DECISION RECORD
AND
FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

FOR ADOPTION OF

STANDARDS

FOR PUBLIC LAND HEALTH

AND

GUIDELINES

FOR LIVESTOCK GRAZING MANAGEMENT

IN

COLORADO

JANUARY 1997

DECISION

It is my decision to adopt the attached standards for public land health and guidelines for livestock grazing management (standards and guidelines), dated November 1996. They are similar to those described in the Standards and Guidelines Environmental Assessment (EA), dated June 28, 1996, but with some minor changes resulting from public comments.

This decision amends the Colorado Resource Management Plans (RMPs). These standards and guidelines supplement (i.e. add to) the existing decisions in each RMP. Some of the decisions in certain RMPs will be modified or replaced as shown in the individual RMP attachments to this Decision Record. The RMPs amended are:

Glenwood Springs
Grand Junction
Gunnison
Kremmling
Little Snake
Northeast
Royal Gorge
San Juan/San Miguel
San Luis
Uncompahgre Basin
White River (Proposed)

This decision will be effective on February 12, 1997 following resolution of any protests, completion of the Governor's consistency review, and approval by the Secretary of the Interior.

ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED

In addition to the proposed action, adoption of the fallback standards and guidelines as described in 43 CFR 4180.2 was considered. By regulation, this alternative will be in effect after February 12, 1997 if the proposed action is not approved prior to that date. If this occurs, the Fallback standards and guidelines will continue in effect until the Colorado standards and guidelines are approved. This alternative was not selected because there was strong support from virtually all public land users to develop standards and guidelines for Colorado.

The alternative of continuing present management was considered. This alternative, although not legally implementable, served as a baseline for describing and comparing implementation processes and impacts with other alternatives.

RATIONALE

These standards and guidelines were developed in partnership with the three Colorado Resource Advisory Councils, utilizing input received during numerous public workshops and meetings, consultations with academicians, and from public comments on the EA.. Correctly applied, they will assure public land health. I am hopeful that the open, collaborative implementation process will help in building mutual trust and respect with and between public land users. Similarly, the common terminology used in assessing rangeland health, should reduce misunderstandings. The focus on sustaining natural systems using a landscape perspective further encourages a collaborative approach using the best information and methods available.

FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

Based on the analysis of anticipated impacts described in the Standards and Guidelines EA, I have determined that no significant impacts will occur and an environmental impact statement is not required. Beneficial resource impacts will occur, including improved soil productivity, riparian function, water quality, plant density and diversity, and wildlife habitat. In a few isolated circumstances some grazing permittees and other public land users may be adversely impacted in the short term by increased costs, and/or reductions in authorized or allowable use. In the long term, grazing permittees should realize a gain, as more predictable, desirable forage is produced. Other public land users and local communities should benefit as well from the use and enjoyment of improved resource conditions on the public lands.

Recommended by:

Colorado BLM Area Managers (signatures on RMP attachments to this record)

Colorado BLM District Managers:

Mark T. Morse — 11-1-96
Mark Morse, District Manager — Date
Craig and Grand Junction Districts

Mark Stiles — 11-8-96
Mark Stiles, District Manager — Date
Montrose District

Donnie R. Sparks — 11-7-96
Donnie Sparks, District Manager — Date
Canon City District

Approved by:

Robert V. Abbey — 11-8-96
Robert V. Abbey, Acting State Director — Date
Colorado

Approved for Implementation by:

Bruce Babbitt, Secretary of the Interior — Date

STANDARDS
FOR PUBLIC LAND HEALTH

AND

GUIDELINES
FOR LIVESTOCK GRAZING MANAGEMENT

IN COLORADO
November 1996

PREAMBLE

Humans use and derive benefits from public lands administered by BLM in Colorado in many ways: to earn a livelihood, to recreate, for education, for science, and to enjoy and appreciate open spaces and irreplaceable cultural heritage resources. Healthy public lands and the uses of those lands contribute to the health and economic well-being of Colorado communities. In turn, healthy human communities create healthy public lands by conserving, protecting, and properly utilizing public land resources and by effectively resolving conservation issues. Healthy public lands and healthy human communities are interrelated; therefore, social, economic, and environmental considerations must be properly balanced.

