be prohibited.

Objective 7 Maintain raptor habitats and territories within the planning area in accordance with the Migratory Bird Treaty Act.

Actions

Intensively Developed Fields

a. Before any surface disturbing activities are initiated within potential raptor habitat, surveys would be conducted for nesting, roosting, and foraging activity within 1 mile of the proposed activity.

b. Activities would be designed and mitigated to prevent take of raptors. Proposals would be examined case by case to determine potential effects and appropriate mitigation.

c. Migratory bird exclusion devices would be required on sediment, evaporation, or other types of pits containing harmful substances or chemicals.

Traditional Leasing Areas

a. Before any surface disturbing activities are initiated within potential raptor habitat, surveys would be conducted for nesting, roosting, and foraging activity within 1 mile of the proposed activity.

b. The following seasonal restrictions for authorized activities near active raptor nests/roosting sites/foraging areas would be imposed:

- February 1 through July 31, within one-half mile of all active raptor nests
- February 1 through July 31, within 1 mile of all active ferruginous hawk nests
- April 1 through August 15, within one-half mile of burrowing owl nesting habitat
- February 1 through August 15, within 1 mile of all bald eagle nests.

c. Surface occupancy would be prohibited within 1,000 feet of active raptor (golden eagle, osprey, Swainson's hawk, goshawk, prairie falcon, northern harrier, great horned owl, red-tailed hawk, burrowing owl, and other raptors) nests; within 1,400 feet of active ferruginous hawk nests, and within 2,600 feet of active bald eagle nests.

d. Migratory bird exclusion devices would be required on sediment, evaporation, or other types of pits containing harmful substances or chemicals.

e. Surface disturbing activities and placement of permanent and high-profile facilities would be restricted within 1 mile of active raptor nests.

f. Actions that prohibit raptors from successfully fledging offspring would be prohibited.

Unavailable Areas

a. Before any surface disturbing activities are initiated within potential raptor habitat, surveys would be conducted for nesting, roosting, and foraging activity within 1 mile of the proposed activity.

b. The following seasonal restrictions for all activities near active raptor nests/roosting sites/foraging areas would be imposed:

- February 1 through July 31, within one-half mile of all active raptor nests
- February 1 through July 31, within 1 mile of all active ferruginous hawk nests
- April 1 through August 15, within one-half mile of burrowing owl nesting habitat.

c. Surface occupancy would be prohibited within 1,000 feet of active raptor (golden eagle, osprey, Swainson's hawk, goshawk, prairie falcon, northern harrier, great horned owl, red-tailed hawk, burrowing owl, and other raptors) nests, or within 1,400 feet of active ferruginous hawk nests.

d. Migratory bird exclusion devices would be required on sediment, evaporation, or other types of pits containing harmful substances or chemicals.

e. Surface disturbing activities and placement of permanent and high-profile facilities would be restricted within 1 mile of active raptor nests.

f. Actions that prohibit raptors from successfully fledging offspring would be prohibited.

Objective 8 Water developments would be constructed to avoid inadvertent injury to wildlife.

Action

a. Water developments would be designed to protect animals from injury, and water would be made accessible for wildlife use with sufficient protective cover to the extent available.

Special Designations and Management Areas

Management Goals

Rock Creek ACEC Management Goals Protect the Rock Creek drainage to ensure quality aquatic habitat for the sensitive CRCT and provide crucial winter range for a portion of the Piney elk herd; and protect visual resources to maintain VRM Class characteristics.

Beaver Creek ACEC Management Goal Ensure quality aquatic habitat for the sensitive CRCT and protect elk calving habitat.

Trapper's Point ACEC Management Goal Preserve cultural and historic resources, viability of the big game migration bottleneck, and important livestock trailing use.

New Fork Potholes ACEC Management Goal Protect unique pothole wildlife habitat for trumpeter swans and other migratory waterfowl, elk and deer parturition areas, and geologically unique areas.

Upper Green River ACEC Management Goals Enhance opportunities for public use and access for recreational activities, provide for the health and safety of visitors, protect the area's recreational and natural resource values, and maintain the integrity of mule deer migration routes.

White-Tailed Prairie Dog ACEC Management Goal Protect prairie dog habitat within the planning area.

Miller Mountain Management Area Management Goal Protect the open space, natural landscape values, and crucial big game winter ranges in the area.

Ross Butte ACEC Management Goal Protect fragile soils and watersheds, sensitive plant species, and visual values in the Ross Butte area.

CCC Ponds ACEC Management Goals Protect the Fremont Lake big game wildlife migration bottleneck; protect wildlife habitat, water quality, and visual resources; promote quality recreation experiences; and prevent or mitigate degradation of the environment and social experience resulting from recreation and other uses.

Wind River Front Management Area Management Goals Maintain the visual, wildlife habitat, recreation, and air quality resources in the management area, and protect the integrity of the U.S. Air Force Detachment 489 Seismic Monitoring Station.

WSA Management Goal Protect wilderness values in all WSAs.

Wild and Scenic River Areas Management Goals Maintain or enhance the outstandingly remarkable scenic, fishery, and ecological values; and maintain the primitive, pristine, rugged, and unaltered character of the WSR units.

Management Objectives and Actions

Objective 1 Provide suitable habitat in the Rock Creek ACEC to support the CAS for CRCT in the States of Colorado, Utah, and Wyoming. Ensure crucial elk winter ranges are available for use by wintering elk.

Actions

a. The entire ACEC area and the Deadline-Graphite elk winter range area (approximately 24,990 acres) would be unavailable for oil and gas leasing (Map 2-8).

b. The entire ACEC would be an ROW exclusion area. No ROWs would be permitted, except to benefit the CRCT or elk habitat.

c. The entire ACEC would be managed as a Class I VRM area and would be closed to OHV use, including over-the-snow vehicles.

The following apply to the Rock Creek ACEC drainage area:

d. Geophysical exploration activities would be prohibited except in areas with existing valid oil and gas lease rights. Geophysical exploration activities would be limited to nonvehicular methods. The use of explosive charges would be prohibited.

e. The area would be closed to livestock grazing.

The following apply to the remainder of the Rock Creek ACEC (outside the drainage area):

f. Geophysical exploration would be permitted in areas with existing oil and gas lease rights.

Objective 2 Provide suitable habitat in the Beaver Creek ACEC to support the CAS for CRCT in the States of Colorado, Utah, and Wyoming. Ensure elk parturition areas are available for use by calving elk.

Actions

a. The Beaver Creek ACEC would be expanded to approximately 10,160 acres (Map 2-26; Table 2-30, p. 2-164). The ACEC would be managed to maintain, improve, or restore riparian habitat conditions.

b. The area would be available for oil and gas leasing and related activities with NSO stipulations.

c. All vehicle use, including geophysical exploration vehicles, would be limited to designated roads and trails.

d. The use of explosive charges would be prohibited.

e. The ACEC would be managed as a Class II VRM area (Map 2-22).

f. Surface disturbance within 1,000 feet of streams and on slopes of 15% or greater would be prohibited.

g. Timber cutting would be prohibited in the ACEC.

h. Roads and ROWs would follow existing alignments.

i. No creek diversions would be permitted unless they benefit CRCT.

Objective 3 Ensure that no obstruction to the Trapper's Point big game migration bottleneck would occur, facilitate livestock trailing and gathering, and provide interpretation of cultural sites for the public.

Actions

a. The Trapper's Point ACEC (9,540 acres) would be designated (Map 2-26; Table 2-30, p. 2-164).

b. The ACEC would be closed to all surface disturbing activities except to enhance the viability of the big game migration and operations of the Green River Drift, or activities to interpret or enhance understanding of the site.

c. The ACEC would be closed to land disposal and mineral location. A withdrawal would be pursued.

d. Construction of additional fences in the ACEC would be prohibited, except to enhance the viability of the big game migration.

e. The ACEC would be unavailable for oil and gas leasing.

f. OHV use would be limited to designated roads and trails and would be closed from November 15 through April 30.

Objective 4 Provide high-quality wildlife habitat in the New Fork Potholes area.

Actions

a. The New Fork Potholes ACEC (1,820 acres) would be designated (Map 2-26; Table 2-30, p. 2-164).

b. Surface disturbing activities would be prohibited except to benefit wildlife habitat, vegetation, or watershed values.

c. The ACEC would be closed to land disposal and mineral location. Withdrawal would be pursued.

d. The ACEC would be unavailable for oil and gas leasing.

e. OHV use would be limited to designated roads and trails, with seasonal closures during crucial winter periods.

Objective 5 Provide the opportunity for recreation activities and facilities, protect natural resources, and maintain big game migration routes in the Upper Green River area.

Actions

a. The Upper Green River ACEC (12,270 acres) would be established (Map 2-26; Table 2-30, p. 2-164).

b. The ACEC would be unavailable for oil and gas leasing.

c. OHV use would be limited to designated roads and trails (Map 2-27).

d. No net increase in miles of road would be allowed in the ACEC.

Objective 6 Maintain habitats sufficient to support WTPD populations.

Actions

a. The WTPD ACEC (Map 2-26) would be designated. Because complete surveys of prairie dog town locations are not available, the ACEC would include a list of townships where prairie dog towns might be located.

b. Surveys would be conducted in the ACEC area to verify prairie dog presence before projects are approved.

c. As opportunity arises, land tenure adjustments, including acquisition of lands, easements, or exchange, would be pursued to meet ACEC objectives.

d. The ACEC would be available for oil and gas leasing with intensive management of surface disturbing activities.

1. Surface disturbing activities in WTPD towns greater than 12.5 acres in size would be prohibited.

2. Above-ground facilities within one-quarter mile of WTPD towns greater than 12.5 acres in size would be equipped with anti-raptor perching devices.

e. Motorized vehicle use in WTPD towns and complexes would be limited to designated roads and trails.

f. Prairie dog poisoning by animal damage control (ADC) would be prohibited in WTPD towns and complexes except for demonstrated human health and safety needs or other demonstrated emergency reasons.

Objective 7 Maintain open space, natural landscapes, and big game winter ranges in the Miller Mountain area.

Actions

a. The Miller Mountain Management Area would be established (approximately 66,440 acres) (Map 2-26; Table 2-30, p. 2-164).

b. OHV use would be limited to designated roads and trails. No net increase in miles of road would be allowed in the area. No roads would be developed in talus slope areas.

c. Surface disturbance would be prohibited on slopes greater than 15%.

d. The Management Area would be unavailable for oil and gas leasing.

e. Commercial timber production would be prohibited.

f. The area would be managed as VRM Class II (Map 2-22).

Objective 8 Maintain sensitive plant communities and control soil erosion in the Ross Butte area.

Actions

a. The Ross Butte ACEC (35,670 acres) would be designated (Map 2-26; Table 2-30, p. 2-164).

b. New communication sites would be prohibited in the ACEC.

c. The ACEC would be unavailable for oil and gas leasing.

d. OHV use would be limited to designated roads and trails (Map 2-27).

e. Surface occupancy on erosive soils and in sensitive plant species habitats would be prohibited.

f. Surface disturbance would be prohibited on slopes greater than 10%.

g. The ACEC would be managed as VRM Class II (Map 2-22).

Objective 9 Maintain recreational values and the viability of the big game migration bottleneck in the CCC Ponds area.

Actions

a. The CCC Ponds ACEC (5,530 acres) would be established (Map 2-26; Table 2-30, p. 2-164).

b. The ACEC would be unavailable for oil and gas leasing.

c. The ACEC would be closed to locatable mineral development and land disposal. Withdrawal would be pursued.

d. OHV use, including over-the-snow vehicles, would be limited to designated roads and trails.

e. Motorized vehicle use would be prohibited on the Pinedale Pathway except for snow removal, maintenance, and ski trail grooming.

f. Proposed projects would be evaluated on a case-by-case basis and would be designed to maintain the integrity of big game migration routes.

Objective 10 Maintain wildlife habitats, big game migration corridors and bottlenecks, scenic quality, and recreation values and uses in the Wind River Front area.

Actions

a. The Wind River Front Management Area (358,400 acres) would be established (Map 2-26; Table 2-30, p. 2-164).

b. Surface disturbing and disruptive activities (for example, gravel pits, campgrounds, and roads) would be mitigated to meet Management Area objectives.

c. Public access to key areas to optimize recreation opportunities would be pursued.

d. The Management Area would be unavailable for oil and gas leasing.

e. Geophysical operations would be prohibited except on existing oil and gas leases.

f. Commercial timber harvest would be prohibited.

Objective 11 Retain the wilderness characteristics of the Lake Mountain WSA.

Action

a. The Lake Mountain WSA would be closed to OHV use (13,490 acres).

Objective 12 Maintain the outstandingly remarkable characteristics of the areas determined suitable for inclusion in the WSR System.

Actions

a. All WSR units would be unavailable for oil and gas leasing.

b. The ***East Fork River unit*** would be managed as suitable for inclusion in the WSR System (tentative classification: wild) (1,130 acres) (Map 2-29).

1. Surface disturbing activities in the East Fork River unit would be prohibited except for those activities that would reestablish and/or enhance the outstandingly remarkable values.

2. Commercial timber sales or harvesting would be prohibited.

3. Salable mineral development would be prohibited.

4. Geophysical activity would be prohibited.

5. The area would be closed to OHV use.

6. The area would be an exclusion area for ROWs.

7. A withdrawal from land disposal, mineral location, and entry would be pursued.

8. Water impoundments, diversions, or hydroelectric power facilities would be prohibited.

9. Increases in active grazing preferences and construction of new range improvements in the area would be prohibited.

10. The area would be open only to vegetation treatment or manipulation that would restore and/or enhance the outstandingly remarkable scenic and ecological values and that would be compatible with a wild waterway classification.

c. The ***Scab Creek and Silver Creek units*** (1,350 acres and 860 acres, respectively) within the Scab

Creek WSA would be managed as suitable for inclusion in the WSR System (tentative classification: wild) (Map 2-29).

1. Increases in active grazing preferences and construction of new range improvements would be prohibited.

2. The areas would be open only to vegetation treatment or manipulation that would restore and/or enhance the outstandingly remarkable scenic and ecological values and that would be compatible with a wild waterway area and comply with interim management policy for lands under wilderness review.

d. The ***Green River unit*** would be managed as suitable for inclusion in the WSR System (tentative classification: scenic) (7,100 acres) (Map 2-29).

1. The area would be closed to land disposal actions.

2. The area would be an avoidance area for ROWs.

3. Increases in active grazing preferences in the area would be prohibited.

4. Geophysical exploration would be prohibited.

5. Recreation developments and wildlife and range improvements would be allowed if there would be no substantial adverse effects on the natural-like appearance of the lands within the waterway corridor and their immediate environment.

6. OHV use would be limited to designated roads and trails.

7. Development of hydroelectric power facilities, flood control dams and levees, water supply dams, and major diversions would be prohibited. Maintenance of existing facilities and construction of some new structures would be permitted, provided the outstandingly remarkable characteristics of the river segment would be maintained or enhanced.

2.5.5 Alternative 4

Air Quality Management

Management Goal

Minimize the impact of management actions in the planning area on air quality by complying with all applicable air quality laws, rules, and regulations. Implement management actions in the planning area to improve air quality as practicable.

Management Objectives and Actions

Objective 1 Maintain concentrations of criteria pollutants associated with management actions in compliance with applicable state and federal AAQS.

Objective 2 Maintain concentrations of PSD pollutants associated with management actions in compliance with the applicable increment.

Objective 3 Reduce visibility-impairing pollutants in accordance with the reasonable progress goals and time frames established within the State of Wyoming's Regional Haze SIP.

Objective 4 Reduce atmospheric deposition pollutants to levels below generally accepted LOCs and LACs.

Actions (these actions apply to all four objectives)

a. BLM would cooperate in the collection of basic climate and meteorological data from remote automatic weather stations.

b. BLM would cooperate with the EPA and State of Wyoming and collaborate with the USFS in monitoring for atmospheric deposition (acid rain) and its impacts on the Class I airsheds of the Bridger and Fitzpatrick Wilderness Areas.

c. Special requirements, such as dust abatement, alternative power sources, and BMPs to alleviate air quality impacts, would be included on a case-by-case basis in use authorizations within the scope of BLM's authority.

d. Prescribed burns would be managed to comply with WDEQ-AQD smoke management rules and regulations.

e. BLM would continue to participate in State of the Atmosphere modeling to assess cumulative changes to air quality over time.

f. BLM would work cooperatively with WDEQ-AQD to develop a memorandum of understanding (MOU) on lease stipulations and COAs, with respect to air quality emissions.

Cultural Resources Management

Management Goals

Protect and preserve significant cultural resources for appropriate use by present and future generations.

Promote stewardship, conservation, and appreciation of cultural resources.

Provide opportunities for scientific, educational, recreational, and traditional uses of cultural resources.

Reduce imminent threats to eligible and unevaluated cultural resources from natural or human-caused impacts or potential conflict with other resource uses.

Develop a public outreach and education program to instill a preservation ethic in the public regarding archeological and historic resources.

Management Objective and Actions

Objective 1 Protect NRHP-eligible cultural sites and national historic trails.

Actions

a. Cultural resource management activity plans would be completed and implemented to identify, record, preserve, and protect archeological and historic sites. Activity plans would be prepared for any current or future sites listed in, or determined eligible for listing in, the NRHP. Site-specific management prescriptions, including data recovery if warranted, would be included in the activity plans.

b. Select NRHP-eligible sites would be monitored and mitigations would be developed to protect the sites from inappropriate use, erosion, trampling, or other damage.

c. Important cultural areas would be identified and inventoried to protect cultural resources before other management actions are proposed.

d. Surface disturbance and occupancy would be prohibited on communal big game kill sites, Oregon Trail inscription sites, rock shelters, select rock alignments, Native American burial locales, Native American TCPs, and rock art sites (4,430 acres). The NSO areas would be tailored to the type, characteristics, and setting of each site.

e. Native American consultation would be conducted before lands containing known rock shelters, rock alignments, Native American burials, rock art sites, or other sites considered important or sacred to modern Native Americans were leased for oil and gas.

f. The Lander Trail and its visual historic setting would be protected through establishment of a VRM Class II designation for about 71,510 acres of public land within 3 miles of contributing segments of the trail (Map 2-30).

g. If a proposed action would diminish the integrity of a historic property's setting, and the integrity of the setting contributes to NRHP eligibility, appropriate mitigation would be applied (Appendices 1, 3, and 5).

h. Segments of the Lander Trail where the setting does not contribute to its eligibility for the NRHP would be managed as determined by the VRM Class inventory.

i. Surface occupancy or disturbance would be prohibited except for linear crossings within one-quarter mile of the Lander Trail.

1. In addition to the one-quarter mile NSO in the South Piney Canyon Area, CSU stipulations would be applied for the next three-quarters of a mile on either side of the Lander Trail, for a total stipulation area of 1 mile on either side of the trail.

j. Surface occupancy would be prohibited within 1 mile on either side of the Sublette Cutoff Trail.

k. BLM would consult with state and local governments and landowners with respect to all trail management issues.

l. Section 110 inventory acreage would be determined annually based on budget, workload, and threats from development, vandalism, and/or erosion.

m. Conservation easements from willing private landowners could be sought to protect historic values.

n. Acquisition of conservation easements, when agreed upon by all consulting parties, including willing private landowners, could serve as a potential mitigation option for adverse effects to national historic trails and their setting that may take place at other locations.

o. Segments of national historic trails not selected for special management consideration would continue to be managed as directed in applicable RMPs and other activity plans, and as required by the NHPA and the State Protocol between the Wyoming BLM and the Wyoming SHPO.

Forestry

Management Goal

Manage all forest and woodland stands for restoration to pre-suppression composition, structure, and function, with generally widely scattered, more fire resilient larger trees and lower numbers of smaller trees in the more frequent fire return interval regimes (primarily Douglas fir, limber and white bark pine). Realizing that pre-suppression characteristics in the longer fire return intervals forests (lodgepole pine and true firs) consisted of stand replacement fires and even aged stands.

Management Objectives and Actions

Objective 1 Return mixed conifer and lodgepole pine stands (approximately 22,000 acres) to their HRV.

Actions

a. Existing old growth stands would be identified and managed to comply with HFRA.

b. Other stands would be managed to move them toward old growth composition, structure, and function as appropriate.

c. Forest health concerns would be identified and stands aggressively managed to improve forest health within the guidelines of HFRA.

d. Forest commodity production and stand improvement activities would be focused on small diameter trees, consistent with making the stand fire resilient. Approximately 1,600 CCF/800 MBF of forest products would be available for sale annually. Up to 200 acres of forest could be commercially or precommercially treated annually.

e. In stands (Fire Regime IV and V) where stand replacement fires are the norm, even age management could be practiced, consistent within the disturbance ecology framework of the vegetation type.

Objective 2 Return woodland ecosystem areas (aspen, aspen/conifer, cottonwood, and other woodland ecosystems—15,280 acres) to their HRVs.

Actions

a. Forest products would be available as a secondary product of management, consistent with forest health, landscape restoration, and reduction of forest fuels objectives.

b. Restoration of aspen stands would be emphasized through removing/reducing conifer and/or sagebrush invasion. Prescribed fire and overstory removal of dead and dying aspen would be used to

rejuvenate and expand these stands so that watershed and wildlife habitat would be improved, and natural fire breaks would be created within the landscape.

c. Up to 700 acres of woodlands could undergo vegetation treatment per year.

Objective 3 Restore or emulate natural/historic forest cycles on the forested lands and woodlands within the Scab Creek and Lake Mountain WSAs.

Action

a. Prescribed or wildland fire could be used to achieve vegetation alteration in the WSAs. Mechanical surface disturbing activities would be prohibited, and no forest products would be removed from WSAs.

Objective 4 Using HFRA guidelines, maintain identified old growth stands.

Action

a. All stands would be analyzed for old growth characteristics and their position within the landscape before entry by using accepted inventory methods and analysis of previous forest management activities. Landscape analysis of the percentage of stands needed to meet old growth standards would establish the management goals for the individual stand for their vegetation type would be managed to maintain old growth characteristics on a landscape scale. Connectivity of existing old growth areas would be maintained at appropriate locations and distribution levels. Old growth, as well as all other stands would be maintained using appropriate mechanical and prescribed fire tools to maintain pre-suppression composition, structure, and function.

Lands and Realty Management

Management Goals

Provide for use of public lands in accordance with federal regulations where compatible with other resources. Pursue land tenure adjustments that are in the public interest.

Management Objectives and Actions

Objective 1 Process land tenure adjustments that would benefit or achieve the goals of other resource programs.

Actions

a. Of the 6,300 acres that meet FLPMA disposal criteria for sale, 790 acres would be available (Appendix 14, Map 2-31).

b. Land acquisitions would be limited to willing buyer and seller with a preference for transactions that create no net loss of private land in the affected counties.

c. Emphasis would be placed on actions that accommodate and enhance wildlife migration routes within the PFO.

Objective 2 Respond to community needs for expansion and economic development.

Actions

a. Proposals for land tenure adjustments would be considered on a case-by-case basis and according to criteria in Appendix 13 (Map 2-31). Before any land tenure adjustments were made, the appropriate level of environmental analysis would be conducted on the proposal. Riparian, wetland,

and aquatic resources would not be available for sale but could be exchanged for lands of equal or greater monetary and/or resource value.

b. Acquisition of nonfederal lands from willing parties would be considered to meet the goals of various resource management programs. Land exchanges would be considered if they would enhance other resource values, provide a public benefit, or improve management efficiency in areas of scattered or intermingled landownership patterns (Appendix 13).

c. No lands would be determined suitable for DLE.

d. Trespass within the planning area would be resolved. BLM would pursue the resolution of occupancy, mineral, or other trespass to the benefit of the BLM and the public.

e. Realty actions that would protect wildlife migration routes would be considered. Public lands would be retained to provide for free movement of migrating big game animals at—

- Trapper's Point
- The south end of Fremont Lake (CCC Ponds Area)
- Other important wildlife migration routes as identified.

Objective 3 Process ROW applications in a timely manner, applying appropriate mitigation to protect resource values.

Actions

a. Energy corridors and criteria would be incorporated. Common ROW routes would be designated, where appropriate, to minimize impacts.

b. ROWs for above-ground power lines would be sited to protect the setting of contributing segments of the national historic trails (Map 2-32).

c. Utility facilities would be restricted to existing routes and designated corridors where practicable, including environmental and socioeconomic considerations. Corridor routes would include U.S. Highways 189 and 191, and State Highways 189, 191, 350, 351, 352, 353, and 354. New corridors could be established as oil and gas fields are developed (Map 3-10).

d. New power lines would be buried to the extent practicable.

e. Linear ROW crossings in 100-year floodplains, wetlands, and riparian areas would be considered on a case-by-case basis (Map 3-14).

f. Exceptions to ROW avoidance areas (Map 2-32; Table 2-27, p. 2-160) would be considered if the activity would meet the following criteria:

- Be within the corridors identified under c.
- Not create substantial surface disturbance
- Be located in areas with a high potential for successful reclamation
- Have impacts that would be temporary
- Be compatible with other resource values being protected
- Be beneficial to the resources being managed.

g. ROWs for communication sites would be processed on a case-by-case basis with the following criteria:

1. Emphasis would be on development on already-existing multiple use sites rather than establishing new sites.

2. Towers on all sites would be restricted to heights not requiring lighting.

3. All new and replacement towers would be self-supporting and non-guyed.

4. New users on all sites would be responsible for notifying existing users of frequencies and for resolving any interference problems with existing facilities.

h. Proposals for alternative energy development would be considered on a case-by-case basis.

