

It is the mission of the Bureau of Land Management to sustain the health, diversity, and productivity of the public lands for the use and enjoyment of present and future generations.

BLM\ID\PT-06\010+1610, Revised April 2010

FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT CONSIDERATIONS: Public comments submitted during this planning review, including names and street addresses of respondents, will be available for public review at the Pocatello Field Office during regular business hours (7:45 a.m. to 4:30 p.m.), Monday through Friday, except holidays. Individual respondents may request confidentiality. If you wish to withhold your name or address from public review or from disclosure under the Freedom of Information Act, you must state this prominently at the beginning of your comments. Such requests will be honored to the extent allowed by law. All submissions from organizations or businesses, and from individuals identifying themselves as representatives or officials of organizations or businesses, will be made available for public inspection in their entirety.



United States Department of the Interior



BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

Pocatello Field Office
4350 Cliffs Drive
Pocatello, Idaho 83204-2105
(208) 478-6340

<http://www.blm.gov/id/st/en/fo/pocatello.html>

In Reply Refer To:

1610
Proposed RMP/Final EIS
ID-320

Greetings:

Enclosed you will find the *Proposed Pocatello Resource Management Plan and Final Environmental Impact Statement* (EIS). This Proposed Plan/Final EIS sets forth the management direction for resources and uses on approximately 613,800 acres of public lands in southeastern Idaho. This Final EIS describes four alternatives and contains an analysis of the impacts related to implementing each of the alternatives.

This Proposed Plan/Final EIS is the result of the planning team review and analysis of Tribal and public comments received on the Draft Pocatello Resource Management Plan/EIS following a 90-day comment period ending on April 4, 2007. The draft document, released in January 2007, presented and analyzed four alternatives in which Alternative B was identified as the Preferred Alternative.

This Proposed Plan/Final EIS, presents an overview of the planning process and planning issues, describes all alternatives and their associated impacts, summarizes public comments received on the *Draft Pocatello Resource Management Plan and EIS* and provides responses to the substantive issues raised. Based on public comments and planning team discussions, **Alternative B** has been modified and is now presented as the **Proposed Plan** in the Final EIS. The extent of changes made between the draft and final documents are described in Chapter 1. Specific changes made to Alternative B are shown in Chapter 2, Table 2-1.

The printed version of the *Proposed Resource Management Plan and Final EIS* contains three volumes which includes all chapters and figures. The appendices to the document can be found on the CD-ROM located inside the back cover of Volume I. The entire document is also available for viewing on the project Web site: <http://www.blm.gov/id/st/en/fo/pocatello/planning.html>.

This Proposed Plan/Final EIS is open for a 30-day no-action/protest period beginning with the date the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) publishes the Notice of Availability of the FEIS in the Federal Register. During this period, the BLM will take no action to implement the plan. However, the Proposed Plan/FEIS may be protested by any person who participated in the planning process and who has an interest that may be adversely affected by its approval. A protest may raise only those issues that were submitted for the record during the planning process (see Code of Federal Regulations 1610.5-2). Protests must be filed with the Director, Bureau of Land Management.

Regular mail protests and overnight mail should be sent to: Director, Bureau of Land Management (210) Attention – Brenda Hudgens-Williams, 1620 L Street, Suite 1075, Washington, D.C. 20036. Emailed and fax protests will not be accepted as valid protests unless the protesting party also provides the original letter by either regular or overnight mail postmarked by the close of the protest period. Under these

conditions, BLM will consider the emailed or faxed protest as an advance copy and it will receive full consideration. If you wish to provide BLM with such advance notification, please direct faxed protests to the attention of the BLM protest coordinator at (202) 452-5112, and emails to Brenda_Hudgens-Williams@blm.gov.

All protests must be written and must be postmarked on or before the 30th day following publication by EPA of the Notice of Availability in the Federal Register. Protests must contain the following information:

- The name, mailing address, telephone number, and interest of the person filing the protest;
- A statement of the issue or issues being protested;
- A statement of the part or parts of the document being protested;
- A copy of all documents addressing the issue or issues previously submitted during the planning process by the protesting party, or an indication of the date the issue or issues were discussed for the record; and
- A concise statement explaining precisely why the decision presented in the Proposed Plan/FEIS is believed to be wrong.

The Director, Bureau of Land Management, will promptly render a decision on the protest. The decision will be in writing and will be sent to the protesting party by certified mail, return receipt requested. The decision of the Director shall be final.

Upon resolution of any protests, a final plan will be approved with a Record of Decision.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "David A. Pacioretty". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

David A. Pacioretty,
Field Manager

**Pocatello Field Office
Proposed Resource Management Plan and
Final Environmental Impact Statement (April 2010)**

[] Draft Environmental Impact Statement [X] Final Environmental Impact Statement

Department of Interior, Bureau of Land Management

Type of Action: [X] Administrative [] Legislative

ABSTRACT:

This Proposed Resource Management Plan and Final Environmental Impact Statement describes and analyzes the impacts of four alternatives for managing the public lands administered by the Pocatello Field Office in southeastern Idaho. The four alternatives are: Alternative A (No Action Alternative), **Alternative B (Proposed Plan)**, Alternatives C and D. The alternatives provide management direction to guide the multiple use management of resources and resource uses.

Planning issues addressed include: OHV use and associated conflicts, containment of hazardous substances (e.g., selenium) and other contaminants from mining/reclamation activities, acquiring and maintaining access to public lands, balance use and demand for quality recreational opportunities with other resources and resource uses, management of the sagebrush ecosystem, and balancing social and economic benefits of commodity and amenity uses.

The alternatives also address the designation of the Petticoat Peak, Area of Critical Environmental Concern and Wild and Scenic River suitability findings.

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION:

This Proposed Resource Management Plan/Final EIS is open for a 30-day no-action/protest period beginning with the date the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) publishes the Notice of Availability of the FEIS in the Federal Register. A protest may raise only those issues that were submitted for the record during the planning process (see Code of Federal Regulations 1610.5-2). Protests must be filed with the Director, Bureau of Land Management as described in the Dear Reader Letter.

CONTACT FOR FURTHER INFORMATION:

Terry Lee Smith, Project Manager
4350 Cliffs Drive,
Pocatello, Idaho 83204
(208) 478-6340

TABLE OF CONTENTS – VOLUME I

Section Page

LIST OF ACRONYMS.....ACRONYMS-1

ES. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY ES-1

ES.1	Introduction	ES-1
ES.2	Purpose of and Need for Action	ES-2
ES.3	Planning Process and Public Collaboration.....	ES-2
ES.3.1	Scoping	ES-2
ES.3.2	Distribution and Availability of the Draft RMP/EIS.....	ES-2
ES.3.3	Comments Received on the Draft RMP/EIS.....	ES-3
ES.3.4	Distribution and Availability of the Proposed RMP/Final EIS	ES-3
ES.4	Need for Change Topics and Issue Identification.....	ES-4
ES.5	Management Alternatives	ES-7
ES.6	Changes From the Draft Resource Management Plan to the Proposed Resource Management Plan	ES-9
ES.7	Environmental Consequences	ES-15
ES.8	Rationale for the Identification of the Proposed RMP—Alternative b	ES-15
ES.9	Addressing Relevant Issues in the Alternatives.....	ES-16
ES.10	Consultation and Coordination.....	ES-20
ES.11	Document Preparation and Preparers	ES-20
ES.12	Comparison of the Alternatives And Environmental Consequences	ES-23

1. INTRODUCTION 1-1

1.1	Overview	1-1
1.2	Purpose of and Need for Action	1-1
1.3	Description of the Planning Area	1-2
1.4	Scoping and Planning Issues	1-3
1.4.1	Scoping Process	1-3
1.4.2	Need for Change Topics.....	1-3
1.4.3	Issue Identification.....	1-4
1.4.4	Issues Considered but Not Further Analyzed.....	1-7
1.5	Planning Criteria.....	1-9
1.6	Planning Process.....	1-11
1.7	Collaboration	1-13
1.7.1	Intergovernmental and Interagency Relationships.....	1-13
1.8	Tribal Treaty Rights and Interests	1-14
1.9	Relationship to BLM Policies, Plans, and Programs.....	1-15
1.10	Related Plans	1-16
1.11	Policy.....	1-17
1.12	Overall Vision.....	1-18
1.13	Changes From the Draft Resource Management Plan to the Proposed Resource Management Plan	1-18

2. ALTERNATIVES..... 2-1

2.1	Introduction	2-1
2.2	How to Read This Chapter	2-2
2.3	Development of Alternatives	2-5
2.3.1	Alternatives Developed.....	2-6
2.4	General Description of the Proposed RMP	2-6

TABLE OF CONTENTS – VOLUME I

Section	Page
2.4.1	Alternative A (No Action Alternative) 2-7
2.4.2	Alternative B (Proposed RMP)..... 2-7
2.4.3	Alternative C..... 2-8
2.4.4	Alternative D..... 2-8
2.5	Alternatives Considered but Eliminated from Detailed Analysis..... 2-8
2.5.1	Exclusive Use or Protection..... 2-8
2.5.2	Designation of All Areas as either Open or Closed to Off-Highway Vehicle Use..... 2-10
2.5.3	Restoration of Crested Wheatgrass Seedings 2-10
2.5.4	No Issuance of New Phosphate Leases..... 2-10
2.6	Management Guidance Changes from the Draft RMP Preferred Alternative to Proposed RMP/Final EIS 2-11
2.7	Management Guidance Common to All Alternatives 2-98
2.8	Management Guidance for Alternative A (No Action) 2-118
2.9	Management Guidance Common to Action Alternatives (Alternatives B, C, and D) 2-135
2.10	Management Guidance for Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)..... 2-141
2.11	Management Guidance for Alternative C 2-177
2.12	Management Guidance for Alternative D..... 2-207
2.13	Rationale for the Identification of the Proposed RMP – (Alternative B) 2-227
2.14	Addressing Relevant Issues in the Alternatives..... 2-227
2.15	Plan monitoring, Implementation and Adaptive Management 2-231
2.15.1	Adaptive Management 2-231
2.15.2	Implementation 2-232
2.15.3	Monitoring 2-232
2.15.4	Evaluation 2-233
2.16	Comparison of Alternatives 2-236
2.17	Summary Comparison of Environmental Consequences 2-267
3.	AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT 3-1
CHAPTER 3 – AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT 3-1
3.1	Introduction 3-1
3.2	Resources..... 3-1
3.2.1	Air Quality 3-2
3.2.2	Cultural Resources..... 3-6
3.2.3	Soils 3-13
3.2.4	Paleontological Resources 3-16
3.2.5	Vegetation 3-18
3.2.6	Fish and Wildlife..... 3-30
3.2.7	Special Status Species..... 3-40
3.2.8	Visual Resources..... 3-62
3.2.9	Water Resources..... 3-67
3.2.10	Wildland Fire Management 3-72
3.3	Resource Uses 3-78
3.3.1	Forestry 3-78
3.3.2	Lands and Realty 3-80
3.3.3	Livestock Grazing..... 3-87
3.3.4	Minerals and Energy 3-90
3.3.5	Recreation 3-110
3.4	Special Designations 3-118

TABLE OF CONTENTS – VOLUME I

Section	Page
3.4.1	Areas of Critical Environmental Concern and Research Natural Areas 3-118
3.4.2	Designated Watchable Wildlife Areas..... 3-124
3.4.3	Wild and Scenic Rivers..... 3-124
3.4.4	Eligibility Determinations..... 3-125
3.4.5	Suitability Determinations 3-125
3.4.6	Wilderness Study Areas 3-127
3.5	Socioeconomic Resources and Environmental Justice..... 3-128
3.5.1	Socioeconomic Resources 3-128
3.5.2	Environmental Justice..... 3-138

LIST OF DIAGRAMS – VOLUME I

Diagram	Page
1-1	BLM Planning Process..... 1-12
2-1	Relationship of Individual Alternative Component 2-4
2-2	The Systematic Process of Adaptive Management to be Used to Evaluate How Well Management Actions Meet Objectives of the RMP..... 2-231

LIST OF TABLES – VOLUME I

Table	Page
ES-1	Acres of Land Status within the Planning Area.....1
ES-2	Description of Need for Change/Management Direction by Resource/Use4
ES-3	Summary of OHV Designations by Alternative.....16
ES-4	Comparison of Special Recreation Management Areas and Extensive Recreation Management Areas (ERMAs).....18
ES-5	Projected Acres of Shrub Steppe by Land Health Condition Class at Year 3019
ES-6	Comparison of Alternatives by Example Social and Economic Tradeoff Indicators19
ES-7	List of Preparers20
ES-8	Summary Comparison of Alternatives24
ES-9	Summary Comparison of Environmental Consequences54
1-1	Acres of Land Status within the Planning Area..... 1-2
1-2	Description of Need for Change/Management Direction by Resource/Use 1-4
1-3	Planning Criteria Summary 1-9
1-4	BLM Planning Process..... 1-13
1-5	Identification of Malad MFP and Pocatello RMP Plan Amendments and Other Documents Considered for Implementation Level Planning 1-15
2-1	Summary Comparison of Preferred Alternative and Proposed Management 2-12
2-2	Management Guidance Common to All Alternatives 2-98
2-3	Management Guidance for Alternative A (No Action)..... 2-118
2-3a	Existing Physical, Social, and Administrative Settings for the Pocatello SRMA..... 2-129
2-3b	Existing Physical, Social, and Administrative Settings for the Blackfoot River SRMA 2-131
2-4	Management Guidance Common to Action Alternatives (Alternatives B, C, and D) 2-135
2-5	Management Guidance for Alternative B 2-142
2-5a	General Management Guidance and Targeted Outcomes for the Wolverine RMZ, Blackfoot River SRMA 2-159
2-5b	General Management Guidance and Targeted Outcomes for the Campground RMZ, Blackfoot River SRMA 2-160
2-5c	General Management Guidance and Targeted Outcomes for the Blackfoot Reservoir RMZ, Blackfoot River SRMA..... 2-161
2-5d	General Management Guidance and Targeted Outcomes for the Mid-River RMZ, Blackfoot River SRMA 2-162
2-5e	General Management Guidance and Targeted Outcomes for the Lower River RMZ, Blackfoot River SRMA 2-163
2-5f	General Management Guidance and Targeted Outcomes for the West Bench RMZ, Pocatello SRMA 2-164
2-5g	General Management Guidance and Targeted Outcomes for the Blackrock RMZ, Pocatello SRMA 2-165
2-5h	General Management Guidance and Targeted Outcomes for the Papoose RMZ, Pocatello SRMA 2-166
2-5i	General Management Guidance and Targeted Outcomes for the East Bench RMZ, Pocatello SRMA 2-167
2-5j	General Management Guidance and Targeted Outcomes for the Dispersed RMZ, Pocatello SRMA 2-168
2-5k	General Management Guidance and Targeted Outcomes for the River RMZ, Oneida Narrows SRMA 2-169
2-5l	General Management Guidance and Targeted Outcomes for the Oneida Reservoir RMZ, Oneida Narrows SRMA 2-170
2-6	Management Guidance for Alternative C 2-177

LIST OF TABLES – VOLUME I

Table	Page
2-6a	General Management Guidance and Targeted Outcomes for the Hawkins Reservoir RMZ of the Campground SRMA..... 2-197
2-6b	General Management Guidance and Targeted Outcomes for the Goodenough RMZ of the Campground SRMA..... 2-198
2-6c	General Management Guidance and Targeted Outcomes for the Pipeline RMZ of the Campground SRMA..... 2-199
2-7	Management Guidance for Alternative D..... 2-207
2-8	Summary of OHV Designations by Alternative..... 2-228
2-9	Comparison of Special Recreation Management Areas and Extensive Recreation Management Areas (ERMAs)..... 2-230
2-10	Projected Acres of Shrub Steppe by Land Health Condition Class at Year 30 2-230
2-11	Comparison of Alternatives by Example Social and Economic Tradeoff Indicators 2-231
2-12	Parameters (Data/Information) by Resource or Resource Use to Be Collected to Determine Effectiveness of the Plan’s Management Decisions (Goals and Objectives)..... 2-233
2-13	Summary Comparison of Alternatives 2-237
2-14	Summary Comparison of Environmental Consequences 2-269
3-1	Extent of Public Lands Described as Prime Farmland within the Pocatello Field Office Planning Area by County 3-15
3-2	Vegetation Types, Descriptions, and Acres of Public Land. 3-19
3-3	Percent Current Land Health Conditions By Vegetation Type..... 3-21
3-4	Riparian Types, Characteristic Native Vegetation and Associated Invasive Species/Noxious Weeds..... 3-28
3-5	Growth Form and Treatment Method for Invasive Species and Noxious Weeds 3-29
3-6	Vegetation Types by Acreage and Representative Wildlife Species 3-31
3-7	Big Game Habitat..... 3-32
3-8	Fish Species within the Planning Area ¹ 3-39
3-9	Table BLM Special Status Species Ranking..... 3-41
3-10	Federally Listed Species in the Pocatello Field Office Area 3-42
3-11	Sensitive Plant Species Known or Suspected to Occur in the Pocatello Field Office Area..... 3-44
3-12	Watch List Plant Species and Associated Vegetation Types 3-46
3-13	BLM Listed Sensitive Fish and Wildlife Species in the Pocatello Field Office Area 3-47
3-14	Pocatello Field Office Greater Sage-grouse Habitat (Acres) 3-55
3-15	Watersheds in the Pocatello Field Office Planning Area..... 3-68
3-16	Listed 303(d) Water Bodies on Public Lands within the Planning Area 3-70
3-17	Historical Fire Regimes..... 3-75
3-18	Historic and Current Fire Regime Condition Class By Vegetation Type 3-76
3-19	Planning Area Forest Lands Classifications 3-79
3-20	Past Commercial Timber Harvesting on Public Lands 3-80
3-21	Allotments Requiring Grazing Management Adjustments 3-89
3-22	PFO-Administered Leasable Phosphate Cases 3-94
3-23	BLM-Administered Phosphate Mines in the Pocatello Field Office Area..... 3-96
3-24	Recreation Opportunity Spectrum..... 3-110
3-25	Recreation Management Area Use in the Pocatello Field Office Area (October 1, 2002 – September 30, 2003) 3-112
3-26	Number of Travel Parties to the Planning Area Region by Season 3-112
3-27	Recreation Management Areas and BLM Developed and Dispersed Use Sites..... 3-114
3-28	Current Off-Highway Vehicle Designations and Existing Routes on Planning Area Public Lands..... 3-117
3-29	Areas of Critical Environmental Concern and Research Natural Areas in the Planning Area 3-121

LIST OF TABLES – VOLUME I

Table		Page
3-30	County Population Estimates	3-129
3-31	County Population Projections.....	3-130
3-32	County Housing Estimates 1990-2000.....	3-131
3-33	County Employment Statistics (2000)	3-131
3-34	County Employment by Sector and Average Sector Growth.....	3-132
3-35	Per Capita Personal Incomes.....	3-133
3-36	Earnings by Industry Sector 2002 (in Thousands of Dollars).....	3-134
3-37	Educational Attainment 2000 (Population 25 years and Over).....	3-136
3-38	Total Percentage of Population by Race/Ethnicity (2000).....	3-139
3-39	County Income and Poverty Level (2000)	3-140

DON'T DELETE - THROWAWAY PAGE

LIST OF ACRONYMS

Acronym or Abbreviation	Full Phrase
ACEC	Area of Critical Environmental Concern
AIRFA	American Indian Religious Freedom Act
AML	Abandoned Mine Lands
AMP	Allotment Management Plan
AMR	Appropriate Management Response
APD	application for permit to drill
ARAR	Applicable or Relevant and Appropriate Requirement
ARPA	Archaeological Resources Protection Act
ATV	all-terrain vehicle
AUM	animal unit month
BLM	United States Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management
BIA	Bureau of Indian Affairs
BMP	Best Management Practice
BOR	United States Department of the Interior, Bureau of Reclamation
BPA	Bonneville Power Authority
BpS	Biophysical Setting
BSD	Blackfoot Stock Driveway
CAA	Clean Air Act
CAR	Communities at Risk
CERCLA	Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act
CEQ	Council on Environmental Quality
CFR	Code of Federal Regulations
cfs	cubic feet per second
CO	carbon monoxide
CO ₂	carbon dioxide
COPC	constituents of particular concern
CRMP	cultural resources management plan
CRP	Conservation Reserve Program
CWPP	Community Wildfire Protection Plan
DFC	desired future condition
DoD	Department of Defense
DOQ	Digital Ortho Quads
EA	environmental assessment
EIA	Energy Information Administration
EIS	environmental impact statement

LIST OF ACRONYMS

Acronym or Abbreviation	Full Phrase
EPA	United States Environmental Protection Agency
ERMA	Extensive Recreation Management Area
ESA	Endangered Species Act of 1973
ES&R	Emergency Stabilization and Rehabilitation
°F	degrees Fahrenheit
FERC	Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
FLPMA	Federal Land Policy and Management Act
FOFEM	First Order Fire Effect Model, Version 5.
Forest Service	US Department of Agriculture, National Forest Service
FRCC	Fire Regime Condition Class
GAP	Gap Analysis Program
GIS	Geographic Information System
GPS	Global Positioning System
HMP	habitat management plan
HUC	Hydrologic Unit Code
IBA	Important Bird Area
ICBEMP	Interior Columbia Basin Ecosystem Management Project
ID	Idaho
IDEQ	Idaho Department of Environmental Quality
IDFG	Idaho Department of Fish and Game
IDL	Idaho Department of Lands
IDT	interdisciplinary team
IMP	Interim Management Policy
INFISH	Inland Native Fish Strategy
IPIF	Idaho Partners in Flight
IPMP	Interagency Area-Wide Investigation of Phosphate Mine Contamination and Final Risk Management Plan
IPCC	Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change
IWI	Index of Watershed Indicators
KGRA	Known Geothermal Resource Area
KPLA	Known Phosphate Leasing Areas
LAC	Limits of Acceptable Change
LHC	land health conditions
LUA	land use authorizations
LWCF	Land and Water Conservation Fund

LIST OF ACRONYMS

Acronym or Abbreviation	Full Phrase
MBF	thousand board feet
MFP	Management Framework Plan
MIAG	Montana/Idaho Airshed Group
MMBF	million board feet
MOA	memorandum of agreement
MW	megawatt
NAA	non-attainment area
NAAQS	National Ambient Air Quality Standards
NAGPRA	Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act
NAIP	National Agricultural Imagery Program
NEI	National Emissions Inventory
NEPA	National Environmental Policy Act of 1969
NHPA	National Historic Preservation Act
NHT	National Historic Trail
NO ₂	Nitrogen Dioxide
NOI	Notice of Intent
NRCS	United States Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service
NRHP	National Register of Historic Places
NSO	no surface occupancy
NWR	National Wildlife Refuge
NWSRS	National Wild and Scenic Rivers System
OHV	off-highway vehicle
PFC	proper functioning condition
PFO	BLM, Idaho Falls District, Pocatello Field Office
PILT	payment in lieu of taxes
PL	Public Law
planning area	Pocatello Field Office boundary and scope for the RMP
PM _{2.5}	particulate matter smaller than 2.5 microns in diameter
PM ₁₀	particulate matter smaller than 10 microns in diameter
PO	Plans of Operations
PSQ	probable sale quantity
PWR	Public Water Reserve
RFDS	Reasonably Foreseeable Development Scenario
RHCA	Riparian Habitat Conservation Area
RMO	Riparian Management Objectives
RMP	Resource Management Plan
RMZ	Recreation Management Zone

LIST OF ACRONYMS

Acronym or Abbreviation	Full Phrase
RNA	Research Natural Area
ROD	record of decision
ROS	Recreation Opportunity Spectrum
ROW	right-of-way
SFP	Special Forest Products
SGPA	Sage-grouse planning area
SHPO	State Historic Preservation Office
SO ₂	sulphur dioxide
SRANK	subnational rank
SRMA	Special Recreation Management Area
SWPA	Source Water Protection Area
TMDLs	total maximum daily loads
US	United States
USC	United States Code
USFWS	United States Department of the Interior, Fish and Wildlife Service
USGS	United States Geological Survey
VOC	Volatile Organic Compounds
VRM	Visual Resource Management
WFU	wildland fire use
WMA	Wildlife Management Area
WSA	Wilderness Study Area
WSR Act	Wild and Scenic Rivers Act of 1968 (Public Law 90-542, as amended; 16 United States Code 1271-2287)
WUI	Wildland Urban Interface

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

ES.1 INTRODUCTION

The United States (US) Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management (BLM) has prepared this Proposed Resource Management Plan (RMP) and final environmental impact statement (EIS). The purposes of the document are to provide direction for managing public lands under the jurisdiction of the Idaho Falls District, Pocatello Field Office (PFO), in southeastern Idaho and to analyze the environmental effects that could result from implementing the alternatives addressed in this plan.

The PFO boundary defines the planning area, which encompasses 5,142,100 acres in Bannock, Bear Lake, Bingham, Bonneville, Caribou, Cassia, Franklin, Oneida, and Power Counties of southeastern Idaho. The BLM administers about 613,800 acres, or 12 percent of the planning area. Land ownership in the planning area is mixed and includes other lands administered by the federal government, the Fort Hall Indian Reservation, State of Idaho lands, and private property. Over 34 percent of the planning area is administered by the federal government, including the BLM, the US Department of Agriculture, Forest Service (Forest Service), and US Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS). **Table ES-1** highlights the ownership pattern of the planning area.

Table ES-1. Acres of Land Status within the Planning Area

Land Status	Acres	Percentage of Planning Area
BLM	613,800	12%
Forest Service	1,102,400	21%
US Fish and Wildlife Service refuges	35,900	1%
Fort Hall Indian Reservation	519,800	10%
State of Idaho	324,400	6%
Water	99,500	2%
Private	2,446,300	48%
TOTAL	5,142,100	100%

Note: Numbers are rounded to nearest 100 acres.

Management direction and actions outlined in this document apply only to BLM-managed public lands in the planning area and to federal mineral estate under BLM jurisdiction that may lie beneath other surface ownership. No specific measures have been developed for private, state, or other federal lands. However, given that private, state, and other federal lands are interspersed with public lands, these lands could be influenced or be indirectly affected by BLM management actions.

This document is being prepared using the BLM's planning regulations and guidance issued under the authority of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act (FLPMA) of 1976. An EIS is incorporated into this document to meet the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA), Council on Environmental Quality regulations for implementing NEPA (40 Code of Federal Regulations, Sections 1500-1508), and requirements of the BLM's NEPA Handbook, H-1790-1 (BLM 2008a).

ES.2 PURPOSE OF AND NEED FOR ACTION

The resource management planning process is a key tool that the BLM uses, in collaboration with tribal, federal, state, and local governments, and interested public parties, to ensure a coordinated and consistent approach to managing public lands. The RMP is being prepared to provide the PFO with a comprehensive framework for managing lands in the planning area under its jurisdiction. The purpose of the RMP is to develop a public, detailed management document that defines multiple use management polices and actions on these lands.

The RMP is needed for the following reasons:

- Ecological, socioeconomic, institutional, and regulatory conditions have changed since the approval of the Malad Management Framework Plan (MFP) in 1981 and the Pocatello RMP in 1988;
- User demands and impacts have evolved, requiring new management direction; and
- The use of two separate plans to manage one administrative unit represents a fragmented approach and complicates decision making.

ES.3 PLANNING PROCESS AND PUBLIC COLLABORATION

ES.3.1 SCOPING

The planning process for this RMP began on November 14, 2001, with publication of the Notice of Intent in the *Federal Register*. To assist in the process, a public scoping and collaboration program was implemented and included producing a public scoping letter and briefing package. The BLM mailed these items on April 23, 2003, to the Shoshone-Bannock Tribal Council, Land Use Policy Commission, federal, state, and local agencies, interest groups, and members of the general public. The BLM PFO compiled the mailing list, which included over 800 entries. The scoping letter and briefing package were also made available for public view on the Internet in April 2003. The briefing package served to inform the recipients of the public scoping process, the scheduled open house scoping meetings, and background information on the purpose and need for the planning activity and identified the need for change topics. The scoping and collaboration program also included producing project newsletters, establishing a project Web site (www.id.blm.gov/planning/pocrmp), publishing newspaper articles, and issuing press releases.

The open house scoping meetings were held throughout southeastern Idaho in Montpelier on May 28, 2003, in Malad on May 29, 2003, in Fort Hall on June 5, 2003, in Pocatello on June 10, 2003, and in Soda Springs on June 11, 2003. The BLM provided the local media with press releases announcing the time, location, and purpose of these meetings. The format for the scoping meetings featured informal one-on-one discussions by individual interdisciplinary team members with members of the public.

ES.3.2 DISTRIBUTION AND AVAILABILITY OF THE DRAFT RMP/EIS

The Draft RMP/EIS was published and released in January 2007. On January 6, 2007, both the US Environmental Protection Agency and the BLM published a Notice of Availability in the

Federal Register. This notified the public of the availability of the Draft RMP/EIS and solicited written public comments during the 90-calendar-day review period that ended on April 4, 2007.

The BLM issued a press release on January 4, 2007, and on January 25, 2007, which announced the availability of the Draft RMP/EIS and that four open houses would be held. The BLM also provided instructions on how to submit public comments in the press releases.

On January 5, 2007, the Draft RMP/EIS was available for downloading from the Idaho BLM Web site at www.blm.gov/id/st/en/fo/pocatello/planning/pocatello_resource.html. On the same day, the BLM distributed paper and electronic (CD-ROM) copies of the Draft RMP/EIS to approximately 365 parties, including elected officials, regulatory agencies, and members of the public. The BLM accommodated additional requests for paper or electronic copies of the Draft RMP/EIS after the initial distribution.

Open houses were held in Soda Springs, Malad City, Pocatello, and Fort Hall, Idaho, during the 90-day public review period. Each open house featured displays, maps, handouts, and interdisciplinary team resource specialists who provided information and answered questions. A total of 88 people attended the open houses.

ES.3.3 COMMENTS RECEIVED ON THE DRAFT RMP/EIS

The comment period closed on April 4, 2007. All written comments sent before 12:00 AM on April 5, 2007, were accepted as official comments. These included those sent by US mail postmarked on April 4, 2007, and electronic mail messages and facsimiles sent on April 4, 2007, regardless of when they were received. Some comments were duplicated with an electronic mail message and a letter submitted via US mail. Identical comments from the same party were considered only once.

Fifty-two written submissions were received, including one form e-mail sent by multiple parties (over 1,150 recorded e-mails), but they were counted only once in the totals. Most of the 52 written submissions contained multiple comments on different topics, for a total of 1,404 individual comments. All information received through these comments has been evaluated, verified, and incorporated into the Proposed RMP/Final EIS, as appropriate. Copies of all accepted written submissions are provided in **Appendix U** (Comments Received on Pocatello Draft RMP/EIS), and the BLM's response to each separate comment within each submission appears to the right of each comment.

ES.3.4 DISTRIBUTION AND AVAILABILITY OF THE PROPOSED RMP/FINAL EIS

A Notice of Availability will be published in the *Federal Register* to notify the public of the availability of the Proposed RMP/Final EIS. The Notice of Availability will also outline protest procedures during the 30-calendar-day protest period. The Proposed RMP/Final EIS will be available for downloading from the Idaho BLM Web site at www.blm.gov/id/st/en/fo/pocatello/planning/pocatello_resource.html. The Proposed RMP/Final EIS will also be available for review at the PFO. Press releases will be issued to notify the public of the Proposed RMP/Final EIS availability.

All recipients of the Draft RMP/EIS and all parties who submitted written comments on the Draft RMP/EIS will receive the Proposed RMP/Final EIS in either a hard copy or CD or will be

able to download it electronically from the Idaho BLM Web site. The PFO will notify those who previously received the Draft RMP/EIS electronically. The PFO maintains the distribution list for the Proposed RMP/EIS, which is available on request.

ES.4 NEED FOR CHANGE TOPICS AND ISSUE IDENTIFICATION

Issue identification is the first step of the nine-step BLM planning process. A planning issue is a major controversy or dispute regarding management of resources or uses on the public lands that could be addressed in a variety of ways. A key component of the scoping process was to provide the public with the opportunity to identify issues and concerns to be addressed in the RMP, based on the need for change topics presented at the open house meetings. The planning team members identified these topics through an extensive review of the Malad MFP (1981) and the Pocatello RMP (1988). The need for change topics and land management direction to be developed for these topics is described in **Table ES-2**.

Table ES-2. Description of Need for Change/Management Direction by Resource/Use

Resource/Use	Description of Need for Change/Management Direction
Vegetation	Management direction is needed to 1) identify desired future condition of vegetation types, 2) maintain or move riparian areas toward proper functioning condition, and 3) identify reclamation guidance for rehabilitating public lands after disturbance, including mining activities, fire, or other ground-disturbing activities.
Special Status Species	Management direction is needed for all special status species habitat (flora and fauna), including greater sage-grouse, and other associated resource uses. This direction would be based on the most recent scientific guidance for the management of affected species.
Fire Management	Management direction is needed to 1) identify wildland fire use areas, 2) treatment levels, and 3) fire management restrictions.
Recreation	Management direction is needed to 1) identify off-highway vehicle (OHV) areas as open, limited, or closed, 2) identify over snow vehicle use limitations, 3) consider identifying the Oneida Narrows as a Special Recreation Management Area (SRMA) to provide enhanced direction for the increasing recreational use, and 4) protect river values and uses for the Blackfoot SRMA.
Lands and Realty	Management direction is needed to 1) identify management areas or zones of public lands planned for retention or available to be considered for disposal and 2) identify areas available for potential alternative energy development, such as wind, solar, or biomass, consistent with the President's National Energy Policy.
Minerals	Management direction is needed to address the process of mining and reclamation to ensure containment and control of hazardous substances, such as selenium and other potential contaminants, to make sure post mining land use is safe and productive, providing for future well-suited resources and uses.
Special Designations	Management direction is needed for the consideration of an Area of Critical Environmental Concern (ACEC) and Wild and Scenic River segments.

Therefore, while some programs, such as livestock grazing, were not initially identified as a need for change topic, their management direction may vary by alternative in order to address other resource concerns and specific management direction of other resources. Public comments received by the planning team on these need for change topics were reviewed, categorized, and analyzed to identify specific issues and concerns to be addressed in the Pocatello RMP. The

comments were analyzed and a scoping summary report was finalized in September 2003 (BLM 2003a). After considering public responses, the BLM identified six major planning issues, as follows:

ISSUE 1: OFF-HIGHWAY VEHICLE (OHV) MANAGEMENT

How will the increasing OHV use and associated conflicts be managed within the planning area?

ISSUE 2: PHOSPHATE MINING AND SELENIUM RELEASE

How does the BLM best manage the process of mining and reclamation to ensure containment and control of hazardous substances such as selenium and other potential contaminants?

ISSUE 3: PUBLIC ACCESS - ACQUIRING/MAINTAINING

How will the planning process address the need for acquiring and maintaining access to public lands while also protecting private property rights?

ISSUE 4: RECREATION MANAGEMENT

How will the increase in recreational use and demand for quality recreational opportunities be balanced within the planning area?

ISSUE 5: SAGEBRUSH ECOSYSTEMS

What effects will future management of sagebrush ecosystems have on greater sage-grouse and sagebrush-obligate species?

ISSUE 6: SOCIOECONOMICS

How will social and economic benefits of commodity and amenity uses be balanced within the planning area?

These issues drive the formulation of the plan alternatives, and addressing them has resulted in a range of management options presented in four alternatives. While other concerns are addressed in the plan, management related to them may or may not change by alternative. Additional discussion on each issue can be found in Chapter 1.

ISSUES CONSIDERED BUT NOT FURTHER ANALYZED

During scoping, several concerns were raised that are beyond the scope of this planning effort or represented questions on how the BLM would go about the planning process and implementation. There are several issues raised in scoping that are clearly of concern to the public but that are governed by existing laws and regulations (for example, water quality). Where certain management is already dictated by law or regulation, alternatives have not been developed, but management instead is applied as “Management Common to All Alternatives.”

The scoping report (BLM 2003a) provides a comprehensive list of issues outside the scope of the RMP. The major issues considered but not analyzed further are summarized below and will not be analyzed further for the reasons stated.

Eliminate all livestock grazing. The BLM is mandated to provide for multiple uses, including livestock grazing. The Idaho Standards for Rangeland Health and Guidelines for Livestock Grazing Management provides guidance to the BLM for evaluating the conditions of allotments. The BLM can adjust grazing activities to respond to land conditions.

Plan and zone private lands. The BLM does not have any authority to determine how private lands are used. Planning and zoning is done on a local level by county or municipal governments.

Control populations of beaver, raccoons, and predators, stock fish, and other wildlife management. The BLM manages habitat rather than populations and does not have the authority to determine what species will be or should be controlled or reintroduced. The RMP may identify areas or parameters to be considered when other agencies propose wildlife management activities.

Implementation of Grasslands Reserve Program initiatives. The Grasslands Reserve Program is not administered by the BLM, rather by the US Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service.

Conduct special research. Various commenters requested that the BLM conduct specialized research, such as effects of pesticides and herbicides on aquatic species and effects of power lines, energy corridors, and wind energy sites on wildlife populations. The BLM periodically conducts specific research related to implementation activities on a project basis but is not a research agency. Instead, the BLM contributes funding to other agencies or institutions to conduct research, which is implemented on a case-by-case basis.

Provide a designated transportation network. The RMP provides direction in terms of what areas would be closed, restricted to designated trails or roads, or open. A travel management plan that would provide specific route designations would be prepared after the travel management direction is approved as part of this RMP.

Control the flow of water through the Oneida Narrows. The BLM does not have the authority to manage the release of water through the Oneida Narrows. Management direction in the RMP recognizes the use of the water and flow variability.

Designate roadless areas as Wilderness Study Areas (WSA). The BLM is not proposing any additional WSAs. Thirteen existing ACECs¹ (six ACECs and seven Research Natural Areas (RNAs)) are redesignated in the proposed resource management plan with the Petticoat Peak RNA being proposed and evaluated.

¹ During the RMP planning process 7 ACECs and 7 RNAs were revisited and reviewed for appropriateness of the designation and management. However, during the summer of 2006 a wildland fire destroyed historical structures associated with the Van Komen Homestead ACEC. Thus, of the total 14 original ACECs and RNAs, 13 are proposed to be redesignated. In the Proposed RMP, management direction has been updated in which the Van Komen Homestead ACEC designation has been removed, with the area no longer managed as an ACEC.

ES.5 MANAGEMENT ALTERNATIVES

The basic goal of developing alternatives was to prepare different combinations of resource uses to address issues and to resolve conflicts among uses. Alternatives must meet the purpose and need, must be reasonable, must provide a mix of resource protection, management use, and development, must be responsive to the issues (each issue must be addressed in at least one alternative), must meet the established planning criteria (Chapter 1), and must meet federal laws, regulations, policies, and standards, including the multiple use mandates of FLPMA.

Four alternatives were developed and carried forward for detailed analysis in the Draft RMP/EIS. Alternative A, continuation of current management, was developed using available inventory data, existing planning and management documents and policies, and established land use allocations. The action alternatives (B, C, and D) were developed with input from public scoping and the BLM interdisciplinary team. Alternative B (identified as the Preferred Alternative in the Draft RMP/EIS) has been revised for the Proposed RMP/Final EIS based on public comments received on the Draft RMP/EIS. **Table ES-8** is a comparison between the Proposed Alternative and the other three alternatives.

All management under the Proposed RMP would comply with applicable laws, regulations, and BLM policy and guidance. All public lands would be managed in accordance with the Idaho Standards for Rangeland Health and Guidelines for Livestock Grazing Management.

ALTERNATIVE A (NO ACTION ALTERNATIVE)

The goal of Alternative A is to continue implementing the direction and actions contained in existing guidance, laws, plans, and policies that are currently in effect, in compliance with the Pocatello RMP and the Malad MFP. Current levels, methods, and mix of multiple use resource management of public lands in the planning area would continue. The current rate of accomplishment of all activities being implemented within the planning area would continue. A key component of Alternative A is managing the following:

- Special status species and their vegetation habitats to provide for their continued presence in accordance with applicable laws and regulations;
- Land tenure adjustments to protect resources while supporting appropriate development and improved public access to public lands;
- Minerals and energy resources and recreation to balance development and protect resources; and
- OHV designations would remain the same.

ALTERNATIVE B (PROPOSED RMP)

The actions described in this section would generally focus on a balanced combination of resource protection and resource use that would provide benefits for the broadest range of public uses. Constraints to protect resources would be implemented but would be less restrictive than under Alternative C. The Proposed RMP would accommodate a higher level of production of food, fiber, minerals, and services through use of public lands than would Alternative C, though to a lesser degree than under Alternative D. Resource values and special status species habitat

would be restored and enhanced, but to a lesser extent than under Alternative C. A key component of Alternative B is managing the following:

- Special status species and vegetation, with an emphasis on maintaining and improving important vegetation habitats (such as sagebrush steppe ecosystem) to provide for species' continued presence and conservation;
- Land tenure adjustments to improve administrative efficiency and protect resources, while supporting appropriate development and improved public access to public lands, with some emphasis on acquiring nonfederal lands;
- Minerals and energy resources to balance development and protect resources;
- OHV opportunities and use by designating public lands as "Limited" to existing routes, maintaining existing routes, limiting mechanized travel to designated routes in SRMAs and WSAs, moderate control of OHVs and minimal intensive use routes; and
- Fire, to include treatments with an emphasis on a broad range of vegetation types (such as Encroached Juniper, Low-Elevation Shrub, Mid-Elevation Shrub, Mountain Shrub, and Wet/Cold Conifer) to move toward Fire Regime Condition Class (FRCC-1).

ALTERNATIVE C

Alternative C would emphasize natural, cultural, scenic, wilderness, and recreation resources. Production of commodities from public lands would be secondary to protecting and enhancing resources, reflecting a reduction in resource production goals for food, fiber, and minerals in comparison to Alternatives B and D. In some cases and some areas, production would be excluded to protect sensitive resources. Management provisions under this alternative would accommodate undeveloped and nonmotorized recreation activities to a greater degree than the other alternatives. Some special management areas would be created to protect special status species and unique vegetative communities. A key component of Alternative C is managing the following:

- Special status species and vegetation, with an emphasis on maintaining and improving important habitats and managing habitats for both flora and fauna in identified priority areas;
- Land tenure adjustments to improve administrative efficiency and protect resources, while supporting appropriate development and improved public access to public lands and with a greater emphasis on acquiring nonfederal lands;
- Minerals and energy resources to provide for development but with an increased emphasis on conservation and protection of resources;
- OHV opportunities and use by designating public lands as "Limited" to existing routes, limiting mechanized travel to designated routes in SRMAs and WSAs, moderate to high control of OHVs, and expanding nonmotorized opportunities by reducing the number of designated routes. Controls and restrictions would be implemented to emphasize the conservation and protection of resources, such as wildlife, special status species, vegetation, soils, and riparian areas; and

- Fire, to include treatments with an emphasis on a broad range of vegetation types, such as seeding, Encroached Juniper, Low-Elevation Shrub, Mid-Elevation Shrub, Mountain Shrub, and Wet/Cold Conifer) to move toward FRCC 1, with an emphasis on actions to improve and restore greater sage-grouse habitat.

ALTERNATIVE D

The goal of Alternative D is to manage public lands in the planning area to develop and maintain a variety of recreation and other multiple-use opportunities. Economic benefits tied to livestock grazing and other commercial uses of public lands would also be promoted, and commodity production of resources within the planning area would be emphasized. Of the three action alternatives, this would have the least resource protection, but management would comply with land health standards. A key component of Alternative D is managing the following:

- Special status species and vegetation, with an emphasis on maintaining and improving important native vegetation habitats but at a lower level than either Alternative B or C. Management treatments would emphasize fiber and biomass production in the forested habitat types;
- Land tenure adjustments to improve administrative efficiency and protect resources, while supporting appropriate development and improved public access to public lands, with a greater emphasis on acquiring nonfederal lands, but only when necessary to enhance multiple use, to protect significant resource values, and to improve public lands administration;
- Minerals and energy resources to emphasize development but also to meet the minimal needs for conserving and protecting resources;
- OHV opportunities and use by designating public lands as “Limited” through maintaining and expanding designated OHV routes using existing trails and routes, minimal control of OHVs, and not restricting nonmotorized uses; and
- Fire, to include treatments with an emphasis on the broad range of vegetation types in the PFO to move toward FRCC 1, but with an emphasis on actions to mimic historical conditions, but reducing wildland fire by one-half.

ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED BUT NOT ANALYZED IN DETAIL

The following four alternatives were eliminated from further consideration because they violated the planning criteria established for the RMP: (1) developing, producing, or protecting one resource at the expense of other resources or uses, (2) designating all areas as either open or closed to OHV use, (3) restoring crested wheatgrass seedings to native species associated with the Low-Elevation Shrub vegetation type, and (4) not issuing new phosphate leases.

ES.6 CHANGES FROM THE DRAFT RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PLAN TO THE PROPOSED RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PLAN

As a result of public comment and internal BLM review, the BLM’s Preferred Alternative, identified as Alternative B as presented in the October 2006 Pocatello Draft RMP/EIS has been modified and is now considered the Proposed RMP for managing BLM-administered public lands in the PFO. The Proposed RMP is a refinement of Alternative B from the Draft RMP/EIS,

with consideration given to public comments, correction, and rewording for clarification of purpose and intent. The Draft RMP/EIS was available for a 90-day comment period ending on April 4, 2007. The Proposed RMP/Final EIS is designed to be used in conjunction with the Draft RMP/EIS for references to appendices and in regard to page numbers cited in the Proposed RMP/Final EIS comment and response section (**Appendix U**).

Modifications to Alternative B focused on addressing public comments, while continuing to meet the BLM's legal and regulatory mandates. Chapter 5 of the Proposed RMP/Final EIS contains a summary of the public comment process and the comments received on the Draft RMP/EIS. All comment letters received and the BLM's responses are in **Appendix U** (Volume III).

New text throughout this Proposed RMP/Final EIS generally includes the following:

- Adjustments to Alternative B (the Proposed RMP);
- Additions to Chapter 3, Affected Environment;
- Clarifications to better explain the purpose and intent of management proposed in the Draft RMP/EIS or the environmental consequences;
- Incorporation of new information;
- Revisions to Chapter 4, Environmental Consequences, to make corrections and to reflect changes in management direction (Proposed RMP) and subsequent impact analysis;
- Additions to Chapter 5, Consultation and Coordination, to describe the public comment process on the Draft RMP/EIS;
- Additions to Chapter 6, References, to include additional references cited in the document; and
- Minor corrections, such as typographical errors.

The detailed description of the Proposed RMP is included in Chapter 2, **Table 2-1**. The environmental consequences of implementing the Proposed RMP (Alternative B from the Draft RMP/EIS, as edited) are described in Chapter 4.

CHANGES TO THE ALTERNATIVES (CHAPTER 2)

Alternative B from the Draft RMP/EIS has been modified and now represents the Proposed RMP. Modifications to Alternative B from the Draft RMP/EIS include the following, which is based on public comment and internal review:

- Additional discussion regarding a no grazing alternative was added to the section, Alternatives Considered but Eliminated from Detailed Analysis;
- Cultural Resources—Language has been added to clarify the management of cultural resources;
- Tribal Treaty Rights and Interest—A new goal with an objective and management actions was added recognizing tribal Treaty Rights and Interests related to traditional/cultural uses and the health of the land and water resources (including the 1868 Fort Bridger Treaty);

- Soils and Water—New management direction has been added regarding roads and trails adjacent to streams or riparian areas that impact water quality;
- Vegetation—For the Aspen/Aspen Conifer Mix and Dry Conifer vegetation types, the objective has been updated, increasing the desired percent of Land Health Condition (LHC) in LHC-B and reducing the percentage in LHC-C;
- Special Status Species
 - Action has been edited to clarify the BLM’s intent on managing for special status species. Conservation measures and guidelines that the BLM would consider have been clarified. Text has been added regarding management for the bald eagle, which has been delisted. Additional management direction has been added under the Wildland Fire Management subsection, clarifying that human life and firefighter safety and property take priority over species protection;
 - Management direction has been edited to reference the Conservation Plan for the Greater Sage-grouse in Idaho (2006).
 - Additionally, “key habitat” was added as a priority for protecting and maintaining greater sage-grouse suitable habitat, and the distance to protect leks from permitted activities was updated;
 - Greater sage-grouse references (e.g., Connelly et. al.) used in the RMP/Draft EIS (2006) are identical to those in the Conservation Plan for the Greater sage-grouse in Idaho (July 2006). However, since the RMP/Draft EIS was in final production prior to the release of the Idaho conservation plan, references for sage-grouse, such as Connelly et al were used. Subsequently sage-grouse references have been updated to the Conservation Plan for the Greater sage-grouse in Idaho (July 2006) in the Proposed Plan/Final EIS to reflect current knowledge and information for sage-grouse and in refining management direction for buffers consistent with guidelines in the Idaho plan.
 - Management direction to protect sage-grouse leks from disturbances was clarified, using buffers of 0.6 and 2.0 miles as identified in the Conservation Plan for the Greater Sage-grouse in Idaho (2006) to distinguish between temporary human disturbance near active leks and permanent infrastructure surface occupancy near occupied leks. This distinction between buffers for active and occupied leks is more discriminating because of the temporary or permanent nature of the disturbance but resulted in approximately the same number of acres being analyzed as in the RMP/Draft EIS and does not represent an addition or expansion to any allocation identified in the Draft EIS. This difference in acres can be attributed to the fact that most leks are not located on BLM-administered public lands.
 - Management direction has been rewritten to clarify management for Columbian sharp-tailed grouse, revising the mileage requirement from known leks for maintaining vegetation in suitable condition (LHC-A) for nesting and brood rearing. Additionally, the distance to protect Columbian sharp-tailed grouse leks from permitted activities was updated;
 - Management direction has been modified to clarify the BLM’s intent regarding management of migratory bird species habitat and management of large spring

systems, to prevent possible extirpation of spring-dependent species, such as springsnails;

- Wildland Fire Management
 - Actions have been added regarding the BLM's collaborative efforts between federally recognized tribes (e.g., Shoshone-Bannock Tribes) during proposed fire and nonfire vegetation treatments;
 - A new objective and management direction has been added to indicate that the BLM will use appropriate management response for fire suppression to protect listed species and related habitat;
 - Management direction has been revised to clarify the BLM's intent regarding fire and nonfire vegetation treatments as they relate to restoring or improving natural or cultural resource values. Additional management direction has been added to clarify fire and nonfire vegetation treatment restrictions for listed species' occupied habitat and designated critical habitat;
 - Changes have been made to management actions to further explain the BLM's intent on managing public lands to protect, improve, or enhance resources and values at risk;
 - The amount of footprint acres treated for the Aspen/Aspen Conifer vegetation type has been modified;
 - Objectives and management actions have been added to address wildland fire management and its effect on greater sage-grouse source habitats, restoration, and key habitats;
- Livestock Grazing
 - Changes have been made to further clarify the BLM's management direction regarding livestock grazing management following wildland fires and fire and nonfire vegetation treatments;
 - Management direction has been modified regarding the Blackfoot Stock Driveway allotments;
- Minerals and Energy Resources
 - Management direction has been modified to further clarify split-estate land stipulations, mitigation, and reclamation requirements;
 - Changes have been made to modify management direction within development areas. The operational guidelines have been modified to clarify direction regarding mine pits;
 - Changes have been made to the "Standards for CWA Regulated Surface Waters" table, specifying contaminants and micrograms per liter;
 - The objective identifying acres available for fluid minerals leasing has been revised. In addition to WSAs identified as closed to fluid mineral leasing, the Curlew area is identified as administratively unavailable in order to protect the Sagebrush Steppe habitat, other sagebrush obligate species habitat and winter ranges, and special status species, such as greater sage-grouse and sharp-tailed grouse. Management direction regarding no surface occupancy for fluid minerals has been revised to clarify those areas and resources that are protected also;

- Management direction has been updated to clarify actions on field drainages or mineral trespass of federally reserved minerals;
- Recreation
 - Management direction has been updated to include the Campground SRMA;
 - Management direction has been updated to clarify OHV use on public lands. Additionally, language has been modified prohibiting cross-country travel;
 - Big game winter range has been added to the list of area restrictions for snowmobiling;
 - Criteria and prioritization for travel management planning has been modified;
- Administrative Designations
 - Language has been added to clarify management direction for WSAs if Congress releases them from wilderness consideration;
 - A management objective has been modified identifying the number of designated ACEC/RNAs from 14 to 13;
 - A management objective has been added to remove the ACEC designation for the Van Komen Homestead because it was burned in a wildland fire; and
 - A management objective has been added to designate Petticoat Peak as an ACEC.

CHANGES TO THE AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT (CHAPTER 3)

Chapter 3 of the Draft RMP/EIS has been adjusted as follows:

- Section 3.2.1, Air Quality, has been updated to reflect that, on August 14, 2006, the Portneuf Valley area was redesignated to attainment for the PM₁₀ National Ambient Air Quality Standards;
- Section 3.2.2, Cultural Resources, has been edited to add an additional subsection (3.2.2.4., Tribal Treaty Rights and Interest);
- Section 3.2.5, Vegetation, has been updated to:
 - Reflect additional information on microbiotic crusts;
 - Add information regarding the number of stream miles that support riparian vegetation (165 miles), as well as the percentages of PFO riparian area conditions in proper functioning condition and those in nonfunctioning condition; and
 - Add information regarding invasive species/noxious weeds;
- Section 3.2.7, Special Status Species, has been updated to:
 - Reflect the bald eagle delisting effective June 28, 2007;
 - Add new information on the greater sage-grouse, specifically the most recent conservation plan published in 2006 by the Idaho Sage-Grouse Advisory Committee; and
 - Add information on the greater sage-grouse including additional discussion on threats to sage-grouse within Idaho.
- Section 3.2.9, Water Resources, has been updated to add information about 303(d) streams. **Figure 3-10** has been added, and **Table 3-16** has been updated;

- Section 3.3.3, Livestock Grazing, has been updated to illustrate that lands adjacent to the Blackfoot Reservoir and Grays Lake National Wildlife Refuge have been withdrawn to the Bureau of Indian Affairs, in connection with the Fort Hall Irrigation Project;
- Section 3.3.4, Mineral Resources, has been updated to explain scheduling for investigating selenium releases from four active phosphate mines and 11 inactive mines;
- Section 3.4.1, Areas of Critical Environmental Concern, has been updated to add information regarding the wildland fire that destroyed the structures of the Van Komen Homestead ACEC in August 2006;
- Section 3.5.1, Socioeconomic Resources, has been updated to:
 - Add information regarding the percentage of people in each county with no high school education; and
 - Add information regarding the Fort Hall Indian Reservation (Section 3.5.2.3).

CHANGES TO THE ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES (CHAPTER 4)

Chapter 4 of the Draft RMP/EIS has been modified as follows:

- This chapter has been edited to improve readability, clarify intent, and make corrections that reflect BLM changes and comments provided by the public;
- In consideration of and response to public comments, the Curlew area has been identified as administratively unavailable to fluid minerals leasing. The analysis associated with this management direction change has been updated throughout Chapter 4 for affected resources and resource uses; and
- Analysis of greater sage-grouse direction was clarified.

CHANGES TO APPENDICES (VOLUME III OF DRAFT RMP/EIS)

The Draft RMP/EIS appendices have been adjusted as follows:

- Appendix B—New text has been added to recognize an additional Executive Order and the Fort Bridger Treaty;
- Appendix C—Numbering of management actions and objectives have been updated to be consistent with the Proposed RMP;
- Appendix D—Text has been revised for clarity (purpose and intent) and to correct noted typographical errors;
- Appendix E—Numbering of management actions and objectives have been updated to be consistent with the Proposed RMP;
- Appendix F—Disposal parcels from the Malad MFP were added and header text was modified;
- Appendix H—Text has been updated regarding seasonal restrictions;
- Appendix I—Numbering of management actions and objectives have been updated to be consistent with the Proposed RMP;
- Appendix Q—Clarification language has been added regarding the processing of Notices of Intent and Applications for a Permit to Drill for fluid mineral exploration;

- Appendix S— Shoshone-Bannock Tribes Policy Statements ;
- Appendix T— Biological Assessment, Addendums, and USFWS Concurrence Memos; and
- Appendix U— Draft RMP/EIS Public Comment Letters and the BLM’s response.

CHANGES TO MAPS (VOLUME III OF DRAFT RMP/EIS)

The Draft RMP/EIS maps (Volume III of the Draft RMP/EIS) have been modified as follows:

- **Figure 3-2** has been updated to remove information about the Portneuf non-attainment area (NAA), which is now in attainment;
- Attributes for steep slopes, highly erodible soils, and riparian vegetation have been added to **Figures 2-8, 2-18, 2-31, and 2-39**. The administratively unavailable Curlew area and all No Surface Occupancy stipulations within the PFO area were revised in **Figure 2-18**;
- Management direction for phosphate lease closures has been updated; as a result, **Figure 2-32** has been deleted and phosphate lease closures for Alternative C are now shown on **Figure 2-19**;
- Management direction for OHV designations has been updated; as a result, **Figure 2-34** has been deleted and OHV designations for Alternative C are now shown on **Figure 2-22**. Big game winter range was added to **Figure 2-22** as an area where snowmobile use would be restricted to designated routes; and
- **Figure 3-10**, Key Water Features, was added.

Figures 2-32 through 2-40 and Figures 3-10 through 3-20 have been renumbered from the Draft RMP/EIS to reflect the revision denoted above.

ES.7 ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES

Alternative A (No Action Alternative) would be a continuation of current management. Alternative B (the Proposed RMP) would allow for many uses to continue but could constrain certain activities in order to maintain or improve land health conditions. Alternative C would have the least potential impact on physical and biological resources but the potential for a greater impact on the local economies and businesses that depend on the public lands in the planning area for tourism, recreation, and resource extraction. Conversely, Alternative D offers the greatest economic potential but greatest potential impact on the physical and biological environment.

Impacts under Alternative B (the Proposed RMP) tend to be within the range of Alternatives C and D. Detailed descriptions of impacts of the four alternatives are provided in Chapter 4, along with a discussion of the cumulative impacts, irretrievable and irreversible commitments of resources, and unavoidable adverse impacts of the alternatives. **Table ES-9** provides a summary of the environmental impacts and differences of each alternative, including in the Proposed RMP.

ES.8 RATIONALE FOR THE IDENTIFICATION OF THE PROPOSED RMP— ALTERNATIVE B

Alternative A, the No Action Alternative, minimally addresses relevant issues identified through public scoping and required components of the land use planning document. Thus Alternative A was dismissed because it did not adequately address issues/concerns identified by the public, required planning components, and concerns of the planning team.

Alternatives C and D address both the identified relevant issues and required components necessary in a land use planning document with varying degrees of flexibility, protection, conservation, and establishment of allowable uses. Alternatives C and D address the public's issues/concerns through identified management direction, as well as the purpose and need, but they lack a balance between resources and resource use allocations.

Alternative B—The Proposed RMP, after tribal and public comments received have been analyzed and changes incorporated (see Chapter 1, Section 1.13, and Chapter 2, Section 2.6), provides the most reasonable and practical approach to managing the public lands resources and uses while addressing the relevant issues and purpose and need. It provides a balanced approach to public lands management, with an appropriate level of flexibility to meet the overall needs of the resources and use allocations. This alternative represents proactive management and provides flexibility to adjust to changing conditions over time, while emphasizing a level of protection, restoration, enhancement, and use of resources and services into the future.

ES.9 ADDRESSING RELEVANT ISSUES IN THE ALTERNATIVES

Public comments received during the public scoping open houses helped to identify issues that shaped the formulation and development of the action alternatives. In turn, the alternatives may address one or more specific relevant issues to varying degrees, or an action alternative may simply be silent for a particular issue. Section 1.4.3 in Chapter 1 provides more detail on issue identification.

Following is a general discussion of how each of the six “relevant issues” identified for this planning process may or may not be addressed by the action alternatives.

Issue 1: How would increasing OHV use and associated conflicts be managed?

The BLM proposes to actively manage OHVs in order to provide a quality OHV experience, while protecting resources and providing opportunities for other user groups (e.g., primitive recreation). Under the action alternatives, the BLM would close about 12,700 acres to protect resources and prevent user conflicts and would limit OHV use on public lands throughout the planning area. These limitations may include restricting the number or types of vehicles, limiting the time or season of use, restricting to permitted or licensed use only, and limiting use to existing and designated roads and trails. The BLM may place other limitations to protect resources, particularly in areas that OHV enthusiasts use intensively or where they participate in competitive events. To avoid conflicts between winter users and to protect sensitive habitats, the alternatives vary in how and where snowmobiling can take place. **Table ES-3** summarizes the OHV designations by alternative, identifying those acreages that are “Open,” “Limited,” “Closed,” or “Not Designated.”

Table ES-3. Summary of OHV Designations by Alternative

OHV Designation	Alternative (acres)			
	A	B	C	D
Open	61,300	0.0	0.0	0.0
Limited	199,000	601,100	601,100	601,100
All vehicles limited to designated routes, snowmobiling not allowed	N/A	[62,100]	[62,100]	[28,700]
All vehicles limited to designated routes, including snowmobiles	N/A	[286,500]	[286,500]	[0.0]
All vehicles limited to designated routes, except snowmobiles, which would not be restricted	N/A	[252,500]	[252,500]	[572,400]
Closed	1,300	12,700	12,700	12,700
Not Designated	352,200	0.0	0.0	0.0

Note: Bracketed numbers are subset acres that total the Limited acres for each alternative.

After the RMP is implemented, the BLM would conduct a public travel management planning process to further define how OHV use would be managed in the “Limited” areas. Each alternative provides a different emphasis regarding motorized, nonmotorized, and mechanized type travel.

- Alternative A would maintain a passive management approach, favoring open travel. While providing the most unencumbered OHV experience, it would not protect resources or resolve user conflicts;
- Alternative B provides for legitimate intensive uses, such as rock crawling, motocross riding, or any other valid motorized activities by emphasizing designated appropriate areas for these activities in front country or rural settings. Intensive use areas would not exceed 80 acres;
- Alternative C emphasizes establishing fewer designated routes for motorized vehicles, especially in important sensitive species habitat, winter range, and calving/fawning areas; and
- Alternative D provides for legitimate intensive uses, such as rock crawling, motocross riding, or any other valid motorized activities, by emphasizing designated appropriate areas for these activities in front country or rural settings. Intensive use areas would not exceed a “footprint” larger than 320 acres.