The interdependent relationship between human communities and their public land brings together people of diverse backgrounds and interests. Open, honest, and sincere interactions, in a spirit of trust and respect, are essential to achieving and maintaining healthy public lands. While all individuals have a voice in public land management goals, the responsibility to maintain healthy public lands ultimately falls with the users of those lands.

To help determine what constitutes healthy public lands, Standards for Public Land Health, by which the health of the land is measured, need to be established. This document defines such standards for BLM lands in Colorado. It also identifies Guidelines for Livestock Grazing Management, which are some of the tools that help achieve the standards.

INTERPRETATION

Standards and guidelines can be an effective communication tool, providing a common understanding of expected resource conditions and acceptable management practices. Although the standards are the measures by which health of the land will be assessed, the results of these assessments are not well-suited for direct reporting of accomplishments. Any reporting of progress associated with application of these standards will need to consider and address the following factors:

- Standards and guidelines for each state will be different.
- To be meaningful, public land health assessment must be determined based upon all standards and not solely upon each individual standard.
- It will be many years before a full assessment of public land health is completed. Initially, statistics concerning public land health may be skewed due to the priority setting process which directs management attention to lands where problems exist.

Standards describe conditions needed to sustain public land health, and relate to all uses of the public lands. The standards are written in a two-part format. The standard is first described in a statement. Then indicators which relate to the standard are identified. The indicators help define the standard and describe features which are observable on the land. Additional indicators may also be applicable to some sites, and some indicators may not apply to every specific site. While a site should match the indicators it is not necessary for each site to perfectly match all the indicators to comply with the standard.

The appropriate use of resources will be determined by the authorized officer on a case by case basis, in consultation, coordination and cooperation with local cooperators and the interested public and in accordance with law and regulation.

Standards are observed on a landscape scale. It is not possible for each acre to achieve every standard. For example, a mosaic of vegetation types and age classes may produce the diversity associated with a healthy landscape; however, some individual vegetation communities within the mosaic may lack diversity.

Standards always relate to the potential of the landscape . Climate, landform, geologic, and biologic characteristics are factors that affect potential. Each landscape has a specific ability to provide values important to humans such as timber, livestock forage, water, wildlife, and minerals. Therefore, the potential of a site can also be altered through a wide variety of human socio-economic factors. When this occurs, a new potential exists. The authorized officer, through the consultation process, will evaluate the site based on its new potential . Comparative analysis of nearby landscapes, (that appear to have similar climate, geology, landform, biologic and socio-economic characteristics), is considered the most reliable means to identify the potential landscape.

It is common for landscapes with nearly identical potential to differ, in their appearance, and in the values they provide. Variability results from both natural plant succession patterns, and human uses. While the climax plant community is significant as an indicator of potential , the climax community does not automatically provide the comparative basis for evaluating the standard. In many circumstances local goals will identify a different plant community which provides the most optimum values. When this occurs, the plant community identified in the local goal replaces the climax community as the foundation for evaluating the standard.

Often, existing information will be sufficient to determine public land health. It is not always necessary to collect measurable baseline data for each standard on each site to determine public land health. However, baseline data is important to establish so that changes can be observed and measured. The BLM's authorized officer will determine the amount and type of data each situation requires in consultation, coordination and cooperation with local cooperators and the interested public. In areas where the standards are not being achieved, current uses and management actions will be reviewed and modified if necessary to assure significant progress toward achieving a healthy ecosystem.

Guidelines are livestock grazing management tools, methods, strategies, and techniques (e.g., best management practices) designed to maintain or achieve healthy public lands as defined by the standards. Grazing by wildlife and wild horses, oil and gas activity, recreation, and logging can affect the health of the land. Guidelines for these and other uses may be developed as needed to conform with the new standards. Implementation of livestock grazing management guidelines must also be coordinated with other uses of the land; collectively, these uses should not detract from the goal of achieving healthy public lands.

STANDARDS FOR PUBLIC LAND HEALTH

STANDARD 1: *Upland soils* exhibit infiltration and permeability rates that are appropriate to soil type, climate, land form, and geologic processes. Adequate soil infiltration and permeability allows for the accumulation of soil moisture necessary for optimal plant growth and vigor, and minimizes surface runoff.