1. Alternative energy development would be avoided in sensitive areas, including—

- Raptor concentration areas
- Neotropical bird migration routes, as determined by site-specific monitoring
- Within 3 miles of occupied sage-grouse leks
- Sage-grouse winter concentration areas
- VRM Class I or II areas
- WSAs, SRMAs, ACECs, and other SD/MAs
- Lander Trail, Sublette Cutoff Trail, and sensitive Native American and cultural sites identified for NSO stipulations or unavailable for oil and gas leasing.
- Crucial big game winter ranges

2. Exceptions would be considered if impacts could be mitigated.

i. No new centralized compression facilities would be permitted in the Wind River Front Management Area (approximately 201,240 acres) (Map 2-33). Wellhead compression for individual wells would be considered on a case-by-case basis.

j. Water disposal pits would be considered on a case-by-case basis in the Intensively Developed Areas.

1. Pits would meet the requirements of Onshore Oil and Gas Order No. 7, the Wyoming Oil and Gas Commission, and the WDEQ.

2. Disposal pits would be restricted to VRM Class IV areas.

3. Disposal pits would be bonded to an amount determined by an Authorized Officer.

k. Reasonable access would be provided to private landowners/private mineral estate holders for transportation of products across public lands to access sales pipelines, or to issue other ROWs across BLM lands when necessary to support activities on private lands.

Objective 4 Approximately 13,770 acres of new withdrawals from locatable mineral entry and land disposal would be pursued to protect cultural, wildlife habitat, and recreational values (Table 2-26, p. 2-159; Map 2-34).

Livestock Grazing Management

Management Goals

Maintain and/or enhance livestock grazing opportunities and rangeland health.

Management Objectives and Actions

Objective 1 Maintain, restore, or enhance livestock grazing to meet the Wyoming Standards for Rangeland Health and achieve allotment objectives.

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.

Actions

a. The current grazing preference of 107,907 AUMs would be maintained, unless changes are warranted through site-specific monitoring.

b. Adjustments in AUMs would be considered through implementation of AMPs, additional NEPA analysis, and rangeland monitoring.

c. Livestock grazing in the oil and gas Intensively Developed Areas would incorporate adaptive management and collaboration with interested parties, including livestock operators, to examine the effects of intense industrial operations on the access to, and availability of, the forage base.

1. Reasonable and prudent mitigation would be implemented to maintain the availability of public lands for authorized livestock grazing use to the extent possible.

2. Reductions in grazing use in industrialized areas could become necessary if mitigation is insufficient to maintain the current level of livestock grazing.

3. Reductions could be temporary in nature, with AUMs restored to affected permittees when appropriate.

d. Grazing systems would be designed to maintain or improve watershed and range condition; for example, through changing seasons of use, implementing rotational or other grazing management systems, or development of infrastructure for livestock management.

e. Livestock grazing in areas of crucial big game winter ranges (Map 3-20) would be managed to maintain or enhance vegetation condition and forage availability for wildlife, as appropriate.

f. Livestock water developments on crucial elk winter ranges would be designed, located, and managed to maintain winter elk forage.

g. Grazing seasons in allotments containing elk parturition areas would be adjusted to begin after June 1 to reduce the potential for brucellosis transmission. This action would only occur after, and in conjunction with, development of a herd management plan through coordination and cooperation with the affected grazing permittee and the WGFD.

h. Approximately 21,000 acres of unallocated forage on public lands would be considered for wildlife and livestock allocation on a case-by-case basis, in accordance with RMP goals and objectives.

1. The number of AUMs to be allocated to each use would be determined after the lands have been evaluated to determine the range condition and appropriate carrying capacity.

i. Developed recreation sites (approximately 100 acres) and vegetation exclosures (approximately 75 acres or up to 150 AUMs) would be closed to livestock grazing.

j. Livestock grazing and range-related improvements would be allowed in the Rock Creek ACEC consistent with ACEC objectives.

k. Forage reserves would be established to accommodate and facilitate rangeland restoration and recovery on a landscape scale. Authorized forage removal would not exceed the livestock carrying capacity (acres/AUM) of the allotment identified as a forage reserve. The PFO would actively pursue opportunities as they arise to establish forage reserves based on reasons such as—

- The cooperation of a current permittee under a partnership agreement or memorandum of understanding
- Newly available forage for livestock on a sustained yield basis such as that created upon cancellation of preference within an individual allotment
- Non-BLM lands made available in cooperation with another agency or entity.

Forage reserves, once established, would be managed in accordance with the provisions of an appropriate activity plan developed in consultation with the interested publics.

l. In allotments with riparian habitat, grazing management actions would be designed to maintain or achieve Proper Functioning Condition.

m. Mineral supplement blocks would be placed in locations that promote proper grazing distribution and prevent inappropriate livestock use on riparian habitat, for example, by locating supplements on ridgetops and/or approximately one-quarter mile from riparian habitat. Placement of supplements near water sources, such as wells and reservoirs, would consider rangeland objectives, such as grazing distribution, wildlife habitat requirements, and reclamation success. Mineral supplement blocks would not be placed within one-quarter mile of an occupied sage-grouse lek. Mineral supplement blocks would not be placed within one-quarter mile of known special status plant locations.

n. Livestock grazing management would be based on monitoring of range condition and trend, consultation, cooperation, and coordination with livestock grazing permittees and other interested parties, and completion of an approved landscape/watershed/AMP with accompanying NEPA documentation.

Minerals Management

Management Goal

Provide opportunities for mineral extraction and energy exploration and development to provide resources to meet national and local needs while avoiding or otherwise mitigating significant impacts to other resource objectives.

Management Objectives and Actions

Objective 1 (Intensively Developed Fields) Make federal lands and minerals within existing oil and gas fields (175,040 acres) available for intensive oil and gas leasing, exploration, development, and production (Map 2-9).

Actions

a. Lands and mineral estate in these areas would be available for lease.

b. New oil and gas leases would include standard lease stipulations and appropriate NSO and CSU stipulations as specifically prescribed in the Cultural, Wildlife, and Recreation sections of this alternative.

c. Exceptions would be considered to allow year-round drilling and development operations on new and existing leases (170,670 acres) in Intensively Developed Areas that are currently encumbered by seasonal restrictions. Such exceptions would be subject to existing federal laws such as the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) and ESA, additional environmental analysis including Cooperating Agency coordination and the leaseholder/operator implementing offsetting mitigation to support other resource objectives.

1. This exception would not be applied to seasonal (timing limitation) protection measures for T&E and migratory bird species unless consultation with USFWS, migratory bird take permits or other sort of permits beyond the scope of BLM's exception process are obtained.

d. BMPs and other mitigation measures would be applied to mitigate impacts on sensitive habitats and other resources (Appendices 3 and 5) to the extent possible and practicable. Post-lease actions (activity plans, APDs, Sundry Notices) would be managed under restrictions and COAs developed

through programmatic and/or site-specific environmental analysis in coordination with cooperating agencies and in consideration of resource objectives.

e. Accelerated reclamation would be implemented to reestablish habitats.

f. Water disposal pits would be considered on a case-by-case basis.

Objective 2 (Traditional Leasing Areas) Make federal lands and mineral estate as depicted on Map 2-9 available for oil and gas leasing and exploration in concert with maintaining the viability of non-oil and gas resource values and land uses (465,720 acres).

Actions

a. Lands and mineral estate in these areas would be available for lease.

b. Mineral leases, including those for minerals other than oil and gas, would be subject to timing limitation, CSU and NSO stipulations, and COAs, as well as the additional resource constraints as established for surface disturbing and disruptive activities in this alternative.

c. Existing oil and gas leases (303,140 acres) would be managed under their existing lease terms and stipulations.

1. Oil and gas activities would be designed to mitigate impacts on important wildlife habitats, including big game crucial winter ranges and greater sage-grouse habitats.

2. BMPs and other mitigation measures would be applied to mitigate impacts on sensitive habitats and other resources (Appendices 3 and 5).

d. Post-lease actions (APDs, Sundry Notices) would be managed under restrictions and COAs developed through programmatic and/or site-specific environmental analysis. Post-lease actions (activity plans, APDs, Sundry Notices) would be managed under restrictions and COAs developed through programmatic and/or site-specific environmental analysis in coordination with cooperating agencies and in consideration of resource objectives.

e. Lands in these areas could convert to Intensively Developed Fields when bottom-hole well density exceeds one well per 160 acres and a surface density of four well pads per 640-acre section. Consideration for conversion would depend on (1) a geology and reservoir analysis determination that additional well density is needed to efficiently and adequately produce the gas or oil resource; (2) that surface resources can be satisfactorily mitigated; and (3) that a project-specific environmental documentation is prepared to analyze impacts and to determine operating methods, mitigation, and BMPs to be used in the efficient and comprehensive development of the field.

f. New fields not adjacent to the current Intensively Developed Fields (Jonah, Pinedale Anticline, Big Piney-LaBarge, Deer Hills, and Camp/Castle Creek) would require an RMP amendment to be designated Intensively Developed Areas.

g. On-lease water disposal pits would not be allowed.

Objective 3 (Unavailable Areas) Make federal lands and minerals as depicted on Map 2-9 unavailable for oil and gas leasing (439,470 acres). As existing oil and gas leases expire in Unavailable Areas, they would not be re-offered for lease, except as necessary to provide drainage protection (as indicated below).

Actions

a. Lands and mineral estate in these areas would be unavailable for lease.

b. A one-half mile NSO area would be established in some areas where the Unavailable Areas abut lands or mineral estate not managed by BLM (Map 2-9). This one-half mile NSO “buffer” area would provide a means for dealing with drainage of resources from BLM mineral estate.

c. The unavailable for oil and gas leasing designation could be re-valuated in site-specific situations under the following circumstances:

1. Development on adjacent state or private mineral estate is determined by BLM's Reservoir Management Group (RMG) to be draining federal oil and gas resources to the extent that an off-setting federal well or wells is/are needed to resolve the drainage issue.
2. Surface resource values (wildlife, cultural, vegetation, visual, livestock grazing, recreation, etc.) can be adequately mitigated.
3. A plan amendment is completed for the conversion.

d. Existing oil and gas leases (118,190 acres) would be managed under their existing lease terms and stipulations.

1. Oil and gas activities would be regulated to mitigate impacts on important wildlife habitats, including big game crucial winter ranges and greater sage-grouse habitats.

2. BMPs and operating standards would be applied to mitigate impacts on sensitive habitats and other resources (Appendices 3 and 5).

3. Post-lease actions (APDs, Sundry Notices) would be managed under restrictions and COAs developed through the appropriate level of additional environmental analysis in coordination with cooperating agencies as appropriate and in consideration of resource objectives.

4. On-lease water disposal pits would not be allowed.

e. Oil and gas operators would have the right to explore, develop, and produce existing leases. As prescribed in 43 CFR §3101.1-2, post-lease actions, such as APDs and Sundry Notices, could be subject to reasonable restrictions as determined necessary by the Authorized Officer.

Objective 4 Provide opportunities for geophysical and geologic data acquisition while mitigating impacts on important resource values.

Actions

a. Geophysical data gathering methods that involve only casual use of the surface (as defined in 43 CFR §3150) would be permitted throughout the planning area.

b. Vehicle-based geophysical activities would be assessed on a case-by-case basis.

c. The use of surface and/or above-ground (Poulter shot) explosive charges for geophysical exploration would be assessed case by case.

d. Geophysical projects, including projects proposed in areas with an NSO restriction, would be analyzed and mitigation developed on a case-by-case basis.

e. Geophysical operations on BLM-administered surface within Native American TCP areas and within one-quarter mile of rock art sites would be restricted to designated roads and trails or nonvehicle-based methods and would be subject to Native American consultation.

f. Geophysical operations on post-FLPMA leased or unleased BLM-administered surface within the Scab Creek and Lake Mountain WSAs would be considered on a case-by-case basis if the operations meet the requirements of the Interim Management Policy for Land under Wilderness Review (BLM Handbook H-8550-1). Geophysical operations on pre-FLPMA leased, BLM-administered surface within the Lake Mountain WSA would be allowed pursuant to environmental analysis and the pre-FLPMA requirements in H-8550-1.

g. Geophysical operations would be allowed on BLM-administered surface within the Wind River Front Management Area and the Beaver Creek, Trapper's Point, and New Fork Potholes ACECs if the operations are conducted using nonvehicular methods or on designated roads and trails.

h. Geophysical activities would be allowed in and within one-quarter mile of developed recreation sites if the recreation site is not occupied and the operations are conducted on designated roads and trails.

i. Geophysical activities would be designed and implemented to minimize impacts to wildlife habitats through means such as the imposition of surface-use, seasonal, and/or other appropriate mitigation developed through project-specific NEPA analysis.

j. Geophysical activities that are considered casual use actions would be allowed within one-quarter mile of active sage-grouse leks provided that:

1. Operations are conducted on designated roads and trails.

2. Operations during the breeding season (March 1 through May 15) are conducted between the hours of 8:00 a.m. and 8:00 p.m.

3. A 150-foot wide strip of undisturbed sagebrush is maintained around the perimeter of the lek for hiding and escape cover.

Objective 5 Make coal resources available for leasing and development.

Action

a. Decisions on lands acceptable for leasing consideration for coal development would be made after an application is received and the coal screening process is conducted.

Objective 6 Lands not withdrawn or segregated from mineral entry would be available for locatable mineral exploration and development (1,185,510 acres).

Actions

a. Locatable mineral activities would be subject to regulatory requirements; resource constraints would be based on the undue and unnecessary degradation standard.

b. New mineral withdrawals (13,770 acres) would be pursued to protect cultural, wildlife, and recreational values in the areas identified in Map 2-34 and Table 2-26, p. 2-159.

Objective 7 Salable mineral resources would be available for development.

Actions

a. Salable mineral activities would be evaluated on a case-by-case basis.

b. The planning area would be open to mineral material disposals with the exception of WSAs (21,200 acres) (Map 2-33).

Objective 8 Make other leasable minerals (phosphate, sodium [trona], and geothermal steam) available for exploration and development.

Actions

a. Geothermal leasing and development would be considered and managed under the same objectives, management actions, and restrictions, and in the same areas identified as being available for Intensive Development and Traditional Leasing Areas for oil and gas leasing and development in this alternative.

b. Management of phosphate, sodium, oil shale, and geothermal steam would be the same as for Alternative 1.

c. Should interest in other leasable minerals materialize in the future, leasing would be considered on a case-by-case basis, and the RMP would be amended as appropriate and necessary.

Paleontology and Natural History

Management Goal

Protect significant fossils and known paleontological resources from damage or destruction and facilitate suitable scientific, educational, and recreational uses of fossils.

Management Objective and Action

Objective 1 Known and newly discovered paleontological resources would be managed to maintain or improve current condition.

Action

a. Areas of unique natural history, important paleontological resources, or particular natural interest, including the Pinedale Glacial Area, would be nominated for designation as NNLs, RNAs, or ACECs, and managed for protection of their unique values.

Recreation and Visitor Services Management

Management Goal

Provide substantial personal, community, economic, and environmental benefits to local residents and visitors through recreational uses of the public lands.

Management Objectives and Actions

Objective 1 Maintain or enhance the health and viability of recreation-dependent natural resources and settings within the planning area.

Actions

a. A 14-day campsite occupancy limit would apply throughout the planning area. This occupancy limit would apply to a 5-mile radius of the campsite and would be restricted to the recreational use of public lands.

b. Commercial operators camping within 200 feet of streams or in riparian areas would be considered on a case-by-case basis and could be restricted or prohibited if resource damage occurs.

c. Dispersed camping within 200 feet of streams or in riparian areas would be allowed but could be restricted or prohibited if resource damage occurs.

d. Surface occupancy within one-quarter mile of developed recreation sites would be prohibited except for activities necessary to maintain or enhance recreation sites, or for activities necessary to protect or enhance soil, vegetation, watershed health, and similar resources.

Objective 2 Promote commercial competitive events and organized group activities where appropriate and compatible with natural resource management objectives.

Action

a. SRP applications would be processed except for additional commercial SRPs for river use on the Green and New Fork Rivers.

b. Additional SRPs and allotted river use for commercial SRPs for the Green and New Fork Rivers would be determined through the development of a RAMP.

Objective 3 Manage SRMAs to provide for current and future recreation opportunities. Refer to RMZ specific objectives below. The Recreation Opportunity Spectrum would be used for each SRMA as a guide to maintain, promote, or modify recreation activities, settings, and experiences (Appendix 16).

a. **Scab Creek SRMA**—the Scab Creek SRMA would be retained and managed as two RMZs (18,460 total acres). The Front Country Zone would consist of BLM access road, trailheads, backpacker and pack stock staging areas, campgrounds, area trails, restrooms, trash collection, and public information facilities. The Back Country Zone would consist of the remaining area generally void of modern, human-created features and located at least one-half mile from any roads.

1. Recreation Tourism Markets: The Front Country Zone would be a *Community and Destination Market*, and the Back Country Zone would be an *Undeveloped Market.* Recreation users would be local residents and regional and national visitors.

2. The Recreation Market Segment for the Front Country Zone would be developed camping, hunting, trailhead access and day use opportunities. The Back Country Zone would provide an undeveloped primitive, nonmotorized setting (within the WSA) for back country camping, hunting, hiking, backpacking, fishing, rock climbing, and other adventure activities requiring a high degree of self-reliance.

3. The Management Objective for the Scab Creek SRMA would be to manage each zone to provide opportunities for the public to achieve targeted, high-quality recreation activities and experiences that would produce significant benefits for the visiting public. Both zones would provide opportunities for visitors to engage in targeted activities, providing a 90% or better realization of targeted benefits (Table 2-17 and Table 2-18).

4. Recreation Management: A RAMP would be prepared to guide management of recreation use while enhancing the area's natural setting. The Front Country Zone would provide quality services and facilities that would accommodate appropriate use levels, meet health and safety standards, and protect the area's natural values. The Back Country Zone would maintain trails for nonmotorized foot and equestrian travel except where limited to designated roads and trails outside of the WSA.

5. The Market Strategy for the Front Country Zone onsite would be to use standard BLM venues for disseminating recreational user information and regulations, and offsite using local BLM publications and Internet technologies. The Market Strategy for the Back Country Zone would be to provide basic user information at trailheads on access, regulations, and resource protection. The provision of onsite information and directional signs would be prohibited unless such facilities complied with BLM Interim Management Policy for Lands Under Wilderness Review (within the WSA).

6. Recreation Monitoring: BLM personnel and volunteers would regularly conduct recreation monitoring. Visitor use surveys would be implemented to determine whether targeted outcomes are being achieved. Surveys would be replicated periodically.

7. Recreation Administration would include: Approval for cost recovery to maintain visitor services and manage it as a U.S. Fee Site. Both zones: The issuance of SRPs could be considered only for commercial and group activities as appropriate for the area setting. Camping would be limited to a 14-day length of stay. The WSA would be closed to motorized vehicles and limited to designated roads and trails outside the WSA. The SRMA would be administratively unavailable for fluid mineral leasing. VRM Class I objectives would apply to the Scab Creek WSA, and VRM Class II objectives would apply to the remainder of the SRMA.

Table 2-17. Targeted Outcomes—Scab Creek SRMA

Activities	Experiences	Benefits
FRONT COUNTRY ZONE		
Camping (auto/RV) Picnicking and day use Hunting Equestrian	Enjoying viewing natural scenery Relaxing physically Engaging in preferred activities with family and friends	Personal: • Nature and aesthetic appreciation • Social bonding, cohesion, and cooperation • Personal health and fitness Community: • Family bonding and better family life Environmental: • Public awareness of environmental stewardship • Better care of Wind River Front Economic: • Contribution to tourism and local economy • Increased attractiveness of region as a place to live
BACKCOUNTRY ZONE		
Backpacking Pack stock use Wilderness camping Hunting Viewing wildlife and natural scenery	Relaxing physically Engaging in preferred activities with family and friends Developing outdoor skills Wilderness experience	Personal: • Nature and aesthetic appreciation • Social bonding and cooperation • Personal health and fitness • Self-reliance Community: • Improved perceived quality of life • Family bonding and better family life • Improved image of BLM Environmental: • Public awareness of environmental stewardship • Enhanced wilderness experience Economic: • Contribution to tourism and local economy

Table 2-18. Prescribed Setting Character - Scab Creek SRMA

Physical	Social	Administrative
FRONT COUNTRY ZONE		
Remoteness: Front Country Naturalness: Front Country Facilities: Front Country	Contacts: Middle Country Group Size: Middle Country Evidence of Use: Front Country Types of Encounters: Front Country	Mechanized Use: Middle Country Visitor Services: Front Country Management Controls: Front Country Domestic Animals: Middle Country
BACK COUNTRY ZONE		
Remoteness: Back Country Naturalness: Back Country Facilities: Back Country	Contacts: Back Country Group Size: Middle Country Evidence of Use: Back Country Types of Encounters: Back Country	Mechanized Use: Back Country Visitor Services: Middle to Back Country Management Controls: Back Country User Fees: Middle Country Domestic Animals: Back Country

c. The **Green and New Fork Rivers SRMA** would consist of two RMZs (32,560 total acres)—The Front Country Zone would include the Warren Bridge Campground located on the Green River (a U.S. Fee Site) and the Warren Bridge River Access complex located upriver of the Warren Bridge on U.S. 191 (9-mile river segment). The Warren Bridge Public Access complex is predominately BLM land; however, WGFD and private lands (shoreline) is also available to the public. Facilities and roads in this zone are primarily BLM roads and trails, developed boat ramps, campgrounds, restrooms, trails, and public information facilities.

The Middle Country Zone would include the Green and New Fork Rivers comprised of the remaining BLM-administered land within one-quarter mile on each side of the Green and New Fork Rivers from about U.S. Highway 191, downstream to Fontenelle Reservoir (approximately 110 Green River miles and New Fork River miles). This zone would provide important opportunities for the public to enjoy a wide variety of recreational activities associated with public land and waters. Public access in this zone would be provided by a combination of BLM, private, and Wyoming State lands. Public river accesses would vary widely from undeveloped to constructed boat ramps with associated user amenities. The majority of developed public accesses in this zone would be provided through the cooperative efforts of BLM, WGFD, and private landowners. Developed river accesses would typically include boat ramps, restrooms, vehicle parking, user information, and camping facilities (Map 3-6).

1. Recreation Tourism Markets: The Front Country and Middle Country Zones would be a *Community and Destination Market.* Recreation users would be local residents and regional and national visitors.

2. The Recreation Market Segment for the Front Country Zone would be easy and contiguous river access where visitors of nearly all abilities could enjoy a myriad of river and upland-based recreation activities such as float and wade fishing, adventure floating, hunting, hiking, equestrian use, wildlife observation, exceptional scenery, camping, and motorized activities. The Recreation Market Segment for the Middle Country Zone would be for visitors to enjoy river-related recreation activities in a less structured setting where access is more dispersed and amenities are few. A greater degree of self-reliance would be required.

3. The Management Objective for the Green and New Fork Rivers SRMA would be to manage each zone to provide opportunities for the public to achieve targeted, high-

quality recreation activities and experiences that produce significant benefits for the visiting public. Both zones would provide opportunities for visitors to engage in targeted activities, providing a 90% or better realization of targeted benefits (Table 2-19 and Table 2-20).

4. Recreation Management for both zones: Quality services and facilities would be provided that accommodate appropriate use levels, meet health and safety standards, and protect the area's natural values. A recreation management plan would be developed.

5. The Market Strategy for both zones would be to use standard BLM venues for disseminating recreation user information onsite and to use regional BLM publications and Internet technologies offsite. A *Guide for Recreational River Use* would be prepared. The Front Country Zone would focus resources on area use information, directional signs, brochures, and interpretation of area natural and historic resources.

6. Recreation Monitoring: BLM personnel and volunteers would regularly conduct monitoring for for both zones. Visitor use surveys would be periodically implemented to determine whether targeted outcomes are being achieved.

7. Recreation Administration for both zones: The issuance of *additional* commercial SRPs for guided fishing would not be considered before completion of the RAMP except through transfer of an existing permit or by clear demonstration by a bonafide guided fishing service provider of continual commercial use of BLM public lands since and *prior to 1998*. Appropriate use levels for commercial, competitive events and groups would be determined. Camping would be limited to a 14-day length of stay. Motorized vehicles would be limited to designated roads and trails. The Front Country Zone would be available for fluid mineral leasing with an NSO stipulation. The Middle Country Zone would also be available for fluid mineral leasing, but no surface disturbance would be allowed within one-quarter mile on either side of the river. VRM Class II objectives would apply to all of the SRMA except for approximately 6 miles of the Green River near La Barge, Wyoming. The Warren Bridge Campground would remain a U.S. Fee Site. The development of a new float boat access could be located within the Warren Bridge Campground. To maintain minimal visitor services and protect resources, the Warren Bridge Public Access area could be considered for authorization as a U.S. Fee Site. For the Green River where BLM jurisdictions are shared, a cooperative management agreement between the Pinedale Field Office and the Rock Springs Field Office would be pursued. The purpose of this agreement would be to facilitate uniform recreation management.