Issue 2: How would mining/reclamation efforts be managed to ensure containment of hazardous substances (e.g., selenium) and other contaminants?

Under all alternatives, the BLM would implement a number of objectives and actions to address this issue. Below is a representative sample of such actions (see Management Guidance Common to Action Alternatives, Minerals and Energy for more information):

- Operational Standards and Guidelines are proposed and would be implemented to reduce impacts from mineral exploration and development;

- Idaho Standards for Rangeland Health would be used to determine success of reclamation efforts;
- Interagency contaminant levels for groundwater, surface water, and vegetation are established for reclamation efforts;
- Best management practices or other appropriate techniques would be applied to control sedimentation and release of contaminants;
- In reclamation, plants known to reduce the risk of bioaccumulation would be used if a hazard is present;
- Sites would be monitored and vegetation would be tested for bioaccumulation; and
- Phosphate mine site plans would be designed to meeting the goals of the Interagency Area-Wide Investigation of Phosphate Mine Contamination and Final Risk Management.

Issue 3: How would the need for acquiring and maintaining access to public lands be addressed, while protecting private property rights?

Under all action alternatives, the BLM would implement a goal focused specifically on maintaining and acquiring access to public lands. A variety of realty tools (e.g., fee acquisition, easements, conservation easements, and donation) would be used to acquire access from willing sellers. The BLM would focus on priority acquisition areas, which include known access conflicts. All land tenure adjustments (including acquisition and disposal) would include public access as part of the proposed screening process. Access to public lands would be retained across lands transferred out of federal ownership. The BLM would coordinate with other entities, such as counties, to identify legal access and use the Cooperative Rights-of-Way Agreement between the BLM and the State of Idaho to acquire access across state lands, as needed.

Issue 4: How would increasing use of and demand for quality recreation opportunities be balanced with other resources and uses?

Under all alternatives, SRMAs would be proposed to provide specific structured recreational opportunities, such as activity, experience, and benefit opportunities. SRMAs would be priority areas for recreational funding and would be managed to target specific activities, thereby controlling user conflicts. As shown on **Table ES-4**, Alternatives B and C propose the most SRMAs (four) and Alternatives A and D the fewest (two).

Table ES-4. Comparison of Special Recreation Management Areas and Extensive Recreation Management Areas (ERMAs)

SRMA/ERMA	Alternative (acres)			
	A	B	C	D
Pocatello SRMA	33,400	33,400	33,400	33,400
Blackfoot River SRMA	21,800	21,800	21,800	21,800
Oneida Narrows SRMA	N/A	3,600	3,600	N/A
Campgrounds SRMA	N/A	430	430	N/A
Pocatello ERMA	558,600	554,570	554,570	558,600

The remaining public lands in the planning area would be managed as an extensive recreation management area (ERMA), which generally provides a less developed, primitive experience. Under all alternatives, management of ERMAs is clarified and focuses on minimizing user conflicts and monitoring for visitor satisfaction.

As discussed above, the BLM proposes to actively manage OHV use to protect resources and minimize conflicts with other user groups. Future travel management planning would incorporate the intent and purpose of the SRMAs to maximize user experiences and protect resources.

Issue 5: How would the sagebrush ecosystem be managed to balance resources and use demands with greater sage-grouse and sagebrush obligate species?

All alternatives focus on managing shrub steppe vegetation to achieve LHC A, which represents a healthy and diversified sagebrush ecosystem. Among the alternatives, the BLM is proposing a variety of fire and nonfire vegetation treatments to achieve LHC A. **Table ES-5** provides the expected acreage of the public lands shrub steppe type, achieving the different LHCs at year 30 post treatments.

Table ES-5. Projected Acres of Shrub Steppe by Land Health Condition Class at Year 30

LHC	Current	Alternative (acres)			
		A	B	C	D
A	295,972	344,500	359,000	344,500	368,700
B	111,596	63,100	0.0	0.0	0.0
C	77,632	77,600	126,200	140,700	116,500

In addition to vegetation treatments, all action alternatives propose closing and limiting OHV travel (see above). This would help protect remaining healthy sagebrush ecosystems. Management of ACECs and RNAs, most notably the Dairy Hollow RNA, would help protect sagebrush from conflicting uses.

Issue 6: How would social and economic benefits of commodity and amenity uses be balanced?

As discussed in Chapter 1, the vision of the RMP is to sustain healthy and functional ecosystems, while meeting the multiple use mandate of FLPMA. All alternatives follow this vision and meet all federal laws, but they vary to some degree in the level of resource protection, opportunities for resource extraction, and recreational benefits. None of the action alternatives are expected to notably alter local population trends, employment levels, demands for public services, or other demographics. There would be intrinsic tradeoffs between market-based economic benefits and nonmarket social benefits among the alternatives. For example, Alternatives B and D would provide the greatest long-term economic opportunities because they contain the fewest encumbrances to development and resource extraction, while Alternative C provides more nonmarket values, such as preserving sensitive areas and promoting primitive nonmotorized experiences. Under Alternatives B and C, up to five percent of public lands may be disposed of, while up to 10 percent may be disposed of under Alternative D. Most of these lands are in fragmented ownership patterns, so any market-based activities, such as grazing, would likely continue. **Table ES-6** provides some indicators to highlight some of the social and economic

benefits and tradeoffs. Due to the personal preference of assessing benefits, these indicators should be considered only as examples.

Table ES-6. Comparison of Alternatives by Example Social and Economic Tradeoff Indicators

Indicator	Alternative (approximate acres ¹)			
	A	B	C	D
Acres available for livestock grazing	556,300	560,000	555,300	527,800
Open to solid minerals leasing	591,200	582,400	582,400	597,500
Discretionary closure for solid leasable minerals	11,400	20,200	20,200	5,100
Discretionary closure for mineral materials	21,500	20,200	57,800	5,100

Table ES-6. Comparison of Alternatives by Example Social and Economic Tradeoff Indicators (continued)

Indicator	Alternative (approximate acres ¹)			
	A	B	C	D
Discretionary closure for locatable minerals	1,500	19,200	19,200	1,500
Wildlife habitat protected by fluid Mineral a No Surface Occupancy (NSO) stipulation	80,600	98,000	143,500	84,100
Proposed acres for possible disposal	32,000	28,150	24,950	60,700
Acres excluded to land use authorizations (e.g., rights-of-way)	30,700	1,900	1,900	0.0
Acres in WSAs, ACECs and RNAs	22,600	22,100	22,100	22,600

¹ All acre figures are rounded to nearest 100 acres.

ES.10 CONSULTATION AND COORDINATION

As discussed above, the BLM implemented an extensive public collaboration process to solicit and address public input. In addition, the BLM conducted formal public scoping and prepared a scoping report summarizing public input. The Shoshone-Bannock Tribes, USFWS, and Idaho Department of Fish and Game (IDFG) are participating agencies with whom the BLM collaborated in developing the RMP. The BLM also coordinated with private landowners and other special interest groups. Additionally, the BLM consulted and coordinated with federal, state, county, and local government elected officials and representatives. Communication is ongoing and will continue through the implementation of the plan. Chapter 5 provides a discussion of coordination and consultation.

ES.11 DOCUMENT PREPARATION AND PREPARERS

An interdisciplinary team of resource specialists from the BLM PFO prepared this document. Tetra Tech, Inc., and Maxim Technologies, Inc., a subsidiary of Tetra Tech, assisted the BLM in preparing these documents and in the planning process (**Table ES-7**). Also providing assistance were Yvette Tuell and Claude Broncho of the Shoshone-Bannock Tribes, Jim Mende of IDFG,

Troy Smith and Deb Mignogno of the USFWS, Lloyd W. Briggs of the Idaho Falls District Resource Advisory Committee, and the US Department of Agriculture, Forest Service.

Table ES-7. List of Preparers

Name	Years Experience	Role/Responsibility	Education
POCATELLO FIELD OFFICE			
Candida Aguirre	16	Lands and Realty	BLM Lands and Realty Professional Development Studies
Jim Bowmer	3	Forestry, Vegetation	BS, Forest Resources
Ray Brainard	30 (Retired)	Forestry, Vegetation	BS, Forestry Management MS, Forestry
Jeff Cundick	17	Minerals, Oil and Gas, Geothermal Resources	BS, Mining Engineering MBA, Business

Table ES-7. List of Preparers (continued)

Name	Years Experience	Role/Responsibility	Education
Cleve B. Davis	6	Special Status Species (flora), Vegetation	BS, Botany
Amy Lapp	3	Cultural Resources	MS, Anthropology, BA, Anthropology
Geoff Hogander	28 (Retired)	Fish and Wildlife, Vegetation, Air, Soils and Geology	BS, Fish and Wildlife Management
Brian Holmes	4	GIS	BS, Zoology MS, Biology
James Kumm	19	Fish and Wildlife, Special Status Species (fauna), Vegetation	BS, Wildlife Biology MS, Wildlife Sciences
Becky Lazdauskas	12	Lands and Realty	BS, Natural Science
Blaine Newman	13	Recreation, Visual Resources, Special Designations	BS, Wildland Recreation Management
Paul Oakes	33 (Retired)	RMP/EIS Planning Coordinator	BA, Biology, Graduate studies in soils
Dave Pacioretty	20	Field Office Manager	BS, Rangeland Science
Matt Rendace	25	Vegetation, Livestock Grazing	BS, Range Management
Terry Lee Smith	21	RMP/EIS Project Manager, Fire Management, Socioeconomics, Cultural/Paleontology, and Vegetation	BS, Agriculture MS, Forestry and Range Management
Mitch Werner	18	Writer, Editor	BBA, Marketing/Film and Video Production
US FISH AND WILDLIFE			
Troy Smith	1	Wildlife, Special Status Species	BS, Wildlife Resources MS, Forest Science
IDAHO FISH AND GAME			
Martha Wackenhut	8	Wildlife, Special Status Species	BS, Wildlife MS, Biology/Zoology
CONTRACTOR – TETRA TECH, INC.			
Cynthia Adornetto	24	Project Manager, Greater Sage-Grouse Analysis, QA/QC, Document Production, Administrative Record	MEPM, Environmental Policy and Management, University of Denver; BS, Natural Resources Management, Colorado State University

Table ES-7. List of Preparers (continued)

Name	Years Experience	Role/Responsibility	Education
Kevin T. Doyle	18	Cultural Resources and Paleontological Resources, Tribal Treaty Rights and Interests	BA, University of California, Santa Barbara
Michael Egan*	17	Mineral Resources	BS, Geology, Montana State University
Cameo Flood	20	Forestry, Fire Management	BS, Forest Resource Management, University of Montana
Derek Holmgren	7	Lands and Realty, Visual Resources	MPA, Environmental Policy and Administration and MSES, Indiana University; BS and BA, Oregon State University
W. Wynn John*	5	Air Quality	MS, Geological Engineering, University of Utah; BS, Environmental Earth Science, University of Utah
Genevieve Kaiser	15	Socioeconomics, GIS	MS, Energy Management and Policy, University of Pennsylvania; BA, Economics, College of William and Mary; Professional Certification: GIS, University of Denver
David Kane*	18	Vegetation, Invasive Species Management, Fire Management, Livestock Grazing	PhD, Ecology and Conservation Biology, University of Denver; BS, Wildlife Ecology, University of Wyoming
Matt Loscalzo	6	QA/QC, Document Production, Administrative Record	MS, Environmental Studies, University of Colorado; BA, Political Science, Binghamton University
Neil Lynn*	6	Biological Assessment, Greater Sage-Grouse Analysis, Administrative Record	BS, Wildlife Biology, Colorado State University
Mike Manka*	12	Special Status Species, Fish and Wildlife, Wilderness Study Areas, Wild and Scenic Rivers	BS, Biological Sciences, Ecology and Systematics, Cornell University
Joy McLain	9	Water Quality, Special Status Species	BS, Environmental Health/Biology minor, Boise State University
Bindi Patel*	4	Socioeconomics, Environmental Justice	MEM, Duke University; BA, Washington and Lee University
David Steed	14	Initial Assistant Project Manager	BS, Idaho State University
Randolph Varney	16	Writer, Editor	MFA in Writing, University of San Francisco; BA, Technical and Professional Writing, San Francisco State University
Walt Vering	12	Aquatic Resources	MS, University of Wisconsin, Stevens Point; BA, Wartburg College
Valerie Waldorf*	10	GIS, Socioeconomic Support, Public Participation (newsletters)	MBA, University of Utah; BS, Westminster College

Table ES-7. List of Preparers (continued)

Name	Years Experience	Role/Responsibility	Education
Ed Yates*	14	Compliance Oversight	JD, Law, University of San Diego School of Law; BA, Political Science, University of California, Davis
Ann Zoidis	12	QA/QC	MS, Physiology and Behavioral Biology, San Francisco University; BA, Geological Sciences, Smith College
SUBCONTRACTOR – EMPSi: ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT AND PLANNING SOLUTIONS, INC.			
Angie Adams*	13	Recreation, Administrative Designations	BA, Biology, Drake University
David Batts*	15	Project Manager, Water Resources and Soils	MS, Natural Resource Planning, Michigan State University; BS, International Development, Lewis and Clark College
Holly Prohaska*	8	Livestock Grazing	MS, Environmental Management, University of San Francisco; BA, Marine Science, Biological Pathway, University of San Diego
Kate Wynant*	3	Document Production/ Technical Review, Administrative Record	BA, Environmental Studies, University of Colorado
Jennifer Zakrowski*	10	Project Manager, Recreation and Administrative Designations	MSM, Project Management, Regis University; BS, Public Affairs, emphasis in Natural Resource Management, Indiana University

*Former employee of Tetra Tech, Inc.

ES.12 COMPARISON OF THE ALTERNATIVES AND ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES

Table ES-8 provides a summary of the primary differences between the Proposed RMP (Alternative B in the Draft RMP/EIS published October 2006) and the other three alternatives. In general, only those resources and uses that have been identified as being a planning issue or need for change topic have differences between the alternatives.

Table ES-9 provides a summary of the impacts on the human and natural environment in terms of environmental, social, and economic consequences that are proposed to occur from implementing the Proposed RMP (Alternative B in the Draft RMP/EIS published October 2006) and the three other alternatives presented in Chapter 2.

Table ES-8. Summary Comparison of Alternatives

General (GE)			
ALTERNATIVE A	PROPOSED RMP	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
<p>Goal GE-1. Continuously update resource and use information/data in order to proactively address changing needs and or conditions. (GE-1)</p> <p>Objective CA-GE-1.1. Inventories and surveys documenting the condition and extent of resources/uses are given sufficient emphasis to monitor changes in conditions, provide "measurements" of ecosystem health or baseline data/information, and enable specialists to respond to changes when needed. (PP-GE-1.1)</p>			
<p>Goal GE-2. Consistent with multiple use management and sustained yield, achieve desired resource and use conditions while providing for an ecologically healthy environment. (GE-2)</p> <p>Objective CA-GE-2.1. Reduce impacts from management actions, and maintain or improve resource conditions. (PP-GE-2.1)</p>			
<p>Goal GE-3. Provide for proper nutrient cycling, hydrological cycling and energy flow consistent with multiple use management and sustained productivity. (GE-3)</p> <p>Objective AA-GE- 3.1. Restore or improve the public lands adversely affected by major surface disturbance resulting from activities such as but not limited to mineral and energy development, wildland fire, and rights-of way (ROW) development. (PP-GE-3.1)</p>			
RESOURCES			
Air Quality (AQ)			
ALTERNATIVE A	PROPOSED RMP	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
<p>Goal AQ-1. Comply with existing laws and regulations to meet health and safety requirements.</p>			
Objective CA-AQ-1.1. Reduce particulate impacts from uncontrolled wildland fires.	No similar objective	Objective CA-AQ-1.1. Reduce particulate impacts from uncontrolled wildland fires.	Objective CA-AQ-1.1. Reduce particulate impacts from uncontrolled wildland fires.
Objective CA-AQ-1.2. Control the particulate level impacts from permitted/authorized activities. (PP-AQ-1.1)			

Cultural Resources (CR)			
ALTERNATIVE A	PROPOSED RMP	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
<p>Goal CR-1. Provide for the identification, protection, and enhancement of historical and cultural sites to ensure scientific and socio-cultural values are maintained and are available for appropriate uses by present and future generations. (CR-1)</p> <p>Objective CA-CR-1.1. Manage important known and future identified cultural and historical sites to maintain and preserve their educational, scientific, and public benefit. (PP-CR-1.1.)</p> <p>Objective CA-CR-1.2. Reduce imminent threats from natural or human-caused deterioration, or potential conflict with other resource uses. (PP-CR-1.2.)</p>			

Tribal Treaty Rights and Interests (TR)			
ALTERNATIVE A	PROPOSED RMP	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
<p>New Goal. Provide for Tribal Treaty Rights and Interests on unoccupied public lands and public lands with the ceded reservation boundary. (TR-1)</p> <p>New Objective: Maintain traditional/cultural use values and the health of land and water resources so treaty rights and interests can be fulfilled by tribal members on unoccupied public lands and those public lands within the ceded reservation boundary. (PP-TR-1.1)</p>			

Soil and Water (SW)			
ALTERNATIVE A	PROPOSED RMP	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
<p>Goal SW-1. Provide for soil quality, productivity, and hydrological function within naturally sustainable limits. (SW-1)</p> <p>Objective CA-SW-1.1. Incorporate resource protections to minimize soil loss when the long-term health of soil function and productivity is at risk. (PP-SW-1.1)</p>			
<p>Goal SW-2. Protect and maintain watersheds so that they appropriately capture, retain, and release water of quality that meets state and national standards and do not impair source water protection areas. (SW-2)</p> <p>Objective CA-SW-2.1. Manage public land activities to maintain or contribute to the long term improvement of surface and ground water quality. (PP-SW-1.2)</p>			

Paleontological Resources (PR)			
ALTERNATIVE A	PROPOSED RMP	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
<p>Goal PR-1. Provide for the identification, protection, and management of paleontological resources for the preservation, interpretation and scientific uses by present and future generations. (PR-1)</p> <p>Objective CA-PR-1.1. Maintain and protect paleontological resources for their educational and scientific benefits. (PP-PR-1.1)</p>			

Vegetation (VE)			
ALTERNATIVE A	PROPOSED RMP	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
<p>Goal VE-1. Provide for the proper functioning condition (PFC) of riparian areas. (VE-1)</p> <p>Objective CA-VE-1.1. Maintain properly functioning riparian areas and restore/improve those areas that are not at PFC. (PP-VE-1.1)</p>			
<p>Goal VE-2. Prevent the establishment of invasive and/or noxious weed species. (VE-2)</p> <p>Objective CA-VE-2.1. Treat invasive/noxious weed species to decrease or control the total number of acres occupied. (PP-VE-2.1)</p>			
	<p>Objective AA-VE-2.1. Treat invasive/noxious weed species to decrease or control the total number of acres occupied. (PP-VE-2.1)</p> <p>Where hay or straw would be used on public lands for permitted/authorized and internal BLM activities, state-certified weed free hay/straw would be required.</p> <p>Public awareness concerning invasive species/noxious weeds control would be promoted including partnerships with other agencies and the Tribes.</p>		
<p>Goal VE-3. Provide for old growth characteristics where forest treatments are implemented. (VE-3)</p> <p>Objective CA-VE-3.1. Maintain or contribute towards the restoration of old growth structure and composition in areas where forest treatments, including those authorized under the Healthy Forests Restoration Act, are proposed. (PP-VE-3.1)</p>			
<p>Goal VE-4: Manage vegetation as part of an ecologically healthy system to provide livestock and wildlife with essential habitat components.</p>		<p>Goal VE-6. Manage vegetation types to provide for their continued presence as part of an ecologically healthy system. (VE-4)</p>	
<p>Objective A-VE-4.1. Maintain or increase forage production for wildlife and livestock.</p>	<p>Objective B-VE-6.1. In Low- and Mid-Elevation Shrub and Mountain Shrub types, commensurate with site potential, maintain or increase LHC-A acres as described below so the landscape is composed of a diversity of desirable/native herbaceous and shrub/woody species consisting of at least 15-25% sagebrush canopy cover in greater sage-grouse habitat in the Low- and Mid-Elevation Shrub types and at least 25% shrub cover in the Mountain Shrub type. (PP-VE-4.1)</p>	<p>Objective C-VE-6.1. In Low- and Mid-Elevation Shrub and Mountain Shrub types, maintain or increase LHC-A acres as described below so the landscape is composed of a diversity of desirable/native herbaceous and shrub/woody species consisting of at least 15-25% sagebrush canopy cover in greater sage-grouse habitat in the Low- and Mid-Elevation Shrub type and at least 25% shrub cover in the Mountain Shrub type.</p>	<p>Objective D-VE-6.1. In Low- and Mid-Elevation Shrub and Mountain Shrub types maintain or increase LHC-A acres as described below so the landscape is composed of a diversity of desirable/native herbaceous and shrub/woody species consisting of at least 15-25% sagebrush canopy cover in greater sage-grouse habitat in the Low- and Mid-Elevation Shrub type and at least 25% shrub cover in the Mountain Shrub type.</p>

Vegetation (VE)					
ALTERNATIVE A	PROPOSED RMP		ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	
	Desired LHC Description	Percent LHC Desired		Desired LHC Description	Percent LHC Desired
	LHC-A -All key components are present as identified in land health standards and as described in the definition of FRCC 1.	> 60%		LHC-A -All key components are present as identified in land health standards and as described in the definition of FRCC 1.	> 50%
	LHC-B - Some or all of the key components as identified in land health standards are present and as described in the definition of FRCC 2.	20-25%		LHC-B - Some or all of the key components as identified in land health standards are present and as described in the definition of FRCC 2.	25-30%
	LHC-C - Key components are absent as identified in land health standards and as described in the definition of FRCC 3.	< 20%		LHC-C - Key components are absent as identified in land health standards and as described in the definition of FRCC 3.	< 25%
No similar objective	Objective VE-6.2. In the Aspen/Aspen Conifer Mix and Dry Conifer types, commensurate with site potential, maintain or increase LHC-A and B acres as described below so the landscape is composed of 40% mixed Aspen/Dry Conifer and 60% Aspen dominate areas consisting of 500-1,000 stems/acre w/ 5-15 ft. height resulting in the distribution of age classes of <30 years (40%), 31-80 years (40%), and >80 years (20%). (Carried forward from Alternative C.) (PP-VE-4.2)		Objective C-VE-6.2. In the Aspen/Aspen Conifer Mix and Dry Conifer types, maintain or increase LHC-A and B acres as described below so the landscape is composed of 40% mixed Aspen/Dry Conifer and 60% Aspen dominate areas consisting of 500-1,000 stems/acre w/ 5-15 ft. height resulting in the distribution of age classes of <30 years (40%), 31-80 years (40%), and >80 years (20%).	Objective D-VE-6.2. In the Aspen/Aspen Conifer Mix and Dry Conifer types, maintain or increase LHC-A and B acres as described below so the landscape is composed of 80% Dry Conifer dominate and 20% Aspen/Dry Conifer mix resulting in a distribution of age classes of <30 years (20%), 31-80 years (40%), and >81 years (40%).	

Vegetation (VE)					
ALTERNATIVE A	PROPOSED RMP		ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	
	Desired LHC Description	Percent LHC Desired		Desired LHC Description	Percent LHC Desired
	LHC-A -All key components are present as identified in land health standards and as described in the definition of FRCC 1.	>30		LHC-A -All key components are present as identified in land health standards and as described in the definition of FRCC 1.	>30
	LHC-B - Some or all of the key components as identified in land health standards are present and as described in the definition of FRCC 2.	35-40		LHC-B - Some or all of the key components as identified in land health standards are present and as described in the definition of FRCC 2.	35-40
	LHC-C - Key components are absent as identified in land health standards and as described in the definition of FRCC 3.	<35		LHC-C - Key components are absent as identified in land health standards and as described in the definition of FRCC 3.	<35
<i>No similar management action</i>	Treat Aspen/ Aspen Conifer sites using appropriate treatment methods and harvest rotation cycles to achieve desired age classes.			Treat Aspen/Aspen Conifer Mix and Dry Conifer types using prescribed fire.	
<i>No similar objective</i>	Objective B-VE-6.3. In the Wet/Cold Conifer type, commensurate with site potential, maintain or increase LHC-A and B acres as described below primarily through natural processes so the landscape is comprised of a distribution of age classes of 0-80 years (30%) and > 80 years (70%). (PP-VE-4.3)			Objective C-VE-6.3. In the Wet/Cold Conifer type, increase LHC-A acres as described below so the landscape is comprised of a distribution of age classes of 0-80 years (30%) and > 80 years (70%).	
				Objective D-VE-6.3. Same as Objective C-VE-6.3.	

Vegetation (VE)						
ALTERNATIVE A		PROPOSED RMP		ALTERNATIVE C		ALTERNATIVE D
		Desired LHC Description	Percent LHC Desired		Desired LHC Description	Percent LHC Desired
		LHC-A -All key components are present as identified in land health standards and as described in the definition of FRCC 1.	>5		LHC-A -All key components are present as identified in land health standards and as described in the definition of FRCC 1.	>10
		LHC-B - Some or all of the key components as identified in land health standards are present and as described in the definition of FRCC 2.	95-100		LHC-B - Some or all of the key components as identified in land health standards are present and as described in the definition of FRCC 2.	85-90
		LHC-C - Key components are absent as identified in land health standards and as described in the definition of FRCC 3.	<5		LHC-C - Key components are absent as identified in land health standards and as described in the definition of FRCC 3.	<5
<i>No similar management action</i>		Use appropriate treatment methods and harvest rotation cycles to achieve desired age classes.		Allow for the natural processes to occur to achieve desired age classes. Minimal treatments would be conducted.		Emphasizes the production of Engelmann spruce. Treat areas to obtain desired age class distribution using mechanical or prescribed fire.

Vegetation (VE)											
ALTERNATIVE A	PROPOSED RMP	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D								
<i>No similar objective</i>	<p>Objective B-VE-6.4. Maintain or increase natural occurring Juniper LHC-A and B acres, commensurate with site potential, as described below through primarily natural processes so the landscape is dominated by widely spaced old juniper trees greater than 300 years. (PP-VE-4.4)</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Desired LHC Description</th> <th>Percent LHC Desired</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>LHC-A -All key components are present as identified in land health standards and as described in the definition of FRCC 1.</td> <td>>5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>LHC-B - Some or all of the key components as identified in land health standards are present and as described in the definition of FRCC 2.</td> <td>95-100</td> </tr> <tr> <td>LHC-C - Key components are absent as identified in land health standards and as described in the definition of FRCC 3.</td> <td><5</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Desired LHC Description	Percent LHC Desired	LHC-A -All key components are present as identified in land health standards and as described in the definition of FRCC 1.	>5	LHC-B - Some or all of the key components as identified in land health standards are present and as described in the definition of FRCC 2.	95-100	LHC-C - Key components are absent as identified in land health standards and as described in the definition of FRCC 3.	<5	<p>Objective C-VE-6.4. Same as Objective B-VE-6.4.</p>	<p>Objective D-VE-6.4. Same as Objective B-VE-6.4.</p>
Desired LHC Description	Percent LHC Desired										
LHC-A -All key components are present as identified in land health standards and as described in the definition of FRCC 1.	>5										
LHC-B - Some or all of the key components as identified in land health standards are present and as described in the definition of FRCC 2.	95-100										
LHC-C - Key components are absent as identified in land health standards and as described in the definition of FRCC 3.	<5										
<i>No similar management action</i>	Use appropriate methods to maintain or promote juniper dominated range sites.	Same as Alternative B.	Same as Alternative B.								
Goal VE-5. Manage rangeland seedings (e.g. crested wheatgrass) for maximum forage production.	<i>No similar goal</i>	<i>No similar goal</i>	<i>No similar goal</i>								
Objective A-VE-5.1. Maintain or improve rangeland seeding forage production.	<i>No similar objective</i>	<i>No similar objective</i>	<i>No similar objective</i>								

Fish and Wildlife (FW)			
ALTERNATIVE A	PROPOSED RMP	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
<p>Goal FW-1. Manage the wildlife habitats so vegetation composition and structure assures the continued presence of fish and wildlife as part of an ecologically healthy system.</p> <p>Objective CA-FW-1.1. Maintain and improve wildlife habitats to support IDFG management objectives.</p>			
<p>Goal FW-2. Provide for the diversity of native and desired non-native species as part of an ecologically healthy system.</p> <p>Objective CA-FW- 2.1. Maintain or improve native and desired non-native species habitat and the connectivity among habitats.</p>			

Special Status Species (SS)			
ALTERNATIVE A	PROPOSED RMP	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
<p>Goal SS-1. Manage special status species and their habitats to provide for their continued presence and conservation as part of an ecologically healthy system.</p> <p>Objective CA-SS-1.1. Conserve, inventory, and monitor special status species. (PP-SS-1.1.)</p> <p>Objective CA-SS-1.2. Maintain or improve the quality of listed (threatened or endangered) species habitat by managing public land activities to support species recovery and the benefit of those species. (PP-SS-1.2.)</p> <p>Objective CA-SS-1.3. Maintain or improve the quality of sensitive species habitat by managing public land activities to support species recovery and the benefit of those species. (PP-SS-1.3.)</p>			
<p>Objective A-SS-1.1. Maintain or improve the quality of listed (threatened or endangered) species habitat by managing public land activities to support species recovery and the benefit of those species.</p> <p>See Chapter 2 for a complete list of management actions for the following listed species:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bald eagle • Gray wolf • Utah valvata snail 	<p>Objective B-SS-1.1. (PP-SS-1.2.)</p> <p>Same as Objective A-SS-1.1.</p>	<p>Objective C-SS-1.1.</p> <p>Same as Objective A-SS-1.1.</p>	<p>Objective D-SS-1.1.</p> <p>Same as Objective A-SS-1.1.</p>
<p>Objective A-SS-1.2. Maintain or improve the quality of sensitive species habitat by managing public land activities to support species recovery and the benefit of those species.</p>	<p>Objective B-SS-1.2. (PP-SS-1.3)</p> <p>Same as Objective A-SS-1.2</p>	<p>Objective C-SS-1.2.</p> <p>Same as Objective A-SS-1.2.</p>	<p>Objective D-SS-1.2.</p> <p>Same as Objective A-SS-1.2</p>

Special Status Species (SS)			
ALTERNATIVE A	PROPOSED RMP	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
Special Status Species: FAUNA			
<p>For Objective A-SS-1.2 see Chapter 2 for a complete list of management actions for the following fauna species:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pygmy rabbits • Boreal toads/leopard frogs • Bear Lake endemic fish • Ferruginous hawk • American white pelican • Yellowstone/Bonneville cutthroat trout 	<p>For Objective B-SS-1.2. (PP-SS-1.3) see Chapter 2 for a complete list of management actions for the following fauna species:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pygmy rabbits (Same as Alternative A) • Boreal toads/leopard frogs (Same as Alternative B) • Bear Lake endemic fish (Same as Alternative A) • Ferruginous hawk (Same as Alternative A) • American white pelican Yellowstone/Bonneville cutthroat trout • Springsnails (<i>Carried forward from Alternative C.</i>) • Migratory birds (<i>Carried forward from Alternative C.</i>) 	<p>For Objective C-SS-1.2 see Chapter 2 for a complete list of management actions for the following fauna species:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pygmy rabbits (Same as Alternative A) • Boreal toads/leopard frogs (Same as Alternative B) • Bear Lake endemic fish • Ferruginous hawk (Same as Alternative A) • American white pelican (Same as Alternative A) • Yellowstone/Bonneville cutthroat trout (Same as Alternative B) • Springsnails • Migratory birds 	<p>For Objective D-SS-1.2 see Chapter 2 for a complete list of management actions for the following fauna species:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pygmy rabbits (Same as Alternative A) • Boreal toads/leopard frogs (Same as Alternative A) • Bear Lake endemic fish (Same as Alternative A) • Ferruginous hawk (Same as Alternative A) • American white pelican (Same as Alternative A) • Yellowstone/Bonneville cutthroat trout (Same as Alternative A)
<p><i>No similar management action</i></p>	<p><i>No similar management action</i></p>	<p>Management guidance to enhance and/or prevent the loss of special status species habitat for the following priority areas and identified species would be as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Curlew Valley - Columbian sharp-tailed and Greater sage-grouse and other sagebrush obligate species • Bear Lake Plateau/Sheep Creek Hills - Greater sage-grouse and sagebrush obligate species • Pleasantview Hills/Samaria Mountains - Columbian sharp-tailed and greater sage-grouse and other sagebrush obligates • Lower Blackfoot River - Greater sage-grouse, raptors, riparian associated species and sagebrush obligates • Deep Creek Mountains - Columbian sharp-tailed and greater sage-grouse 	<p><i>No similar management action</i></p>

Special Status Species (SS)			
ALTERNATIVE A	PROPOSED RMP	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
		(See Chapter 2 for a complete list of management actions for the above priority areas.)	
<p>The following guidelines for greater sage-grouse habitats would be implemented as adapted from Giesen and Connelly (1993):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maintain and enhance existing greater sage-grouse habitats used during each stage of the life cycle. • Minimize human activities that disrupt greater sage-grouse habitats during their seasons of use particularly during the breeding and winter seasons. • Minimize undesired habitat modifications resulting from authorized activities such as land-tenure adjustments, road and facility construction, etc. • Minimize undesired habitat modifications from adverse natural disturbances (wildland fire, insects, disease, etc.) 	<p>To the extent possible and to promote conservation, sage-grouse would be managed consistent with the intent of the <i>Conservation Plan for Greater Sage-grouse in Idaho</i> (Idaho Sage-grouse Advisory Committee, 2006) or any future revisions/amendments and/or current BLM guidance. Appropriate actions, conservation measures, and guidelines that may be considered include, but are not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continue efforts to map populations and habitat for greater sage-grouse. Map seasonal (lek, nesting, brood-rearing and winter) habitats along with source and isolated populations. • Establish goals for greater sage-grouse habitat conservation at the local level in conjunction with IDFG and local working groups for protection and maintenance of existing populations and restoration goals. • Protect and maintain suitable habitats and reconnect separated populations based upon the following priorities: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Key habitats 2. Source habitats (S1) 3. Restoration areas (R1, R2) 4. Areas that link isolated populations • Commensurate with site potential, manage key habitat for a range of sagebrush canopy cover averaging 15 to 25 percent (11 to 31 inches in height); at least 15 percent grass cover; and 10 percent cover of a diversity of forbs. 	Same as Alternative B.	Same as Alternative A.

Special Status Species (SS)			
ALTERNATIVE A	PROPOSED RMP	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Monitor progress and adjust activities to make progress towards greater sage-grouse goals and objectives. • In areas where grouse habitats are fragmented by land ownership pattern, cooperate with IDFG and local working groups to identify and maintain long-term habitat by acquiring conservation easements or bringing crucial habitats into public ownership. • In cooperation with IDFG identify areas where application of pesticides for grasshopper or Mormon cricket control may negatively affect grouse broods. Identify a cooperative strategy to review requests for pesticide application in these identified locations • <u>Active sage-grouse leks</u> would be protected during the lekking season from temporary human disturbance (e.g., routine maintenance, inspections, and construction activities) by requiring a minimum buffer of 0.6 miles. • New infrastructure facilities/structures (e.g., major power transmission lines, power distribution lines, communications towers, and temporary meteorological towers) requiring permanent surface occupancy would be sited in a manner that avoids sage-grouse habitat to the extent possible and would be placed at least 2.0 miles from <u>occupied leks</u> or other important sage-grouse seasonal habitats as identified locally. • Future permitted/authorized activities would be evaluated on a site specific basis for potential 		

Special Status Species (SS)			
ALTERNATIVE A	PROPOSED RMP	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
	<p>threats consistent with the Conservation Plan for Greater Sage-grouse in Idaho (Idaho Sage-grouse Advisory Committee, 2006) and mitigated through the NEPA process. Restore shrub-steppe habitats in the following priority:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. source areas, 2. restoration areas 3. areas that link isolated populations 		
<p>Nesting and brood rearing habitat would be maintained in suitable condition for approximately 1.2 miles from known leks for Columbian sharp-tailed grouse. When assessing the condition of the habitat, adjacent land uses within two miles of these areas would be considered. (Adapted from Giesen and Connelly, 1993).</p>	<p>As appropriate, the following guidelines (as adapted from Geisen and Connelly 1993), or the most current management document and/or BLM policy, would be used in the management of the Columbian sharp-tailed grouse habitat.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As appropriate based upon a site specific habitat assessment, maintain vegetation in suitable condition (LHC-A) for nesting and brood rearing for 2.0 miles from known leks. Any manipulation of habitats must not be greater than 10 percent of the 2.0 mile radius. • As appropriate based upon a site specific habitat assessment, maintain availability of deciduous shrubs (e.g. serviceberry, chokecherry) within 4 miles of leks to protect winter habitat. • Coordinate with IDFG as population targets and monitoring locations are established for Columbian sharp-tailed grouse. Monitoring would be conducted for populations in key or source areas and restorations areas in that order. • In areas where grouse habitats are fragmented by land ownership pattern, cooperate with IDFG and local working groups to identify 	<p>Guidelines would be implemented for Columbian sharp-tailed grouse habitats as adapted from Giesen and Connelly (1993):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maintain vegetation in suitable condition (LHC-A) for nesting and brood rearing for 1.5 miles from known leks. • Within source, key or connective habitats manipulation of sagebrush habitats must be not be greater than 10 percent of the total sagebrush community within a 1.5 mile radius of leks. • Minimize disturbance of deciduous shrubs within 4 miles of leks to protect winter habitat. • Cooperate with IDFG to establish population targets and monitoring routes for Columbian sharp-tailed grouse. Monitoring would be conducted for populations in key or source areas and restorations areas in that order. • In areas where grouse habitats are fragmented by land ownership pattern, cooperate with IDFG and local working groups to identify and maintain long-term habitat by acquiring conservation easements or bringing crucial habitats into 	<p>Same as Alternative A.</p>

Special Status Species (SS)			
ALTERNATIVE A	PROPOSED RMP	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
	<p>and maintain long-term habitat by acquiring conservation easements or bringing crucial habitats into public ownership.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In cooperation with IDFG identify areas where application of pesticides for grasshopper or Mormon cricket control may negatively affect grouse broods. Identify a cooperative strategy to review requests for pesticide application in these identified locations. As appropriate based upon a site specific habitat assessment, protect leks from disturbances from permitted activities for 0.6 mile from March 1 to May 31. 	<p>public ownership.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In cooperation with IDFG identify areas where application of pesticides for grasshopper or Mormon cricket control may negatively affect grouse broods. Identify a cooperative strategy to review requests for pesticide application in these identified locations. Protect leks from disturbances from permitted activities for 0.6 mile from March 1 to May 31. 	

Special Status Species (SS)			
ALTERNATIVE A	PROPOSED RMP	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
Special Status Species: FLORA			
<p>The following general management actions would be considered to promote healthy, naturally functioning ecosystems in sensitive plant habitat:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Avoid actions that cause concentrated use or disturbance (e.g. trampling, OHVs, dozer lines, range improvements) in habitat. • Avoid spraying of pesticides within a 1/4 mile of occupied habitat unless clearly beneficial to sensitive plants. • Avoid seeding within occupied habitat unless clearly beneficial to sensitive plants. • Methods of weed spraying within or near (1/4 mile) habitat would be formulated on site specific and species specific basis. • Promote healthy naturally functioning ecosystem components within a 1/4 mile of habitat to support a viable population. • Inventory potential habitat. • Monitor flora sensitive species population trends. 	<p>Site/project specific assessments for special status plants would be required prior to authorizing activities to determine:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The presence or absence of special status species, and 2. Appropriate mitigation/guidelines (e.g. avoidance of occupied areas, distances from occupied habitat). Examples of mitigation/guidelines to be considered may include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reducing adverse impacts to special status plant habitats from permitted/authorized activities. • Limiting water developments and mineral supplements near special status plant populations sufficient to protect these species. • Avoiding pesticide and herbicide applications near occupied habitat to preserve pollinators and non-target species. • Promoting seeding within occupied habitat only when clearly beneficial for special status plants. • Formulate methods of weed spraying near special status habitat on site specific and species specific basis. • Special status plant areas would be priority for weed treatment. • Inventory and monitor special status plant habitats. 	<p>Site/project specific assessments for special status plants would be identical to the Proposed RMP (Alternative B).</p>	<p>The following general management actions would be considered to promote healthy, naturally functioning ecosystems in sensitive plant habitat:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Avoid actions that cause concentrated use or disturbance (e.g. trampling, OHVs, dozer lines, range improvements) in habitat. • Avoid spraying of pesticides within a 1/4 mile of occupied habitat unless clearly beneficial to sensitive plants. • Avoid seeding within occupied habitat unless clearly beneficial to sensitive plants. • Methods of weed spraying within or near (1/4 mile) habitat would be formulated on site specific and species specific basis. • Promote healthy naturally functioning ecosystem components within a 1/4 mile of habitat to support a viable population. • Inventory potential habitat for flora sensitive species monitor population trends.

Visual Resources (VR)			
ALTERNATIVE A	PROPOSED RMP	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
Goal VR-1. Maintain scenic qualities consistent with the management of resources and uses.			
Objective CA-VR-1.1. Manage visual resources according to established guidelines for visual resource management (VRM) classes. (PP-VR-1.1.)			
Wildland Fire Management (WF)			
ALTERNATIVE A	PROPOSED RMP	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
Goal WF-1. Minimize impacts to natural and human resources from various fire related practices, including both wildland fire suppression and fuels management activities.			
Objective CA-WF-1.1. Utilize the appropriate management response (AMR) for fire suppression activities to protect natural and cultural resource values. (PP-WF-1.1.)			
Objective CA-WF-1.2. Assure fire and non-fire vegetation treatments maintain, restore or improve natural or cultural resource values. (PP-WF-1.3.)			
No similar objective	New Objective: Choose the AMR when suppressing wildfire to protect Listed Species and related habitat. (PP-WF-1.2)	No similar objective	No similar objective
	Goal WF-3: Protect life, property, and resources. (WF-2)		
	Objective AA-WF-3.1. Manage public land in and around WUI areas to reduce fire hazards. (PP-WF-2.1)		
	Objective AA-WF-3.2. Manage public lands to protect, improve, or enhance resources /values at risk. (PP-WF-2.2)		
Goal WF-2: Provide for the protection of life and property and suppression of wildland fires for the protection of natural resources.	Goal WF- 4: Return fire to a more natural role in the ecosystem to improve FRCC and achieve desired LHC.		
Objective A-WF-2.1. Emphasize protection from wildland fire and ES&R within the WUI.	Objective B-WF-4.1. Manage the Low-Elevation Shrub and Perennial Grass vegetation types in order to move towards FRCC 1 (LHC-A) so wildland fire occurs less frequently and at a smaller scale on the landscape. (PP-WF-3.1)	Objective C-WF-4.1. Same as Objective B-WF-4.1.	Objective D-WF-4.1. Same as Objective B-WF-4.1
No similar management action	The AMR would be used to safely manage wildland fires, reducing acres burned to a rate similar to historic levels. AMR in Low-Elevation Shrub would be suppression of all wildland fire starts to protect existing sagebrush communities.	Chemical, mechanical, seeding, prescribed fire and WFU treatments would be used as appropriate. In Perennial Grass and Juniper encroached vegetation types, the sagebrush steppe would be restored with an aggressive sagebrush seeding effort, utilizing the appropriate sagebrush species for treatment areas.	Use prescribed fires. Treatments would be strategically placed on a landscape scale to prevent fire from spreading toward WUI areas, Low-Elevation Shrub communities, or other resources at risk using the entire array of mechanical, chemical, and small-scale prescribed fire operations to thin, reduce and control hazardous fuels.

Wildland Fire Management (WF)			
ALTERNATIVE A	PROPOSED RMP	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
Objective A-WF-2.2. Reduce fine fuels and invasive exotic plants to create perennial vegetation communities so that wildland fire occurs less frequently than currently and at a smaller scale on the landscape.	Objective B-WF-4.2. Manage the Mid-Elevation Shrub, Juniper, Dry Conifer, Aspen/Conifer, and Mountain Shrub vegetation types in order to move towards FRCC 1 (LHC-A) so wildland fire mimics historical conditions. (PP-WF-3.2)	<i>No similar objective</i>	Objective D-WF-4.2. Manage the Mid-Elevation Shrub, Juniper, Dry Conifer, Aspen/Conifer, and Mountain Shrub vegetation types by increasing the use of wildland fire and prescribed fire in order to mimic historical conditions (FRCC 1 [LHC-A]).
AMR in Low-Elevation Shrub to protect existing sagebrush communities would be suppression of all wildland fire starts. Following wildland fire, utilize chemical, mechanical, and seeding treatments with appropriate plant materials to provide the best opportunity to stabilize sites and prevent dominance of invasive annual vegetation and noxious weeds. The use of native plant materials would be emphasized. Prescribed fire may be used to prepare areas for subsequent chemical, mechanical, and/or seeding treatments.	The AMR would be used to safely manage wildland fires.	<i>No similar objective</i>	Mechanical and chemical treatments would be used to prepare areas in Fire Condition Class 2 and 3 for prescribed fire and WFU. Where prescriptive parameters, resource conditions, and vegetation conditions allow, WFU or prescribed fire would be use to increase annual average wildland fire acres to a rate similar to historical conditions. Site-specific NEPA analysis would be completed prior to implementation.
<i>No similar objective</i>	Objective C-WF-4.2. Maintain, protect, and expand greater sage-grouse Source Habitats. (Carried forward from Alternative C.) (PP-WF-3.7)	Objective C-WF-4.2. Maintain, protect, and expand greater sage-grouse Source Habitats.	<i>No similar objective</i>
<i>No similar management action</i>	Wildland fires would be suppressed in Source Habitats except where WFU could benefit the habitat, which would require site specific project level coordination with IDFG. Vegetation treatments would be conducted in areas that pose a wildland fire risk to Source Habitats, and areas to be treated within Source Habitats would be those that have low resiliency characterized by low species diversity, undesirable composition, and dead or decadent sagebrush. (Carried forward from Alternative C.)	Wildland fires would be suppressed in Source Habitats except where WFU could benefit the habitat, which would require site specific project level coordination with IDFG. Vegetation treatments would be conducted in areas that pose a wildland fire risk to Source Habitats, and areas to be treated within Source Habitats would be those that have low resiliency characterized by low species diversity, undesirable composition, and dead or decadent sagebrush.	<i>No similar management action</i>

Wildland Fire Management (WF)			
ALTERNATIVE A	PROPOSED RMP	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
	Objective B-WF-4.3. Maintain Wet/Cold Conifer, Riparian and Other/Vegetated Lava vegetation types fire frequencies within the historical range of variability, FRCC 1 (LHC-A). (PP-WF-3.3)		
<i>No similar objective</i>	Objective C-WF-4.3. Maintain and improve greater sage-grouse Restoration and Key Habitats. (Carried forward from Alternative C.) (PP-WF-3.8)	Objective C-WF-4.3. Maintain and improve greater sage-grouse Restoration and Key Habitats.	<i>No similar objective</i>
<i>No similar management action</i>	WFU may be used in greater sage-grouse Restoration and Key Habitats for the benefit of the habitat only after site specific project level coordination with IDFG. Vegetation treatments would be conducted to reduce risk of wildland fire and reconnect Restoration and Key Habitats, and areas treated would be those that have low resiliency characterized by low species diversity. (Carried forward from Alternative C.)	WFU may be used in greater sage-grouse Restoration and Key Habitats for the benefit of the habitat only after site specific project level coordination with IDFG. Vegetation treatments would be conducted to reduce risk of wildland fire and reconnect Restoration and Key Habitats, and areas treated would be those that have low resiliency characterized by low species diversity.	<i>No similar management action</i>
Objective A-WF-2.3. Conduct vegetation treatments for resource benefits in Mid-Elevation Shrub, Juniper, Dry Conifer, Aspen/Conifer, and Mountain Shrub.	Objective C-WF-4.4 – Manage the Aspen/Aspen Dry Conifer Mix, Dry Conifer, Wet/Cold Conifer, Riparian, and Other/Vegetated Lava vegetation types in order to maintain vegetation conditions and wildland fire regimes similar to historical conditions (FRCC 1 [LHC-A]). (Carried forward from Alternative C.) (PP-WF-3.9)	Objective C-WF-4.4 – Manage the Aspen/Aspen Dry Conifer Mix, Dry Conifer, Wet/Cold Conifer, Riparian, and Other/Vegetated Lava vegetation types in order to maintain vegetation conditions and wildland fire regimes similar to historical conditions (FRCC 1 [LHC-A]).	Objective D-WF-4.3. In Wet/Cold Conifer, Riparian, and Other/Vegetated Lava vegetation types and/or areas in Fire Condition Class 1, (LHC-A) maintain vegetation conditions using mechanical, chemical, prescribed fire, or WFU treatments, such that wildland fire regimes are similar to historical conditions (FRCC 1) (i.e., maintain the current level of fire in these vegetation types).
Objective A-WF-2.4. Manage 0.0 acres as suitable for WFU.	Objective B-WF-4.4. Manage for WFU on approximately 265,000 acres identified as suitable. (PP-WF-3.4)	Objective C-WF-4.5. Manage for WFU on approximately 212,600 acres identified as suitable.	Objective D-WF-4.4. Manage for WFU on approximately 468,900 acres identified as suitable.

Wildland Fire Management (WF)			
ALTERNATIVE A	PROPOSED RMP	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
Objective A-WF-2.5. For the vegetation types identified, implement over 10 years approximately 3,400 footprint acres of treatment using various treatment methods (e.g. mechanical, chemical, seeding, and prescribed fire), as appropriate.	Objective B-WF-4.5. For the vegetation types identified, implement over 10 years approximately 124,250 footprint acres of treatment using various treatment methods (e.g. WFU, mechanical, chemical, seeding, and prescribed fire), as appropriate. (PP-WF-3.5)	Objective C-WF-4.6. For the vegetation types identified, implement over 10 years approximately 54,920 footprint acres of treatment using various treatment methods (e.g. WFU, mechanical, chemical, seeding, and prescribed fire), as appropriate.	Objective D-WF-4.5. For the vegetation types identified, implement over 10 years approximately 162,170 footprint acres of treatment using various treatment methods (e.g. WFU, mechanical, chemical, seeding, and Prescribed fire), as appropriate.
Low-Elevation Shrub 0.0	Low-Elevation Shrub 18,950	Low-Elevation Shrub 0.0	Low-Elevation Shrub 9,500
Mid-Elevation Shrub 0.0	Mid-Elevation Shrub 25,400	Mid-Elevation Shrub 16,650	Mid-Elevation Shrub 64,000
Mountain Shrub 0.0	Mountain Shrub 16,500	Mountain Shrub	Mountain Shrub
Perennial Grass/Seeding 0.0	Perennial Grass/Seeding 50,200	Perennial Grass/Seeding 1,300	Perennial Grass/Seeding 53,300
Juniper (Natural Only) 0.0	Juniper (Natural Only) 0.0	Juniper (Natural Only) 16,600 0.0	Juniper (Natural Only) 15,000 0.0
Aspen/Aspen Conifer Mix/Dry Conifer 3,400	Aspen/Aspen Conifer Mix/Dry Conifer	Aspen/Aspen Conifer Mix/Dry Conifer	Aspen/Aspen Conifer Mix/Dry Conifer 20,000
Wet/Cold Conifer 0.0	Wet/Cold Conifer 0.0	Wet/Cold Conifer 70	Wet/Cold Conifer 70
Riparian 0.0	Riparian	Riparian	Riparian
Other/Vegetated Lava 0.0	Other/Vegetated Lava 0.0	Other/Vegetated Lava	Other/Vegetated Lava 100
Total footprint acres 3,400	Total footprint acres 131,050	Total footprint acres 100,920	Total footprint acres 162,170
Objective A-WF-2.6. Implement priorities for wildland fire ignitions, suppression and fire and non-fire treatments.	Objective B-WF-4.6. Implement priorities for wildland fire suppression and vegetation treatments. (PP-WF-3.6) 20,000	Objective C-WF-4.7. Same as Objective B-WF-4.6 20,000	Objective D-WF-4.6. Same as Objective B-WF-4.6

RESOURCE USES			
Forestry (FO)			
ALTERNATIVE A	PROPOSED RMP	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
<p>Goal FO-1. Use a variety of silvicultural techniques and harvest systems to provide for an ecologically healthy system while offering products and services. (FO-1)</p> <p>Objective CA-FO-1.1. Maintain a sustainable forest management program. (PP-FO-1.1)</p>			
<p>Goal FO-2. Provide the Tribes and public opportunities for the use of forest/vegetal products to promote an ecologically healthy system. (FO-2)</p> <p>Objective CA-FO-2.1. Maintain approximately 45,700 acres of commercial forest land in order to offer on a yearly basis 600-900 thousand board feet as a “not to exceed” annual probable sale quantity. (PP-FO-2.1)</p> <p>Objective CA-FO-2.2. Based upon tribal and public demand allow for the collection of forest and vegetal products. (PP-FO-2.2)</p>			
Lands and Realty (LR)			
ALTERNATIVE A	PROPOSED RMP	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
<p>Goal LR-1. Consolidate public land to retain and acquire land that is important to the public and protection of resources and to dispose of parcels that are small, isolated and unmanageable.</p> <p>Objective A-LR-1.1. Implement land tenure adjustments through exchange or sale.</p> <p>A public land base of approximately 581,600 acres would be retained for long-term management in federal ownership and approximately 32,200 acres considered for disposal actions.</p>	<p>Goal: LR-5. Improve administrative management efficiency, natural resources management and protection, and public benefit. (LR-5)</p> <p>Objective AA-LR-5.1. Adjust and consolidate public lands ownership patterns through land tenure adjustments. (PP-LR-5.1)</p>		
<p>Objective A-LR-1.1. Implement land tenure adjustments through exchange or sale.</p> <p>A public land base of approximately 581,600 acres would be retained for long-term management in federal ownership and approximately 32,200 acres considered for disposal actions.</p>	<p>Objective B-LR-5.1. Maintain the overall public land base, acquire nonfederal lands or interest in nonfederal lands through exchange, purchase, easement or donation which enhance multiple-use, protect significant resource values and which improve the management and administration of the public lands. (PP-LR-5.2)</p>	<p>Objective C-LR-5.1. Maintain the overall public land base, acquire nonfederal lands or interest in nonfederal lands through exchange, purchase, easement or donation which enhance multiple-use, protect significant resource values and improve the management and administration of the public lands.</p>	<p>Objective D-LR-5.1. Maintain the overall public land base, acquire nonfederal lands or interest in nonfederal lands through exchange, purchase, easement or donation which enhance multiple-use, protect significant resource values and improve the management and administration of the public lands.</p>
<p><i>No similar management action</i></p>	<p>A land tenure adjustment program would be implemented based upon a four zone concept.</p> <p>Zone 1: Approximately 50,800 acres</p> <p>Zone 2: Approximately 365,700 acres</p> <p>Zone 3: Approximately 141,000 acres</p> <p>Zone 4: Approximately 56,300 acres</p>	<p>A land tenure adjustment program would be implemented based upon a four zone concept.</p> <p>Zone 1: Approximately 50,800 acres</p> <p>Zone 2: Approximately 418,900 acres</p> <p>Zone 3: Approximately 94,200 acres</p> <p>Zone 4: Approximately 49,900 acres</p>	<p>A land tenure adjustment program would be implemented based upon a four zone concept.</p> <p>Zone 1: Approximately 50,800 acres</p> <p>Zone 2: Approximately 18,400 acres</p> <p>Zone 3: Approximately 423,200 acres</p> <p>Zone 4: Approximately 121,400 acres</p>

Lands and Realty (LR)			
ALTERNATIVE A	PROPOSED RMP	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
Goal LR-2. Balance development of public land, such as ROWs and utility corridors, with the protection of natural resources and public enjoyment and recreation, consistent with natural resource values and uses.		Goal LR-6. Balance development of public land, such as ROW, utility corridors and alternative energy development (e.g. wind, solar, biomass) with the protection of natural resources and public enjoyment and recreation, consistent with natural resource values and uses. (LR-6)	
Objective A-LR-2.1. Implement management actions for ROWs and utility corridors.	Objective B-LR-6.1. Issue land use authorizations consistent with following management actions (See Chapter 2 for complete list of management actions) (PP-LR-6.1)	Objective C-LR-6.1. Same as Objective B-LR-6.1	Objective D-LR-6.1. Same as Objective B-LR-6.1
For ROWs which include energy and non-energy related ROWs and land use authorizations, 562,900 acres would be managed as Open; 20,200 acres would be managed as Avoidance; and 30,700 acres would be managed as Exclusion areas.	For ROWs which include energy and non-energy related ROWs and land use authorizations, 590,000 acres would be managed as open areas; 21,900 acres would be managed as avoidance areas and 1,900 acres would be managed as exclusion areas.	Same as Alternative B	For ROWs which include energy and non-energy related ROWs and land use authorizations, 590,000 acres would be managed as open areas; 23,800 acres would be managed as avoidance areas. No areas would be managed as exclusion area acres.
Goal LR-3. Maintain and acquire legal access to public land. (LR-3)			
Objective A-LR-3.1. Implement management actions for public access.	Objective AA-LR-3.1. Maintain existing access and acquire public and administrative access consistent with resource values and to ensure efficient administration of public lands. (PP-LR-3.1)		
Goal LR-4. Assure land classifications and withdrawals of public lands are appropriate to protect important resource values. (LR-4)			
Objective A-LR-4.1 Manage approximately 60,700 acres of land classified as withdrawn from the general land laws for the specific purposes intended.	Objective B-LR-4.1. Continue to manage approximately 84,760 acres of land classified as withdrawn from the general land laws for the specific purposes intended. (PP-LR-4.1)	Objective C-LR-4.1. Same as Objective B-LR-4.1	Objective D-LR-4.1. Continue to manage approximately 67,060 acres of land classified as withdrawn from the general land laws for the specific purposes intended.
Withdrawal of public lands from mineral entry would be pursued on approximately 1,500 acres for the following areas: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cheatbeck Canyon RNA • Dairy Hollow RNA • Formation Cave RNA • Oneida Narrows RNA • Pine Gap RNA 	Finalize the withdrawal classification process for the following areas consisting of approximately 19,200 acres : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cheatbeck Canyon RNA • Dairy Hollow RNA • Formation Cave RNA • Oneida Narrows RNA • Pine Gap RNA 	Same as Alternative B	Finalize the withdrawal classification process for the following RNA's consisting of approximately 1,500 acres : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cheatbeck Canyon RNA • Dairy Hollow RNA • Formation Cave RNA • Oneida Narrows RNA • Pine Gap RNA

Lands and Realty (LR)			
ALTERNATIVE A	PROPOSED RMP	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Robbers Roost RNA Travertine Park RNA 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Robbers Roost RNA Travertine Park RNA Petticoat Peak RNA Soda Springs Hills Management Area Bowen Canyon Bald Eagle Sanctuary ACEC 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Robbers Roost RNA Travertine Park RNA

Livestock Grazing (LG)			
ALTERNATIVE A	PROPOSED RMP	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
Goal LG-1. Provide forage for livestock grazing consistent with other resources/uses as part of an ecologically healthy system consistent with multiple use and sustained yield. (LG-1)			
Objective A-LG-1.1. Maintain approximately 556,300 acres available for livestock grazing and approximately 57,500 acres not available for livestock grazing.	Objective B-LG-1.1. Maintain approximately 560,000 acres available for livestock grazing and approximately 53,800 acres not available for livestock grazing. (PP-LG-1.1)	Objective C-LG-1.1. Maintain approximately 555,300 acres available for livestock grazing and approximately 58,500 acres not available for livestock grazing.	Objective D-LG-1.1. Maintain approximately 527,800 acres available for livestock grazing and approximately 86,000 acres not available for livestock grazing.
Objective A-LG-1.2. Consistent with Idaho Standards for Rangeland Health and maintaining a thriving ecological balance and multiple use relationships provide annually a total preference (active + suspended) of approximately 86,900 AUMs .	Objective B-LG-1.2. Consistent with maintaining a thriving ecological balance and multiple use relationships provide annually a total preference (active + suspended) of approximately 87,500 AUMs . (PP-LG-1.2)	Objective C-LG-1.2. Consistent with maintaining a thriving ecological balance and multiple use relationships provide annually a total preference (active + suspended) of approximately 86,600 AUMs .	Objective D-LG-1.2. Consistent with maintaining a thriving ecological balance and multiple use relationships provide annually a total preference (active + suspended) of approximately 82,200 AUMs .
<i>No similar objective</i>	Objective B-LG-1.3. Implement the Secretarial Order (Congressional Withdrawal #157, Idaho #9) which established the BSD. (PP-LG-1.3)	Objective C-LG-1.3. Implement the Secretarial Order (Congressional Withdrawal #157, Idaho #9) which established the BSD and which did not provide for grazing allotments within the driveway.	Objective D-LG-1.3. Implement the Secretarial Order (Congressional Withdrawal #157, Idaho #9) which established the BSD and did not include the creation of grazing allotments within the driveway.

Minerals and Energy (ME)			
ALTERNATIVE A	PROPOSED RMP	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
<p>Goal ME-1. Develop mineral resources (oil and gas, geothermal, solid minerals) consistent with other resource and use direction. (ME-1)</p> <p>Objective CA-ME-1.1. Fulfill Indian Trust Responsibilities related to minerals management. (PP-ME-1.1)</p> <p>Objective CA-ME-1.2. Coordinate with federal agencies (e.g. Bureau of Indian Affairs, BOR, Forest Service, and USFWS) on minerals development proposals related to the federal mineral estate where such agencies have surface management responsibilities. (PP-ME-1.2)</p>			
<p>Goal ME-2. Develop mineral resources (oil and gas, geothermal, solid minerals) consistent with other resources and uses as part of an ecologically healthy ecosystem. (ME-2)</p>			
	<p>Objective AA-ME-2.1. Coordinate with private surface owners on minerals development proposals related to federal mineral estates. (PP-ME-2.1)</p> <p>Objective AA-ME-2.2. Maintain or reestablish the hydrologic function, integrity, quality, and other surface resource values of lands affected by mining actions consistent with the disturbed site potential. (PP-ME-2.2)</p> <p>Objective AA-ME 2.3. Regulate mineral development activities to prevent or control sediment and the release of contaminants such as selenium and metals into the environment. (PP-ME-2.3)</p>		
Objective A-ME-2.1. Manage approximately 602,600 acres of the federal mineral estate as open for fluid minerals leasing (e.g. oil, gas, and geothermal resources).	Objective B-ME-2.1. Manage approximately 344,500 acres of the federal mineral estate as open for fluid minerals leasing (e.g. oil, gas, and geothermal resources). (PP-ME-2.4)	Objective C-ME-2.1. Same as Objective A-ME-2.1	Objective D-ME-2.1. Same as Objective A-ME-2.1
On approximately 314,000 acres , lease with an NSO stipulation.	On approximately 226,000 acres , lease with a NSO stipulation. Approximately 258,100 acres of public lands in the Curlew area would be administratively unavailable (i.e., postponed from lease offering) (Figure 2-18) pending further NEPA analysis to demonstrate that the objectives for initially holding such public lands from lease offering can be alternatively met or no longer apply. Identified objectives are to maintain and protect important resources such as the sagebrush steppe ecosystem; sagebrush obligate species; sensitive species habitat, such as sage and sharp-tailed grouse, and the globally important ferruginous hawk population and habitat.	On approximately 347,300 acres lease with a NSO stipulation.	On approximately 315,400 acres , lease with a NSO stipulation.