Indicators:

- Expression of rills and soil pedestals is minimal.
- Evidence of actively-eroding gullies (incised channels) is minimal.
- Canopy and ground cover are appropriate.
- There is litter accumulating in place and is not sorted by normal overland water flow.
- There is appropriate organic matter in soil.
- There is diversity of plant species with a variety of root depths.
- Upland swales have vegetation cover or density greater than that of adjacent uplands.
- There are vigorous, desirable plants.

STANDARD 2: *Riparian systems* associated with both running and standing water, function properly and have the ability to recover from major disturbance such as fire, severe grazing, or 100-year floods. Riparian vegetation captures sediment, and provides forage, habitat and bio-diversity. Water quality is improved or maintained. Stable soils store and release water slowly.

Indicators:

- Vegetation is dominated by an appropriate mix of native or desirable introduced species.
- Vigorous, desirable plants are present.
- There is vegetation with diverse age class structure, appropriate vertical structure, and adequate composition, cover, and density.
- Streambank vegetation is present and is comprised of species and communities that have root systems capable of withstanding high streamflow events.
- Plant species present indicate maintenance of riparian moisture characteristics.
- Stream is in balance with the water and sediment being supplied by the watershed (e.g., no headcutting, no excessive erosion or deposition).
- Vegetation and free water indicate high water tables.
- Vegetation colonizes point bars with a range of age classes and successional stages.
- An active floodplain is present.
- Residual floodplain vegetation is available to capture and retain sediment and dissipate flood energies.
- Stream channels have appropriate size and meander patterns for the streams' position in the landscape, and parent materials.
- Woody debris contributes to the character of the stream channel morphology.

STANDARD 3: Healthy, productive plant and animal communities of native and other desirable species are maintained at viable population levels commensurate with the species and habitat's potential. Plants and animals at both the community and population level are productive, resilient, diverse, vigorous, and able to reproduce and sustain natural fluctuations, and ecological processes.

Indicators:

- Noxious weeds and undesirable species are minimal in the overall plant community.
- Native plant and animal communities are spatially distributed across the landscape with a density, composition, and frequency of species suitable to ensure reproductive capability and sustainability.
- Plants and animals are present in mixed age classes sufficient to sustain recruitment and mortality fluctuations.
- Landscapes exhibit connectivity of habitat or presence of corridors to prevent habitat fragmentation.
- Photosynthetic activity is evident throughout the growing season.
- Diversity and density of plant and animal species are in balance with habitat/landscape potential and exhibit resilience to human activities.
- Appropriate plant litter accumulates and is evenly distributed across the landscape.
- Landscapes are composed of several plant communities that may be in a variety of successional stages and patterns.

STANDARD 4: Special status, threatened and endangered species (federal and state), and other plants and animals officially designated by the BLM, and their habitats are maintained or enhanced by sustaining healthy, native plant and animal communities.

Indicators:

- All the indicators associated with the plant and animal communities standard apply.
- There are stable and increasing populations of endemic and protected species in suitable habitat.
- Suitable habitat is available for recovery of endemic and protected species.

STANDARD 5: The water quality of all water bodies, including ground water where applicable, located on or influenced by BLM lands will achieve or exceed the Water Quality Standards established by the State of Colorado. Water Quality Standards for surface and ground waters include the designated beneficial uses, numeric criteria, narrative criteria, and antidegradation requirements set forth under State law as found in (5 CCR 1002-8), as required by Section 303(c) of the Clean Water Act.

Indicators:

- Appropriate populations of macroinvertabrates, vertebrates, and algae are present.
- Surface and ground waters only contain substances (e.g. sediment, scum, floating debris, odor, heavy metal precipitates on channel substrate) attributable to humans within the amounts, concentrations, or combinations as directed by the Water Quality Standards established by the State of Colorado (5 CCR 1002-8).

Standard 6:
Socioeconomic

COLORADO LIVESTOCK GRAZING MANAGEMENT GUIDELINES

1. Grazing management practices promote plant health by providing for one or more of the following:

- periodic rest or deferment from grazing during critical growth periods;
- adequate recovery and regrowth periods;
- opportunity for seed dissemination and seedling establishment.