Table 2-19. Targeted Outcomes—Green and New Fork Rivers SRMA

Activities	Experiences	Benefits
FRONT COUNTRY ZONE		
Float and wade fishing Hunting Family and group camping Float camping Viewing wildlife	Being with family and friends Relaxing physically Enjoying viewing natural scenery Personal health and fitness	Personal: • Nature and aesthetic appreciation • Identification with a special place • Stronger ties with family and friends • Improved mental and physical well-being Community/Social: • Improved image of land

Activities	Experiences	Benefits
		management agencies • Improved perceived quality of life • Family bonding Environmental: • Greater environmental stewardship of Green River • Increased awareness of protection and management of natural landscapes Economic • Increased contributions to local economy
MIDDLE COUNTRY ZONE		
Same as Front Country Zone	Same as Front Country Zone	Same as Front Country Zone

Table 2-20. Prescribed Setting Character—Green and New Fork Rivers SRMA

Physical	Social	Administrative
FRONT COUNTRY ZONE		
Remoteness: Front Country Naturalness: Middle Country Facilities: Front Country	Contacts: Middle and Front Country Group Size: Middle and Front Country Types of Encounters: Front Country Personal Gear and Equipment: Front Country Evidence of Use: Front Country	Visitor Services: Front Country Management Controls: Front Country Domestic Animals: Middle Country Individual User Fees: Middle Country Mechanized Use: Middle Country
MIDDLE COUNTRY ZONE		
Remoteness: Front Country and Rural Naturalness: Front Country and Rural Facilities: Middle Country	Group Size: Back Country and Middle Country Contacts: Middle Country Types of Encounters: Middle Country Personal Gear and Equipment: Middle Country and Front Country Evidence of Use: Middle Country and Front Country	Visitor Services: Back Country Management Controls: Middle Country Domestic Animals: Middle Country Individual User Fees: Primitive Mechanized Use: Front Country

d. **Boulder Lake SRMA**—The Boulder Lake SRMA would be retained (5,790 acres) and managed as a Front Country Zone. The developments consist of the BLM access road, boat launch area, restrooms, parking area, two non-fee campgrounds, public information facilities, and undeveloped primitive roads and trails.

1. The Recreation Tourism Market would be a *Community and Destination Market.* Recreation users would be local residents and regional and national visitors.

2. The Recreation Market Segment would be a natural-appearing landscape that provides easy lake and river access and substantial opportunities to experience lake and upland-based recreation activities such as lake fishing and river wade fishing, boating, hunting,

camping, equestrian use, cycling, motorized activities, wildlife viewing, and exemplary glacial lake scenery.

3. The Management Objective would be to provide opportunities for the public to achieve targeted, high-quality recreation activities and experiences that produce significant benefits for the visiting public. The SRMA would provide opportunities for visitors to engage in targeted activities, providing a 90% or better realization of targeted benefits (Table 2-21 and Table 2-22).

4. Recreation Management: A RAMP would be prepared to provide quality services and facilities that accommodate appropriate use levels, meet health and safety standards, and protect the area's natural values. Appropriate use levels for commercial, competitive events and groups would be determined.

5. The Market Strategy would be to use standard BLM venues for disseminating recreational user information and regulations onsite, and to use local BLM publications and BLM Internet technologies offsite.

6. Recreation Monitoring: BLM personnel and volunteers would regularly conduct recreation monitoring. Visitor use surveys would be periodically implemented to determine whether targeted outcomes are being achieved.

7. Recreation Administration: To recover costs to maintain minimal visitor services and protect resources, the SRMA would be considered for authorization as a U.S. Fee Site. Camping would be limited to a 14-day length of stay. Motorized and mechanized upland activities would be limited to designated roads and trails. The SRMA would be administratively unavailable for fluid mineral leasing. VRM Class II objectives would apply to the SRMA.

Table 2-21. Targeted Outcomes—Boulder Lake SRMA

Activities	Experiences	Benefits
Lake and river fishing Boating Camping Hunting Picnicking and day use	Viewing wildlife and natural Scenery Relaxing physically Engaging in preferred activities with family and friends	Personal: • Nature and aesthetic appreciation • Social bonding and cooperation • Personal health and fitness Community: • Improved perceived quality of life • Family bonding and better family life • Improved image of land management agencies Environmental: • Public awareness of environmental stewardship Economic: • Contribution to tourism and local economy • Increased attractiveness of region as a place to live

Table 2-22. Prescribed Setting Character—Boulder Lake SRMA

Physical	Social	Administrative
Remoteness: Middle and Front Country Naturalness: Middle Country Facilities: Front Country	Contacts: Middle and Front Country Group Size: Middle and Front Country Evidence of Use: Front Country Types of Encounters: Front Country	Mechanized Use: Middle Country Visitor Services: Middle Country Management Controls: Middle Country Domestic Animals: Middle Country

e. The **CCC Ponds SRMA** would be designated (1,040 acres). The SRMA would be managed as a Front Country RMZ. SRMA would consist of a complex of day-use recreation facilities, recreation trails, water impoundments, and interpretive facilities. Recreation management and direction would be implemented in collaboration with the Bridger Teton National Forest, Sublette County, WGFD, Town of Pinedale, and Sublette County School District No. 1 (Map 2-33).

1. Recreation Tourism Market would be a *Community Market.*

2. The Recreation Market Segment for the SRMA would be quick access for area residents and visitors to enjoy open space and view spectacular lake and glacial scenery. Substantial opportunities exist for visitors to participate in a myriad of nonmotorized recreation activities such as wildlife viewing, fishing, hiking, cycling, cross-country skiing, and natural and historic resources appreciation. The CCC Ponds SRMA would also encompass a portion of the Fremont Lake big game wildlife migration corridor bottleneck.

3. The Management Objective for the SRMA would be to provide opportunities for the public to achieve targeted, high-quality recreation activities and experiences that produce significant benefits for the visiting public. The SRMA would provide opportunities for visitors to engage in targeted activities, providing a 90% or better realization of targeted benefits (Table 2-23 and Table 2-24).

4. Recreation Management: A RAMP would be prepared to provide quality services and facilities that accommodate appropriate use levels, meet health and safety standards, and protect the area's natural values.

5. The Market Strategy would be to use standard BLM venues for disseminating recreation user information onsite and offsite using regional BLM publications and Internet technologies.

6. A Recreation Monitoring survey would be implemented to determine whether targeted outcomes are being achieved.

7. Recreation Administration: A withdrawal from mineral location and disposal would be pursued. Motorized and mechanized use, including over-the-snow equipment, would be limited to designated roads and trails. Motorized vehicle use would be prohibited on the Pinedale Pathway, except for snow removal, maintenance, and ski trail grooming. The CCC Pond walking trails would be closed to motorized vehicles except for area maintenance activities. Proposed projects would be evaluated on a case-by-case basis to ensure functionality of the migration corridor. SRPs would be considered for group and competitive activities to manage use in a manner appropriate for the area setting and environment. Camping would be prohibited unless authorized in the RAMP. The SRMA would be administratively unavailable for oil and gas leasing. VRM Class II objectives would apply to the SRMA. The SRMA would be withdrawn from entry for locatable minerals.

Table 2-23. Targeted Outcomes—CCC Ponds SRMA

Activities	Experiences	Benefits
Hiking Cycling Fishing Viewing wildlife Education activities Skiing	Being with family and friends Relaxing physically Physical exercise Enjoying viewing natural scenery	Personal: • Health and well-being • Nature and aesthetic appreciation • Identification with a special place • Social bonding and cooperation • Stronger ties with family and friends Community/Social: • Improved image of land management agencies • Improved perceived quality of life • Family bonding Environmental: • Greater environmental stewardship • Greater preservation of Freemont Lake Area • Increased awareness of protection and management of natural landscapes Economic: • Greater recognition of area as a tourist destination

Table 2-24. Prescribed Setting Character—CCC Pond SRMA

Physical	Social	Administrative
Remoteness: Front Country Naturalness: Front Country Facilities: Front Country	Contacts: Middle Country Group Size: Middle and Front Country Evidence of Use: Front Country Types of Encounters: Front Country Personal Gear and Equipment: Middle Country	Mechanized Use: Front Country Visitor Services: Middle Country Management Controls: Middle Country Domestic Animals: Middle Country Individual User Fees: Primitive

Objective 4 **Extensive Recreation Management Area** (remainder of the Pinedale planning area) Provide an array of resource-dependent dispersed recreation opportunities such as hunting, fishing, motorized use, and open space. Management would be extensive rather than intensive. Management actions would be custodial in nature and focus on—

a. The development of new recreation facilities only when necessary to protect human health, safety, and natural resource values

b. The maintenance and enhancement of important public access

c. The resolution of resource and social conflicts.

Soils Management

Management Goal

Prevent or mitigate impacts on soil stability, productivity, and water infiltration to prevent accelerated erosion and chemical degradation of the soil resource, and provide for optimal plant growth.

Management Objectives and Actions

Objective 1 Prevent, reclaim, or mitigate impacts of erosion and chemical degradation from past surface disturbing and other activities within 5 years of RMP implementation.

Actions

a. BLM would work with state and local cooperating government agencies, communities, bonding companies, and operators to achieve the objective.

b. Disturbed areas would be reclaimed to achieve natural erosion rates and soil productivity to the extent practicable.

Objective 2 Ensure that all newly disturbed areas are successfully reclaimed and that management actions are consistent with inherent soil resource capabilities.

Actions

a. Mitigation, including WDEQ BMPs, would be applied in all areas to limit soil erosion and related undesirable conditions with special emphasis in areas with soils that are classified as highly erodible, such as Ross Butte, Blue Rim, Milleson Draw, Red Canyon, and the Long Island Watershed (HUC 1404010108); and saline, fragile, and other sensitive soils (Appendices 3 and 5).

b. Disturbed areas would be reclaimed to achieve natural erosion rates and soil productivity to the extent practicable.

c. Soils impacted by spills or leaks of chemicals, petroleum products, and produced water would be mitigated or reclaimed in coordination with the State of Wyoming.

d. BLM would coordinate and work with cooperating agencies and conservation districts in addressing soil, water, vegetation, and livestock grazing and related issues.

e. BLM would collaborate with state, local, and federal agencies on Level III soil surveys so that the BLM, other agencies, and conservation entities, including the SCCD, have access to adequate and useful information to guide the use and management of the soil and related resources.

Transportation, Access, and Travel Management

Management Goals

Provide access for approved public land uses consistent with public health and safety and other resource value concerns.

Provide opportunities for OHV use and activities, including motorized, nonmotorized mechanized, and foot travel where compatible with other resource values.

Management Objectives and Actions

Objective 1 Provide needed and appropriate ingress, egress, and access routes to and across public lands for authorized uses.

Actions

a. Transportation planning would be completed within 5 years of implementation of the RMP (see Appendix 17 and Map A17-1).

b. Access to county and state roads would be minimized and consolidated where practicable to enhance safety and minimize conflict points. Ingress and egress to state highways and county roads would be coordinated with the state highway department and counties, respectively.

c. Reasonable access would be provided across public lands to landlocked private and state lands, consistent with BLM Manual 2801.49.

d. Access across private lands to isolated public land parcels would be acquired from willing landowners.

e. Common ROW routes would be designated, where appropriate, to minimize environmental impacts. Road construction would be planned and implemented to avoid creating unusable islands of wildlife habitat.

f. New developments would be designed to minimize the number and miles of new roads, habitat fragmentation, and main access points to new fields.

g. OHV designations for restrictions to existing roads and trails would remain in effect until travel management planning is completed and designated roads and trails are identified.

Objective 2 Reclaim or mitigate erosion impacts on transportation corridors.

Actions

a. Road or trail closure and abandonment would be based on desired road or trail densities, demands for new roads, closure methods, type of access needed, resource development or protection needs, and existing uses.

b. BLM's roads, trails, and bridges would be maintained in fair or better condition.

c. Land users would be required to use BMPs and operating standards for road maintenance (Appendices 3 and 5).

Objective 3 Make public lands available for responsible OHV use where appropriate.

Actions

a. OHV designations would be established for all lands within the PFO. Periodic adjustments and use constraints could be necessary to ensure that sensitive resources are appropriately protected from excessive disturbance; road, route, and trail proliferation; and human encroachment.

b. Motorized vehicle use, except for over-the-snow equipment, would be limited to existing roads and trails unless otherwise specified.

c. No open OHV use areas would be designated.

d. The following areas would be closed to motorized access (Map 2-35):

- The Lake Mountain WSA (13,490 acres)

- The Scab Creek WSA (7,710 acres)
- Rock Creek ACEC (4,960 acres)
- The Pinedale Pathway, except for maintenance or repair
- Select rock alignment sites
- Native American burial locales
- Communal big game kill sites
- Holden Hill
- Known locations of Special Status Plant Species
- The East Fork WSR unit (1,130 acres).

e. Motorized vehicle use, except for over-the-snow equipment, would be limited to designated roads and trails in the following (Map 2-35):

- Boulder Lake, Upper Green River, and Scab Creek SRMAs
- Trapper's Point ACEC
- East Fork River/Irish Canyon area
- Miller Mountain and Ross Butte Management areas
- Oregon Trail inscription sites, Native American TCPs, Native American burial locales, and communal big game kill sites
- Muddy Creek/Badlands area
- Green River WSR unit
- CCC Ponds SRMA
- Red Canyon area.

f. The Red Dugway road would be limited to all-terrain vehicles (ATV), horse, and foot traffic (Map 2-35).

g. Additional restrictions for seasonal use of over-the-snow recreational motorized equipment would apply as appropriate in the following areas:

- Big game crucial winter range (except designated routes on Map 2-35) (November 15 to April 30)
- Elk feedgrounds (November 15 to April 30)
- CCC Ponds SRMA (closed year round).

h. OHV use (including over-the-snow) on BLM roads and off-road use in certain areas would be limited on a seasonal basis as needed (Table 2-28, p. 2-162).

i. Additional restrictions for all motorized equipment would apply as follows:

- Approximately 2,500 acres between Silver Creek and Cottonwood Creek would be closed from November 15 through January 31.
- Roads could be closed seasonally to avoid damage or to protect resource values.

j. OHV closures and seasonal restrictions would be effective immediately upon signing of the ROD for the RMP.

k. OHV designations could be changed to Limited to Designated Roads and Trails if the following were to occur:

- Presence of a previously unknown resource
- Change in resource extent or condition
- Resource damage to the extent that designation of routes is necessary
- New information leads to a need to change the OHV designation.

l. OHV use to conduct necessary tasks, as defined in the Glossary, would be permitted.

Vegetation Management

Management Goals

Maintain and/or enhance native vegetation community health, composition, and diversity in conformance with Wyoming Standards for Rangeland Health. Reclaim disturbed areas to desired plant communities.

Management Objectives and Actions

Objective 1 Establish and maintain an accurate ecological site and vegetation inventory for the planning area.

Action

a. BLM would collaborate with stakeholders (federal, state, and local agencies; operators; landowners) to identify funding mechanisms and methods to complete vegetation inventory.

Objective 2 Manage permitted actions to control the spread of and/or eradicate noxious weed infestations.

Actions

a. BLM would collaborate with Sublette and Lincoln counties in the treatment of noxious weeds and/or invasive species.

b. Mitigation would be applied to all activities to control noxious weeds (Appendices 3 and 5).

c. Weed control would be achieved through chemical, mechanical, and biological methods.

d. All vegetation treatments would be assessed for the potential to introduce invasive species before a treatment method was selected.

e. BLM would support and cooperate with efforts to manage and control invasive plant species or noxious weeds, including collaboration with local plans and control efforts.

Objective 3 Ensure Special Status Plant Species habitats are maintained at a level sufficient for long-term species sustainability.

Actions

a. Special Status Plant Species surveys would be required on potential habitats before any project or activity was approved. If species were found, all new surface disturbing activities would comply with applicable species-specific protective measures. If none were established, BLM would follow guidance. For listed species, protective measures would include those found in programmatic assessments and biological opinions provided by the USFWS.

b. Areas where Wyoming BLM sensitive plant species were known to exist would be avoidance areas for ROWs.

c. Known and discovered locations of Special Status Plant Species would be protected and closed to—

- Surface disturbing activities that could adversely affect the plants or their habitat
- Location of new mining claims (withdrawal from mineral location and entry under the land laws would be pursued)
- Mineral material sales
- All OHV use, including those vehicles used for geophysical exploration activities, surveying, etc.
- Use of explosives and blasting.

d. In areas where sensitive plant species were known to exist, OHV use would be limited to designated roads and trails.

e. Where applicants could demonstrate that proposed activities would not impact sensitive plant species, permit authorizations would be allowed.

f. Vehicle use for fire suppression activities in habitat for Special Status Plant Species would be subject to consultation with the BLM Fire Resource Advisor.

Objective 4 Conduct vegetation treatments to maintain important vegetation types and meet vegetation management goals.

Actions

a. Prescribed fire, WFURB, chemical, biological, and mechanical methods, and livestock grazing could be used to achieve vegetation goals.

b. Vegetation treatments would be designed to reduce erosion, protect Special Status Plant Species, enhance vegetation community and watershed health, increase forage production, and enhance wildlife habitats.

c. Treatments would be designed to consider the natural role of fire in ecosystem management and to restore the natural range of variability in vegetation community types.

d. Treated areas would generally be rested from livestock grazing for a minimum of two full growing seasons after treatment unless the appropriate level of environmental analysis determined that shorter durations would be adequate. Analysis could indicate a need for a longer rest period.

e. Vegetation treatments would be designed and implemented to prevent introduction and reduce the spread of invasive species.

Objective 5 Ensure disturbed areas are reclaimed to the original site plant composition and productivity over the long term.

Actions

a. Disturbed areas would be reclaimed to native site plant composition. If reclamation of original plant composition is impossible or not desirable, reclamation would achieve a native plant community that meets the Wyoming Standards for Rangeland Health.

b. Reclamation would be conducted according to operating standards and mitigation measures in Appendix 3, as appropriate.

Visual Resources Management

Management Goals

Manage public lands in accordance with VRM objectives. Minimize the impacts on visual resources.

Management Objectives and Actions

Objective 1 Manage the public lands in a manner that protects the quality of the scenic values of those lands.

Actions

a. VRM classifications would be managed according to Map 2-30 (Table 2-29, p. 2-164): 21,290 acres would be managed as VRM Class I; 239,520 acres as VRM Class II; 419,410 acres as VRM Class III; and 242,660 acres as VRM Class IV.

b. VRM Class I areas would be managed to preserve the existing character of the landscape. This class provides for natural ecological changes; however, it does not preclude very limited management activity. The level of change to the characteristic landscape should be very low and must not attract attention.

c. VRM Class II areas would be managed to retain the existing character of the landscape. The level of change to the characteristic landscape should be low. Management activities may be seen but should not attract the attention of the casual observer. Any changes must repeat the basic elements of form, line, color, and texture found in the predominant natural features of the characteristic landscape.

d. VRM Class III areas would be managed to partially retain the existing character of the landscape. The level of change to the characteristic landscape should be moderate. Management activities may attract attention but should not dominate the view of the casual observer. Changes should repeat the basic elements found in the predominant natural features of the characteristic landscape.

e. VRM Class IV areas would be managed to provide for management activities that require major modification of the existing character of the landscape. The level of change to the characteristic landscape could be high. These management activities may dominate the view and be the major focus of viewer attention. However, every attempt should be made to minimize the impact of these activities through careful location, minimal disturbance, and repetition of the basic elements.

Watershed and Water Quality (Surface Water and Groundwater) Management

Management Goals

Minimize adverse impacts on surface water and groundwater resources and recharge areas from public land uses.

Maintain or improve surface water and groundwater quantity and quality consistent with applicable state and federal standards and regulations.

Maintain or reestablish proper watershed, wetland, riparian, and stream channel functions to support natural or desired surface water flow regimes and meet state water quality standards and the Wyoming Standards for Rangeland Health.

Prevent, minimize, and/or remediate contributions of nonpoint source pollution from federal lands to all receiving waters.

Prevent, minimize, and/or remediate elevated levels of salinity contribution from federal lands to the Colorado River System.

Management Objectives and Actions

Objective 1 Collaborate with the state to protect designated uses, achieve water quality standards, and take appropriate actions in consideration of State of Wyoming established time frames to control causes of impairment resulting from BLM-authorized actions and permitted activities and prevent listing of additional streams under the Clean Water Act, Section 303(d).

Actions

a. BLM would coordinate all proposed surface discharges of industrially produced water with WDEQ to avoid impacts on other resources.

b. Sources of stream degradation that occur on public lands would be prevented, minimized, and/or remediated in cooperation with WDEQ and authorized land users.

c. BLM would cooperate with the State of Wyoming, stakeholders, and affected entities, as appropriate, to discharge produced water in a manner that causes the least environmental harm and/or contributes to beneficial uses.

d. BLM would participate in the development, implementation, and monitoring of watershed management plans and/or total maximum daily loads (TMDL) with interested stakeholders and the WDEQ.

e. Use of produced waters to assist in reclamation could be considered on a case-by-case basis and would be governed by operating WDEQ standards and appropriate irrigation water quality standards (Appendix 3).

f. Oil and gas operators would be encouraged to develop and implement methods that treat produced water.

g. BLM would continue cooperation with stakeholders in monitoring surface water and groundwater resources potentially affected by public land uses.

h. Produced water from CBNG wells would be treated and disposed of in collaboration and consistent with the requirements of the state.

i. BLM would take appropriate actions to protect the healthy stream channel form and function.

Objective 2 Meet the Wyoming Standards for Rangeland Health and maintain or enhance wetland and riparian vegetation to achieve Proper Functioning Condition.

Actions

a. Achieve and/or maintain Proper Functioning Condition as a minimum standard on all riparian and wetland areas to control nonpoint source pollution to the extent possible. Wetland and riparian areas that show a negative trend and/or do not achieve Proper Functioning Condition would be addressed in activity or implementation plans that would move these areas to Proper Functioning Condition.

b. The 100-year floodplains, wetlands, and riparian areas would be closed to surface disturbance and new permanent facilities (for example, storage tanks, structures, pits). Proposals for linear crossings or actions beneficial to the resource in these areas would be considered on a case-by-case basis. ROWs necessary to provide access to water rights holders would be considered on a case-by-case basis.

c. Surface disturbing and construction activities (for example, mineral exploration and development

activities, pipelines, power lines, roads, recreation sites, fences, wells) that could reduce water quality or degrade wetlands or riparian habitats would avoid the area within 500 feet of 100-year floodplains, wetlands, or perennial streams, and within 100 feet of the edge of the inner gorge of intermittent and large ephemeral drainages. Proposals for linear crossings in these areas would be considered on a case-by-case basis.

d. Riparian areas would be maintained or improved to enhance forage conditions, provide wildlife habitat, and improve stream water quality.

e. Riparian areas providing sensitive wildlife species habitat would be managed for a vegetative or successional state appropriate for the benefit of those species, including vertical and horizontal vegetation structure and composition.

Objective 3 Control water runoff from developed sites and maintain soil erosion at appropriate rates for natural conditions.

Actions

a. BMPs and operating standards would be applied to mitigate surface disturbance and control nonpoint source erosion (Appendices 3 and 5).

b. The 100-year floodplains, wetlands, and riparian areas would be closed to surface disturbance or new permanent facilities (for example, storage tanks, structures, pits) except those designed and implemented to enhance wetland or riparian area condition or function. Proposals for linear crossings or actions beneficial to the resource in these areas would be considered on a case-by-case basis.

c. Surface disturbing and construction activities (for example, mineral exploration and development activities, pipelines, power lines, roads, recreation sites, fences, wells) that could reduce water quality or degrade wetlands or riparian habitats would avoid the area within 500 feet of 100-year floodplains, wetlands, or perennial streams, and within 100 feet of the edge of the inner gorge of intermittent and large ephemeral drainages. Proposals for linear crossings in these areas would be considered on a case-by-case basis.

d. Commercial outfitter camps within 200 feet of springs and seeps, streams, and in riparian areas would be considered on a case-by-case basis and could be restricted.

e. Interim reclamation standards would be developed to reduce soil erosion on a project or site-specific basis. Emphasis would be placed on areas adjacent to waters and wetlands.

f. Where threats to Class 1 waters are identified from federal lands or management actions, or approved public land uses, BMPs that address the threat would be implemented on all contributing federal lands.

g. Salt loading in the Colorado River System would be controlled by applying BMPs on all highly erodible, saline soils potentially affected by management activities.

Objective 4 Point source pollution would be addressed under the guidance of appropriate State of Wyoming and federal agencies, including but not limited to, WDEQ, WSEO, and EPA.

Actions

a. BLM would cooperate with the state as it develops Source Water and Wellhead Protection Plans to protect drinking water sources.

b. In areas of concentrated oil and gas development where groundwater has been determined to be of 'High' and 'Moderately High' priority by WDEQ, a groundwater monitoring program would be established in collaboration with WDEQ to detect pollution and ensure that the groundwater resource remains unaffected.

c. BLM would protect groundwater quality and known water recharge areas during BLM activities and permitted actions (Appendix 3).

Wildland Fire and Fuels Management

Management Goals

Protect firefighters, public safety, and private property, working cooperatively with state and local fire authorities to ensure that all high-priority areas of mixed ownership have common interagency goals and objectives.

Maintain a landscape of diverse plant communities and successional stages that would have been produced by historic fire regimes.

Management Objectives and Actions

Objective 1 No loss of life or improved property losses would occur from wildland fire.

Actions

a. Wildland fire mitigation and fuels activities would be managed to provide for firefighter and public safety as a first priority. Public lands within intermixed landownership areas would be managed in association with the adjoining and nearby private and state lands.

b. Areas of mixed landownership, communities at risk as identified in the *Federal Register*, Volume 66, Number 160, 2001 (Antelope Run, Beaver Creek area, Boulder, Cottonwood Creek, Daniel, Forty Rod, Hoback Ranches, New Fork, Pinedale, Pocket Creek, and Upper Green); urban and industrial interface areas; and areas containing high-priority resource values would have high priority for response to wildland fires and/or for fuels reduction and mitigation. Wildland fire suppression activities would be based on the AMR (see Glossary).

Objective 2 Use prescribed fire and WFURB to meet vegetation goals and to return the ecosystem to pre-suppression composition, structure, and function where possible.