Minerals and Energy (ME)			
ALTERNATIVE A	PROPOSED RMP	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
Objective A-ME-2.2. Manage approximately 591,200 acres of the federal mineral estate (leasable minerals) as open to solid minerals leasing (e.g. phosphate) subject to standard lease terms, and conditions.	Objective B-ME-2.2. Manage approximately 582,400 acres of the federal mineral estate (leasable minerals) as open to solid minerals leasing (e.g. phosphate) subject to standard lease terms, and conditions. (PP-ME-2.5)	Objective C-ME-2.2. Manage approximately 582,400 acres of the federal mineral estate (leasable minerals) as open to solid minerals leasing (e.g. phosphate) subject to standard lease terms, and conditions.	Objective D-ME-2.2. Manage approximately 597,500 acres of the federal mineral estate (leasable minerals) as open for solid minerals leasing (e.g. phosphate) subject to standard lease terms, and conditions.
Discretionary closures (agency administrative) consisting of approximately 11,400 acres would be in effect for ACECs and RNAs : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Downey Watershed ACEC Juniper Town Site ACEC Indian Rocks ACEC Bowen Canyon Bald Eagle Sanctuary ACEC Travertine Park ACEC Stump Creek ACEC Van Komen Homestead ACEC Dairy Hollow RNA Formation Cave RNA Oneida Narrows RNA Travertine Park RNA Pine Gap RNA Robber's Roost RNA Cheatbeck Canyon RNA 	Discretionary closures (agency administrative) would be in effect on approximately 20,200 acres as identified below: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Petticoat Peak RNA Dairy Hollow RNA Formation Cave RNA Oneida Narrows RNA Travertine Park RNA Pine Gap RNA Robber's Roost RNA Cheatbeck Canyon RNA Soda Springs Hills Management Area (LWCF/BPA and public lands portions) 	Discretionary closures (agency administrative) would be in effect on approximately 20,200 acres as identified below: Identified areas are identical to Alternative B.	Discretionary closures (agency administrative) would be in effect on approximately 5,100 acres as identified below: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Dairy Hollow RNA Formation Cave RNA Oneida Narrows RNA Travertine Park RNA Pine Gap RNA Robber's Roost RNA Cheatbeck Canyon RNA Soda Springs Hills Management Area (Only LWCF/BPA acquired lands)
Objective A-ME-2.3 Manage approximately 581,100 acres of the federal mineral estate (salable minerals) as open to mineral material disposal subject to standard permit terms, and conditions.	Objective B-ME-2.3. Manage approximately 582,400 acres of the federal mineral estate (salable minerals) as open to mineral material disposal subject to standard permit terms, and conditions. (PP-ME-2.6)	Objective C-ME-2.3. Manage approximately 544,800 acres of the federal mineral estate (salable minerals) as open to mineral material disposal subject to standard permit terms, and conditions.	Objective D-ME-2.3. Manage approximately 597,500 acres of the federal mineral estate (salable minerals) as open for mineral material disposal subject to standard permit terms, and conditions.
Discretionary closures (agency administrative) consisting of approximately 21,500 acres would be in effect for all water and power withdrawals, communication sites, RNAs, and historical sites/trails as identified: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Withdrawal - Bear River Reclamation Project Withdrawal - Soda Point 	Discretionary closures (agency administrative) would be in effect on approximately 20,200 acres as identified below: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Petticoat Peak RNA Dairy Hollow RNA Formation Cave RNA Oneida Narrows RNA 	Discretionary closures (agency administrative) would be in effect on approximately 57,800 acres as listed below: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Withdrawal - Bear River Reclamation Project Withdrawal - Soda Point Withdrawal - Last Chance 	Discretionary closures (agency administrative) would be in effect on approximately 5,100 acres as identified listed below: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Dairy Hollow RNA Formation Cave RNA Oneida Narrows RNA Travertine Park RNA

Minerals and Energy (ME)			
ALTERNATIVE A	PROPOSED RMP	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Withdrawal - Last Chance • Withdrawal - Fort Hall Irrigation Project • Withdrawal - Soda Springs Project • Withdrawals - Public Water Reserves (125 & 107) • Withdrawals - Power Sites and Generating Facilities • Communications sites • Downey Watershed ACEC • Dairy Hollow RNA • Formation Cave RNA • Oneida Narrows RNA • Travertine Park RNA • Pine Gap RNA • Robber's Roost RNA • Cheatbeck Canyon RNA • Historical Sites/Trails 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Travertine Park RNA • Pine Gap RNA • Robber's Roost RNA • Cheatbeck Canyon RNA • Soda Springs Hills Management Area (LWCF/BPA and public lands portions) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Withdrawal - Fort Hall Irrigation Project • Withdrawal - Soda Springs Project • Withdrawals - Public Water Reserves (125 & 107) • Withdrawals - Power Sites and Generating Facilities • Malad Air Navigation Site • Water/Power - Minidoka Reclamation Project • Communications sites • Downey Watershed ACEC • Dairy Hollow RNA • Formation Cave RNA • Oneida Narrows RNA • Travertine Park RNA • Pine Gap RNA • Robber's Roost RNA • Petticoat Peak RNA • Cheatbeck Canyon RNA • Soda Springs Hills Management Area • Rare and Sensitive Plant Habitat • Blackfoot Stock Driveway 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pine Gap RNA • Robber's Roost RNA • Cheatbeck Canyon RNA • Soda Springs Hills Management Area (Only LWCF/BPA acquired lands)
<p>Objective A-ME-2.4 Manage approximately 582,600 acres of the federal mineral estate (locatable minerals) managed as open to location of mining claims.</p>	<p>Objective B-ME-2.4. Manage approximately 564,900 acres of the federal mineral estate (locatable minerals) as open to location of mining claims. (PP-ME-2.7)</p>	<p>Objective C-ME-2.4. Same as Objective B-ME-2.4</p>	<p>Objective D-ME-2.4 Same as Objective A-ME-2.4</p>
<p>A mineral entry withdrawal (discretionary closure, agency administrative) would be pursued on approximately 1,500 acres for the following RNAs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cheatbeck Canyon RNA • Dairy Hollow RNA • Formation Cave RNA • Oneida Narrows RNA • Pine Gap RNA • Robbers Roost RNA 	<p>A mineral entry withdrawal (discretionary closure, agency administrative) would be pursued on approximately 19,200 acres for the following areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cheatbeck Canyon RNA • Dairy Hollow RNA • Formation Cave RNA • Oneida Narrows RNA • Pine Gap RNA • Robbers Roost RNA 	<p>A mineral entry withdrawal (discretionary closure, agency administrative) would be pursued on approximately 19,200 acres for the following areas:</p> <p>Identified areas are identical to Alternative B.</p>	<p>A mineral entry withdrawal (discretionary closure, agency administrative) would be pursued on approximately 1,500 acres for the following areas:</p> <p>Identified areas are identical to Alternative B.</p>

Minerals and Energy (ME)			
ALTERNATIVE A	PROPOSED RMP	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Travertine Park RNA 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Travertine Park RNA • Petticoat Peak RNA • Soda Springs Hills Management Area • Bowen Canyon Bald Eagle Sanctuary ACEC 		
<p>Nondiscretionary closures of approximately 29,700 acres would be in effect for the following areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Withdrawal - Bear River Reclamation Project • Withdrawal - Soda Point • Withdrawal - Last Chance • Withdrawal - Fort Hall Irrigation Project • Withdrawal - Soda Springs Project • Withdrawal - Downey Watershed • Withdrawals - Public Water Reserves (125 & 107) • Withdrawals - Power Generating Facilities • Recreation and Public Purpose Patents • Recreation and Public Purpose Leases • Soda Springs Hills Management Area (only LWCF/BPA acquired lands) 	<p>Nondiscretionary closures would be in effect for approximately 29,700 acres as identified below:</p> <p>Identified areas are identical to those under Alternative A.</p>	<p>Nondiscretionary closures would be in effect for approximately 29,700 acres as identified below</p> <p>Identified areas are identical to those under Alternative A.</p>	<p>A nondiscretionary closure of approximately 29,700 acres would be in effect on the following identified areas:</p> <p>Identified areas are identical to those under Alternative A.</p>

Recreation (RE)			
ALTERNATIVE A	PROPOSED RMP	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
Goal RE-1: Manage lands for dispersed recreation. (RE-1)			
Objective A-RE-1.1. Continue to manage for dispersed recreation.	Objective B-RE-1.1. Manage lands for a variety of non-motorized, mechanized, and motorized opportunities. (PP-RE-1.1)	Objective C-RE-1.1. Manage lands for a variety of non-motorized, mechanized, and motorized opportunities, with an emphasis on non-motorized and mechanized opportunities.	Objective D-RE-1.1. Manage lands for non-motorized, mechanized, and motorized activities in a variety of settings, with an emphasis on motorized activities.
<i>No similar objective</i>	Objective B-RE-1.2. Recreation facility development and permitted	Objective C-RE-1.2. Same as	Objective D-RE-1.2. Same as Alternative B.

Recreation (RE)			
ALTERNATIVE A	PROPOSED RMP	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
	recreation activities would be consistent with other resource goals of the area in which they are located. (PP-RE-1.2)	Alternative B.	
<i>No similar management action</i>	Facility development and improvements would be focused on existing recreation sites and SRMAs.	Same as Alternative B.	No focus on facility development and improvements in existing recreation sites and SRMAs.
Goal RE-2. Manage motorized vehicular (OHV) use.	Goal RE-4: Establish a comprehensive approach to travel planning and management (RE-4) Objective AA-RE-4.1 Provide on-the-ground travel management operations and maintenance programs to sustain and enhance recreation opportunities and experiences, visitor access and safety, and resource conservation. (PP-RE-4.1)		
Objective A-RE-2.1. Manage BLM-administered lands as Open, Limited, or Closed for OHV use.	Objective B-RE-4.1. Designate all public lands in the planning area as Open, Limited, or Closed. (PP-RE-4.2)	Objective C-RE-4.1. Same as Alternative B	Objective D-RE-4.1. Same as Alternative B
OHV acreage designations: Approximately 61,300 acres: Open to all vehicles. Approximately 1,300 acres: Closed to all vehicles. Approximately 199,000 acres: All vehicles limited to designated/existing routes. Approximately 352,200 acres not yet designated	OHV acreage designations: WSAs and RNAs (approximately 12,700 acres) would be designated Closed to OHV use and all remaining public lands (approximately 601,100 acres) would be designated Limited for OHV use. Cross country travel would not be allowed on public lands, and upon completion of the travel management plans, motorized travel off designated routes (identified on travel maps) would not be allowed.	OHV acreage designations: WSAs and RNA's (approximately 12,700 acres) would be designated Closed to OHV use and all remaining public lands (approximately 601,100 acres) would be designated as Limited for OHV use.	OHV acreage designations: WSAs and RNA's (approximately 12,700 acres) would be designated Closed to OHV use and all remaining public lands (approximately 601,100 acres) would be designated as Limited for OHV use.
<i>No similar management action</i>	During travel management planning, provide intensive use areas for valid motorized activities (e.g., rock crawling, motocross riding) by designating appropriate routes for these activities in front country or rural settings. These areas would not exceed a "footprint" larger than 80 acres.	During travel management planning, intensive use areas for valid motorized activities (e.g., rock crawling, motocross riding) would not be provided.	During travel management planning, provide intensive use areas for valid motorized activities (e.g. rock crawling, motocross riding) by designating appropriate routes for these activities in front country or rural settings. These areas would not exceed a "footprint" larger than 320 acres
<i>No similar objective</i>	Objective B-RE-4.2 Implement comprehensive travel management planning utilizing strategies for motorized, mechanized, and non-motorized recreation. (PP-RE-4.3)	Objective C-RE-4.2 Same as Objective B-RE-4.2	Objective D-RE-4.2 Same as Objective B-RE-4.2
<i>No similar management action</i>	Roads, routes and trails would be inventoried and mapped using best	Same as Alternative B	Same as Alternative B

Recreation (RE)			
ALTERNATIVE A	PROPOSED RMP	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
	<p>available technology, such as GPS and GIS.</p> <p>Areas would be prioritized for travel management planning based upon the following criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Known conflicts with other resources/uses, • Proximity of areas to population centers, • Special management areas and special designations, • Areas of contiguous public land, particularly those that have not been fragmented by motorized routes, and • Wildlife habitat, such as wintering habitat for ungulates or sage-grouse, or breeding habitat. 		
Goal RE-3. Provide for a variety of recreational opportunities and experiences. (RE-3)			
Objective A-RE-3.1. Continue to recognize recreation as the principal use on approximately 55,200 acres of public lands within existing SRMAs.	Objective B-RE-3.1. Recognize recreation as the principal use on approximately 59,230 acres of public lands within SRMAs. (PP-RE-3.1)	Objective C-RE-3.1. Recognize recreation as the principal use on approximately 59,200 acres of public lands within SRMAs.	Objective D-RE-3.1. Recognize recreation as the principal use on approximately 55,200 acres of public lands within SRMAs.
The Blackfoot River SRMA (approximately 21,800 acres) would continue to be managed to maintain existing physical, social, and administrative settings, providing various recreational activities, experiences and benefits for a “ Destination ” market base of southeast Idaho.	<p>The Blackfoot River SRMA (approximately 21,800 acres) would continue to be managed to maintain and/or enhance targeted recreational opportunities, experiences and benefits with a primary market based strategy being “Destination” for a market base of southeast Idaho.</p> <p>The SRMA would be managed to provide various recreational opportunities and outcomes (activities, experiences and benefits) based on a unique niche in each of the 5 RMZs identified below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wolverine Canyon (approximately 4,300 acres) • Campground (approximately 	Same as Alternative B.	Same as Alternative B.

Recreation (RE)			
ALTERNATIVE A	PROPOSED RMP	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
	<p>80 acres)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reservoir (approximately 7,200 acres) • Mid River (approximately 7,800 acres) • Lower River (approximately 2,400 acres) 		
<p>The Pocatello SRMA (approximately 33,400 acres) would continued to be managed to maintain existing physical, social, and administrative settings, providing various recreational activities, experiences and benefits for a “Community” market base of southeast Idaho.</p>	<p>The Pocatello SRMA (approximately 33,400 acres) would continue to be managed to maintain and/or enhance targeted recreational opportunities, experiences and benefits with a primary market based strategy being “Community” for a market base of southeast Idaho.</p> <p>The SRMA would be managed to provide various recreational opportunities and outcomes (activities, experiences and benefits) based on a unique niche in each of the 5 RMZ identified below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • West Bench (approximately 4,100 acres) • Blackrock (approximately 15,100 acres) • Papoose (approximately 3,400 acres) • East Bench (approximately 1,400 acres) • Dispersed (approximately 9,400 acres) 	<p>Same as Alternative B.</p>	<p>Same as Alternative B.</p>
<p><i>No similar management action</i></p>	<p>The Oneida Narrows SRMA (approximately 3,600 acres) would be identified and managed to maintain and/or enhance targeted recreational opportunities, experiences, and benefits with the primary market based strategy being “Destination” for a market base of SE Idaho and northern Utah.</p> <p>The SRMA would be managed to provide various recreational opportunities and outcomes (activities, experiences and</p>	<p>Same as Alternative B.</p>	<p><i>No similar management action.</i></p>

Recreation (RE)			
ALTERNATIVE A	PROPOSED RMP	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
	benefits) based on a unique niche in each of the 2 RMZ identified below: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • River (approximately 1,900 acres) • Reservoir (approximately 1,700 acres) 		
<i>No similar management action</i>	The Campground SRMA (approximately 430 acres) would be identified and managed to maintain and/or enhance targeted recreational opportunities, experiences and benefits with the primary market based strategy being " Destination " for a market base of southeast Idaho and northern Utah. The SRMA would be managed to provide various recreational opportunities and outcomes (activities, experiences and benefits) based on a unique niche in each of the 3 RMZ identified below: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hawkins Reservoir (approximately 120 acres) • Goodenough (approximately 280 acres) • Pipeline (approximately 30 acres) (<i>Carried forward from Alternative C.</i>) 	The Campground SRMA (approximately 430 acres) would be identified and managed to maintain and/or enhance targeted recreational opportunities, experiences and benefits with the primary market based strategy being " Destination " for a market base of southeast Idaho and northern Utah. The SRMA would be managed to provide various recreational opportunities and outcomes (activities, experiences and benefits) based on a unique niche in each of the 3 RMZ identified below: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hawkins Reservoir (approximately 120 acres) • Goodenough (approximately 280 acres) • Pipeline (approximately 30 acres) 	<i>No similar management action.</i>
Objective A-RE-3.2 - Continue to manage approximately 558,600 acres as an ERMA.	Objective B-RE-3.2 - Continue to manage approximately 554,600 acres as an ERMA. (PP-RE-3.2)	Objective C-RE-3.2 - Continue to manage approximately 554,600 acres as an ERMA.	Objective D-RE-3.2 - Continue to manage approximately 558,600 acres as an ERMA.

SPECIAL DESIGNATIONS

ADMINISTRATIVE DESIGNATIONS (AD)

ALTERNATIVE A	PROPOSED RMP	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
Goal AD-1. Provide for public land areas suitable for administrative designations. (AD-1)			
Objective CA-AD-1.1. Continue to manage WSAs to maintain wilderness characteristics. (PP-AD-1.1)			
Objective CA-AD-1.2. Continue to manage the 5 designed Watchable Wildlife Viewing Sites. (PP-AD-1.2)			

ADMINISTRATIVE DESIGNATIONS (AD)			
ALTERNATIVE A	PROPOSED RMP	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
Objective CA-AD-1.3. Continue to manage Oregon/California historic trails and alternate routes for a meaningful historic recreational and educational experience. (PP-AD-1.3)			
Objective A-AD-1.1. Manage eligible river segments for the values identified in the wild and scenic river evaluation.	Objective AA-AD-1.1. Determine which eligible river segments are suitable for inclusion in the NWSRS. (PP-AD-1.4)		
<i>No similar management action</i>	Objective B-AD-1.1 - Designate approximately 400 acres as the Petticoat Peak RNA due to the areas unique and undisturbed vegetative communities. (PP-AD-1.5)	Objective C-AD-1.1 Same as Objective B-AD-1.1	<i>No similar management action.</i>
Objective A-AD-1.2. Continue to manage the 7 ACECs (approximately 9,900 acres) and 7 RNAs (approximately 1,500 acres) designated for the unique geological, vegetative, visual, cultural, historical and/or wildlife resource values.	Objective B-AD-1.2. Continue to manage the 6 ACECs (approximately 9,900 acres) and 7 RNAs (approximately 1,500 acres) designated for the unique geological, vegetative, visual, cultural, historical and/or wildlife resource values. (PP-AD-1.6)	Objective C-AD-1.2. Continue to manage the 7 ACECs (approximately 9,900 acres) and 7 RNAs (approximately 1,500 acres) designated for the unique geological, vegetative, visual, cultural, historical and/or wildlife resource.	Objective D-AD-1.1. Continue to manage the 7 ACECs (approximately 9,900 acres) and 7 RNAs (approximately 1,500 acres) designated for the unique geological, vegetative, visual, cultural, historical and/or wildlife resource values.
See Chapter 2 for management actions specific to Alternative A for each ACEC and RNA.	See Chapter 2 for management actions specific to Alternative B for each ACEC and RNA.	See Chapter 2 for management actions specific to Alternative C for each ACEC and RNA.	See Chapter 2 for management actions specific to Alternative D for each ACEC and RNA.
<i>No similar objective</i>	New Objective: The Van Komen ACEC (approximately 3 acres) designation would be removed with the area no longer managed as an ACEC. (PP-AD-1.7)	<i>No similar objective.</i>	<i>No similar objective.</i>
<i>No similar management action</i>	The Van Komen area would be managed as adjacent public lands under the general land laws. If interested or willing parties would desire to restore/develop the Van Komen Homestead, BLM would work with such parties to the extent possible.	<i>No similar management action.</i>	<i>No similar management action.</i>

Table ES-9. Summary Comparison of Environmental Consequences

RESOURCES			
Air Quality (AQ)			
ALTERNATIVE A	PROPOSED RMP	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
Approximately 968 tons of PM ₁₀ and approximately 821 tons of PM _{2.5} would result from fire treatments and slash pile burning during the first 10 years of plan implementation. Since fire suppression would be emphasized, zero emissions would result from WFU.	Approximately 9,953 tons of PM ₁₀ and 8,417 tons of PM _{2.5} would be produced by fire treatments, such as prescribed burns and WFU, and slash pile burning, during the first 10 years of plan implementation.	Approximately 12,603 tons of PM ₁₀ and 10,680 tons of PM _{2.5} would be produced by fire treatments, such as prescribed burns and WFU, and slash pile burning, during the first 10 years of plan implementation.	Approximately 13,546 tons of PM ₁₀ and 11,451 tons of PM _{2.5} would be produced by fire treatments, such as prescribed burns and WFU, and slash pile burning, during the first 10 years of plan implementation.
Current particulate emissions resulting from phosphate mining in the planning area are estimated to average 30,555 tons of PM ₁₀ and 6,110 tons of PM _{2.5} over a ten year period.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.
Sand and gravel quarrying on public lands are estimated to produce approximately 10 tons of PM ₁₀ and 2 tons of PM _{2.5} emissions over a ten year period.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.
Approximately 1 ton of PM ₁₀ and approximately 0.15 ton of PM _{2.5} would result from fluid mineral development over a ten year period.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.
Particulate emissions (fugitive dust) from activities associated with recreation, forestry, grazing and range improvement projects, and ROW development are anticipated to continue at current levels.	Same as Alternative A, however, impacts on air quality due to OHV use may decrease due to the designation of all BLM-administered lands as "limited" for OHV use.	Same as Alternative B.	Substantially increased acreages (compared to all other alternatives) of lands available for sale or exchange under this alternative could result in various impacts (negative or positive) on air quality, depending on the current or intended future use of the lands.

Cultural Resources (CR)			
ALTERNATIVE A	PROPOSED RMP	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
Current management would result in the least risk of direct impacts on cultural resources from land tenure adjustments, ROW development, and vegetation treatments. Risks to cultural resources from open or undesignated OHV use would be the greatest under this Alternative as would the long-term risk to cultural resources from catastrophic wildland fire resulting from limited vegetation treatment.	The risk of impacts on cultural resources would be reduced by limiting OHV use to designated routes. This Alternative would also increase the acres withdrawn and acres closed to locatable minerals.	The risk of impacts on cultural resources would be the least by limiting OHV use to designated routes, increasing the acres withdrawn and acres closed to locatable minerals, disposing the least amount of federal land while increasing NSO or closure provisions for mineral and energy development to the greatest area of land. These actions would provide indirect protection to cultural resources from surface-disturbing or other incompatible activities.	This Alternative would result in the greatest risk to cultural resources because it anticipates the most surface disturbance and provides the fewest constraints on potentially incompatible activities. This Alternative would limit OHV use to designated routes reducing the risk of impacts. However, it would dispose of the most acres of public lands, treat the most area of vegetation, allow WFU on the most acreage, and close the smallest area of land to locatable minerals, mineral material disposal, and non-energy leasing.

Fish And Wildlife (FW)			
ALTERNATIVE A	PROPOSED RMP	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
An estimated 4,200 acres of deer winter range would potentially be lost due to specific public land parcels identified for sale and/or exchange. This would be the least acres of all alternatives.	An estimated 15,700 acres of deer winter range would potentially be lost due to zone concept land tenure adjustment program (sale/exchange). This would be approximately 4 times greater than Alternative A.	Same as Alternative B.	An estimated 46,000 acres of deer winter range would potentially be lost due to zone concept land tenure adjustment program (sale/exchange). This would be approximately 11 times greater than Alternative A.
An estimated 80,600 acres of wildlife habitat would be protected by fluid minerals NSO stipulation which would be the least acres of all alternatives.	An estimated 98,000 acres of wildlife habitat would be protected by fluid minerals NSO stipulation.	An estimated 143,500 acres of wildlife habitat would be protected by fluid minerals NSO stipulation which would be approximately 2 times greater than Alternative A and the greatest number of acres of all alternatives.	An estimated 84,100 acres of wildlife habitat would be protected by fluid minerals NSO stipulation.
Seasonal occupancy restrictions would protect an estimated 439,000 acres of wildlife habitat.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.
An estimated 36 riparian-stream miles would be maintained in PFC.	Management actions would result in a likely increase in total riparian-stream miles in proper function condition over Alternative A.	Same as Alternative B.	Same as Alternative B.

Fish And Wildlife (FW)			
ALTERNATIVE A	PROPOSED RMP	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
Acres achieving desired canopy cover (15-25%) for key wildlife vegetation types at 30 years following fire and non-fire vegetation treatments are displayed below:			
Low-Elevation Shrub 37,500	Low-Elevation Shrub 27,800	Low-Elevation Shrub 36,400	Low-Elevation Shrub 37,500
Mid-Elevation Shrub 29,600	Mid-Elevation Shrub 41,500	Mid-Elevation Shrub 37,400	Mid-Elevation Shrub 51,600
Mountain Shrub 187,000	Mountain Shrub 187,000	Mountain Shrub 187,000	Mountain Shrub 187,000
Crested wheatgrass Seedings 0.0	Crested wheatgrass Seedings 34,600	Crested wheatgrass Seedings 1,300	Crested wheatgrass Seedings 42,100

Soil and Water (SW)			
ALTERNATIVE A	PROPOSED RMP	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
Greatest potential long-term impacts to sensitive (wind and water erodible) soils from catastrophic wildland fire compared to Alternatives B, C, and D. No acres identified as suitable for WFU. Identifies the fewest number of acres (3,400) as suitable for fire and non-fire vegetation treatments following suppression.	Vegetation treatments, including prescribed burning and WFU, would have a short term impact by increasing erosion potential. As sites become revegetated, long term potential for improving soil conditions from existing conditions. 124,250 acres are proposed for vegetation treatments and 265,000 acres as suitable for WFU.	Same as Alternative B. 54,920 acres identified for fire and non-fire vegetation treatment and 212,600 acres identified as suitable for WFU.	Same as Alternative B. 162,170 acres identified for fire and non-fire vegetation treatment and 468,900 acres identified as suitable for WFU.
Greatest risk of impacts from OHV use. Erosion and compaction impacts would continue to occur at current rates. Approximately 1,300 acres would be closed to all vehicles; 61,300 acres would be open to all vehicles; 352,000 acres would be undesignated, and 199,000 acres would be limited to designated routes.	Would likely result in fewer impacts than Alternative A. Approximately 12,700 acres would be closed to all vehicles; 0.0 acres would be open to all vehicles; and all vehicles would be limited to designated routes on 601,100 acres .	Same as Alternative B.	Same as Alternative B.
Greatest risk of impacts from OHV use; 361,572 acres of wind erodible soils and 215,830 acres of water erodible soils would occur in open, undesignated, and limited OHV use areas.	Lower risk than Alternative A for impacts from OHV use; 361,572 acres of wind erodible soils and 215,830 acres of water erodible soils would occur in open, undesignated, and limited OHV use areas.	Same as Alternative B.	Same as Alternative B.
Soils would be indirectly protected from minerals development. Fluid leasable minerals; 314,000 acres would have an NSO stipulation. Solid leasable minerals;	Fluid leasable minerals; 226,000 acres would have an NSO stipulation and 258,100 acres would be administratively unavailable. Solid leasable minerals;	Fluid leasable minerals; 347,300 acres would have an NSO stipulation. Solid leasable minerals; 31,400 acres subject to discretionary and nondiscretionary	Fluid leasable minerals; 315,300 acres would have an NSO stipulation. Solid leasable minerals; 16,300 acres subject to discretionary and nondiscretionary

Soil and Water (SW)			
ALTERNATIVE A	PROPOSED RMP	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
22,600 acres subject to discretionary and nondiscretionary closure. Minerals materials; 32,700 acres subject to discretionary and nondiscretionary closure. Locatable mineral claims; 31,200 acres subject to discretionary and non-discretionary closure.	31,400 acres subject to discretionary and nondiscretionary closure. Mineral materials; 31,400 acres subject to discretionary and nondiscretionary closure. Locatable mineral claims; 48,900 acres subject to discretionary and non-discretionary closures.	closure. Mineral materials; 69,000 acres subject to discretionary and nondiscretionary closure. Locatable mineral claims; 48,900 acres subject to discretionary and non-discretionary closure.	closure. Mineral materials; 16,300 acres subject to discretionary and nondiscretionary closure. Locatable mineral claims; 31,200 acres subject to withdrawal.
Livestock grazing has the potential to reduce vegetation cover, disturb the surface, and compact soil in areas of concentrated use such as salting and watering areas. Livestock grazing could also contribute to nutrient loading in surface runoff in localized areas. Under Alternative A 556,300 acres would be available for grazing.	Under Alternative B 560,000 acres would be available for grazing, the most of any of the alternatives.	Under Alternative C 555,300 acres would be available for grazing. Six allotments would specifically be closed to benefit riparian areas.	Under Alternative D 527,800 acres would be available for grazing, the least of any of the alternatives.
An estimated 36 riparian-stream miles would be maintained in PFC. Riparian areas in PFC generally support stable stream banks and desirable vegetative cover; therefore, their condition is not contributing to sedimentation and they may serve as a filter to control pollutants from adjacent lands	Management actions would result in a likely increase in total riparian-stream miles over Alternative A.	Same as Alternative B.	Same as Alternative B.

Paleontological Resources (PR)			
ALTERNATIVE A	PROPOSED RMP	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
Presence or potential for paleontological resources would remain unchanged from current conditions.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.
The extent of change associated with management, the potential for ground-disturbing activities, and increases in access or activity areas to modify the risk of impacts on scientifically important paleontological resources would remain unchanged from current conditions.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.

Special Status Species (SS)			
ALTERNATIVE A	PROPOSED RMP	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
Fauna			
No SS Species geographical areas identified. Management of SS species habitat would continue to maintain existing habitat and not contribute to the potential listing of SS species.	Same as Alternative A.	An estimated 267,400 acres (SS Species geographical areas) would benefit from enhanced management of habitat (e.g., nesting, brood rearing) for SS species. Management of geographical areas would enhance habitat reducing the potential listing of SS species.	Same as Alternative A.
Least risk of potential impacts from public lands disposal resulting in an estimated potential loss of 8,100 acres of combined Colombian sharp-tailed grouse winter/ nesting habitat and greater sage-grouse habitat.	Risk of potential impacts from public lands disposal resulting in an estimated potential loss of 49,400 acres of combined Colombian sharp-tailed grouse winter/ nesting habitat and greater sage-grouse habitat. Risk is greater than Alternatives A and C, but less than Alternatives D.	Risk of potential impacts from public lands disposal resulting in an estimated potential loss of 44,300 acres of combined Colombian sharp-tailed grouse winter/nesting habitat and greater sage-grouse habitat. Risk is greater than Alternative A, but less than Alternatives B and D.	Risk is greatest with potential impacts from public lands disposal, resulting in an estimated potential loss of 102,200 acres of combined Colombian sharp-tailed grouse winter/nesting habitat and greater sage-grouse habitat.
At 30 years following fire and non-fire vegetation treatments, an estimated 254,100 acres of Shrub Steppe (Low-, Mid- and Mountain Shrub) would achieve a desired canopy cover of 15-25%.	At 30 years following fire and non-fire vegetation treatments, an estimated 256,300 acres of Shrub Steppe (Low-, Mid- and Mountain Shrub) would achieve a desired canopy cover of 15-25%.	At 30 years following fire and non-fire vegetation treatments, an estimated 260,800 acres of Shrub Steppe (Low-, Mid- and Mountain Shrub) would achieve a desired canopy cover of 15-25%.	At 30 years following fire and non-fire vegetation treatments, an estimated 276,100 acres of Shrub Steppe (Low-, Mid- and Mountain Shrub) would achieve a desired canopy cover of 15-25%.
An estimated 36 riparian-stream miles would be maintained in PFC.	Management actions would result in a likely increase in total riparian-stream miles in PFC over Alternative A.	Same as Alternative B.	Same as Alternative B.
Flora			
Least risk of potential direct impacts from fire and non-fire vegetation treatment, and WFU.	Increased risk of potential direct impacts from fire and non-fire vegetation treatment and WFU. More than Alternatives A and C, but less than Alternative D.	Increased risk of potential direct impacts from fire and non-fire vegetation treatments, and WFU. Greater than Alternative A, but less than Alternatives B and C.	Greatest risk of potential direct impacts from fire and non-fire vegetation treatment, and WFU.
Impacts to SS plant species would be potentially greater than Alternative C from surface disturbing activities. Site specific inventory and mitigation measures would be implemented as appropriate to avoid potential impacts or disturbance.	Same as Alternative A.	Impacts to SS plant species would be the least from surface disturbing activities. A ¼ mile buffer zone around SS plant species habitat would minimize potential impacts or disturbance. Establishment of priority areas for SS	Same as Alternative A.

Special Status Species (SS)			
ALTERNATIVE A	PROPOSED RMP	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
		plants (approximately 280 acres) would provide additional protective measures to improve/enhance SS plants/habitats while minimizing surface disturbing activities.	
Due to surface disturbing activities (e.g., OHV use, mineral resource development, livestock grazing, and fire and non-fire vegetation treatments), the threat of noxious/invasive weeds impacting SS plant habitat would remain unchanged. Alternative A poses the greatest risks to SS plants with the most acres open/ undesignated to motorized OHVs.	Due to surface disturbing activities (e.g., OHV use, mineral resource development, livestock grazing, and fire and non-fire vegetation treatments), the threat of noxious/invasive weeds impacting SS plant habitat would be the same as Alternative A, less than Alternative D, but greater than Alternative C.	Due to surface disturbing activities (e.g., OHV use, mineral resource development, livestock grazing, and fire and non-fire vegetation treatments), the threat of noxious/invasive weeds impacting SS plant habitat would be less than Alternative A. Non-motorized used would be emphasized under this alternative and would put SS plants at the lowest risk compared to alternatives.	Due to surface disturbing activities (e.g., OHV use, mineral resource development, livestock grazing, and fire and non-fire vegetation treatments), the threat of noxious/invasive weeds impacting SS plant habitat would be greatest. Motorized use would be emphasized under this alternative and would put SS plants at higher risk than Alternatives B and C.

Vegetation (VE)			
ALTERNATIVE A	PROPOSED RMP	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
Treatment footprint acres would be 3,400. However, the long term LHC and distribution of vegetation classes within all vegetation types would be comparable to the more intensively treated Alternatives. Vegetation treatments focus on stabilizing, restoring, and rehabilitating vegetation resources using chemical and mechanical treatments and biological control agents. Wildland fire suppression would continue to be emphasized.	Treatment footprint acres would be 124,250. Vegetation treatments would focus on stabilizing, restoring, and rehabilitating vegetation resources, and similar to Alternative A, they would be more reactive than proactive responses to wildland fire as wildfire suppression would continue to be emphasized.	Treatment footprint acres would be 54,920. Treatments would focus on stabilizing, restoring, and rehabilitating vegetation resources with minimal human intervention. Treatments would occur on one-third of the acres treated under Alternative B and one-quarter of those acres treated under Alternative D. This alternative would de-emphasize wildfire suppression.	Treatment footprint acres would be 162,200. Treatments would focus on stabilizing, restoring, and rehabilitating vegetation resources and are more proactive rather than reactive responses to wildland fire. Wildfire suppression would be emphasized and priority would be placed on protecting, maintaining, and providing resources and resource uses for commercial use.
No acreage in Shrub Steppe (Low-Elevation Shrub, Mid-Elevation Shrub, and Mountain Shrub) types would be treated. The lack of proactive restorative treatment to reestablish sagebrush in the Low Elevation Shrub type under Alternative A would increase the risk of losing this vegetation type.	Approximately 111,000 acres in the Shrub Steppe are proposed for treatment. This Alternative would have a greater effect on restoring vegetation types in the Shrub Steppe than under Alternatives A, but the long-term beneficial effect for representative Shrub Steppe species would be less than under Alternatives C or D.	Approximately 35,000 acres in the Shrub Steppe are proposed for treatment. This Alternative would emphasize maintenance of sagebrush structure within Shrub Steppe to maximally protect greater sage-grouse and Colombian sharp-tailed grouse nesting and brooding habitats and other representative sagebrush species.	Approximately 142,000 acres in the Shrub Steppe are proposed for treatment. This Alternative would have about the same long-term effect on restoring vegetation cover types in the Shrub Steppe as well as improving habitat conditions for representative sagebrush species as Alternatives A and C.
3,400 acres of vegetation treatment is proposed in the Aspen/Aspen-conifer Mix/Dry Conifer type.	Greater emphasis on pure aspen management and over the long term maintains the second most acreage (42,400 acres) in LHC class A. Impacts	Greater emphasis on pure aspen management and over the long term, maintains the most acreage (56,900 acres) in LHC class A. Impacts from	Less emphasis on pure aspen management and, over the long term, maintains the least acreage (12,600 acres) in LHC class A. Impacts from

Vegetation (VE)			
ALTERNATIVE A	PROPOSED RMP	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
	from treatments within the Aspen/Aspen-Conifer Mix/Dry Conifer type would be similar to Alternatives A and C and likely would be greater than under Alternative D.	treatments within the Aspen/Aspen-Conifer Mix/Dry Conifer type would be similar to those under Alternatives A and B and likely would be greater than under Alternative D. This alternative also calls for a very minimal amount of treatment in the Wet/Cold Conifer, Riparian, and Other types, totaling approximately 400 acres.	treatments within the Aspen/Aspen-Conifer Mix/Dry Conifer type would be less than under the other three alternatives. This alternative also calls for a very minimal amount of treatment in the Wet/Cold Conifer, Riparian, and Other types, totaling 400 acres.
Land Health Condition Class Acres Achieved Following Fire and Non-Fire Vegetation Treatments at 30 Years			
Low-Elevation Shrub LHC-A: 102,800 LHC-B: 0.0 LHC-C: 41,900	Low-Elevation Shrub LHC-A: 111,500 LHC-B: 0.0 LHC-C: 33,300	Low-Elevation Shrub LHC-A: 102,800 LHC-B: 0.0 LHC-C: 41,900	Low-Elevation Shrub LHC-A: 112,900 LHC-B: 0.0 LHC-C: 31,900
Mid-Elevation Shrub LHC-A: 52,500 LHC-B: 56,800 LHC-C: 32,700	Mid-Elevation Shrub LHC-A: 58,200 LHC-B: 0.0 LHC-C: 83,800	Mid-Elevation Shrub LHC-A: 49,700 LHC-B: 0.0 LHC-C: 92,300	Mid-Elevation Shrub LHC-A: 63,900 LHC-B: 0.0 LHC-C: 78,100
Mountain Shrub LHC-A: 187,100 LHC-B: 0.0 LHC-C: 0.0	Mountain Shrub LHC-A: 187,100 LHC-B: 0.0 LHC-C: 0.0	Mountain Shrub LHC-A: 187,100 LHC-B: 0.0 LHC-C: 0.0	Mountain Shrub LHC-A: 187,100 LHC-B: 0.0 LHC-C: 0.0
Naturally-occurring Juniper LHC-A: 0.0 LHC-B: 14,100 LHC-C: 0.0	Naturally-occurring Juniper LHC-A: 0.0 LHC-B: 14,100 LHC-C: 0.0	Naturally-occurring Juniper LHC-A: 0.0 LHC-B: 14,100 LHC-C: 0.0	Naturally-occurring Juniper LHC-A: 0.0 LHC-B: 14,100 LHC-C: 0.0
Shrub Steppe (includes Low-Elevation, Mid-Elevation, and Mountain Shrub) LHC-A: 344,500 LHC-B: 63,100 LHC-C: 77,600	Shrub Steppe (includes Low-Elevation, Mid-Elevation, and Mountain Shrub,) LHC-A: 359,000 LHC-B: 0.0 LHC-C: 126,200	Shrub Steppe (includes Low-Elevation, Mid-Elevation, and Mountain Shrub) LHC-A: 344,500 LHC-B: 0.0 LHC-C: 140,700	Shrub Steppe (includes Low-Elevation, Mid-Elevation, and Mountain Shrub) LHC-A: 368,700 LHC-B: 0.0 LHC-C: 116,500
Aspen/Aspen-Conifer Mix/Dry Conifer LHC-A: 38,800 LHC-B: 0.0 LHC-C: 51,500	Aspen/Aspen-Conifer Mix/Dry Conifer LHC-A: 42,400 LHC-B: 0.0 LHC-C: 47,900	Aspen/Aspen-Conifer Mix/Dry Conifer LHC-A: 56,900 LHC-B: 0.0 LHC-C: 33,400	Aspen/Aspen-Conifer Mix/Dry Conifer LHC-A: 12,600 LHC-B: 36,100 LHC-C: 41,500

Vegetation (VE)			
ALTERNATIVE A	PROPOSED RMP	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
Wet/Cold Conifer LHC-A: 0.0 LHC-B: 700 LHC-C: 0.0	Wet/Cold Conifer LHC-A: 0.0 LHC-B: 700 LHC-C: 0.0	Wet/Cold Conifer LHC-A: 0.0 LHC-B: 700 LHC-C: 0.0	Wet/Cold Conifer LHC-A: 0.0 LHC-B: 700 LHC-C: 0.0
Approximate acres dominated by juniper due to juniper encroachment.			
Approximate acres dominated by juniper due to juniper encroachment would be 11,300 acres.	Approximate acres dominated by juniper due to juniper encroachment would be 5,650 acres.	Approximate acres dominated by juniper due to juniper encroachment would be 0.0 acres.	Approximate acres dominated by juniper due to juniper encroachment would be 0.0 acres.
An estimated 36 riparian-stream miles would be maintained in PFC.	Management actions would result in a likely increase in total riparian-stream miles in PFC over Alternative A.	Same as Alternative B.	Same as Alternative B.

Visual Resources (VR)			
ALTERNATIVE A	PROPOSED RMP	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
ROW exclusion areas and withdrawn areas would remain the same. Approximately 5 % of public lands would continue to be closed to ROW development and approximately 11% would continue to be withdrawn from mineral entry.	Approximately 3% of public lands would be closed to ROW development resulting in greater ROW development than Alternative A. Approximately 14% of lands would be withdrawn from mineral entry, resulting in less mineral entry access than Alternative A.	ROW exclusion areas and mineral entry withdrawals would be the same as Alternative B. However, greater protection to visual resources would be provided by routing ROW development at minimum of ¼ mile from known special status species (flora and fauna) habitat.	There would be no ROW exclusion areas. Mineral entry withdrawals would be the same as Alternative A
Ongoing recreation actions that affect visual resources would remain the same. Visual resources on lands without OHV use designations may deteriorate from the continuation of route pioneering in "Open" and undesignated areas.	With the exception of potential individual areas no larger than 80 acres that may be identified and designated "Open" during travel management planning, all public lands would be designated as "Limited" for motorized and mechanized travel.	All public lands would be designated as "Limited" for motorized and mechanized travel.	With the exception of potential individual areas no larger than 320 acres that may be identified and designated "Open" during travel management planning, all public lands would be designated as "Limited" for motorized and mechanized travel.

Wildland Fire Management (WF)			
ALTERNATIVE A	PROPOSED RMP	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
Acquiring 44 miles of ROW and opening 37,300 acres to public recreation would contribute to human caused fire but would also provide easier access for fire suppression.	Would not acquire additional ROWs or open additional acres to public recreation for fire suppression.	Same as Alternative B.	Same as Alternative B.
64,400 acres identified as isolated tracts available for disposal (Zone 4); however of these identified lands, disposal of 50% would result in improved fire management planning and suppression activities on 32,200 acres.	56,300 acres identified as isolated tracts available for disposal (Zone 4); however, disposal of 50% of these identified lands would result in improved fire management planning and suppression activities on 28,150 acres.	49,900 acres identified as isolated tracts available for disposal (Zone 4); however, disposal of 50% of these lands would result in improved fire management planning and suppression activities on 24,950 acres.	121,400 acres identified as isolated tracts available for disposal (Zone 4); however, disposal of 50% of these lands would result in improved fire management planning and suppression activities on 60,700 acres.
Maintaining and enhancing existing greater sage-grouse habitat would eliminate planned fire management actions in Low-elevation Shrub. Restrictions on activities for protection of wolves would not affect fire management.	Maintaining and enhancing existing greater sage-grouse habitat could restrict some planned fire management actions. Over 10 years, approximately 69,150 acres in Low-Elevation Shrub would be treated. Restrictions on activities for protection of wolves would not affect fire management.	Greater sage-grouse habitat requirements would limit fire management actions in Low-Elevation Shrub (Perennial Grass/Seeding) (1,300 acres) and Mid-Elevation Shrub (16,650 acres). Restrictions on activities for wolf protection may limit springtime fuel reduction in denning areas.	Maintaining and enhancing existing greater sage-grouse habitat could restrict some planned fire management actions. Approximately 62,800 acres in Low-Elevation Shrub would be treated. Restrictions on activities for wolf protection may limit springtime fuel reduction in denning areas.
Current fire management direction would continue suppression of all wildland fires. No treatments would occur in any vegetation types with the exception of Aspen/Aspen Conifer Mix/Dry Conifer (3,400 acres).	Over a period of 10 years, footprint fire and non-fire vegetation treatments are planned on 69,150 acres Low-Elevation Shrub/ Perennial Grass/Seedings, 25,400 acres Mid-Elevation Shrub, 16,500 acres Mountain Shrub, 7,000 acres Aspen/ Aspen Conifer Mix and 6,200 acres Dry Conifer.	Over a period of 10 years, footprint fire and non-fire vegetation treatments are planned on 1,300 acres Low-Elevation Shrub/ Perennial Grass/Seedings, 16,650 acres Mid-Elevation Shrub, 16,600 acres Mountain Shrub, 20,000 acres Dry Conifer, 70 acres Wet/Cold Conifer, 100 acres Riparian, and 200 acres Other/Vegetated Lava.	Over a period of 10 years, footprint fire and non-fire vegetation treatments are planned on 62,800 acres Low-Elevation Shrub/ Perennial Grass/Seedings, 64,000 acres Mid-Elevation Shrub, 15,000 acres Mountain Shrub, 20,000 acres Dry Conifer, 70 acres Wet/Cold Conifer, 100 acres Riparian, and 200 acres Other/Vegetated Lava.
Full-scale suppression would continue to be the primary tool in reacting to wildland fires. The least amount of acreage in WUI areas would be treated (1,980) under Alternative A. Risk from unwanted wildland fire is moderate in 3 of the 11 WUI polygons.	Alternative B treats 55 times more acres in the WUI areas than Alternative A. Potential risk from unwanted wildland fire would be low in all of the 11 WUI polygons.	Alternative C treats the fewest acres of all the action alternatives (42% as many as Alternative B); however it has low potential risks in WUI polygons.	Alternative D treats 35% more acres in the WUI areas than Alternative B. Potential risk from unwanted wildland fire would be low in all of the 11 WUI polygons.
FRCC in 30 years (all vegetation types currently FRCC 2, except the Aspen/Aspen-Conifer Mix/Dry Conifer type is FRCC 3)			
Low- Elevation Shrub: 1	Low- Elevation Shrub: 1	Low- Elevation Shrub: 1	Low- Elevation Shrub: 1
Mid-Elevation Shrub: 2	Mid-Elevation Shrub: 2	Mid-Elevation Shrub: 2	Mid-Elevation Shrub: 2
Mountain Shrub: 2	Mountain Shrub: 1	Mountain Shrub: 1	Mountain Shrub: 1

Wildland Fire Management (WF)			
ALTERNATIVE A	PROPOSED RMP	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
Naturally-occurring Juniper: 2	Naturally-occurring Juniper: 2	Naturally-occurring Juniper: 2	Naturally-occurring Juniper: 2
Aspen/Aspen-Conifer Mix/Dry Conifer: 3	Aspen/Aspen-Conifer Mix/Dry Conifer: 2	Aspen/Aspen-Conifer Mix/Dry Conifer: 2	Aspen/Aspen-Conifer Mix/Dry Conifer: 2
Wet/Cold Conifer: 2	Wet/Cold Conifer: 2	Wet/Cold Conifer: 2	Wet/Cold Conifer: 2

RESOURCE USES			
Forestry (FO)			
ALTERNATIVE A	PROPOSED RMP	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
Commercial Forestry			
The probable sale quantity would remain unchanged, approximately 600-900 thousand board feet per year.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.
Commercial forest lands would remain unchanged, approximately 45,700 acres .	Commercial forest lands would potentially be reduced by approximately 3,700 acres through land tenure adjustments (Zone 4 disposal).	Same as Alternative A.	Commercial forest lands would potentially be reduced by approximately 13,700 acres through land tenure adjustments (Zone 4 disposal).
Proposed fuel reduction and fire management activities are planned for a total of 3,400 footprint acres of forested vegetation types (Aspen/Aspen-Conifer/Dry Conifer types) within a 10-year period (340 acres per year).	Proposed fuel reduction and fire management activities are planned for a total of 13,200 footprint acres of forested vegetation types (Aspen/Aspen-Conifer/Dry Conifer and Wet Cold Conifer vegetation types) within a 10-year period (1,320 acres per year).	Proposed fuel reduction and fire management activities are planned for a total of 20,000 footprint acres of forested vegetation types (Aspen/Aspen-Conifer/Dry Conifer and Wet Cold Conifer vegetation types) within a 10-year period (2,070 acres per year).	Same as Alternative C.
Commercial timber harvesting could account for a portion (120 to 180 acres annually) of fuel reduction and fire management treatments within this 10-year period.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.
Minerals and Energy development (oil and gas, geothermal and phosphate leasing) could potentially impact approximately 15,070 acres of commercial forest lands.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.

Non-Commercial Forestry			
Fire and non-fire vegetation treatments would annually treat approximately 160-220 acres of Aspen/Aspen Conifer Mix/Dry Conifer non-commercial forest lands.	Fire and non-fire vegetation treatments would annually treat approximately 1140-1200 acres of Aspen/Aspen Conifer Mix/Dry Conifer non-commercial forest lands.	Fire and non-fire vegetation treatments would annually treat approximately 1820-1880 acres of Aspen/Aspen Conifer Mix/Dry Conifer non-commercial forest lands.	Same as Alternative A.
The least amount, approximately 2,300 acres of non-commercial forest lands, would potentially be disposed through land tenure adjustments (Zone 4 disposal).	Approximately 8,000 acres of non-commercial forest lands would potentially be disposed through land tenure adjustments (Zone 4 disposal).	Approximately 7,000 acres of non-commercial forest lands would potentially be disposed through land tenure adjustments (Zone 4 disposal).	The greatest amount, approximately 22,100 acres non-commercial forest lands, would potentially be disposed through land tenure adjustments (Zone 4 disposal).
Minerals and Energy development (oil and gas, geothermal and phosphate leasing) could potentially impact approximately 31,200 acres of non-commercial forest lands.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.

Lands and Realty (LR)			
ALTERNATIVE A	PROPOSED RMP	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
Approximately 5% (32,200 acres) of public lands would be disposed of while retaining a public lands base of approximately 581,600 acres . Specific parcels currently identified for land tenure adjustment would not change.	Approximately 5% (28,150 acres) of public lands would be disposed based upon a zone concept while retaining a public lands base of approximately 585,650 acres .	Approximately 4% (24,950 acres) of public lands would be disposed based upon a zone concept while retaining a public lands base of approximately 588,850 acres .	Approximately 10% (60,700 acres) of public lands would be disposed based upon a zone concept while retaining a public lands base of approximately 553,100 acres .
Current classification of public lands identified as "Open", "Avoidance", or "Exclusion" areas for land use authorizations (e.g., ROW) would not change.	Public lands would be identified as "Open", "Avoidance", or "Exclusion" areas for land use authorizations (e.g., ROW). Acres for these three areas would change in comparison to Alternative A. Acres of "Open and Avoidance" areas would increase approximately 5 and 8% respectively and "Exclusion" areas would decrease by approximately 94%.	Same as Alternative B. In addition to the "Avoidance and Exclusion" areas a 1/4 mile buffer around SS plant habitat would be observed.	Public lands would be identified as "Open" or "Avoidance" areas for land use authorizations (e.g., ROW). Acres for these three areas would change in comparison to Alternatives A, B and C. Acres of "Open" areas would be the same as Alternatives B and C. Acres of "Avoidance" areas would increase approximately 18%.
"Open" – 562,900 acres "Avoidance" - 20,200 acres "Exclusion" - 30,700 acres	"Open" - 590,000 acres "Avoidance" - 21,900 acres "Exclusion" - 1,900 acres	"Open" - 590,000 acres "Avoidance" - 21,900 acres "Exclusion" - 1,900 acres	"Open" – 590,000 acres "Avoidance" - 23,800 acres

Lands and Realty (LR)			
ALTERNATIVE A	PROPOSED RMP	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
Land withdrawal management would not change. Seven RNAs, totaling 1,500 acres (< 1% of public lands) would be withdrawn from locatable mineral entry.	Approximately 19,200 acres of public land (approximately 3%) consisting of eight RNAs and the Soda Springs Hills Management Area would be withdrawn from locatable mineral entry.	Same as Alternative B.	Same as Alternative A.
Approximately 44 miles of specific road and trail legal access would be acquired to open approximately 37,300 acres to the public primarily for recreation purposes and to support other resource programs.	Key priority areas are identified for acquisition of legal road and trail access to public lands. Public access would be retained in all land tenure adjustments.	Same as Alternative B.	Same as Alternative B.

Livestock Grazing (LG)			
ALTERNATIVE A	PROPOSED RMP	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
Current grazing management would remain unchanged. Approximately 556,300 acres would be available for livestock grazing and 57,500 acres would not be available with a preference/permitted use of 86,900 AUMS .	Approximately 560,000 acres would be available for livestock grazing and 53,800 acres would not be available with a preference/permitted use of 87,500 AUMS .	Approximately 555,300 acres would be available for livestock grazing and 58,500 acres would not be available with a preference/permitted use of 86,600 AUMS .	Approximately 527,800 acres would be available for livestock grazing and 86,000 acres would not be available with a preference/permitted use of 82,200 AUMS .
Acres unavailable to livestock grazing resulting from specific resources and uses management actions include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land Tenure Adjustments (32,200 acres) • Minerals and Energy Development (480 acres) • Fluid Minerals Development (300 acres) 	Acres unavailable to livestock grazing resulting from specific resources and uses management actions include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land Tenure Adjustments (28,150 acres) • Minerals and Energy Development (480 acres) • Fluid Minerals Development (300 acres) • Available acres not permitted/leased would be reclassified as unavailable acres (330 acres) 	Acres unavailable to livestock grazing resulting from specific resources and uses management actions include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land Tenure Adjustments (24,950 acres) • Minerals and Energy Development (480 acres) • Fluid Minerals Development (300 acres) • Available acres not permitted/leased would be reclassified as unavailable acres (7,500 acres) 	Acres unavailable to livestock grazing resulting from specific resources and uses management actions include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land Tenure Adjustments (60,700 acres) • Minerals and Energy Development (480 acres) • Fluid Minerals Development (300 acres)
Fire and non-fire vegetation treatments (3,400 acres) would temporarily reduce preference/permitted use annually by 120 AUMS during the 10 year treatment period.	Fire and non-fire vegetation treatments (124,300 acres) would temporarily reduce preference/permitted use annually by 4,200 AUMS during the 10 year treatment period.	Fire and non-fire vegetation treatments (54,900 acres) would temporarily reduce preference/permitted use annually by 1,800 AUMS during the 10 year treatment period.	Fire and non-fire vegetation treatments (162,200 acres) would temporarily reduce preference/permitted use annually by 5,400 AUMS during the 10 year treatment period.

Livestock Grazing (LG)			
ALTERNATIVE A	PROPOSED RMP	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
Long-term forage quality and quantity due to limited vegetation treatments would not improve.	Long-term forage quality and quantity as a result of increased fire and non-fire vegetation treatments would improve compared to Alternative A.	Long-term forage quality and quantity as a result of increased fire and non-fire vegetation treatments would improve more than Alternative A but less than Alternative B.	Long-term forage quality and quantity as a result of fire and non-fire vegetation treatments would improve the greatest.
Livestock grazing within the BSD would remain unchanged.	Livestock use within the BSD would be limited to trailing only. Approximately 1,400 AUMS would be available for trailing purposes. Allotments within the BSD would be closed entirely and portions of allotments within the BSD would be closed.	Same as Alternative B.	Same as Alternative B.

Minerals and Energy (ME)			
ALTERNATIVE A	PROPOSED RMP	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
Reclamation conducted in accordance with current regulations and approved site specific operations plan.	Idaho Standards for Rangeland Health would be incorporated into reclamation requirements for all Minerals and Energy development to provide clear reclamation direction and objective criteria from which to design reclamation activities and measure the adequacy of final reclamation. Long term reclamation costs may be reduced by having clear reclamation direction and avoiding situations where reclamation would be judged inadequate and have to be revisited in the future.	Same as Alternative B.	Same as Alternative B.
No similar action under Alternative A.	For all Minerals and Energy operations, operational standards and guidelines would be implemented to protect hydrologic function and surface resource values and to prevent the release of contaminants into the environment resulting in operators having to expand or modify reclamation activities and possibly adding to overall operational costs and complexity of Minerals and Energy development.	Same as Alternative B.	Same as Alternative B.

Minerals and Energy (ME)			
ALTERNATIVE A	PROPOSED RMP	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
Non-discretionary closures for Solid Leasable Minerals, Mineral Materials and Locatable Minerals would be in effect for approximately 11,200 – 29,700 acres (1.8 – 4.8% of total public lands) depending on type of mineral.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.
Seasonal timing restrictions to protect special status species and wildlife habitat would be in effect for approximately 439,000 acres (72% of total public lands).	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.
The following acreages would be discretionarily closed under this alternative <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Solid Leasable Minerals - 11,400 acres • Mineral Materials - 21,500 acres • Locatable Minerals – 1,500 acres 	The following acreages would be discretionarily closed under this alternative. Number in parentheses indicates percent increase/decrease from Alternative A: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Solid Leasable Minerals - 20,200 acres (77%) • Mineral Materials - 20,200 acres (-11%) • Locatable Minerals - 19,200 acres (155.3%) 	The following acreages would be discretionarily closed under this alternative. Number in parentheses indicates percent increase/decrease from Alternative A: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Solid Leasable Minerals - 20,200 acres (0.0%) • Mineral Materials - 57,800 acres (330%) • Locatable Minerals - 19,200 acres (0.0%) 	The following acreages would be discretionarily closed under this alternative. Number in parentheses indicates percent increase/decrease from Alternative A: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Solid Leasable Minerals - 5,100 acres (133%) • Mineral Materials - 5,100 acres (462%) • Locatable Minerals - 1,500 acres (155%)
Fluid Leasable Minerals			
Approximately 602,600 acres (98%) would be “open” to fluid mineral leasing and 11,200 acres would be closed.	Approximately 344,500 acres (98%) would be “open” to fluid mineral leasing. 258,100 acres would be “administratively unavailable” and 11,200 acres would be “closed” for fluid mineral leasing.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.
Approximately 314,000 acres (51%) open to leasing (Oil and Gas and Geothermal resources) would be managed with an NSO stipulation to protect resources, wildlife habitat, special status species, and special designations.	Approximately 226,000 acres (37%) open to leasing (Oil and Gas and Geothermal resources) would be managed with an NSO stipulation to protect resources, wildlife habitat, special status species, and special designations.	Approximately 347,300 acres (57%) open to leasing (Oil and Gas and Geothermal resources) would be managed with an NSO stipulation to protect resources, wildlife habitat, special status species, and special designations.	Approximately 315,400 acres (51%) open to leasing (Oil and Gas and Geothermal resources) would be managed with an NSO stipulation to protect resources, wildlife habitat, special status species, and special designations.
Approximately 66,800 acres open to leasing in the “ High ” potential <u>Oil and Gas</u> area would be leased with an NSO stipulation to protect resources, wildlife	Approximately 74,200 acres open to leasing in the “ High ” potential <u>Oil and Gas</u> area would be leased with an NSO stipulation to protect resources, wildlife	Approximately 99,700 acres open to leasing in the “ High ” potential <u>Oil and Gas</u> area would be leased with an NSO stipulation to protect resources, wildlife	Same as Alternative A.