2. Grazing management practices address the kind, numbers, and class of livestock, season, duration, distribution, frequency and intensity of grazing use and livestock health.

3. Grazing management practices maintain sufficient residual vegetation on both upland and riparian sites to protect the soil from wind and water erosion, to assist in maintaining appropriate soil infiltration and permeability, and to buffer temperature extremes. In riparian areas, vegetation dissipates energy, captures sediment, recharges ground water, and contributes to stream stability.

4. Native plant species and natural revegetation are emphasized in the support of sustaining ecological functions and site integrity. Where reseeding is required, on land treatment efforts, emphasis will be placed on using native plant species. Seeding of non-native plant species will be considered based on local goals, native seed availability and cost, persistence of non-native plants and annuals and noxious weeds on the site, and composition of non-natives in the seed mix.

5. Range improvement projects are designed consistent with overall ecological functions and processes with minimum adverse impacts to other resources or uses of riparian/wetland and upland sites.

6. Grazing management will occur in a manner that does not encourage the establishment or spread of noxious weeds. In addition to mechanical, chemical, and biological methods of weed control, livestock may be used where feasible as a tool to inhibit or stop the spread of noxious weeds.

7. Natural occurrences such as fire, drought, flooding, and prescribed land treatments should be combined with livestock management practices to move toward the sustainability of biological diversity across the landscape, including the maintenance, restoration, or enhancement of habitat to promote and assist the recovery and conservation of threatened, endangered, or other special status species, by helping to provide natural vegetation patterns, a mosaic of successional stages, and vegetation corridors, and thus minimizing habitat fragmentation.

8. Colorado Best Management Practices and other scientifically developed practices that enhance land and water quality should be used in the development of activity plans prepared for land use.

FLEXIBILITY

The standards are designed to maintain or achieve healthy public lands while allowing for the development of local goals and objectives. For example, on sites of similar potential a desired plant community designed to provide deer winter range would differ from one designed for cattle summer range, yet both could achieve the standards. Local goals and specific objectives consistent with standards will be developed by BLM in consultation, cooperation and coordination with local cooperators and the interested public.

Guidelines were designed to provide direction, yet offer flexibility for local implementation through grazing permits. Activity plans may add specificity to the guidelines based on local goals and objectives. A wide variety of grazing management strategies can produce healthy rangelands. One or more guidelines would be employed to achieve the standards.

IMPLEMENTATION

Recognizing that social and economic factors must be considered in achieving healthy public lands, the authorized officer will coordinate, consult and cooperate with the local cooperators and interested publics during all phases of implementing standards and guidelines, whether it be for an allotment, group of allotments, or watershed. BLM will strive to make use of collaborative approaches involving the various interested publics within an affected allotment, group of allotments, or watershed. The Resource Advisory Council (RAC) may be requested by any party to assist in reaching agreement in resolving disputes. As greater understanding of ecosystems, including socio-economic factors, becomes available, it will be applied to our management of public lands.

The section below describes the general process for applying the Colorado standards and guidelines in the field. If mutual agreement on a course of action is reached at any point during this process, such agreement may eliminate the need for some of the process steps described.

It is unreasonable to assume that standards and guidelines will be applied to all public lands immediately upon adoption. Therefore, it is imperative that a logical system for prioritizing work be adopted. Following are some criteria that the authorized officer uses to prioritize areas such as allotments, watersheds, or other landscapes:

- Are there situations where legal requirements must be met?
- Is there information to indicate resources at risk, or that the severity of resource damage demands immediate attention? (monitoring results, allotment categorization, professional judgement, results of ESI or other inventory data, etc.)
- Is use conflict present?
- Is there public concern or interest for possible resources at risk?
- What is scheduled for completion according to the RMP implementation schedule?
- Where can efficiencies with limited resources be realized?
- Where are the best opportunities to effect positive change toward public land health?
- Are there permits or other resource use authorizations that need to be acted upon (e.g.grazing, right-of-ways, timber sales, etc.)?