Actions

a. BLM would evaluate and include when possible all BLM lands abutting the Bridger Teton National Forest, including the Scab Creek and Lake Mountain WSAs, into WFURB areas, working in conjunction with the USFS to maintain a single, integrated WFURB area.

b. Prescribed fire would be used where possible on all BLM-administered lands to emulate the return intervals of natural fire and to restore the vegetation to Condition Class I in Fire Regimes I, II, and III.

c. Where reintroduction of fire onto the landscape is not feasible because of ecological condition or industrial or urban development, mechanical and chemical methods would be used to manage the vegetation toward the DPC.

d. In the WUI or Industrial Interface, fuels reduction methods best suited to the area would be used to reduce the risk of catastrophic fire to these areas.

Objective 3 Manage wildfire with minimal damage to other resources.

Actions

a. Vehicles and equipment used for fire suppression would be subject to the OHV restrictions applicable in the area of the fire.

b. Use of fire suppression chemicals, including foaming agents and surfactants, would not be allowed within 500 feet of surface water.

c. Movement of waters from whirling-disease-positive to whirling-disease-negative waters would be prohibited.

d. Fire suppression activities in areas of known sensitive species habitat and fragile or erosive soils would avoid damage to these other resources.

Wildlife and Fish Habitat Management

Management Goals

Maintain or enhance aquatic and wildlife habitat.

Maintain functioning big game habitats and migration corridors that allow free movement and use of habitats.

In and adjacent to elk feedgrounds, maintain and improve habitat quality and ensure the continued viability of the elk feedgrounds.

Sustain the sagebrush biome on a landscape scale to provide the amount, continuity, and quality of habitat necessary to maintain viable populations of sage-grouse and other sagebrush obligate species.

Management Objectives and Actions

Objective 1 Maintain sufficient undisturbed or minimally disturbed habitats to maintain persistent, well-distributed, self-sustaining, and productive populations of all native and desirable non-native fish (e.g., brook, brown, and rainbow trout) and wildlife species within the planning area.

Action

a. The planning area would be divided into three distinct, noncontiguous wildlife management zones for the purpose of oil and gas activities (Map 2-9) as follows:

- Intensively Developed Areas (Map 2-9) would be managed for intensive oil and gas activities while protecting habitats and minimizing direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts on the extent practicable.
- Traditional Leasing Areas (Map 2-9) would be managed for protection of important values during oil and gas exploration but would provide opportunity for intensive oil and gas development. Should a discovery be made and proceed to development, these lands could be moved to Intensively Developed Field status under the criteria in the Minerals Section of this Alternative and would be subject to mitigation to minimize direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts of such activities.
- Unavailable Areas (Map 2-9) would be managed for protection of wildlife habitats through indefinite postponement of the availability of lands for oil and gas leasing.

Objective 2 Maintain sufficient undisturbed or minimally disturbed greater sage-grouse source habitats to maintain persistent, well-distributed, self-sustaining, productive populations of sage-grouse within the planning area.

Actions

Intensively Developed Fields

a. Permitted OHV activities would be allowed for the purposes of oil and gas development activities.

b. Surface disturbing activities would be allowed subject to mitigation to minimize direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts.

c. Noise generating activities would be minimized through the application of BMPs such as high efficiency mufflers.

d. Surface disturbing activities would be designed and implemented to minimize impacts on greater sage-grouse habitats to the extent practicable.

e. Oil and gas developmental operations would be subject to stipulations and mitigations provided in Appendix 3.

f. New power lines would be buried where technologically feasible to minimize predation of sage-grouse.

Traditional Leasing Areas

a. Vehicular activities would be limited to existing roads and trails in accordance with dates established for each stage of greater sage-grouse activity as follows:

- Lekking/strutting (March 1 to May 15)
- Nesting and early brood rearing (March 15 to July 15)
- Winter concentration (November 15 to March 14).

b. Surface disturbing activities would be avoided in suitable nesting and early brood-rearing habitat within 2 miles of occupied greater sage-grouse leks from March 15 to July 15.

c. Human activity would be avoided between 8:00 p.m. and 8:00 a.m. from March 1 to May 15 within one-quarter mile of the perimeter of occupied sage-grouse leks.

d. Surface disturbing activities would be prohibited in suitable habitat within one-quarter mile of occupied leks (Map 2-36).

e. Noise generating activities would be minimized through the application of BMPs, such as high efficiency mufflers.

f. All surface disturbing activities would be prohibited in greater sage-grouse winter concentration areas from November 15 through March 15.

g. Oil and gas development operations would be subject to stipulations and mitigations provided in Appendix 3.

h. New power lines would be buried to the extent technologically feasible to minimize predation of sage-grouse.

i. Placement of permanent and high-profile facilities (greater than 15 feet in height) would be restricted within 1 mile (or the visual horizon, whichever is nearer) of leks, or mitigated with raptor anti-perching devices.

Unavailable Areas

a. Management actions on existing leases within the Unavailable Areas would be designed to protect important habitats by excluding surface occupancy and/or disturbance to the extent this restriction does not violate the leaseholder's/operator's lease rights. Management actions/projects designed to maintain or improve wildlife habitat would be excluded from this restriction.

b. Vehicle activities would be limited to existing roads and trails in accordance with dates established for each stage of greater sage-grouse activity as follows:

- Lekking (March 1 to May 15)
- Nesting and early brood rearing (March 15 to July 15)
- Winter concentration (November 15 to March 14).

c. Surface disturbing activities would be avoided in suitable nesting and early brood-rearing habitat within 2 miles of occupied greater sage-grouse leks from March 15 to July 15.

d. Human activity would be avoided between 8:00 p.m. and 8:00 a.m. from March 1 to May 15 within one-quarter mile of the perimeter of occupied sage-grouse leks.

e. Surface disturbing activities would be prohibited in suitable habitat within one-quarter mile of occupied leks (Map 2-36).

f. Noise generating activities would be minimized through the application of BMPs, such as high efficiency mufflers.

g. All surface disturbing activities would be prohibited in greater sage-grouse winter concentration areas from November 15 through March 15.

h. Oil and gas development operations on preexisting leases would be subject to stipulations and mitigations provided in Appendix 3.

i. New power lines would be buried to the extent technologically feasible to minimize predation of sage-grouse.

j. Placement of permanent and high-profile facilities (greater than15 feet) would be restricted within 1 mile (or the visual horizon, whichever is nearer) of leks, or mitigated with raptor anti-perching devices.

Objective 3 Maintain and enhance big game habitats to support big game populations at WGFD planning objective levels.

Actions

Intensively Developed Fields

a. Elk feedgrounds would be maintained.

b. Surface occupancy would be prohibited on elk feedgrounds, except for authorized activities to maintain feedground facilities and manage wintering elk.

c. No unauthorized human presence would be permitted within 2 miles of elk feedgrounds from November 15 through April 30. Where the feedground location is split estate (private surface ownership and federal minerals), this restriction would be limited to BLM-permitted mineral activities.

d. BLM would work with the WGFD and affected parties to improve habitat quality in areas surrounding feedgrounds.

e. BLM-permitted activities would be designed and implemented to minimize impacts on big game during migration.

f. BLM-permitted activities would be designed and implemented to minimize impacts in big game parturition areas from May 1 to June 30 to the extent practicable.

g. Surface activities would be designed and implemented to minimize impacts in big game crucial winter ranges from November 15 to April 30 (Map 3-20) to the extent practicable.

h. Transportation planning for oil and gas development would be designed and implemented to minimize cumulative impacts.

i. To minimize fragmentation and human presence in winter ranges, access to big game crucial winter ranges outside producing gas fields would be limited to existing designated access routes. Exceptions could be allowed to provide reasonable access to private and state-owned lands as well as to valid existing federal oil and gas leases.

j. Oil and gas development operations would be subject to stipulations and mitigations provided in Appendix 3.

Traditional Leasing Areas

a. Elk feedgrounds would be maintained.

b. Surface occupancy would be prohibited on elk feedgrounds, except for authorized activities to maintain feedground facilities and manage wintering elk.

c. No unauthorized human presence would be permitted on elk feedgrounds from November 15 through April 30. Where the feedground location is split estate (private surface ownership and federal minerals), this restriction would be limited to BLM-permitted mineral activities.

d. BLM would work with the WGFD and affected parties to improve habitat quality in areas surrounding feedgrounds.

e. Big game migration routes would be protected. Known big game migration bottleneck areas would be available for oil and gas leasing with NSO restrictions, unless other protection is provided.

f. BLM-permitted activities would be prohibited in big game parturition areas from May 1 to June 30.

g. No surface disturbing or disruptive activities would be permitted in big game crucial winter ranges from November 15 to April 30 (Map 3-20).

h. To minimize fragmentation and human presence in winter ranges, access to big game crucial winter ranges outside producing gas fields would be limited to existing designated access routes. Exceptions could be allowed to provide reasonable access to private and state-owned lands as well as to valid existing federal oil and gas leases.

i. Transportation planning would be implemented to avoid creating unusable islands of wildlife habitat and proliferation of access points (usable patch size varies by species).

j. Oil and gas developmental operations would be subject to stipulations and mitigations provided in Appendix 3.

Unavailable Areas

a. Management actions on existing leases within the Unavailable Areas would be designed to protect important habitats by excluding surface occupancy and/or disturbance to the extent this restriction does not violate the leaseholder's/operator's lease rights. Management actions/projects designed to maintain or improve wildlife habitat would be excluded from this restriction.

b. Elk feedgrounds would be maintained.

c. Surface occupancy would be prohibited on feedgrounds, except for authorized activities to maintain feedground facilities and manage wintering elk.

d. No unauthorized human presence would be permitted on elk feedgrounds from November 15 through April 30. Where the feedground location is split estate (private surface ownership and federal minerals), this restriction would be limited to BLM-permitted mineral activities.

e. BLM would work with the WGFD and affected parties to improve habitat quality in areas

surrounding feedgrounds.

f. Big game migration routes would be protected.

g. BLM-permitted activities would be prohibited in big game parturition areas from May 1 through June 30.

h. No surface disturbing or disruptive activities would be permitted in big game crucial winter ranges from November 15 through April 30 (Map 3-20).

i. To minimize fragmentation and human presence in winter ranges, access to big game crucial winter ranges outside producing gas fields would be limited to existing designated access routes. Exceptions could be allowed to provide reasonable access to private or state-owned lands as well as to valid existing federal oil and gas leases.

j. Transportation planning would be implemented to avoid creating unusable islands of wildlife habitat and proliferation of access points (usable habitat patch size varies by species).

k. Oil and gas developmental operations on preexisting leases would be subject to stipulations and mitigations provided in Appendix 3.

Objective 4 Maintain sufficient, undisturbed, or minimally disturbed sensitive species habitats to ensure persistent, well-distributed, self-sustaining, and productive populations of sensitive species within the planning area.

Actions

Intensively Developed Fields

a. Surveys for Special Status Species would be conducted on BLM-administered public lands and mineral estate before any federal project or federal activity was approved.

b. Oil and gas operations would be subject to stipulations and mitigations provided in Appendix 3.

Traditional Leasing Areas

a. Oil and gas exploration activities would be intensively managed and mitigated. No exceptions to seasonal restrictions for exploration would be permitted.

b. Permitted activities potentially affecting the habitat of Special Status Species would be considered on a case-by-case basis.

c. Surveys for Special Status Species would be conducted on BLM-administered public lands and mineral estate before any federal project or federal activity was approved.

1. Mountain plover: Surveys demonstrating presence could result in surface disturbing activities being prohibited from April 10 to July 10 on a case-by case-basis.

2. Pygmy rabbits: Surveys identifying pygmy rabbit burrows would require avoidance of the burrow by 50 feet. Pipeline crossings and surface disturbing activities through ephemeral drainages and in basin, Wyoming, and big sagebrush communities would be minimized.

3. White-tailed prairie dogs: WTPD habitats would be managed to protect prairie dogs and their habitat, while allowing for compatible multiple use.

- Surface disturbing activities would be avoided in WTPD towns greater than 12.5 acres in size.
- Above-ground facilities within one-quarter mile of WTPD towns greater than 12.5 acres in size would be equipped with anti-raptor perching devices.

- Motorized vehicle use in all WTPD towns and complexes would be limited to designated roads and trails.
- Prairie dog poisoning would be prohibited in all WTPD towns and complexes except for demonstrated human health and safety needs or for other demonstrated emergency reasons.
- Surveys identifying WTPD burrows would require avoidance of the burrow by 50 feet.

4. Other Sensitive Species: If surveys conducted within areas not subject to timing limitations identify sensitive species' life-cycle activities, surface disturbing activities would be delayed until wildlife activity is completed.

d. Oil and gas development operations would be subject to stipulations and mitigations provided in Appendix 3.

Unavailable Areas

a. Management actions on existing leases within Unavailable Areas would be designed to protect important habitats by excluding surface occupancy and/or disturbance to the extent this restriction does not violate the leaseholder's/operator's lease rights. Management actions/projects designed to maintain or improve wildlife habitat would be excluded from this restriction.

b. Permitted activities potentially affecting the habitat of Special Status Species would be considered on a case-by-case basis.

c. Surveys for Special Status Species would be conducted on BLM-administered public lands and mineral estate before any federal project or federal activity was approved.

1. Mountain plover: Surveys demonstrating presence could result in surface disturbing activities being prohibited from April 10 to July 10 on a case-by case-basis.

2. Pygmy rabbits: Surveys identifying pygmy rabbit burrows would require avoidance of the burrow by 50 feet. Pipeline crossings and surface disturbing activities through ephemeral drainages and in basin, Wyoming, and big sagebrush communities would be minimized.

3. White-tailed prairie dogs: WTPD habitats would be managed to protect prairie dogs and their habitat, while allowing for compatible multiple use.

- Surface disturbing activities would be avoided in WTPD towns greater than 12.5 acres in size.
- Motorized vehicle use in all WTPD towns and complexes would be limited to designated roads and trails.
- Prairie dog poisoning would be prohibited in all WTPD towns and complexes, except for demonstrated human health and safety needs or for other demonstrated emergency reasons.
- Surveys identifying WTPD burrows would require avoidance of the burrow by 50 feet.

4. Other Sensitive Species: If life-cycle activities of sensitive species are identified during a survey in an area not protected by timing limitations, surface disturbing activities would be delayed until wildlife activity is completed.

d. Oil and gas developmental operations on preexisting leases would be subject to stipulations and mitigations provided in Appendix 3.

Objective 5 Conserve functioning sagebrush habitats on a landscape scale sufficient to support identified wildlife objectives.

Actions

a. Large contiguous patches of sagebrush habitat would be protected through NSO stipulations and Unavailable Areas (Map 2-9).

b. Common ROW routes and corridors would be designated, where appropriate, to minimize environmental impacts.

c. Surface disturbing activities and interim and final reclamation would be designed and implemented to minimize impacts, maximize and increase habitat patch sizes, and reduce habitat fragmentation for sagebrush-obligate species, for example:

- Condensate and produced water would be transported from well locations by pipelines rather than by trucks when feasible.
- All surface disturbing activities would be subject to interim and final reclamation procedures to reestablish sagebrush habitat function and value.
- Transportation planning would be required in all areas to optimize access; minimize development footprint, human presence, and habitat fragmentation; and reduce road density, duplication of routes, and unnecessary routes.

d. Oil and gas developmental operations on preexisting leases would be subject to stipulations and mitigations provided in Appendix 3.

Objective 6 Collaborate with state and local governments to identify areas for offsite mitigation.

Objective 7 Provide suitable habitat to ensure long-term species sustainability and widely distributed functioning habitats to support the CAS for CRCT in the States of Colorado, Utah, and Wyoming; the 'Three Species' CAS, and to support all other sensitive fish species.

Actions

a. To protect spawning CRCT, redds, and fry, instream disturbing activities would be prohibited between June 1 and August 15.

b. Projects in CRCT and other sensitive fish species habitats would be evaluated on a case-by-case basis. Projects could be approved if no impacts on CRCT or other sensitive fish species would be caused, or if impacts could be satisfactorily mitigated.

c. Chemical use for the purpose of fisheries management to enhance native fish populations or to remove unwanted fish species in streams or lakes would be allowed.

d. New or widened stream crossing (roads, pipelines, etc.) would not be allowed in waters with genetically pure populations of native cutthroat trout.

e. Projects that could impact habitats of roundtail chubs, flannelmouth suckers, and bluehead suckers (the 'Three Species' designated in the CAS) would be designed to avoid or mitigate impacts to these or other sensitive fish species. Specific dates for avoidance of instream activities to protect spawning, redds, and fry vary by species, stream, and elevation and would be determined case by case and in coordination with the WGFD.

Objective 8 Maintain raptor habitats and territories within the planning area to ensure long-term species sustainability and widely distributed functioning habitats in accordance with the MBTA. (See Appendix 18 for management and conservation measures for bald eagle.)

Actions

Intensively Developed Fields

a. Prior to initiating surface disturbing activities within potential raptor habitat, surveys would be conducted for nesting, roosting, and foraging activity within a 1-mile radius of the proposed activity.

b. Migratory bird exclusion devices would be required on sediment, evaporation, or other types of pits containing harmful substances or chemicals.

c. The following seasonal restrictions for surface disturbing and disruptive activities near active raptor nest, roosting sites, and foraging areas would be imposed:

- February 1 through July 31, within one-half mile of all active raptor nests
- April 1 through August 15, within one-half mile of burrowing owl nesting habitat
- March 1 through July 31, within 1 mile of all active ferruginous hawk nests
- February 1 through August 15, within 1 mile of bald eagle nests.

d. Surface occupancy (permanent structures) would be prohibited within 1,000 feet of an active raptor nest, within 1,400 feet of an active ferruginous hawk nest, or within 2,600 feet of an active bald eagle nest.

e. Oil and gas developmental operations would be subject to stipulations and mitigations provided in Appendix 3.

Traditional Leasing Areas

a. Prior to initiating surface disturbing activities within potential raptor habitat, surveys would be conducted for nesting, roosting, and foraging activity within a 1-mile radius of the proposed activity.

b. Migratory bird exclusion devices would be required on sediment, evaporation, or other types of pits containing harmful substances or chemicals.

c. The following seasonal restrictions for activities near active raptor nest, roosting sites, and foraging areas would be imposed:

- February 1 through July 31, within one-half mile of all active raptor nests
- April 1 through August 15, within one-half mile of burrowing owl nesting habitat
- February 1 through July 31, within 1 mile of all active ferruginous hawk nests
- February 1 through August 15, within 1 mile of bald eagle nests.

d. Surface occupancy (permanent structures) would be prohibited within 1,000 feet of an active raptor nest, within 1,400 feet of an active ferruginous hawk nest, or within 2,600 feet of an active bald eagle nest.

e. Oil and gas developmental operations would be subject to stipulations and mitigations provided in Appendix 3.

Unavailable Areas

a. Management actions on existing leases within Unavailable Areas would be designed to protect important habitats by excluding surface occupancy and/or disturbance to the extent this restriction does not violate the leaseholder's/operator's lease rights. Management actions/projects designed to maintain or improve wildlife habitat would be excluded from this restriction.

b. Before any surface disturbing activities were initiated within potential raptor habitat, surveys would be conducted for nesting, roosting, and foraging activity within 1 mile of the proposed activity.

c. The following seasonal restrictions for all activities near active raptor nests, roosting sites, and foraging areas would be imposed:

- February 1 through July 31, within one-half mile of all active raptor nests
- April 1 through August 15, within one-half mile of burrowing owl nesting habitat
- February 1 through July 31, within 1 mile of all active ferruginous hawk nests
- February 1 through August 15, within 1 mile of bald eagle nests.

c. Surface occupancy (permanent structures) would be prohibited within 1,000 feet of active raptor (golden eagle, osprey, Swainson's hawk, goshawk, prairie falcon, northern harrier, great horned owl, red-tailed hawk, burrowing owl, and other raptors) nests, within 1,400 feet of active ferruginous hawk nests, or within 2,600 feet of active bald eagle nests.

d. Migratory bird exclusion devices would be required on sediment, evaporation, or other types of pits containing harmful substances or chemicals.

e. Surface disturbing activities and placement of permanent and high-profile facilities would be restricted within 1 mile of active raptor nests.

f. To minimize impacts on raptors, actions that prohibit raptors from successfully fledging offspring would be prohibited.

g. Oil and gas developmental operations on preexisting leases would be subject to stipulations and mitigations provided in Appendix 3.

Objective 9 Water developments would be constructed to avoid inadvertent injury to wildlife.

Action

a. Water developments would be designed to protect animals from injury, and water would be made accessible for wildlife use with sufficient protective cover to the extent available.

Special Designations and Management Areas

The following SD/MAs would be retained, modified, or established.

Management Goals

Rock Creek ACEC Management Goals Protect the Rock Creek drainage to enhance wildlife habitat, ensure quality aquatic habitat for the sensitive CRCT, provide crucial winter range for a portion of the Piney elk herd, and protect visual resources to maintain VRM class characteristics.

Beaver Creek ACEC Management Goals Enhance wildlife habitat, ensure quality aquatic habitat for the sensitive CRCT, and protect elk calving habitat.

Trapper's Point ACEC Management Goal Preserve the viability of the big game migration bottleneck, cultural and historic resources, and important livestock trailing use.

New Fork Potholes ACEC Management Goal Protect unique pothole wildlife habitat for trumpeter swans and other migratory waterfowl, elk and deer parturition areas, and geologically unique areas.

Miller Mountain Management Area Management Goal Protect the open space, natural landscape values, and crucial big game winter ranges in the Miller Mountain area.

Ross Butte Management Area Management Goal Protect fragile soils and watersheds, sensitive plant species and communities, paleontological and archeological sites, unique geology, and visual values in the Ross Butte area.

Wind River Front Management Area Management Goal Maintain the visual, recreation, and air quality resources in the management area, enhance wildlife habitat, and protect the integrity of the U.S. Air Force Detachment 489 Seismic Monitoring Station.

WSA Management Goal Protect wilderness characteristics in all WSAs.

Wild and Scenic River Areas Management Goals Maintain or enhance the outstandingly remarkable scenic, recreation, fishery, ecological, and other values. Maintain the primitive, pristine, rugged, and unaltered character of the WSR units.

Management Objectives and Actions

Objective 1 Provide suitable habitat within the Rock Creek ACEC to ensure long-term species sustainability and functioning habitats and support the CAS for CRCT in the States of Colorado, Utah, and Wyoming. Ensure crucial elk winter ranges are available for use by wintering elk.

Actions

a. The Rock Creek ACEC (Map 2-33) would be reduced in size to 4,960 acres by aligning the boundary with the Lake Mountain WSA boundary (eliminating the remainder areas outside the Rock Creek drainage area).

b. The ACEC would be unavailable for oil and gas leasing.

c. The ACEC would be managed as a ROW exclusion area. No ROWs would be permitted except to benefit the CRCT or elk habitat.

d. The area would be managed as a Class I VRM area and would remain closed to OHV use, including over-the-snow vehicles.

e. Geophysical exploration activities would comply with nonimpairment criteria for lands under wilderness review.

f. Livestock grazing and related improvements would be allowed, provided they meet the Wyoming Standards for Rangeland Health and the non-impairment criteria for lands under wilderness review.

g. Forest management activities would comply with nonimpairment criteria for lands under wilderness review.

Objective 2 Provide suitable habitat in the Beaver Creek ACEC to ensure long-term species sustainability and functioning habitats and to support the CAS for CRCT in the States of Colorado, Utah, and Wyoming. Ensure elk parturition areas are available for use by calving elk.

Actions

a. The Beaver Creek ACEC (3,590 acres) would be retained (Map 2-33; Table 2-30, p. 2-164), and would be managed to maintain, improve, or restore riparian and elk parturition habitat conditions.

b. The ACEC would be available for mineral leasing and related activities.

c. All vehicle use, including geophysical exploration vehicles, would be limited to designated roads and trails.

d. The use of surface and/or above-ground (Poulter shot) explosive charges for geophysical exploration would be analyzed on a case-by-case basis.

e. The ACEC would encompass Class III and IV VRM areas (Map 2-30).

f. No surface disturbance or clearcutting would be permitted within 1,000 feet of streams or on slopes of 25% or greater. Partial timber cutting would be allowed if adverse impacts on the CRCT could be mitigated.

g. Roads and ROW would follow existing alignments unless design and implementation would preclude adverse impacts on trout and elk calving habitat.

h. No water diversion ROWs would be permitted unless they benefit CRCT.

Objective 3 Ensure that no obstruction to the big game migration bottleneck within the Trapper's Point ACEC would occur, facilitate livestock trailing and gathering, and provide interpretation of cultural sites for the public.

Actions

a. The Trapper's Point ACEC (4,160 acres) would be designated (Map 2-33; Table 2-30, p. 2-164).

b. Surface disturbing activities would be prohibited except those to enhance the viability of the big game migration and operations of the Green River Drift, or activities to interpret or enhance understanding of the cultural site.

c. The ACEC would be closed to land disposal and mineral location. A withdrawal would be pursued.

d. No additional fences would be constructed in the ACEC area except to enhance the viability of the big game migration.

e. The ACEC would be unavailable for oil and gas leasing.

f. OHV use would be limited to designated roads and trails and would be closed from November 15 to April 30.

Objective 4 Provide high-quality wildlife habitat values in the New Fork Potholes area.

Actions

a. The New Fork Potholes ACEC (1,820 acres) would be designated (Map 2-33; Table 2-30, p. 2-164).

b. Surface disturbing activities would be prohibited except those that benefit wildlife habitat, vegetation, or watershed values.

c. The area would be closed to land disposal and mineral location. Withdrawal would be pursued.

d. The ACEC would be unavailable for oil and gas leasing.

e. OHV use would be limited to designated roads and trails, with seasonal closures during crucial winter periods.