Minerals and Energy (ME)			
ALTERNATIVE A	PROPOSED RMP	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
habitat, special status species, and special designated areas.	habitat, special status species, and special designated areas. This is an 11% increase over Alternative A.	habitat, special status species, and special designated areas. This is a 49% increase over Alternative A.	
Approximately 8,200 acres open to leasing in " High " <u>Geothermal</u> potential areas would be leased with an NSO stipulation to protect resources, wildlife habitat, special status species, and special designated areas.	Same as Alternative A.	Approximately 11,400 acres open to leasing in " High " <u>Geothermal</u> potential areas would be leased with an NSO stipulation to protect resources, wildlife habitat, special status species, and special designated areas. This is a 39% increase over Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.
Over the next 20 years under a reasonably foreseeable development scenario approximately 185 acres would be developed for Oil and Gas and 129 acres for Geothermal resources.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.
Solid Leasable Minerals			
Approximately 591,200 acres (96%) would be "open" for leasing.	Approximately 582,400 acres (95%) would be "open" for leasing. This is a 1% decrease in acres from Alternative A.	Same as Alternative B.	Approximately 597,500 acres (97%) would be "open" for leasing. This is a 1% increase in acres from Alternative A.
No similar action under Alternative A.	Where selenium and other contaminants are known to be problematic, action levels would be established as concentration release standards for reclamation of phosphate mines.	Same as Alternative B.	Same as Alternative B.
Mineral Materials			
Approximately 581,100 acres (95%) would be "open".	Approximately 582,400 acres (95%) would be "open". This is a slight increase in acres from Alternative A.	Approximately 544,800 acres (89%) would be "open". This is a 6% decrease in acres from Alternative A.	Approximately 597,500 acres (97%) would be "open". This is a 2% increase in acres from Alternative A.
Locatable Minerals			
Approximately 582,600 acres (95%) would be "open".	Approximately 564,900 acres (92%) would be "open". This is a 3% decrease in acres from Alternative A.	Same as Alternative B.	Same as Alternative A

Recreation (RE)			
ALTERNATIVE A	PROPOSED RMP	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
Developed recreational opportunities would remain the same with two SRMAs totaling approximately 55,200 acres .	Developed recreational opportunities would be increase over Alternative A with the identification of the Oneida Narrows SRMA (approximately 3,600 acres) and the identification of the Campground SRMA (approximately 430 acres). Recreation would be recognized as the principle use providing opportunities and experiences on approximately 59,230 acres .	Same as Alternative B.	Same as Alternative A.
Dispersed recreation opportunities would remain the same. Approximately 558,600 acres would be available for recreational purposes.	Dispersed recreation opportunities would decrease slightly from Alternative A. Approximately 555,000 acres would be available for such purposes.	Dispersed recreation opportunities would decrease slightly from Alternative A. Approximately 554,570 acres would be available for such purposes.	Same as Alternative A.
Travel management would be the least restrictive.	Travel management would have more restrictions in comparison to Alternative A.	Travel management restrictions would further increase in comparison to Alternative B.	Travel management would have fewer restrictions that Alternative B and C, but more than Alternative A.
There would be no changes in current conditions and OHV designations would remain unchanged.	12,700 acres would be designated as "Closed" to OHVs. All remaining public lands (601,100 acres) would be designated as "Limited" – restricting motorized and mechanized travel to designated routes which would reduce surface disturbance impacts to vegetation, wildlife habitat, erosive soils and water quality.	Same as Alternative B	Same as Alternative B
"Open/Undesignated" - 413,500 acres "Limited" - 199,000 acres "Closed" - 1,300 acres	"Open/Undesignated" - 0.0 acres "Limited" - 601,100 acres "Closed" - 12,700 acres	Same as Alternative B	Same as Alternative B
No similar action under Alternative A.	Within areas designated as "Limited" to OHVs, snowmobiling would not be allowed on 62,100 acres to protect winter range habitat.	Same as Alternative B	Within areas designated as "Limited" to OHVs, snowmobiling would not be allowed on 28,700 acres to protect winter range habitat.
No similar action under Alternative A.	Snowmobiling would be restricted to designated routes on 286,500 acres within big game winter range.	Snowmobiling would be restricted to designated routes on 286,500 acres within big game winter range.	No similar action under Alternative D.
No similar action under Alternative A.	Snowmobiling would be unrestricted on 252,500 acres .	Snowmobiling would be unrestricted on 252,500 acres .	Snowmobiling would be unrestricted on 572,400 acres .

Recreation (RE)			
ALTERNATIVE A	PROPOSED RMP	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
No similar action under Alternative A.	Travel management planning would provide for legitimate intensive use routes not to exceed a “footprint” larger than 80 acres .	Travel management planning would not provide for legitimate intensive use routes.	Travel management planning would provide for legitimate intensive use routes not to exceed a “footprint” larger than 320 acres .

SPECIAL DESIGNATIONS			
ADMINISTRATIVE DESIGNATIONS (AD)			
ALTERNATIVE A	PROPOSED RMP	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
Wilderness Study Areas			
Current WSA designations of approximately 11,200 acres would be retained. No activities are anticipated to impact WSA management.	Current WSA designations of approximately 11,200 acres would be retained. No activities are anticipated to impact WSA management. WSAs would be “Closed” to OHV.	Same as Alternative B.	Same as Alternative B.
National Wild and Scenic Rivers System (NWSRS)			
Current Bear River and Blackfoot River eligible segments, totaling approximately 17 miles , would be managed to protect the values for which they were identified. Management would be applied to protect values when activities are proposed.	Of the 10 eligible river segments identified for the Bear River and the one eligible river segment identified for the Blackfoot River, none would be recommended for inclusion in the NWSRS.	Same as Alternative B.	Same as Alternative B.
Areas of Critical Environmental Concern and Research Natural Areas			
Seven established ACECs (approximately 9,900 acres) would continue to be managed for the values for which they were established. Management would be applied to protect relevant and important values when activities are proposed.	Six established ACECs (approximately 9,900 acres) would continue to be managed for the values for which they were established. Management would be applied to protect relevant and important values when activities are proposed.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.
No similar action under Alternative A.	The Van Komen ACEC (approximately 3 acres) designation would be removed and the area no longer managed as an ACEC.	No similar action under Alternative C.	No similar action under Alternative D.

ADMINISTRATIVE DESIGNATIONS (AD)			
ALTERNATIVE A	PROPOSED RMP	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
Seven established RNAs (approximately 1,500 acres) would continue to be managed for the values for which they were established. All RNAs would be "Closed" to OHV. Management would be applied to protect relevant and important values when activities are proposed.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A. In addition, all public lands within established RNAs would be unavailable to livestock grazing.	Same as Alternative A.
No new RNAs would be designated.	One area, approximately 400 acres , would be designated as the Petticoat Peak RNA. The RNA would be closed to OHV, Solid Leasable, Mineral Materials and Locatable Materials with an NSO stipulation for Fluid Minerals. ROWs would be excluded from the RNA.	Same as Alternative B. In addition, all public lands within the designated Petticoat Peak RNA would be unavailable to livestock grazing.	Same as Alternative A.

Socio-Economics (SO)			
ALTERNATIVE A	PROPOSED RMP	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
No changes in population trends, local housing market, demand for public services and facilities, employment rates, and total income or earnings.	Same as Alternative A except for the following. Decreasing the lands available for minerals and energy entry could decrease minerals and energy employment, income, and earnings if actual minerals and energy activity were to decrease as a result. Reductions in available AUMS could increase costs and decrease incomes of permittees.	Same as Alternative A except for the following. Decreasing the lands available for minerals and energy entry could decrease minerals and energy employment, income, and earnings; however this is not expected because actual minerals and energy activity is not expected to change. Greater reductions in available AUMS than in Alternative B could increase costs and decrease incomes of permittees to a greater extent.	Same as Alternative A except for the following. Increasing the lands available for minerals and energy entry could increase minerals and energy employment, income, and earnings; however this is not expected because actual minerals and energy activity is not expected to change. The greatest reduction in available AUMS could increase costs and decrease incomes of permittees to the greatest extent of all of the alternatives.
Land tenure adjustments over the period of full implementation of the RMP would result in a potential reduction in the Payment In Lieu of Taxes (PILT) of \$38,640 and a potential increase in property taxes of \$16,905.	Land tenure adjustments over the period of full implementation of the RMP would result in a potential reduction in the PILT of \$33,780 and a potential increase in property taxes of \$14,910.	Land tenure adjustments over the period of full implementation of the RMP would result in a potential reduction in the PILT of \$29,940 and a potential increase in property taxes of \$13,100.	Land tenure adjustments over the period of full implementation of the RMP would result in a potential reduction in the PILT of \$72,840 and a potential increase in property taxes of \$31,870.

Socio-Economics (SO)			
ALTERNATIVE A	PROPOSED RMP	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
Potential temporary loss to BLM in livestock grazing fee receipts (\$1,672) and increased cost to ranchers (\$13,405 to \$45,600) to replace forage temporarily lost over the first 10 years during vegetation and fuel treatments. Direct expenditures within the local economy by BLM for fuels treatments would provide an additional indirect annual economic stimulus of \$24,990.	Potential temporary loss to BLM in livestock grazing fee receipts (\$58,653) and increased cost to ranchers (\$469,224 to \$1,596,000) to replace forage temporarily lost over the first 10 years during vegetation and fuel treatments. Direct expenditures within the local economy by BLM for fuels treatments would provide an additional indirect annual economic stimulus of \$913,238.	Potential temporary loss to BLM in livestock grazing fee receipts (\$25,137) and increased cost to ranchers (\$201,096 to \$684,000) to replace forage temporarily lost over the first 10 years during vegetation and fuel treatments. Direct expenditures within the local economy by BLM for fuels treatments would provide an additional indirect annual economic stimulus of \$403,662.	Potential temporary loss to BLM in livestock grazing fee receipts (\$75,411) and increased cost to ranchers (\$603,288 to \$2,052,000) to replace forage temporarily lost over the first 10 years during vegetation and fuel treatments. Direct expenditures within the local economy by BLM for fuels treatments would provide an additional indirect annual economic stimulus of \$1,191,950.
Management actions would not result in a change in the number of available AUMs. No changes in potential loss to BLM in livestock grazing fee receipts and no potential increased cost to ranchers due to loss of AUMs over the first 10 years of the plan.	Management actions would result in changes in the number of available of AUMs (a reduction of 3,505). Compared to Alternatives A and D, greater potential loss to BLM in livestock grazing fee receipts (\$5,152) and potential increased cost to ranchers (\$41,219 to \$140,200) over the first 10 years of the plan.	Management actions would result in changes in the number of available of AUMs (200). Compared to Alternatives B and D, smallest potential loss to BLM in livestock grazing fee receipts (\$294) and potential increased cost to ranchers (\$2,352 to \$8,000) over the first 10 years of the plan.	Management actions would result in changes in the number of available of AUMs (8,800). Compared to Alternatives A, B, and C, greatest potential loss to BLM in livestock grazing fee receipts (\$12,936) and potential increased cost to ranchers (\$103,488 to \$352,000) over the first 10 years of the plan.
Greatest number of acres available for minerals and energy development without surface occupancy restrictions). 292,700 acres would be available for minerals energy or development. More lands available for minerals entry and development could result in greater employment, income, and overall local economic activity, depending on the level of minerals development activity and future interest in minerals development.	122,700 acres would be open to mineral resource development.	259,500 acres would be open to mineral resource development.	291,400 acres would be open to mineral resource development.
Potential revenues from power plant operation due the reasonably foreseeable development of fluid minerals would be \$19.7 million annually. Potential loss in grazing fees over 10 years of \$460 and potential increased cost to ranchers) to replace forage in areas of development of \$3,650 to \$12,400 over 10 years.	Potentially reduced revenues from power plant operation from the reasonably foreseeable development of fluid minerals, as a result of a 58 percent decrease in total lands available to fluid minerals activities with no NSO restrictions	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.
No change in environmental justice issues, possible effects on tribal uses due to land disposal potentially lower than Alternative D.	Low-income and minority groups would not be disproportionately affected; possible effects on tribal uses due to land disposal potentially lower than Alternatives A and D.	Low-income and minority groups would not be disproportionately affected; possible effects on tribal uses due to land disposal potentially lower than all alternatives.	Low-income and minority groups would not be disproportionately affected; possible effects on tribal uses due to land disposal potentially higher than all alternatives.

CHAPTER 1 - INTRODUCTION

1.1 OVERVIEW

The United States (US) Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management (BLM) has prepared this Proposed Resource Management Plan (RMP) and final environmental impact statement (EIS). The purposes of the document are to provide direction for managing public lands under the jurisdiction of the Idaho Falls District, Pocatello Field Office (PFO) in southeastern Idaho and to analyze the environmental effects that could result from implementing the management alternatives addressed in this plan. The affected lands are currently being managed under two separate land use plans: the Malad Management Framework Plan (MFP) (BLM 1981a) and the Pocatello RMP (BLM 1988a).

The land use planning process is the key tool used by the BLM to manage resources and designate uses on public lands in coordination with tribal, state and local government, land users and interested public. Generally, an RMP does not result in a wholesale change of management direction. Accordingly, this RMP: (1) incorporates new information and regulatory guidance since the previous plans and (2) concentrates on providing management direction where it may be lacking or requiring clarification to resolve land use issues or conflicts. Current management direction that has proven effective and that requires no change has been carried forward into this document, as well as through the analysis process.

The RMP is being prepared using BLM planning regulations and guidance issued under the authority of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act (FLPMA) of 1976 (43 US Code 1701 et seq.) and BLM's Land Use Planning Handbook, H-1601-1 (BLM 2005a). An EIS is incorporated into this document to meet the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA), Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) regulations for implementing NEPA (40 Code of Federal Regulations, Sections 1500-1508) (CEQ 1978), and requirements of BLM's NEPA Handbook, H-1790-1 (BLM 2008a).

1.2 PURPOSE OF AND NEED FOR ACTION

The resource management planning process is a key tool that the BLM uses, in collaboration with tribal, federal, state, and local governments, and interested public parties, to ensure a coordinated and consistent approach to managing public lands. The RMP is needed to respond to changing ecological, socioeconomic, institutional, and regulatory conditions that have occurred since the approval of the Malad MFP in 1981 and the Pocatello RMP in 1988. Many new laws, regulations, and policies have created additional public land management considerations. As a result, some of the decisions in the MFP and RMP are no longer valid, or have been superseded by requirements that did not exist when they were prepared. Likewise, user demands and impacts have evolved, requiring new management direction. Additionally, the use of two separate plans to manage one administrative unit represents a fragmented approach and complicates decision making.

The purpose of this Pocatello RMP is to provide a single, comprehensive land use plan that will replace both the Malad MFP (BLM 1981a) and Pocatello RMP (BLM 1988a). This new RMP will guide multiple use management of the public lands and interests administered by the PFO.

The plan provides objectives, land use allocations, and management direction to maintain, improve, or restore resource conditions and provide for the economic needs of local communities over the long term. The RMP incorporates new data, addresses land use issues and conflicts, specifies where and under what circumstances particular activities will be allowed on public lands, and incorporates the mandate of multiple use in accordance with FLPMA. The RMP does not describe how particular programs or projects would be implemented or prioritized; rather, those decisions are deferred to more-detailed implementation-level planning.

1.3 DESCRIPTION OF THE PLANNING AREA

The PFO area boundary defines the planning area assessed in this RMP. The planning area encompasses 5,142,100 acres in Bannock, Bear Lake, Bingham, Bonneville, Caribou, Cassia, Franklin, Oneida, and Power Counties of southeastern Idaho (**Figure 1-1**). About 613,800 acres, or 12 percent of the planning area, are administered by the BLM. The US Department of Interior has been charged with managing the federal mineral estate. The BLM within the Department is the agency responsible for administering the mineral estate on behalf of the US. This includes split estate lands and most federal lands with surface managed by other agencies such as the USFS. Land ownership in the planning area is mixed and includes other lands administered by the federal government, the Fort Hall Indian Reservation, State of Idaho lands, and private property. Over 34 percent of the planning area land is administered by the federal government, including the BLM, the US Department of Agriculture, National Forest Service (Forest Service), and US Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS). **Table 1-1** highlights the ownership pattern of the planning area.

Table 1-1. Acres of Land Status within the Planning Area

Land Status	Acres	Percentage of Planning Area
BLM	613,800	12%
Forest Service	1,102,400	21%
US Fish & Wildlife Service Refuges	35,900	1%
Fort Hall Indian Reservation	519,800	10%
State of Idaho	324,400	6%
Water	99,500	2%
Private	2,446,300	48%
TOTAL	5,142,100	100%

Note: Numbers are rounded to nearest 100 acres.

Management direction and actions outlined in this document apply only to BLM-managed public lands in the planning area and to federal mineral estate under BLM jurisdiction that may lie beneath other surface ownership. No specific measures have been developed for private, state, or other federal lands. However, given that private, state, and other federal lands are interspersed with public lands, these lands could be influenced or be indirectly affected by BLM management actions.

1.4 SCOPING AND PLANNING ISSUES

1.4.1 SCOPING PROCESS

Early in the planning process, the public was invited to identify planning issues and concerns relating to the management of public lands and resources and uses in the planning area.

The formal scoping period began with publication of the Notice of Intent in the Federal Register on November 14, 2001. The scoping period for receipt of public comments ended June 30, 2003.

The BLM prepared and mailed a public scoping letter and briefing package to the Shoshone-Bannock Tribal Council, Land Use Policy Commission, federal, state and local agencies, interest groups, and members of the general public on April 23, 2003. The mailing list was compiled by the PFO and included over 800 entries. The scoping letter and briefing package were also made available for public view on the Internet in April 2003. The briefing package served to inform the recipients of the public scoping process, the scheduled open house scoping meetings, background information on the purpose and need for the planning activity and identified the Need for Change Topics.

Public scoping meetings were held throughout southeastern Idaho in Montpelier on May 28, 2003; Malad on May 29, 2003; Fort Hall on June 5, 2003; Pocatello on June 10, 2003; and Soda Springs on June 11, 2003. The BLM provided the local media with press releases announcing the time, location and purpose of these meetings. The format for the scoping meetings featured informal, one-on-one discussion by individual interdisciplinary team (IDT) members with members of the public (Chapter 5 details discussion on scoping and public collaboration). A key component of the scoping process was to provide the public the opportunity to identify issues and concerns to be addressed in the RMP based upon the Need for Change Topics presented at these open house meetings.

1.4.2 NEED FOR CHANGE TOPICS

The planning team members identified Need for Change Topics through an extensive review of the Malad MFP (1981) and Pocatello RMP (1988). This resulted in the identification of land management direction for resources and uses that could be carried forward and management direction that needed to be changed to address: 1) new laws, regulations and policies, 2) changed conditions on the public lands, and 3) new and emerging demands on the public land. It is important to note that resolution of Need for Change Topics may require changes in management direction not only for that particular resource and use, but also changes in management direction for other interdependent resources and uses. For example, a management approach for protecting a sensitive plant species may require changing management direction for livestock grazing in the affected area. Thus, the need to change management for special status species may influence the management direction for other resource programs. Likewise, while livestock grazing was not initially identified as a Need for Change Topic, livestock grazing management direction varies by alternative in order to address resource concerns and specific management direction of other resources. The Need for Change Topics and land management direction to be developed in the Pocatello RMP is described by resource/use in **Table 1-2**.

Table 1-2. Description of Need for Change/Management Direction by Resource/Use

Resource/Use	Description of Need for Change/Management Direction
Vegetation	Management direction is needed to 1) identify desired future condition of vegetation types, 2) maintain or move riparian areas toward Proper Functioning Condition, and 3) identify reclamation guidance for rehabilitating public lands after disturbance, including mining activities, fire, or other ground-disturbing activities.
Special Status Species	Management direction is needed for all special status species habitat (flora and fauna), including greater sage-grouse, and other associated resource uses. This direction would be based on the most recent scientific guidance for the management of affected species.
Fire Management	Management direction is needed to 1) identify wildland fire use areas, 2) treatment levels, and 3) fire management restrictions.
Recreation	Management direction is needed to 1) identify Off-Highway Vehicle (OHV) areas as open, limited, or closed, 2) identify over snow vehicle use limitations, 3) consider identifying the Oneida Narrows as a Special Recreation Management Area (SRMA) to provide enhanced direction for the increasing recreational use, and 4) protect river values and uses for the Blackfoot SRMA.
Lands & Realty	Management direction is needed to 1) identify management areas or zones of public lands planned for retention or available to be considered for disposal and 2) identify areas available for potential alternative energy development, such as wind, solar, or biomass, consistent with the President's National Energy Policy.
Minerals	Management direction is needed to address the process of mining and reclamation to ensure containment and control of hazardous substances, such as selenium and other potential contaminants, to make sure post mining land use is safe and productive, providing for future well-suited resources and uses.
Special Designations	Management direction is needed for the consideration of an Area of Critical Environmental Concern (ACEC) and Wild and Scenic River segments.

Public comments received by the planning team on these Need for Change Topics were reviewed, categorized and analyzed to identify specific issues and concerns to be addressed in the Pocatello RMP.

1.4.3 ISSUE IDENTIFICATION

Issue identification is the first step of the nine-step BLM planning process. A planning issue is a major controversy or dispute regarding management of resources or uses on the public lands that can be addressed in a variety of ways. Analysis of the comments was completed and a Scoping Summary Report finalized in September of 2003 (BLM 2003a). After consideration of public responses, six major planning issues were identified.

The criteria used to identify issues included identifying if the effects would 1) approach or exceed standards or a threshold, 2) substantially change a resource, 3) be controversial, 4) offer a wide range of opportunities, or 5) cause disagreement regarding their environmental impact. These issues drive the formulation of the plan alternatives and addressing them has resulted in a range of management direction presented in four alternatives. While other concerns are addressed in the plan, management related to them may or may not change by alternative.

A summary of the six issues and public comments are as follows:

Issue 1: Off-Highway Vehicle Management

How will the increasing OHV use and associated conflicts be managed within the planning area?

Off-trail vegetation and soil damage, erosion, damage to riparian areas, spread of noxious weeds, and disturbance to wildlife were identified as concerns by a portion of the public. Large acreages of the resource area, like the Pocatello front, are being modified due to trail pioneering and the development of alternative routes over time. A portion of the public believes the BLM must take strong steps to limit OHV use and to restore damaged lands as part of the process. Some public feel that cross county travel should be prohibited. A portion of the public said the BLM needs to restrict all OHV use to designated roads and manage roads as closed unless marked open. Motorized vehicle use must not be allowed in areas with sensitive or highly erodible soils, or at times of the year when soil conditions are inappropriate for such use. Illegal routes should be closed and fully restored.

Some winter users feel the “open” designation for over snow vehicle use should be reconsidered. Over snow vehicles interfere with backcountry skiers' outdoor experience and also cause avalanche dangers. Certain areas should be closed to over snow vehicles and left open for skiers and foot travel.

Other comments encouraged the preservation of the public’s historical and lawful OHV use. OHV access over the existing roads and trails on public land should continue. OHVs can also be an excellent vehicle to access otherwise difficult to access areas. Education can encourage respectful recreation that is not damaging to the resource. A portion of the public feel that the BLM needs to work with and educate user groups, OHV dealers, and OHV manufacturers to promote responsible OHV behavior and direct users to appropriate places to ride.

Issue 2: Phosphate Mining and Selenium Release

How does the BLM best manage the process of mining and reclamation to ensure containment and control of hazardous substances such as selenium and other potential contaminants?

Phosphate is the largest mineral resource in the PFO area. The BLM is mandated to promote orderly and efficient mining operations which maximize its mineral resources for the economic benefit of the public, while avoiding or minimizing environmental damage. Phosphate mining and processing are key components of southeast Idaho and Star Valley, Wyoming economies. Operators are required to return disturbed lands back to beneficial use at the completion of a mining operation, which is ensured through monitoring, reclamation, and reclamation bonds.

In 1996, the BLM and other regulatory agencies became aware of selenium releases from both active and inactive phosphate mines in the region. Recent investigations have shown that some types of waste rock generated by phosphate mining can release selenium and other contaminants to the environment. Elevated levels of selenium have been found in surface water, groundwater, vegetation, and in biota associated with phosphate mine activity. Locally, these occurrences exceed some state and federal water quality standards. Selenium has been linked to several sheep kills on phosphate mine waste dumps. Federal and state investigations are currently evaluating the nature and extent of the selenium release and its effects on grazing, recreation, wildlife and

human populations. Clean-up and remediation of affected sites would occur under an ongoing combined federal, state, and phosphate industry Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act project.

Issue 3: Public Access - Acquiring/Maintaining

How will the planning process address the need for acquiring and maintaining access to public lands while also protecting private property rights?

There is strong sentiment among the public that the RMP should solidify the rights of the public to access public lands. Some feel that the BLM must keep all historical routes to public lands open and, if possible, acquire rights-of-way on existing roads. A common concern is access to grazing allotments and farming areas. Public comments, with respect to access to BLM lands, included the following concerns:

- Some private landowners adjacent to public lands have locked gates and denied access;
- All individuals should have access to roads, streams, and rivers (such as the Blackfoot River public land) and that access should be kept open and available to the public for hunting, fishing, camping, floating, etc;
- Routes through private lands where the landowners do not want to provide access should be specifically identified and categorically removed from consideration; and
- Protection of landowner's property rights and litter control on public access to BLM.

Issue 4: Recreation Management

How will the increase in recreational use and demand for quality recreational opportunities be balanced within the planning area?

A portion of the public would like to see the Pocatello RMP recognize and start the process of managing the resources of the public lands with higher emphasis on recreational needs. It is easy to anticipate that increased population and use will bring increased pressure for the BLM to expand facilities. Planning efforts in southeast Idaho have shown a need for additional recreational opportunities in close proximity to the Pocatello and Idaho Falls areas. While dispersed recreation already takes place on BLM lands in the area, there will be an increased demand for destination recreation. These lands presently provide a wealth of dispersed recreation opportunities.

Others feel recreational use of the public lands, managed by the PFO, has environmental impacts, and these impacts can be severe depending on the use and on the habitat type. Recreation opportunities should not impact cultural, historical, tribal, paleontological, geological, biological, and other values. Certain types of uses are incompatible and must be separated so that user conflict is minimized. For instance, motorized use and hiking are generally incompatible. Management tools should include seasonal and visitor restrictions to prevent impacts on wildlife populations from increased use and recreation. Restrictions can take the form of seasonal closures, complete closures, or changes in use types or intensities. There needs to be an emphasis on dispersed recreation instead of concentrating everything into a few small areas. The BLM was encouraged to operate from the frame of reference that demand will grow

infinitely yet the land will always remain finite. Clearly, high quality recreational experiences depend on healthy habitats and ecosystems.

Issue 5: Sagebrush Ecosystems

What effects will future management of sagebrush ecosystems have on greater sage-grouse and sagebrush-obligate species?

Sagebrush plant communities across the West are besieged by an array of threats such as wildfire, weed invasions, conversion to agriculture and herbivory. Given the wide scale loss, fragmentation, and degradation of low elevation big sagebrush communities, the RMP should identify strategies to protect, improve, and restore them. Connectivity of sagebrush communities is a key component of greater sage-grouse habitat. Reestablishing connectivity of sagebrush communities, particularly communities occupied by sage grouse have long-term benefits for sage grouse populations. The RMP must focus on unfragmented core habitat for greater sage-grouse, pygmy rabbit, antelope, sage-steppe obligate migratory birds as well as gray flycatcher and other juniper dependent species. Actions are needed to ensure that there will not be a future need to list greater sage-grouse or other sagebrush-dependent species in Idaho as threatened or endangered. Efforts should be made to conserve and restore these species and their habitats.

Issue 6: Socioeconomics

How will social and economic benefits of commodity and amenity uses be balanced within the planning area?

A portion of the public feel amenities (non-consumptive uses) derived from intact, healthy sagebrush communities, old growth pinion-juniper, wild and untrammelled vistas, native fish, wildlife habitat, properly functioning riparian areas, and clean water are more important than benefits derived from commodity (consumptive) type uses, such as timber harvesting, mining and livestock grazing. Particular comments indicate a desire that a higher emphasis be placed on recreational needs and less on extractive type uses.

Others feel commodity uses, such as livestock grazing, timber harvesting and mining, are appropriate uses of public lands and provide local and regional social and economic benefits. Some comments indicate management activities must operate within biological parameters in order to keep ecosystems healthy and to continue providing a stream of benefits to local communities and visitors alike.

1.4.4 ISSUES CONSIDERED BUT NOT FURTHER ANALYZED

During scoping, several concerns were raised that are beyond the scope of this planning effort or represented questions on how the BLM would go about the planning process and implementation. There are several issues raised in scoping that are clearly of concern to the public but which are governed by existing laws and regulations (for example, water quality). Where certain management is already dictated by law or regulation, alternatives have not been developed but management will instead be applied as “Management Common to All Alternatives.”

The Scoping Report (BLM 2003a) provides a comprehensive list of issues outside the scope of the RMP. The major issues considered but not analyzed further are summarized below and will not be analyzed further for the reasons stated.

Eliminate all livestock grazing. The BLM is mandated to provide for multiple uses, including livestock grazing. The *Idaho Standards for Rangeland Health and Guidelines for Livestock Grazing Management (Appendix A)* (BLM 1997a) provides guidance to the BLM for evaluating the conditions of allotments. The BLM can adjust grazing activities to respond to land conditions.

Plan and zone private lands. The BLM does not have any authority to determine how private lands are used. Planning and zoning is done on a local level by county or municipal governments.

Control populations of beaver, raccoons, and predators, stock fish, and other wildlife management. The BLM manages habitat rather than populations and does not have the authority to determine what species will or should be controlled or reintroduced. The RMP may identify areas or parameters to be considered when other agencies propose wildlife management activities.

Implementation of Grasslands Reserve Program initiatives. The Grasslands Reserve Program is not administered by the BLM, rather by the US Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service.

Conduct special research. Various commenters requested that the BLM conduct specialized research, such as effects of pesticides and herbicides on aquatic species and effects of power lines, energy corridors, and wind energy sites on wildlife populations. The BLM periodically conducts specific research related to implementation activities on a project basis; however, the BLM is not a research agency but contributes funding to other agencies or institutions to conduct research. Research would be implemented on a case-by-case basis.

Provide a designated transportation network. The RMP provides direction in terms of what areas would be closed, restricted to designated trails or roads, or open. Travel management plans, that would provide specific route designations, would be prepared after the travel management direction is approved as part of this RMP.

Control the flow of water through the Oneida Narrows. The BLM does not have the authority to manage the release of water through Oneida Narrows. Management direction in the RMP recognizes the use of the water and flow variability.

Designate roadless areas as Wilderness Study Areas (WSA). The BLM is not proposing any additional WSAs. Thirteen existing ACECs¹ (six ACECs and seven Research Natural Areas

¹ During the RMP planning process 7 ACECs and 7 RNAs were revisited and reviewed for appropriateness of the designation and management. However, during the summer of 2006 a wildland fire destroyed historical structures associated with the Van Komen Homestead ACEC. Thus, of the total 14 original ACECs and RNAs, 13 are proposed to be redesignated. In the Proposed RMP, management direction has been updated in which the Van Komen Homestead ACEC designation has been removed, with the area no longer managed as an ACEC.

(RNAs) are redesignated in the proposed resource management plan with the Petticoat Peak RNA being proposed and evaluated.

1.5 PLANNING CRITERIA

The FLPMA is the primary authority for the BLM's management of public lands. This law provides the overarching policy by which public lands will be managed and establishes provisions for land use planning, land acquisition and disposition, administration, range management, rights-of-way, designated management areas, and the repeal of certain laws and statutes. NEPA provides the basic national charter for environmental responsibility and requires the consideration and public availability of information regarding the environmental impacts of major federal actions significantly affecting the quality of the human environment. In concert, these two laws provide the overarching guidance for administration of all BLM activities.

Planning criteria are the standards, rules, and guidelines that help to guide data collection, alternative formulation, and alternative selection in the RMP development process. In conjunction with the planning issues, planning criteria assure the planning process is focused. The criteria also help guide the final plan selection and provide a basis for judging the responsiveness of the planning options.

Preliminary planning criteria were developed prior to public scoping meetings to set the side boards for focused planning of the Pocatello RMP and to guide decision making by topic. These criteria were introduced to the public for review in May and June 2003 at all scoping meetings. The public was encouraged to comment on, and suggest additions to, these criteria at the meetings, through written correspondence and at the Pocatello RMP web site (www.id.blm.gov/planning/pocrmp), which has posted the criteria since April 2003.

Comments on the preliminary planning criteria were collected through June 30, 2003, and were incorporated, as appropriate. The final planning criteria, as summarized in **Table 1-3** were approved by the Acting District Manager in September 2003.

Table 1-3. Planning Criteria Summary

Resource or Use	Planning Criteria
General	The principles of multiple use and sustained yield as set forth in FLPMA will be applied in the RMP. The RMP will comply with applicable federal and state laws and regulations. The RMP will be accompanied by an EIS that will comply with the NEPA.
Air Quality	All lands within the planning area will be managed in compliance with applicable local, state, tribal, and federal air quality laws, statutes, regulations, standards, and implementation plans. This includes applicable conformity regulations for BLM initiated or authorized activities within designated nonattainment or maintenance areas.
Water Quality	Recognize Idaho Non-Point Source Management Program Plans and relevant state water quality standards. Recognize Idaho Department of Environmental Quality (IDEQ) Total Maximum Daily Load program and other water quality programs. Incorporate appropriate management practices where applicable.
Soils	Incorporate program and activity Best Management Practices (BMPs), as appropriate. Incorporate <i>Idaho Standards for Rangeland Health and Guidelines for Livestock Grazing Management</i> (BLM 1997a). Incorporate guidance from scientific findings of the Interior Columbia Basin Ecosystem Management Project (ICBEMP).
Riparian Vegetation	Comply with Executive Orders 11990 (Floodplains) and Executive Order 11998 (Wetlands) Maintain, improve, and restore natural functions to benefit water storage, groundwater recharge, water quality, and fish and wildlife values. Design BMPs to maintain or improve resource integrity. Incorporate <i>Idaho Standards for Rangeland Health and Guidelines for Livestock Grazing Management</i> (BLM 1997a). Apply BLM Idaho Riparian Policy guidance as applicable. Incorporate Idaho Statewide Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation and Tourism Plan. Incorporate Visual Resource Management classifications.

Table 1-3. Planning Criteria Summary

Resource or Use	Planning Criteria
Upland Vegetation	Incorporate <i>Idaho Standards for Rangeland Health and Guidelines for Livestock Grazing Management</i> (BLM 1997a) Provide for the protection and restoration of native species. Provide for multiple use and sustained yield of forage for wildlife and domestic livestock. In consultation with the Idaho Department of Fish and Game (IDFG), assure wildlife habitat is sustained.
Invasive Species/Noxious Weeds	Integrate weed management guidelines and design features identified in the “Vegetation Treatment on BLM Land in the 13 Western States EIS” and the “Northwest Area Noxious Weed Control Program EIS.” Protect non-target and special status plant species during treatment(s). Incorporate <i>Idaho Standards for Rangeland Health and Guidelines for Livestock Grazing Management</i> (BLM 1997a). Consider availability of alternatives to mix or combine control methods to increase effectiveness of application techniques. Adhere to laws and executive orders requiring control of invasive species/noxious weeds on federal land. Comply with Executive Order 13112, Invasive Species (February 1999).
Cultural Resources	Consultation with Tribal Government(s) and the Idaho State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) to assist in evaluating planned cultural resources uses. Identify and protect of historical and cultural places. Protect, preserve, and enhance sites listed in the National Register of Historic Places. Through consultation with tribal governments, ensure that management measures are implemented in a manner that protects and provides access to sacred places in accordance with the American Indian Religious Freedom Act and Executive Order 13007
Visual Resource Management	Incorporate guidance described in BLM Manual Section 8400 – Visual Resource Management.
Special Status Species	Incorporate as applicable, Interior Columbia Basin Science Assessment guidance. Incorporate applicable conservation agreement and strategy plans (i.e., Bonneville Cutthroat Trout, and greater sage-grouse). Incorporate management actions that do not jeopardize the continued existence of federally listed threatened or endangered plant or animal species, or result in the destruction or modification of critical habitat. Incorporate <i>Idaho Standards for Rangeland Health and Guidelines for Livestock Grazing Management</i> (BLM 1997a) Incorporate management actions that protect sensitive species and do not contribute to the listing of species proposed for federal listing (candidate species).
Fish and Wildlife	Incorporate as applicable the Interior Columbia Basin Science Assessment guidance. Protect and preserve genetic integrity. Consider risks associated with federal listing of fish species. Protect and maintain the intrinsic and recreational values associated with native and appropriate nonnative species. Identify habitat needs in consultation with the IDFG. Protect critical deer and elk winter range and big game habitat.
Fire Management	Incorporate National Fire Plan direction. Ensure public health and safety in the wildland urban interface. Ensure the safety of the public and firefighters while protecting natural resources, historic properties, and private property. Coordinate with cooperators in developing community assistance plans.
Forestry	Implement guidance and criteria contained in the PFO Programmatic Forestry Environmental Assessment, December 2000. Recognize the ICBEMP: Scientific Assessment, September 1999, and guidance contained in BLM Manual 5400/5000-12-a1. Incorporate <i>Idaho Standards for Rangeland Health and Guidelines for Livestock Grazing Management</i> (BLM 1997a). Need to enhance/protect wildlife habitat(s). Consider pre-European settlement stand composition. Address availability of access. Recognize public demand for forest products. Incorporate continuing effects of drought, insects, and disease. Inventory of Timber Production and Capability Classifications.
Livestock Grazing	Conform with existing laws, regulations, and BLM policy pertaining to livestock grazing on public lands. Incorporate <i>Idaho Standards for Rangeland Health and Guidelines for Livestock Grazing Management</i> (BLM 1997a). Consider ecological site inventory information. Need to protect important biological resource functions that provide for soil stability, water quality, and healthy riparian and uplands vegetation communities, and maintain conditions for desired plant communities. Authorize use to minimize environmental impacts under the principles of multiple use and sustained yield.
Recreation Opportunities	Consider availability of law enforcement. Consider need to provide for and enhance recreation opportunities to accommodate use and reduce impacts on resources. Consider lands identified as SRMA and those areas subject to special measures to protect resources or reduce conflicts among uses. Consider need to ensure existing recreation facilities can be properly maintained prior to proposals and construction of new facilities. Consider need to provide and enhance recreation opportunities to accommodate use and reduce impacts on resources.

Table 1-3. Planning Criteria Summary

Resource or Use	Planning Criteria
OHV Management	<p>Manage for public safety.</p> <p>Consider need to minimize damage to soil, watershed, vegetation, and other resources.</p> <p>Consider need to minimize harassment of wildlife or significant disruption of wildlife habitats.</p> <p>Consider need to minimize conflicts between OHV use and other existing or proposed recreational uses.</p> <p>Ensure compatibility of OHV designations with designations and conditions on neighboring federal, state, county, and municipal subdivisions, taking into account safety, noise and other related factors.</p> <p>Comply with the BLM's National Off-Highway Vehicle Management Strategy.</p> <p>Comply with Executive Orders 11644 and 11989.</p>
Rights-of-Way	<p>Accommodate the West Wide Corridor Study Amendment and Programmatic EIS.</p> <p>Apply the appropriate policies and BMPs identified in the Record of Decision (ROD) for the <i>Wind Energy Development Programmatic EIS and Associated Land Use Plan Amendments</i> (BLM 2005b)</p> <p>Comply with Section 503 of FLPMA.</p> <p>Recognize the need to minimize adverse environmental impacts and the proliferation of separate rights-of-way.</p> <p>Utilize existing/common rights-of-way to the extent possible.</p> <p>Identify public lands with existing rights-of-way corridors that may or may not be suitable for additional rights-of-way.</p> <p>Identify areas where corridors are not permitted.</p> <p>Identify conflicts with existing or potential resource values and uses.</p> <p>Consider Visual Resource Management classifications.</p>
Access	<p>Consider the type and need.</p> <p>Consider conflicts with existing or potential resource values and uses.</p> <p>Comply with Section 205 of FLPMA.</p> <p>Consider cost and benefits.</p>
Land Tenure Adjustments	<p>Comply with Federal Land Transaction Facilitation Act of 2000 and FLPMA of 1976.</p> <p>Facilitate access to public lands and resources.</p> <p>Maintain or enhance important resource values uses.</p> <p>Consider maintaining or enhancing local social and economic values.</p> <p>Improve management efficiency through the elimination of isolated tracts and consolidation of public lands.</p>
Minerals and Energy Management/Development	<p>Consider the need to make public lands available for the orderly and efficient development of energy and mineral resources.</p> <p>Identify areas that are managed specifically to protect non-mineral resource values but may conflict with mineral resource development.</p>
Special Designations	<p>Comply with FLPMA, Sections 201 and 202.</p> <p>Comply with Interim Management Policy for Lands Under Wilderness Review, BLM Handbook 8550-1.</p> <p>Rivers and streams will be analyzed for potential addition to the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System in accordance with BLM Manual 8351, Wild and Scenic Rivers Policy.</p>
American Indian Concerns	<p>Manage to retain values that make cultural resources/areas significant to tribal members.</p> <p>Protect cultural use areas in cooperation with Tribal Government(s).</p> <p>Comply with the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act of 1990 and Amendments (post 1987) to the National Historic Preservation Act.</p>
Treaty Rights	<p>Recognize Fort Bridger Treaty rights with all associated management activities and uses.</p>
Social and Economic Sustainability	<p>Recognize the need to promote social and economic diversification and resiliency in southeastern Idaho.</p> <p>Recognize increasing demand for outdoor recreational opportunities.</p> <p>Recognize that local community economies are dependant on goods and services from public lands.</p>


1.6 PLANNING PROCESS

An RMP guides the management of public lands in a particular area or administrative unit. RMPs are usually prepared to cover the lands administered by a certain field office. An approved RMP with the ROD describes the following:

- Resource conditions goals and objectives;
- Allowable resource uses and related levels of production or use to be maintained;
- Land areas to be managed for limited, restricted, or exclusive resource uses or for transfer from the BLM administration;
- Program constraints and general management practices and protocols;
- General implementation schedule or sequences; and
- Intervals and standards for monitoring the plan.

Preparation of an RMP involves interrelated steps as illustrated in **Diagram 1-1** and described in **Table 1-4**.

Diagram 1-1: BLM Planning Process



* These steps may be revisited throughout the planning process

Table 1-4. BLM Planning Process

BLM Planning Process Step	Description	Timeframe
Step 1 – Planning Issues Identification	Issues and concerns are identified through a scoping process that includes the public, Indian tribes, other federal agencies, and state and local governments.	November 2003
Step 2 – Planning Criteria Development	Planning criteria are created to ensure decisions are made to address the issues pertinent to the planning effort. Planning criteria are derived from a variety of sources including applicable laws and regulations, existing management plans, coordination of other agencies' programs, and the results of public and agency scoping. The planning criteria may be updated and changed as planning proceeds.	September 2003
Step 3 – Data and Information Collection	Data and information for the resources in the planning area are collected based on the planning criteria.	Ongoing
Step 4 – Management Situation Analysis	The current management of resources in the planning area is assessed.	November 2003
Step 5 – Alternatives Formulation	A range of reasonable management alternatives that address issues identified during scoping is developed.	June 2004
Step 6 – Alternatives Assessment	The effects of each alternative are estimated.	February 2006
Step 7 – Preferred Alternative Selection	The alternative that best resolves planning issues is identified as the preferred alternative.	July 2006
Step 8 – Resource Management Selection	First, a draft RMP/EIS is issued and is made available to the public for a review period of 90 calendar days. After comments to the draft document have been received and analyzed, it is modified as necessary, and the proposed RMP/Final EIS is published and made available for public review for 30 calendar days. A ROD is signed to approve the RMP/EIS.	Draft RMP/EIS: October 2006 Proposed RMP/Final EIS: Estimated Fall 2008 ROD: Estimated Spring 2009
Step 9 – Implementation Monitoring	Management measures outlined in the approved plan are implemented on the ground, and future monitoring is conducted to test their effectiveness. Changes are made as necessary to achieve desired results.	Ongoing after RMP approval

1.7 COLLABORATION

1.7.1 INTERGOVERNMENTAL AND INTERAGENCY RELATIONSHIPS

In the spring of 2002, the BLM invited the counties within the District to be involved in upcoming planning efforts as cooperating agencies. However, no counties within the Pocatello RMP planning area requested to be involved as cooperating agencies.

To enhance public participation, tribal, county, and city governments were contacted about the RMP and invited to submit comments. As a result, Idaho Department of Parks and Recreation, USFWS, and IDFG, submitted comment letters through the public scoping process.

In addition, the Shoshone-Bannock Tribes, IDFG, IDEQ, USFWS, and Forest Service were invited to participate on the BLM's IDT charged with developing the Pocatello RMP.

In 2001, the BLM representatives in the PFO briefed local congressional staffers for Congressman Mike Simpson and Senators Michael Crapo and Larry Craig. The PFO also has conducted periodic briefings with the Upper Snake River/Idaho Falls District Resource Advisory Council, including meetings held in May 2001 and November 2002. The Resource Advisory Council is a citizen-based group and provides an opportunity for individuals from all backgrounds and interests to have a voice in the management of these public lands.

1.8 TRIBAL TREATY RIGHTS AND INTERESTS

The relationship of the US Government with American Indian tribes is based on legal agreements between these sovereign nations. The 1867 Executive Order provided for the establishment of the Fort Hall Indian Reservation, and the 1868 Fort Bridger Treaty affirmed the reservation as a homeland for the Shoshone-Bannock Tribes. Subsequently, a series of land cessations occurred, which resulted in the present-day reservation boundaries established in 1900. Even though the Shoshone-Bannock Tribes relinquished ownership of these lands, the 1868 Fort Bridger Treaty reserved off-reservation treaty rights to tribal members, which include gathering, hunting, fishing, and practicing tribal cultural activities on unoccupied public lands. Within the ceded boundary of the original Fort Hall Indian Reservation, the tribes are able to graze tribal livestock and cut timber for tribal use.

As a federal agency, the BLM acknowledges the treaties, statutes, executive orders, and the historical relations between the United States and Indian tribes. The Shoshone-Bannock Tribes describe their reserved treaty rights, as provided in their comments on the Draft RMP/EIS, as follows:

The Shoshone-Bannock Tribes has a unique legal relationship with the United States Government. Various federal statutes, policies and executive orders protect the Tribes natural and cultural interests, and historic and contemporary uses. The federal trust responsibility doctrine requires federal agencies to consult with recognized tribal governments. Government-to-government consultation with the Fort Hall Business Council, the governing body of the Shoshone-Bannock Tribes, is required on actions that would impact treaty rights and cultural resources on land management activities that could affect these rights and resources.

In addition, the BLM Idaho Falls District recognizes the Shoshone-Bannock Tribe's policy statements concerning management of Snake River Basin resources, the disposition, sale, or transfer of federal lands, and development of campgrounds on federal lands.

Before public scoping, the BLM held a meeting on May 15, 2003, with the Land Use Commission and Resources and Wildlife staff specialists of the Shoshone-Bannock Tribes to offer information on the development of the Pocatello RMP and to solicit input. In April 2003, the BLM sent individual scoping letters and briefing packages to the Tribal Council, members of the Land Use Commission, and resource staff specialists. The BLM held two public scoping meetings on the Fort Hall Indian Reservation, one in June 2003 and the other in February 2007. The Shoshone-Bannock Tribes have participated in the initial stages of the RMP development as an IDT member.

1.9 RELATIONSHIP TO BLM POLICIES, PLANS, AND PROGRAMS

Since the development and approval of the Malad MFP (1981) and Pocatello RMP (1988) it has been necessary to amend these plans to provide additional broad land management direction. As the land use plan guidance is put into practice on the ground, implementation level planning is directed by BLM policy and program specific guidance. **Table 1-5** identifies approved plan amendments incorporated into the existing land use plans and other BLM guidance considered at the implementation level planning stages. These plan amendments and guidance documents provide a perspective of the many management considerations pertinent to the planning area.

Section 368 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (designation of West-wide energy corridors) is being implemented through the current development of an interagency Programmatic EIS. The final Programmatic EIS will identify plan amendment decisions that will address numerous energy corridor related issues, including the use of existing corridors (potentially including enhancements and upgrades), identification of new corridors, supply and demand considerations, and compatibility with other corridor and project planning efforts. It is likely that the identification of corridors in the Programmatic EIS will affect the Pocatello planning area, and the approved Programmatic EIS would amend the Pocatello RMP.

Table 1-5. Identification of Malad MFP and Pocatello RMP Plan Amendments and Other Documents Considered for Implementation Level Planning

Amendments to the Malad MFP and Pocatello RMP	BLM Policy and Program Guidance Documents Considered During Implementation Level Planning
Plan Amendment/Environmental Assessment for the Monument RMP, Cassia RMP, Twin Falls MFP, and Malad Hills MFP (BLM 1990a)	Idaho Standards for Rangeland Health and Guidelines for Livestock Grazing Management (BLM-ISO 1997, Appendix A) (BLM 1997a)
Plan Amendment for the Malad Hills MFP for Exchange of 220 acres (BLM 1988b)	Programmatic Forestry Environmental Assessment for the Upper Snake River District, December (BLM 2000)
RMP Amendment to Designate 3,138 acres to Multiuse and 668 acres for Public Use (BLM 1992)	Vegetation Treatment on BLM Lands in Thirteen Western States (BLM 1991)
RMP Amendment to Allow for a Land Exchange with Bingham County (BLM 1994)	National Fire Plan: Review and Update of the 1995 Federal Wildland Fire Management Policy (National Interagency Fire Center 2001)
Amendment for the Pocatello RMP to Designate 3,560 Acres of Public Land Known as Indian Rocks as an ACEC (BLM 1999)	National Fire Plan: Federal Wildland Fire Management Policy (USDI and USDA 1995)
	Draft National BLM Sage Grouse Habitat Conservation Strategy (BLM 2003b)
	Northwest Area Noxious Weed Control Program Final EIS (BLM 1985a)
	Supplemental EIS on Northwest Area Noxious Weed Control Program (BLM 1987a)
	Eastern Idaho Proposed MFP Amendment and Final EIS – Wilderness (BLM 1986)

Table 1-5. Identification of Malad MFP and Pocatello RMP Plan Amendments and Other Documents Considered for Implementation Level Planning

Amendments to the Malad MFP and Pocatello RMP	BLM Policy and Program Guidance Documents Considered During Implementation Level Planning
	Final Resource Assessment for the Blackfoot River Wild and Scenic Eligibility and Tentative Classification Study (BLM 2002a)
	The BLM's Priorities for Recreation and Visitor Services (BLM 2003c).
	The BLM's National Management Strategy for Motorized Off-Highway Vehicle Use on Public Lands (BLM 2001a)
	National Mountain Bicycling Strategic Action Plan (BLM 2002b)
	Final Resource Assessment, Bear River Wild and Scenic Eligibility, Bear River, Idaho (BLM 1995a)
	Final Resource Assessment, Blackfoot River and Bear River Wild and Scenic River Suitability Study (BLM 2003d)

1.10 RELATED PLANS

BLM planning regulations require that BLM plans be consistent with officially approved or adopted resource related plans of other federal, state, local, and tribal governments to the extent those plans are consistent with federal laws and regulations applicable to public lands. Plans formulated by federal, state, local, and tribal governments that relate to management of lands and resources have been reviewed and considered as the RMP/EIS has been developed. These plans include the following:

- Caribou National Forest Revised Forest Plan and EIS (Forest Service 2003a);
- Greater Yellowstone Bald Eagle Management Plan – 1995 update (Wyoming Game and Fish Department 1996);
- ICBEMP: Project Data (Forest Service and BLM 2001);
- Interior Columbia Basin Final EIS (Forest Service and BLM 2000a);
- Conservation Plan for the Greater Sage-Grouse in Idaho (Idaho Sage-Grouse Advisory Committee 2006);
- Guidelines for Management of Columbian Sharp-tailed Grouse Habitats (Giesen and Connelly 1993);
- Inland Native Fish Strategy Environmental Assessment Decision Notice and Finding of No Significant Impact (BLM 1995b);
- Memorandum of Agreement for Conservation and Management of Yellowstone Cutthroat Trout among Montana, Idaho, Wyoming, Nevada, Utah, Forest Service,

Yellowstone National Park and Grand Teton National Park and the IDFG (Montana Department of Fish, Wildlife, and Parks et. al. 2000);

- Utah Division of Wildlife Resources Range-wide Conservation Agreement and Strategy for Bonneville Cutthroat trout (Utah Division of Wildlife Resources 2000);
- Management Plan for Yellowstone Cutthroat Trout in Idaho, 2003 (IDFG 2003a);
- Memorandum of Understanding Concerning the Conservation of Spring Snails in the Great Basin (BLM et. al. 1998);
- Portneuf Valley Particulate Matter (PM₁₀) Air Quality Improvement Plan 1998-1999 (IDEQ 1999);
- Draft Portneuf Valley PM₁₀ Nonattainment Area State Implementation Plan, Maintenance Plan, and Redesignation Request (IDEQ 2004a);
- BMPs for Mining in Idaho (Idaho Department of Lands [IDL] 1992);
- Draft Selenium BMP Catalog for Phosphate Mining (Idaho Mining Association and IDEQ 2004);
- IDEQ's Final Area Wide Risk Management Plan (IDEQ 2004b);
- A View to the Future: A Comprehensive Historic Preservation Plan for Idaho (SHPO 2002);
- Proposed Plan Amendments and EIS for Small Wilderness Study Areas, Statewide (BLM 1988c);
- Idaho's 2003-2007 Statewide Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation and Tourism Plan, (Idaho State Parks and Recreation 2003);
- Comprehensive Management and Use Plan/EIS for the California National Historic Trail, Pony Express National Historic Trail, Oregon National Historic Trail, and Mormon Pioneers National Historic Trail (National Park Service 1998);
- Shoshone-Bannock Tribes Forest Management Plan (Shoshone-Bannock Tribes 2004);
- Shoshone-Bannock Tribes Fire Management Plan (Shoshone-Bannock Tribes 2001);
- Shoshone-Bannock Tribes Water Master Plan (Shoshone-Bannock Tribes 2006); and
- Upper Snake River Subbasin Plan *in* Columbia River Basin Fish and Wildlife Program (Northwest Power Planning Council 2004).

1.11 POLICY

In the Fort Bridger Treaty of July 3, 1868, the Shoshone and Bannock Tribes reserved hunting, fishing, and gathering rights, as well as grazing rights on ceded lands to the tribes. All alternatives in the RMP consider this historic use.

Implementation of the RMP begins when the Idaho BLM State Director signs the ROD for the RMP. Decisions in the RMP would be implemented tied to the BLM budgeting process. An implementation schedule would be developed, providing for the systematic accomplishment of decisions in the approved RMP.

1.12 OVERALL VISION

Comments received during scoping represented a broad range of desires expressed by both individuals and organizations. These same desires were expressed by the planning team during discussion of the overarching vision for management of public lands in the planning area. As a result, the following vision statements were developed to provide overall direction for the planning process. Within the capability of the resources:

- Sustain and where necessary restore the health and diversity of forest, rangeland, and riparian ecosystems;
- Ensure that vegetation communities across the PFO area have the necessary structure and composition, ecological processes, and proper function to sustain native and desired nonnative plants and animals;
- Support a sustainable flow of benefits in consideration of the social and economic systems of southeast Idaho;
- Provide diverse recreational and educational opportunities;
- Minimize soil loss to promote the long-term health of the land and watersheds through advance planning and accepted management practices;
- Manage watersheds to provide for the proper infiltration, retention, and release of water appropriate to soil type, vegetation, climate, and landform to provide for proper nutrient cycling, hydrologic cycling and energy flow;
- Reduce potential for emissions from uncontrolled wildland fire by using prescribed fire and other fuels management opportunities;
- Reduce/minimize emissions and impacts from mining and mineral processing, and other activities using BMPs and other applicable standards;
- Consider air quality sensitive areas and receptors in all planning and management activities;
- Provide wood fiber while maintaining a healthy and sustainable forest; and
- Facilitate resource extraction with protection of newly identified and existing areas of biological, natural and cultural resources as well as identified values and uses; and obtain a balance between the economic health of the area and the long term health of nonconsumptive resources.

1.13 CHANGES FROM THE DRAFT RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PLAN TO THE PROPOSED RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PLAN

As a result of public comment and internal BLM review, the BLM's Preferred Alternative, identified as Alternative B as presented in the October 2006 Pocatello Draft RMP/EIS has been modified and is now considered the Proposed RMP for managing BLM-administered public lands in the PFO. The Proposed RMP is a refinement of Alternative B from the Draft RMP/EIS, with consideration given to public comments, correction, and rewording for clarification of purpose and intent. The Draft RMP/EIS was available for a 90-day comment period ending on April 4, 2007. The Proposed RMP/Final EIS is designed to be used in conjunction with the Draft

RMP/EIS in regard to page numbers cited in the Proposed RMP/Final EIS comment and response section (**Appendix U**).

Modifications to Alternative B focused on addressing public comments, while continuing to meet the BLM's legal and regulatory mandates. Chapter 5 of the Proposed RMP/Final EIS contains a summary of the public comment process and the comments received on the Draft RMP/EIS. All comment letters received and the BLM's responses are in **Appendix U** (Volume III).

New text throughout this Proposed RMP/Final EIS generally includes the following:

- Adjustments to Alternative B (the Proposed RMP);
- Additions to Chapter 3, Affected Environment;
- Clarifications to better explain the purpose and intent of management proposed in the Draft RMP/EIS or the environmental consequences;
- Incorporation of new information;
- Revisions to Chapter 4, Environmental Consequences, to make corrections and reflect changes in management direction (Proposed RMP) and subsequent impact analysis;
- Additions to Chapter 5, Consultation and Coordination, to describe the public comment process on the Draft RMP/EIS;
- Additions to Chapter 6, References, to include additional references cited in the document; and
- Minor corrections, such as typographical errors.

The detailed description of the Proposed RMP is included in Chapter 2, **Table 2-1**. The environmental consequences of implementing the Proposed RMP (Alternative B from the Draft RMP/EIS, as edited) are described in Chapter 4.

CHANGES TO THE ALTERNATIVES (CHAPTER 2)

Alternative B from the Draft RMP/EIS has been modified and now represents the Proposed RMP. Modifications to Alternative B from the Draft RMP/EIS include the following, which is based on public comment and internal review:

- Additional discussion regarding a no grazing alternative was added to the section, Alternatives Considered but Eliminated from Detailed Analysis;
- Cultural Resources—Language has been added to clarify the management of cultural resources;
- Tribal Treaty Rights and Interests—A new goal with an objective and management actions was added recognizing Tribal Treaty Rights and Interests related to traditional/cultural uses, as well as the health of the land and water resources (including the 1868 Fort Bridger Treaty);
- Soils and Water—New management direction has been added regarding roads and trails adjacent to streams or riparian areas that impact water quality;

- Vegetation—For the Aspen/Aspen Conifer Mix and Dry Conifer vegetation types, the objective has been updated, increasing the desired percent of Land Health Condition (LHC) in LHC-B and reducing the percentage in LHC-C;
- Special Status Species
 - Action has been edited to clarify the BLM’s intent on managing for special status species. Conservation measures and guidelines that the BLM would consider have been clarified. Text has been added regarding management for the bald eagle, which has been delisted. Additional management direction has been added under the Wildland Fire Management subsection, clarifying that human life and firefighter safety and property take priority over species protection;
 - Management direction has been edited to reference the Conservation Plan for the Greater Sage-grouse in Idaho (2006).
 - Additionally, “key habitat” was added as a priority for protecting and maintaining greater sage-grouse suitable habitat, and the distance to protect leks from permitted activities was updated;
 - Greater sage-grouse references (e.g., Connelly et. al.) used in the RMP/Draft EIS (2006) are identical to those in the Conservation Plan for the Greater sage-grouse in Idaho (July 2006). However, since the RMP/Draft EIS was in final production prior to the release of the Idaho conservation plan, references for sage-grouse, such as Connelly et al were used. Subsequently sage-grouse references have been updated to the Conservation Plan for the Greater sage-grouse in Idaho (July 2006) in the Proposed Plan/Final EIS to reflect current knowledge and information for sage-grouse and in refining management direction for buffers consistent with guidelines in the Idaho plan.
 - Management direction to protect sage-grouse leks from disturbances was clarified, using buffers of 0.6 and 2.0 miles as identified in the Conservation Plan for the Greater Sage-grouse in Idaho (2006) to distinguish between temporary human disturbance near active leks and permanent infrastructure surface occupancy near occupied leks. This distinction between buffers for active and occupied leks is more discriminating because of the temporary or permanent nature of the disturbance but resulted in approximately the same number of acres being analyzed as in the RMP/Draft EIS and does not represent an addition or expansion to any allocation identified in the Draft EIS. This difference in acres can be attributed to the fact that most leks are not located on BLM-administered public lands..
 - Management direction has been rewritten to clarify management for Columbian sharp-tailed grouse, revising the mileage requirement from known leks for maintaining vegetation in suitable condition (LHC-A) for nesting and brood rearing. Additionally, the distance to protect Columbian sharp-tailed grouse leks from permitted activities was updated;
 - Management direction has been modified to clarify the BLM’s intent regarding management of migratory bird species habitat and management of large spring systems, to prevent possible extirpation of spring-dependent species, such as springsnails;

- Wildland Fire Management
 - Actions have been added regarding the BLM's collaborative efforts between federally recognized tribes (e.g., Shoshone-Bannock Tribes) during proposed fire and nonfire vegetation treatments;
 - A new objective and management direction has been added to indicate that the BLM will use appropriate management response for fire suppression to protect listed species and related habitat;
 - Management direction has been revised to clarify the BLM's intent regarding fire and nonfire vegetation treatments as they relate to restoring or improving natural or cultural resource values. Additional management direction has been added to clarify fire and nonfire vegetation treatment restrictions for listed species' occupied habitat and designated critical habitat;
 - Changes have been made to management actions to further explain the BLM's intent on managing public lands to protect, improve, or enhance resources and values at risk;
 - The amount of footprint acres treated for the Aspen/Aspen Conifer vegetation type has been modified;
 - Objectives and management actions have been added to address wildland fire management and its effect on greater sage-grouse source habitats, restoration, and key habitats;
- Livestock Grazing
 - Changes have been made to further clarify the BLM's management direction regarding livestock grazing management following wildland fires and nonfire vegetation treatments;
 - Management direction has been modified regarding the Blackfoot Stock Driveway allotments;
- Minerals and Energy
 - Management direction has been modified to further clarify split-estate land stipulations, mitigation, and reclamation requirements;
 - Changes have been made to modify management direction within development areas. The operational guidelines have been modified to clarify direction regarding mine pits;
 - Changes have been made to the "Standards for CWA Regulated Surface Waters" table, specifying contaminants and micrograms per liter;
 - The objective identifying acres available for fluid minerals leasing has been revised. In addition to WSAs identified as closed to fluid mineral leasing, the Curlew area is identified as administratively unavailable in order to protect the Sagebrush Steppe habitat, other sagebrush obligate species habitat and winter ranges, and special status species, such as greater sage-grouse and sharp-tailed grouse. Management direction regarding no surface occupancy for fluid minerals has been revised to clarify those areas and resources that are protected also;

- Management direction has been updated to clarify actions on field drainages or mineral trespass of federally reserved minerals;
- Recreation
 - Management direction has been updated to include the Campground SRMA;
 - Management direction has been updated to clarify OHV use on public lands. Additionally, language has been modified prohibiting cross-country travel;
 - Big game winter range has been added to the list of area restrictions for snowmobiling; and
 - Criteria and prioritization for travel management planning has been modified;
- Administrative Designations
 - Language has been added to clarify management direction for WSAs if Congress releases them from wilderness consideration;
 - A management objective has been modified identifying the number of designated ACECs and RNAs from 14 to 13;
 - A management objective has been added to remove the ACEC designation for the Van Komen Homestead because it was burned in a wildland fire; and
 - A management objective has been added to designate Petticoat Peak as an ACEC.