The following steps describe a typical sequence for assessing public land health and trend on established priority areas. The authorized officer will:

1. Using public scoping, identify issues and values in detail; identify existing management objectives from sources such as the Resource Management Plan (RMP), and activity plans.

2. Assess public land health and if possible determine the trend relating to public land health.

3. Determine the relationship between existing land uses and the assessed health of the land.

4. If needed, establish measurable objectives or redefine/modify existing management objectives that will result in desired conditions. (Note: If significant changes to RMP decisions are needed, an amendment to the RMP will be needed.)

5. Identify which land use actions will achieve the desired objectives and resource conditions.

NOTE: This document addresses the livestock grazing guidelines; guidelines that relate to other land uses will be consulted or developed as necessary to deal with the appropriate objectives.

6. Identify specific management practices, in-conformance with the guidelines, and attach as terms and conditions on grazing permits, or as stipulations on specific projects or actions.

7. Establish an evaluation schedule to determine if the standard is being achieved or if significant progress is being made.

- If the evaluation indicates that objectives are being achieved or there is movement towards the objective, continue with management practices.

- If the evaluation indicates no movement or movement away from the objectives, reassess the objectives and management actions. Determine the objectives and management actions necessary to assure significant progress toward achieving the standards. Amend plans and permits as necessary.

The authorized officer will take immediate administrative action to implement appropriate guidelines upon a determination that the following three circumstances all apply:

1. Public land health is unaccepatable;

2. Existing management is not likely to produce significant progress towards public land health; and

3. The consultation process has failed to yield a negotiated resolution.

If needed, future modifications to the Standards and Guidelines may be made. Typically, a proposal for modification is presented to the local Designated Field Official (DFO). The DFO then forwards the proposal for modification to other DFOs throughout the state for consideration in consultation with the RACs. (A copy of the proposal for modification is also submitted to the State Director). The DFOs considering advise from the RACs then submit to the State Director recommendations regarding the proposal for modification. The State Director decides if the proposal for modification has merit. If so, a determination is made whether the modification is a maintenance change to the Resource Management Plans or requires a plan amendment. Maintenance changes require no action except to make a notation in the RMPs (43 CFR 1610.5-4). Actions requiring a RMP amendment will require NEPA analysis and conformance with 43 CFR 1610.5.

GLOSSARY OF TERMS

Activity Plan - A more detailed and specific plan for management of a single resource program to achieve specific objectives undertaken only when needed to implement the more general resource management plan (RMP) decisions.

Allotment - An area of land designated and managed for the grazing of livestock by one or more livestock operators. It generally consists of public lands, but may include parcels of private or State-owned lands. The number of livestock and period of use are stipulated for each allotment.

Allotment Management Plan - A written plan for livestock grazing management, including supportive measures if required, designed to attain specific multiple-use management, sustained yield, economic and other goals in a grazing allotment.

Best Management Practices - Best Management Practices (BMPs) are methods, measures, or practices to prevent or reduce water pollution, including, but not limited to, structural and nonstructural controls and operation and maintenance procedures. Usually BMP's are applied as a system of practices rather than a single practice. BMPs are selected on the basis of site-specific conditions that reflect natural background conditions and political, social, economic, and technical feasibility.

Biodiversity or Diversity - The variety of plants and animals that occupy a landscape.

Climax - The natural plant community that occurs at the end of the plant successional path, in the absence of disturbances or physical site deterioration.

Desired Plant Community - A plant community that meets the goals established for a landscape.

Ecosystem - Living organisms and non-living substances, interacting to produce and exchange material between the living and non-living parts.

Endemic Species - A species or subspecies native to a particular location with narrow limits of habitat variability.

Goal - A general description of a desired future condition. (e.g. improve watershed conditions, achieve a desired plant community)

Grazing Permit - A document authorizing use of public lands within an established grazing district.

Habitat Management Plans - A type of activity plan relating to wildlife habitat.

Heritage Resources - Any prehistoric, historic, landscape, site, building, structure, or object, normally greater than 50 years of age and includes artifacts, records, and material remains associated therewith.

Interested Public - An individual, group or organization that has submitted a written request to the authorized officer to be provided an opportunity to be involved in the decision making process.