Objective 5 Maintain open space, natural landscapes, and crucial big game winter ranges in the Miller Mountain area.

Actions

a. The Miller Mountain Management Area would be established (approximately 66,440 acres) (Map 2-33; Table 2-30, p. 2-164).

b. Forest management activities, (for example, harvest, planting, or stand improvement) would be implemented, consistent with the HFRA and other objectives for this area.

c. The management area would be available for oil and gas leasing subject to mitigation.

d. OHV use would be limited to designated roads and trails.

e. No net increase in miles of road would be allowed.

f. Surface disturbance would be prohibited on slopes greater than 15%.

g. Road construction would be prohibited on talus slopes.

Objective 6 Maintain sensitive plant communities and control soil erosion in the Ross Butte area.

Actions

a. The Ross Butte Management Area (35,670 acres) would be designated (Map 2-33; Table 2-30, p. 2-164).

b. No new communication sites would be permitted in the Management Area. Additional facilities could be installed at the existing site on Ross Butte.

c. The Management Area would be unavailable for oil and gas leasing.

d. OHV use would be limited to designated roads and trails (Map 2-35).

e. COAs would be applied on existing oil and gas lease activities to mitigate impacts on erosive soils and sensitive plant species habitat.

f. The Management Area would be classified VRM Classes II and III (Map 2-30).

Objective 7 Maintain and improve wildlife habitats; big game migration corridors and bottlenecks; scenic quality; and recreation values and uses in the Wind River Front area.

Actions

a. The Wind River Front Management area (201,240 acres) would be designated (Map 2-33; Table 2-30, p. 2-164).

b. Surface disturbing activities (gravel pits, campgrounds, and new roads) would be mitigated to meet management area objectives.

c. Forest management activities would be consistent with the HFRA and management area objectives.

d. The management area would be unavailable for oil and gas leasing.

e. Geophysical operations on BLM-administered surface in the Wind River Front Management area would be restricted to designated roads and trails or to nonvehicle-based methods. The use of surface and/or above-ground (Poulter shot) explosive charges for geophysical exploration would be analyzed on a case-by-case basis.

f. Public access to key recreation areas would be pursued as opportunities arise.

Objective 8 Maintain the wilderness characteristics of the Lake Mountain WSA.

Action

a. The Lake Mountain WSA would be closed to OHV use (approximately 13,490 acres).

Objective 9 Maintain the outstandingly remarkable characteristics of areas determined suitable for inclusion in the WSR System.

Actions

a. WSR units would be unavailable for oil and gas leasing.

b. The ***East Fork River unit*** would be managed as suitable for inclusion in the WSR System (tentative classification: wild (1,130 acres) (Map 2-29).

1. Surface disturbing activities in the East Fork River unit would be prohibited except for those activities that would reestablish and/or enhance the outstandingly remarkable values.

2. The unit would be closed to commercial timber sales or harvesting, salable mineral development, and OHV use.

3. The unit would be an exclusion area for ROWs.

4. A withdrawal from land disposal, mineral location, and entry would be pursued.

5. Water impoundments, diversions, or hydroelectric power facilities would be prohibited. Diversions necessary to access an adjudicated water right would be considered on a case-by-case basis and designed to maintain the outstandingly remarkable characteristics of the area.

6. Increases in active grazing preferences would be prohibited.

7. Construction of new range improvements could be considered for purposes such as grazing protection from fire, insects, or disease, as well as rehabilitation or stabilization of damaged resources, provided the area would retain its natural appearance; and the practices or structures were compatible and in harmony with the environment. Any improvements would be unobtrusive and would not have a significant direct and adverse effect on the natural character of the river area.

8. The unit would be open only to vegetation treatment or manipulation that would reestablish and/or enhance the outstandingly remarkable scenic and ecological values and are compatible with a wild waterway classification.

c. The ***Scab Creek and Silver Creek units*** (1,350 acres/860 acres respectively) within the Scab Creek WSA would be managed as suitable for inclusion in the WSR System (tentative classification: wild) (Map 2-29).

1. Increases in active grazing preferences would be prohibited.

2. Construction of new range improvements could be considered for purposes such as grazing protection from fire, insects, or disease, as well as rehabilitation or stabilization of damaged resources, provided the area will retain its natural appearance and the practices or structures are compatible and in harmony with the environment. Any improvements would be unobtrusive and would not have a significant direct and adverse effect on the natural character of the river area.

2. The units would be open to vegetation treatment or manipulation that would reestablish and/or enhance the outstandingly remarkable scenic and ecological values, was compatible with a wild waterway area, and complied with interim management policy for lands under wilderness review.

d. The ***Green River unit*** would be managed as suitable for inclusion in the WSR System (tentative classification: scenic (7,100 acres) (Map 2-29).

1. The unit would be closed to land disposal actions.

2. The unit would be an avoidance area for ROWs.

3. Increases in active grazing preferences in the unit would be prohibited.

4. Geophysical exploration would be prohibited unless adverse impacts could be

adequately mitigated.

5. Recreation developments and wildlife and range improvements would be allowed if there would be no substantial adverse effects to the natural-like appearance of the lands within the waterway corridor and their immediate environment.

6. OHV use would be limited to designated roads and trails.

7. Development of hydroelectric power facilities, flood control dams and levees, water supply dams, and major diversions would be prohibited. Maintenance of existing facilities and construction of some new structures would be permitted if the outstandingly remarkable characteristics of the river segment would be maintained or enhanced.

Table 2-25. Summary Comparison of Alternatives

Allowable Use or Restriction	Alternative 1 (Continuation of Existing Management)	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4 (Proposed RMP)
CULTURAL RESOURCES				
Cultural site types protected by NSO restriction	None	Communal big game kill sites, Oregon Trail inscription sites, rock shelters, and Native American TCPs	Communal big game kill sites, Native American burial locales, select rock alignments, Oregon Trail inscription sites, rock art sites, Native American TCPs, and rock shelters	Communal big game kill sites, Native American burial locales, select rock alignments, Oregon Trail inscription sites, rock art sites, Native American TCPs, and rock shelters
Historic trail protection actions	None	No visual intrusions within one-quarter mile of trails. Additional stipulations on contributing segments of the Lander Trail up to 1 mile from the trail	VRM Class II designation within 3 miles of contributing portions of the National Historic Trail system. CSU will extend 3 miles or the visual horizon, whichever is closer, of contributing portions of the National Historic Trail system to ensure that surface disturbing activities avoid trail remains and the lands immediately surrounding them. No oil and gas leasing within 1 mile of historic trails No surface disturbance within 1 mile of trails	VRM Class II designation within 3 miles of contributing portions of the National Historic Trail system. CSU will extend 3 miles or the visual horizon, whichever is closer, of contributing portions of the National Historic Trail system to ensure that surface disturbing activities avoid trail remains and the lands immediately surrounding them. No oil and gas leasing within 1 mile of the Sublette Cutoff No surface disturbance within one-quarter mile of trails
Cultural site types protected by OHV closure	Select rock alignments Holden Hill	Select rock alignments	Native American burial locales, communal big game kill sites, select rock alignments, and Native American TCPs	Select rock alignments Holden Hill
FORESTRY				
Forest and woodland treatment areas	Forest: 200 acres annually Woodlands: None	Forest: 300 acres annually Woodlands: 250 acres annually	Forest: 200 acres annually Woodlands: 700 acres annually	Forest: 200 acres annually Woodlands: 700 acres annually

Allowable Use or Restriction	Alternative 1 (Continuation of Existing Management)	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4 (Proposed RMP)
Estimated timber harvest	3,600 CCF/1,800 MBF annually	2,400 CCF/1,200 MBF annually	1,600 CCF/800 MBF annually	1,600 CCF/800 MBF annually
LANDS AND REALTY				
New withdrawals proposed (Table 2-26)	14,540 acres to protect wildlife habitat, recreation, cultural, and wilderness values	None	65,750 acres to protect wildlife habitat, visual and recreational values, and cultural sites	13,770 acres to protect cultural, wildlife habitat, recreation, and WSR values
Lands considered for disposal	6,380 acres	5,000 acres	790 acres	790 acres
Alternative energy development	Not applicable	Permitted throughout the field office where not prohibited by law	Considered on a case-by-case basis, and prohibited in sensitive areas	Considered on a case-by-case basis, and avoided in sensitive areas
LIVESTOCK GRAZING				
AUMs available for livestock grazing	107,907	157,308	84,000	107,907
MINERALS				
Oil and gas Unavailable Management Area	0 acres	21,300 acres	641,820 acres	439,470 acres
Oil and gas Traditional Leasing Management Area	0 acres	1,021,320 acres	500,840 acres	461,380 acres
Oil and gas Intensively Developed Field Management Area	0 acres	178,420 acres	78,270 acres	175,040 acres
Areas open to oil and gas leasing subject to the terms and conditions of the standard lease form	187,540 acres	866,990 acres	60,220 acres	358,450 acres
Areas with seasonal restrictions on oil and gas development	936,050 acres	26,660 acres	308,180 acres	852,180 acres
Areas protected by CSU restrictions	253,220 acres	295,900 acres	54,740 acres	222,460 acres

Allowable Use or Restriction	Alternative 1 (Continuation of Existing Management)	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4 (Proposed RMP)
Areas protected by NSO restrictions	41,300 acres	31,010 acres	379,450 acres	198,370 acres
Area unavailable for oil and gas leasing	172,500 acres	21,850 acres	723,200 acres	441,100 acres
Estimated number of new federal gas well locations anticipated to be developed	7,192	7,804	5,209	7,136
Coal leasing and development	Available	Available	Closed	Available
Locatable mineral exploration and development	Open, except for withdrawn lands	Open, except for withdrawn or segregated lands	Open, except for withdrawn or segregated lands	Open, except for withdrawn or segregated lands
Salable mineral activities	Available, and evaluated on a case-by-case basis	Available, and evaluated on a case-by-case basis	Available, and evaluated on a case-by-case basis	Available, and evaluated on a case-by-case basis
OFF-HIGHWAY VEHICLE USE				
OHV open use areas	247,250 acres	20,640 acres	None	None
Areas closed to OHV use	13,620 acres	8,400 acres	30,350 acres	26,320 acres
Areas with OHV use limited to existing roads and trails	662,060 acres	874,870 acres	751,920 acres	754,480 acres
Areas with OHV use limited to designated roads and trails	None	18,970 acres	140,610 acres	139,000 acres
Areas with seasonal restrictions on OHV use	577,850 acres	540 acres	518,860 acres	518,860 acres
Areas with special restrictions on OHV use	None	3,110 acres	1,010 acres	7,230 acres
RECREATION AND VISITOR SERVICES				
Number and acreage of SRMAs	3 SRMAs; 29,410 acres	3 SRMAs; 29,410 acres	3 SRMAs; 142,800 acres	5 SRMAs; 65,030 acres

Allowable Use or Restriction	Alternative 1 (Continuation of Existing Management)	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4 (Proposed RMP)
VEGETATION RESOURCES				
Vegetation treatment types allowed	Prescribed and wildland fire; chemical, biological, and mechanical methods	Prescribed and wildland fire; chemical, biological, and mechanical methods	Prescribed and wildland fire; biological and mechanical methods	Prescribed and wildland fire; chemical, biological, and mechanical methods
WATERSHED AND WATER QUALITY				
Restrictions on surface discharge of produced water	Not covered under existing RMP	Discharge to non-isolated surface features if permitted by WDEQ using BLM BMPs (Appendix 3)	No surface discharge to non-isolated surface features	No surface discharge to non-isolated surface features. Limited use of produced water for reclamation Produced water would meet WDEQ standards for discharge and follow BLM BMPs (Appendix 3)
WILDLIFE AND FISH HABITAT				
Wildlife protection restrictions—big game	No surface disturbing or disruptive activities within big game crucial winter ranges from November 15 to April 30 No surface disturbing or disruptive activities within big game parturition areas from May 1 to June 30	None	No surface disturbing or disruptive activities within big game crucial winter ranges from November 15 to April 30 No surface disturbing or disruptive activities within big game parturition areas from May 1 to June 30 NSO in migration routes NSO in migration bottlenecks NSO in crucial winter ranges Deadline-Graphite elk winter range unavailable for leasing NSO within 1 mile of elk feedgrounds	No surface disturbing or disruptive activities within big game crucial winter ranges from November 15 to April 30 No surface disturbing or disruptive activities within big game parturition areas from May 1 to June 30 Protect migration routes through avoidance NSO in migration bottlenecks No new main arterial access routes to the Mesa or in the Wind River Front areas Deadline-Graphite elk winter range unavailable for leasing
Wildlife protection restrictions—greater sage-grouse	Avoid human activity between 8:00 p.m. and 8:00 a.m. within one-quarter mile of leks from March 1 to May 15 No surface disturbing or disruptive activities within 2 miles of an occupied lek in	None	Avoid human activity between 8:00 p.m. and 8:00 a.m. within one-quarter mile of leks from March 1 to May 15 Vehicles limited to existing roads in nesting habitats NSO within 1 mile of leks	Avoid human activity between 8:00 p.m. and 8:00 a.m. within one-quarter mile of leks from March 1 to May 15 NSO within one-quarter mile of leks No surface disturbing or

Allowable Use or Restriction	Alternative 1 (Continuation of Existing Management)	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4 (Proposed RMP)
	nesting habitats from March 15 to July 15 No surface disturbing or disruptive activities in winter habitat from November 15 through March 15		No activities within 1 mile of leks from March 1 through May 15 No surface disturbing or disruptive activities within 3 miles of leks in nesting habitats from March 15 to July 15 No surface disturbing or disruptive activities in winter concentration areas from November 15 through March 15 No new structures 15 feet in height within 2 miles of breeding habitats	disruptive activities within 2 miles of leks in nesting habitats from March 15 to July 15 No surface disturbing or disruptive activities in winter concentration areas from November 15 through March 15 No new structures more than 15 feet in height within 2 miles of breeding habitats
Wildlife protection restrictions—raptors	No surface disturbing or disruptive activities within one-half mile of raptor nests from February 1 to July 31	No surface disturbance or permanent or high-profile structures within one-quarter mile of active nests	Survey for raptors within 1 mile of proposed projects No surface disturbance or permanent or high-profile structures within at least 1 mile of active nests	Survey for raptors within 1 mile of proposed projects No surface disturbance or permanent or high-profile structures within up to 1 mile of active nests
Wildlife protection restrictions—fish	The CRCT would be monitored in cooperation with the WGFD.	Instream activities such as construction of stream crossings would be designed to protect spawning CRCT, redds, and fry.	To protect spawning CRCT, redds, and fry, instream disturbing activities would be prohibited between June 1 and August 15. Chemical use for the purpose of fisheries management would be prohibited.	To protect spawning CRCT, redds, and fry, instream disturbing activities would be prohibited between June 1 and August 15.
SPECIAL DESIGNATIONS AND MANAGEMENT AREAS				
Number and acreage of existing SD/MAs	2 ACECs—8,860 acres 1 management area—243,040 acres 2 WSAs—21,200 acres	2 WSAs—21,200 acres	1 ACEC—5,270 acres 2 WSAs—21,200 acres	1 ACEC—3,590 acres 2 WSAs—21,200 acres

Allowable Use or Restriction	Alternative 1 (Continuation of Existing Management)	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4 (Proposed RMP)
Number and acreage of new or modified SD/MAs	None	1 ACEC—550 acres	1 expanded ACEC—10,160 acres 6 new ACECs—65,340 acres 1 expanded management area—358,400 acres 1 new management area—66,440	1 reduced ACEC—4,960 acres 2 new ACECs—5,980 acres 1 reduced management area—201,240 2 new management areas—102,110 acres

Table 2-26. Proposed Withdrawal Areas by Alternative

Proposed Withdrawal Area[1]	Acres			
	Alternative 1 (Continuation of Existing Management)	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4 (Proposed RMP)
Beaver Creek ACEC	3,590			
New Fork Potholes ACEC			1,820	1,820
Trapper's Point ACEC			9,540	4,000
Upper Green River ACEC			12,270	
Upper Green River SRMA	5,160			
CCC Ponds ACEC			5,530	
CCC Ponds SRMA				1,040
Boulder Lake SRMA	5,790		5,790	
Scab Creek SRMA (outside the WSA)			10,730	
East Fork River Unit WSR			1,090	1,090
Upper Green Bottleneck			1,200	
Special Status Plant Species			920	920
Sublette Cutoff Historical Trail (within 1 mile)			11,960	
Sensitive cultural sites (burials, rock alignments, rock inscriptions)			4,620	4,620
Total Affected Area (in acres)	**14,540**	**0**	**65,750**	**13,770**

[1]Withdrawal from mineral entry and the public land laws

Table 2-27. ROW Avoidance and Exclusion Areas by Alternative

Area	Alternative 1 (Continuation of Existing Management)	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4 (Proposed RMP)
ROW AVOIDANCE AREAS[1]				
Lander Trail		X	X	X
Sublette Cutoff Trail		X	X	X
USAF Seismic Monitoring Station (6-mile radius)			X	X
Known paleontological sites		X	X	X
All SRMAs		X	X	X
Highly erodible and/or fragile soils			X	X
Known locations of Special Status Plant Species		X		X
Potential habitat for Special Status Plant Species			X	X
VRM Class II areas		X	X	X
Floodplains, riparian areas, and wetlands[2]			X	X
Lynx analysis units		X	X	X
Active raptor nests (within one-quarter mile)		X		
Active raptor nests (within 1 mile)			X	X
Big game migration routes			X	X
Active sage-grouse leks (within one-quarter mile)				X
All ACECs		X	X	X
Green River WSR Unit			X	X
Total Affected Area (in acres)	**7,720**	**201,420**	**555,210**	**550,210**
ROW EXCLUSION AREAS[3]				
Communal big game kill sites, Oregon Trail inscription sites, rock shelters and alignments, Native American burial locales, Native American TCPs, and rock art sites		X	X	X
Known locations of Special Status Plant Species			X	
VRM Class I areas			X	X
Elk feedgrounds			X	X
Active greater sage-grouse leks (within 1 mile)			X	
Active greater sage-grouse leks (within 200 feet)	X			X
Active sage-grouse leks (no buffer)		X		
Rock Creek ACEC	X		X	X
All WSAs	X	X	X	X

Area	Alternative 1 (Continuation of Existing Management)	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4 (Proposed RMP)
WSR management units: Scab Creek, East Fork, and Silver Creek			X	X
Total Affected Area (in acres)	**23,370**	**28,420**	**166,980**	**41,500**

[1]Areas with sensitive resource values where ROWs and Section 302 permits, leases, and easements would be strongly discouraged. Authorizations made in avoidance areas would have to be compatible with the purpose for which the area was designated and not be otherwise practicable or technologically feasible on lands outside the avoidance area.

[2]Acreage calculated reflects 500 feet from perennial surface waters, wells, springs, and wetland/riparian areas. Those avoidance areas not calculated and acres not mapped would be assessed on a case-by-case basis.

[3]Areas where future ROWs may be granted only when mandated by law.

Table 2-28. Summary of OHV Use Designations

Area	Alternative 1 (Continuation of Existing Management)	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4 (Proposed RMP)
CLOSED				
Lake Mountain WSA			X	X
Scab Creek WSA	X	X	X	X
Rock Creek ACEC	X		X	X
Native American TCPs			X	
Rock Shelters			X	
Native American Burial Locales			X	X
Communal Big Game Kill Sites			X	X
Select Rock Alignments	X	X	X	X
Holden Hill			X	X
Red Dugway/Fish Creek Area			X	
East Fork WSR unit			X	X
Known Locations of Special Status Plant Species			X	X
Pinedale Pathway	X		X	X
Total Affected Area (in acres)	**13,620**	**8,400**	**30,350**	**26,320**
OPEN				
Mt. Airy OHV Area	X	X		
Big Piney OHV Area	X	X		
LaBarge OHV Area		X		
Desert General Use Area	X			
Burma Area		X		
Total affected area (in acres)	**247,250**	**20,640**	**0**	**0**
LIMITED TO DESIGNATED ROADS AND TRAILS				
Lake Mountain WSA		X		
Scab Creek SRMA (outside the WSA)		X	X	X
Boulder Lake SRMA			X	X
Upper Green River SRMA			X	X
CCC Ponds SRMA				X
Trapper's Point ACEC		X	X	X
CCC Ponds ACEC			X	
Ross Butte ACEC			X	
Beaver Creek ACEC			X	X
New Fork Potholes ACEC			X	X
Upper Green River ACEC			X	
Ross Butte Management Area				X
Miller Mountain Management Area			X	X
East Fork River/Irish Canyon Area			X	X
Muddy Creek/Badlands Area			X	X

Area	Alternative 1 (Continuation of Existing Management)	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4 (Proposed RMP)
Red Canyon			X	X
Wyoming Front Area				X
Hoback Area			X	X
Soap Holes Area				X
WTPD Towns			X	X
Green River WSR Unit			X	X
Known Locations of Special Status Plant Species				X
Oregon Trail Inscription Sites		X		X
Native American TCPs				X
Native American Burial Locales		X		X
Communal Big Game Kill Sites				X
Total Affected Area (in acres)	**0**	**18,970**	**140,610**	**139,000**
LIMITED TO EXISTING ROADS AND TRAILS				
Remainder of the Planning Area	X	X	X	X
Total Affected Area (in acres)	**662,060**	**874,870**	**751,920**	**754,480**
SEASONAL LIMITATIONS				
Trapper's Point ACEC		X	X	X
Approximately 2,500 acres between Silver Creek and Cottonwood Creek	X		X	X
Big Game Crucial Winter Ranges	X		X	X
New Fork Potholes ACEC			X	X
Elk Feedgrounds	X			X
Total Affected Area (in acres)	**577,850**	**540**	**518,860**	**518,860**
SPECIAL LIMITATIONS				
Total Affected Area (in acres)	**0**	**3,110**	**1,010**	**7,230**

Table 2-29. Visual Resource Management Classification and Acreage

Classification	Alternative 1 (Continuation of Existing Management)	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4 (Proposed RMP)
I	21,290	0	21,290	21,290
II	73,430	87,150	393,260	239,520
III	187,070	118,390	225,830	419,410
IV	641,140	717,390	282,300	242,660

Note: All lands in the planning area were rated; however, only BLM-administered lands are managed within the VRM system, and only BLM lands are included in the above acreages. (BLM 2004)

Table 2-30. Summary of Special Designations and Management Areas

SD/MA Area	Alternative 1 (Continuation of Existing Management)	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4 (Proposed RMP)
AREAS OF CRITICAL ENVIRONMENTAL CONCERN (ACEC)				
Rock Creek ACEC	5,270		5,270	4,960
Beaver Creek ACEC	3,590		10,160	3,590
New Fork Potholes ACEC			1,820	1,820
Trapper's Point ACEC		550	9,540	4,160
White-Tailed Prairie Dog ACEC			--[1]	
Upper Green River ACEC			12,270	
CCC Ponds ACEC			5,530	
Ross Butte ACEC			35,670	
Total Acres	**8,860**	**550**	**70,610**	**14,530**
MANAGEMENT AREAS				
Miller Mountain Management Area			66,440	66,440
Ross Butte Management Area				35,670
Wind River Front Management Area	243,040		358,400	201,240
Total Acres	**243,040**	**0**	**424,840**	**303,350**
SPECIAL RECREATION MANAGEMENT AREAS (SRMA)				
Boulder Lake SRMA	5,790	5,790	5,790	5,790
Scab Creek SRMA	18,460	18,460	18,460	18,460
Upper Green River SRMA	5,160	5,160		7,180
Green and New Fork Rivers SRMA			118,550	32,560
CCC Ponds SRMA				1,040
Total Acres	**29,410**	**29,410**	**142,800**	**65,030**

SD/MA Area	Alternative 1 (Continuation of Existing Management)	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4 (Proposed RMP)
WILD AND SCENIC RIVERS (WSR)				
East Fork River Unit			1,130	1,130
Green River Unit			7,100	7,100
Scab Creek Unit			1,350	1,350
Silver Creek Unit			860	860
Total Acres	**0**	**0**	**10,440**	**10,440**
ACEC PROPOSALS THAT DID NOT MEET THE RELEVANCE AND IMPORTANCE CRITERIA				
Beaver Creek ACEC expansion				
Rock Creek ACEC expansion				
North Cottonwood Creek				
South Cottonwood Creek				
LaBarge Elk Winter Range				
The Mesa				
Miller Mountain				
Muddy Creek				
Wind River Front				
Wyoming Range Front				
5 Miles Either Side of the Green River				
Soap Holes				
Boulder Lake				
Sage-grouse Winter Concentration Areas				
Tip Top Watershed				
Critical Watersheds and Recharge Areas for Big Piney, Marbleton, and LaBarge				

[1] Specific area for the WTPD ACEC cannot be calculated.