CHANGES TO THE AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT (CHAPTER 3)

Chapter 3 of the Draft RMP/EIS has been adjusted as follows:

- Section 3.2.1, Air Quality, has been updated to reflect that, on August 14, 2006, the Portneuf Valley area was redesignated to attainment for the PM₁₀ National Ambient Air Quality Standards;
- Section 3.2.2, Cultural Resources, has been edited to add an additional subsection (3.2.2.4., Tribal Treaty Rights and Interests);
- Section 3.2.5, Vegetation, has been updated to
 - Reflect additional information on microbiotic crusts;
 - Add information regarding the number of stream miles that support riparian vegetation (165 miles), as well as the percentages of PFO riparian area conditions in proper functioning condition and those in nonfunctioning condition; and
 - Add information regarding invasive species/noxious weeds;
- Section 3.2.7, Special Status Species, has been updated to
 - Reflect the bald eagle delisting effective June 28, 2007; and
 - Add new information on the greater sage-grouse, specifically the most recent conservation plan published in 2006 by the Idaho Sage-Grouse Advisory Committee; and
 - Add information on the greater sage-grouse including additional discussion on threats to sage-grouse within Idaho.
- Section 3.2.9, Water Resources, has been updated to add information about 303(d) streams. **Figure 3-10** has been added, and **Table 3-16** has been updated;

- Section 3.3.3, Livestock Grazing, has been updated to illustrate that lands adjacent to the Blackfoot Reservoir and Grays Lake National Wildlife Refuge have been withdrawn to the Bureau of Indian Affairs, in connection with the Fort Hall Irrigation Project;
- Section 3.3.4, Mineral Resources, has been updated to explain scheduling for investigating selenium releases from four active phosphate mines and 11 inactive mines;
- Section 3.4.1, Areas of Critical Environmental Concern, has been updated to add information regarding the wildland fire that destroyed the structures of the Van Komen Homestead ACEC in August 2006;
- Section 3.5.1, Socioeconomic Resources, has been updated to
 - Add information regarding the percentage of people in each county with no high school education; and
 - Add information regarding the Fort Hall Indian Reservation (Section 3.5.2.3).

CHANGES TO THE ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES (CHAPTER 4)

Chapter 4 of the Draft RMP/EIS has been modified as follows:

- This chapter has been edited to improve readability, clarify intent, and make corrections that reflect BLM changes and comments provided by the public;
- In consideration of and response to public comments, the Curlew area has been identified as administratively unavailable to fluid minerals leasing. The analysis associated with this management direction change has been updated throughout Chapter 4 for affected resources and resource uses; and
- Analysis of greater sage-grouse direction was clarified.

CHANGES TO APPENDICES (VOLUME III OF DRAFT RMP/EIS)

The Draft RMP/EIS appendices have been adjusted as follows:

- Appendix B—New text has been added to recognize an additional Executive Order and the Fort Bridger Treaty;
- Appendix C—Numbering of management actions and objectives have been updated to be consistent with the Proposed RMP;
- Appendix D—Text has been revised for clarity (purpose and intent) and to correct noted typographical errors;
- Appendix E—Numbering of management actions and objectives have been updated to be consistent with the Proposed RMP;
- Appendix F—Disposal parcels from the Malad MFP were added and header text was modified;
- Appendix H—Text has been updated regarding seasonal restrictions;
- Appendix I—Numbering of management actions and objectives have been updated to be consistent with the Proposed RMP;
- Appendix Q—Clarification language has been added regarding the processing of Notices of Intent and Applications for a permit to drill for fluid mineral exploration;

- Appendix S— Shoshone-Bannock Tribes Policy Statements;
- Appendix T— Biological Assessment, Addendums, and USFWS Concurrence Memos; and
- Appendix U— Draft RMP/EIS Public Comment Letters and BLM’s response.

CHANGES TO MAPS (VOLUME III OF DRAFT RMP/EIS)

- The Draft RMP/EIS maps (Volume III of the Draft RMP/EIS) have been modified as follows: **Figure 3-2** has been updated to remove information about the Portneuf NAA, which is now in attainment;
- Attributes for steep slopes, highly erodible soils, and riparian vegetation have been added to **Figure 2-8, 2-18, 2-31, and 2-39**. The administratively unavailable Curlew area and all No Surface Occupancy stipulations within the PFO area were revised in **Figure 2-18**;
- Management direction for phosphate lease closures has been updated; as a result, **Figure 2-32** has been deleted, and phosphate lease closures for Alternative C are now shown on **Figure 2-19**;
- Management direction for OHV designations has been updated; as a result, **Figure 2-34** has been deleted, and OHV designations for Alternative C are now shown on **Figure 2-22**. Big game winter range was added to **Figure 2-22** as an area where snowmobile use would be restricted to designated routes; and
- **Figure 3-10**, Key Water Features, was added.

Figures 2-32 through 2-40 and Figures 3-10 through Figure 3-20 have been renumbered from the Draft RMP/EIS to reflect the revision denoted above.

CHAPTER 2 – ALTERNATIVES

2.1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter includes a discussion of the Proposed Resource Management Plan (RMP). The Proposed RMP (Table 2-1) is a combination of management direction from Section 2.7, Management Common to All Alternatives; Section 2.9, Management Common to All Action Alternatives; Section 2.10, Management Guidance for Alternative B (Preferred Alternative); and Section 2.11, Management Guidance for Alternative C, as described in the Draft Pocatello Resource Management Plan (RMP)/Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) (October 2006) made in response to public comments received during the 90-day draft comment period.

This chapter also includes a discussion of Alternatives A (No Action), B (Preferred), C, and D, as originally presented and described in the Draft RMP/EIS. All alternatives presented in this chapter provide a complete and reasonable range of different ways to manage the public lands resources and uses. Each alternative is a description of desired future conditions based on the following:

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

These components of each alternative are integral in guiding future management of the public land resources and uses within the planning area.

The Proposed RMP (Alternative B) and Alternatives A, C, and D presented in detail in this chapter provide a range of choices for achieving the purpose and need (Section 1.2), meeting the multiple-use mandate of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act (FLPMA), and resolving the planning issues identified in Chapter 1. The following is a brief description of the alternatives:

- Alternative A—No Action Alternative. This alternative is required by the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and provides a baseline for comparison to all other alternatives. The No Action Alternative retains the current management in the Pocatello Field Office (PFO) area.
- Alternative B—Proposed RMP. This alternative balances resource conservation and ecosystem health with the production of commodities and with public use of the land. Resource management strategies were identified upon review of the existing management direction in the current PFO land use plans and the identification of goals and objectives associated with current resource management requirements.
- Alternative C—This alternative emphasizes the non-consumptive use and management of resources through protection, restoration, and enhancement of the land resources in the planning area, while also providing for multiple uses, including livestock grazing and mineral development. Resource development would be more constrained than in Alternatives B or D and in some cases and some areas, uses would be excluded to protect

sensitive resources (e.g., soils, sensitive plant habitat). For special designations, this alternative includes changes in management direction for existing and proposed Research Natural Areas (RNAs) to enhance resource values within these areas.

- Alternative D—This alternative emphasizes the production of natural resources commodities and public use opportunities. Resource uses such as recreation, livestock grazing, and mining consistent with United States (US) Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management (BLM) guidance, would be emphasized. Potential impacts on sensitive resources would be mitigated on a case-by-case basis. Emphasis would be on maintaining resource conditions where required. Restoration actions that would enhance resource use or commodity production would be utilized.

All alternatives include leasing fluid minerals with standard lease terms and conditions and applicable special stipulations as outlined in **Appendix H**. Only the anticipated direct and indirect effects of fluid mineral leasing are assessed in this EIS. Approval of any actual surface disturbance on a fluid mineral lease would be authorized only after completion of a future site specific environmental evaluation of any proposed exploration or development activities. In cases where the Proposed RMP/Final EIS is determined to be inadequate for evaluation of fluid mineral leasing at a particular location, additional analysis in the form of an Environmental Assessment or EIS would be conducted.

2.2 HOW TO READ THIS CHAPTER

Chapter 2 begins with introductory materials regarding the development of the alternatives for the Pocatello RMP/EIS, followed by a general narrative description of the alternatives. The chapter continues with a discussion of the alternatives considered but eliminated from further detailed analysis. Seven in-depth tables detailing the desired future conditions, management objectives, and management actions for each alternative follow the narrative sections. The tables include:

- Comparison of Management Guidance Specific to Alternative B (Preferred Alternative, Draft RMP/EIS) and the Proposed RMP/Final EIS (**Table 2-1**);
- Management Guidance Common to All Alternatives (**Table 2-2**);
- Management Guidance Specific to Alternative A - No Action (**Table 2-3**);
- Management Guidance Common to the Action Alternatives B, C, and D (**Table 2-4**);
- Management Guidance Specific to Alternative B (**Table 2-5**);
- Management Guidance Specific to Alternative C (**Table 2-6**); and
- Management Guidance Specific to Alternative D (**Table 2-7**).

Each table is further organized into three management program categories. These categories include:

- Resources (Air Quality, Cultural, Soils, Paleontological, Fish and Wildlife, Vegetation, Special Status Species, Visual, Water, and Wildland Fire Management);
- Resource Uses (Forestry, Lands and Realty, Livestock Grazing, Minerals and Energy, and Recreation); and

- Special Designations (Administrative Designations).

Management direction for cave and karst resources, coal, and wild horses was not developed because these resources are not found within the planning area.

The BLM interdisciplinary team (IDT) reviewed BLM-administered public lands for wilderness characteristics, which included those public lands dropped from the initial (1978-1979) wilderness inventory and public lands not already designated as Wilderness Study Areas (WSA).

This review was conducted to determine whether conditions have changed and whether such lands might be identified that may exhibit wilderness characteristics. In addition, certain public lands were also reviewed to determine whether they may exhibit wilderness characteristics. These were lands that were recommended for wilderness status in Forest Service planning efforts and that were acquired since the original wilderness inventory and public lands adjacent to Forest Service Inventoried Roadless Areas.

This review was based on field reports available from the original 1978-1979 inventory, the Idaho Intensive Wilderness Inventory Report (BLM 1980), and knowledge of current resource staff members who have completed field work throughout the planning area. Based on this additional review, none of the public lands previously dropped from the original inventory, newly acquired lands, or BLM-administered public lands adjacent to Forest Service-recommended wilderness were found to exhibit wilderness characteristics. This was because these public lands have been influenced by the presence of man's work, resulting in no opportunities for solitude, or a primitive and unconfined type of recreation.


Guidance for a specific resource, use, or designation is generally provided in the corresponding management program; however, additional plan direction for a resource, use, or designation may also be included under another management program. For example, a special designation may close an area to livestock grazing. This closure may not necessarily be represented in the management direction for the livestock grazing program.

The Proposed RMP (**Table 2-1**) described in Section 2.6 is the complete suite of substantial and noneditorial changes made to all the management guidance, originally described as the Preferred Alternative (Alternative B) and composed of Sections 2.7, 2.9, and 2.10 in the Draft RMP/EIS.

In addition, **Table 2-1** identifies the Preferred Alternative, as described in the Draft RMP/EIS in its entirety, which is composed of the corresponding components described in the following tables: **Table 2-2**, Management Guidance Common to All Alternatives; **Table 2-4**, Management Guidance Common to the Action Alternatives; and **Table 2-5**, Management Guidance for Alternative B.

Sections 2.7 through 2.12 provide the original individual alternative components described in the Draft RMP/EIS. This is so the reader can understand the complete suite of all management objectives and actions for the *specific* alternatives considered and analyzed in the Draft RMP/EIS. The reader is encouraged to read management guidance common to all alternatives, management guidance common to the action alternatives, and lastly, the management guidance specific to a particular alternative, as shown in **Diagram 2-1**.

Diagram 2-1: Relationship of Individual Alternative Component



The management actions for each alternative have been given unique alpha-numeric codes to help the reader understand and compare differences between the alternatives. Management actions under the Proposed RMP (**Table 2-1**) begin with “PP.” Each action under the Proposed RMP also maintains its original alpha-numeric code from the Draft RMP/EIS, so the management action can be traced to its original location in the Draft RMP/EIS. The original alpha-numeric code is at the end of each management action identified under the Proposed RMP. New management actions are the result of addressing public comments on the Draft RMP/EIS and are denoted as “new.”

Table 2-13 provides a summary of the general differences between the Proposed RMP (Alternative B from the Draft RMP/EIS, as edited) and the other three alternatives and follows the management guidance described for each alternative in **Tables 2-1 through 2-7**.

Table 2-14 provides a summary of the impacts on the human and natural environment in terms of environmental, social, and economic consequences that are proposed to occur from implementing the Proposed RMP (Alternative B in the Draft RMP/EIS, as edited) and the three other alternatives presented in Chapter 2. The effects of the various management actions in each alternative are discussed in detail in the environmental consequences section presented in Chapter 4.

Acreage and other numbers used in the alternatives are approximate and are for comparison and analytic purposes only. Data from geographic information systems (GIS) have been used in developing acreage calculations and are rounded to the nearest ten or hundred acres. Readers should not infer that they reflect exact measurements or precise calculations.

Alternative B, as modified, has been selected as the BLM’s Proposed RMP (Section 2.13, Rationale for the Identification of the Proposed Plan—Alternative B). Alternative B was identified as the Preferred Alternative in the Draft RMP/EIS. All alternatives address issues that were identified by the public (Section 2.14, Addressing Relevant Issues in the Alternatives).

2.3 DEVELOPMENT OF ALTERNATIVES

The goal in formulating alternatives for an RMP is to identify combinations of management practices to resolve planning issues and provide guidance where direction for a resource or use is currently lacking or is insufficient in the existing planning documents (termed Need for Change Topic). Each alternative is to represent a complete and reasonable interdisciplinary land use plan to achieve the purpose of and need for the land use plan, and to guide future management of the public land resources and uses in the planning area. As discussed in Chapter 1, the PFO used a collaborative approach in developing the alternatives.

The PFO implemented the first five steps of the BLM Planning Process (see Chapter 1) in developing alternatives: scoping, planning criteria development, issue identification, data collection, and current management assessment.

The issue identification and current management assessment processes began in 2003 with the RMP IDT's extensive review of current land management decisions/direction from the Malad Management Framework Plan (MFP) (BLM 1981a) and Pocatello RMP (BLM 1988a). This resulted in the identification of: (1) key direction for resources and uses that could be carried forward into a new RMP; and (2) resources and uses that need new management direction (Need For Change Topics) to address current laws, regulations, and policies, or to respond to changes

Planning Issues express concerns, conflicts, and problems with the existing management of public lands. Frequently, issues are based on how land uses affect resources. Some issues are concerned with how land uses can affect other land uses or how the protection of resources affects land uses.

Need for Change Topics are resources and land uses that require new management direction to better address current laws, regulations, and policies, or to respond to changes in conditions, such as increased recreational demand. Need for Change Topics may affect multiple resource programs.

in conditions on public lands managed by the PFO (**Figure 1-1**). Need for Change Topics addressed in this RMP include vegetation, special status species, fire management, recreation, lands and realty, minerals, and special designations. Management direction and allocations for other resource programs that are interdependent with Need for Change Topics (e.g., livestock grazing) have been revised accordingly.

Special designations may address both congressional (e.g., Wilderness Areas, Wild and Scenic Rivers [WSRs]) and administrative (e.g., WSAs and Areas of Critical Environmental Concern [ACEC]) designations; however, there are currently no congressional designations in the planning area. Therefore, the PFO only addresses administrative designations in this RMP.

The list of Need for Change Topics was distributed during the scoping process for public comment, along with a request for identification of issues. Based on scoping and collaboration efforts, the PFO identified six key planning issues and carried forward the seven Need for Change Topics during alternative development.

Following the close of the public scoping period in June 2003, BLM began the alternative-development process by assembling an IDT consisting of resource professionals from BLM, Shoshone-Bannock Tribes, Idaho Department of Fish and Game (IDFG), and US Department of the Interior, Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS). Between September 2003 and May 2004, the

IDT developed management goals and objectives, as well as management actions to meet those goals and objectives, in consideration of public comment received through briefings and scoping.

2.3.1 ALTERNATIVES DEVELOPED

Four management alternatives were developed to fulfill the purpose and need (Section 1.2), meet the multiple-use mandates of FLPMA, and address the major planning issues and Need for Change Topics. Each alternative provides direction for resource programs based upon the development of specific goals, objectives, and management actions. Each alternative describes specific issues influencing land management and emphasizes a different combination of resource uses, allocations, and restoration measures to address issues and resolve conflicts among users. Resource program goals are met in varying degrees across alternatives. Management scenarios for programs not tied to major planning issues and/or mandated by laws and regulations often contain few or no differences in management between alternatives. Alternatives may result in different long-term conditions, and objectives established may take longer than the life of the RMP to achieve.

Alternative A, the “No Action” Alternative, is a continuation of the current management and is based on existing planning decisions and amendments. Alternatives B, C, and D, the “Action” Alternatives, were developed with input received from scoping and IDT expertise.

2.4 GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSED RMP

All management under the Proposed RMP would comply with state and federal laws, regulations, policies, and standards, including the multiple-use mandates of FLPMA. A list of legal authorities is provided in **Appendix B**, and some authorities are identified by program areas in each section in Chapter 3. Additionally, the Proposed RMP includes management to meet the *Idaho Standards for Rangeland Health and Guidelines for Livestock Management (1997)* (**Appendix A**) (BLM 1997a) and management that addresses greater sage-grouse, as described in the Conservation Plan for Greater Sage-Grouse in Idaho (Idaho Sage-grouse Advisory Committee 2006).

Future plan monitoring, implementation, and evaluation are described in Section 2.15. A systematic process of adaptive management (Section 2.15) planning, implementation, monitoring, and evaluation (**Diagram 2-2**) would be used to determine the success of management actions in obtaining goals and objectives, as described in the Proposed RMP. Adaptive management enables resource managers to determine how well management actions meet the objectives and what steps are needed to modify activities to increase success or improve results.

Prior to and during the RMP planning effort, a WSR suitability study for all rivers of the PFO planning area was conducted and completed in July 2003. Several eligible segments were identified for both the Bear and Blackfoot Rivers. However, none of these segments were determined to be suitable for inclusion in the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System (NWSRS). Subsequently, recommendations from this study have been included in the Proposed RMP (BLM 2003d).

During the RMP planning process, all designated ACECs (seven ACECs and seven RNAs) were revisited and reviewed for appropriateness of their designation and management. However, during the summer of 2006 a wildland fire destroyed historical structures of the Van Komen Homestead ACEC. Thus, of the 14 original ACECs and RNAs, 13 are proposed to be redesignated, with management being updated in the Proposed RMP. In the Proposed RMP, the Van Komen Homestead ACEC designation has been removed, and the area is no longer managed as an ACEC.

2.4.1 ALTERNATIVE A (NO ACTION ALTERNATIVE)

Alternative A is the continuation of the present management situation. Referred to as the No Action Alternative, this alternative would continue present management practices based on existing land use plans and plan amendments incorporated into the existing plans. Valid decisions contained in the 1988 Pocatello RMP (BLM 1988a) and the Malad MFP (BLM 1981a) would be implemented if not already completed. Direction contained in existing laws, regulations, policies, and standards would also continue to be implemented, sometimes superseding provisions of the 1988 RMP and the MFP. The current levels, methods, and mix of multiple-use management of public lands in the PFO would continue, and resource values would receive attention at present levels.

2.4.2 ALTERNATIVE B (PROPOSED RMP)

Alternative B from the Draft RMP/EIS, as modified, is the Proposed RMP. It balances resource conservation and ecosystem health with commodity production and public land use. It includes IDT recommendations on resolving issues identified through the current management assessment and concerns raised during scoping, with some adjustments as necessary to meet current policy and guidance. It represents a mix and variety of management actions that best resolve the issues identified while assessing need for change topics, concerns raised during public scoping, and future management considerations. The Proposed RMP reflects the goals and objectives for all values and programs.

The Proposed RMP emphasizes an intermediate level of protection, restoration, enhancement, and use of resources and services to meet ongoing programs and land uses. The management strategy would be accomplished by the utilization of an array of proactive and prescriptive measures that would protect vegetation and habitat and would promote continued multiple resource management. Vegetation and special status species habitat would be restored and enhanced to provide for the continued presence of an ecologically healthy ecosystem using a suite of proactive and specific prescriptive management tools and implementation measures. Commodity- and development-based resources such as timber, livestock grazing, and minerals production would be maintained on public lands through specific actions to meet resource goals and protect ecosystem health. Management strategies would continue to provide for recreational opportunities and access to and on public lands and would take into consideration the result of management actions on the economics of communities within the region.

The Proposed RMP represents the mix and variety of actions that the BLM believes best resolves the issues and management concerns in consideration of all values and programs.

2.4.3 ALTERNATIVE C

Alternative C includes management strategies to preserve and protect ecosystem health across the PFO while providing for multiple uses, including livestock grazing and mineral development. Resource development would be more constrained than in Alternatives B or D and in some cases and some areas, uses would be excluded to protect sensitive resources. This alternative includes the most special designations with specific measures to protect or enhance resource values within these areas. This alternative emphasizes active and specific measures to protect and enhance vegetation and habitat for special status species, fish, and wildlife. Likewise, this alternative would reflect a reduction in resource production goals for forage, fiber, and minerals. Production of products from vegetation management in all habitats would be secondary to restoring healthy sagebrush steppe, upland, forest, and riparian areas.

Under this alternative, management actions would be applied to broad areas containing important habitat, as well as specific priority geographical areas. Such management actions would benefit sensitive resources and a broad array of associated species rather than focusing on specific sensitive resources and their habitats in specific geographic areas.

2.4.4 ALTERNATIVE D

Alternative D emphasizes active management for natural resources commodity production and public use opportunities. Resource uses such as recreation, livestock grazing, and mining, consistent with BLM guidance, would be emphasized. Intensive recreational uses such as rock crawling and motocross riding would be considered during future travel management planning. This alternative would provide the greatest opportunity for land tenure adjustments with the public land base potentially being less than Alternatives A, B, and C. Land use authorizations (e.g., rights-of-way [ROW] for wind and power) would have fewer areas with restrictions than under the other alternatives. Management emphasis would be on maintaining resource conditions where required.

Constraints to protect resource values or habitat would be implemented in very specific geographic areas rather than across the planning area. This alternative would continue management of existing special designations with identified measures to protect or enhance resource values within these areas. Potential impacts on sensitive resources (e.g., soils, sensitive plant habitat) would be mitigated on a case-by-case basis. Restoration actions that would enhance resource use or commodity production would be utilized.

2.5 ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED BUT ELIMINATED FROM DETAILED ANALYSIS

The following alternatives were eliminated from detailed study because they did not meet the purpose and need (Section 1.2) or were outside of the technical, legal, and/or policy constraints of developing a land use plan for public land resources/uses.

2.5.1 EXCLUSIVE USE OR PROTECTION

Alternatives and general management options proposing exclusive use or maximum development, production, or protection of one resource at the expense of other resources/uses were not considered. The FLPMA mandates BLM to manage public lands for multiple use and

sustained yield. This eliminates alternatives such as closing all public lands to grazing or mineral leasing, or managing only for fish, wildlife, or wilderness values at the exclusion of other resource considerations. In addition, resource conditions do not warrant planning area-wide prohibition of any particular use. Alternatives eliminating traditional uses where resource conditions do not justify such measures are not reasonable. Each alternative considered allows for some level of support, protection, and/or use of all resources present in the planning area. In some instances, the alternatives analyzed in detail do include various considerations for eliminating or maximizing individual resource values or uses in specific areas where conflicts exist.

An alternative that proposes to make all BLM-administered public lands unavailable to livestock grazing within the planning area would not meet the purpose and need for action. NEPA requires that agencies study, develop, and describe appropriate alternatives to recommend courses of action in any proposal that involves unresolved conflicts concerning alternative uses of available resources. Closures and adjustments to livestock grazing use have been incorporated into the action alternatives in order to address issues identified in this planning effort. Because the BLM has considerable discretion through its grazing regulations (43 CFR 4100) to determine and adjust stocking levels, seasons of use, grazing management activities, and to allocate forage for uses of the public lands, the analysis of an alternative which would make all public lands unavailable to livestock grazing through the resource management planning process is not reasonable.

Such an alternative would not be consistent with the intent of the Taylor Grazing Act (1934), which directs the BLM to provide for livestock use on public lands; adequately safeguard grazing privileges; provide for the orderly use, improvement, and development of the range; and stabilize the livestock industry dependent upon the public range.

The FLPMA requires that public lands be managed on a “multiple use and sustained yield basis” (FLPMA Sections 302(a) and 102(7)) which includes livestock grazing as a “principal or major” use of public lands. While multiple use does not require that all public lands be used for livestock grazing, making all BLM-administered public lands unavailable to livestock grazing within the planning area would be arbitrary and would not meet the principle of multiple use and sustained yield.

Livestock grazing is and has been an important use of the public lands in the planning area for many years. Livestock grazing is managed consistent with the grazing regulations (43 CFR 4100), land use plan guidance and standards and guidelines for rangeland health. Removal of livestock grazing at the site specific level (e.g., allotment or pasture) for the term or portion of the permit/lease may be appropriate to consider in response to findings associated with Idaho Standards for Rangeland Health and Guidelines assessments.

For these reasons, an alternative that would consider making all public lands unavailable for livestock grazing has been eliminated from further detailed analysis for this planning effort.

2.5.2 DESIGNATION OF ALL AREAS AS EITHER OPEN OR CLOSED TO OFF-HIGHWAY VEHICLE USE

Suggestions to designate all public lands as entirely open for yearlong off-highway vehicle (OHV) use without regard to current travel restrictions, or to entirely close public lands to any OHV use, were considered but dismissed. Public lands management not only requires implementing restrictions to address travel concerns and recreation demands, but also to protect resource values. In addition, BLM concluded that the current level of open, closed, or limited OHV uses would be used as a baseline for alternatives comparison.

2.5.3 RESTORATION OF CRESTED WHEATGRASS SEEDINGS

The RMP IDT considered a proposal for extensive restoration of existing crested wheatgrass seedings to native species associated with the Low-Elevation Shrub vegetation type. These seedings, on approximately 52,500 acres, are located mainly in the Black Pine and Curlew Valleys of the planning area. In considering the following factors, this restoration proposal was dismissed from further consideration:

- These areas, previously homesteaded and farmed, have altered soil properties (e.g., lacking microbiotic crusts) that influence the successful establishment of native vegetation.
- These lands, when returned to the federal government, were seeded with crested wheatgrass for soil stabilization.
- The successful establishment of native vegetation is highly unlikely because a majority of the seedings receive less than eight inches of precipitation annually.
- Restoration activities would likely increase the establishment of invasive species/noxious weeds.
- These seedings provide a stable forage base, thereby reducing grazing pressure on adjacent native vegetation.

Maintaining seedings integrity and improving diversity is addressed in the action alternatives.

2.5.4 NO ISSUANCE OF NEW PHOSPHATE LEASES

A proposal was considered in which no new phosphate leases would be issued on public lands, National Forest System lands, or other lands within the planning area. This proposal was in response to past development of phosphate leases in southeast Idaho that have resulted in the release of some contaminants affecting surface water, groundwater, soil, and vegetation. In some cases, contaminants such as selenium have exceeded maximum allowable levels.

Since 1998, BLM has assessed in detail the potential for the release of selenium and other contaminants from proposed phosphate mines. Mining alternatives and site-specific contaminant control measures have been developed and applied at active southeast Idaho mining sites administered by BLM. These measures applied as a result of this ongoing effort allow mining to proceed in an environmentally sensitive manner and are in compliance with pertinent resource-protection laws. Modification of mining practices continues to occur based on the results of associated environmental monitoring, with additional practices being developed through research

and analysis. Mining and reclamation plans are not approved for any lease until it can be demonstrated that measures would be taken to ensure that environmental impacts are predicted at levels below those set in the Clean Water Act, Clean Air Act, and other established requirements.

In addition, considering closure of all lands to new phosphate leasing may also be in conflict with the intent of Congress as outlined in the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920, the FLPMA of 1976, other statutes and federal court opinions.

Because of this, and in consideration of measures currently being applied and additional control methods/practices that may be developed and implemented in the future, this proposal was not considered for detailed analysis.

2.6 MANAGEMENT GUIDANCE CHANGES FROM THE DRAFT RMP PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE TO PROPOSED RMP/FINAL EIS

Table 2-1 is a comparison between Alternative B of the Draft RMP/EIS (October 2006) and the Proposed RMP, which is largely Alternative B but with modifications based on public comments received on the Draft RMP/EIS. This table illustrates the substantial and noneditorial changes from the Draft RMP/EIS to the Proposed RMP/Final EIS.

Table 2-1. Summary Comparison of Preferred Alternative and Proposed Management

Draft RMP/EIS Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)	Proposed RMP/Final EIS Alternative B (Proposed Plan)
GENERAL (GE)	
Goal GE-1. Continuously update resource and use information/data in order to proactively address changing needs and or conditions.	Goal GE-1. Continuously update resource and use information/data in order to proactively address changing needs and or conditions. (GE-1)
Objective CA-GE-1.1. Inventories and surveys documenting the condition and extent of resources/uses are given sufficient emphasis to monitor changes in conditions, provide “measurements” of ecosystem health or baseline data/information, and enable specialists to respond to changes when needed.	Objective PP-GE-1.1. Inventories and surveys documenting the condition and extent of resources/uses are given sufficient emphasis to monitor changes in conditions, provide “measurements” of ecosystem health or baseline data/information, and enable specialists to respond to changes when needed. (CA-GE-1.1)
<p>Action CA-GE-1.1.1 – Resource inventory, survey and monitoring programs would be implemented as appropriate.</p> <p>Action CA-GE-1.1.2 – Information gained through inventory, survey and monitoring programs would be used in making management decisions.</p> <p>Action CA-GE-1.1.3 – Undertake proactive management of public land activities, including, but not limited to, mitigating potential adverse effects.</p>	<p>Action PP-GE-1.1.1 – Resource inventory, survey and monitoring programs would be implemented as appropriate. (CA-GE-1.1.1)</p> <p>Action PP-GE-1.1.2 – Information gained through inventory, survey and monitoring programs would be used in making management decisions. (CA-GE-1.1.2)</p> <p>Action PP-GE-1.1.3 – Undertake proactive management of public land activities, including, but not limited to, mitigating potential adverse effects. (CA-GE-1.1.3)</p>
Goal GE-2. Consistent with multiple use management and sustained yield, achieve desired resource and use conditions while providing for an ecologically healthy environment.	Goal GE-2. Consistent with multiple use management and sustained yield, achieve desired resource and use conditions while providing for an ecologically healthy environment. (GE-2)
Objective CA-GE-2.1. Reduce adverse impacts from management actions, and maintain or improve resource conditions.	Objective PP-GE-2.1. Reduce impacts from management actions, and maintain or improve resource conditions. (CA-GE-2.1)
<p>Action CA-GE-2.1.1 – As appropriate, management guidelines, techniques and practices (Appendix C) would be applied to proactively make progress towards desired resource and/or use conditions.</p> <p>Action CA-GE-2.1.2 – As appropriate, the modification of existing or development of new guidelines, techniques and practices to reduce adverse effects or maintain/ improve resource conditions would be analyzed through the NEPA process.</p>	<p>Action PP-GE-2.1.1 - As appropriate, management guidelines, techniques and practices (Appendix C) would be applied to proactively make progress towards desired resource and/or use conditions. (CA-GE-2.1.1)</p> <p>Action PP-GE-2.1.2 - As appropriate, the modification of existing or development of new guidelines, techniques and practices to reduce adverse effects or maintain/ improve resource conditions would be analyzed through the NEPA process. (CA-GE-2.1.2)</p>
Goal GE-3. Provide for proper nutrient cycling, hydrological cycling and energy flow consistent with multiple use management and sustained productivity.	Goal GE-3. Provide for proper nutrient cycling, hydrological cycling and energy flow consistent with multiple use management and sustained productivity. (GE-3)
Objective AA-GE- 3.1. Restore or improve the public lands adversely affected by major surface disturbance resulting from activities such as but not limited to mineral and energy development, wildland fire, and ROW development.	Objective PP-GE-3.1. Restore or improve the public lands adversely affected by major surface disturbance resulting from activities such as but not limited to mineral and energy development, wildland fire, and ROW development.(AA-GE- 3.1)
Action AA-GE-3.1.1 – Applicable Idaho Standards for Rangeland Health and indicators (Appendix A) would be employed to determine the successfulness of reclamation, rehabilitation or restoration activities following major surface disturbance.	Action PP-GE-3.1.1 – Applicable Idaho Standards for Rangeland Health and indicators (Appendix A) would be employed to determine the successfulness of reclamation, rehabilitation or restoration activities following major surface disturbance. (AA-GE-3.1.1)

Draft RMP/EIS Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)	Proposed RMP/Final EIS Alternative B (Proposed Plan)
AIR QUALITY (AQ)	
Goal AQ-1. Comply with existing laws and regulations to meet health and safety requirements.	Goal AQ-1. Comply with existing laws and regulations to meet health and safety requirements. (AQ-1)
Objective CA-AQ-1.1. Reduce particulate impacts from uncontrolled wildland fires.	
Action CA-AQ-1.1.1 – As appropriate, fuels management opportunities would be implemented to reduce particulate matter impacts.	
Objective CA-AQ-1.2. Control the particulate level impacts from permitted/ authorized activities.	Objective PP-AQ-1.1. Control the particulate level impacts from permitted/ authorized activities. (CA-AQ-1.2)
Action CA-AQ-1.2.1 – As appropriate, management techniques, practices or guidelines to control fugitive dust emissions would be implemented as identified in Appendix C .	Action PP-AQ-1.1.1 – As appropriate, management techniques, practices or guidelines to control fugitive dust emissions would be implemented as identified in Appendix C . (CA-AQ-1.2.1)
Action CA-AQ-1.2.2 – Planned activities would be conducted in accordance with the Idaho State Implementation Plan of the CAA (upon completion).	Action PP-AQ-1.1.2 – Planned activities would be conducted in accordance with the EPA approved Idaho State Implementation Plan of the CAA and the Idaho/Montana Smoke management program. (CA-AQ-1.2.2)
Action CA-AQ-1.2.3 – Fire treatment activities (e.g., wildland fire use [WFU], prescribed fire) would be consistent with the US Environmental Protection Agency, National Ambient Air Quality Standards for particulate matter (PM ₁₀ and PM _{2.5}) and coordinated through the Montana/Idaho Airshed Group Smoke Management Program.	Action PP-AQ-1.1.3 – Fire treatment activities (e.g., wildland fire use [WFU], prescribed fire, and the appropriate management response [AMR]) would be consistent with the US Environmental Protection Agency, National Ambient Air Quality Standards for particulate matter (PM ₁₀ and PM _{2.5}) and coordinated through the Montana/Idaho Airshed Group Smoke Management Program. (CA-AQ-1.2.3)
Draft RMP/EIS Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)	Proposed RMP/Final EIS Alternative B (Proposed Plan)
CULTURAL RESOURCES (CR)	
Goal CR-1. Provide for the identification, protection, and enhancement of historical and cultural sites to ensure scientific and socio-cultural values are maintained and are available for appropriate uses by present and future generations.	Goal CR-1. Provide for the identification, protection, and enhancement of historical and cultural sites to ensure scientific and socio-cultural values are maintained and are available for appropriate uses by present and future generations. (CR-1)
Objective CA-CR-1.1. Manage important known and future identified cultural and historical sites to maintain and preserve their educational, scientific and public benefit.	Objective PP-CR-1.1. Manage important known and future identified cultural and historical sites to maintain and preserve their educational, scientific and public benefit. (CA-CR-1.1)
Action CA-CR-1.1.1 – Federally recognized tribes (e.g., Shoshone-Bannock Tribes) would be consulted with on the evaluation, impact assessment and management of cultural resources and traditional cultural properties.	Action PP-CR-1.1.1 – Federally recognized tribes (e.g., Shoshone-Bannock Tribes) would be consulted with on the evaluation, impact assessment, development of mitigation measures, and management of cultural resources and traditional cultural properties. (CA-CR-1.1.1)
Action CA-CR-1.1.2 – In compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA), the effects of all actions or undertakings (as defined in the NHPA) on cultural resources including traditional cultural properties would be considered through appropriate identification, evaluation, assessment of effects, and implementation of appropriate management measures. This consideration would be conducted through appropriate consultation with the Idaho State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) and appropriate tribes.	Action PP-CR-1.1.2 – In compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act, the effects of all actions or undertakings (as defined in the NHPA) on cultural resources including traditional cultural properties would be considered through appropriate identification, evaluation, assessment of effects, and implementation of appropriate management measures (e.g., signing, fencing/gating, stabilization, detailed recording, archaeological data recovery techniques). This consideration would be conducted through appropriate consultation with the Idaho State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) and appropriate tribes. (CA-CR-1.1.2)
Action CA-CR-1.1.3 – Archaeological collections from the PFO would be properly maintained in conformance with 36 Code of Federal Regulations 79 and Bureau policy and would be available for study by qualified researchers.	

<p style="text-align: center;">Draft RMP/EIS Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Proposed RMP/Final EIS Alternative B (Proposed Plan)</p>
CULTURAL RESOURCES (CR)	
<p>Action CA-CR-1.1.4 – Special management measures would be developed, enhanced and/or maintained for currently identified cultural resources:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Indian Rocks ACEC according to approved Cultural Resources Management Plan (CRMP). • The Van Komen Homestead and Juniper Town Site would be managed according to approved plans considering stabilization and rehabilitation of historic structures and interpretive signage. <p>Action CA-CR-1.1.5 – Manage identified cultural resource management areas in the following manner: approximately 2,100 acres (Historic Railroad Grade, Blackrock Canyon, and Historic Trail Segments) with a No Surface Occupancy (NSO) stipulation for fluid minerals, and approximately 6,300 acres as sensitive areas (Prehistoric Areas A-G, Upper Valley, and Bear Lake Plateau).</p> <p>Action CA-CR-1.1.6 – Maps of known cultural resources, cultural resource inventories and areas of cultural resource sensitivity would be reviewed and updated accordingly.</p> <p>Action CA-CR-1.1.7 – Review and update current holdings for cultural resource site and survey records with Idaho SHPO and acquire any new or missing documents.</p> <p>Action CA-CR-1.1.8 – Known or anticipated cultural resources would be allocated to the following uses according to their nature and relative preservation value.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Scientific Use <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Preserved until research potential is realized • Conservation for Future Use <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Preserved until conditions for use are met • Traditional Use <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Long-term preservation • Public Use <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Long-term preservation, on-site interpretation • Experimental Use <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Protected until used • Discharged from Management <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ No use after recordation; not preserved <p>Action CA-CR-1.1.9 – Known or anticipated cultural uses would be subject to the following use actions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Scientific Use: Permit appropriate research, including data recovery • Conservation for Future Use: Propose protective measures/designations • Traditional Use: Consult with tribes; determine limitations • Public Use: Determine limitations, permitted uses • Experimental Use: Determine nature of experiment • Discharged from Management: Remove protective measures 	<p>Action PP-CR-1.1.3 – Archaeological collections from the PFO would be properly maintained in conformance with 36 Code of Federal Regulations 79 and Bureau policy and would be available for study by qualified researchers. (CA-CR-1.1.3)</p> <p>Action PP-CR-1.1.4 – Special management measures would be developed, enhanced and/or maintained for currently identified cultural resources: (CA-CR-1.1.4)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Indian Rocks ACEC according to the Indian Rocks Cultural Resources Management Plan (August 1997), and • The Juniper Town Site would be managed according to approved plans considering stabilization and rehabilitation of historic structures and interpretive signage. <p>Action PP-CR-1.1.5 – Manage identified cultural resource management areas in the following manner: approximately 2,100 acres (Historic Railroad Grade, Blackrock Canyon, and Historic Trail Segments) with a No Surface Occupancy (NSO) stipulation for fluid minerals, and approximately 6,300 acres as sensitive areas (Prehistoric Areas A-G, Upper Valley, and Bear Lake Plateau). (CA-CR-1.1.5)</p> <p>Action PP-CR-1.1.6 – Maps of known cultural resources, cultural resource inventories and areas of cultural resource sensitivity would be reviewed and updated accordingly. (CA-CR-1.1.6)</p> <p>Action PP-CR-1.1.7 – Review and update current holdings for cultural resource site and survey records with Idaho SHPO and acquire any new or missing documents. (CA-CR-1.1.7)</p> <p>Action PP-CR-1.1.8 – Known or anticipated cultural resources would be allocated to the following uses according to their nature and relative preservation value. (CA-CR-1.1.8)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Scientific Use <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Preserved until research potential is realized • Conservation for Future Use <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Preserved until conditions for use are met • Traditional Use <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Long-term preservation • Public Use <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Long-term preservation, on-site interpretation • Experimental Use <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Protected until used • Discharged from Management <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ No use after recordation; not preserved <p>Action PP-CR-1.1.9 – Known or anticipated cultural uses would be subject to the following use actions. (CA-CR-1.1.9)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Scientific Use: Permit appropriate research, including data recovery • Conservation for Future Use: Propose protective measures/designations

<p style="text-align: center;">Draft RMP/EIS Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Proposed RMP/Final EIS Alternative B (Proposed Plan)</p>
CULTURAL RESOURCES (CR)	
<p>Action CA-CR-1.1.10 – Formal nominations for historic and traditional cultural properties that are eligible for the listing on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) would be prepared as necessary.</p> <p>Action CA-CR-1.1.11 – As the need is identified, CRMPs to provide more specific management direction for cultural resources, including NRHP-listed and eligible properties, classes of cultural resources or defined areas, Traditional Cultural Properties and historic trails (e.g., Blackfoot River, Oregon/California Trail and alternate routes) would be developed.</p> <p>Action CA-CR-1.1.12 – Ethnographic, prehistoric and historic overviews would be prepared and maintained to guide future cultural resource compliance studies, research and resource allocation.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Traditional Use: Consult with tribes; determine limitations • Public Use: Determine limitations, permitted uses • Experimental Use: Determine nature of experiment • Discharged from Management: Remove protective measures <p>Action PP-CR-1.1.10 – Formal nominations for historic and traditional cultural properties that are eligible for the listing on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) would be prepared as necessary. (CA-CR-1.1.10)</p> <p>Action PP-CR-1.1.11 – As the need is identified, CRMPs to provide more specific management direction for cultural resources, including NRHP-listed and eligible properties, classes of cultural resources or defined areas, Traditional Cultural Properties and historic trails (e.g., Blackfoot River, Oregon/California Trail and alternate routes) would be developed. (CA-CR-1.1.11)</p> <p>Action PP-CR-1.1.12 – As appropriate, ethnographic, prehistoric and historic overviews would be prepared and maintained to guide future cultural resource compliance studies, research and resource allocations. (CA-CR-1.1.12)</p>
<p>Objective CA-CR-1.2. Reduce imminent threats from natural or human-caused deterioration, or potential conflict with other resource uses.</p>	<p>Objective PP-CR-1.2. Reduce imminent threats from natural or human-caused deterioration, or potential conflict with other resource uses. (CA-CR-1.2)</p>
<p>Action CA-CR-1.2.1 – Proposed activities would only be authorized after compliance with Section 106 of NHPA has been completed and documented, including, where applicable, consultation with the SHPO and federally recognized Indian tribes (e.g., Shoshone-Bannock Tribes).</p> <p>Action CA-CR-1.2.2 – Priority geographic areas to be inventoried for cultural resources would be closely coordinated with other field office programs and based upon a probability for unrecorded significant resources to be identified.</p> <p>Action CA-CR-1.2.3 – Information on documented cultural resources and cultural resource investigations (e.g., cultural resource inventories) will continue to be maintained and updated with current information so that cultural resources are adequately considered in future planning and management actions.</p> <p>Action CA-CR-1.2.4 – Cultural resource information would be made available to qualified researchers for study and use.</p>	<p>Action PP-CR-1.2.1 – Proposed activities would only be authorized after compliance with Section 106 of NHPA has been completed and documented, including, where applicable, consultation with the SHPO and federally recognized Indian tribes (e.g., Shoshone-Bannock Tribes). (CA-CR-1.2.1)</p> <p>Any persons/entities authorized to conduct activities with the potential to alter, damage or destroy cultural resources of significant interest on public lands would be required to immediately bring to the attention of the Authorized Officer any discovery of cultural resources. Activities affecting the discovery would be suspended immediately with the discovery left intact until the Authorized Officer is able to evaluate the discovery and take appropriate action to protect or remove the resource.</p> <p>Action PP-CR-1.2.2 – Partnerships, agreements, contracts, and volunteer coordinated efforts would be encouraged to expand the inventory, protection and management of cultural resources in areas deemed to be of high probability but lacking in field survey data. Areas considered high priority for proactive cultural resource inventory include: (CA-CR-1.2.2)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Snake River/Massacre Rocks area, • Portneuf River/Chesterfield area, • Blackfoot River Watershed, • Curlew Grassland/Badger Hole Spring Area, • Bear River Corridor, • Elkhorn Mountain/Malad Obsidian Source <p>Action PP-CR-1.2.3 – Information on existing and changing conditions at cultural resource sites would be focused on sites deemed to be at-risk to impacts. Cultural resource monitoring data would be collected systematically using standardized formats to</p>

Draft RMP/EIS Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)	Proposed RMP/Final EIS Alternative B (Proposed Plan)
CULTURAL RESOURCES (CR)	
	<p>allow for assessment and comparison of site conditions over time. Approximately 10-25 cultural resource sites would be monitored annually. (new)</p> <p>Action PP-CR-1.2.4 – Information on documented cultural resources and cultural resource investigations (e.g., cultural resource inventories) will continue to be maintained and updated with current information so that cultural resources are adequately considered in future planning and management actions. (CA-CR-1.2.3)</p> <p>Action PP-CR-1.2.5 – Cultural resource information would be made available to qualified researchers for study and use. (CA-CR-1.2.4)</p>
Draft RMP/EIS Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)	Proposed RMP/Final EIS Alternative B (Proposed Plan)
TRIBAL TREATY RIGHTS AND INTERESTS (TR)	
No similar goal.	Goal TR-1. Provide for Tribal Treaty Rights and Interests on unoccupied public lands and public lands with the ceded reservation boundary. (new)
No similar objective.	Objective PP-TR-1.1. Maintain traditional/cultural use values and the health of land and water resources so treaty rights and interests can be fulfilled by tribal members on unoccupied public lands and those public lands within the ceded reservation boundary. (new)
No similar management action.	<p>Action PP-TR-1.1.1 – Land management decisions affecting BLM-administered public lands would be made in consideration of the 1868 Fort Bridger Treaty which reserves to Tribal members off-reservation treaty rights (i.e., gathering, hunting, fishing and practicing tribal cultural activities) on unoccupied public lands and on previously ceded reservation lands the right to graze livestock. (new)</p> <p>Action PP-TR-1.1.2 – Tribal governments would be consulted on land management actions and allocations that could affect treaty rights. (new)</p>
Draft RMP/EIS Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)	Proposed RMP/Final EIS Alternative B (Proposed Plan)
SOIL AND WATER (SW)	
Goal SW-1. Provide for soil quality, productivity and hydrological function within naturally sustainable limits.	Goal SW-1. Provide for soil quality, productivity and hydrological function within naturally sustainable limits. (SW-1)
Objective CA-SW-1.1. Incorporate resource protections to minimize soil loss when the long-term health of soil function and productivity is at risk.	Objective PP-SW-1.1. Incorporate resource protections to minimize soil loss when the long-term health of soil function and productivity is at risk. (CA-SW-1.1)
<p>Action CA-SW-1.1.1 – Appropriate management techniques, guidelines or practices (Appendix C) would be implemented to limit soil loss to an amount (generally 5 tons per acre per year (5 ton/acre/yr)) that would not affect its long term quality, productivity or hydrological function.</p> <p>Action CA-SW-1.1.2 – Reclamation of disturbed sites would be done as soon as conditions (e.g., soil moisture, weather) would support or promote success.</p>	<p>Action PP-SW-1.1.1 – Appropriate management techniques, guidelines or practices (Appendix C) would be implemented to limit soil loss to an amount (generally 5 tons per acre per year (5 ton/acre/yr)) that would not affect its long term quality, productivity or hydrological function. (CA-SW-1.1.1)</p> <p>Action PP-SW-1.1.2 – Reclamation of disturbed sites would be done as soon as conditions (e.g., soil moisture, weather) would support or promote success. (CA-SW-1.1.2)</p>

<p align="center">Draft RMP/EIS Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)</p>	<p align="center">Proposed RMP/Final EIS Alternative B (Proposed Plan)</p>
<p align="center">SOIL AND WATER (SW)</p>	
<p>Action CA-SW-1.1.3 – Surface-disturbing activities (e.g., Oil and Gas/Geothermal leasing stipulations) on erosive soils would be stipulated/mitigated as appropriate.</p>	<p>Action PP-SW-1.1.3 – Surface-disturbing activities (e.g., Oil and Gas/Geothermal leasing stipulations) on erosive soils would be stipulated/mitigated as appropriate. (CA-SW-1.1.3)</p>
<p>Goal SW-2. Protect and maintain watersheds so that they appropriately capture, retain and release water of quality that meets state and national standards and do not impair source water protection areas.</p>	<p>Goal SW-2. Protect and maintain watersheds so that they appropriately capture, retain and release water of quality that meets state and national standards and do not impair source water protection areas. (SW-2)</p>
<p>Objective CA-SW-2.1. Manage public land activities to maintain or contribute to the long term improvement of surface and ground water quality.</p>	<p>Objective PP-SW-2.1. Manage public land activities to maintain or contribute to the long term improvement of surface and ground water quality. (CA-SW-2.1)</p>
<p>Action CA-SW- 2.1.1 – Appropriate management techniques, guidelines or practices (Appendix C) would be applied to promote:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The delisting of water quality impaired water bodies as identified by the State of Idaho, • The protection of groundwater, • Designated beneficial uses (e.g., cold water biota). <p>Action CA-SW-2.1.2 – Cooperate with adjacent landowners, state agencies, Tribes, communities, municipalities, other agencies, and other individuals and organizations to meet beneficial use criteria.</p> <p>Action CA-SW-2.1.3 – Priority areas for stream management and restoration would be based upon the presence of sensitive species.</p> <p>Action CA-SW-2.1.4 – Stream crossings, if necessary, would be designed to minimize adverse impacts to soils, water quality and riparian vegetation.</p>	<p>Action PP-SW-2.1.1 – Appropriate management techniques, guidelines or practices (Appendix C) would be applied to promote: (CA-SW-2.1.1)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The delisting of water quality impaired water bodies as identified by the State of Idaho, • The protection of groundwater, • Designated beneficial uses (e.g., cold water biota). <p>Action PP-SW-2.1.2 – Cooperate with adjacent landowners, state agencies, Tribes, communities, municipalities, other agencies, and other individuals and organizations to meet beneficial use criteria. (CA-SW-2.1.2)</p> <p>Action PP-SW-2.1.3 – Priority areas for stream management and restoration would be based upon the following: (CA-SW-2.1.3)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Presence of sensitive species, 2. Amount of the stream reach on BLM-administered public lands or under the BLM control, and 3. Condition and importance of the stream for achieving multiple use objectives. <p>Action PP-SW-2.1.4 – Stream crossings, if necessary, would be designed to minimize adverse impacts to soils, water quality, and riparian vegetation and provide for fish passage as appropriate. (CA-SW-2.1.4)</p> <p>Action PP-SW-2.1.5 – As appropriate, roads and trails adjacent to streams or riparian areas that impact water quality may be redesigned, repaired, maintained, or re-located to a location not impacting the water quality. (new)</p>

<p align="center">Draft RMP/EIS Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)</p>	<p align="center">Proposed RMP/Final EIS Alternative B (Proposed Plan)</p>
<p align="center">PALEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCES (PR)</p>	
<p>Goal PR-1. Provide for the identification, protection, and management of paleontological resources for the preservation, interpretation and scientific uses by present and future generations.</p>	<p>Goal PR-1. Provide for the identification, protection, and management of paleontological resources for the preservation, interpretation and scientific uses by present and future generations. (PR-1)</p>
<p>Objective CA-PR-1.1. Maintain and protect paleontological resources for their educational and scientific benefits.</p>	<p>Objective PP-PR-1.1. Maintain and protect paleontological resources for their educational and scientific benefits. (CA-PR-1.1)</p>
<p>Action CA-PR-1.1.1 – Areas would be identified that may contain significant paleontological resources.</p> <p>Action CA-PR-1.1.2 – Areas would be identified that may have potential conflicts with authorized activities and resources/uses.</p> <p>Action CA-PR-1.1.3 – Significant paleontological resources (generally rare or vertebrate fossils, as determined by current BLM policy) would be protected from disturbance, or the effects of disturbance mitigated to conserve scientific, interpretive, and legacy values.</p> <p>Action CA-PR-1.1.4 – In areas where the potential for paleontological values exist (e.g., alluvial valleys) inventories would be conducted (e.g., literature search, field surveys) prior to authorizing activities or as appropriate, protective measures/protocols would be developed to be followed should paleontological resources be found.</p> <p>Action CA-PR-1.1.5 – Any persons/entities authorized to conduct activities with the potential to alter, damage or destroy paleontological resources of significant interest on the public lands would be required to immediately bring to the attention of the Authorized Officer any discovery of paleontological resources. Activities affecting the discovery would be suspended immediately with the discovery left intact until the Authorized Officer is able to evaluate the discovery and take appropriate action to protect or remove the resource.</p> <p>Action CA-PR-1.1.6 – Permits would be required for commercial and non-commercial removal of paleontological resources from public lands. However, permits would not be required for non-commercial removal of <u>small amounts</u> of common or non-significant fossils (generally plants and common invertebrates) for personal hobby and enjoyment uses.</p>	<p>Action PP-PR-1.1.1 – Areas would be identified that may contain significant paleontological resources. (CA-PR-1.1.1)</p> <p>Action PP-PR-1.1.2 – Areas would be identified that may have potential conflicts with authorized activities and resources/uses. (CA-PR-1.1.2)</p> <p>Action PP-PR-1.1.3 – Significant paleontological resources (generally rare or vertebrate fossils, as determined by current BLM policy) would be protected from disturbance, or the effects of disturbance mitigated to conserve scientific, interpretive, and legacy values. (CA-PR-1.1.3)</p> <p>Action PP-PR-1.1.4 – In areas where the potential for paleontological values exist (e.g., alluvial valleys) inventories would be conducted (e.g., literature search, field surveys) prior to authorizing activities or as appropriate, protective measures/protocols would be developed to be followed should paleontological resources be found. (CA-PR-1.1.4)</p> <p>Action PP-PR-1.1.5 – Any persons/entities authorized to conduct activities with the potential to alter, damage or destroy paleontological resources of significant interest on the public lands would be required to immediately bring to the attention of the Authorized Officer any discovery of paleontological resources. Activities affecting the discovery would be suspended immediately with the discovery left intact until the Authorized Officer is able to evaluate the discovery and take appropriate action to protect or remove the resource. (CA-PR-1.1.5)</p> <p>Action PP-PR-1.1.6 – Permits would be required for commercial and non-commercial removal of paleontological resources from public lands. However, permits would not be required for non-commercial removal of <u>small amounts</u> of common or non-significant fossils (generally plants and common invertebrates) for personal hobby and enjoyment uses. (CA-PR-1.1.6)</p>
<p align="center">Draft RMP/EIS Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)</p>	
<p align="center">Proposed RMP/Final EIS Alternative B (Proposed Plan)</p>	
<p align="center">VEGETATION (VE)</p>	
<p>Goal VE-1. Provide for the proper functioning condition (PFC) of riparian areas.</p>	<p>Goal VE-1. Provide for the proper functioning condition (PFC) of riparian areas. (VE-1)</p>
<p>Objective CA-VE-1.1. Maintain properly functioning riparian areas and restore/improve those areas that are not at PFC.</p>	<p>Objective PP-VE-1.1. Maintain properly functioning riparian areas and restore/improve those areas that are not at PFC. (CA-VE-1.1)</p>
<p>Action CA-VE-1.1.1 – Appropriate management guidelines, techniques or practices (Appendix C) would be implemented to control erosion, stabilize streambanks, shade/reduce water temperature, and encourage a diversity of desirable riparian vegetation.</p>	<p>Action PP-VE-1.1.1 – Appropriate management guidelines, techniques or practices (Appendix C) would be implemented to control erosion, stabilize streambanks, shade/reduce water temperature, and encourage a diversity of desirable riparian vegetation. (CA-VE-1.1.1)</p>

<p align="center">Draft RMP/EIS Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)</p>	<p align="center">Proposed RMP/Final EIS Alternative B (Proposed Plan)</p>
<p align="center">VEGETATION (VE)</p>	
<p>Action CA-VE-1.1.2 – Idaho Standards for Rangeland Health (Appendix A) would be implemented to maintain or improve riparian areas.</p> <p>Action CA-VE-1.1.3 – Mitigation measures would be identified to reduce visual contrasts with rehabilitation/restoration actions identified to address landscape modifications on a case-by-case basis.</p> <p>Action CA-VE-1.1.4 – Stream crossings, if necessary, would be designed to minimize adverse impacts to soils, water quality and riparian vegetation.</p>	<p>Action PP-VE-1.1.2 – Idaho Standards for Rangeland Health (Appendix A) would be implemented to maintain or improve riparian areas. (CA-VE-1.1.2)</p> <p>Action PP-VE-1.1.3 – Mitigation measures would be identified to reduce visual contrasts with rehabilitation/restoration actions identified to address landscape modifications on a case-by-case basis. (CA-VE-1.1.3)</p> <p>Action PP-VE-1.1.4 – Stream crossings, if necessary, would be designed to minimize adverse impacts to soils, water quality and riparian vegetation. (CA-VE-1.1.4)</p>
<p>Goal VE-2. Prevent the establishment of invasive species/noxious weed species.</p>	
<p>Objective CA-VE-2.1. Treat invasive species/noxious weeds to decrease or control the total number of acres occupied.</p>	
<p>Action CA-VE-2.1.1 – Invasive species/noxious weeds would be treated based upon the following priority:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Idaho Noxious Weeds list 2. Invasive species/noxious weeds <p>Action CA-VE-2.1.2 – Priority treatment areas would be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RNAs • Riparian areas • Springs/Seeps • Developed Recreation Sites/Campgrounds/Campsites • Heavily used roads/trails • Big game winter range • Special Status Species (flora habitat area) • Wildland Urban Interfaces (WUIs) • Mine reclamation sites • New areas identified: treat smallest populations first <p>Action CA-VE-2.1.3 – Where applicable, stipulations would be incorporated for the prevention and treatment of noxious weeds when authorizing new permitted/authorized activities. Examples of such stipulations to consider would promote:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The replacement of weeds by perennial plant cover which includes purchasing and planting of desirable seeds or plants to replace invasive species. • The use of perennial green fire breaks rather than brown fire breaks so these areas do not harbor or disperse weedy species if and when maintenance efforts are incomplete. • Weed management into all forms of restoration • Vegetation management and minimal perennial grass cover as requirements in any new or renewal of permitted/authorized activities resulting in major surface disturbance. <p>Action CA-VE-2.1.4 – Priority treatment areas would be coordinated with Counties and other land management agencies.</p> <p>Action CA-VE-2.1.5 – As appropriate, Chemical, Biological, Mechanical and Manual methods would be used in treating invasive/noxious weeds. The use of biological control</p>	<p>Objective PP-VE-2.1. Treat invasive species/noxious weeds to decrease or control the total number of acres occupied. (CA-VE-2.1/AA-VE-2.1)</p> <p>Action PP-VE-2.1.1 – Invasive species/noxious weeds would be treated based upon the following priority: (CA-VE-2.1.1)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Idaho Noxious Weeds list 2. Invasive species/noxious weeds <p>Action PP-VE-2.1.2 – Priority treatment areas would be: (CA-VE-2.1.2)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RNAs • Riparian areas • Springs/Seeps • Developed Recreation Sites/Campgrounds/Campsites • Heavily used roads/trails • Big game winter range • Special Status Species (flora habitat area) • Wildland Urban Interfaces (WUIs) • Mine reclamation sites • New areas identified: treat smallest populations first <p>Action PP-VE-2.1.3 – When authorizing new permitted/authorized activities, stipulations would be incorporated for the prevention and treatment of invasive species/noxious weeds as applicable. Examples of such stipulations to consider would promote: (CA-VE-2.1.3)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The replacement of invasive species/noxious weeds by perennial plant cover which includes purchasing and planting of desirable seeds or plants. • The use of perennial green fire breaks when ES&R or restoration efforts are planned/implemented. • Invasive species/noxious weed management being integrated into any new or renewal of permitted/authorized activities resulting in major surface disturbance. <p>Action PP-VE-2.1.4 – As appropriate, chemical, biological, mechanical and manual methods would be used in treating invasive species/noxious weeds. The use of biological control agents would be promoted when reasonable as identified through current BLM policy. (CA-VE-2.1.5)</p>