Landscape - A defined area that forms a management unit or basis of analysis.

Land Treatments - Controlled burning, mechanical, biological, or chemical manipulation of the land.

Local Cooperator - An individual who directly influences the management of public lands, and who's cooperation is needed to alter existing conditions. BLM permit holders are local cooperators.

Objective - A measurable description of a desired future condition that specifies, what is to be accomplished, location, and time frame.

Plant and Animal Communities - Those plant and animals which occur on public land; the definition excludes people, livestock, and crops.

Potential - The ecological condition of an area that is possible due to physical, biological, social, and economic factors.

Preliminary Assessment - An analysis of a tract of land that provides general information on the status of the land. This assessment does not provide in-depth issue analysis.

Public Lands - Those tracts of land owned by the people of the United States, that are administered by the Bureau of Land Management.

Riparian - An area of land directly influenced by permanent water. It has visible vegetation or physical characteristics reflective of permanent water influence. Lakeshores and streambanks are typical riparian areas. Excluded are such sites as ephemeral streams or washes that do not have vegetation dependent on free water in the soil.

Trend - The direction of change in health of the land, observed over time.

GLENWOOD SPRINGS RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PLAN

The Glenwood Springs RMP is amended to include the standards for public land health and guidelines for livestock grazing management dated November 1996. Existing RMP decisions modified or replaced by adoption of standards for public land health and guidelines for livestock grazing management are shownin the following table.

Page # in Approved RMP	Description of Change/Rationale *(modifications are shown in italics)*
11	Replace (remove) the water yield management objective, that reads, "To increase water yield throughout the resource area through forest management practices and through treatment of mountain brush vegetation types to improve livestock and big game forage." Rationale: This objective is inconsistent with the standards.
18	Modify the terrestrial habitat management objective by deleting, *"(the amount needed to meet Colorado Division of Wildlife goals in 1988)"* so that the objective reads, "To provide approximately 57,933 animal unit months (AUMs) of big game forage to improve existing wildlife habitat conditions, and to increase wildlife species diversity." Rationale: This reference to the Colorado Division of Wildlife's 1988 goals is out of date, and is not needed.
20	Modify the first sentence of the livestock grazing management objective to read, "To provide 56,885 animal unit months of livestock forage *commensurate with meeting public land health standards."* Rationale: This objective is modified to be consistent with the regulations and to avoid a potential conflict with the standards.
31	Modify the forest management objective to read, "To manage all suitable commercial forest land and woodland to meet sawtimber and fuelwood demand and *to* maintain stand productivity *commensurate with meeting public land health standards."* Rationale: This objective is modified to assure consistency with the standards.

Recommended by:

Stephen R Moore

for Mike Mottice, Area Manager
Glenwood Springs Resource Area

11/4/96
Date

GRAND JUNCTION RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PLAN

The Grand Junction RMP is amended to include the standards for public land health and guidelines for livestock grazing management dated November 1996. Existing RMP decisions modified or replaced by adoption of standards for public land health and guidelines for livestock grazing management:

Page # in Approved RMP	Description of Change/Rationale *(modifications are shown in italics)*
2-14	Modify the first sentence of the wildlife management objective to read, "To provide sufficient forage, cover, and protection from disturbance to maintain a population of 15,500 deer and 2,950 elk in winter, *commensurate with public land health standards."* Rationale: This objective is modified to assure consistency with the standards.
2-17	Modify the first sentence of the livestock management objective to read, "To manage livestock grazing as described in the Grand Junction Grazing Environmental Statement, *commensurate with public land health standards."* Rationale: This objective is modified to assure consistency with the standards.