Table 2-31. Summary of Surface Disturbance Restrictions

Area	Alternative 1 (Continuation of Existing Management)	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4 (Proposed RMP)
SURFACE DISTURBANCE PROHIBITED				
Lander and Sublette Cutoff Trails (within one-quarter mile or the visual horizon, whichever is nearer)	X	X		
Lander and Sublette Cutoff Trails (within one-quarter mile)			X	X
Trapper's Point ACEC		X	X	X
Communal Big Game Kill Sites			X	X
Oregon Trail Inscription Sites			X	X
Rock Shelters			X	X
Select Rock Alignments			X	X
Native American Burial Locales			X	X
Native American TCPs			X	X
Rock Art Sites			X	X
Sensitive Soils on Slopes Greater Than 8%			X	
Known Locations of Special Status Plant Species			X	X
Greater Sage-Grouse Winter Concentration Areas (in the Traditional Leasing Areas)			X	
Beaver Creek ACEC (on slopes of 15% or greater; and within 1,000 feet of streams)	X		X	X
New Fork Potholes ACEC			X	X
Upper Green River SRMA	X			
WTPD Towns Greater Than 12.5 acres in size			X	
Miller Mountain Management Area (on slopes greater than 15%)			X	X
Ross Butte ACEC (on slopes greater than 10%)			X	
Ross Butte ACEC (on erosive soils and in sensitive plant species habitats)			X	
East Fork WSR Unit			X	X
Lander Trail (within one-quarter mile)				X
Suitable Sage-Grouse Habitat (within one-quarter mile of occupied leks in the oil and gas Traditional Leasing and Unavailable Areas)				X
Suitable Sage-Grouse Habitat (within one-quarter mile of occupied leks)	X			
Riparian Habitat, Wetlands, and Live Water Sources (within 500 feet)	X			

Area	Alternative 1 (Continuation of Existing Management)	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4 (Proposed RMP)
Total Affected Area (in acres)	**166,140**	**550**	**33,340**	**33,240**
CLOSED TO SURFACE OCCUPANCY				
Lander Trail (within 1 mile)			X	
Sublette Cutoff (within 1 mile)			X	X
Lander Trail (within one-quarter mile)	X			X
Sublette Cutoff (within one-quarter mile)	X			
Contributing segments of the Lander and the Sublette Cutoff Trails (within one-quarter mile)		X		
Communal Big Game Kill Sites		X	X	X
Oregon Trail Inscription Sites		X	X	X
Rock Shelters		X	X	X
Native American Burial Locales		X	X	X
Native American TCPs		X	X	X
Select Rock Alignments			X	X
Native American TCPs			X	X
Rock Art Sites			X	X
Developed Recreation Sites (within one-quarter mile)	X	X		X
Developed Recreation Sites (within one-half mile)			X	
Big Game Migration Routes and Bottlenecks (in the oil and gas Traditional Leasing and Unavailable Areas)			X	
Big Game Crucial Winter Ranges (in the oil and gas Traditional Leasing and Unavailable Areas)			X	
Big Game Parturition Areas (in the oil and gas Traditional Leasing and Unavailable Areas)			X	
Active Raptor Nests (within 825 feet)	X			
Active raptor nests (within 1,000 feet in the oil and gas Traditional Leasing and Unavailable Areas)			X	
Active Raptor Nests (within 1,000 feet in the oil and gas Traditional Leasing and Unavailable Areas)				X
Active Ferruginous Hawk Nests (within 1,400 feet in the oil and gas Traditional Leasing and Unavailable Areas)			X	
Active Ferruginous Hawk Nests (within 1,400 feet in the oil and gas Traditional Leasing and Unavailable Areas)				X
Elk Feedgrounds	X		X	X
Total Affected Area (in acres)	**28,500**	**9,300**	**641,830**	**31,870**

Area	Alternative 1 (Continuation of Existing Management)	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4 (Proposed RMP)
SEASONAL LIMITATIONS				
Known Active Leks During Strutting Season	X			
Known Active Leks During Strutting Season (in the oil and gas Traditional Leasing and Unavailable Areas)			X	
Known Active Leks During Strutting Season (in the oil and gas Traditional Leasing and Unavailable Areas)				X
Suitable Sage-Grouse Nesting Habitat (within 3 miles of active greater sage-grouse leks in the oil and gas Traditional Leasing and Unavailable Areas)			X	
Greater Sage-Grouse Winter Concentration Areas (in the oil and gas Traditional Leasing and Unavailable Areas)			X	
Greater Sage-Grouse Winter Concentration Areas (in the oil and gas Traditional Leasing and Unavailable Areas)				X
Big Game Parturition Areas	X			
Big Game Parturition Areas (in the oil and gas Traditional Leasing and Unavailable Areas)			X	
Big Game Parturition Areas (in the oil and gas Traditional Leasing and Unavailable Areas)				X
Big Game Crucial Winter Ranges	X			
Big Game Crucial Winter Ranges (in the oil and gas Traditional Leasing and Unavailable Areas)			X	
Big Game Crucial Winter Ranges (in the oil and gas Traditional Leasing and Unavailable Areas)				X
Elk Feedgrounds	X			X
Active Raptor Nests (within one-half mile in the oil and gas Traditional Leasing and Unavailable Areas)			X	
Active Raptor Nests (within one-half mile in the oil and gas Traditional Leasing and Unavailable Areas)				X
Active Ferruginous Hawk Nests (within 1 mile in the oil and gas Traditional Leasing and Unavailable Areas)			X	
Active Ferruginous Hawk Nests (within 1 mile in the oil and gas Traditional Leasing and Unavailable Areas)				X
Total Affected Area (in acres)	**599,150**	**0**	**884,240**	**535,310**

Table 2-32 shows the number of acres of BLM mineral estate that is subject to leasing restrictions for conventional oil and gas exploration and development. The acreage values provided in the table are organized by the type and level of restriction and mineral potential.

Table 2-32. Areas of Fluid Mineral Lease Conditional Requirements by Hydrocarbon Potential (Approximate Federal Subsurface Acres) for Conventional Oil and Gas

Area—Conventional Oil and Gas	Hydrocarbon Potential (Federal Subsurface Acres)[1]					Total
	Very High	High	Moderate	Low	None	
ALTERNATIVE 1 (Continuation of Existing Management)						
UNAVAILABLE FOR LEASING[2]						
Deadline-Graphite elk winter range	0	0	4,740	2,330	13,300	20,370
Lake Mountain WSA	0	0	0	50	13,440	13,490
Scab Creek WSA	0	0	0	0	7,710	7,710
Wind River Front MA	0	5,140	12,850	84,790	48,690	151,470
Total Affected Area (in acres)[5]	**0**	**5,140**	**17,940**	**87,210**	**62,210**	**172,500**
NO SURFACE OCCUPANCY[3,4]						
100-year floodplains on perennial channels	110	1,520	17,500	10,460	750	30,350
Boulder Lake Boat Ramp (within one-quarter mile)	0	0	0	130	0	130
Boulder Lake Campground (within one-quarter mile)	0	0	0	490	0	490
CCC Ponds (within one-quarter mile)	0	0	0	500	0	500
Elk feedgrounds	0	2,100	6,460	2,760	4,140	15,460
Fear Boat Access (within one-quarter mile)	0	0	180	0	0	180
48LN300	0	0	240	620	0	860
Huston Boat Access (within one-quarter mile)	0	0	0	450	0	450
NADP acid rain monitoring site (within one-half mile)	0	0	0	340	0	340
New Fork Campground (within one-quarter mile)	0	0	0	470	0	470
Rock Creek ACEC drainage area	0	0	30	40	4,550	4,620
Scab Creek Campground (within one-quarter mile)	0	0	0	0	130	130
Stokes Crossing Campground (within one-quarter mile)	0	0	0	750	0	750
Trapper's Point (cultural site)	0	0	10	360	0	370
48SU301	0	0	0	170	0	170
Warren Bridge Campground (within one-quarter mile)	0	0	0	110	0	110
Total Affected Area (in acres)[5]	**180**	**3,380**	**25,240**	**12,500**	**0**	**41,300**

Area—Conventional Oil and Gas	Hydrocarbon Potential (Federal Subsurface Acres)[1]					Total
	Very High	High	Moderate	Low	None	
CONTROLLED SURFACE USE[3,4]						
100-year floodplains of intermittent channels	1,530	2,170	4,850	4,290	60	12,900
48SU4100	0	0	0	120	0	120
48SU285	0	0	390	800	0	1,190
Beaver Creek ACEC	0	0	3,590	0	0	3,590
Bench Corral winter OHV closure area	0	0	41,890	0	0	41,890
Boulder Lake Archeological District	0	0	0	470	0	470
Boulder Lake SRMA	0	0	0	4,070	1,220	5,290
48SU354	0	0	200	0	0	200
Class II VRM areas	380	1,470	27,200	60,090	39,700	128,840
Known locations of Special Status Plant Species	50	50	280	550	0	930
Lander Trail (within one-quarter mile)	0	950	6,420	7,160	0	14,530
Lynx analysis units	0	11,090	89,050	63,430	37,770	201,340
Potential habitat for Special Status Plant Species	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND
Rock Creek ACEC (outside the drainage area)	0	0	320	70	230	610
Sage-grouse leks (within one-quarter mile)	640	1,380	6,220	4,830	140	13,210
Scab Creek SRMA (outside the WSA)	0	0	0	0	16,800	16,800
Soap Holes Basin	0	0	7,500	2,880	0	10,390
Sublette Cutoff (within one-quarter mile)	0	0	1,100	1,150	0	2,250
Upper Green River SRMA	0	0	0	4,800	0	4,800
48SU4000	70	100	0	0	0	800
Total Affected Area (in acres)[5]	**3,110**	**9,910**	**146,430**	**93,770**	**0**	**253,220**
SEASONAL LIMITATIONS[3,4]						
Big game crucial winter range	13,610	25,540	295,280	249,870	52,090	636,390
Big game parturition range	0	2,270	72,870	45,980	13,410	134,520
Big game winter OHV closure areas	9,190	11,210	170,240	113,300	11,120	315,060
Cora Stock Driveway	0	0	0	3,350	0	3,350
Raptor nests (within one-quarter mile)	1,950	2,480	8,800	8,980	180	22,390
Sage-grouse nesting habitat	23,160	51,410	198,120	163,600	6,540	442,830
Total Affected Area (in acres)[5]	**28,470**	**64,890**	**409,010**	**376,860**	**56,820**	**936,050**
ALTERNATIVE 2						
UNAVAILABLE FOR LEASING[2]						
Lake Mountain WSA	0	0	0	50	13,440	13,490
Scab Creek WSA	0	0	0	0	7,710	7,710
Trapper's Point ACEC	0	0	20	530	0	550

Area—Conventional Oil and Gas	Hydrocarbon Potential (Federal Subsurface Acres)[1]					Total
	Very High	High	Moderate	Low	None	
Total Affected Area (in acres)[5]	**0**	**0**	**30**	**570**	**21,250**	**21,750**
NO SURFACE OCCUPANCY[3,4]						
Developed recreation sites (within one-quarter mile)	0	0	80	1,210	430	1,720
Lander Trail east of Hwy 191 (one-quarter mile either side of the trail)	0	0	3,540	0	0	3,540
Lander Trail south of Piney Canyon (one-quarter mile either side of the trail)	0	0	820	0	0	8,210
NADP acid rain monitoring site (within one-half mile)	0	0	0	340	0	340
Sensitive cultural sites	0	50	1,190	2,530	300	4,080
Unincorporated municipalities or zoned rural subdivisions	0	1,570	5,000	14,110	730	21,410
Total Affected Area (in acres)[5]	**0**	**1,620**	**7,160**	**21,100**	**1,130**	**31,010**
CONTROLLED SURFACE USE[3,4]						
Boulder Lake SRMA, including the Boat Ramp and Campground	0	0	0	4,070	1,220	5,290
Class II VRM areas	380	1,420	16,070	56,990	38,680	113,540
Known locations of Special Status Plant Species	50	50	280	550	0	930
Lander Trail (within one-quarter mile)	0	950	6,420	7,160	0	14,530
Lynx Analysis Units	0	11,090	89,050	63,430	37,770	201,340
Raptor nests (within one-quarter mile) (high profile structures)	1,950	2,480	8,800	8,980	180	22,390
Scab Creek SRMA (outside the WSA)	0	0	0	0	16,800	16,800
Sublette Cutoff (within one-quarter mile)	0	0	1,100	1,150	0	2,250
Upper Green SRMA (within one-quarter mile of the Green River)	0	0	0	4,800	0	4,800
Total Affected Area (in acres)[5]	**2,330**	**14,260**	**111,200**	**128,880**	**39,230**	**295,900**
SEASONAL LIMITATIONS[3,4]						
Cora Stock Driveway	0	0	0	3,350	0	3,350
Raptor nests (within ½ mile in the oil and gas Traditional Leasing and Unavailable Areas	2,020	2,590	8,880	9,820	0	23,310
Total Affected Area (in acres)[5]	**2,020**	**2,590**	**8,880**	**13,170**	**0**	**26,660**
ALTERNATIVE 3						
UNAVAILABLE FOR LEASING						
Beaver Creek ACEC	0	0	10,070	10	0	10,080
Boulder Lake SRMA	0	0	0	4,070	1,220	5,290
CCC Ponds ACEC	0	0	0	5,000	0	5,000
Deadline-Graphite elk winter range	0	0	4,740	2,330	13,300	20,370
East Fork River Unit WSR	0	0	0	0	1,090	1,090
Green and New Fork Rivers SRMA	1,890	2,340	16,170	30,090	0	50,500

Area—Conventional Oil and Gas	Hydrocarbon Potential (Federal Subsurface Acres)[1]					Total
	Very High	High	Moderate	Low	None	
Lake Mountain WSA	0	0	0	50	13,440	13,490
Lander Trail (within 1 mile)	0	4,060	25,160	27,980	0	57,200
Miller Mountain Management Area	0	0	0	57,210	0	57,210
New Fork Potholes ACEC	0	0	0	1,820	0	1,820
Rock Creek ACEC	0	0	30	40	4,550	4,620
Ross Butte ACEC	0	0	9,720	23,000	0	32,720
Scab Creek SRMA (including the WSA)	0	0	0	0	16,800	16,800
Sensitive cultural sites	0	50	1,190	2,530	300	4,080
Sublette Cutoff (within 1 mile)	0	0	3,270	5,200	0	8,470
Trapper's Point ACEC	0	0	1,440	8,080	0	9,520
Upper Green River migration bottleneck area	0	0	450	710	0	1,160
Upper Green River ACEC	0	0	400	11,010	0	11,410
WSR Units	0	0	0	7,100	3,340	10,440
Wind River Front Management Area	0	9,750	19,970	177,960	48,320	256,000
Oil and Gas Unavailable Areas	0	390	206,570	359,020	48,700	614,680
Total Affected Area (in acres)[5]	**1,960**	**16,310**	**255,290**	**387,430**	**62,210**	**723,200**
NO SURFACE OCCUPANCY[3,4]						
100-year floodplains on perennial channels	110	1,520	17,500	10,460	750	30,350
Beaver Creek ACEC	0	0	10,070	10	0	10,080
Big game crucial winter range (in the oil and gas Traditional Leasing and Unavailable Areas)	0	8,050	292,940	249,760	52,090	602,840
Big game migration routes and bottlenecks	0	1,950	19,290	10,930	0	32,170
Big game parturition areas (in the oil and gas Traditional Leasing and Unavailable Areas)	0	2,270	69,700	45,980	13,410	131,360
Developed recreation sites (within one-half mile)	140	370	0	1,390	860	2,760
Elk feedgrounds	0	6,410	30,090	17,080	14,080	67,660
Known locations of Special Status Plant Species	50	50	280	550	0	930
NADP acid rain monitoring site (within one-half mile)	0	0	0	340	0	340
Raptor nests (permanent and high profile structures within 1 mile)	16,820	25,680	87,900	80,610	2,870	213,880
Active raptor nests (within 1,000 feet in the oil and gas Traditional Leasing and Unavailable Areas)	0	20	1,020	600	0	1,640
Active ferruginous hawk nests (within 1,400 feet in the oil and gas Traditional Leasing and Unavailable Areas)	0	0	0	280	0	280

Area—Conventional Oil and Gas	Hydrocarbon Potential (Federal Subsurface Acres)[1]					Total
	Very High	High	Moderate	Low	None	
Sage-grouse nesting habitat (within 3 miles of leks in the oil and gas Traditional Leasing and Unavailable Areas)	690	31,040	289,590	248,840	12,220	582,280
Sage-grouse winter concentration areas (in the oil and gas Traditional Leasing and Unavailable Areas)	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND
Unincorporated municipalities or zoned rural subdivisions	0	1,570	5,000	14,110	730	21,410
White-tailed prairie dog towns greater than 12.5 acres in size	1,440	2,520	490	2,520	0	6,960
Total Affected Area (in acres)[5]	**18,090**	**59,290**	**225,160**	**76,910**	**0**	**379,450**
CONTROLLED SURFACE USE[3,4]						
100-year floodplains of intermittent channels	1,530	2,170	4,850	4,290	60	12,900
Wetlands and riparian areas (within one-quarter mile)	4,590	25,410	154,480	161,050	30,570	376,100
Class II VRM areas	1,350	14,160	138,020	348,510	40,970	543,010
Lynx analysis units	0	11,090	89,050	63,430	37,770	201,340
Soap Holes Basin	0	0	7,500	2,880	0	10,390
Potential habitat for Special Status Plant Species	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND
Total Affected Area (in acres)[5]	**2,190**	**8,640**	**14,020**	**29,890**	**0**	**54,740**
SEASONAL LIMITATIONS[3,4]						
Bench Corral winter OHV closure area	0	0	41,890	0	0	41,890
Cora Stock Driveway	0	0	0	3,350	0	3,350
Raptor nests, foraging, and roosting areas (within 1 mile in the oil and gas Traditional Leasing and Unavailable Areas)	0	9,040	50,860	80,560	2,870	143,330
Sage-grouse leks (within 1 mile in the oil and gas Traditional Leasing and Unavailable Areas)	610	7,680	77,410	60,410	1,890	148,000
Total Affected Area (in acres)[5]	**690**	**14,520**	**149,940**	**138,270**	**4,760**	**308,180**
ALTERNATIVE 4 (Proposed RMP)						
UNAVAILABLE FOR LEASING[2]						
CCC Ponds SRMA	0	0	0	1,040	0	1,040
Deadline-Graphite elk winter range	0	0	5,040	2,400	13,530	20.970
Lake Mountain WSA	0	0	0	50	13,530	13,580
New Fork Potholes ACEC	0	0	0	1,820	0	1,820
Rock Creek ACEC	0	0	30	40	4,550	4,620
Trapper's Point ACEC	0	0	1,280	2,710	0	3,990
WSR Units	0	0	0	7,300	3,340	10,640
Oil and Gas Unavailable Area	10	940	141,070	235,040	62,410	439,470

Area—Conventional Oil and Gas	Hydrocarbon Potential (Federal Subsurface Acres)[1]					Total
	Very High	High	Moderate	Low	None	
Total Affected Area (in acres)[5]	**10**	**940**	**142,650**	**235,090**	**62,410**	**441,100**
NO SURFACE OCCUPANCY[3,4]						
100-year floodplains of perennial channels	110	1,520	17,500	10,460	750	30,350
Beaver Creek ACEC (within 1,000 feet of streams)	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND
Beaver Creek ACEC (slopes of 25% or greater)	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND
Developed recreation sites (within one-quarter mile)	0	0	80	1,210	430	1,720
Elk feedgrounds	0	2,620	10,970	5,580	5,550	24,720
Green and New Fork Rivers SRMA	130	210	1,700	3,830	0	5,870
Lander Trail (within one-quarter mile)	0	950	6,420	7,160	0	14,530
NSO one-half-mile buffer area	560	2,170	85,420	56,350	0	144,500
NADP acid rain monitoring site (within one-half mile)	0	0	0	340	0	340
Raptor nests (within one-quarter mile)	1,950	2,480	8,800	8,980	180	22,390
Ryegrass NSO area	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND
Sage-grouse leks (within one-quarter mile in the oil and gas Traditional Leasing and Unavailable Areas)	120	510	4,550	4,460	150	9,790
Sensitive cultural sites	0	50	1,200	2,880	300	4,430
Sublette Cutoff (within 1 mile)	0	0	3,270	5,200	0	8,470
Unincorporated municipalities or zoned rural subdivisions	0	1,570	5,000	14,110	730	21,410
Upper Green River bottleneck area	0	0	450	710	0	1,160
West Mesa NSO area	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND
Active raptor nests (within 1,000 feet in the oil and gas Traditional Leasing and Unavailable Areas)	30	480	1,940	4,040	100	6,590
Active ferruginous hawk nests (within 1,400 feet in the oil and gas Traditional Leasing and Unavailable Areas)	0	60	420	2,340	0	2,820
Total Affected Area (in acres)[5]	**900**	**9,500**	**111,300**	**76,670**	**0**	**198,370**
CONTROLLED SURFACE USE[3,4]						
100-year floodplains of intermittent channels	1,530	2,170	4,850	4,280	60	12,890
Beaver Creek ACEC	0	0	3,590	0	0	3,590
Bench Corral winter OHV closure area	0	0	41,890	0	0	41,890
Class II VRM areas	960	14,090	84,980	258,680	39,730	398,440
Cora Stock Driveway	0	0	0	3,350	0	3,350
Known locations of Special Status Plant Species	50	50	280	550	0	930

Area—Conventional Oil and Gas	Hydrocarbon Potential (Federal Subsurface Acres)[1]					Total
	Very High	High	Moderate	Low	None	
Lander Trail—South Piney Canyon area (within one-quarter mile to 1 mile)	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND
Lynx analysis units	0	11,090	89,050	63,430	37,770	201,340
Miller Mountain Management Area	0	0	0	57,210	0	57,210
Raptor nests (within 1 mile in the oil and gas Traditional Leasing and Unavailable Areas)	800	8,560	40,360	75,810	2,700	128,230
Soap Holes Basin	0	0	7,500	2,890	0	10,390
Total Affected Area (in acres)[5]	**2,610**	**18,420**	**84,730**	**116,700**	**0**	**222,460**
SEASONAL LIMITATIONS[3,4]						
Big game crucial winter range (in the oil and gas Traditional Leasing and Unavailable Areas)	0	8,050	292,940	249,760	52,090	602,840
Big game parturition range (in the oil and gas Traditional Leasing and Unavailable Areas)	0	2,270	54,470	42,040	13,740	112,520
Raptor nests (within 1 mile in the oil and gas Traditional Leasing and Unavailable Areas)	800	8,560	40,360	75,810	2,700	128,230
Active ferruginous hawk nests (within 1 mile)	2,950	310	0	4,020	0	7,280
Greater sage-grouse nesting habitat (in the oil and gas Traditional Leasing and Unavailable Areas)	690	21,060	124,980	148,510	6,540	301,780
Greater sage-grouse concentration areas (in the oil and gas Traditional Leasing and Unavailable Areas)	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND
Elk feedgrounds	0	2,100	6,470	3,080	4,140	15,790
Cora Stock Driveway	0	0	0	3,350	0	3,350
Total Affected Area (in acres)[5]	**3,880**	**33,520**	**378,440**	**382,000**	**54,340**	**852,180**

[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 disrupting use would follow the surface disturbance prescriptions.
[3]All activities would be subject to intensive mitigation, including offsite placement of facilities; remote control monitoring; restricted or prohibited surface use, including road construction; multiple wells from a single pad; central tank batteries and facilities; pipelines and power lines concentrated in specific areas; etc., based on site-specific analysis.
[4]Refer to Appendix 3. These requirements apply to all surface disturbing activities.
[5]Acres may not add because of overlap of land resources and land restrictions.
[6]Habitat is protected by riparian stipulations.
[7]The Boulder Lake Archeology District is contained within the Wind River Front Management Area.
*ND—Non-Determinable—Do not have data at this time.

Table 2-33 shows the number of acres of BLM mineral estate that is subject to leasing restrictions for coalbed natural gas exploration and development. The acreage values provided in the table are organized by the type and level of restriction and mineral potential.