<p align="center">Draft RMP/EIS Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)</p>	<p align="center">Proposed RMP/Final EIS Alternative B (Proposed Plan)</p>
<p align="center">VEGETATION (VE)</p>	
<p>agents would be promoted when reasonable rather than chemical control as identified through current BLM policy.</p> <p>Action CA-VE-2.1.6 – Herbicides used would be consistent with current BLM policy (e.g., Draft Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement Vegetation Treatments Using Herbicides On Bureau Of Land Management Lands In 17 Western States, November 2005).</p> <p>Action AA-VE-2.1.1 – Where hay or straw would be used on public lands for permitted/authorized and internal BLM activities, state-certified weed free hay/straw would be required.</p> <p>Action AA-VE-2.1.2 – Public awareness concerning invasive/noxious weed species control would be promoted including partnerships with other agencies and the Tribes.</p>	<p>Action PP-VE-2.1.5 – Herbicide use would be consistent with current BLM policy (e.g., Final Vegetation Treatments on Bureau of Land Management Lands in 17 Western States, June 2007). (CA-VE-2.1.6)</p> <p>Action PP-VE-2.1.6 – Projects involving the application of herbicides, pesticides and insecticides that may affect Special Status Species would be analyzed at the project level and designed such that applications would support species conservation and recovery and minimize risks of exposure. (CA-VE-2.1.7)</p> <p>Action PP-VE-2.1.7 – Control of invasive species/noxious weeds would be coordinated with adjacent land owners and local governments through cooperative management programs. (CA-VE-2.1.8)</p> <p>Action PP-VE-2.1.8 – Fuels and restoration projects would be coordinated with other programs to reduce the risk of invasive species/noxious weeds. (CA-VE-2.1.9)</p> <p>Action PP-VE-2.1.9 – Suppression equipment would be washed for invasive species/noxious weeds at designated sites. (CA-VE-2.1.10)</p> <p>Action PP-VE-2.1.10 – Following wildland fire and prescribed fire treatments, chemical, mechanical, and revegetation/restoration treatments would utilize appropriate plant materials to provide the best opportunity to stabilize sites and prevent dominance of invasive species/noxious weeds. The use of native plant materials would be emphasized in Emergency Stabilization and Rehabilitation (ES&R) and restoration activities. (CA-VE-2.1.11)</p> <p>Action PP-VE-2.1.11 – Where hay or straw would be used on public lands for permitted/authorized and internal BLM activities, state-certified noxious weed free hay/straw would be required. (AA-VE-2.1.1)</p> <p>Action PP-VE-2.1.12 – Integrated weed management strategies would be coordinated and developed with Tribal, Federal and State agencies and local governments at appropriate scales to restore affected BLM-administered public lands. Such strategies or actions may include but are not limited to: (CA-VE-2.1.4/AA-VE-2.1.2)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • coordination of treatment efforts; • identification of priority areas; • promote public awareness; and • develop educational material regarding control, prevention, etc.
<p>Goal VE-3. Provide for old growth characteristics where forest treatments are implemented.</p>	<p>Goal VE-3. Provide for old growth characteristics where forest treatments are implemented. (VE-3)</p>
<p>Objective CA-VE-3.1. Maintain or contribute towards the restoration of old growth structure and composition in areas where forest treatments, including Healthy Forests Restoration Acts, are proposed.</p>	<p>Objective PP-VE-3.1. Maintain or contribute towards the restoration of old growth structure and composition in areas where forest treatments, including those authorized under the Healthy Forests Restoration Act projects, are proposed. (CA VE-3.1)</p>
<p>Action CA-VE-3.1.1 – Structure and composition characteristics for old growth forest/woodland types would be used as defined in <i>Characteristics of Old-Growth Forests in the Intermountain Region, Forest Service Intermountain Region, Ogden Utah (1993)</i> or if amended or revised (Hamilton 1993).</p>	<p>Action PP-VE-3.1.1 – Structure and composition characteristics for old growth forest/woodland types would be used as defined in current literature and or <i>Characteristics of Old-Growth Forests in the Intermountain Region, Forest Service Intermountain Region, Ogden Utah (Hamilton 1993)</i> as amended or revised. (CA-VE-3.1.1)</p>

Draft RMP/EIS Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)	Proposed RMP/Final EIS Alternative B (Proposed Plan)																
VEGETATION (VE)																	
Action CA-VE-3.1.2 – Current literature would be researched and used to describe old growth characteristics of Rocky Mountain Juniper.																	
Goal VE-6. Manage vegetation types to provide for their continued presence as part of an ecologically healthy system.	Goal VE-4. Manage vegetation types to provide for their continued presence as part of an ecologically healthy system. (VE-6)																
<p>Objective B-VE-6.1. In Low- and Mid-Elevation Shrub and Mountain Shrub types, maintain or increase land health condition (LHC)-A acres as described below so the landscape is composed of a diversity of desirable/native herbaceous and shrub/woody species consisting of at least 15-25% sagebrush canopy cover in greater sage-grouse habitat in the Low- and Mid-Elevation Shrub types and at least 25% shrub cover in the Mountain Shrub type. (Appendix J, Section III)</p> <table border="1" style="margin-left: auto; margin-right: auto;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="text-align: center;">Desired LHC Description</th> <th style="text-align: center;">Percent LHC Desired</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>LHC-A - All key components are present as identified in land health standards and as described in the definition of Fire Regime Condition Class (FRCC) 1.</td> <td style="text-align: center;">> 60%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>LHC-B - Some or all of the key components as identified in land health standards are present and as described in the definition of FRCC 2.</td> <td style="text-align: center;">20-25%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>LHC-C - Key components are absent as identified in land health standards and as described in the definition of FRCC 3.</td> <td style="text-align: center;">< 20%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Desired LHC Description	Percent LHC Desired	LHC-A - All key components are present as identified in land health standards and as described in the definition of Fire Regime Condition Class (FRCC) 1.	> 60%	LHC-B - Some or all of the key components as identified in land health standards are present and as described in the definition of FRCC 2.	20-25%	LHC-C - Key components are absent as identified in land health standards and as described in the definition of FRCC 3.	< 20%	<p>Objective PP-VE-4.1. In Low- and Mid-Elevation Shrub and Mountain Shrub types, commensurate with site potential, maintain or increase LHC-A acres as described below so the landscape is composed of a diversity of desirable/native herbaceous and shrub/woody species consisting of at least 15-25% sagebrush canopy cover in greater sage-grouse habitat in the Low- and Mid-Elevation Shrub types and at least 25% shrub cover in the Mountain Shrub type. (Appendix J, Section III) (B-VE-6.1)</p> <table border="1" style="margin-left: auto; margin-right: auto;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="text-align: center;">Desired LHC Description</th> <th style="text-align: center;">Percent LHC Desired</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>LHC-A - All key components are present as identified in land health standards and as described in the definition of Fire Regime Condition Class (FRCC) 1.</td> <td style="text-align: center;">> 60%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>LHC-B - Some or all of the key components as identified in land health standards are present and as described in the definition of FRCC 2.</td> <td style="text-align: center;">20-25%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>LHC-C - Key components are absent as identified in land health standards and as described in the definition of FRCC 3.</td> <td style="text-align: center;">< 20%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Desired LHC Description	Percent LHC Desired	LHC-A - All key components are present as identified in land health standards and as described in the definition of Fire Regime Condition Class (FRCC) 1.	> 60%	LHC-B - Some or all of the key components as identified in land health standards are present and as described in the definition of FRCC 2.	20-25%	LHC-C - Key components are absent as identified in land health standards and as described in the definition of FRCC 3.	< 20%
Desired LHC Description	Percent LHC Desired																
LHC-A - All key components are present as identified in land health standards and as described in the definition of Fire Regime Condition Class (FRCC) 1.	> 60%																
LHC-B - Some or all of the key components as identified in land health standards are present and as described in the definition of FRCC 2.	20-25%																
LHC-C - Key components are absent as identified in land health standards and as described in the definition of FRCC 3.	< 20%																
Desired LHC Description	Percent LHC Desired																
LHC-A - All key components are present as identified in land health standards and as described in the definition of Fire Regime Condition Class (FRCC) 1.	> 60%																
LHC-B - Some or all of the key components as identified in land health standards are present and as described in the definition of FRCC 2.	20-25%																
LHC-C - Key components are absent as identified in land health standards and as described in the definition of FRCC 3.	< 20%																
<p>Action B-VE-6.1.1 – Activities would be permitted/authorized in a manner consistent with Idaho Standards for Rangeland Health (Appendix A).</p> <p>Action B-VE-6.1.2 – Priority areas for treatment and restoration would be:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Greater sage- and Columbian sharp-tailed grouse Source and Key habitat: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Enhance source habitat, b. Treat areas of low resilience c. Treat areas that pose a fire risk to source habitats, d. Enhance key habitat areas, e. Treat areas that pose a fire risk to key habitats, 	<p>Action PP-VE-4.1.1 – Activities would be permitted/authorized in a manner consistent with Idaho Standards for Rangeland Health (Appendix A). (B-VE-6.1.1)</p> <p>Action PP-VE-4.1.2 – Priority areas for treatment and restoration would be: (B-VE-6.1.2)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Greater sage- and Columbian sharp-tailed grouse Source and Key habitat: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Enhance source habitat, b. Treat areas of low resilience c. Treat areas that pose a fire risk to source habitats, d. Enhance key habitat areas, e. Treat areas that pose a fire risk to key habitats, 																

<p align="center">Draft RMP/EIS Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)</p>	<p align="center">Proposed RMP/Final EIS Alternative B (Proposed Plan)</p>
<p align="center">VEGETATION (VE)</p>	
<p>f. Enhance restoration habitat</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Habitats for the conservation and recovery of special status species. 3. Areas with hazardous fuels or potential for catastrophic wildland fire. 4. Areas infested by invasive species/noxious weeds. 5. Areas at risk of loss of key ecosystem components/functions (structure, diversity, composition, hydrological function, nutrient cycling, energy flow). 6. Areas adversely impacted/degraded by uses or activities (e.g., recreation, OHV, grazing, mining) 7. Crested wheatgrass seedings. <p>Criteria to treat and maintain the crested wheatgrass forage base are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Suppress wildland fires until sagebrush canopy cover exceeds 25%. • Consider various treatment methods (e.g., mechanical, chemical, and prescribed fire) as areas exceed 25% sagebrush canopy cover. • As areas are treated allow for no less than 15% sagebrush canopy cover. • Interseed desirable species that add diversity while not displacing crested wheatgrass. • Treat areas to discourage invasive/noxious weed species. 8. Juniper encroached areas 	<p>f. Enhance restoration habitat</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Habitats for the conservation and recovery of special status species. 3. Areas with hazardous fuels or potential for catastrophic wildland fire. 4. Areas infested by invasive species/noxious weeds. 5. Areas at risk of loss of key ecosystem components/functions (structure, diversity, composition, hydrological function, nutrient cycling, energy flow). 6. Areas adversely impacted/degraded by uses or activities (e.g., recreation, OHV, grazing, mining) 7. Crested wheatgrass seedings. <p>Criteria to treat and maintain the crested wheatgrass forage base are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The AMR is full suppression with perimeter control until canopy cover exceeds 25 percent. When canopy cover exceeds 25 percent, the AMR considered would range from full suppression to monitoring. • Consider various treatment methods (e.g., mechanical, chemical, and prescribed fire) as areas exceed 25% sagebrush canopy cover. • As areas are treated allow for no less than 15% sagebrush canopy cover. • Interseed desirable species that add diversity while not displacing crested wheatgrass. • Treat areas to prevent the establishment or spread of invasive species/noxious weeds. 8. Juniper encroached areas

Draft RMP/EIS Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)	Proposed RMP/Final EIS Alternative B (Proposed Plan)																
VEGETATION (VE)																	
<p>Objective B-VE-6.2. In the Aspen/Aspen Conifer Mix and Dry Conifer types, maintain or increase LHC-A acres as described below so the landscape is composed of an even mix of Aspen and Dry Conifer resulting in a distribution of age classes of <30 years (40%), 31-80 years (40%), and >80 years (20%).</p> <table border="1" style="margin-left: auto; margin-right: auto;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="text-align: center;">Desired LHC Description</th> <th style="text-align: center;">Percent LHC Desired</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>LHC-A - All key components are present as identified in land health standards and as described in the definition of FRCC 1.</td> <td style="text-align: center;">>30</td> </tr> <tr> <td>LHC-B - Some or all of the key components as identified in land health standards are present and as described in the definition of FRCC 2.</td> <td style="text-align: center;">25-30</td> </tr> <tr> <td>LHC-C - Key components are absent as identified in land health standards and as described in the definition of FRCC 3.</td> <td style="text-align: center;"><45</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Desired LHC Description	Percent LHC Desired	LHC-A - All key components are present as identified in land health standards and as described in the definition of FRCC 1.	>30	LHC-B - Some or all of the key components as identified in land health standards are present and as described in the definition of FRCC 2.	25-30	LHC-C - Key components are absent as identified in land health standards and as described in the definition of FRCC 3.	<45	<p>Objective PP-VE-4.2. In the Aspen/ Aspen Conifer Mix and Dry Conifer types, commensurate with site potential, maintain or increase LHC-A and B acres as described below so the landscape is composed of 40% mixed Aspen/Dry Conifer and 60% Aspen dominate areas consisting of 500-1,000 stems/acre w/ 5-15 ft. height resulting in the distribution of age classes of <30 years (40%), 31-80 years (40%), and >80 years (20%). (C-VE-6.2)</p> <table border="1" style="margin-left: auto; margin-right: auto;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="text-align: center;">Desired LHC Description</th> <th style="text-align: center;">Percent LHC Desired</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>LHC-A - All key components are present as identified in land health standards and as described in the definition of FRCC 1.</td> <td style="text-align: center;">>30</td> </tr> <tr> <td>LHC-B - Some or all of the key components as identified in land health standards are present and as described in the definition of FRCC 2.</td> <td style="text-align: center;">35-40</td> </tr> <tr> <td>LHC-C - Key components are absent as identified in land health standards and as described in the definition of FRCC 3.</td> <td style="text-align: center;"><35</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Desired LHC Description	Percent LHC Desired	LHC-A - All key components are present as identified in land health standards and as described in the definition of FRCC 1.	>30	LHC-B - Some or all of the key components as identified in land health standards are present and as described in the definition of FRCC 2.	35-40	LHC-C - Key components are absent as identified in land health standards and as described in the definition of FRCC 3.	<35
Desired LHC Description	Percent LHC Desired																
LHC-A - All key components are present as identified in land health standards and as described in the definition of FRCC 1.	>30																
LHC-B - Some or all of the key components as identified in land health standards are present and as described in the definition of FRCC 2.	25-30																
LHC-C - Key components are absent as identified in land health standards and as described in the definition of FRCC 3.	<45																
Desired LHC Description	Percent LHC Desired																
LHC-A - All key components are present as identified in land health standards and as described in the definition of FRCC 1.	>30																
LHC-B - Some or all of the key components as identified in land health standards are present and as described in the definition of FRCC 2.	35-40																
LHC-C - Key components are absent as identified in land health standards and as described in the definition of FRCC 3.	<35																
<p>Action B-VE-6.2.1 – Aspen/Conifer sites would be treated using appropriate treatment methods and harvest rotation cycles to achieve desired age classes. Appropriate methods may include but are not limited to regeneration and partial cuts.</p> <p>Action B-VE-6.2.2 – Within the Aspen/Aspen Conifer Mix and Dry Conifer vegetation types, treatment and restoration priority areas would be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Areas with greater than 50% mature conifer composition. • Areas adjacent to deer/elk summer range. • Areas significant to special status species. • Areas impacted by insects or disease. 	<p>Action PP-VE-4.2.1 – Aspen/Conifer sites would be treated using appropriate treatment methods and harvest rotation cycles to achieve desired age classes. Appropriate methods may include but are not limited to regeneration and partial cuts. (B-VE-6.2.1)</p> <p>Action PP-VE-4.2.2 – Within the Aspen/Aspen Conifer Mix and Dry Conifer vegetation types, treatment and restoration priority areas would be: (B-VE-6.2.2)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Areas with greater than 50% mature conifer composition. • Areas adjacent to deer/elk summer range. • Areas significant to special status species. • Areas impacted by insects or disease. 																

Draft RMP/EIS Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)	Proposed RMP/Final EIS Alternative B (Proposed Plan)																
VEGETATION (VE)																	
<p>Objective B-VE-6.3. In the Wet/Cold Conifer type, maintain or increase LHC-A and B acres as described below primarily through natural processes so the landscape is comprised of a distribution of age classes of 0-80 years (30%) and > 80 years (70%).</p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="text-align: center;">Desired LHC Description</th> <th style="text-align: center;">Percent LHC Desired</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>LHC-A - All key components are present as identified in land health standards and as described in the definition of FRCC 1.</td> <td style="text-align: center;">>5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>LHC-B - Some or all of the key components as identified in land health standards are present and as described in the definition of FRCC 2.</td> <td style="text-align: center;">95-100</td> </tr> <tr> <td>LHC-C - Key components are absent as identified in land health standards and as described in the definition of FRCC 3.</td> <td style="text-align: center;"><5</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Desired LHC Description	Percent LHC Desired	LHC-A - All key components are present as identified in land health standards and as described in the definition of FRCC 1.	>5	LHC-B - Some or all of the key components as identified in land health standards are present and as described in the definition of FRCC 2.	95-100	LHC-C - Key components are absent as identified in land health standards and as described in the definition of FRCC 3.	<5	<p>Objective PP-VE-4.3. In the Wet/Cold Conifer type, commensurate with site potential, maintain or increase LHC-A and B acres as described below primarily through natural processes so the landscape is comprised of a distribution of age classes of 0-80 years (30%) and > 80 years (70%). (B-VE-6.3)</p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="text-align: center;">Desired LHC Description</th> <th style="text-align: center;">Percent LHC Desired</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>LHC-A - All key components are present as identified in land health standards and as described in the definition of FRCC 1.</td> <td style="text-align: center;">>5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>LHC-B - Some or all of the key components as identified in land health standards are present and as described in the definition of FRCC 2.</td> <td style="text-align: center;">95-100</td> </tr> <tr> <td>LHC-C - Key components are absent as identified in land health standards and as described in the definition of FRCC 3.</td> <td style="text-align: center;"><5</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Desired LHC Description	Percent LHC Desired	LHC-A - All key components are present as identified in land health standards and as described in the definition of FRCC 1.	>5	LHC-B - Some or all of the key components as identified in land health standards are present and as described in the definition of FRCC 2.	95-100	LHC-C - Key components are absent as identified in land health standards and as described in the definition of FRCC 3.	<5
Desired LHC Description	Percent LHC Desired																
LHC-A - All key components are present as identified in land health standards and as described in the definition of FRCC 1.	>5																
LHC-B - Some or all of the key components as identified in land health standards are present and as described in the definition of FRCC 2.	95-100																
LHC-C - Key components are absent as identified in land health standards and as described in the definition of FRCC 3.	<5																
Desired LHC Description	Percent LHC Desired																
LHC-A - All key components are present as identified in land health standards and as described in the definition of FRCC 1.	>5																
LHC-B - Some or all of the key components as identified in land health standards are present and as described in the definition of FRCC 2.	95-100																
LHC-C - Key components are absent as identified in land health standards and as described in the definition of FRCC 3.	<5																
<p>Action B-VE-6.3.1 – Appropriate treatment methods and harvest rotation cycles would be used to achieve desired age classes.</p> <p>Action B-VE-6.3.2 – Treatment/restoration priority areas would be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Areas impacted by insects or disease. • Wildlife ranges (summer/winter). • Areas significant to special status species. 	<p>Action PP-VE-4.3.1 – Appropriate treatment methods and harvest rotation cycles would be used to achieve desired age classes. (B-VE-6.3.1)</p> <p>Action PP-VE-4.3.2 – Treatment/restoration priority areas would be: (B-VE-6.3.2)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Areas impacted by insects or disease. • Wildlife ranges (summer/winter). • Areas significant to special status species. 																

Draft RMP/EIS Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)	Proposed RMP/Final EIS Alternative B (Proposed Plan)																
VEGETATION (VE)																	
<p>Objective B-VE-6.4. Maintain or increase natural occurring Juniper LHC-A and B acres as described below through primarily natural processes so the landscape is dominated by widely spaced old juniper trees greater than 300 years.</p> <table border="1" style="margin-left: auto; margin-right: auto;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="text-align: center;">Desired LHC Description</th> <th style="text-align: center;">Percent LHC Desired</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>LHC-A - All key components are present as identified in land health standards and as described in the definition of FRCC 1.</td> <td style="text-align: center;">>5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>LHC-B - Some or all of the key components as identified in land health standards are present and as described in the definition of FRCC 2.</td> <td style="text-align: center;">95-100</td> </tr> <tr> <td>LHC-C - Key components are absent as identified in land health standards and as described in the definition of FRCC 3.</td> <td style="text-align: center;"><5</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Desired LHC Description	Percent LHC Desired	LHC-A - All key components are present as identified in land health standards and as described in the definition of FRCC 1.	>5	LHC-B - Some or all of the key components as identified in land health standards are present and as described in the definition of FRCC 2.	95-100	LHC-C - Key components are absent as identified in land health standards and as described in the definition of FRCC 3.	<5	<p>Objective PP-VE-4.4. Maintain or increase natural occurring Juniper LHC-A and B acres, commensurate with site potential, as described below through primarily natural processes so the landscape is dominated by widely spaced old juniper trees greater than 300 years. (B-VE-6.4)</p> <table border="1" style="margin-left: auto; margin-right: auto;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="text-align: center;">Desired LHC Description</th> <th style="text-align: center;">Percent LHC Desired</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>LHC-A - All key components are present as identified in land health standards and as described in the definition of FRCC 1.</td> <td style="text-align: center;">>5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>LHC-B - Some or all of the key components as identified in land health standards are present and as described in the definition of FRCC 2.</td> <td style="text-align: center;">95-100</td> </tr> <tr> <td>LHC-C - Key components are absent as identified in land health standards and as described in the definition of FRCC 3.</td> <td style="text-align: center;"><5</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Desired LHC Description	Percent LHC Desired	LHC-A - All key components are present as identified in land health standards and as described in the definition of FRCC 1.	>5	LHC-B - Some or all of the key components as identified in land health standards are present and as described in the definition of FRCC 2.	95-100	LHC-C - Key components are absent as identified in land health standards and as described in the definition of FRCC 3.	<5
Desired LHC Description	Percent LHC Desired																
LHC-A - All key components are present as identified in land health standards and as described in the definition of FRCC 1.	>5																
LHC-B - Some or all of the key components as identified in land health standards are present and as described in the definition of FRCC 2.	95-100																
LHC-C - Key components are absent as identified in land health standards and as described in the definition of FRCC 3.	<5																
Desired LHC Description	Percent LHC Desired																
LHC-A - All key components are present as identified in land health standards and as described in the definition of FRCC 1.	>5																
LHC-B - Some or all of the key components as identified in land health standards are present and as described in the definition of FRCC 2.	95-100																
LHC-C - Key components are absent as identified in land health standards and as described in the definition of FRCC 3.	<5																
<p>Action B-VE-6.4.1 – Appropriate methods (e.g., fire suppression) would be used to maintain or promote juniper dominated range sites.</p>	<p>Action PP-VE-4.4.1 – Vegetation manipulation methods such as but not limited to the appropriate management response (AMR), mechanical, chemical, and/or prescribed fire would be used to maintain or promote juniper range sites. (B-VE-6.4.1).</p>																

Draft RMP/EIS Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)	Proposed RMP/Final EIS Alternative B (Proposed Plan)
FISH AND WILDLIFE (FW)	
<p>Goal FW-1. Manage wildlife habitats so vegetation composition and structure assures the continued presence of fish and wildlife as part of an ecologically healthy system.</p>	<p>Goal FW-1. Manage wildlife habitats so vegetation composition and structure assures the continued presence of fish and wildlife as part of an ecologically healthy system. (FW-1)</p>
<p>Objective CA-FW-1.1. Maintain and improve big game seasonal habitats to support IDFG management objectives.</p>	<p>Objective PP-FW-1.1. Maintain and improve wildlife habitats to support IDFG management objectives. (CA-FW-1.1)</p>
<p>Action CA-FW-1.1.1 – As appropriate and practicable, elk and deer habitat on public lands would be managed as identified below in order to generally support IDFG management objectives as described in the <i>White-Tailed Deer, Mule Deer, and Elk Management Plan - Status and Objectives of Idaho's White-Tailed Deer, Mule Deer, and Elk Resources</i> (IDFG 1999) for southeast (SE) Idaho management units.</p>	<p>Action PP-FW-1.1.1 – As appropriate and practicable, elk and deer habitat on public lands would be managed as identified below in order to generally support IDFG management objectives as described in the <i>White-Tailed Deer, Mule Deer, and Elk Management Plan - Status and Objectives of Idaho's White-Tailed Deer, Mule Deer, and Elk Resources</i> (IDFG 1999) for southeast (SE) Idaho management units. (CA-FW-1.1.1)</p>

<p style="text-align: center;">Draft RMP/EIS Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Proposed RMP/Final EIS Alternative B (Proposed Plan)</p>
<p>FISH AND WILDLIFE (FW)</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Riparian areas would be managed for habitat and population linkage areas by applying appropriate management techniques that include but are not limited to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Fencing if practical, ▪ Providing adjacent cover strips as appropriate ▪ Controlling noxious weeds • Aspen would be treated by applying appropriate management techniques that may include but are not limited to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Removing encroaching conifer in Aspen clones. ▪ Slashing old age aspen clones while leaving snags and some live trees. ▪ Fencing degraded aspen clones. ▪ Pursuing the use of prescribed fire. ▪ Plowing Aspen roots to release clones. • Degraded riparian areas would be restored. • Livestock grazing practices compatible with providing good mule deer habitat would be implemented. • During travel management planning consider reducing the number of designated routes/roads within deer/elk winter range to avoid adverse impacts. • Seasonal restrictions (Appendix D) would be implemented for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Winter range closures. ▪ Fawning habitat disturbances. <p>Action CA-FW-1.1.2 – The integrity of the elk calving areas would be protected by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Treating no more than 20% of any individual elk calving area during any 20 year period. Weed treatment in these areas would not account towards the 20% limitation. • Implementing seasonal restrictions (Appendix D) <p>Action CA-FW-1.1.3 – Big game movement and safety would be enhanced through fence modifications using approved BLM fence designs.</p> <p>Action CA-FW-1.1.4 – Big game winter ranges would be wildland fire suppression and ES&R priority areas.</p> <p>Action CA-FW-1.1.5 – During travel management planning reducing the number of designated routes/roads would be considered in big game habitats (calving/fawning areas, winter range) to avoid adverse impacts.</p> <p>Action CA-FW-1.1.6 – The management of deer winter range in the Soda Springs Hills Management Area would be coordinated with various partners such as the Shoshone-Bannock Tribes, IDFG, Bonneville Power Authority (BPA), and Caribou County.</p> <p>Action CA-FW-1.1.8 – The introduction or re-introduction of wildlife or fish species on public lands would be coordinated with IDFG and other agencies.</p> <p>Action CA-FW-1.1.9 – Seasonal restrictions (Appendix D) would be applied to protect wildlife. The Authorized Officer may waive or adjust seasonal restrictions when appropriate conditions exist. Examples of such conditions may include, but are not limited to:</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Riparian areas would be managed for habitat and population linkage areas by applying appropriate management techniques that may include but are not limited to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Fencing, ▪ Providing adjacent cover strips, and ▪ Controlling noxious weeds. • Aspen would be treated by applying appropriate management techniques that may include but are not limited to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Removing encroaching conifer in Aspen clones. ▪ Slashing old age aspen clones while leaving snags and some live trees. ▪ Fencing degraded aspen clones. ▪ Pursuing the use of prescribed fire. ▪ Plowing Aspen roots to release clones. • Degraded riparian areas would be restored. • Livestock grazing practices compatible with providing good mule deer habitat would be implemented. • During travel management planning, give special consideration (e.g., timing of use, number of roads/trails, road locations) for reducing impacts on big game winter range. • Seasonal restrictions for permitted/authorized activities as identified in Appendix D would be implemented for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Winter ranges, ▪ Fawning/calving habitats <p>Action PP-FW-1.1.2 – The integrity of the elk calving areas would be protected by: (CA-FW-1.1.2)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Design fire and non-fire vegetation treatments to protect the integrity of individual elk calving areas by providing for a desired mix of successional stages (e.g., 33% early, 33% mid, and 33% late), and • Seasonal restrictions for permitted/authorized activities as identified in Appendix D would be implemented for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Winter ranges, ▪ Calving/fawning habitats <p>Action PP-FW-1.1.3 – Big game movement and safety would be enhanced through fence modifications using approved BLM fence designs. (CA-FW-1.1.3)</p> <p>Action PP-FW-1.1.4 – Big game winter ranges would be wildland fire suppression and ES&R priority areas. (CA-FW-1.1.4)</p> <p>Action PP-FW-1.1.5 – During travel management planning reducing the number of designated routes/roads would be considered in big game habitats (calving/fawning areas, winter range) to avoid adverse impacts. (CA-FW-1.1.5)</p> <p>Action PP-FW-1.1.6 – The management of deer winter range in the Soda Springs Hills Management Area would be coordinated with various partners such as the Shoshone-Bannock Tribes, IDFG, Bonneville Power Authority (BPA), and Caribou County.(CA-FW-1.1.6)</p>

<p style="text-align: center;">Draft RMP/EIS Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Proposed RMP/Final EIS Alternative B (Proposed Plan)</p>
<p>FISH AND WILDLIFE (FW)</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Snow conditions, • Soil moisture, • Weather, • When young of the year birds have fledged occupied nests. <p>Action CA-FW-1.1.10 – Livestock grazing would be managed in big game winter range (Figure 3-5) to ensure sufficient shrub forage for wildlife utilizing such tools as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide 80% of annual growth for wildlife • Adjust season of use • Adjust kind of livestock • Adjust stocking rates. <p>Action CA-FW-1.1.11 – For the following big game summer/winter range areas (Figure 2-1), management guidance would be as follows to enhance and/or prevent the loss of habitat:</p> <p>Soda Spring Hills Management Area – (approximately 18,700 acres) (Big game winter range and sagebrush obligate species)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Native vegetation conditions (LHC-A) would be maintained or improved. ▪ Seasonal closures for motorized vehicles would be implemented. ▪ Snowmobiling would not be allowed. ▪ Designated routes for OHV use would be Idaho Ranch Canyon, 90 Percent Canyon, Swenson Canyon, Ridgeline Road, Doe Alley (Figure 2-2). ▪ Aspen regeneration (e.g., cutting/harvesting, prescribed fire) would be enhanced as appropriate. <p>Pleasantview Hills/Samaria Mountains – (approximately 101,100 acres) (Big game summer range)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Native vegetation conditions (LHC-A) would be maintained or improved. ▪ Aspen regeneration (e.g., cutting/harvesting, prescribed fire) would be enhanced as appropriate. <p>Blackrock Canyon – (approximately 10,700 acres) (Big game winter range)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Native vegetation conditions (LHC-A) would be maintained or improved. ▪ Seasonal closures for motorized and mechanized vehicles would be implemented. ▪ Designated routes for OHV use would be maintained. ▪ Private land in holdings would be acquired from willing sellers as appropriate. 	<p>Action PP-FW-1.1.7 – The introduction or re-introduction of species on public lands would be coordinated with IDFG and other agencies to benefit riparian recovery and amphibian/waterfowl/non-game habitat. (CA-FW-1.1.8)</p> <p>Action PP-FW-1.1.8 – Seasonal restrictions (Appendix D) for permitted/authorized activities (i.e., OHV and snowmobile usage, timber harvesting, fire and non-fire vegetation treatments, ROW development (energy and non-energy) and mineral exploration and energy exploration and development would be implemented as needed to mitigate impacts to wildlife habitat/activities (e.g., nesting, brood rearing, calving/fawning). The Authorized Officer may waive or adjust these restrictions when conditions warrant, such as but not limited to: (CA-FW-1.1.9)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Weather conditions, • Young of the year birds have fledged occupied nests, • Human health and safety <p>Action PP-FW-1.1.9 – Livestock grazing would be managed in big game winter range (Figure 3-5) to ensure sufficient shrub forage for wildlife utilizing such tools as: (CA-FW-1.1.10)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Providing 80% of annual shrub growth for wildlife; • Adjusting season of use; • Adjusting kind of livestock; and • Adjusting stocking rates. <p>Action PP-FW-1.1.10 – For the following big game summer/winter range areas (Figure 2-1), management guidance would be as follows to enhance and/or prevent the loss of habitat: (CA-FW-1.1.11)</p> <p>Soda Spring Hills Management Area – (approximately 18,700 acres) (Big game winter range and sagebrush obligate species)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Native vegetation conditions (LHC-A) would be maintained or improved. ▪ Seasonal closures for motorized vehicles would be implemented. ▪ Snowmobiling would not be allowed. ▪ Designated routes for OHV use would be Idaho Ranch Canyon, 90 Percent Canyon, Swenson Canyon, Ridgeline Road, Doe Alley (Figure 2-2). ▪ Aspen regeneration (e.g., cutting/harvesting, prescribed fire) would be enhanced as appropriate. <p>Pleasantview Hills/Samaria Mountains – (approximately 101,100 acres) (Big game summer range)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Native vegetation conditions (LHC-A) would be maintained or improved. ▪ Aspen regeneration (e.g., cutting/harvesting, prescribed fire) would be enhanced as appropriate. <p>Blackrock Canyon – (approximately 10,700 acres) (Big game winter range)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Native vegetation conditions (LHC-A) would be maintained or improved. ▪ Seasonal closures for motorized and mechanized vehicles would be implemented.

Draft RMP/EIS Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)	Proposed RMP/Final EIS Alternative B (Proposed Plan)
FISH AND WILDLIFE (FW)	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Designated routes for OHV use would be maintained. ▪ Consider acquiring private land in-holdings from willing sellers as opportunities arise.
Goal FW-2. Provide for the diversity of native and desired non-native species as part of an ecologically healthy system.	Goal FW-2. Provide for the diversity of native and desired non-native species as part of an ecologically healthy system. (FW-2)
Objective CA-FW- 2.1. Maintain or improve native and desired non-native species habitat and the connectivity among habitats.	Objective PP-FW- 2.1. Maintain or improve native and desired non-native species habitat and the connectivity among habitats. (CA-FW- 2.1)
<p>Action CA-FW-2.1.1 - Efforts to reintroduce or augment populations of native and/or historic species would be coordinated with IDFG.</p> <p>Action CA-FW-2.1.2 - The following snag retention guidelines would be implemented during forestry project implementation (forest management) to maintain adequate availability and distribution of snags.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Human safety would be considered and provided for in selecting the arrangement of retained snags and trees. • Snags with existing cavities or nests would be priority for retention. • Snag diameter breast height would be the equivalent of the largest class on site and would be retained in clusters where possible. • If site potential allows, would retain 5-7 snags per acre, preferably in a clumped configuration. • If possible, would retain at least 15 live trees per acre for future snag recruitment. Recruitment snags would not have to be structurally superior; live trees with forked and broken tops may be preferred. • Do not disturb or destroy active or inactive nests of raptors which are reused. <p>Action CA-FW-2.1.3 - Opportunities would be considered to improve habitat connectivity and reduce fragmentation through land actions (exchanges, acquisitions, and easements), partnerships, habitat improvement projects and wildland fire ES&R and restoration projects.</p>	<p>Action PP-FW-2.1.1 - Efforts to reintroduce or augment populations of native and/or historic species would be coordinated with IDFG. (CA-FW-2.1.1)</p> <p>Action PP-FW-2.1.2 - The following snag retention guidelines would be implemented during forestry project implementation (forest management) to maintain adequate availability and distribution of snags. (CA-FW-2.1.2)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Human safety would be considered and provided for in selecting the arrangement of retained snags and trees. • Snags with existing cavities or nests would be priority for retention. • Snag diameter breast height would be the equivalent of the largest class on site and would be retained in clusters where possible. • If site potential allows, would retain 5-7 snags per acre, preferably in a clumped configuration. • If possible, would retain at least 15 live trees per acre for future snag recruitment. Recruitment snags would not have to be structurally superior; live trees with forked and broken tops may be preferred. • Do not disturb or destroy active or inactive nests of raptors. <p>Action PP-FW-2.1.3 - Opportunities would be considered to improve habitat connectivity and reduce fragmentation of both upland and riparian habitats, through land actions (exchanges, acquisitions, and easements), partnerships, habitat improvement projects and wildland fire ES&R and restoration projects. (CA-FW-2.1.3)</p>
Draft RMP/EIS Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)	Proposed Plan/Final EIS Alternative B (Proposed Plan)
SPECIAL STATUS SPECIES (SS)	
Goal SS-1. Manage special status species and their habitats to provide for their continued presence and conservation as part of an ecologically healthy system.	Goal SS-1. Manage special status species and their habitats to provide for their continued presence and conservation as part of an ecologically healthy system. (SS-1)
Objective CA-SS-1.1. Conserve, inventory and monitor special status species.	Objective PP-SS-1.1. Conserve, inventory and monitor special status species. (CA-SS-1.1)
Action CA-SS-1.1.1- The USFWS would be consulted consistent with Endangered Species Act (ESA) requirements.	Action PP-SS-1.1.1- The USFWS would be consulted consistent with Endangered Species Act (ESA) requirements. (CA-SS-1.1.1)

<p align="center">Draft RMP/EIS Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)</p>	<p align="center">Proposed Plan/Final EIS Alternative B (Proposed Plan)</p>
<p align="center">SPECIAL STATUS SPECIES (SS)</p>	
<p>Action CA-SS-1.1.2 -The priorities for special status species conservation actions, inventory and monitoring based upon habitat risk, rarity, and endemism would be as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Federally Threatened, Endangered, Candidate, and Proposed Species (Type 1). 2) Rangewide/Globally Imperiled Species – High Endangerment possibility (Type 2). 3) Rangewide/Globally Imperiled Species – Moderate Endangerment: Species of Concern (Types 3 and 4). 	<p>Action PP-SS-1.1.2 -The priorities for special status species conservation actions, inventory and monitoring based upon habitat risk, rarity, and endemism would be as follows (CA-SS-1.1.2):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Federally Threatened, Endangered, Candidate, and Proposed Species (Type 1). 2) Rangewide/Globally Imperiled Species – High Endangerment possibility (Type 2). 3) Rangewide/Globally Imperiled Species – Moderate Endangerment: Species of Concern (Types 3 and 4).
<p>Action CA-SS-1.1.3 - Appropriate actions that contribute to the continued presence and conservation of SS species and which would not contribute to the listing of the species would be implemented.</p>	<p>Action-PP-SS-1.1.3 - On a case by case basis, appropriate actions (e.g., timing and spatial closures, habitat avoidance/restrictions, and agency specific guidance), conservation measures and guidelines that contribute to the continued presence and conservation of special status species would be considered to minimize the potential for the listing of species. Appropriate actions, conservation measures and guidelines that may be considered include, but are not limited to: (CA-SS-1.1.3/new)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conservation Plan for Greater Sage-grouse (IDFG 2006), • Guidelines for management of Columbian sharp-tailed grouse habitats (Geisen, KM and Connelly, JW., 1993), • Biology and Management of Ferruginous Hawks (Olendorff 1993), • Appendix C - Guidelines/Techniques/Practices, and • Appendix D – Seasonal Restrictions Identified for Wildlife Habitat Areas and Raptors.
<p>Objective CA-SS-1.2. Maintain or improve the quality of listed (threatened or endangered) species habitat by managing public land activities to support species recovery and the benefit of those species.</p>	<p>Objective PP-SS-1.2. Maintain or improve the quality of listed (threatened or endangered) species habitat by managing public land activities to support species recovery and the benefit of those species. (CA-SS-1.2) / (B-SS-1.1)</p>
<p>Action CA-SS-1.2.1 - Consistent with ESA requirements, the USFWS would be consulted regarding activities concerning Listed species.</p> <p>Action CA-SS-1.2.2 - Identified actions to maintain or improve the quality of Listed species habitat would be modified through the ESA consultation process.</p> <p>Action CA-SS-1.2.3 - Seasonal restrictions (Appendix D) would be implemented for Listed species.</p> <p>Action CA-SS-1.2.4 - For the following Listed species (Bald Eagle, Gray Wolf, Utah Valvata Snail), conservation measures would be implemented to support species recovery as identified below by resources and uses:</p> <p>BALD EAGLE: Common to All Resources and Uses</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) In cooperation with Idaho IDFG, USFWS, and others: 	<p>Action PP-SS-1.2.1 - Consistent with ESA requirements, the USFWS would be consulted regarding activities concerning Listed species. (CA-SS-1.2.1)</p> <p>Action PP-SS-1.2.2 - Identified actions to maintain or improve the quality of Listed species habitat would be modified through the ESA consultation process. (CA-SS-1.2.2)</p> <p>Action PP-SS-1.2.3 - Seasonal restrictions (Appendix D) would be implemented for Listed species. (CA-SS-1.2.3)</p> <p>Action PP-SS-1.2.4 - For the following Listed species (Bald Eagle¹, Gray Wolf, Utah Valvata Snail), conservation measures would be implemented to support species recovery as identified below by resources and uses (CA-SS-1.2.4):</p> <p>BALD EAGLE: Common to All Resources and Uses</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) In cooperation with Idaho IDFG, USFWS, and others:

¹ While the Bald eagle has been removed from the Endangered Species List as of June 28, 2007, it is addressed in this document under Special Status Species (fauna).

<p align="center">Draft RMP/EIS Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)</p>	<p align="center">Proposed Plan/Final EIS Alternative B (Proposed Plan)</p>
<p align="center">SPECIAL STATUS SPECIES (SS)</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continue to cooperate in determining the distribution of populations and suitable habitats. • Following current monitoring protocols continue to cooperate in conducting systematic nest surveys and monitoring. • Cooperate in the management of nest sites and communal roost sites to promote species recovery. • Cooperate in the maintenance and improvement of habitat in key foraging areas, for example, mule deer winter range, and aquatic and riparian habitat for fish and waterfowl, where a need exists. • Cooperate to maintain and develop nesting and roosting habitat for future use by bald eagles. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2) Ensure that ongoing Federal actions support or do not preclude species recovery. 3) Ensure that new Federal actions support or do not preclude species recovery. 4) Protect bald eagles from disturbance that might result in displacement during critical periods. 5) Implement adaptive management as needed to achieve conservation objectives. 6) Support conservation easements, cooperative management efforts, and other programs on adjacent non-Federal lands to support recovery of the bald eagle. 7) The following additional conservation measures would be implemented by respective resources and uses in addition to the six (6) conservation measures identified above: 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continue to cooperate in determining the distribution of populations and suitable habitats. • Following current monitoring protocols continue to cooperate in conducting systematic nest surveys and monitoring. • Cooperate in the management of nest sites and communal roost sites to promote species conservation. • Cooperate in the maintenance and improvement of habitat in key foraging areas, for example, mule deer winter range, and aquatic and riparian habitat for fish and waterfowl, where a need exists. • Cooperate to maintain and develop nesting and roosting habitat for future use by bald eagles. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2) Ensure that ongoing Federal actions support or do not preclude species conservation. 3) Ensure that new Federal actions support or do not preclude species conservation. 4) Protect bald eagles from disturbance that might result in displacement during critical periods. 5) Implement adaptive management as needed to achieve conservation objectives. 6) Support conservation easements, cooperative management efforts, and other programs on adjacent non-Federal lands to support conservation of the bald eagle. 7) The following additional conservation measures would be implemented by respective resources and uses in addition to the six (6) conservation measures identified above:
<p><u>Soil and Water (SW)</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Projects involving the application of pesticides (herbicides, insecticides, etc.) that may affect the species would be analyzed at the project level and designed such that pesticide applications would support conservation and recovery and minimize risks of exposure. 2) Where needed and feasible, coordinate with adjacent land owners and local governments regarding control of invasive plants in riparian areas through cooperative weed management programs. 3) Conserve mature riparian forests (i.e., cottonwood galleries) in suitable habitat to maintain their integrity for use as bald eagle nesting, roosting, or perching substrate. 	<p><u>Soil and Water (SW)</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Projects involving the application of pesticides (herbicides, insecticides, etc.) that may affect the species would be analyzed at the project level and designed such that pesticide applications would support conservation and minimize risks of exposure. 2) Where needed and feasible, coordinate with adjacent land owners and local governments regarding control of invasive plants in riparian areas through cooperative weed management programs. 3) Conserve mature riparian forests (i.e., cottonwood galleries) in suitable habitat to maintain their integrity for use as bald eagle nesting, roosting, or perching substrate.
<p><u>Vegetation (VE)</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Projects involving the application of pesticides (herbicides, insecticides, etc.) that may affect the species would be analyzed at the project level and designed such that pesticide applications would support conservation and recovery and minimize risks of exposure. 	<p><u>Vegetation (VE)</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Fire and non-fire vegetation treatment projects involving the application of pesticides, herbicides, insecticides, etc. that may affect the species would be analyzed at the project level and designed such that application of such would support conservation and minimize risks of exposure to the species.
<p><u>Forestry (FO)</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Projects involving the application of pesticides (herbicides, insecticides, etc.) that may affect the species would be analyzed at the project level and designed such that pesticide applications would support conservation and recovery and minimize risks of exposure. 2) Conserve mature upland forests in suitable habitat to maintain their integrity for use as bald eagle nesting, roosting, or perching substrate. 	<p><u>Forestry (FO)</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Projects involving the application of pesticides (herbicides, insecticides, etc.) that may affect the species would be analyzed at the project level and designed such that pesticide applications would support conservation and minimize risks of exposure. 2) Conserve mature upland forests in suitable habitat to maintain their integrity for use as bald eagle nesting, roosting, or perching substrate.

<p align="center">Draft RMP/EIS Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)</p>	<p align="center">Proposed Plan/Final EIS Alternative B (Proposed Plan)</p>
<p align="center">SPECIAL STATUS SPECIES (SS)</p>	
<p><u>Livestock Grazing (LG)</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Manage livestock grazing and trailing to promote nesting and roosting tree growth and recruitment, healthy riparian communities, or a combination of these objectives. Maintain and promote suitable habitat and restore areas for the bald eagle while implementing Idaho Standards for Rangeland Health and Guidelines. 2) Promote suitable habitat following wildland fire, or other major disturbances. 3) Maintain regular compliance checks on grazing allotments with nest sites and communal roost sites to identify problems as soon as possible and take immediate corrective measures. 4) Manage livestock facilities to promote nesting and roosting tree growth and recruitment, healthy riparian communities, or a combination of these objectives. Maintain and promote suitable habitat and restore areas for the bald eagle while implementing Idaho Standards for Rangeland Health and Guidelines. <p><u>Recreation (RE)</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Developed facilities (boat access, paved campgrounds, vault toilets, interpretive kiosks, etc.): Manage existing and new recreation facilities so as to not preclude species habitat conservation and recovery. This includes management of the physical facilities, as well as disturbances to the species resulting from human uses. 2) Dispersed use areas (informal areas, including camping areas and tie-up areas for pack animals and boats): Manage dispersed use sites so as not to preclude species habitat conservation and recovery. This includes limiting disturbances to the species resulting from human uses. 3) Commercial and noncommercial recreation permits, including outfitter camps: Issue commercial and noncommercial recreation permits so as not to preclude species habitat conservation and recovery. This includes management of physical facilities (such as camps), as well as disturbances to the species resulting from human uses. 4) Coordinate with the IDFG to educate recreation users at boat ramps and at designated camp areas about the need to conserve bald eagle habitat. 5) Manage roads, OHV routes and areas, as well as non-motorized trails, so as not to preclude species habitat conservation and recovery. This includes management of physical facilities, as well as disturbances to the species resulting from human uses. 6) Maintain regular compliance checks on OHV closures to protect suitable habitat and to identify problems as soon as possible and take immediate corrective measures. <p><u>Wildland Fire Management (WF)</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Human life and firefighter safety and property take priority over species protection. 2) Fire suppression efforts would be conducted, as possible, to protect bald eagle habitat. Place a high priority on protecting suitable habitat. 3) Coordinate with US Department of Agriculture, National Forest Service (Forest Service), Idaho Department of Lands (IDL), or other applicable agency personnel regarding fire suppression activities in or near nest sites and communal roost areas. 4) Implement ES&R activities following wildland fire to promote bald eagle habitat. 	<p><u>Livestock Grazing (LG)</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Manage livestock grazing and trailing to promote nesting and roosting tree growth and recruitment, healthy riparian communities, or a combination of these objectives. Maintain and promote suitable habitat and restore areas for the bald eagle while implementing Idaho Standards for Rangeland Health and Guidelines. 2) Promote suitable habitat following wildland fire, or other major disturbances. 3) Maintain regular compliance checks on grazing allotments with nest sites and communal roost sites to identify problems as soon as possible and take immediate corrective measures. 4) Manage livestock facilities to promote nesting and roosting tree growth and recruitment, healthy riparian communities, or a combination of these objectives. Maintain and promote suitable habitat and restore areas for the bald eagle while implementing Idaho Standards for Rangeland Health and Guidelines. <p><u>Recreation (RE)</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Developed facilities (boat access, paved campgrounds, vault toilets, interpretive kiosks, etc.): Manage existing and new recreation facilities so as to not preclude species habitat conservation. This includes management of the physical facilities, as well as disturbances to the species resulting from human uses. 2) Dispersed use areas (informal areas, including camping areas and tie-up areas for pack animals and boats): Manage dispersed use sites so as not to preclude species habitat conservation. This includes limiting disturbances to the species resulting from human uses. 3) Commercial and noncommercial recreation permits, including outfitter camps: Issue commercial and noncommercial recreation permits so as not to preclude species habitat conservation. This includes management of physical facilities (such as camps), as well as disturbances to the species resulting from human uses. 4) Coordinate with the IDFG to educate recreation users at boat ramps and at designated camp areas about the need to conserve bald eagle habitat. 5) Manage roads, OHV routes and areas, as well as non-motorized trails, so as not to preclude species habitat conservation. This includes management of physical facilities, as well as disturbances to the species resulting from human uses. 6) Maintain regular compliance checks on OHV closures to protect suitable habitat and to identify problems as soon as possible and take immediate corrective measures. <p><u>Wildland Fire Management (WF)</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Human life and firefighter safety and property take priority over species protection. 2) Fire suppression efforts including fire for resource benefit and/or the AMR, ranging from suppression to monitoring, would be considered to protect bald eagle habitat. Protecting suitable habitat for bald eagles would be a high priority. 3) Coordinate with US Department of Agriculture, National Forest Service (Forest Service), Idaho Department of Lands (IDL), or other applicable agency personnel regarding fire suppression activities in or near nest sites and communal roost areas. 4) Implement activities following wildland fire to promote bald eagle habitat.

<p align="center">Draft RMP/EIS Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)</p>	<p align="center">Proposed Plan/Final EIS Alternative B (Proposed Plan)</p>
<p align="center">SPECIAL STATUS SPECIES (SS)</p>	
<p>5) ES&R projects involving the application of pesticides (herbicides, insecticides, etc.) that may affect the species would be analyzed at the project level and designed such that pesticide applications would support conservation and recovery and minimize risks of exposure.</p> <p>6) WFU projects (where allowed) would be designed to conserve suitable bald eagle habitat.</p> <p>7) Prescribed fire projects would be designed to conserve suitable bald eagle habitat.</p> <p>8) Promote establishment of plant species needed to achieve suitable bald eagle habitat.</p>	<p>5) ES&R projects involving the application of pesticides (herbicides, insecticides, etc.) that may affect the species would be analyzed at the project level and designed such that pesticide applications would support conservation and minimize risks of exposure.</p> <p>6) Prescribed fire projects would be designed to conserve suitable bald eagle habitat.</p> <p>7) Promote establishment of plant species needed to achieve suitable bald eagle habitat.</p>
<p><u>Lands and Realty (LR)</u></p> <p>1) Where feasible and funding is available, acquire through land exchange or purchase private lands in suitable habitat areas that could enhance habitat for bald eagles.</p> <p>2) Retain bald eagle habitat in Federal ownership to the extent possible, while balancing other needs.</p> <p>3) Issue new land use permits and leases and review existing permits and leases at renewal so as not to preclude species habitat conservation and recovery. This includes management of physical facilities, as well as disturbances to the species resulting from human uses.</p> <p>4) Review existing ROWs at renewal time and issue new ROWs so as not to preclude species habitat conservation and recovery. This includes management of physical facilities, as well as disturbances to the species resulting from human uses.</p>	<p><u>Lands and Realty (LR)</u></p> <p>1) Where feasible and funding is available, acquire through land exchange or purchase private lands in suitable habitat areas that could enhance habitat for bald eagles.</p> <p>2) Retain bald eagle habitat in Federal ownership to the extent possible, while balancing other needs.</p> <p>3) Issue new land use permits and leases and review existing permits and leases at renewal so as not to preclude species habitat conservation. This includes management of physical facilities, as well as disturbances to the species resulting from human uses.</p> <p>4) Review existing ROWs at renewal time and issue new ROWs so as not to preclude species habitat conservation. This includes management of physical facilities, as well as disturbances to the species resulting from human uses.</p>
<p><u>Minerals and Energy (ME)</u></p> <p>1) Approve plans of operations (POs) or allow notice level operations so as not to preclude species habitat conservation and recovery. This includes management of physical facilities, as well as disturbances to the species resulting from human uses.</p> <p>2) Approve development of saleable or leasable minerals so as not to preclude species habitat conservation and recovery. This includes management of physical facilities, as well as disturbances to the species resulting from human uses.</p>	<p><u>Minerals and Energy (ME)</u></p> <p>1) Approve plans of operations (POs) or allow notice level operations so as not to preclude species habitat conservation. This includes management of physical facilities, as well as disturbances to the species resulting from human uses.</p> <p>2) Approve development of saleable or leasable minerals so as not to preclude species habitat conservation. This includes management of physical facilities, as well as disturbances to the species resulting from human uses.</p>
<p><u>GRAY WOLF:</u></p>	<p><u>GRAY WOLF²:</u></p>
<p><u>Common to All Resources and Uses</u></p> <p>1. In cooperation with IDFG, USFWS, and others:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Determine the distribution of wolves and key gray wolf habitat areas (dens, rendezvous sites, and crucial big game winter ranges). • Cooperate in maintaining and improving gray wolf habitat by focusing on reducing human/wolf interactions and improving big game winter range. <p>2. Ensure that ongoing Federal actions support or do not preclude species recovery.</p> <p>3. Ensure that new Federal actions support or do not preclude species recovery.</p> <p>4. Protect gray wolves from disturbance that might result in displacement during critical periods.</p>	<p><u>Common to All Resources and Uses</u></p> <p>1. In cooperation with IDFG, USFWS, and others:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Determine the distribution of wolves and key gray wolf habitat areas (dens, rendezvous sites, and crucial big game winter ranges). • Cooperate in maintaining and improving gray wolf habitat by focusing on reducing human/wolf interactions and improving big game winter range. <p>2. Ensure that ongoing Federal actions support or do not preclude species recovery.</p> <p>3. Ensure that new Federal actions support or do not preclude species recovery.</p> <p>4. Protect gray wolves from disturbance that might result in displacement during critical periods.</p> <p>5. Support conservation easements, cooperative management efforts, and other programs on adjacent non-Federal lands to support recovery of the gray wolf.</p>

² As the gray wolf status is currently endangered (non-essential experimental population [USFWS 2008]) plan direction would not change in the future with a change in status of the gray wolf.