Recommended by:

Catherine Robertson

10/31/96

Catherine Robertson, Area Manager
Grand Junction Resource Area

Date

GUNNISON RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PLAN

The Gunnison RMP is amended to include the standards for public land health and guidelines for livestock grazing management dated November 1996. Existing RMP decisions modified or replaced by adoption of standards for public land health and guidelines for livestock grazing management:

Page # in Approved RMP	Description of Change/Rationale *(modifications are shown in italics)*
2-2	Modify the vegetation objective by deleting, *"or achieve at least a late seral ecological status"* so it reads, "Vegetation resources will be managed to maintain or improve the vigor, production and diversity of desirable plants within alpine, sagebrush/mixed mountain shrub, and woodland types at a level to support a variety of resource uses, including, but not limited to livestock grazing, wildlife habitat and recreation." Rationale: Achieving late seral status is not always consistent with achieving public land health.
2-5	Modify the first sentence under Sage Grouse and Other Upland Game Bird Habitat to read, "Identified sage grouse brood-rearing habitat and nesting area, and winter habitat will be maintained or improved, such that approximately 9,000 sage grouse could be supported on public lands, *commensurate with achieving public land health standards."* Rationale: This objective is modified to assure consistency with the standards.
2-6	Modify the first sentence of the livestock grazing management objective to read, "Allow grazing *if commensurate with public land health standards* on 470,460 acres (approximately 60,135 AUMs of which 45,539 are active and the balance are suspended)." Rationale: This objective is reworded for brevity and to assure that use is consistent with the standards.

Recommended by:

Barry Tollefson, Area Manager
Gunnison Resource Area

11/9/96
Date

KREMMLING RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PLAN

The Kremmling RMP is amended to include the standards for public land health and guidelines for livestock grazing management dated November 1996. Existing RMP decisions modified or replaced by adoption of standards for public land health and guidelines for livestock grazing management:

Page # in Approved RMP	Description of Change/Rationale *(modifications are shown in italics)*
7	Replace (remove) livestock grazing management objective 3 that reads, "To improve overall range condition on permitted lands from the current 20% in satisfactory condition to 70 %." Rationale: These percentages were expressed in terms of seral stages, and are not consistent with the standards.
7	Modify livestock grazing management objective 2 to read, "To increase sustained forage production in 20 years by 37% to an estimated level of 54,296 AUMs and intensify management on 76 large allotments representing 51% of the public land, *commensurate with public land health standards.*" Rationale: The referenced increases in forage levels, and intensified management may or may not be achieved or exceeded depending on the results achieved by applying the standards and guidelines.
8	Modify the first sentence of the wildlife habitat management objective to read, "Manage public land habitat to support optimum wildlife population levels as determined by the Colorado Division of Wildlife's Strategic Plan, *commensurate with public land health standards and other allocations.*" Rationale: This objective is modified to assure consistency with the standards.

Recommended by:

Linda Gross, Area Manager
Kremmling Resource Area

11/1/96
Date

LITTLE SNAKE RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PLAN

The Little Snake RMP is amended to include the standards for public land health and guidelines for livestock grazing management dated November 1996. Existing RMP decisions modified or replaced by adoption of standards for public land health and guidelines for livestock grazing management:

Page # in Approved RMP	Description of Change/Rationale *(modifications are shown in italics)*
11	Modify the first sentence of planned action # 10 by deleting the word, "*all*" and adding the words, "*if needed.*" so that it reads, "Allotment management plans will be developed for allotments within the Little Snake Resource Area if needed." Rationale: Attempting to implement allotment management plans on all allotments with the BLM's limited resources is unrealistic and inconsistent with the prioritization process described for implementing standards and guidelines.

Recommended by:

Craig Haymes for John Husband, Area Manager
Little Snake Resource Area

11-4-96
Date

NORTHEAST RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PLAN

The Northeast RMP is amended to include the standards for public land health and guidelines for livestock grazing management dated November 1996.

Recommended by:

Levi Deike

Levi Deike, Area Manager
Royal Gorge Resource Area

11-4-96
Date

ROYAL GORGE RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PLAN

The Royal Gorge RMP is amended to include the standards for public land health and guidelines for livestock grazing management dated November 1996. Existing RMP decisions modified or replaced by adoption of standards for public land health and guidelines for livestock grazing management:

Page # in Approved RMP	Description of Change/Rationale *(modifications are shown in italics)*
2-2, referencing page 3-3 of the proposed RMP/Draft EIS	On page 3-3, in the last sentence of column 2, after "fire", insert, " and prescribed natural fire" so that the sentence reads, "Prescribed fire and prescribed natural fire could be used as a management tool to enhance other resources." Rationale: This is to clarify that fire prescriptions may be written for natural ignitions also.