Table 2-33. Areas of Fluid Mineral Lease Conditional Requirements by Hydrocarbon Potential (Approximate Federal Subsurface Acres) for Coalbed Natural Gas

Area—Coalbed Natural Gas	Coalbed Natural Gas Potential (Federal Subsurface Acres)[1]					Total
	High	Moderate	Low	Very Low	None	
ALTERNATIVE 1 (Continuation of Existing Management)						
UNAVAILABLE FOR LEASING[2]						
Deadline-Graphite elk winter range	0	0	1,160	6,270	13,530	20,960
Lake Mountain WSA	0	0	0	50	13,440	13,490
Scab Creek WSA	0	0	0	0	7,710	7,710
Wind River Front MA	0	0	3,670	82,750	64,720	151,140
Total Affected Area (in acres)[5]	**0**	**0**	**4,900**	**89,050**	**78,240**	**172,190**
NO SURFACE OCCUPANCY[3,4]						
100-year floodplains on perennial channels	960	3,160	4,800	19,500	1,860	30,280
Sensitive cultural sites	0	0	850	620	0	1,470
Boulder Lake Boat Ramp (within one-quarter mile)	0	0	0	130	0	130
Boulder Lake Campground (within one-quarter mile)	0	0	0	490	0	490
CCC Ponds (within one-quarter mile)	0	0	0	500	0	500
Elk feedgrounds	1,420	1,490	630	7,080	4,840	15,460
Fear Boat Access (within one-quarter mile)	0	0	180	0	0	180
48LN300	0	0	240	620	0	860
Huston Boat Access (within one-quarter mile)	0	0	0	450	0	450
NADP acid rain monitoring site (within one-half mile)	0	0	0	340	0	340
New Fork Campground (within one-quarter mile)	0	0	0	470	0	470
Rock Creek ACEC drainage area	0	0	0	70	4,550	4,620
Scab Creek Campground (within one-quarter mile)	0	0	0	0	130	130
Stokes Crossing Campground (within one-quarter mile)	0	0	0	750	0	750
Trapper's Point (cultural site)	0	0	10	360	0	370
48SU301	0	0	0	170	0	170
Warren Bridge Campground (within one-quarter mile)	0	0	0	110	0	110
Total Affected Area (in acres)[5]	**2,380**	**4,910**	**8,310**	**25,050**	**470**	**41,120**

Area—Coalbed Natural Gas	Coalbed Natural Gas Potential (Federal Subsurface Acres)[1]					Total
	High	Moderate	Low	Very Low	None	
CONTROLLED SURFACE USE[3,4]						
100-year floodplains of intermittent channels	0	520	0	9,770	170	10,460
48SU4100						
48SU285						
Beaver Creek ACEC	770	810	60	1,950	0	3,590
Bench Corral winter OHV closure area	0	0	0	41,890	0	41,890
Boulder Lake Archeological District						
Boulder Lake SRMA	0	0	0	1,730	3,560	5,290
48SU354						
Class II VRM areas	2,820	7,500	700	66,210	51,500	128,720
Known locations of Special Status Plant Species	0	0	10	920	0	930
Lander Trail (within one-quarter mile)	1,260	2,670	0	10,600	0	14,530
Lynx analysis units	13,350	30,920	12,430	101,400	43,250	201,340
Potential habitat for Special Status Plant Species	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND
Rock Creek ACEC (outside the drainage area)	0	0	0	380	230	610
Sage-grouse leks (within one-quarter mile)	0	1,620	500	10,830	270	13,220
Scab Creek SRMA (outside the WSA)	0	0	0	0	16,800	16,800
Soap Holes Basin	0	0	0	10,390	0	10,390
Sublette Cutoff (within one-quarter mile)	0	0	2,230	0	0	2,230
Upper Green River SRMA	0	0	0	4,800	0	4,800
48SU4000						
Total Affected Area (in acres)[5]	**12,160**	**34,150**	**15,690**	**187,670**	**3,450**	**253,120**
SEASONAL LIMITATIONS[3,4]						
Big game crucial winter range	17,290	72,650	119,070	364,290	62,190	635,490
Big game parturition range	9,260	27,890	16,230	65,040	16,110	134,520
Big game winter OHV closure areas	1,160	43,470	84,580	173,500	12,340	315,050
Cora Stock Driveway (CSU)	0	0	0	3,350	0	3,350
Raptor nests (within one-quarter mile)	490	1,630	2,230	17,860	180	22,390
Sage-grouse nesting habitat	0	53,350	21,880	351,690	15,710	442,500
Total Affected Area (in acres)[5]	**17,990**	**102,170**	**132,170**	**609,180**	**73,540**	**935,050**
ALTERNATIVE 2						
UNAVAILABLE FOR LEASING						
Lake Mountain WSA	0	0	0	50	13,440	13,490
Scab Creek WSA	0	0	0	0	7,710	7,710
Trapper's Point ACEC	0	0	0	550	0	550
Total Affected Area (in acres)[5]	**0**	**0**	**0**	**600**	**21,250**	**21,850**

Area—Coalbed Natural Gas	Coalbed Natural Gas Potential (Federal Subsurface Acres)[1]					Total
	High	Moderate	Low	Very Low	None	
NO SURFACE OCCUPANCY[3,4]						
Developed recreation sites (within one-quarter mile)	0	0	0	310	80	390
Lander Trail east of Hwy 191 (one-quarter mile either side of the trail)	0	0	3,540	0	0	3,540
Lander Trail south of Piney Canyon (one-quarter mile either side of the trail)	0	0	820	0	0	820
NADP acid rain monitoring site (within one-half mile)	0	0	0	340	0	340
Unincorporated municipalities or zoned rural subdivisions	0	80	5,960	13,500	1,870	21,410
Total Affected Area (in acres)[5]	**740**	**370**	**6,900**	**20,190**	**2,810**	**31,010**
CONTROLLED SURFACE USE[3,4]						
Boulder Lake SRMA, including the Boat Ramp and Campground	0	0	0	4,070	0	4,070
Class II VRM areas	2,080	1,480	690	63,350	45,830	113,440
Known locations of Special Status Plant Species	0	0	10	920	0	930
Lander Trail (within one-quarter mile)	520	2,580	0	6,990	0	10,090
Lynx Analysis Units	12,610	30,830	11,260	98,490	21,680	174,870
Raptor nests (within one-quarter mile)	490	1,630	2,230	17,540	0	21,890
Scab Creek SRMA (outside the WSA)	0	0	0	0	16,800	16,800
Sublette Cutoff (within one-quarter mile)	0	0	2,230	0	0	2,230
Upper Green SRMA (within one-quarter mile of the Green River)	0	0	0	6,460	11,860	18,320
Total Affected Area (in acres)[5]	**13,360**	**36,020**	**15,500**	**182,520**	**51,690**	**299,070**
SEASONAL LIMITATIONS[3,4]						
Cora Stock Driveway	0	0	0	3,350	0	3,350
Raptor nests (within one-half mile in the oil and gas Traditional Leasing and Unavailable Areas)	490	1,650	2,260	18,920	0	23,320
Total Affected Area (in acres)[5]	**490**	**1,650**	**2,260**	**22,260**	**0**	**26,660**
ALTERNATIVE 3						
UNAVAILABLE FOR LEASING						
Beaver Creek ACEC	3,580	3,110	80	3,300	0	10,070
Boulder Lake SRMA	0	0	0	1,730	3,560	5,290
CCC Ponds ACEC	0	0	0	5,000	0	5,000
Deadline-Graphite elk winter range	0	0	1,160	5,910	13,300	20,370
East Fork River Unit WSR	0	0	0	0	1,090	1,090
Green and New Fork Rivers SRMA	0	1,480	8,750	40,030	0	50,260
Lake Mountain WSA	0	0	0	50	13,440	13,490
Lander Trail (within 1 mile)	5,390	9,520	0	42,270	0	57,190

Area—Coalbed Natural Gas	Coalbed Natural Gas Potential (Federal Subsurface Acres)[1]					Total
	High	Moderate	Low	Very Low	None	
Miller Mountain Management Area	0	0	0	57,210	10	57,220
New Fork Potholes ACEC	0	0	0	1,820	0	1,820
Rock Creek ACEC	0	0	0	70	4,550	4,620
Ross Butte ACEC	0	130	20	32,570	0	32,720
Scab Creek SRMA (including the WSA)	0	0	0	0	16,800	16,800
Sensitive cultural sites						
Sublette Cutoff (within 1 mile)	0	0	8,450	0	0	8,450
Trapper's Point ACEC	0	0	0	9,520	0	9,520
Upper Green River migration bottleneck area	0	0	0	0	1,160	1,160
Upper Green River ACEC	0	0	0	11,410	0	11,410
WSR Units	0	0	0	7,100	3,340	10,440
Wind River Front Management Area	0	0	6,200	183,050	66,210	255,460
Oil and gas Unavailable Areas	0	22,450	37,360	476,190	69,310	605,310
Total Affected Area (in acres)[5]	**8,970**	**37,100**	**55,050**	**537,230**	**83,770**	**722,120**
NO SURFACE OCCUPANCY[3,4]						
100-year floodplains on perennial channels	960	3,160	4,800	19,500	1,860	30,280
Beaver Creek ACEC	3,580	3,110	80	3,300	0	10,070
Big game crucial winter range (in the oil and gas Traditional Leasing and Unavailable Areas)	17,290	72,650	118,820	330,990	62,190	601,940
Big game migration routes and bottlenecks	4,980	48,450	53,420	227,580	30,280	364,710
Big game parturition areas (in the oil and gas Traditional Leasing and Unavailable Areas)	9,260	24,710	16,230	65,040	16,110	131,350
Developed recreation sites (within one-half mile)	0	0	0	1,550	1,200	2,750
Elk feedgrounds	4,770	8,500	4,840	33,660	15,770	67,540
Known locations of Special Status Plant Species	0	0	10	920	0	930
NADP acid rain monitoring site (within one-half mile)	0	0	0	340	0	340
Raptor nests (within 1 mile)	6,950	14,170	21,400	168,480	2,870	213,870
Active raptor nests (within 1,000 feet in the oil and gas Traditional Leasing and Unavailable Areas)	10	500	290	840	0	1,630
Active ferruginous hawk nests (within 1,400 feet in the oil and gas Traditional Leasing and Unavailable Areas)	0	0	0	280	0	280
Sage-grouse nesting habitat (within 3 miles of leks in the oil and gas Traditional Leasing and Unavailable Areas)	1,930	82,860	37,980	432,590	26,130	581,490

Area—Coalbed Natural Gas	Coalbed Natural Gas Potential (Federal Subsurface Acres)[1]					Total
	High	Moderate	Low	Very Low	None	
Sage-grouse winter concentration areas (in the oil and gas Traditional Leasing and Unavailable Areas)	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND
Unincorporated municipalities or zoned rural subdivisions	0	80	5,960	13,500	1,870	21,410
White-tailed prairie dog towns greater than 12.5 acres in size	0	0	0	13,480	0	13,480
Total Affected Area (in acres)[5]	**10,190**	**74,380**	**100,860**	**193,110**	**350**	**378,890**
CONTROLLED SURFACE USE[3,4]						
100-year floodplains of intermittent channels	0	520	2,350	9,770	170	12,810
Wetlands and riparian areas (within one-quarter mile)	8,410	44,860	54,640	224,890	43,040	375,840
Class II VRM areas	17,350	38,140	35,860	389,950	60,480	541,780
Lynx analysis units	13,350	30,920	12,430	101,400	43,250	201,340
Soap Holes Basin	0	0	0	10,390	0	10,390
Potential habitat for Special Status Plant Species						
Total Affected Area (in acres)[5]	**10**	**5,110**	**11,560**	**37,520**	**510**	**54,710**
SEASONAL LIMITATIONS[3,4]						
Bench Corral winter OHV closure area	0	0	0	41,890	0	41,890
Cora Stock Driveway	0	0	0	3,350	0	3,350
Raptor nests, foraging and roosting areas (within 1 mile in the oil and gas Traditional Leasing and Unavailable Areas)	6,950	10,300	1,690	121,940	2,870	143,750
Sage-grouse leks (within 1 mile in the oil and gas Traditional Leasing and Unavailable Areas)	0	19,710	7,080	116,740	4,430	147,960
Total Affected Area (in acres)[5]	**6,950**	**28,940**	**8,830**	**256,120**	**7,300**	**308,140**
ALTERNATIVE 4 (Proposed RMP)						
UNAVAILABLE FOR OIL AND GAS LEASING[2]						
CCC Ponds SRMA	0	0	0	1,040	0	1,040
Deadline-Graphite elk winter range	0	0	1,220	6,630	13,530	21,380
Lake Mountain WSA	0	0	0	50	13,530	13,580
New Fork Potholes ACEC	0	0	0	1,820	0	1,820
Rock Creek ACEC	0	0	30	40	4,550	4,620
Trapper's Point ACEC	0	0	0	3,990	0	3,990
WSR Units	0	0	0	7,290	3,340	10,630
Oil and Gas Unavailable Area	0	13,010	980	343,310	81,620	438,920
Total Affected Area (in acres)[5]	**0**	**13,010**	**1,680**	**334,250**	**81,620**	**430,560**

Area—Coalbed Natural Gas	Coalbed Natural Gas Potential (Federal Subsurface Acres)[1]					Total
	High	Moderate	Low	Very Low	None	
NO SURFACE OCCUPANCY[3,4]						
100-year floodplains of perennial channels	960	3,160	4,800	19,500	1,860	30,280
Beaver Creek ACEC (within 1,000 feet of streams)	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND
Beaver Creek ACEC (slopes of 25% or more)	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND
Developed recreation sites (within one-quarter mile)	0	100	100	1,040	820	2,060
Elk feedgrounds	2,280	2,910	2,040	11.090	6,390	24,710
Green and New Fork Rivers SRMA	0	140	1,280	4,400	0	5,820
Lander Trail (within one-quarter mile)	1,260	2,670	0	10,600	0	14,530
NSO one-half-mile buffer area	0	15,320	8,800	117,170	3,210	144,500
NADP acid rain monitoring site (within one-half mile)	0	0	0	340	0	340
Raptor nests (within one-quarter mile)	490	1,630	2,230	17,860	180	22,390
Ross Butte MA	0	130	20	32,570	0	32,720
Ryegrass NSO area	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND
Sage-grouse leks (within one-quarter mile in the oil and gas Traditional Leasing and Unavailable Areas)	0	1,020	0	8,480	270	9,770
Sensitive cultural sites	0	200	850	2,610	770	4,430
Sublette Cutoff (within 1 mile)	0	0	0	8,450	0	8,450
Unincorporated municipalities or zoned rural subdivisions	0	80	5,900	13,500	1,870	21,410
Upper Green River bottleneck area	0	0	0	0	1,160	1,160
West Mesa NSO area	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND
Active raptor nests (within 1,000 feet in the oil and gas Traditional Leasing and Unavailable Areas)	30	640	60	5,760	100	6,590
Active ferruginous hawk nests (within 1,400 feet in the oil and gas Traditional Leasing and Unavailable Areas)	0	0	0	2,820	0	2,820
Total Affected Area (in acres)[5]	**3,920**	**23,570**	**30,520**	**136,940**	**3,210**	**198,160**
CONTROLLED SURFACE USE[3,4]						
100-year floodplains of intermittent channels	0	520	2,350	9,770	170	12,810
Beaver Creek ACEC	770	810	60	1,950	0	3,590
Bench Corral winter OHV closure area	0	0	0	41,890	0	41,890
Class II VRM areas	17,150	26,900	58,090	235,460	59,760	397,360
Cora Stock Driveway	0	0	0	3,350	0	3,350
Known locations of Special Status Plant Species	0	0	10	920	0	930

Area—Coalbed Natural Gas	Coalbed Natural Gas Potential (Federal Subsurface Acres)[1]					Total
	High	Moderate	Low	Very Low	None	
Lander Trail—South Piney Canyon area (within one-quarter mile to 1 mile)	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND
Lynx analysis units	13,350	30,920	12,430	101,400	43,250	201,340
Miller Mountain Management Area	0	0	0	57,210	10	57,220
Raptor nests (within 1 mile in the oil and gas Traditional Lease and Unavailable Areas)	1,670	9,600	1,750	112,410	2,700	128,130
Soap Holes Basin	0	0	0	10,390	0	10,390
Total Affected Area (in acres)[5]	**14,790**	**18,570**	**39,500**	**149,200**	**0**	**222,060**
SEASONAL LIMITATIONS[3,4]						
Big game crucial winter range (in the oil and gas Traditional Leasing and Unavailable Areas)	17,290	72,650	118,820	330,990	62,190	601,940
Big game parturition range (in the oil and gas Traditional Leasing and Unavailable Areas)	9,260	17,800	11,990	58,360	15,100	112,510
Raptor nests (within 1 mile in the oil and gas Traditional Leasing and Unavailable Areas)	1,670	9,700	1,750	112,410	2,700	128,230
Active ferruginous hawk nests (within 1 mile)	0	0	0	7,270	0	7,270
Greater sage-grouse nesting habitat (in the oil and gas Traditional Leasing and Unavailable Areas)	0	31,160	3,790	251,240	15,390	301,580
Greater sage-grouse winter concentration areas (in the oil and gas Traditional Leasing and Unavailable Areas)	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND
Elk feedgrounds	1,420	1,490	630	7,420	4,840	15,800
Cora Stock Driveway	0	0	0	3,350	0	3,350
Total Affected Area (in acres)[5]	**18,470**	**91,360**	**127,720**	**544,240**	**69,370**	**851,160**

[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 disrupting use would follow the surface disturbance prescriptions.
[3]All activities would be subject to intensive mitigation, including offsite placement of facilities; remote control monitoring; restricted or prohibited surface use, including road construction; multiple wells from a single pad; central tank batteries and facilities; pipelines and power lines concentrated in specific areas; etc., based on site-specific analysis.
[4]Refer to Appendix 3. These requirements apply to all surface disturbing activities.
[5]Acres may not add because of overlap of land resources and land restrictions.
[6]Habitat is protected by riparian stipulations.
[7]The Boulder Lake Archeology District is contained within the Wind River Front Management Area.
*ND—Non-Determinable—Do not have data at this time.

Table 2-34. Summary Comparison of Impacts

Summary Comparison of Impacts			
Alternative 1 (Continuation of Existing Management)	**Alternative 2**	**Alternative 3**	**Alternative 4 (Proposed RMP)**
IMPACTS ON AIR RESOURCES			
NO_x emissions could increase by 7,483 tons per year in 2011. NO_x emissions could increase by 15,780 tons per year in 2021.	NO_x emissions could increase by 8,461 tons per year in 2011. NO_x emissions could increase by 17,306 tons per year in 2021.	NO_x emissions could increase by 4,876 tons per year in 2011. NO_x emissions could increase by 11,133 tons per year in 2021.	NO_x emissions could increase by 7,338 tons per year in 2011. NO_x emissions could increase by 15,426 tons per year in 2021.
IMPACTS ON CULTURAL RESOURCES			
Disturbance of more than 43,000 acres through oil and gas activities and unlimited OHV use in the Desert General Use area would cause potential damage to undiscovered or undocumented sites.	An increase in the disturbed area for oil and gas activities and reduced protections for historic trails and other sites would result in greater impacts than under Alternative 1. Restriction of the Desert General Use Area to existing roads and trails would reduce impacts from direct physical damage and unauthorized collecting in this area.	A decrease in the disturbed area for oil and gas and other activities and generally more restrictive protections for cultural sites and historic trails would result in fewer impacts on sites. Impacts of OHV use would also be reduced. This alternative would provide the most protection for cultural sites.	This alternative would provide more protection to cultural sites than Alternative 1, but less than Alternative 3. The area disturbed for oil and gas development, the protections for cultural sites, and the restrictions on OHV use would all fall between Alternatives 1 and 3.
IMPACTS ON FORESTRY			
Fire suppression activities could impact forest resources by contributing to the build-up of fuels, which would increase the potential for fire to destroy these resources. However, fuel reduction projects, as well as some commercial harvesting, could reduce this potential impact by reducing the intensity of wildland fires and making wildland fire easier to control.	More commercial timber would be harvested and forest health actions would be directed toward sustaining a greater yield of forest products. In addition, aspen stands would be managed for early seral aspen communities to maximize commodity benefits, thus having a greater impact on the management of aspen as a commodity compared to the other alternatives. Old growth stands would be identified and preserved.	Increased treatment of woodlands and forest management to meet forest health standards would result in a greater range of variability in stands. Old growth stands would be identified and preserved.	Same as Alternative 3.

Summary Comparison of Impacts			
Alternative 1 (Continuation of Existing Management)	**Alternative 2**	**Alternative 3**	**Alternative 4 (Proposed RMP)**
IMPACTS ON LANDS AND REALTY			
Impacts on lands and realty management could result in rerouting of ROWs and restricting land tenure adjustments for the protection of sensitive resources on BLM administered lands.	Overall impacts would include increased opportunity for ROW authorizations and tenure adjustments resulting from reduced land use restrictions.	Impacts on lands and realty management would indirectly result from the potential decrease in opportunities for development and ROW authorizations. Furthermore, nearly 40% of the entire planning area would be withdrawn from all disposal actions.	Impacts would be anticipated from the implementation of management actions designed to protect natural resources and limit impacts on these resources from surface disturbing activities. Impacts would often be localized and would primarily include relocation and redesign of ROWs but could also affect land tenure adjustments.
IMPACTS ON LIVESTOCK GRAZING			
Current grazing levels (107,907 AUMs) would be maintained. Unallocated parcels (20,991 AUMs) would be available for livestock grazing. About 51 AUMs in any one year, or a total of 153 AUMs at any one time, could be temporarily lost to pipeline construction and other ROW developments.	Grazing would be increased to 157,308 AUMs. Unallocated parcels (20,991 AUMs) would be available for livestock grazing. Long-term vegetation disturbance would occur on 7,434 acres (870 AUMs) of the planning area.	Grazing would be reduced to about 84,000 AUMs. Unallocated parcels (20,991 AUMs) would not be available for livestock grazing.	Current grazing levels (107,907 AUMs) would be maintained. Unallocated parcels (20,991 AUMs) would be available for livestock grazing.
IMPACTS ON MINERALS			
Leasable Minerals			
This alternative would be the second least restrictive to oil and gas exploration and development activities. The 7,192 wells projected under this alternative would potentially extract 19,104 billion cubic feet (BCF) of natural gas and 157 million barrels of oil over the life of the plan. Approximately 172,500 acres would be unavailable for fluid mineral leasing, exploration, development, or production.	This alternative would be the least restrictive to oil and gas exploration and development activities. The 7,804 wells projected under this alternative would potentially extract 20,052 BCF of natural gas and 157 million barrels of oil over the life of the plan. Approximately 21,850 acres would be unavailable for fluid mineral leasing, exploration, development, or production.	This alternative would be the most restrictive to oil and gas exploration and development activities. The 5,209 wells projected under this alternative would potentially extract 16,730 BCF of natural gas and 130 million barrels of oil over the life of the plan. Approximately 723,200 acres would be unavailable for fluid mineral leasing, exploration, development, or production.	This alternative would be the second most restrictive to oil and gas exploration and development activities. The 7,136 wells projected under this alternative would potentially extract 19,168 BCF of natural gas and 150 million barrels of oil over the life of the plan. Approximately 441,100 acres would be unavailable for fluid mineral leasing, exploration, development, or production.

Summary Comparison of Impacts			
Alternative 1 (Continuation of Existing Management)	**Alternative 2**	**Alternative 3**	**Alternative 4 (Proposed RMP)**
Locatable Minerals			
Approximately 14,540 acres would be withdrawn from mineral entry. Approximately 8,860 acres would be designated as ACECs, which could encumber, but not prohibit, access to development.	Under Alternative 2, no areas would be withdrawn from mineral entry. Approximately 550 acres would be designated as an ACEC, which could encumber, but not prohibit access to development.	Approximately 65,750 acres would be withdrawn from mineral entry, the most restrictive of any alternative. Approximately 80,260 acres would be designated as ACECs, which could encumber, but not prohibit, access to development.	Approximately 13,770 acres would be withdrawn from mineral entry. Approximately 14,530 acres would be designated as ACECs, which could encumber, but not prohibit, access to development.
Salable Minerals			
Designation of 21,290 acres of VRM Class I and 73,430 acres of Class II could decrease salable mineral production.	Acres classified as VRM Class I and Class II would be reduced under this alternative (to 87,150 total acres), which could increase salable mineral production compared with Alternative 1. Fewer restrictions on oil and gas development would likely result in a higher demand for mineral materials.	Alternative 3 would be the most restrictive for development. Approximately 21,290 acres would be classified as VRM Class I and 393,260 acres as Class II.	Alternative 4 would generally be more restrictive than Alternatives 1 and 2, and less restrictive than Alternative 3. Approximately 21,290 acres would be classified as VRM Class I and 256,320 acres would be Class II.
IMPACTS ON PALEONTOLOGY AND NATURAL HISTORY			
Disturbance of more than 43,000 acres through oil and gas activities and unlimited OHV use in the Desert General Use area would cause potential damage to undiscovered or undocumented sites.	An increase in the disturbed area for oil and gas activities would result in greater impacts than under Alternative 1. Restriction of the Desert General Use Area to existing roads and trails would somewhat reduce impacts from direct physical damage and unauthorized collecting.	A decrease in the disturbed area for oil and gas and other activities would result in fewer impacts on sites. Impacts of OHV use would also be reduced. This alternative would provide the most protection for paleontological sites.	This alternative would provide more protection for paleontological sites than Alternative 1, but less than Alternative 3. The area disturbed for oil and gas development and the restrictions on OHV use would fall between Alternatives 1 and 3.
IMPACTS ON RECREATION AND VISITOR SERVICES			
Indirect long-term major adverse impacts on recreation activities and opportunities would likely occur because of increased loss of wildlife habitat and other recreation resources. Impacts on wildlife, and the recreation setting would create a long-term reduction in recreation benefits. This	Impacts would be similar to Alternative 1 except adverse impacts would be greatest across the planning area.	Impacts would be similar to Alternative 1 except adverse impacts would be considerably less across the planning area, and important recreational settings would be protected.	Impacts would be similar to Alternative 1 except adverse impacts would be less across the management area, and important recreation settings would generally be protected. SRMAs would be managed to produce long-term significant public benefits.