<p align="center">Draft RMP/EIS Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)</p>	<p align="center">Proposed Plan/Final EIS Alternative B (Proposed Plan)</p>
<p align="center">SPECIAL STATUS SPECIES (SS)</p>	
<p>5. Support conservation easements, cooperative management efforts, and other programs on adjacent non-Federal lands to support recovery of the gray wolf.</p> <p>6. The following additional conservation measures would be implemented by respective resources and uses in addition to the five (5) conservation measures identified above:</p> <p>Forestry (FO)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Projects involving the application of pesticides (herbicides, insecticides, etc.) in forested areas and woodlands that may affect the species would be analyzed at the project level and designed such that pesticide applications would support conservation and recovery and minimize risks of exposure. Implement forest management actions that maintain the integrity of gray wolf habitat. <p>Fish and Wildlife (FW)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Coordinate with IDFG to improve big game winter range conditions. <p>Recreation (RE)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Developed facilities (boat access, paved campgrounds, vault toilets, interpretive kiosks, etc.): Manage existing and new recreation facilities so as not to preclude species habitat conservation and recovery. This includes management of the physical facilities, as well as disturbances to the species resulting from human uses. Dispersed use areas (informal areas, including camping areas and tie-up areas for pack animals and boats): Manage dispersed use sites so as not to preclude species habitat conservation and recovery. This includes limiting disturbances to the species resulting from human uses. Commercial and noncommercial recreation permits, including outfitter camps: Issue commercial and noncommercial recreation permits so as not to preclude species habitat conservation and recovery. This includes management of physical facilities (such as camps), as well as disturbances to the species resulting from human uses. Manage roads, OHV routes and areas, as well as non-motorized trails, so as not to preclude species habitat conservation and recovery. This includes management of physical facilities, as well as disturbances to the species resulting from human uses. Manage recreational travel towards reducing human/gray wolf interactions within and adjacent to key habitat areas to promote gray wolf recovery. Maintain regular compliance checks on road and OHV closures to protect key gray wolf habitat areas and to identify problems as soon as possible and take immediate corrective measures. <p>Wildland Fire Management (WF)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> As possible fire suppression efforts would be conducted to protect gray wolf habitat, placing a high priority on enhancing key gray wolf habitat areas. Coordinate with Forest Service, IDL, or other applicable agency personnel regarding fire suppression activities in or near key gray wolf habitat areas. ES&R projects involving the application of pesticides (herbicides, insecticides, etc.) that may affect the species would be analyzed at the project level and designed such 	<p>6. The following additional conservation measures would be implemented by respective resources and uses in addition to the five (5) conservation measures identified above:</p> <p>Forestry (FO)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Projects involving the application of pesticides (herbicides, insecticides, etc.) in forested areas and woodlands that may affect the species would be analyzed at the project level and designed such that pesticide applications would support conservation and recovery and minimize risks of exposure. Implement forest management actions that maintain the integrity of gray wolf habitat. <p>Fish and Wildlife (FW)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Coordinate with IDFG to improve big game winter range conditions. <p>Recreation (RE)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Developed facilities (boat access, paved campgrounds, vault toilets, interpretive kiosks, etc.): Manage existing and new recreation facilities so as not to preclude species habitat conservation and recovery. This includes management of the physical facilities, as well as disturbances to the species resulting from human uses. Dispersed use areas (informal areas, including camping areas and tie-up areas for pack animals and boats): Manage dispersed use sites so as not to preclude species habitat conservation and recovery. This includes limiting disturbances to the species resulting from human uses. Commercial and noncommercial recreation permits, including outfitter camps: Issue commercial and noncommercial recreation permits so as not to preclude species habitat conservation and recovery. This includes management of physical facilities (such as camps), as well as disturbances to the species resulting from human uses. Manage roads, OHV routes and areas, as well as non-motorized trails, so as not to preclude species habitat conservation and recovery. This includes management of physical facilities, as well as disturbances to the species resulting from human uses. Manage recreational travel towards reducing human/gray wolf interactions within and adjacent to key habitat areas to promote gray wolf recovery. Maintain regular compliance checks on road and OHV closures to protect key gray wolf habitat areas and to identify problems as soon as possible and take immediate corrective measures. <p>Wildland Fire Management (WF)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Human life and firefighter safety and property take priority over species protection. Fire suppression efforts, including fire for resource benefit, would be considered to protect gray wolf habitat. Enhancing gray wolf habitat areas would be a high priority. Coordinate with Forest Service, IDL, or other applicable agency personnel regarding fire suppression activities in or near key gray wolf habitat areas. ES&R projects involving the application of pesticides (e.g., herbicides, insecticides, etc.) that may affect the species would be analyzed at the project level and designed such that pesticide applications would support conservation and recovery and

<p align="center">Draft RMP/EIS Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)</p>	<p align="center">Proposed Plan/Final EIS Alternative B (Proposed Plan)</p>
<p align="center">SPECIAL STATUS SPECIES (SS)</p>	
<p>that pesticide applications would support conservation and recovery and minimize risks of exposure.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> ES&R projects involving the application of pesticides would be analyzed and implemented in accordance with the approach described above in the Soil and Water (SW) section. Where opportunities exist, prescribed fire projects would be designed to conserve and enhance gray wolf habitat. Where opportunities exist, non-fire fuels management projects would be designed to conserve and enhance gray wolf habitat. <p><u>Lands and Realty (LR)</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Where feasible and funding is available, acquire through land exchange or purchase private lands in or adjacent to key gray wolf habitat areas that could enhance habitat value for gray wolves. Retain key gray wolf habitat areas in Federal ownership to the extent possible, while balancing other needs. Issue new land use permits and leases so as not to preclude species habitat conservation and recovery. This includes management of physical facilities, as well as disturbances to the species resulting from human uses. Issue ROWs so as not to preclude species habitat conservation and recovery. This includes management of physical facilities, as well as disturbances to the species resulting from human uses. <p><u>Minerals and Energy (ME)</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Approve POs or allow notice level operations so as not to preclude species habitat conservation and recovery. This includes management of physical facilities, as well as disturbances to the species resulting from human uses. Approve development of saleable or leasable minerals so as not to preclude species habitat conservation and recovery. This includes management of physical facilities, as well as disturbances to the species resulting from human uses. <p><u>UTAH VALVATA SNAIL:</u></p> <p><u>Common to All Resources and Uses</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> In cooperation with IDFG, USFWS, US Bureau of Reclamation (BOR), hydroelectric power companies, and others: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cooperate in gathering existing information to understand the distribution of known populations, and contribute new information as opportunities arise. Ensure that ongoing Federal actions support or do not preclude species recovery. Ensure that new Federal actions support or do not preclude species recovery. Implement adaptive management as needed to achieve conservation objectives. Support conservation easements, cooperative management efforts, and other programs on adjacent non-Federal lands to support recovery of the Snake River snails. The following additional conservation measures would be implemented by respective 	<p>minimize risks of exposure.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> ES&R projects involving the application of pesticides would be analyzed and implemented in accordance with the approach described above in the Soil and Water (SW) section. Prescribed fire and non-fire fuels management projects would be designed to conserve and enhance gray wolf habitat. <p><u>Lands and Realty (LR)</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Where feasible and funding is available, acquire through land exchange or purchase private lands in or adjacent to key gray wolf habitat areas that could enhance habitat value for gray wolves. Retain key gray wolf habitat areas in Federal ownership to the extent possible, while balancing other needs. Issue new land use permits and leases so as not to preclude species habitat conservation and recovery. This includes management of physical facilities, as well as disturbances to the species resulting from human uses. Issue ROWs so as not to preclude species habitat conservation and recovery. This includes management of physical facilities, as well as disturbances to the species resulting from human uses. <p><u>Minerals and Energy (ME)</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Approve POs or allow notice level operations so as not to preclude species habitat conservation and recovery. This includes management of physical facilities, as well as disturbances to the species resulting from human uses. Approve development of saleable or leasable minerals so as not to preclude species habitat conservation and recovery. This includes management of physical facilities, as well as disturbances to the species resulting from human uses. <p><u>UTAH VALVATA SNAIL:</u></p> <p><u>Common to All Resources and Uses</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> In cooperation with IDFG, USFWS, US Bureau of Reclamation (BOR), hydroelectric power companies, and others: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cooperate in gathering existing information to understand the distribution of known populations, and contribute new information as opportunities arise. Ensure that ongoing Federal actions support or do not preclude species recovery. Ensure that new Federal actions support or do not preclude species recovery. Implement adaptive management as needed to achieve conservation objectives. Support conservation easements, cooperative management efforts, and other programs on adjacent non-Federal lands to support recovery of the Snake River snails. The following additional conservation measures would be implemented by respective resources and uses in addition to the five (5) conservation measures identified above:

<p align="center">Draft RMP/EIS Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)</p>	<p align="center">Proposed Plan/Final EIS Alternative B (Proposed Plan)</p>
<p align="center">SPECIAL STATUS SPECIES (SS)</p>	
<p>resources and uses in addition to the five (5) conservation measures identified above:</p>	
<p><u>Soil and Water (SW)</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Projects involving the application of pesticides (herbicides, insecticides, etc.) that may affect the species would be analyzed at the project level and designed such that pesticide applications would support conservation and recovery and minimize risks of exposure. 2) Where needed and feasible, coordinate with adjacent landowners and local governments regarding control of invasive plants in riparian areas through cooperative weed management programs. 3) Where needed, improve watershed conditions adjacent to suitable habitat to prevent soil erosion and negative water quality impacts. Conserve riparian vegetation near suitable habitat to minimize potential for erosion and sediment delivery to springs. <p><u>Vegetation (VE)</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Projects involving the application of pesticides (herbicides, insecticides, etc.) that may affect the species would be analyzed at the project level and designed such that pesticide applications would support conservation and recovery and minimize risks of exposure. 2) Manage upland areas to minimize sediment delivery into suitable habitat. <p><u>Grazing (LG)</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Manage livestock grazing and trailing adjacent to suitable Snake River snails' habitat to promote healthy watershed conditions while implementing Idaho Standards for Rangeland Health. 2) Promote restoration of areas adjacent to suitable habitat following fire, fire rehabilitation, restoration treatments, or other major disturbances. 3) Maintain regular compliance checks on grazing allotments adjacent to suitable habitat to identify problems as soon as possible and take immediate corrective measures. 4) Manage livestock facilities to promote healthy riparian communities or to prevent erosion, or a combination of these objectives, while implementing Idaho Standards for Rangeland Health. 5) Protect springs in or adjacent to suitable habitat to conserve and recover Snake River snails' habitat. <p><u>Recreation (RE)</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Developed facilities (boat access, paved campgrounds, vault toilets, interpretive kiosks, etc.): Manage existing and new recreation facilities so as not to preclude species habitat conservation and recovery. This includes management of the physical facilities, as well as disturbances to the species resulting from human uses. 2) Dispersed use areas (informal areas, including camping areas, spring access, and tie-up areas for pack animals and boats): Manage dispersed use sites so as not to preclude species habitat conservation and recovery. This includes limiting 	<p><u>Soil and Water (SW)</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Projects involving the application of pesticides (herbicides, insecticides, etc.) that may affect the species would be analyzed at the project level and designed such that pesticide applications would support conservation and recovery and minimize risks of exposure. 2) Where needed and feasible, coordinate with adjacent landowners and local governments regarding control of invasive plants in riparian areas through cooperative weed management programs. 3) Where needed, improve watershed conditions adjacent to suitable habitat to prevent soil erosion and negative water quality impacts. Conserve riparian vegetation near suitable habitat to minimize potential for erosion and sediment delivery to springs. <p><u>Vegetation (VE)</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Projects involving the application of pesticides (herbicides, insecticides, etc.) that may affect the species would be analyzed at the project level and designed such that pesticide applications would support conservation and recovery and minimize risks of exposure. 2) Manage upland areas to minimize sediment delivery into suitable habitat. <p><u>Grazing (LG)</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Manage livestock grazing and trailing adjacent to suitable Snake River snails' habitat to promote healthy watershed conditions while implementing Idaho Standards for Rangeland Health. 2) Promote restoration of areas adjacent to suitable habitat following fire, fire rehabilitation, restoration treatments, or other major disturbances. 3) Maintain regular compliance checks on grazing allotments adjacent to suitable habitat to identify problems as soon as possible and take immediate corrective measures. 4) Manage livestock facilities to promote healthy riparian communities or to prevent erosion, or a combination of these objectives, while implementing Idaho Standards for Rangeland Health. 5) Protect springs in or adjacent to suitable habitat to conserve and recover Snake River snails' habitat. <p><u>Recreation (RE)</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Developed facilities (boat access, paved campgrounds, vault toilets, interpretive kiosks, etc.): Manage existing and new recreation facilities so as not to preclude species habitat conservation and recovery. This includes management of the physical facilities, as well as disturbances to the species resulting from human uses. 2) Dispersed use areas (informal areas, including camping areas, spring access, and tie-up areas for pack animals and boats): Manage dispersed use sites so as not to preclude species habitat conservation and recovery. This includes limiting

<p align="center">Draft RMP/EIS Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)</p>	<p align="center">Proposed Plan/Final EIS Alternative B (Proposed Plan)</p>
<p align="center">SPECIAL STATUS SPECIES (SS)</p>	
<p>disturbances to the species resulting from human uses.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3) Commercial and noncommercial recreation permits, including outfitter camps: Issue commercial and noncommercial recreation permits so as not to preclude species habitat conservation and recovery. This includes management of physical facilities (such as camps), as well as disturbances to the species resulting from human uses. 4) Protect springs with known populations to conserve Snake River snails' habitat. 5) Educate the public on the Snake River snails' unique ecological requirements, sensitivity to habitat alteration, and need for habitat protection. 6) Manage roads, OHV routes and areas, and non-motorized trails, so as to not preclude species habitat conservation and recovery. This includes management of physical facilities, as well as disturbances to the species resulting from human uses. 7) Maintain regular compliance checks on OHV closures to protect known populations and to identify problems as soon as possible and take immediate corrective measures. <p><u>Wildland Fire Management (WF)</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Fire suppression efforts would be conducted, as possible, to protect Snake River snails habitat. Place a high priority on protecting highly erosive areas adjacent to suitable habitat from wildfire. 2) Coordinate with Forest Service, IDL, or other applicable agency personnel regarding fire suppression activities in or near suitable habitat. 3) Implement ES&R activities to promote restoration of areas adjacent to suitable Snake River snails' habitat. 4) Fire rehabilitation projects involving the application of pesticides would be analyzed and implemented in accordance with the approach described above in the Soil and Water (SW) section. 5) WFU projects (where allowed) would be designed to conserve suitable Snake River snails habitat. 6) Prescribed fire projects would be designed to conserve suitable Snake River snails' habitat. 7) Promote establishment of plant species needed to control erosion adjacent to suitable habitat. <p><u>Lands and Realty (LR)</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Where feasible and funding is available, acquire through land exchange or purchase private lands that support known populations or could enhance habitat for Snake River snails. 2) Retain Snake River riparian habitat in Federal ownership to the extent possible, while balancing other needs. 3) Issue new land use permits and leases and review existing permits and leases at renewal so as not to preclude species habitat conservation and recovery. This includes management of physical facilities, as well as disturbances to the species resulting from human uses. 4) Protect the watershed contributing to Snake River snails' habitat. 	<p>disturbances to the species resulting from human uses.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3) Commercial and noncommercial recreation permits, including outfitter camps: Issue commercial and noncommercial recreation permits so as not to preclude species habitat conservation and recovery. This includes management of physical facilities (such as camps), as well as disturbances to the species resulting from human uses. 4) Protect springs with known populations to conserve Snake River snails' habitat. 5) Educate the public on the Snake River snails' unique ecological requirements, sensitivity to habitat alteration, and need for habitat protection. 6) Manage roads, OHV routes and areas, and non-motorized trails, so as to not preclude species habitat conservation and recovery. This includes management of physical facilities, as well as disturbances to the species resulting from human uses. 7) Maintain regular compliance checks on OHV closures to protect known populations and to identify problems as soon as possible and take immediate corrective measures. <p><u>Wildland Fire Management (WF)</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Human life and firefighter safety and property take priority over species protection. 2) Fire suppression efforts would be conducted, as possible, to protect Snake River snails habitat. Protecting highly erosive areas adjacent to suitable habitat from wildfire would be a high priority. 3) Coordinate with Forest Service, IDL, or other applicable agency personnel regarding fire suppression activities in or near suitable habitat. 4) Implement ES&R activities to promote restoration of areas adjacent to suitable Snake River snails' habitat. 5) Fire rehabilitation projects involving the application of pesticides would be analyzed and implemented in accordance with the approach described above in the Soil and Water (SW) section. 6) WFU projects (where allowed) would be designed to conserve suitable Snake River snails habitat. 7) Prescribed fire projects would be designed to conserve suitable Snake River snails' habitat. 8) Promote establishment of plant species needed to control erosion adjacent to suitable habitat. <p><u>Lands and Realty (LR)</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Where feasible and funding is available, acquire through land exchange or purchase private lands that support known populations or could enhance habitat for Snake River snails. 2) Retain Snake River riparian habitat in Federal ownership to the extent possible, while balancing other needs. 3) Issue new land use permits and leases and review existing permits and leases at renewal so as not to preclude species habitat conservation and recovery. This includes management of physical facilities, as well as disturbances to the species resulting from human uses.

<p align="center">Draft RMP/EIS Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)</p>	<p align="center">Proposed Plan/Final EIS Alternative B (Proposed Plan)</p>
<p align="center">SPECIAL STATUS SPECIES (SS)</p>	
<p>5) Issue new ROWs and review existing ROWs at renewal so as not to preclude species habitat conservation and recovery. This includes management of physical facilities, as well as disturbances to the species resulting from human uses.</p> <p>Minerals and Energy (ME)</p> <p>1) Approve POs or allow notice level operations so as not to preclude species habitat conservation and recovery. This includes management of physical facilities, as well as disturbances to the species resulting from human uses.</p> <p>2) Approve development of saleable or leasable minerals so as not to preclude species habitat conservation and recovery. This includes management of physical facilities, as well as disturbances to the species resulting from human uses.</p> <p>3) Protect the watershed contributing to Snake River snail habitat.</p>	<p>4) Protect the watershed contributing to Snake River snails' habitat.</p> <p>5) Issue new ROWs and review existing ROWs at renewal so as not to preclude species habitat conservation and recovery. This includes management of physical facilities, as well as disturbances to the species resulting from human uses.</p> <p>Minerals and Energy (ME)</p> <p>1) Approve POs or allow notice level operations so as not to preclude species habitat conservation and recovery. This includes management of physical facilities, as well as disturbances to the species resulting from human uses.</p> <p>2) Approve development of saleable or leasable minerals so as not to preclude species habitat conservation and recovery. This includes management of physical facilities, as well as disturbances to the species resulting from human uses.</p> <p>3) Protect the watershed contributing to Snake River snail habitat.</p>
<p>Management Actions reorganized, but retained in their entirety, for Proposed RMP.</p>	<p>Action PP-SS-1.2.5 - The following guidelines would be implemented to maintain and protect nesting and roosting sites for bald eagles as adapted from the Greater Yellowstone Bald Eagle Management Plan (Wyoming Game and Fish Department 1996): (B-SS-1.1.1)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New permitted activities which would cause disturbance within the vicinity of occupied nests and primary use areas (Zones I and II) would not be allowed from February 1 to August 15, or winter roosting trees from December 1 to March 1. • New structures, such as powerlines and wind turbines, would be designed to minimize the potential to cause direct mortality to eagles. Existing lines posing potential problems would be modified to minimize collision or electrocution upon renewal of the ROW. • Mature trees would be maintained and recruited for suitable nesting, perching and roosting sites. • Within the 2.5-mile home range (Zone III) follow management direction to maintain adequate foraging conditions and aid in maintaining the integrity of Zones I and II. • Proposed projects would be stipulated to prevent loss of prey. • Maintain trees and snags for perching and visual screening (interrupt the line of sight between the perched eagle and human activity) • Within the home range of nesting eagles to avoid indirect impacts, pesticides/herbicides would be used in accordance with label instructions. <p>Action PP-SS-1.2.6 - Gray wolf habitat (e.g., reproductive, rearing) would be conserved/managed in the following manner by: (B-SS-1.1.2)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Analyzing habitat characteristics of public lands adjacent to the Caribou NF in conjunction with the planned Caribou National Forest evaluation to determine if suitable wolf habitat exists. • Activities on public lands within the Yellowstone Nonessential Experimental Population Area (east of I-15) or the Central Idaho Nonessential Experimental Population Area (west of I-15) which would disturb within one mile of active gray

<p align="center">Draft RMP/EIS Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)</p>	<p align="center">Proposed Plan/Final EIS Alternative B (Proposed Plan)</p>
<p align="center">SPECIAL STATUS SPECIES (SS)</p>	
	<p>wolf den sites and rendezvous sites between April 1 and June 30 when five or fewer breeding pairs are present would not be allowed. (USFWS 1994a and 1994b).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Coordinate habitat management with IDFG. <p>Action PP-SS-1.2.7 - Quality shoreline habitats would be maintained on all public lands adjacent to the Snake River used by Utah valvata snail. No shore-disturbing activities would be allowed if found to be detrimental to snail populations. (B-SS-1.1.3)</p>
<p>Objective CA-SS-1.3. Maintain or improve the quality of sensitive species habitat by managing public land activities to benefit those species.</p>	<p>Objective PP-SS-1.3. Maintain or improve the quality of sensitive species habitat by managing public land activities to support species recovery and the benefit those species. (CA-SS-1.3)/(B-SS-1.2)</p>
<p>Action CA-SS-1.3.1 - Public land activities would be managed to minimize the likelihood of sensitive species being listed as threatened or endangered under the ESA.</p> <p>Action CA-SS-1.3.2 - Sensitive bat species habitat (e.g., caves, underground mine openings) would be protected by gating or restricting human access.</p>	<p>Action PP-SS-1.3.1 - Public land activities would be managed to minimize the likelihood of sensitive species being listed as threatened or endangered under the ESA. (CA-SS-1.3.1)</p> <p>Action PP-SS-1.3.2 - Sensitive species habitat on BLM-administered public lands would be managed in coordination with IDFG to maintain a balance between habitat requirements and species populations (new).</p> <p>Action PP-SS-1.3.3 - Sensitive bat species habitat (e.g., caves, underground mine openings) would be protected by gating or restricting human access. (CA-SS-1.3.2)</p>
<p>Objective B-SS-1.1. Maintain or improve the quality of listed (threatened or endangered) species habitat by managing public land activities to benefit those species.</p>	<p>Objective CA-SS-1.2 and Objective B-SS-1.1 rewritten as Objective PP-SS-1.2 (above).</p>
<p>Action B-SS-1.1.1 - The following guidelines would be implemented to maintain and protect nesting and roosting sites for bald eagles as adapted from the Greater Yellowstone Bald Eagle Management Plan (Wyoming Game and Fish Department 1996):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New permitted activities which would cause disturbance within the vicinity of occupied nests and primary use areas (Zones I and II) would not be allowed from February 1 to August 15, or winter roosting trees from December 1 to March 1. • New structures, such as powerlines and wind turbines, would be designed to minimize the potential to cause direct mortality to eagles. Existing lines posing potential problems would be modified to minimize collision or electrocution upon renewal of the ROW. • Mature trees would be maintained and recruited for suitable nesting, perching and roosting sites. • Within the 2.5-mile home range (Zone III) follow management direction to maintain adequate foraging conditions and aid in maintaining the integrity of Zones I and II. • Stipulate that proposed projects would not lower prey availability. • Maintain trees and snags for perching and visual screening (interrupt the line of sight between the perched eagle and human activity) 	<p>Management Actions reorganized, but retained in their entirety, for Proposed RMP.</p>

<p align="center">Draft RMP/EIS Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)</p>	<p align="center">Proposed Plan/Final EIS Alternative B (Proposed Plan)</p>
<p align="center">SPECIAL STATUS SPECIES (SS)</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Within the home range of nesting eagles to avoid indirect impacts, pesticides/herbicides would be used in accordance with label instructions. <p>Action B-SS-1.1.2 - Gray wolf habitat (e.g., reproductive, rearing) would be conserved/managed in the following manner by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Analyzing habitat characteristics of public lands adjacent to the Caribou NF in conjunction with the planned Caribou National Forest evaluation to determine if suitable wolf habitat exists. • Activities on public lands within the Yellowstone Nonessential Experimental Population Area (east of I-15) or the Central Idaho Nonessential Experimental Population Area (west of I-15) which would disturb within one mile of active gray wolf den sites and rendezvous sites between April 1 and June 30 when five or fewer breeding pairs are present would not be allowed. (USFWS 1994a and 1994b). • If and when wolves are de-listed coordinate habitat management with IDFG. <p>Action B-SS-1.1.3 - Quality shoreline habitats would be maintained on all public lands adjacent to the Snake River used by Utah valvata snail. No shore-disturbing activities would be allowed if found to be detrimental to snail populations.</p>	
<p>Objective B-SS-1.2. Maintain or improve the quality of sensitive species habitat by managing public land activities to benefit those species.</p>	<p>Objective CA-SS-1.3 and Objective B-SS-1.2 rewritten as Objective PP-SS-1.3 (above).</p>
<p><u>FAUNA ONLY:</u></p> <p>Action B-SS-1.2.1 - On-going efforts to locate populations of pygmy rabbits would be supported.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Survey all potential habitats within the next five years. • When populations are located, manage sagebrush habitats for suitable pygmy rabbit conditions. • Suitable and potential pygmy rabbit habitat should be managed to allow for the expansion of populations into areas where they might not be currently found. <p>Action B-SS-1.2.2 - Populations of boreal toads and Northern leopard frogs would be identified and inventoried and where populations are located, permitted activities would be managed to maintain quality frog and or toad habitat by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Managing riparian areas to make progress towards or achieving PFC. • Increasing pool habitat based upon site potential. • Mitigating or adjusting activities having adverse effects on boreal toad and Northern leopard frog habitats. • Managing Lane and Lander Creeks as priority areas for boreal toad and Northern leopard frog habitat. <p>Action B-SS-1.2.3 - The following guidelines for greater sage-grouse habitats would be implemented as adapted from Connelly et al (2000):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continue efforts to map populations and habitat for greater sage-grouse. Map seasonal (lek, nesting, brood-rearing and winter) habitats along with source and 	<p><u>FAUNA ONLY:</u></p> <p>Action PP-SS-1.3.3 - On-going efforts to locate populations of pygmy rabbits would be supported. (B-SS-1.2.1)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Survey all potential habitats. • When populations are located, manage sagebrush habitats for suitable pygmy rabbit conditions. • Suitable and potential pygmy rabbit habitat should be managed to allow for the expansion of populations into areas where they might not be currently found. <p>Action PP-SS-1.3.4 - Populations of boreal toads and Northern leopard frogs would be identified and inventoried and where populations are located, permitted activities would be managed to maintain quality frog and or toad habitat by: (B-SS-1.2.2)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Managing riparian areas to make progress towards or achieving PFC. • Increasing pool habitat based upon site potential. • Mitigating or adjusting activities having adverse effects on boreal toad and Northern leopard frog habitats. • Managing Lane and Lander Creeks as priority areas for boreal toad and Northern leopard frog habitat. <p>Action PP-SS-1.3.5 – To the extent possible and to promote conservation, sage-grouse would be managed consistent with the intent of the <i>Conservation Plan for Greater Sage-grouse in Idaho</i> (Idaho Sage-grouse Advisory Committee, 2006) or any future revisions/amendments and or current BLM guidance. Appropriate actions, conservation</p>

<p style="text-align: center;">Draft RMP/EIS Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Proposed Plan/Final EIS Alternative B (Proposed Plan)</p>
<p>SPECIAL STATUS SPECIES (SS)</p>	
<p>isolated populations within 3 years after signing the Record of Decision (ROD).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establish goals for greater sage-grouse habitat conservation at the local level in conjunction with IDFG and local working groups for protection and maintenance of existing populations and restoration goals. • Protect and maintain suitable habitats and reconnect separated populations based upon the following priorities: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Source habitats (S1) 2. Restoration areas (R1, R2) 3. Areas that link isolated populations • Manage key habitat for a range of sagebrush canopy cover averaging 15 to 25 percent (11 to 31 inches in height); at least 15 percent grass cover; and 10 percent cover of a diversity of forbs or commensurate with site potential. • Monitor progress and adjust activities to make progress towards greater sage-grouse goals and objectives. • In areas where grouse habitats are fragmented by land ownership pattern, cooperate with IDFG and local working groups to identify and maintain long-term habitat by acquiring conservation easements or bringing crucial habitats into public ownership. • In cooperation with IDFG identify areas where application of pesticides for grasshopper or Mormon cricket control may negatively affect grouse broods. Identify a cooperative strategy to review requests for pesticide application in these identified locations. • As appropriate based upon a site specific habitat assessment, protect leks from disturbances from permitted activities for 0.6 mile from Mar 1 to May 31. • Restore shrub-steppe habitats in the following priority: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. source areas, 2. restoration areas 3. areas that link isolated populations <p>Action B-SS-1.2.4 - The following guidelines for Columbian sharp-tailed grouse habitats would be implemented as adapted from Giesen and Connolly (1993):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As appropriate based upon a site specific habitat assessment, maintain vegetation in suitable condition (LHC-A) for nesting and brood rearing for 1.5 miles from known leks. Any manipulation of habitats must not be greater than 10 percent of the 1.5 mile radius (Figure 3-6). • As appropriate based upon a site specific habitat assessment, maintain availability of deciduous shrubs (e.g., serviceberry, chokecherry) within 4 miles of leks to protect winter habitat. • Coordinate with IDFG as population targets and monitoring locations are established for Columbian sharp-tailed grouse. Monitoring would be conducted for populations in key or source areas and restorations areas in that order. • In areas where grouse habitats are fragmented by land ownership pattern, cooperate with IDFG and local working groups to identify and maintain long-term habitat by acquiring conservation easements or bringing crucial habitats into public ownership. 	<p>measures and guidelines that may be considered include, but are not limited to (B-SS-1.2.3):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continue efforts to map populations and habitat for greater sage-grouse. Map seasonal (lek, nesting, brood-rearing and winter) habitats along with source and isolated populations. • Establish goals for greater sage-grouse habitat conservation at the local level in conjunction with IDFG and local working groups for protection and maintenance of existing populations and restoration goals. • Protect and maintain suitable habitats and reconnect separated populations based upon the following priorities: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Key habitats 2. Source habitats (S1) 3. Restoration areas (R1, R2) 4. Areas that link isolated populations • Commensurate with site potential, manage key habitat for a range of sagebrush canopy cover averaging 15 to 25 percent (11 to 31 inches in height); at least 15 percent grass cover; and 10 percent cover of a diversity of forbs. • Monitor progress and adjust activities to make progress towards greater sage-grouse goals and objectives. • In areas where grouse habitats are fragmented by land ownership pattern, cooperate with IDFG and local working groups to identify and maintain long-term habitat by acquiring conservation easements or bringing crucial habitats into public ownership. • In cooperation with IDFG identify areas where application of pesticides for grasshopper or Mormon cricket control may negatively affect grouse broods. Identify a cooperative strategy to review requests for pesticide application in these identified locations. • <u>Active sage-grouse leks</u> would be protected during the lekking season from temporary human disturbance (e.g., routine maintenance, inspections, and construction activities) by requiring a minimum buffer of 0.6 miles. • New infrastructure facilities/structures (e.g., major power transmission lines, power distribution lines, communications towers, and temporary meteorological towers) requiring permanent surface occupancy would be sited in a manner that avoids sage-grouse habitat to the extent possible and would be placed at least 2.0 miles from <u>occupied leks</u> or other important sage-grouse seasonal habitats as identified locally. • Future permitted/authorized activities would be evaluated on a site specific basis for potential threats consistent with the Conservation Plan for Greater Sage-grouse in Idaho (Idaho Sage-grouse Advisory Committee, 2006) and mitigated through the NEPA process. • Restore shrub-steppe habitats in the following priority: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. source areas, 2. restoration areas 3. areas that link isolated populations

<p style="text-align: center;">Draft RMP/EIS Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Proposed Plan/Final EIS Alternative B (Proposed Plan)</p>
<p>SPECIAL STATUS SPECIES (SS)</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In cooperation with IDFG identify areas where application of pesticides for grasshopper or Mormon cricket control may negatively affect grouse broods. Identify a cooperative strategy to review requests for pesticide application in these identified locations. • As appropriate based upon a site specific habitat assessment, protect leks from disturbances from permitted activities for 0.6 mile from Mar 1 to May 31. <p>Action B-SS-1.2.5 - The following guidelines for the globally important ferruginous hawk habitat in the Curlew Valley would be implemented as adapted from Chipley 1998:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As appropriate based upon a site specific habitat assessment, Activities which would disturb within ½ mi. of active nests from Mar 1 to July 15 would not be allowed. • Monitor the populations in Curlew Valley and on the Bear Lake Plateau (Figure 3-6). • Maintain existing scattered juniper trees for nesting substrate and maintain or improve habitat suitable for prey populations such as jackrabbits. <p>Action B-SS-1.2.6 - The following conservation actions (Utah Division of Wildlife Resources [UDWR] 2000, Montana Department of Fish, Wildlife, and Parks [MDFWP] et al. 2000, IDFG 2003) would be implemented to ensure the continued presence of native cutthroat trout within their historic range:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support cooperative work with IDFG to determine cutthroat trout life histories, protect the genetic integrity of cutthroat trout populations, expand those populations within their historic range through reintroduction in those areas where restoration is practicable after reintroduction protocols have been established with federal agencies and monitor populations as they are restored. • Cooperate with IDFG to selectively control non-native salmonid species and discontinue non-native fish stocking in native cutthroat trout drainages. • Enhance and maintain channel integrity, channel processes, water quality, salmonid habitat and habitat connectivity. • Monitor populations, habitat quantity and habitat quality. • Cooperate with adjacent landowners and/or other agencies when opportunities for watershed scale improvements are possible. • All streams known to hold either of these species would be fenced to exclude livestock use unless it is already in PFC condition. • Strive to eliminate or significantly reduce threats to present or potential cutthroat trout distribution within their historic range and to habitat quality and quantity. • Strive to achieve the criteria for highest quality trout habitats as described in the Cutthroat Trout Matrix (Appendix E). • Consider land tenure adjustments which would provide for reconnecting streams in migratory corridors. Disposition of trout-bearing streams would be allowed if habitat with more potential for stream reconnection is acquired. • Coordinate with IDFG and other agencies to implement an information/education/outreach program. • Participate in coordination and data sharing meetings between state, private and federal jurisdictions. 	<p>Action PP-SS-1.3.6 - As appropriate, the following guidelines (as adapted from Geisen and Connelly 1993), or the most current management document and/or BLM policy would be used in the management of the Columbian sharp-tailed grouse habitat. (B-SS-1.2.4)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As appropriate based upon a site specific habitat assessment, maintain vegetation in suitable condition (LHC-A) for nesting and brood rearing for 2.0 miles from known leks. Any manipulation of habitats must not be greater than 10 percent of the 2.0 mile radius (Figure 3-6). • As appropriate based upon a site specific habitat assessment, maintain availability of deciduous shrubs (e.g., serviceberry, chokecherry) within 4 miles of leks to protect winter habitat. • Coordinate with IDFG as population targets and monitoring locations are established for Columbian sharp-tailed grouse. Monitoring would be conducted for populations in key or source areas and restorations areas in that order. • In areas where grouse habitats are fragmented by land ownership pattern, cooperate with IDFG and local working groups to identify and maintain long-term habitat by acquiring conservation easements or bringing crucial habitats into public ownership. • In cooperation with IDFG identify areas where application of pesticides for grasshopper or Mormon cricket control may negatively affect grouse broods. Identify a cooperative strategy to review requests for pesticide application in these identified locations. • As appropriate based upon a site specific habitat assessment, protect leks from disturbances from permitted activities for 0.6 mile from Mar 1 to May 31. <p>Action PP-SS-1.3.7 - The following guidelines for the globally important ferruginous hawk habitat in the Curlew Valley would be implemented as adapted from Chipley 1998: (B-SS-1.2.5)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As appropriate based upon a site specific habitat assessment, Activities which would disturb within ½ mi. of active nests from Mar 1 to July 15 would not be allowed. • Monitor the populations in Curlew Valley and on the Bear Lake Plateau (Figure 3-6). • Maintain existing scattered juniper trees for nesting substrate and maintain or improve habitat suitable for prey populations such as jackrabbits. <p>Action PP-SS-1.3.8 - The following conservation actions (Utah Division of Wildlife Resources [UDWR] 2000, Montana Department of Fish, Wildlife, and Parks [MDFWP] et al. 2000, IDFG 2003) would be implemented to ensure the continued presence of native cutthroat trout within their historic range: (B-SS-1.2.6)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support cooperative work with IDFG to determine cutthroat trout life histories, protect the genetic integrity of cutthroat trout populations, expand those populations within their historic range through reintroduction in those areas where restoration is practicable after reintroduction protocols have been established with federal agencies and monitor populations as they are restored. • Cooperate with IDFG to selectively control non-native salmonid species and discontinue non-native fish stocking in native cutthroat trout drainages.

<p style="text-align: center;">Draft RMP/EIS Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Proposed Plan/Final EIS Alternative B (Proposed Plan)</p>
<p>SPECIAL STATUS SPECIES (SS)</p>	
<p>Action B-SS-1.2.7 - Where populations of American white pelicans are located on public lands, manage the quality of nesting habitat as a priority for the benefit of the pelican.</p> <p>Action B-SS-1.2.8 - For Bear Lake endemic fish (Bear Lake cutthroat trout, Bonneville cisco, Bonneville whitefish, Bear Lake whitefish and Bear Lake sculpin)water degrading activities on public lands with streams connecting to Bear Lake would be reduced.</p> <p>FLORA ONLY:</p> <p>Action B-SS-1.2.9 - Site/project specific assessments for special status plants would be required prior to authorizing activities to determine:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The presence or absence of special status species, and 2. Appropriate mitigation/guidelines (e.g., avoidance of occupied areas, distances from occupied habitat). Examples of mitigation/guidelines to be considered may include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reducing adverse impacts to special status plant habitats from permitted/authorized activities. • Limiting water developments and mineral supplements near special status plant populations sufficient to protect these species. • Avoiding pesticide and herbicide applications near occupied habitat to preserve pollinators and non-target species. • Promoting seeding within occupied habitat only when clearly beneficial for special status plants. • Formulate methods of weed spraying near special status habitat on site specific and species specific basis. • Special status plant areas would be priority for weed treatment. • Inventory and evaluate areas for special status plants while conducting land health standards evaluations. • Inventory and monitor potential special status plant habitats. <p>Action B-SS-1.2.10 - Meet or make significant progress towards meeting Idaho Standards for Rangeland Health (Appendix A) for special status plant habitat.</p> <p>Action B-SS-1.2.11 - Special status plant known occurrence's maps would be updated regularly.</p> <p>Action B-SS-1.2.12 - To conserve starveling milkvetch (<i>Astragalus jejunus</i> var. <i>jejunus</i>) and silky cryptantha (<i>Cryptantha sericea</i>).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consider plant habitat protection during route designation process. • Inventory and monitor habitat in Bear Lake County. • Promote Idaho Standards for Rangeland Health (Appendix A) to maintain species populations. <p>Action B-SS-1.2.13 - Where special status species can be conserved and habitat connectivity improved, lands would be acquired through land tenure adjustments, easements, and inter-agency cooperation.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enhance and maintain channel integrity, channel processes, water quality, salmonid habitat and habitat connectivity. • Monitor populations, habitat quantity and habitat quality. • Cooperate with adjacent landowners and/or other agencies when opportunities for watershed scale improvements are possible. • All streams known to hold either of these species would be fenced to exclude livestock use unless it is already in PFC condition. • Strive to eliminate or significantly reduce threats to present or potential cutthroat trout distribution within their historic range and to habitat quality and quantity. • Strive to achieve the criteria for highest quality trout habitats as described in the Cutthroat Trout Matrix (Appendix E). • Consider land tenure adjustments which would provide for reconnecting streams in migratory corridors. Disposition of trout-bearing streams would be allowed if habitat with more potential for stream reconnection is acquired. • Coordinate with IDFG and other agencies to implement an information/education/outreach program. • Participate in coordination and data sharing meetings between state, private and federal jurisdictions. <p>Action PP-SS-1.3.9 - American white pelican habitat on BLM-administered public lands would be managed in coordination with IDFG to maintain habitat requirements to sustain viable populations (B-SS-1.2.7).</p> <p>Action PP-SS-1.3.10 - For Bear Lake endemic fish (Bear Lake cutthroat trout, Bonneville cisco, Bonneville whitefish, Bear Lake whitefish and Bear Lake sculpin)water degrading activities on public lands with streams connecting to Bear Lake would be reduced. (B-SS-1.2.8)</p> <p>Action PP-SS-1.3.11 - During restoration and rehabilitation of migratory bird species habitat, emphasis would be placed on riparian, non-riverine wetlands, sagebrush and Douglas fir habitats and the following management guidelines would be implemented as appropriate based upon site specific characteristics. (C-SS-1.2.8)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improve both the canopy cover and understory health of sagebrush. • At minimum, maintain 30 to 50 percent of sagebrush habitat in a 5th code Hydrologic Unit Code (includes all lands) in contiguous blocks greater than 320 acres to support sagebrush obligate species and greater sage-grouse (Page and Ritter 1999). • Use practices that stabilize or increase native grass and forb cover in sagebrush habitats with 5 to 25 percent sagebrush canopy cover. (Page and Ritter 1999) • In sagebrush habitats manage herbaceous cover to conceal nests throughout the first incubation period for ground and low shrub-nesting birds. • Restore shrub-steppe habitats in restoration or corridor areas. • Use native species where appropriate/practical for ES&R and restoration treatments to shorten recovery time and prevent establishment of invasive species/noxious weeds.

<p style="text-align: center;">Draft RMP/EIS Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Proposed Plan/Final EIS Alternative B (Proposed Plan)</p>
<p>SPECIAL STATUS SPECIES (SS)</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maintain multiple vegetation layers in woody riparian habitats that are stable or increasing with all age classes (seedlings, young plants, mature and decadent) represented to support native bird communities and other wildlife. • Improve aspen stands by reducing conifer invasion and overall reduction of average stand age to <40 years. • Improve dry conifer with reductions of stand density. <p>Action PP-SS-1.3.12 - Large spring systems (e.g., Heart Mountain, Formation Springs) would be managed to prevent possible extirpation of spring-dependent species such as Springsnails. Examples of such actions to maintain or improve spring systems habitat may include but are not limited to: (Action C-SS-1.2.9)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Manage riparian areas of spring systems in accordance with Idaho Standards for Range Health. • As appropriate, develop and implement conservation agreements with Federal and State agencies, Tribes and other interested parties on a site specific or species specific basis. • As appropriate and in cooperation with other interested parties, evaluate the status of springsnails and recommend actions to protect species habitat if need be. • As appropriate and in cooperation with other interested parties, provide educational materials explaining the ecology and diversity of springsnails and the need to conserve spring habitats. <p><u>FLORA ONLY:</u></p> <p>Action PP-SS-1.3.13 - Site/project specific assessments for special status plants would be required prior to authorizing activities to determine: (B-SS-1.2.9)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The presence or absence of special status species, and 2. Appropriate mitigation/guidelines (e.g., avoidance of occupied areas, distances from occupied habitat). Examples of mitigation/guidelines to be considered may include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reducing adverse impacts to special status plant habitats from permitted/authorized activities. • Limiting water developments and mineral supplements near special status plant populations sufficient to protect these species. • Avoiding pesticide and herbicide applications near occupied habitat to preserve pollinators and non-target species. • Promoting seeding within occupied habitat only when clearly beneficial for special status plants. • Formulate methods of weed spraying near special status habitat on site specific and species specific basis. • Special status plant areas would be priority for weed treatment.

<p align="center">Draft RMP/EIS Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)</p>	<p align="center">Proposed Plan/Final EIS Alternative B (Proposed Plan)</p>
<p align="center">SPECIAL STATUS SPECIES (SS)</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inventory and monitor special status plant habitats. <p>Action PP-SS-1.3.14 - Meet or make significant progress towards meeting Idaho Standards for Rangeland Health (Appendix A) for special status plant habitat. (B-SS-1.2.10)</p> <p>Action PP-SS-1.3.15 - Special status plant known occurrence's maps would be updated regularly. (B-SS-1.2.11)</p> <p>Action PP-SS-1.3.16 - To conserve starveling milkvetch (<i>Astragalus jejunus</i> var. <i>jejunus</i>) and silky cryptantha (<i>Cryptantha sericea</i>). (B-SS-1.2.12)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consider plant habitat protection during route designation process. • Inventory and monitor habitat in Bear Lake County. • Promote Idaho Standards for Rangeland Health (Appendix A) to maintain species populations. <p>Action PP-SS-1.3.17 - Where special status species can be conserved and habitat connectivity improved, lands would be acquired through land tenure adjustments, easements, and inter-agency cooperation. (B-SS-1.2.13)</p>
<p align="center">Draft RMP/EIS Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)</p>	<p align="center">Proposed Plan/Final EIS Alternative B (Proposed Plan)</p>
<p align="center">VISUAL RESOURCES (VR)</p>	
<p>Goal VR-1. Maintain scenic qualities consistent with the management of resources and uses.</p>	<p>Goal VR-1. Maintain scenic qualities consistent with the management of resources and uses. (VR-1)</p>
<p>Objective CA-VR-1.1. Manage visual resources according to established guidelines for Visual Resource Management (VRM) classes.</p>	<p>Objective PP-VR-1.1. Manage visual resources according to established guidelines for Visual Resource Management (VRM) classes. (CA-VR-1.1)</p>
<p>Action CA-VR-1.1.1 - Public lands would continue to be managed according to the following VRM class designations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Class I - 11,200 acres Class II - 78,600 acres Class III - 221,000 acres Class IV - 303,000 acres <p>Action CA-VR-1.1.2 - The visual resource contrast rating system would be used during project level planning to determine whether or not proposed activities meet VRM objectives.</p> <p>Action CA-VR-1.1.3 - Mitigation measures would be identified to reduce visual contrasts with rehabilitation actions identified to address landscape modifications on a case-by-case basis.</p>	<p>Action PP-VR-1.1.1 - Public lands would continue to be managed according to the following VRM class designations: (CA-VR-1.1.1)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Class I - 11,200 acres Class II - 78,600 acres Class III - 221,000 acres Class IV - 303,000 acres <p>Action PP-VR-1.1.2 - The visual resource contrast rating system would be used during project level planning to determine whether or not proposed activities meet VRM objectives. (CA-VR-1.1.2)</p> <p>Action PP-VR-1.1.3 - Mitigation measures would be identified to reduce visual contrasts with rehabilitation actions identified to address landscape modifications on a case-by-case basis. (CA-VR-1.1.1)</p>

<p align="center">Draft RMP/EIS Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)</p>	<p align="center">Proposed Plan/Final EIS Alternative B (Proposed Plan)</p>
<p align="center">WILDLAND FIRE MANAGEMENT (WF)</p>	
<p>Goal WF-1. Minimize impacts to natural and human resources from various fire related practices, including both wildland fire suppression and fuels management activities.</p>	<p>Goal WF-1. Minimize impacts to natural and human resources from various fire related practices, including both wildland fire suppression and fuels management activities. (WF-1)</p>
<p>Objective CA-WF-1.1. Utilize the appropriate management response (AMR) for fire suppression activities to protect natural and cultural resource values.</p>	<p>Objective PP-WF-1.1. Utilize the appropriate management response (AMR) for fire suppression activities to protect natural and cultural resource values. (CA-WF-1.1)</p>
<p>Action CA-WF-1.1.1 - While recognizing that wildland fire suppression is an emergency action, appropriate fire suppression restrictions would be implemented as identified below. The Authorized Officer could suspend any or all of these restrictions as necessary in order to protect human life, property or valuable resources as determined by the Authorized Officer.</p> <p>Cultural Resources and Historic Trails</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Through the Authorized Officer or Resource Advisor an archaeologist would be notified to: 1) provide technical expertise, 2) identify cultural resources that may be encountered, and 3) identify best cultural protection practices to be used during fire suppression activities. Examples of cultural protection practices may include but are not limited to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Manually reduce fuels from vulnerable sites/features; dispose of debris away from cultural features. • Create fire breaks near or around sites. • Wrap structures in fire proof materials or use retardant/foam to protect structures. • Flush cut and cover stumps with dirt, foam, or retardant, where subsurface cultural resources could be affected. • Identify and reduce hazard trees next to structures. • Use low intensity backing fire in areas near historic features. • Saturate ground/grass adjacent to vulnerable structures with water, foam, or gel before burning. • Cover rock art or wrap carved trees, dendroglyphs, and other such features in fire retardant fabric. • Limb carved trees to reduce ladder fuels. • Minimize fuels and smoke near rock art • Cover fuels near rock art with foam, water, or retardant, avoiding the rock art. 2. No dozer blading would occur within 300 feet of playas or dry lakebeds to protect cultural resources. Buffer zones greater than 300 feet from playas and dry lake beds would be preferable. 3. No dozer blading would occur within 300 feet of known historic trails and cultural sites. <p>Special Status Species (Federally Threatened, Endangered and Sensitive Species)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Establishment of base camps and support facilities would be avoided in known habitat of Listed species and sensitive plants unless life, property or resource 	<p>Action PP-WF-1.1.1 - While recognizing that wildland fire suppression is an emergency action, appropriate fire suppression restrictions would be implemented as identified below. The Authorized Officer could suspend any or all of these restrictions as necessary in order to protect human life, property or valuable resources as determined by the Authorized Officer. (CA-WF-1.1.1)</p> <p>Cultural Resources and Historic Trails</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Through the Authorized Officer or Resource Advisor an archaeologist would be notified to: 1) provide technical expertise, 2) identify cultural resources that may be encountered, and 3) identify best cultural protection practices to be used during fire suppression activities. Examples of cultural protection practices may include but are not limited to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Manually reduce fuels from vulnerable sites/features; dispose of debris away from cultural features. • Create fire breaks near or around known sites and or temporarily demarcate to create buffer zones to protect sites from fire suppression activities. • Wrap structures in fire proof materials or use retardant/foam to protect structures. • Flush cut and cover stumps with dirt, foam, or retardant, where subsurface cultural resources could be affected. • Identify and reduce hazard trees next to structures. • Use low intensity backing fire in areas near historic features. • Saturate ground/grass adjacent to vulnerable structures with water, foam, or gel before burning. • Cover rock art or wrap carved trees, dendroglyphs, and other such features in fire retardant fabric. • Limb carved trees to reduce ladder fuels. • Minimize fuels and smoke near rock art • Cover fuels near rock art with foam, water, or retardant, avoiding the rock art. 2. No blading would occur within 300 feet of playas or dry lakebeds to protect cultural resources. Buffer zones greater than 300 feet from playas and dry lake beds would be preferable. 3. No blading would occur within 300 feet of known historic trails and cultural sites. <p>Special Status Species (Federally Threatened, Endangered and Sensitive Species)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Establishment of base camps and support facilities would be avoided in known

<p align="center">Draft RMP/EIS Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)</p>	<p align="center">Proposed Plan/Final EIS Alternative B (Proposed Plan)</p>
<p align="center">WILDLAND FIRE MANAGEMENT (WF)</p>	
<p>values are threatened.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Unless life and property are threatened, suppression techniques (e.g., foaming agents, fire retardant, hand lines, and dozer lines) that negatively affect Listed species and sensitive plant and fish habitat would be avoided. <p>Riparian Areas</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Dozer blading would not occur within 150 feet of perennial fish bearing streams, 100 feet of perennial non fish bearing streams, and 50 feet of ephemeral streams. Buffer zones greater than 300 feet from riparian areas would be preferable. Dozer blading would be allowed on existing roads. <p>Vegetation</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Unburned islands within the fire perimeter would be retained whenever their presence does not constitute a threat to life, property or valuable resource values. Dozer blading would occur on existing roads where possible. Dozer blading through undisturbed areas, especially those supporting native plant communities would be avoided unless necessary to protect life, property or resource values. Burnouts would be limited to the smallest acreage possible and avoided in sagebrush communities unless public health and safety and firefighter safety is at risk. Suppression equipment would be washed for invasive/noxious weeds at designated sites. <p>Soils and Water Quality</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Dozer blading would not occur within 150 feet of perennial fish bearing streams, 100 feet of perennial non fish bearing streams, and 50 feet of ephemeral streams. Buffer zones greater than 300 feet from riparian areas would be preferable. No use of retardant or foam would occur within 300 feet of waterways. As appropriate, during suppression activities soils would be stabilized by : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Revegetating control lines (e.g., dozer and hand lines) and safety zones. Utilizing erosion control structures on control lines (e.g., water bars, contour drainages, remove berms). <p>Hazardous Materials and Abandoned Mine Sites</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Hazardous materials and abandoned mine sites that could pose a threat to firefighter health and safety would be identified to allow firefighters to avoid these sites. <p>Special Designations</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Within WSAs, fuels and vegetation treatments and wildland fire management 	<p>habitat of Listed species and sensitive plants unless life, property or resource values are threatened.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Unless life and property are threatened, suppression techniques (e.g., foaming agents, fire retardant, hand lines, and dozer lines) that negatively affect Listed species and sensitive plant and fish habitat would be avoided. <p>Riparian Areas</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Blading would not occur within 150 feet of perennial fish bearing streams and 100 feet of perennial non fish bearing streams. Buffer zones greater than 300 feet from riparian areas would be preferable. Blading would be allowed on existing roads. <p>Vegetation</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Unburned islands within the fire perimeter would be retained whenever their presence does not constitute a threat to life, property or valuable resource values. Blading would occur on existing roads where possible. Blading through undisturbed areas, especially those supporting native plant communities would be avoided unless necessary to protect life, property or resource values. Burnouts would be limited to the smallest acreage possible and avoided in sagebrush communities unless public health and safety and firefighter safety is at risk. Suppression equipment would be washed at designated sites to prevent the establishment/spread of invasive species/noxious weeds. <p>Soils and Water Quality</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Blading would not occur within 150 feet of perennial fish bearing streams and 100 feet of perennial non fish bearing streams. Buffer zones greater than 300 feet from riparian areas would be preferable. Use of retardant or foam would be in accordance with Bureau policy, typically no closer than 300 feet of waterways (i.e., lakes, rivers, streams or ponds). As appropriate, during suppression activities soils would be stabilized by : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Revegetating control lines (e.g., dozer and hand lines) and safety zones. Utilizing erosion control structures/methods on control lines (e.g., water bars, contour drainages, remove berms). <p>Hazardous Materials and Abandoned Mine Sites</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Hazardous materials and abandoned mine sites that could pose a threat to firefighter health and safety would be identified to allow firefighters to avoid these sites. <p>Special Designations</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Within WSAs, fuels and vegetation treatments and wildland fire management activities would follow H-8550-1 (Interim Policy for Lands under Wilderness

<p align="center">Draft RMP/EIS Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)</p>	<p align="center">Proposed Plan/Final EIS Alternative B (Proposed Plan)</p>
<p align="center">WILDLAND FIRE MANAGEMENT (WF)</p>	
<p>activities would follow H-8550-1 (Interim Policy for Lands under Wilderness Review). The use of earth-moving equipment within these areas would require approval of the Authorized Officer.</p> <p>2. Specific guidelines would include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Placement of fire camps and staging areas would be outside of WSA boundaries. • Use whenever feasible natural firebreaks and existing roads to contain wildland fires. • Conduct wildland fire suppression activities in designated ACEC and RNA areas to maintain and protect identified resource values. 	<p>Review). The use of earth-moving equipment within these areas would require approval of the Authorized Officer.</p> <p>2. Specific guidelines would include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Placement of fire camps and staging areas would be outside of WSA boundaries. • Use whenever feasible natural firebreaks and existing roads to contain wildland fires. • The appropriate management response for fire suppression would be used in designated ACEC and RNA areas to maintain and protect identified resource values.
<p>No similar objective.</p>	<p>Objective PP-WF-1.2 Choose the AMR when suppressing wildfire to protect Listed Species and related habitat. (new)</p>
<p>No similar management action.</p>	<p>Action PP-WF-1.2.1 - The following actions would be taken to protect Listed Species occupied and designated critical habitat: (new)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. At no time would the activities designed to protect Listed Species compromise fire-fighter and public safety. At no time would the activities described in this PRMP/Final EIS compromise fire-fighter and public safety. 2. The BLM will coordinate annually with the USFWS to update Listed Species status in the planning area. 3. The Field Manager will ensure resource staff initiates emergency consultation with the USFWS whenever suppression activities may impact Listed Species habitat; more specifically, during emergency suppression actions to protect life and property. 4. Control lines, base camps, support facilities and other suppression related facilities should not be established within: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ ½ mile of known bald eagle nests (February 1 - August 15) ▪ 1 mile of occupied gray wolf den sites (April 1 - June 30) ▪ 300 feet of all water bodies and springs occupied by Listed Species 5. Follow Minimum Impact Suppression Techniques (MIST) guidelines in occupied Listed Species habitat where appropriate (Appendix T <i>in</i>: Interagency Standards for Fire and Aviation Operations, 2005). MIST guidelines direct suppression techniques, procedures, tools, and equipment that least impact the environment. Water and wet-lining (using water to soak/saturate fuels) are the preferred fire line construction tactic. 6. The Field Manager will assign a Resource Advisor or other designated representative as per the current Red Book guidance. 7. BLM will notify USFWS when appropriate; to discuss T&E species mitigation within the suppression area to assure conservation practices are being followed to avoid adverse effects. 8. When Incident Management Teams (IMT) are required, the Resource Advisor will brief the Incident Commander (IC) about conservation measures needed to avoid adverse effects.

<p style="text-align: center;">Draft RMP/EIS Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Proposed Plan/Final EIS Alternative B (Proposed Plan)</p>
<p>WILDLAND FIRE MANAGEMENT (WF)</p>	
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 9. No water-dipping by helicopters will occur within ½ mile of any occupied bald eagle nest. 10. Fuel storage, fuel trucks, and refueling activities will not occur within 300 feet of live waters containing Listed Species. The most current field office Planning Area Hazardous Material Plan will be followed to ensure Listed Species and habitat will not be adversely affected in the event of a spill. 11. Blading should not occur within 300 feet of perennial streams or their tributaries occupied by Listed Species. 12. Drafting equipment for pumps will be properly screened to prevent entrapment of Listed Species. Maximum screen mesh size shall be 3/32-inch diameter. 13. Any sump created by blocking flow in any occupied Listed Species habitat will be performed in coordination with a natural resource specialist to prevent dewatering. 14. If chemical products will be injected into the system, water will not be pumped directly from the streams. If chemicals are needed, water will be pumped from a portable tank, or a backflow check valve will be used. 15. Application of retardant or foam (aerial or ground) will be avoided within 300 feet of perennial streams or their tributaries occupied by Listed Species pursuant to the current Red Book guidance. 16. To minimize spread of noxious weeds, equipment used for extended attack or Type I/II incidents should be cleaned before arriving on-site and prior to leaving the incident. Staging areas and fire camps will avoid sites with noxious weed infestations. 17. Listed Species Reporting Requirements: Because of the programmatic nature of this planning document, the exact timing, site-specific suppression methods, location, and size of fires are currently unknown. In order to monitor the impacts of wildland fire suppression activities, a Level I team will meet after the fire season to review a summary of activities (fire suppression) that may have occurred in or adjacent to Listed Species habitat. If the Level I team identifies fire suppression activities for which more information is needed to ascertain potential effects to the environmental baseline for a particular Listed Species, BLM will provide a report providing the necessary information identified by the Level I team to the USFWS Eastern Idaho Field Office no later than December 31 for the preceding 12-month period. For example, the types of information that may be needed include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The location, timing, size, intensity, and suppression activities used for each fire. • Any mitigation used during fire suppression activities to avoid effects to Listed Species, any habitat affected, and the estimated extent of effects. • Results of post-fire reviews and monitoring.

<p align="center">Draft RMP/EIS Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)</p>	<p align="center">Proposed Plan/Final EIS Alternative B (Proposed Plan)</p>
<p align="center">WILDLAND FIRE MANAGEMENT (WF)</p>	
<p>Objective CA-WF-1.2. Assure fire and non-fire vegetation treatments maintain, restore or improve natural or cultural resource values.</p>	<p>Objective PP-WF-1.3. Assure fire and non-fire vegetation treatments maintain, restore or improve natural or cultural resource values. (CA-WF-1.2)</p>
<p>Action CA-WF-1.2.1 - Fire and non-fire vegetation treatment restrictions would be implemented as identified below:</p>	<p>Action PP-WF-1.3.1 - Fire and non-fire vegetation treatment restrictions would be implemented as identified below: (CA-WF-1.2.1)</p>
<p>Air Quality</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> All fire activities would be done in coordination with the MIAG Smoke Management Program. Under this program prescribed fire and WFU could be restricted when regional or local air quality is compromised, or if the project would negatively affect visual quality in Class 1 Airsheds (Yellowstone and Grand Teton National Parks, Bridger Wilderness, Teton Wilderness, and Craters of the Moon Wilderness) Non Attainment Areas (PM₁₀), and sensitive receptors. <p>Cultural Resources and Historic Trails</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Cultural resource inventories/surveys would be completed prior to implementing site-specific fuels projects. A Class II or Class III inventory would be conducted for all proposed prescribed fire areas unless previous inventory has been deemed adequate in consultation with the SHPO. Areas supporting historic, prehistoric, or ethno-historic sites would be demarcated and avoided if at all possible. All prescribed fires and fuels projects would be subject to further site-specific analyses and Section 106 of the NHPA compliance and consultation. All proposed fire and non-fire (mechanical, chemical and seeding) vegetation treatment actions would be assessed in consultation with the SHPO for their potential to effect cultural resources. Where previous inventory has been sufficient to identify vulnerable cultural resources, no inventory should be needed. However, where adequate inventory is lacking, appropriate and required inventory of the area as determined in consultation with the SHPO would be conducted. Fire project planners would coordinate with the archeologist to incorporate as appropriate cultural protection practices in burn plans as identified in Appendix C. No dozer blading would occur within 300 feet of known historic trails and cultural sites. <p>Fish and Wildlife</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Seasonal guidelines would be applied as appropriate to mitigate adverse impacts of planned fuels management and vegetation treatments for the following areas: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Crucial Big Game Winter Ranges -Activities would be limited from November 15 through April 30. Pile burning permitted on a case-by-case basis. Fuels projects occurring on crucial winter range would be coordinated with IDFG. Elk Calving Areas - Activities would be limited from May 15 through 	<p>Air Quality</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> All fire activities would be done in coordination with the MIAG Smoke Management Program. Under this program, prescribed fire, and AMR could be restricted when regional or local air quality is compromised, or if the project would negatively affect visual quality in Class 1 Airsheds (Yellowstone and Grand Teton National Parks, Bridger Wilderness, Teton Wilderness, and Craters of the Moon Wilderness) Non Attainment Areas (PM₁₀), and sensitive receptors. <p>Cultural Resources and Historic Trails</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Federally recognized tribes (e.g., Shoshone-Bannock Tribes) would be consulted when proposed fire and non-fire vegetation treatment actions have the potential to affect cultural resources. Cultural resource inventories/surveys would be completed prior to implementing site-specific fuels projects. A Class II or Class III inventory would be conducted for all proposed prescribed fire areas unless previous inventory has been deemed adequate in consultation with the SHPO. Areas supporting historic, prehistoric, or ethno-historic sites would be demarcated and avoided if at all possible. All prescribed fires and fuels projects would be subject to further site-specific analyses and Section 106 of the NHPA compliance and consultation. All proposed fire and non-fire (mechanical, chemical and seeding) vegetation treatment actions would be assessed in consultation with the SHPO for their potential to effect cultural resources. Where previous inventory has been sufficient to identify vulnerable cultural resources, no inventory should be needed. However, where adequate inventory is lacking, appropriate and required inventory of the area as determined in consultation with the SHPO would be conducted. Fire project planners would coordinate with the archeologist to incorporate as appropriate cultural protection practices in burn plans as identified in Appendix C. No blading would occur within 300 feet of known historic trails and cultural sites. <p>Fish and Wildlife</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Seasonal guidelines would be applied to mitigate adverse impacts of planned fuels management and vegetation treatments for the following areas: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Crucial Big Game Winter Ranges -Activities would be limited from November 15 through April 30. Pile burning permitted on a case-by-case basis. Fuels projects occurring on crucial winter range would be coordinated with IDFG.