Recommended by:

Levi Deike, Area Manager
Royal Gorge Resource Area

11-4-96
Date

SAN JUAN/SAN MIGUEL RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PLAN

The San Juan/San Miguel RMP is amended to include the standards for public land health and guidelines for livestock grazing management dated November 1996. Existing RMP decisions modified or replaced by adoption of standards for public land health and guidelines for livestock grazing management:

Page # in Approved RMP	Description of Change/Rationale *(modifications are shown in italics)*
6	Modify the first sentence under Critical Grazing Period by replacing, "*select "I" category allotments" with,* "all allotments" so it reads, "Spring use by domestic livestock in *all allotments* will not be permitted on native ranges during the critical period of early growth unless a grazing system is implemented that provides critical period rest once every three years, or a spring use pasture is developed to absorb grazing use in meeting rest requirements. Rationale: This modification is required to be consistent with guideline one, which requires, "periodic rest or deferment from grazing during critical growth periods;"
26	Modify the second sentence under Management Guidance for Area A: by adding, "*contingent on meeting public health standards" so it* reads, "Emphasis is on increasing forage, red meat and animal fiber production, and improving forage composition and watershed conditions, *contingent on meeting public land health standards."* Rationale: This objective is modified to assure consistency with public land health standards.
27	Modify livestock management, specific management direction by replacing, "*71 AMPs(810,000 acres)"* with "*where needed."* so it reads, "Develop AMPs *where needed."* Rationale: Developing 71 AMPs is probably not realistic considering BLM's limited resources, and setting a specific number of AMPs to be developed is inconsistent with the prioritization process described for implementing standards and guidelines.
33	Modify the second paragraph under Management Guidance for Area C: by adding, "*contingent on developments being able to meet public land health standards"* so it reads, "The primary management goal is to ensure the continued availability of outdoor recreation opportunities which the public seek and which are not readily available from other public or private entities, *contingent on developments being able to meet public land health standards."* Rationale: This goal is modified to assure consistency with public land health standards.

Recommended by:

Cal Joyner, Area Manager — San Juan Resource Area

Allan Belt, Area Manager — Uncompahgre Basin R.A. — Date: 11/1/96

SAN LUIS RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PLAN

The San Luis RMP is amended to include the standards for public land health and guidelines for livestock grazing management dated November 1996. Existing RMP decisions modified or replaced by adoption of standards for public land health and guidelines for livestock grazing management:

Page # in Approved RMP	Description of Change/Rationale *(modifications are shown in italics)*
9	Modify the first sentence under Vegetation, by deleting, "*(late seral stage)*" so it reads, "Overall objectives will be to move toward good condition based on site potential using grazing management." Rationale: This modification is needed because managing to achieve a late seral stage is not always consistent with achieving public land health.

Recommended by:

Julie Howard, Divide District Ranger/ Area Mannager — Date 11/4/96

Carlos Pinto, Conejos Peak District Ranger/ Area Manager — Date 4 Nov 96

Thomas Goodwin, Saguache District Ranger/ Area Manager — Date 11/4/96

UNCOMPAHGRE BASIN RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PLAN

The Uncompahgre Basin RMP is amended to include the standards for public land health and guidelines for livestock grazing management dated November 1996.Existing RMP decisions modified or replaced by adoption of standards for public land health and guidelines for livestock grazing management:

Page # in Approved RMP	Description of Change/Rationale *(modifications are shown in italics)*
20	Modify the first sentence under Livestock Grazing by adding, "*commensurate with public land health*" so it reads, "Livestock grazing and facility maintenance will be managed at levels and conditions established prior to wilderness designation *commensurate with public land health standards.*" Rationale: This modification is needed to assure consistency with the standards and guidelines.
22	Modify the first sentence of the second paragraph under Management Unit-8, by adding, "*commensurate with public land health standards*" so it reads, "The management unit will be managed as open to OHV use, *commensurate with public land health standards.*" Rationale: This modification is needed to assure consistency with the standards.

Recommended by:

Allan J. Belt

Allan Belt, Area Manager
Uncompahgre Basin Resource Area

11/1/96
Date