Summary Comparison of Impacts			
Alternative 1 (Continuation of Existing Management)	**Alternative 2**	**Alternative 3**	**Alternative 4 (Proposed RMP)**
impact would be most evident within the Extensive Recreation Management Area (ERMA).			
IMPACTS ON SOCIOECONOMICS			
Economic Impacts			
Continued management actions within the planning area would be expected to perpetuate trends that are already occurring within the economic study area. This includes support of jobs and income in the regional economy associated with oil and gas development, grazing, and recreation. The economic impacts in terms of average annual employment were estimated for oil and gas development (10,250 jobs), grazing (77 jobs), and recreation (87 jobs). Similarly, the average annual earnings per job, in 2005 dollars, were estimated for oil and gas development ($54,616), grazing ($33,395), and recreation ($14,233). Total mineral tax revenues from ad valorem tax, severance tax, and federal royalties in the economic study area over the 20-year study period were estimated at more than $11.730 billion in 2005 dollars.	Oil and gas development and grazing are expected to be greatest under Alternative 2, generating additional oil and gas development- and grazing-related jobs. Such increases would be 721 and 35 jobs, respectively. There would be a loss of six jobs supporting recreation activities compared with Alternative 1. There would be an increase in revenue from mineral taxes of $464.7 million compared with Alternative 1. The average annual earnings per job are assumed to be the same.	Alternative 3 would allow the least amount of oil and gas development and grazing, generating less oil and gas development- and grazing-related jobs. Such decreases would be 2,282 and 17 jobs, respectively. There would be an increase of 11 jobs supporting recreation activities compared with Alternative 1. Also, there would be $2.3 billion less revenue received from mineral taxes compared with Alternative 1. The average annual earnings per job are assumed to be the same.	The pace of oil and gas development and expected grazing activity would be similar to Alternative 1. Under Alternative 4, 65 fewer oil and gas-related jobs would be generated, while grazing employment would remain the same as Alternative 1. In addition, there would be four more jobs supporting recreation activities compared with Alternative 1. There would be a slight increase of $27.6 million from mineral taxes compared with Alternative 1. The average annual earnings per job are assumed to be the same.
Social Impacts			
Increased oil and gas development would be expected to continue to contribute to social impacts on housing, crime, education, emergency response, and some community services in various ways throughout the study area. For example, oil and gas development would contribute to housing shortages and increased crime rates, traffic, and demand for community services.	With the greatest amount of oil and gas development expected under this alternative, it is likely that the need for emergency response and community services would be greatest under this alternative. Increased development is expected to exacerbate existing trends in some areas of the economic study	With the least amount of oil and gas development expected under this alternative, it is likely that the need for housing, education, emergency response, and community services would increase at a slower rate compared with Alternative 1. Decreases in future mineral taxes from oil and gas production could	Continued development of oil and gas resources would be expected to contribute to social impacts associated with housing, crime, education, emergency response, and community services, similar to Alternative 1. For example, oil and gas development would contribute to housing shortages and increased crime rates, traffic, and demand for

Summary Comparison of Impacts			
Alternative 1 (Continuation of Existing Management)	**Alternative 2**	**Alternative 3**	**Alternative 4 (Proposed RMP)**
Existing conflicts between conservation-minded individuals and groups and the pro-development community would be expected to continue. Environmental justice impacts would not be expected.	area, including housing shortages and increased crime rates, traffic, and demands on community services compared with Alternative 1. It is expected that there would be a decline in the quality of life for some conservation-oriented lifestyles. Environmental justice impacts would not be expected.	have an impact on government services. Existing conflicts between conservation-minded individuals and groups and the pro-development community would be expected to continue, although to a lesser degree. Environmental justice impacts would not be expected.	community services. Existing conflicts between conservation-minded individuals and groups and the pro-development community would be expected to continue. Environmental justice impacts would not be expected.
IMPACTS ON SOILS			
Soil resources would be impacted by management actions that remove vegetation and expose the surface to accelerated wind and water erosion. Management of other resources and resource uses such as cultural resources, forest and woodlands, livestock grazing, and recreation would have a minimal impact on erosion. Surface disturbing activities associated with minerals activities would expose soils to wind and water erosion in the short term and long term. The initial disturbance of 21,599 acres for well pad development would result in 132,402 tons per year of soil erosion in the short term. Once these sites are stabilized, erosion rates would drop to 64,212 tons per year. Allowing open to unrestricted OHV use on 247,250 acres could result in accelerated erosion. In the unlikely event that the entire 247,250 acres were used as an OHV open area, erosion rates could be up to 101,373 tons per year. The widespread nature of this impact could significantly impact soil resources.	Management of other resources and resource uses such as cultural resources, forest and woodlands, livestock grazing, and recreation would have a minimal impact on erosion. Surface disturbing activities associated with minerals activities would expose soils to wind and water erosion in the short term and long term. Maximizing mineral development, primarily oil and gas activity, would increase associated annual erosion rates approximately 10% compared with Alternative 1. The initial disturbance of 23,872 acres for well pad development would result in 146,335 tons per year of soil erosion in the short term. Once these sites are stabilized, erosion rates would be reduced to 68,993 tons per year. The designation of 10,460 acres for two OHV open areas would result in the erosion of 4,289 tons per year of soil, resulting in a 95% decrease in the potential erosion	The increased emphasis on protection of natural resources would minimize erosion from surface disturbing activities. Management of other resources and resource uses such as cultural resources, forest and woodlands, livestock grazing, and recreation would have a minimal impact on erosion. The level of mineral development, primarily oil and gas activity, would decrease associated annual erosion rates by 26% compared with Alternative 1. The initial disturbance of 15,923 acres for well pad development would result in 97,608 tons per year of soil erosion in the short term. Once these sites are stabilized, erosion rates would be reduced to 49,193 tons per year. Not allowing OHV open areas would reduce or eliminate erosion caused by OHV activity. In the long term, these areas would revegetate, and erosion rates would approach more natural	Management of other resources and resource uses such as cultural resources, forest and woodlands, livestock grazing, and recreation would have a minimal impact on erosion. Emphasizing appropriate environmental protection would allow for development while protecting natural resources, including soil resources, from surface disturbing activities. The level of mineral development, primarily oil and gas activity, would slightly decrease associated annual erosion rates by 1% compared with Alternative 1. The initial disturbance of 21,853 acres for well pad development would result in 133,959 tons per year of soil erosion in the short term. Once these sites are stabilized, erosion rates would be reduced to 63,997 tons per year. Not allowing OHV open areas would reduce or eliminate erosion caused by OHV activity. In the long term, these areas would revegetate, and erosion rates would approach more natural

Summary Comparison of Impacts			
Alternative 1 (Continuation of Existing Management)	**Alternative 2**	**Alternative 3**	**Alternative 4 (Proposed RMP)**
	rate for Alternative 1.	levels.	levels.
IMPACTS ON TRANSPORTATION, ACCESS, AND TRAVEL MANAGEMENT			
Impacts on Transportation and Access			
Management of VRM, fish and wildlife, Special Status Species, and ACECs would affect the design and location of transportation systems. These management actions could result in rerouting transportation systems.	Management of cultural resources, VRM, fish and wildlife, and SD/MAs would be more restrictive on the transportation program compared with Alternative 1. Management actions for these resource programs would further restrict the design and location of transportation systems.	Management of cultural resources, VRM, fish and wildlife, and SD/MAs would be more restrictive on the transportation program compared with Alternatives 1 and 2. Management for these resource programs would further restrict the design and location of transportation systems.	Management of cultural resources, VRM, fish and wildlife, and SD/MAs would be more restrictive on the transportation program compared with Alternatives 1 and 2, but less restrictive than Alternative 3. Management actions for these resource programs would restrict the design and location of transportation systems.
Impacts on Off-Highway Vehicle Management			
This alternative would be the least restrictive to OHV use. Approximately 247,250 acres of the planning area would be open to OHV use. Approximately 13,620 acres would be closed to OHV use.	The vast majority of the planning area would be limited to existing roads and trails (874,870 acres). Open areas would be reduced to include 20,640 acres, and closed areas would be reduced to include 8,400 acres.	This alternative would eliminate all open areas and increase closed areas to 30,350 acres. Management actions under this alternative would be the most restrictive to OHV use.	This alternative would eliminate all open areas and increase closed areas to 26,320 acres.
IMPACTS ON VEGETATION			
Impacts would result from mineral development and the associated roads, pipelines, and facilities throughout the planning area. Removal of sagebrush would increase habitat loss and fragmentation of native plant communities.	Under Alternative 2, there would be an increased loss of native sagebrush habitat compared with Alternative 1. Increased surface disturbance from more oil and gas drilling and its associated infrastructure would cause some long-term localized impacts.	Impacts on native vegetation from Alternative 3 would be less than under Alternative 1. Native plant communities would have the greatest protection from surface disturbance, and sagebrush habitats would recover and increase in cover, density, and function compared with the other alternatives.	Impacts from surface disturbance would be less than under Alternatives 1 and 2. Surface disturbance would be more than under Alternative 3, but with protection of sensitive areas, utilization of BMPs, and vegetation management, the impacts would be minimized.

Summary Comparison of Impacts			
Alternative 1 (Continuation of Existing Management)	**Alternative 2**	**Alternative 3**	**Alternative 4 (Proposed RMP)**
IMPACTS ON VISUAL RESOURCES			
Nearly 90% of the planning area would be in VRM Classes III and IV, allowing visual impacts that would change the character of the landscape and be readily apparent or dominate the view of the casual observer.	Approximately 91% of the planning area would be in VRM Classes III and IV, with a larger proportion in Class IV compared with Alternative 1. There would be no VRM Class I areas.	Approximately 58% of the planning area would be in VRM Classes III and IV, 40% in Class II, and 2% in VRM Class I.	Approximately 72% of the planning area would be in VRM Classes III and IV, 26% in Class II, and 2% in VRM Class I.
IMPACTS ON WATERSHED AND WATER QUALITY			
This alternative has the second highest potential for impacts on watershed health and water quality. Development of 7,192 federal oil and gas wells would create 43,000 acres of initial surface disturbance, which would impact water resources by increasing soil erosion, surface runoff, stream flows, and sediment, salt, and nutrient loads to nearby channels. Allowing cross-country OHV use and not designating roads and trails for OHV use would increase the potential for unregulated OHV travel. The disturbance caused by this activity could affect landscape features that, in turn, could affect watershed quality. Surface discharge of produced water would augment flows and could accelerate erosion in stream channels. This could increase salinity and sedimentation.	This alternative would result in the greatest impacts on water resources from mineral development. The amount of surface disturbance (46,749 acres) and the number of wells that would be drilled (7,804) would be greater than other alternatives. Roads and trails would be designated, and OHV open areas would be redefined to more discrete areas, resulting in fewer disturbances from OHV use than under Alternative 1. Increased disturbance to water bodies and riparian areas from grazing activities would occur. Surface discharge of produced waters would be more restrictive than under Alternative 1. This would reduce impacts such as salinity and sedimentation.	This alternative would result in the lowest level of impacts on water resources. The amount of surface disturbance (31,139 acres) and the number of wells that would be drilled (5,209) would be less than the other alternatives. Cross-country OHV use would be prohibited, and roads and trails would be designated for OHV use, which would reduce the effects to water resources. Decreased disturbance to water bodies and riparian areas from grazing activities would occur. Surface discharge of produced waters would not be allowed.	Oil and gas development (7,136 wells) would result in less surface disturbance (42,180 acres) compared with Alternatives 1 and 2. Less surface disturbance would result in fewer impacts on water resources. Cross-country OHV use would be prohibited and roads and trails would be designated for OHV use, which would reduce the effects to water resources. Decreased disturbance to water bodies and riparian areas from grazing activities would occur. Surface discharge of produced waters would not be allowed. Produced water would meet WDEQ standards for discharge and follow BLM BMPs (Appendix 3). The limited use of produced water could improve reclamation success
IMPACTS ON WILDLAND FIRE AND FUELS			
Management actions designed to reduce the amount of vegetative fuel within the planning area would aid in fire suppression efforts. However, continued fire suppression in most areas would increase the amount of fuel within the planning area, having a significant impact on the ability to	Managing fire for the appropriate response and using wildland fire for resource benefit would have a greater impact on fire management compared with Alternative 1, which focuses on suppression. Additional management actions	In addition to the impacts that would occur under Alternative 2, reinstating fire to its natural role in the ecosystem would have a greater impact on the fire program by limiting suppression activities and increasing the use of fire throughout the planning area. The	In addition to the impacts that would occur under Alternative 3, additional restrictions on the use of surface explosives would reduce the risk of wildfire in specific areas. This alternative would have the greatest impact on fire and fuels as compared to the other alternatives.

Summary Comparison of Impacts			
Alternative 1 (Continuation of Existing Management)	**Alternative 2**	**Alternative 3**	**Alternative 4 (Proposed RMP)**
suppress and manage wildland fires. This alternative would have the least impact to the fire program.	for fuels management under this alternative would also increase impacts on the fire program by reducing the amount of fine fuels through prescribed fire and other methods.	establishment of reserve common allotments, which would not be included in Alternatives 1 and 2, would facilitate prescribed burns in areas that would otherwise be difficult to conduct.	
IMPACTS ON WILDLIFE AND FISH HABITAT			
Impacts would result from mineral development throughout the planning area, particularly from the removal of wildlife sensitive habitats. Estimated initial surface disturbance for Alternative 1 is 43,022 acres. Minerals development would continue to impact wildlife and fish through loss, alteration, and fragmentation of habitats and displacement of wildlife. An increased number or roads, pipelines, and infrastructure for surface water disposal would increase habitat loss, fragmentation, and changes in surface hydrology. Vegetation treatments would not be adequate to achieve wildlife habitat goals and could be detrimental in some cases. The combined impacts from these actions would lead to significant impacts in localized areas. Additional impacts could result from livestock management, OHV activities, vegetation management, road crossings, impoundments, and instream structures.	Under Alternative 2, more surface disturbance is estimated to occur. The estimated initial surface disturbance is 46,739 acres. Impacts would result from yearlong drilling in the Intensively Developed Fields. Minerals development would continue to impact wildlife and fish through loss, alteration, and fragmentation of habitats and displacement of wildlife. An increased number of roads, pipelines, and infrastructure for surface water disposal would increase habitat loss, fragmentation, and changes in surface hydrology. The combined impacts from these actions would lead to significant impacts in localized areas and would be more likely under this alternative. Additional impacts would result from livestock management, OHV activities, SD/MA, vegetation management, road crossings, impoundments, and instream structures.	Alternative 3 provides the greatest detail and protection mechanisms of all the alternatives by incorporating the most up-to-date research conducted within the planning area. If these strategies were thoughtfully planned and implemented, they could provide the greatest success in maintaining and improving habitat quality and function, as well as species diversity within the planning area. The estimated initial surface disturbance is 31,139 acres.	Mitigation measures and BMPs designed to reduce surface disturbing and other disruptive activities in sensitive habitats during critical times of the year would be used to minimize impacts. The estimated initial surface disturbance is 42,180 acres. Vegetation management in wetland/riparian areas to meet DPC would result in significant, long-term benefits to wildlife. Additional impacts would result from livestock management, minerals management, and OHV activities, and increased numbers of SD/MAs would benefit wildlife. In addition, fire and fuels management would displace wildlife but could improve forest health to maintain diversity.

Summary Comparison of Impacts			
Alternative 1 (Continuation of Existing Management)	**Alternative 2**	**Alternative 3**	**Alternative 4 (Proposed RMP)**
IMPACTS ON SPECIAL DESIGNATIONS AND MANAGEMENT AREAS			
Rock Creek			
Managing the ACEC as a ROW avoidance area, deferring mineral leasing, and implementing seasonal road closures would ensure long-term reductions in sediment loading and enhancement of ACEC values.	Elimination of the Rock Creek ACEC designation would lead to OHV impacts on roads, particularly in the Rock Creek drainage, potentially leading to reduction of the CRCT population.	Closure of the ACEC to ROWs, livestock grazing, mineral location and leasing, geophysical exploration, and OHV use would provide the greatest level of protection of ACEC values among the alternatives.	Impacts would be slightly reduced from Alternative 1 because the watershed area would be closed to mineral leasing and location and geophysical exploration.
Beaver Creek			
Impacts of oil and gas development would be controlled through use of management prescriptions on surface disturbing activities, use of explosives, water diversions, and locatable mineral withdrawal.	Elimination of the Beaver Creek ACEC designation would lead to increases in road construction, human presence and disturbance during elk parturition, and increased sedimentation in Beaver Creek and possible reduction in CRCT populations.	Expansion of the Beaver Creek ACEC to approximately 10,160 acres and an increase in restrictions on surface disturbing and disruptive activities would lead to reductions in human presence, disturbance, and habitat fragmentation over a larger area. This alternative would provide the greatest level of protection to ACEC values.	Impacts would be substantially similar to Alternative 1.
Trapper's Point			
Mineral development in the area would lead to degradation or elimination of the big game migration through this bottleneck area. Impacts on sensitive Native American sites would also increase. This alternative would provide no substantial protection of the Trapper's Point area.	ACEC designation (550 acres) and closing of the area to mineral leasing would protect the viability of the big game migration bottleneck and provide protection for cultural sites.	ACEC designation (9,540 acres) would protect staging and feeding areas for big game as they approach the bottleneck and provide increased protection for cultural sites. This alternative would provide the greatest amount of protection for the Trapper's Point area.	ACEC designation (4,160 acres) would protect staging and feeding areas for big game as they approach the bottleneck and provide protection for cultural sites.
Impacts would occur from the loss of forage for wildlife and livestock, disruption of the Green River Drift stock driveway, vegetation loss, and soil erosion.	Not allowing the construction of new fences and other surface disturbing activities and limiting OHV use to designated roads and trails would protect the viability of the big game migration bottleneck.	Same as Alternative 2.	Same as Alternative 2.

Summary Comparison of Impacts			
Alternative 1 (Continuation of Existing Management)	**Alternative 2**	**Alternative 3**	**Alternative 4 (Proposed RMP)**
New Fork Potholes			
Mineral development and geophysical operations would potentially result in accelerated erosion and sedimentation into the potholes and cause a loss of wildlife habitat.	Impacts would be similar to Alternative 1. Making the area available for leasing with a CSU stipulation could reduce impacts on surface resource values.	Establishing the New Fork Potholes ACEC would provide the greatest protection for the sensitive resources in the area. Restrictions on development would provide protection to pristine pothole habitat, scenic values, vegetation health, and the hydrologic regime of the potholes. Limiting OHV use to designated roads and trails and implementing seasonal OHV restrictions would decrease impacts on vegetation and erosion, and decrease stress to wildlife.	Same as Alternative 3.
Upper Green River			
The Upper Green River SRMA (5,160 acres) would be designated. Allowing mineral leasing with CSU stipulations would impact the visual and recreational values in the SRMA if development of mineral leases occurred.	Same as Alternative 1.	Designation of the Upper Green River ACEC (12,270 acres) would provide the greatest protection to the area. Closure to oil and gas leasing and withdrawal from mineral location would reduce human presence and disturbance of wildlife, including during sensitive migration periods.	The Upper Green River SRMA would be enlarged to 7,180 acres. Most impacts would be similar to Alternative 3. The area would be available for mineral location, although the potential for a mineral discovery is small.
The anticipated increase in recreational use of the SRMA would benefit from upgrading facilities. However, recreational and visual qualities in the SRMA would be impacted from increased OHV use.	Same as Alternative 1.	A slight reduction would occur in motorized recreation opportunities from limiting OHV use to designated roads and trails.	Same as Alternative 3.
White-Tailed Prairie Dog			
Impacts on prairie dogs would occur from habitat loss, degradation, displacement, and mortality from linear features and facilities.	Impacts from these causes would increase as a result of increased mineral development, particularly gas field development.	Impacts would be reduced because the ACEC would be closed to locatable mineral entry, sale, and mineral material disposals. Furthermore, land tenure adjustments would be	The area would not be designated as an ACEC. However, impacts would be reduced from Alternative 1 because of acquisition of habitats from willing partners and restrictions on surface disturbing activities within prairie dog

Summary Comparison of Impacts			
Alternative 1 (Continuation of Existing Management)	**Alternative 2**	**Alternative 3**	**Alternative 4 (Proposed RMP)**
		pursued to meet ACEC objectives. This alternative would provide the greatest level of protection for WTPD habitats.	towns. This alternative would be adequate to protect prairie dog habitats.
Permitted above-ground facilities near prairie dogs complexes could contribute to increased predation by raptors by creating artificial raptor nesting sites.	Impact magnitude from these facilities would increase because increased numbers of above-ground facilities would increase predation on prairie dogs.	Impact magnitude would decrease because of decreased above-ground facilities, prohibitions on surface disturbance in prairie dog towns, and requirements for raptor-inhibiting devices on above-ground facilities within one-quarter mile of prairie dog towns.	Impact magnitude would decrease because of restrictions on surface disturbing activities within prairie dog towns and requirements for raptor-inhibiting devices on above-ground facilities within one-quarter mile of prairie dog towns.
OHV use and recreational shooting of prairie dogs, particularly in the Desert OHV open area, would impact prairie dogs and their habitat.	Impacts from OHV would decrease as a result of limiting OHVs to existing roads and trails, which could also reduce the level of recreational shooting of prairie dogs.	Limiting OHV use to designated roads and trails in sensitive prairie dog habitats would reduce impacts. This limitation could also reduce recreational shooting of prairie dogs.	Impacts from OHV use (and associated recreational shooting) would be slightly higher than those described in Alternative 3 because the area would not be a high priority for travel planning and road designations.
Miller Mountain			
Commercial timber harvest, mineral location and development, OHV activity, and allowing increases in road density and surface disturbance would potentially increase soil erosion and degrade wildlife habitat, opportunity for open space, and the visual qualities of the area.	Same as Alternative 1.	Establishing the Miller Mountain Management Area and prohibiting commercial timber harvest, closing the area to the operation of public land laws, limiting OHV use to designated roads and trails, and limiting surface disturbance would provide the greatest level of protection to open space and natural landscape values and crucial winter ranges.	Similar to Alternative 3. Impacts would be somewhat higher because timber harvest, oil and gas leasing, and locatable mineral development could occur.

Summary Comparison of Impacts			
Alternative 1 (Continuation of Existing Management)	**Alternative 2**	**Alternative 3**	**Alternative 4 (Proposed RMP)**
Ross Butte			
Mineral development and geophysical operations would potentially result in accelerated erosion and loss of sensitive plant species habitat.	Same as Alternative 1.	Establishing the Ross Butte ACEC and closing the area to the operation of public land laws, implementing NSO and CSU stipulations, limiting surface disturbance, and limiting OHV use to designated roads and trails would help protect the area from erosion and adverse impacts on sensitive plant species.	Establishing the Ross Butte Management Area would result in impacts generally similar to Alternative 3.
CCC Ponds			
Surface disturbing activities would impact recreation resources by increasing disturbance and visual intrusions. Requiring CSU stipulations within one-quarter mile of the CCC Ponds and prohibiting motorized vehicle use on the Pinedale Pathway would help reduce impacts.	Designation of the area as a SRMA and implementing NSO stipulations throughout the SRMA would protect recreation resources. Impacts related to OHV use on existing roads and trails and allowing motorized vehicle use on the Pinedale Pathway would still occur from increased user conflicts and associated resource damage.	Designation of the CCC Ponds ACEC, closing the area to oil and gas development, and expansion of the area would reduce impacts on recreation resources. Prohibiting over-the-snow vehicles in certain areas would further reduce impacts on recreation resources in the area.	The CCC Ponds SRMA under this alternative would provide the greatest protection to recreation resources in the area by limiting all OHV use to designated roads and trails, closing the area to oil and gas development, and allowing existing leases to expire.
Oil and gas development in the area would degrade mule deer migration routes, which would impact associated recreation opportunities in the area.	NSO restrictions on oil and gas development would protect the integrity of the mule deer migration route, thus reducing impacts on associated recreation opportunities.	Closure of the area to oil and gas leasing and development would provide the greatest protection for the mule deer migration route, thus preserving associated recreational opportunities.	Same as Alternative 3.

Summary Comparison of Impacts			
Alternative 1 (Continuation of Existing Management)	**Alternative 2**	**Alternative 3**	**Alternative 4 (Proposed RMP)**
Wind River Front			
A large portion of the area would be unavailable for oil and gas leasing, preventing fragmentation of wildlife transitional ranges and impacts on the recreational experience and scenic quality of the area. Allowing commercial timber harvest would impact the area by increasing soil erosion, reducing opportunity for open space and degrading wildlife habitat and the visual qualities of the area.	There would be no special protections for the Wind River Front area. Impacts on wildlife habitats, scenic quality, and recreation opportunities could occur.	This alternative would provide the greatest protection for important resource values of the area by establishing a larger Wind River Front Management Area and closing the area to mineral leasing, geophysical operations, timber harvesting, and commercial mineral entry.	Impacts would be slightly more than Alternative 2 and similar to Alternative 1.
WSAs			
The continued use of existing roads and trails in the Lake Mountain WSA would impact the area's suitability as a WSA.	Limiting OHV use to designated roads and trails in the Lake Mountain WSA would reduce impacts compared with Alternative 1; however, the area would continue to be impacted by the use of motorized vehicles.	Closing the WSAs to OHV use would maintain the overall wilderness suitability of the WSAs.	Same as Alternative 3.
East Fork River WSR Unit			
Existing mineral leases would allow surface disturbing activities, which would impact the outstanding remarkable characteristics of the area.	Same as Alternative 1.	Prohibiting water impoundments, closing the area to new mineral leasing and related exploration, and implementing mineral leasing stipulations would reduce impacts. This would preserve the outstandingly remarkable values.	Same as Alternative 3.
Green River WSR Unit			
Existing mineral leases would allow for surface disturbing activities, which would impact the outstanding remarkable characteristics of the area.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1, except prohibiting the development of new range improvements and water impoundments, and implementing mineral leasing stipulations would reduce impacts. This would preserve the outstanding remarkable characteristics of the area.	Same as Alternative 3.

Summary Comparison of Impacts			
Alternative 1 (Continuation of Existing Management)	**Alternative 2**	**Alternative 3**	**Alternative 4 (Proposed RMP)**
Scab Creek WSR Unit			
Management actions designed to protect the Scab Creek WSA would preserve the outstandingly remarkable characteristics of the WSR values of the area. However, the area would not be included in the WSR System.	Same as Alternative 1	Same as Alternative 1, except the area would be managed as suitable for inclusion in the WSR System. In addition, prohibiting the construction of new range improvements and maintaining the closure to oil and gas leasing would further preserve the outstandingly remarkable characteristics of the area.	Same as Alternative 3.
Silver Creek WSR Unit			
Management actions designed to protect the Scab Creek WSA would preserve the outstandingly remarkable characteristics of the WSR values of the area. However, the area would not be included in the WSR System.	Same as Alternative 1	Same as Alternative 1, except the area would be managed as suitable for inclusion in the WSR System. In addition, prohibiting the construction of new range improvements and maintaining the closure to oil and gas leasing would further preserve the outstandingly remarkable characteristics of the area.	Same as Alternative 3.