<p align="center">Draft RMP/EIS Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)</p>	<p align="center">Proposed Plan/Final EIS Alternative B (Proposed Plan)</p>
<p align="center">WILDLAND FIRE MANAGEMENT (WF)</p>	
<p>June 30. Fuels projects occurring in elk calving areas would be coordinated with IDFG.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Pronghorn And Mule Deer Fawning Grounds -Treatments occurring in fawning areas would be coordinated with IDFG with limited activities occurring from May 15 through June 30. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. No more than 20% of any individual big game winter range (shrub species) would be treated during any 20 year period. Weed treatment in these areas would not account towards the 20% limitation. 3. To reduce potential wildlife impacts from chemical treatments, herbicide use would conform to all label restrictions and recommendations, and to all applicable laws, policies, standards, and guidelines. In addition, the prescription for herbicide application (desired, optimum environmental conditions) would evaluate wind speed and direction, temperature, precipitation forecast, soil infiltration potential, constraints on overland water transport due to precipitation or flooding, establishment of riparian buffer strips, and risk to special status species. Fishery and/or wildlife biologists would assist project planners in selecting appropriate herbicides approved for aquatic use, when applicable, or for use among or near terrestrial fauna sensitive to herbicides. <p>Special Status Species (Federally Threatened, Endangered and Sensitive Species)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Follow the guidelines in Appendix D for implementing fuels management and vegetation treatment projects in areas that would disturb nesting raptors, greater sage-grouse and Columbian sharp-tailed grouse breeding and wintering habitats. Treatment proposals would be coordinated with IDFG. 2. Fire and non-fire vegetation treatments which would disturb areas supporting greater sage- and Columbian sharp-tailed grouse would be coordinated with IDFG. 3. Greater sage-grouse Key and Source Habitats would be maintained and enhanced within the Low- and Mid-Elevation Shrub types. Treatments would generally be limited in habitats supporting live sagebrush communities. Treatments to enhance and restore habitat would be focused in areas where the sagebrush component is lost or dead and the understory degraded. 4. Seeding would be avoided in occupied habitat unless seeding is clearly beneficial for the species of concern. 5. Guidelines accepted by BLM to protect sensitive species such as pygmy rabbits, Northern goshawk, Cooper's rubberweed, etc. would be utilized. 6. All fuels management and vegetation treatment activities in areas supporting "Listed" species would be conducted in consultation with USFWS, complying with provisions in current interagency streamlined consultation agreements. 7. Fuels management and vegetation treatment activities in bald eagle areas would be conducted according to Action B-SS-1.1.1 8. Fuels management and vegetation treatment activities in areas of gray wolf den areas or near rendezvous sites would be conducted according to Action B-SS 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Elk Calving Areas - Activities would be limited from May 15 through June 30. Fuels projects occurring in elk calving areas would be coordinated with IDFG. ▪ Pronghorn And Mule Deer Fawning Grounds -Treatments occurring in fawning areas would be coordinated with IDFG with limited activities occurring from May 15 through June 30. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. To maintain a desired shrub component (e.g., sagebrush, mountain mahogany) within individual big game winter ranges, WFU, AMR, or prescribed fire treatments would be limited to no more than 15-25% of any individual big game winter range during any 20 year period. 3. To reduce potential wildlife impacts from chemical treatments, herbicide use would conform to all label restrictions and recommendations, and to all applicable laws, policies, standards, and guidelines. In addition, the prescription for herbicide application (desired, optimum environmental conditions) would evaluate wind speed and direction, temperature, precipitation forecast, soil infiltration potential, constraints on overland water transport due to precipitation or flooding, establishment of riparian buffer strips, and risk to special status species. Fishery and/or wildlife biologists would assist project planners in selecting appropriate herbicides approved for aquatic use, when applicable, or for use among or near terrestrial fauna sensitive to herbicides. <p>Special Status Species (Federally Threatened, Endangered and Sensitive Species)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Seasonal restrictions for implementing fuels management and vegetation treatment projects in areas that would disturb nesting raptors, greater sage-grouse and Columbian sharp-tailed grouse breeding and wintering habitats would be followed as identified in Appendix D. Treatment proposals would be coordinated with IDFG. 2. Fire and non-fire vegetation treatments which would disturb areas supporting greater sage- and Columbian sharp-tailed grouse would be coordinated with IDFG. 3. Greater sage-grouse Key and Source Habitats would be maintained and enhanced within the Low- and Mid-Elevation Shrub types. Treatments would generally be limited in habitats supporting live sagebrush communities. Treatments to enhance and restore habitat would be focused in areas where the sagebrush component is lost or dead and the understory degraded. 4. Seeding would be avoided in occupied habitat unless seeding is clearly beneficial for the species of concern. 5. Guidelines accepted by BLM to protect sensitive species such as pygmy rabbits, Northern goshawk, Cooper's rubberweed, etc. would be utilized. 6. All fuels management and vegetation treatment activities in areas supporting "Listed" species would be conducted in consultation with USFWS, complying with provisions in current interagency streamlined consultation agreements. 7. Fuels management and vegetation treatment activities in bald eagle areas

<p align="center">Draft RMP/EIS Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)</p>	<p align="center">Proposed Plan/Final EIS Alternative B (Proposed Plan)</p>
<p align="center">WILDLAND FIRE MANAGEMENT (WF)</p>	
<p>1.1.2</p> <p>9. Planning would be conducted in consultation with USFWS for fuels management and vegetation treatments with potential to decrease dissolved oxygen concentrations, and increase water temperature and turbidity in portions of the Snake River that support populations of threatened and endangered Utah Valvata snail.</p> <p>Riparian Areas</p> <p>1. Dozer blading would not occur within 150 feet of perennial fish bearing streams, 100 feet of perennial non-fish bearing streams, and 50 feet of ephemeral streams. Buffer zones greater than 300 feet from riparian areas would be preferable. Dozer blading would be allowed on existing roads.</p> <p>Vegetation</p> <p>1. Plant materials used in revegetation actions would be predominately native. However, non-native species may be used in re-vegetation actions on harsh or degraded sites where they are needed to structurally mimic the natural plant community and prevent soil loss and invasion by undesirable plant species. The species used would be those that have the highest probability of establishment on these sites. These “placeholders” would maintain the area for future native restoration. Native seed would be used more frequently and at larger scales as species adapted to local areas become more available.</p> <p>Visual Resources</p> <p>1. Wherever possible, landscape modifications would replicate a natural line, form, color and texture found in the surrounding area. Treatments that result in long-term disruption of natural visual qualities (e.g., drill seeding that establishes vegetation rows) would be avoided or hidden by design.</p> <p>Water Quality</p> <p>1. Dozer blading would not occur within 150 feet of perennial fish bearing streams, 100 feet of perennial non-fish bearing streams, and 50 feet of ephemeral streams. Buffer zones greater than 300 feet from riparian areas would be preferable. Dozer blading would be allowed on existing roads.</p> <p>2. The use of retardant or foam would not occur within 300 feet of waterways.</p> <p>Livestock Grazing</p> <p>1. All areas burned by wildfire, treated under ES&R, or proactively treated under restoration would be rested from livestock grazing for a minimum of two growing seasons or until vegetation establishment and resource objectives are achieved. Monitoring criteria typically include soil stability and desired vegetation cover. Site specific plans would address specific monitoring criteria.</p> <p>Hazardous Materials and Abandoned Mine Sites</p> <p>1. Hazardous materials and abandoned mine sites would be identified and avoided within any fuels management or vegetation treatment project area.</p>	<p>would be conducted according to Action PP-SS-1.2.4.</p> <p>8. Fuels management and vegetation treatment activities in areas of gray wolf den areas or near rendezvous sites would be conducted according to Action PP-SS-1.2.5.</p> <p>9. Planning would be conducted in consultation with USFWS for fuels management and vegetation treatments with potential to decrease dissolved oxygen concentrations, and increase water temperature and turbidity in portions of the Snake River that support populations of threatened and endangered Utah Valvata snail.</p> <p>10. Treatments would be designed to minimize to the extent practicable adverse impacts on migratory bird habitat.</p> <p>Riparian Areas</p> <p>1. Blading would not occur within 150 feet of perennial fish bearing streams and 100 feet of perennial non-fish bearing streams. Buffer zones greater than 300 feet from riparian areas would be preferable. Blading would be allowed on existing roads.</p> <p>Vegetation</p> <p>1. Plant materials used in revegetation actions would be predominately native. However, non-native species may be used in re-vegetation actions on harsh or degraded sites where they are needed to structurally mimic the natural plant community and prevent soil loss and invasion by undesirable plant species. The species used would be those that have the highest probability of establishment on these sites. These “placeholders” would maintain the area for future native restoration. Native seed would be used more frequently and at larger scales as species adapted to local areas become more available.</p> <p>Visual Resources</p> <p>1. Wherever possible, landscape modifications would replicate a natural line, form, color and texture found in the surrounding area. Treatments that result in long-term disruption of natural visual qualities (e.g., drill seeding that establishes vegetation rows) would be avoided or hidden by design.</p> <p>Water Quality</p> <p>1. Blading would not occur within 150 feet of perennial fish bearing streams and 100 feet of perennial non-fish bearing streams. Buffer zones greater than 300 feet from riparian areas would be preferable. Blading would be allowed on existing roads.</p> <p>2. Use of retardant or foam would be in accordance with Bureau policy, typically no closer than 300 feet of waterways (i.e., lakes, rivers, streams or ponds).</p> <p>Livestock Grazing</p> <p>1. Upon the start of or immediately after a wildland fire, a determination will be made whether an emergency stabilization and/or rehabilitation plan is needed based on size, resources impacted, intensity of the fire etc. If actions that are</p>

<p align="center">Draft RMP/EIS Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)</p>	<p align="center">Proposed Plan/Final EIS Alternative B (Proposed Plan)</p>
<p align="center">WILDLAND FIRE MANAGEMENT (WF)</p>	
<p>Recreation</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Treatments in developed or high-use recreation areas would be designed to minimize impacts to the recreational resource or users. <p>Special Designations</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Within WSAs, fuels and vegetation treatments and wildland fire management activities would follow H-8550-1 (Interim Policy for Lands Under Wilderness Review). The use of earth-moving equipment within these areas would require the approval of the Authorized Officer. 	<p>affected by grazing (e.g., seeding, fence construction, erosion control, weed control, rest from grazing) are needed to stabilize or rehabilitate the burned area, then beginning the following grazing season, livestock would be excluded from the burned area until an evaluation is completed to determine if objectives specific to or potentially impacted by livestock grazing in site-specific emergency stabilization and/or rehabilitation plans have been met. Should it be determined that treatments failed (plan objectives not met), at the discretion of the authorized officer livestock grazing could resume provided that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Livestock grazing be adjusted (e.g., number, season of use, kind) to compensate for the change in rangeland health and forage conditions, and Livestock grazing would not prevent meeting or moving towards meeting Standards of Rangeland Health and or ES&R objectives. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Following fire and non-fire vegetation treatments, livestock would be excluded from these areas if grazing would jeopardize attaining restoration objectives. In these situations, the area would be closed to grazing until an evaluation is completed to determine if objectives specific to or potentially impacted by livestock grazing in site-specific restoration plans have been met. Should it be determined that restoration treatments failed (plan objectives not met), at the discretion of the authorized officer livestock grazing could resume provided that: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Livestock grazing be adjusted (e.g., number, season of use, kind) to compensate for the change in rangeland health and forage conditions, and Livestock grazing would not prevent meeting or moving towards meeting Standards of Rangeland Health and or ES&R objectives. <p>Hazardous Materials and Abandoned Mine Sites</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Hazardous materials and abandoned mine sites would be identified and avoided within any fuels management or vegetation treatment project area. <p>Recreation</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Treatments in developed or high-use recreation areas would be designed to minimize impacts to the recreational resource or users. <p>Special Designations</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Within WSAs, fuels and vegetation treatments and wildland fire management activities would follow H-8550-1 (Interim Policy for Lands Under Wilderness Review). The use of earth-moving equipment within these areas would require the approval of the Authorized Officer.
<p>No similar management action.</p>	<p>Action PP-WF-1.3.2 - Fire and non-fire vegetation treatment restrictions would be implemented as identified: (new)</p> <p>Listed Species: The following restrictions apply to Listed Species occupied habitat and designated critical habitat.</p>

<p style="text-align: center;">Draft RMP/EIS Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Proposed Plan/Final EIS Alternative B (Proposed Plan)</p>
<p>WILDLAND FIRE MANAGEMENT (WF)</p>	
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Treatment activities may occur near or adjacent to Listed Species habitat and will be designed to minimize or mitigate impacts to Listed Species occupied habitat and designated critical habitat, so that the species or their habitats will not be adversely affected. All fire and non-fire vegetation treatment activities in areas that may affect Listed Species would be conducted in consultation with USFWS. Further, all such activities would be designed and implemented in a manner that potential impacts to Listed Species from disturbance or habitat modification would be so small as to not be meaningfully measured, detected, analyzed, or would be extremely unlikely to occur. 2. Listed Species with recovery plans, conservation agreements and conservation strategies, will be protected as specified in their respective plans/agreements/strategies. These protections include such measures as adequate habitat and range for a given species, including mitigation measures for multiple land use activities authorized by the BLM. 3. Herbicide applicators will obtain a weather forecast for the area prior to initiating a spraying project to ensure no extreme precipitation or wind events could occur during or immediately after spraying. Aerial application of herbicides will not occur during periods of inversion. All spraying will follow label instructions. 4. Fuels management and vegetation treatment activities would be conducted according to standards and guidelines in the Greater Yellowstone Bald Eagle Management Plan (Wyoming Game and Fish Department 1996). 5. No vegetation treatment activities would occur within one half mile radius of known Bald eagle nesting zones during February 1 - August 15. No fuels activities or vegetation management treatments would occur within one half mile of Bald eagle winter roost sites from November 15 - April 15. 6. Gray wolf populations have been designated as experimental/ nonessential. Presence or absence of gray wolf dens or rendezvous sites in fuels management or vegetation treatment areas would be determined prior to initiating projects. In the event active den or rendezvous sites are established, vegetation treatments would be designed and implemented to minimize noise disturbance or habitat modifications within one mile of the den or rendezvous sites from April 1 through June 30. 7. No ground-based applications of herbicides, surfactants, or adjuvants would occur within 100 feet of perennial streams or their live water tributaries occupied by listed snails. 8. Blading would not occur within 300 feet of streams that have habitat occupied by Listed Species. 9. Ground disturbing activities other than tree and shrub planting will not occur within 300 feet of all water bodies and springs containing listed snails. 10. No aerial application of herbicides within one-half mile of all water bodies and springs containing listed snail.

<p align="center">Draft RMP/EIS Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)</p>	<p align="center">Proposed Plan/Final EIS Alternative B (Proposed Plan)</p>
<p align="center">WILDLAND FIRE MANAGEMENT (WF)</p>	
<p>Goal: WF-3. Protect life, property, and resources.</p>	<p>Goal: WF-2. Protect life, property, and resources. (WF-3)</p>
<p>Objective AA-WF-3.1. Manage public land in and around the WUI areas to reduce fire hazards.</p>	<p>Objective PP-WF-2.1. Manage public land in and around the WUI areas to reduce fire hazards. (AA-WF-3.1)</p>
<p>Action AA-WF-3.1.1 - Appropriate treatment methods to reduce/remove hazardous fuels would be used. Action AA-WF-3.1.2 - Treatment activities would be coordinated and conducted in conjunction with community participation, partners and stakeholders. Action AA-WF-3.1.3 - AMR would be utilized on all wildland fires commensurate with values at risk and to protect public/firefighter safety.</p>	<p>Action PP-WF-2.1.1 - Appropriate treatment methods (e.g., mechanical, chemical, seeding, WFU, and prescribed fire) to reduce/remove hazardous fuels would be used. (AA-WF-3.1.1) Action PP-WF-2.1.2 - Treatment activities would be coordinated and conducted in conjunction with community participation, partners and stakeholders. (AA-WF-3.1.2) Action PP-WF-2.1.3 - AMR would be utilized on all wildland fires commensurate with values at risk and to protect public/firefighter safety. (AA-WF-3.1.3)</p>
<p>Objective AA-WF-3.2. Manage public lands to protect, improve or enhance resources /values at risk.</p>	<p>Objective PP-WF-2.2. Manage public lands to protect, improve or enhance resources /values at risk. (AA-WF-3.2)</p>
<p>Action AA-WF-3.2.1 - Appropriate treatment methods to improve FRCC/LHC. Action AA-WF-3.2.2 - AMR commensurate with values at risk.</p>	<p>Action PP-WF-2.2.1 - Appropriate treatment methods (e.g., mechanical, chemical, seeding, WFO, and prescribed fire) would be used to maintain or improve FRCC/LHC or to reduce fire hazard. (AA-WF-3.2.1) Action PP-WF-2.2.2 - The AMR would be commensurate with values at risk. (AA-WF-3.2.2) Action PP-WF-2.2.3 - Seeding treatments determined to be unsuccessful due to drought or other factors would be prioritized for reseeding in subsequent years with ongoing fire and non-fire vegetation treatment projects as appropriate. (new)</p>
<p>Goal WF-4. Return fire to a more natural role in the ecosystem to improve FRCC and achieve desired LHC.</p>	<p>Goal WF-3. Return fire to a more natural role in the ecosystem to improve FRCC and achieve desired LHC. (WF-4)</p>
<p>Objective B-WF-4.1. Manage the Low-Elevation Shrub and Perennial Grass vegetation types in order to move towards FRCC 1 (LHC-A) so wildland fire occurs less frequently and at a smaller scale on the landscape.</p>	<p>Objective PP-WF-3.1. Manage the Low-Elevation Shrub and Perennial Grass vegetation types in order to move towards FRCC 1 (LHC-A) so wildland fire occurs less frequently and at a smaller scale on the landscape. (B-WF-4.1)</p>
<p>Action B-WF-4.1.1 - The AMR would be used to safely manage wildland fires, reducing acres burned to a rate similar to historic. AMR in Low-Elevation Shrub would be suppression of all wildland fire starts to protect existing sagebrush communities. Action B-WF-4.1.2 - Fuels and restoration projects would be conducted in areas invaded by or at risk of invasion by invasive species/noxious weeds. Action B-WF-4.1.3 - Following wildland fire and prescribed fire treatments, chemical, mechanical, and revegetation treatments would utilize appropriate plant materials to provide the best opportunity to stabilize sites and prevent dominance of invasive annual vegetation and noxious weeds. The use of native plant materials would be emphasized. Action B-WF-4.1.4 - Fire use would be allowed in annual grass dominated areas following site specific NEPA analysis. Action B-WF-4.1.5 - Prescribed fire may be used to prepare areas for subsequent chemical, mechanical, and/or revegetation treatments, or, if needed, for disposal of vegetation (i.e., roadside burning, pile burning). Action B-WF-4.1.6 - Sagebrush would be seeded on appropriate sites where natural</p>	<p>Action PP-WF-3.1.1 - The AMR would be used to safely manage wildland fires, reducing acres burned to a rate similar to historic. AMR in Low-Elevation Shrub would be suppression of all wildland fire starts to protect existing sagebrush communities. (B-WF-4.1.1) Action PP-WF-3.1.2 - Fuels and restoration projects would be conducted in areas invaded by or at risk of invasion by invasive species/noxious weeds. (B-WF-4.1.2) Action PP-WF-3.1.3 - Following wildland fire and prescribed fire treatments, chemical, mechanical, and revegetation treatments would utilize appropriate plant materials to provide the best opportunity to stabilize sites and prevent dominance of invasive annual vegetation and noxious weeds. The use of native plant materials would be emphasized. (B-WF-4.1.3) Action PP-WF-3.1.4 - Fire use would be allowed in annual grass dominated areas following site specific NEPA analysis. (B-WF-4.1.4) Action PP-WF-3.1.5 - Prescribed fire may be used to prepare areas for subsequent chemical, mechanical, and/or revegetation treatments, or, if needed, for disposal of</p>

<p align="center">Draft RMP/EIS Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)</p>	<p align="center">Proposed Plan/Final EIS Alternative B (Proposed Plan)</p>
<p align="center">WILDLAND FIRE MANAGEMENT (WF)</p>	
<p>recovery is unlikely in 10 to 20 years. Action B-WF-4.1.7 - Projects would be strategically placed on a landscape scale to protect and restore sagebrush steppe.</p>	<p>vegetation (i.e., roadside burning, pile burning). (B-WF-4.1.5) Action PP-WF-3.1.6 - Seeding of sagebrush on appropriate ecological sites to facilitate the maintenance or improvement of the sagebrush steppe following wildland fire (ES&R) or restoration activities would be considered. (B-WF-4.1.6) Action PP-WF-3.1.7 - Projects would be strategically placed on a landscape scale to protect and restore sagebrush steppe. (B-WF-4.1.7)</p>
<p>Objective B-WF-4.2. Manage the Mid-Elevation Shrub, Juniper, Dry Conifer, Aspen/Conifer, and Mountain Shrub vegetation types in order to move towards FRCC 1 (LHC-A) so wildland fire mimics historical conditions.</p>	<p>Objective PP-WF-3.2. Manage the Mid-Elevation Shrub, Juniper, Dry Conifer, Aspen/Conifer, and Mountain Shrub vegetation types in order to move towards FRCC 1 (LHC-A) so wildland fire mimics historical conditions. (B-WF-4.2)</p>
<p>Action B-WF-4.2.1 -The AMR would be used to safely manage wildland fires. Action B-WF-4.2.2 - Fire use would be allowed following site-specific NEPA analysis. Action B-WF-4.2.3 - Vegetation treatments would be designed to simulate the effect of historic fire on vegetation structure and composition. Action B-WF-4.2.4 - In Mid-Elevation Shrub prescribed fire, chemical, mechanical, and revegetation treatments would be conducted in all areas invaded by or at risk of invasion by invasive and noxious weeds. Action B-WF-4.2.5 - Encroaching juniper in the Mid-Elevation Shrub type would be removed using chemical, mechanical, and prescribed fire treatments.</p>	<p>Action PP-WF-3.2.1 -The AMR would be used to safely manage wildland fires. (B-WF-4.2.1) Action PP-WF-3.2.2 - Fire for resource benefit would be allowed following wildfire containment if vegetation conditions would be improved. (B-WF-4.2.2) Action PP-WF-3.2.3 - Vegetation treatments would be designed to simulate the effect of historic fire on vegetation structure and composition. (B-WF-4.2.3) Action PP-WF-3.2.4 - In Mid-Elevation Shrub prescribed fire, chemical, mechanical, and revegetation treatments would be conducted in all areas invaded by or at risk of invasion by invasive and noxious weeds. (B-WF-4.2.4) Action PP-WF-3.2.5 - Encroaching juniper in the Mid-Elevation Shrub type would be removed using chemical, mechanical, and prescribed fire treatments. (B-WF-4.2.5)</p>
<p>Objective B-WF-4.3. Maintain Wet/Cold Conifer, Riparian and Other/Vegetated Lava vegetation types fire frequencies within the historical range of variability, FRCC 1 (LHC-A).</p>	<p>Objective PP-WF-3.3. Maintain Wet/Cold Conifer, Riparian and Other/Vegetated Lava vegetation types fire frequencies within the historical range of variability, FRCC 1 (LHC-A). (B-WF-4.3)</p>
<p>Action B-WF-4.3.1 -The AMR would be used to safely manage wildland fires. Action B-WF-4.3.2 - WFU would be allowed in Other/Vegetated Lava following site-specific NEPA analysis. Action B-WF-4.3.3 - Projects in Other/Vegetated Lava and Wet/Cold Conifer communities would generally be limited to chemical treatments to control invasive species/noxious weeds.</p>	<p>Action PP-WF-3.3.1 - The AMR ranging from suppression to monitoring would be used to safely manage wildland fires. (B-WF-4.3.1) Action PP-WF-3.3.2 - Fire for resource benefit would be allowed following wildfire containment if vegetation conditions would be improved. (B-WF-4.3.2) Action PP-WF-3.3.3 - Projects in Other/Vegetated Lava and Wet/Cold Conifer communities would generally be limited to chemical treatments to control invasive species/noxious weeds. (B-WF-4.3.3)</p>
<p>Objective B-WF-4.4. Manage for WFU on approximately 265,000 acres identified as suitable (Figure 2-14).</p>	<p>Objective PP-WF-3.4. Manage for WFU on approximately 265,000 acres identified as suitable (Figure 2-14). (B-WF-4.4)</p>
<p>Action B-WF-4.4.1 - WFU may be used in Mid-Elevation Shrub, Perennial Grass/Seedings, Mountain Shrub, Aspen/Aspen Conifer Mix and Dry Conifer vegetation types. Action B-WF-4.4.2 - WFU would not be appropriate on approximately 348,600 acres due to social, economic, political or resource constraints (e.g., which may include wildlife habitats, areas previously rehabilitated or small tracts of public land) Action B-WF-4.4.3 - Should social, economic, political or resource constraints be</p>	<p>Action PP-WF-3.4.1 - WFU and AMR may be used in Mid-Elevation Shrub, Perennial Grass/Seedings, Mountain Shrub, Aspen/Aspen Conifer Mix and Dry Conifer vegetation types. (B-WF-4.4.1) Action PP-WF-3.4.2 - The AMR would be full suppression on approximately 348,600 acres due to social, economic, political or resource constraints, which may include wildlife habitats, areas previously rehabilitated or small tracts of public land. (B-WF-4.4.2)</p>

Draft RMP/EIS Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)	Proposed Plan/Final EIS Alternative B (Proposed Plan)																																												
WILDLAND FIRE MANAGEMENT (WF)																																													
resolved, it would be possible to use WFU in areas identified as not appropriate.	Action PP-WF-3.4.3 - Should social, economic, political or resource constraints be resolved, it would be possible to use a full range of AMR and manage fire for resource benefit in areas identified as not suitable. (B-WF-4.4.3)																																												
Objective B-WF-4.5. For the vegetation types identified, implement over 10 years approximately 124,250 footprint acres of treatment using various treatment methods (e.g., WFU, mechanical, chemical, revegetation, and prescribed fire), as appropriate.	Objective PP-WF-3.5. For the vegetation types identified, implement over 10 years approximately 124,250 footprint acres of treatment using various treatment methods (e.g., WFU, mechanical, chemical, revegetation, and prescribed fire), as appropriate. (B-WF-4.5)																																												
<p>Action B-WF-4.5.1 - By vegetation type, the following approximate footprint acres would be treated.</p> <table border="1" style="margin-left: auto; margin-right: auto;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="text-align: center;">Vegetation Type</th> <th style="text-align: center;">Footprint Acres</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr><td style="text-align: center;">Low-Elevation Shrub</td><td style="text-align: center;">18,950</td></tr> <tr><td style="text-align: center;">Mid-Elevation Shrub ¹</td><td style="text-align: center;">25,400</td></tr> <tr><td style="text-align: center;">Mountain Shrub</td><td style="text-align: center;">16,500</td></tr> <tr><td style="text-align: center;">Perennial Grass/Seeding</td><td style="text-align: center;">50,200</td></tr> <tr><td style="text-align: center;">Juniper (Natural Only)</td><td style="text-align: center;">0.0</td></tr> <tr><td style="text-align: center;">Aspen/Aspen Conifer Mix/Dry Conifer</td><td style="text-align: center;">13,200</td></tr> <tr><td style="text-align: center;">Wet/Cold Conifer</td><td style="text-align: center;">0.0</td></tr> <tr><td style="text-align: center;">Riparian</td><td style="text-align: center;">0.0</td></tr> <tr><td style="text-align: center;">Other/Vegetated Lava</td><td style="text-align: center;">0.0</td></tr> <tr><td style="text-align: center;">Total</td><td style="text-align: center;">124,250</td></tr> </tbody> </table> <p>¹ Acres identified include encroached juniper.</p>	Vegetation Type	Footprint Acres	Low-Elevation Shrub	18,950	Mid-Elevation Shrub ¹	25,400	Mountain Shrub	16,500	Perennial Grass/Seeding	50,200	Juniper (Natural Only)	0.0	Aspen/Aspen Conifer Mix/Dry Conifer	13,200	Wet/Cold Conifer	0.0	Riparian	0.0	Other/Vegetated Lava	0.0	Total	124,250	<p>Action PP-WF-3.5.1 - By vegetation type, the following approximate footprint acres would be treated. (B-WF-4.5.1)</p> <table border="1" style="margin-left: auto; margin-right: auto;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="text-align: center;">Vegetation Type</th> <th style="text-align: center;">Footprint Acres</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr><td style="text-align: center;">Low-Elevation Shrub</td><td style="text-align: center;">18,950</td></tr> <tr><td style="text-align: center;">Mid-Elevation Shrub ¹</td><td style="text-align: center;">25,400</td></tr> <tr><td style="text-align: center;">Mountain Shrub</td><td style="text-align: center;">16,500</td></tr> <tr><td style="text-align: center;">Perennial Grass/Seeding</td><td style="text-align: center;">50,200</td></tr> <tr><td style="text-align: center;">Juniper (Natural Only)</td><td style="text-align: center;">0.0</td></tr> <tr><td style="text-align: center;">Aspen/Aspen Conifer Mix/Dry Conifer</td><td style="text-align: center;">20,000</td></tr> <tr><td style="text-align: center;">Wet/Cold Conifer</td><td style="text-align: center;">0.0</td></tr> <tr><td style="text-align: center;">Riparian</td><td style="text-align: center;">0.0</td></tr> <tr><td style="text-align: center;">Other/Vegetated Lava</td><td style="text-align: center;">0.0</td></tr> <tr><td style="text-align: center;">Total</td><td style="text-align: center;">131,050</td></tr> </tbody> </table> <p>¹ Acres identified include encroached juniper.</p>	Vegetation Type	Footprint Acres	Low-Elevation Shrub	18,950	Mid-Elevation Shrub ¹	25,400	Mountain Shrub	16,500	Perennial Grass/Seeding	50,200	Juniper (Natural Only)	0.0	Aspen/Aspen Conifer Mix/Dry Conifer	20,000	Wet/Cold Conifer	0.0	Riparian	0.0	Other/Vegetated Lava	0.0	Total	131,050
Vegetation Type	Footprint Acres																																												
Low-Elevation Shrub	18,950																																												
Mid-Elevation Shrub ¹	25,400																																												
Mountain Shrub	16,500																																												
Perennial Grass/Seeding	50,200																																												
Juniper (Natural Only)	0.0																																												
Aspen/Aspen Conifer Mix/Dry Conifer	13,200																																												
Wet/Cold Conifer	0.0																																												
Riparian	0.0																																												
Other/Vegetated Lava	0.0																																												
Total	124,250																																												
Vegetation Type	Footprint Acres																																												
Low-Elevation Shrub	18,950																																												
Mid-Elevation Shrub ¹	25,400																																												
Mountain Shrub	16,500																																												
Perennial Grass/Seeding	50,200																																												
Juniper (Natural Only)	0.0																																												
Aspen/Aspen Conifer Mix/Dry Conifer	20,000																																												
Wet/Cold Conifer	0.0																																												
Riparian	0.0																																												
Other/Vegetated Lava	0.0																																												
Total	131,050																																												
Objective B-WF-4.6. Implement priorities for wildland fire suppression and vegetation treatments.	Objective PP-WF-3.6. Implement priorities for wildland fire suppression and vegetation treatments. (B-WF-4.6)																																												
<p>Action B-WF-4.6.1 - When multiple wildland fire ignitions occur, the criteria for establishing suppression priorities would be:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Protect the WUI and communities-at-risk where public and firefighter health and safety are a concern. 2. Minimize risks to sagebrush steppe. 3. Minimize risks to Dry Conifer. <p>Action B-WF-4.6.2 - Priority areas for establishing vegetation treatments would be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sagebrush steppe protection/maintenance. Prioritize treatment to areas that are adjacent to existing sagebrush cover types. • Sagebrush steppe restoration. 	<p>Action PP-WF-3.6.1 - When multiple wildland fire ignitions occur, the criteria for establishing suppression priorities would be: (B-WF-4.6.1)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Protect the WUI and communities-at-risk where public and firefighter health and safety are a concern. 2. Minimize risks to sagebrush steppe. 3. Minimize risks to Dry Conifer. <p>Action PP-WF-3.6.2 - Priority areas for establishing vegetation treatments would be: (B-WF-4.6.2)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sagebrush steppe protection/maintenance. Prioritize treatment to areas that are adjacent to existing sagebrush cover types. 																																												

<p align="center">Draft RMP/EIS Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)</p>	<p align="center">Proposed Plan/Final EIS Alternative B (Proposed Plan)</p>
<p align="center">WILDLAND FIRE MANAGEMENT (WF)</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Aspen/Conifer, Mountain Shrub, Dry Conifer restoration. Protection of areas of key ecosystem components that are at high risk of loss. <p>Action B-WF-4.6.3 - For the Low-Elevation Shrub, Wet/Cold Conifer and Natural Juniper vegetation types, the AMR would be a "FULL" suppression emphasis with initial attack to stop fire spread and put out wildland fire at least cost.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> For Perennial Grass/Seedings vegetation types the AMR would be a "Limited" emphasis of monitoring and confinement actions commensurate with the values at risk and public/firefighter safety. <p>Action B-WF-4.6.4 - For the Mid-Elevation Shrub (including juniper encroachment) Mountain Shrub and Aspen/Aspen Conifer Mix/Dry Conifer vegetation types, the AMR would be a "Limited" emphasis of monitoring and confinement actions commensurate with the values at risk and public/firefighter safety.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sagebrush steppe restoration. Aspen/Conifer, Mountain Shrub, Dry Conifer restoration. Protection of areas of key ecosystem components that are at high risk of loss. <p>Action PP-WF-3.6.3 - For the Low-Elevation Shrub, Wet/Cold Conifer and Natural Juniper vegetation types, the AMR would be a "FULL" suppression emphasis with initial attack to stop fire spread and put out wildland fire at least cost. (B-WF-4.6.3)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> For Perennial Grass/Seedings vegetation types the AMR would be a "Limited" emphasis of monitoring and confinement actions commensurate with the values at risk and public/firefighter safety. <p>Action PP-WF-3.6.4 - For the Mid-Elevation Shrub (including juniper encroachment) Mountain Shrub and Aspen/Aspen Conifer Mix/Dry Conifer vegetation types, the AMR would be a "Limited" emphasis of monitoring and confinement actions commensurate with the public/firefighter safety and values at risk. (B-WF-4.6.4)</p>
<p>No similar objective.</p>	<p>Objective PP-WF-3.7. Maintain, protect, and expand greater sage grouse Source Habitats. (C-WF-4.2)</p>
<p>No similar management action.</p>	<p>Action PP-WF-3.7.1 - Wildland fires would be suppressed in Source Habitats except where WFU could benefit the habitat. (C-WF-4.2.1)</p> <p>Action PP-WF-3.7.2 - WFU would be used in sage grouse Source Habitats for the benefit of the habitat only after site specific project level coordination with IDFG.(C-WF-4.2.2)</p> <p>Action PP-WF-3.7.3 - Vegetation treatments would be conducted in areas that pose a wildland fire risk to Source Habitats. (C-WF-4.2.3)</p> <p>Action PP-WF-3.7.4 - The areas to be treated within Source Habitats would be those that have low resiliency characterized by low species diversity, undesirable composition, and dead or decadent sagebrush. (C-WF-4.2.4)</p>
<p>No similar objective.</p>	<p>Objective PP-WF-3.8. Maintain and improve greater sage grouse Restoration and Key Habitats. (C-WF-4.3)</p>
<p>No similar management action.</p>	<p>Action PP-WF-3.8.1 - Use AMR to safely manage and suppress wildland fires. (C-WF-4.3.1)</p> <p>Action PP-WF-3.8.2 – AMR and wildland fire may be used in greater sage-grouse Restoration and Key Habitats for the benefit of the habitat only after site specific project level coordination with IDFG.(C-WF-4.3.2)</p> <p>Action PP-WF-3.8.3 - Vegetation treatments would be conducted to reduce risk of wildland fire and reconnect Restoration and Key Habitats. (C-WF-4.3.3)</p> <p>Action PP-WF-3.8.4 - Areas treated would be those that that have low resiliency characterized by low species diversity. (C-WF-4.3.4)</p>

Draft RMP/EIS Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)	Proposed Plan/Final EIS Alternative B (Proposed Plan)
WILDLAND FIRE MANAGEMENT (WF)	
No similar objective.	Objective PP-WF-3.9. Manage the Aspen/Aspen Dry Conifer Mix, Dry Conifer, Wet/Cold Conifer, Riparian, and Other/Vegetated Lava vegetation types in order to maintain vegetation conditions and wildland fire regimes similar to historical conditions (FRCC 1 [LHC-A]). (C-WF-4.4)
No similar management action.	Action PP-WF 3.9.1 - Appropriate treatments (e.g., mechanical, chemical, seeding, prescribed fire, or WFU) would be used to maintain or make progress towards landscapes in FRCC 1. (C-WF 4.4.1)

Draft RMP/EIS Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)	Proposed RMP/Final EIS Alternative B (Proposed Plan)
FORESTRY (FO)	
Goal FO-1. Use a variety of silvicultural techniques and harvest systems to provide for an ecologically healthy system while offering products and services.	Goal FO-1. Use a variety of silvicultural techniques and harvest systems to provide for an ecologically healthy system while offering products and services. (FO-1)
Objective CA-FO-1.1. Maintain a sustainable forest management program.	Objective PP-FO-1.1. Maintain a sustainable forest management program. (CA-FO-1.1)
<p>Action CA-FO-1.1.1 - For tree planting projects, tree seedlings used would be native species grown from seed from the appropriate seed zone, matched to site and elevation.</p> <p>Action CA-FO-1.1.2 - All activities normally associated with reforestation would be used (e.g., bare root or containerized seedlings, hand or machine scalping, hand or machine planting, auger or hoedad planting, rodent and/or brush control using appropriate measures such as herbicide, machine or hand removal.)</p> <p>Action CA-FO-1.1.3 - Forest management projects would be designed to simulate natural patch sizes, shapes, connectivity, and species composition and age-class diversity in accordance with silvicultural prescription.</p> <p>Action CA-FO 1.1.4 - Silvicultural prescriptions would provide for stand health through the management of insects and disease, animal damage, and vegetation competition to promote regeneration of tree growth.</p> <p>Action CA-FO-1.1.5 - Appropriate management guidelines, techniques or practices (Appendix C) would be utilized to stabilize soils, protect watersheds and streams and control soil erosion.</p>	<p>Action PP-FO-1.1.1 - For tree planting projects, tree seedlings used would be native species grown from seed from the appropriate seed zone, matched to site and elevation. (CA-FO-1.1.1)</p> <p>Action PP-FO-1.1.2 - All activities normally associated with reforestation would be used (e.g., bare root or containerized seedlings, hand or machine scalping, hand or machine planting, auger or hoedad planting, rodent and/or brush control using appropriate measures such as herbicide, machine or hand removal.) (CA-FO-1.1.2)</p> <p>Action PP-FO-1.1.3 - Forest management projects would be designed to simulate natural patch sizes, shapes, connectivity, and species composition and age-class diversity in accordance with silvicultural prescription. (CA-FO-1.1.3)</p> <p>Action PP-FO 1.1.4 - Silvicultural prescriptions would provide for stand health through the management of insects and disease, animal damage, and vegetation competition to promote regeneration of tree growth. (CA-FO-1.1.4)</p> <p>Action PP-FO-1.1.5 - Appropriate management guidelines, techniques or practices (Appendix C) would be utilized to stabilize soils, protect watersheds and streams and control soil erosion. (CA-FO-1.1.5)</p>
Goal FO-2. Provide the Tribes and public opportunities for the use of forest/vegetal products to promote an ecologically healthy system.	Goal FO-2. Provide the Tribes and public opportunities for the use of forest/vegetal products to promote an ecologically healthy system.
Objective CA-FO-2.1. Maintain approximately 45,700 acres of commercial forest land in order to offer on a yearly basis 600-900 thousand board feet as a “not to exceed” probable sale quantity.	Objective PP-FO-2.1. Maintain approximately 45,700 acres of commercial forest land in order to offer on a yearly basis 600-900 thousand board feet as a “not to exceed” probable sale quantity. (CA-FO-2.1)
<p>Action CA-FO-2.1.1 - A full complement of harvest systems and other treatment methods and techniques would be used unless specifically prohibited or limited by individual prescription direction.</p> <p>Action CA-FO-2.1.2 - All activities normally associated with reforestation would be used</p>	<p>Action PP-FO-2.1.1 - A full complement of harvest systems and other treatment methods and techniques would be used unless specifically prohibited or limited by individual prescription direction. (CA-FO-2.1.1)</p> <p>Action PP-FO-2.1.2 - All activities normally associated with reforestation would be used</p>

<p style="text-align: center;">Draft RMP/EIS Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Proposed RMP/Final EIS Alternative B (Proposed Plan)</p>
FORESTRY (FO)	
<p>(e.g., bare root or containerized seedlings, hand or machine scalping, hand or machine planting, auger or hoedad planting, gopher and/or brush control using appropriate measures such as herbicide, machine or hand removal.)</p> <p>Action CA-FO-2.1.3 - The following mitigation measures would be applied for all harvest activities to reduce adverse impacts to wildlife habitat, streams and riparian areas.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide for a minimum no cutting buffer of 66 feet along all forest shrub ecotones. • In Douglas fir stands, leave no fewer than 5 snags per acre and recruit an additional 15 trees per acre of live trees. The size of snags and snag recruitment should be the equivalent of the largest size class on site. Recruitment snags would not have to be structurally superior. Live trees with forked and broken tops may be preferred. • Maintain all snags and dead topped trees along 50 foot perimeters of wet meadows. • Prescribe and maintain site specific levels of down/dead woody materials to balance the needs for nutrient recycling, wildlife habitat and wildfire protection. • No harvest activities in known ungulate fawning or calving areas until after July 1st in any given year. • No harvest activities in ungulate winter range areas from November 15th to April 30th in any given year. • No harvest or yarding activities within 150 feet of perennial fish bearing streams. • No harvest or yarding activities within 100 feet of perennial streams without fish. • No harvest or yarding activities within 50 feet of intermittent and ephemeral channels. <p>Action CA-FO-2.1.4 - As appropriate, management guidelines, techniques and practices (Appendix C, see Forestry - Road Construction, Reconstruction and Maintenance) would be applied for road construction activities near stream channels. All stream alterations would be regulated by the Idaho Stream Protection Act, Title 42, Chapter 38, Idaho Code.</p>	<p>(e.g., bare root or containerized seedlings, hand or machine scalping, hand or machine planting, auger or hoedad planting, gopher and/or brush control using appropriate measures such as herbicide, machine or hand removal.) (CA-FO-2.1.2)</p> <p>Action PP-FO-2.1.3 - The following mitigation measures would be applied for all harvest activities to reduce adverse impacts to wildlife habitat, streams and riparian areas. (CA-FO-2.1.3)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide for a minimum no cutting buffer of 66 feet along all forest shrub ecotones. • In Douglas fir stands, leave no fewer than 5 snags per acre and recruit an additional 15 trees per acre of live trees. The size of snags and snag recruitment should be the equivalent of the largest size class on site. Recruitment snags would not have to be structurally superior. Live trees with forked and broken tops may be preferred. • Maintain all snags and dead topped trees along 50 foot perimeters of wet meadows. • Prescribe and maintain site specific levels of down/dead woody materials to balance the needs for nutrient recycling, wildlife habitat and wildfire protection. • No harvest activities in known ungulate fawning or calving areas until after July 1st in any given year. • No harvest activities in ungulate winter range areas from November 15th to April 30th in any given year. • No harvest or yarding activities within 150 feet of perennial fish bearing streams. • No harvest or yarding activities within 100 feet of perennial streams without fish. • No harvest or yarding activities within 50 feet of intermittent and ephemeral channels. • Fuels will be reduced to pre harvest or to within natural loading range. <p>Action PP-FO-2.1.4 - As appropriate, management guidelines, techniques and practices (Appendix C, see Forestry - Road Construction, Reconstruction and Maintenance) would be applied for road construction activities near stream channels. All stream alterations would be regulated by the Idaho Stream Protection Act, Title 42, Chapter 38, Idaho Code. (CA-FO-2.1.4)</p>
<p>Objective CA-FO-2.2. Based upon tribal and public demand allow for the collection of forest and vegetal products.</p>	<p>Objective PP-FO-2.2. Based upon tribal and public demand allow for the collection of forest and vegetal products. (CA-FO-2.2)</p>
<p>Action CA-FO-2.2.1 - Areas available for collection of forest products (e.g., post/poles, fuelwood, Christmas trees) would be identified based upon the following criteria such as but not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Public access, • Insects and disease • Fuel load conditions 	<p>Action PP-FO-2.2.1 - Areas available for collection of forest products (e.g., post/poles, fuelwood, Christmas trees) would be identified based upon the following criteria such as but not limited to: (CA-FO-2.2.1)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Public access, • Insects and disease • Fuel load conditions

Draft RMP/EIS Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)	Proposed RMP/Final EIS Alternative B (Proposed Plan)																																				
FORESTRY (FO)																																					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Wildlife habitat improvement <p>Action CA-FO-2.2.2 - Vegetal collection of reasonable amounts of commonly available renewable resources (e.g., seeds, cones, wildlings, berries, mushrooms, flowers, nuts, and leaves) from public lands for non-commercial use would be allowed in the amounts identified below consistent with other resource goals/objectives.</p> <table border="1" style="margin-left: auto; margin-right: auto;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="text-align: center;">Vegetal Product</th> <th style="text-align: center;">Reasonable Amount (Allowed per Person per year)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">Berries</td> <td style="text-align: center;">5 gal/species</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">Boughs, All Coniferous Species</td> <td style="text-align: center;">15 lbs</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">Cones - Ornamental</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2 bushels</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">Cones - Seed - Nuts</td> <td style="text-align: center;">1 bushels</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">Leaves - Greenery - All types</td> <td style="text-align: center;">15 lbs</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">Moss</td> <td style="text-align: center;">15 lbs</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">Mushrooms</td> <td style="text-align: center;">5 gal/species</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">Wildlings</td> <td style="text-align: center;">5</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Action CA-FO-2.2.3 - The use of limbs, branches, or other woody debris for campfire use on public lands would be allowed. Any other firewood collections would require a free-use or fuelwood permit.</p>	Vegetal Product	Reasonable Amount (Allowed per Person per year)	Berries	5 gal/species	Boughs, All Coniferous Species	15 lbs	Cones - Ornamental	2 bushels	Cones - Seed - Nuts	1 bushels	Leaves - Greenery - All types	15 lbs	Moss	15 lbs	Mushrooms	5 gal/species	Wildlings	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Wildlife habitat improvement <p>Action PP-FO-2.2.2 - Vegetal collection of reasonable amounts of commonly available renewable resources (e.g., seeds, cones, wildlings, berries, mushrooms, flowers, nuts, and leaves) from public lands for non-commercial use would be allowed in the amounts identified below consistent with other resource goals/objectives. (CA-FO-2.2.2)</p> <table border="1" style="margin-left: auto; margin-right: auto;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="text-align: center;">Vegetal Product</th> <th style="text-align: center;">Reasonable Amount (Allowed per Person per year)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">Berries</td> <td style="text-align: center;">5 gal/species</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">Boughs, All Coniferous Species</td> <td style="text-align: center;">15 lbs</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">Cones - Ornamental</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2 bushels</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">Cones - Seed - Nuts</td> <td style="text-align: center;">1 bushels</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">Leaves - Greenery - All types</td> <td style="text-align: center;">15 lbs</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">Moss</td> <td style="text-align: center;">15 lbs</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">Mushrooms</td> <td style="text-align: center;">5 gal/species</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">Wildlings</td> <td style="text-align: center;">5</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Action PP-FO-2.2.3 - The use of limbs, branches, or other woody debris for campfire use on public lands would be allowed. Any other firewood collections would require a free-use or fuelwood permit. (CA-FO-2.2.3)</p>	Vegetal Product	Reasonable Amount (Allowed per Person per year)	Berries	5 gal/species	Boughs, All Coniferous Species	15 lbs	Cones - Ornamental	2 bushels	Cones - Seed - Nuts	1 bushels	Leaves - Greenery - All types	15 lbs	Moss	15 lbs	Mushrooms	5 gal/species	Wildlings	5
Vegetal Product	Reasonable Amount (Allowed per Person per year)																																				
Berries	5 gal/species																																				
Boughs, All Coniferous Species	15 lbs																																				
Cones - Ornamental	2 bushels																																				
Cones - Seed - Nuts	1 bushels																																				
Leaves - Greenery - All types	15 lbs																																				
Moss	15 lbs																																				
Mushrooms	5 gal/species																																				
Wildlings	5																																				
Vegetal Product	Reasonable Amount (Allowed per Person per year)																																				
Berries	5 gal/species																																				
Boughs, All Coniferous Species	15 lbs																																				
Cones - Ornamental	2 bushels																																				
Cones - Seed - Nuts	1 bushels																																				
Leaves - Greenery - All types	15 lbs																																				
Moss	15 lbs																																				
Mushrooms	5 gal/species																																				
Wildlings	5																																				

Draft RMP/EIS Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)	Proposed RMP/Final EIS Alternative B (Proposed Plan)
LANDS AND REALTY (LR)	
<p>Goal LR- 3. Maintain and acquire legal access to public land.</p> <p>Objective AA-LR-3.1. Maintain existing access and acquire public and administrative access consistent with resource values and to ensure efficient administration of public lands.</p> <p>Action AA-LR-3.1.1- Access to public lands would be acquired with an emphasis on priority areas (Figure 2-13).</p> <p>Action AA-LR-3.1.2 - Public access would be secured or acquired through all land tenure adjustments.</p> <p>Action AA-LR-3.1.3 - The Cooperative Rights-of-Way Agreement (2002) between the</p>	<p>Goal LR- 3. Maintain and acquire legal access to public land. (LR-3)</p> <p>Objective PP-LR-3.1. Maintain existing access and acquire public and administrative access consistent with resource values and to ensure efficient administration of public lands. (AA-LR-3.1)</p> <p>Action PP-LR-3.1.1- Access to public lands would be acquired with an emphasis on priority areas (Figure 2-13). (AA-LR-3.1.1)</p> <p>Action PP-LR-3.1.2 - Public access would be retained or acquired through land tenure adjustments as needed or appropriate. (AA-LR-3.1.2)</p> <p>Action PP-LR-3.1.3 – BLM would seek access across state and county lands as needed.</p>

Draft RMP/EIS Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)	Proposed RMP/Final EIS Alternative B (Proposed Plan)																
LANDS AND REALTY (LR)																	
<p>BLM and the State of Idaho would be followed to acquire access across state lands as needed.</p> <p>Action AA-LR-3.1.4 - Access to public lands would be acquired, from willing parties, through easements, fee purchase, donation, conservation easements or other means.</p> <p>Action AA-LR-3.1.5 - New route construction, route alignment or maintenance to improve access to public lands would be allowed.</p> <p>Action AA-LR-3.1.6 - Counties would be coordinated with to identify legal access to public lands.</p> <p>Action AA-LR-3.1.7 - Legal access routes to public lands would be recognized during the development of travel management plans.</p>	<p>(AA-LR-3.1.3)</p> <p>Action PP-LR-3.1.4 - Access to public lands would be acquired, from willing parties, through easements, fee purchase, donation, conservation easements or other means. (AA-LR-3.1.4)</p> <p>Action PP-LR-3.1.5 - New route construction, route alignment or maintenance to improve access to public lands would be allowed. (AA-LR-3.1.5)</p> <p>Action PP-LR-3.1.6 - Counties would be coordinated with to identify legal access to public lands. (AA-LR-3.1.6)</p> <p>Action PP-LR-3.1.7 - Legal access routes to public lands would be recognized during the development of travel management plans. (AA-LR-3.1.7)</p>																
<p>Goal LR-4. Assure land classifications and withdrawals of public lands are appropriate to protect important resource values.</p>	<p>Goal LR-4. Assure land classifications and withdrawals of public lands are appropriate to protect important resource values. (LR-4)</p>																
<p>Objective B-LR-4.1. Continue to manage approximately 84,760 acres of land classified as withdrawn from the general land laws for the specific purposes intended.</p>	<p>Objective PP-LR-4.1. Continue to manage approximately 84,760 acres of land classified as withdrawn from the general land laws for the specific purposes intended. (B-LR-4.1)</p>																
<p>Action B-LR-4.1.1 - Continue to manage approximately 45,400 acres of public land as withdrawn (e.g., power sites, public water reserves, power projects, administrative sites, BSD).</p> <p>Action B-LR-4.1.2 - The following withdrawals (approximately 20,160 acres) would be maintained and managed as closed to locatable mineral entry.</p>	<p>Action PP-LR-4.1.1 - Continue to manage approximately 45,400 acres of public land as withdrawn (e.g., power sites, public water reserves, power projects, administrative sites, BSD). (B-LR-4.1.1)</p> <p>Action PP-LR-4.1.2 - The following withdrawals (approximately 20,160 acres) would be maintained and managed as closed to locatable mineral entry.(B-LR-4.1.2)</p>																
<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th style="text-align: center;">Federal Agency</th> <th style="text-align: center;">Mineral Estate Withdrawn Acres ¹</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">USFWS - Bear Lake Refuge</td> <td style="text-align: center;">17,500</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">USFWS - Minidoka Refuge</td> <td style="text-align: center;">760</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">USFWS - Oxford Slough Waterfowl Production Area</td> <td style="text-align: center;">1,900</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Federal Agency	Mineral Estate Withdrawn Acres ¹	USFWS - Bear Lake Refuge	17,500	USFWS - Minidoka Refuge	760	USFWS - Oxford Slough Waterfowl Production Area	1,900	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th style="text-align: center;">Federal Agency</th> <th style="text-align: center;">Mineral Estate Withdrawn Acres ¹</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">USFWS - Bear Lake Refuge</td> <td style="text-align: center;">17,500</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">USFWS - Minidoka Refuge</td> <td style="text-align: center;">760</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">USFWS - Oxford Slough Waterfowl Production Area</td> <td style="text-align: center;">1,900</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Federal Agency	Mineral Estate Withdrawn Acres ¹	USFWS - Bear Lake Refuge	17,500	USFWS - Minidoka Refuge	760	USFWS - Oxford Slough Waterfowl Production Area	1,900
Federal Agency	Mineral Estate Withdrawn Acres ¹																
USFWS - Bear Lake Refuge	17,500																
USFWS - Minidoka Refuge	760																
USFWS - Oxford Slough Waterfowl Production Area	1,900																
Federal Agency	Mineral Estate Withdrawn Acres ¹																
USFWS - Bear Lake Refuge	17,500																
USFWS - Minidoka Refuge	760																
USFWS - Oxford Slough Waterfowl Production Area	1,900																
<p>¹ These acres are not considered in the PFO public lands base of 613,800 acres. Acreages are rounded.</p> <p>Action B-LR-4.1.3 - Withdrawal of public lands from mineral entry would be pursued on approximately 19,200 acres for the following areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cheatbeck Canyon RNA • Dairy Hollow RNA • Formation Cave RNA • Oneida Narrow RNA • Pine Gap RNA • Robbers Roost RNA 	<p>¹ These acres are not considered in the PFO public lands base of 613,800 acres. Acreages are rounded.</p> <p>Action PP-LR-4.1.3 - Withdrawal of public lands from mineral entry would be pursued on approximately 19,200 acres for the following areas: (B-LR-4.1.3)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cheatbeck Canyon RNA • Dairy Hollow RNA • Formation Cave RNA • Oneida Narrow RNA • Pine Gap RNA • Robbers Roost RNA 																

<p align="center">Draft RMP/EIS Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)</p>	<p align="center">Proposed RMP/Final EIS Alternative B (Proposed Plan)</p>
<p align="center">LANDS AND REALTY (LR)</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Travertine Park RNA • Petticoat Peak RNA • Soda Springs Hills Management Area (public lands portion only) • Bowen Canyon Bald Eagle Sanctuary ACEC <p>Action B-LR-4.1.4 - Withdrawals which no longer serve the purpose for which they were established would be modified, revoked or relinquished. Prior to modification, revocation or relinquishment, withdrawn lands would be reviewed to determine if any other resource values require withdrawal protection.</p> <p>Action B-LR-4.1.5 - Lands currently under review by the Washington Office for the revocation of withdrawal status and which are approved for revocation would be managed the same as adjacent public lands per the final decision.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Travertine Park RNA • Petticoat Peak RNA • Soda Springs Hills Management Area (public lands portion only) • Bowen Canyon Bald Eagle Sanctuary ACEC <p>Action PP-LR-4.1.4 - Withdrawals which no longer serve the purpose for which they were established would be modified, revoked or relinquished. Prior to modification, revocation or relinquishment, withdrawn lands would be reviewed to determine if any other resource values require withdrawal protection. (B-LR-4.1.4)</p> <p>Action PP-LR-4.1.5 - Lands currently under review by the Washington Office for the revocation of withdrawal status and which are approved for revocation would be managed the same as adjacent public lands per the final decision. (B-LR-4.1.5)</p>
<p>Goal: LR-5. Improve administrative management efficiency, natural resources management and protection, and public benefit.</p>	<p>Goal: LR-5. Improve administrative management efficiency, natural resources management and protection, and public benefit. (LR-5)</p>
<p>Objective AA-LR-5.1. Adjust and consolidate public land ownership patterns through land tenure adjustments.</p>	<p>Objective PP-LR-5.1. Adjust and consolidate public land ownership patterns through land tenure adjustments. (AA-LR-5.1)</p>
<p>Action AA-LR-5.1.1 - Lands acquired would be managed in a manner consistent with adjacent or nearby public lands or managed for the goals, objectives and standards for which they were acquired.</p> <p>Action AA-LR-5.1.2 - Management direction, including designations for such programs as OHV, Special Recreation Management Area (SRMA), VRM, Livestock Grazing, Lands & Realty, Mining (leasable, saleable) would be applied to acquired lands consistent with adjacent or nearby public lands, or those with similar values, goals and objectives for which they were acquired.</p> <p>Action AA-LR-5.1.3 - The following screening and criteria process would be considered for all land tenure adjustment proposals.</p>	<p>Action PP-LR-5.1.1 - Lands acquired would be managed in a manner consistent with adjacent or nearby public lands or managed for the goals, objectives and standards for which they were acquired. (AA-LR-5.1.1)</p> <p>Action PP-LR-5.1.2 - Management direction, including designations for such programs as OHV, Special Recreation Management Area (SRMA), VRM, and Livestock Grazing, would be applied to acquired lands consistent with adjacent or nearby public lands, or those with similar values, goals and objectives for which they were obtained. (AA-LR-5.1.2)</p> <p>Action PP-LR-5.1.3 - The following screening and criteria process would be considered for all land tenure adjustment proposals. (AA-LR-5.1.3)</p>
<div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px;"> <p>Step 1: Land Tenure Adjustment Proposal Submitted.</p> <p><i>Does the proposal meet the intent of FLPMA? Is there a Federal interest (e.g., public benefit) to implementing the proposal? If the proposal is a land exchange, are the monetary values of the offered and selected lands relatively similar?</i></p> <p>YES - Continue to Step 2.</p> <p>NO - No further consideration of the action as presently proposed.</p> <p>Step 2: Proposal Screened by Zone Definition.</p> </div>	<div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px;"> <p>Step 1: Land Tenure Adjustment Proposal Submitted.</p> <p><i>Does the proposal meet the intent of FLPMA? Is there a Federal interest (e.g., public benefit) to implementing the proposal? If the proposal is a land exchange, are the monetary values of the offered and selected lands relatively similar?</i></p> <p>YES - Continue to Step 2.</p> <p>NO - No further consideration of the action as presently proposed.</p> <p>Step 2: Proposal Screened by Zone Definition.</p> </div>

Draft RMP/EIS Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)	Proposed RMP/Final EIS Alternative B (Proposed Plan)
LANDS AND REALTY (LR)	
<p><i>Does the proposal fit within the guidelines of the zone definitions (see Action LR-5.1.1)?</i></p> <p>YES - Continue to Step 3.</p> <p>NO - No further consideration of the action as presently proposed.</p> <p>Step 3: Proposal Screened by Land Ownership Adjustment Criteria.</p> <p><i>Is the proposed action a high priority based on the land ownership adjustment criteria and factors as identified in Actions LR-5.1.2 and LR-5.1.3?</i></p> <p>YES - Continue to Step 4.</p> <p>NO - No further consideration of the action as presently proposed.</p> <p>Step 4: Likelihood of Proposal Receiving Public Support.</p> <p><i>Is it likely the proposal will receive public support during the NEPA process?</i></p> <p>YES - Continue to Step 5.</p> <p>NO - No further consideration of the action as presently proposed</p> <p>Step 5: Schedule the Proposal for Appropriate Public Involvement and NEPA.</p> <p><i>This proposal's priority for completing the NEPA work would be based upon other workload, current and anticipated public and private funding and staffing, and the extent to which the proposal would benefit the public.</i></p> <p>Action AA-LR-5.1.4 - Proceeds from the sale or exchange of public lands identified for disposal as of July 25, 2000 (Appendix F) may be used to purchase additional public lands within the planning area, as provided for in the Federal Land Transaction Facilitation Act through July 25, 2010 unless extended by Congress.</p> <p>Action AA-LR-5.1.5 - Work with willing parties to acquire land that is in the public interest to improve administrative efficiencies or based upon priorities to acquire land with unique resources values such as but not limited to special status species habitat, riparian, and/or access to public lands.</p> <p>Action AA-LR-5.1.6 - The Shoshone-Bannock Tribes would be coordinated with regarding land tenure adjustments within the ceded land boundary.</p> <p>Action AA-LR-5.1.7 - Disposal of lands would be allowed under Sec 203 and 206 of FLPMA and would be classified for disposal under Section 7 of the Taylor Grazing Act of 1934, as amended (43 USC 315f).</p> <p>Action AA-LR-5.1.8 - Lands would be made available, as appropriate, to support local community and development needs.</p> <p>Action AA-LR-5.1.9 - All public lands would be classified as unsuitable for entry under</p>	<p><i>Does the proposal fit within the guidelines of the zone definitions (see Action LR-5.1.1)?</i></p> <p>YES - Continue to Step 3.</p> <p>NO - No further consideration of the action as presently proposed.</p> <p>Step 3: Proposal Screened by Land Ownership Adjustment Criteria.</p> <p><i>Is the proposed action a high priority based on the land ownership adjustment criteria and factors as identified in Actions LR-5.1.2 and LR-5.1.3?</i></p> <p>YES - Continue to Step 4.</p> <p>NO - No further consideration of the action as presently proposed.</p> <p>Step 4: Schedule the Proposal for Appropriate Public Involvement and NEPA.</p> <p><i>This proposal's priority for completing the NEPA work would be based upon other workload, current and anticipated public and private funding and staffing, and the extent to which the proposal would benefit the public.</i></p> <p>Action PP-LR-5.1.4 - Proceeds from the sale or exchange of public lands identified for possible disposal as of July 25, 2000 (Appendix F) may be used to purchase additional public lands within the planning area, as provided for in the Federal Land Transaction Facilitation Act through July 25, 2010 unless extended by Congress. (AA-LR-5.1.4)</p> <p>Action PP-LR-5.1.5 - Work with willing parties to acquire land that is in the public interest to improve administrative efficiencies or based upon priorities to acquire land with unique resources values such as but not limited to special status species habitat, riparian, and/or access to public lands. (AA-LR-5.1.5)</p> <p>Action PP-LR-5.1.6 - Consultation with the Shoshone-Bannock Tribes would occur when the BLM considers land tenure adjustments on public lands involving Tribal-reserved treaty rights. (AA-LR-5.1.6 and AA-LR-5.1.11)</p> <p>Action PP-LR-5.1.7 - Disposal of lands would be allowed under Sec 203 and 206 of FLPMA. (AA-LR-5.1.7)</p> <p>Action PP-LR-5.1.8 - Lands would be made available, as appropriate, to support local community and development needs. (AA-LR-5.1.8)</p> <p>Action PP-LR-5.1.9 - All public lands would be classified as unsuitable for entry under the Desert Land Entry Act (1877, as amended) or the Carey Act (1894, as amended) due to one or more factors such as, unsuitable soils, lack of available water or valid water right, topography or economic feasibility. (AA-LR-5.1.9)</p> <p>Action PP-LR-5.1.10 - Coordination with the Shoshone-Bannock Tribes would occur when BLM considers land tenure adjustments on lands involving Tribal-reserved rights. (AA-LR-5.1.11)</p>

<p style="text-align: center;">Draft RMP/EIS Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Proposed RMP/Final EIS Alternative B (Proposed Plan)</p>
LANDS AND REALTY (LR)	
<p>the Desert Land Entry Act (1877, as amended) or the Carey Act (1894, as amended) due to one or more factors such as, unsuitable soils, lack of available water or valid water right, topography or economic feasibility.</p> <p>Action AA-LR-5.1.10 - Public access to public lands would be retained when lands are transferred out of federal ownership.</p> <p>Action AA-LR-5.1.11 - Consultation with the Shoshone-Bannock Tribes would occur when BLM considers land tenure adjustments on lands involving Tribal-reserved rights.</p>	
<p>Objective B-LR-5.1. Maintain the overall public land base, acquire nonfederal lands or interest in nonfederal lands through exchange, purchase, easement or donation which enhance multiple-use, protect significant resource values and which improve the management and administration of the public lands.</p>	<p>Objective PP-LR-5.2. Maintain the overall public land base, acquire nonfederal lands or interest in nonfederal lands through exchange, purchase, easement or donation which enhance multiple-use, protect significant resource values and which improve the management and administration of the public lands. (B-LR-5.1)</p>
<p>Action B-LR-5.1.1 - A land tenure adjustment program would be implemented based upon a four zone concept where zones (areas that contain common issues or planned actions) and respective priorities are described below (Figure 2-15). Land tenure adjustments would be considered across FO and District boundaries.</p> <p>Zone 1 lands are public lands with special designations because of significant resource values. Zone 1 lands would be retained in public ownership. Examples of Zone 1 lands include WSAs, ACECs and RNAs, special status species habitat, and crucial wildlife habitat. BLM's priority for Zone 1 is to seek to acquire all private and State land in-holdings. Public access would be considered in all land tenure actions. Approximately 50,800 acres (9%) of public land would be identified in this zone.</p> <p>Zone 2 lands are public lands that have a fairly well-consolidated ownership pattern and contain potentially high values for resources and land uses such as minerals, recreation, range, riparian, cultural resources, and wildlife habitat. The priorities within Zone 2 are to retain existing large blocks of high value public lands, consolidate public land ownership according to identified priority resources, and acquire lands with high resource values which improve efficiencies in public lands administration. Public lands within ½ mile of either side of the Zone 2 boundary would be considered potentially suitable for disposal primarily by exchange (secondarily by sale or R&PP patents) unless that ½ mile extends into a Zone 1 (retention) area. Approximately 365,700 acres (60%) of public land would be identified in this zone.</p> <p>Zone 3 lands are small to medium-sized blocks of public lands which are interspersed with state and private lands or are adjacent to National Forest boundaries. The priority emphasis for Zone 3 is to consolidate ownership, which would maximize public values, provide public access and improve efficiencies in public lands administration. Overall public land acreage would be maintained. Acquisition, primarily through exchange, would be done to add high resource value lands that improve the manageability of public lands; lower resource value</p>	<p>Action PP-LR-5.2.1 - A land tenure adjustment program would be implemented based upon a four zone concept where zones (areas that contain common issues or planned actions) and respective priorities are described below (Figure 2-15). Land tenure adjustments would be considered across FO and District boundaries. (B-LR-5.1.1)</p> <p>Zone 1: public lands that contain special designations because of significant resource values. Zone 1 lands would be retained in public ownership. Examples of Zone 1 lands include WSAs, ACECs and RNAs, special status species habitat, and crucial wildlife habitat. BLM's priority for Zone 1 is to seek to acquire all private and State land in-holdings. Public access would be considered in land tenure actions. Approximately 50,800 acres (9%) of public land would be identified in this zone.</p> <p>Zone 2: public lands that have a fairly well-consolidated ownership pattern and contain potentially high values for resources and land uses such as minerals, recreation, range, riparian, cultural resources, and wildlife habitat. The priorities within Zone 2 are to retain existing large blocks of high value public lands, consolidate public land ownership according to identified priority resources, and acquire lands with high resource values which improve efficiencies in public lands administration. Public lands within ½ mile of either side of the Zone 2 boundary would be considered potentially suitable for disposal primarily by exchange (secondarily by sale or R&PP patents) unless that ½ mile extends into a Zone 1 (retention) area. Approximately 365,700 acres (60%) of public land would be identified in this zone.</p> <p>Zone 3: public lands that are interspersed with state and private lands or are adjacent to National Forest boundaries. The priority emphasis for Zone 3 is to consolidate ownership, which would maximize public values, provide public access and improve efficiencies in public lands administration. Overall public land acreage would be maintained. Acquisition, primarily through exchange, would be done to add high resource value lands that improve the manageability of public lands; lower resource value and difficult-to-manage tracts would be</p>

<p align="center">Draft RMP/EIS Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)</p>	<p align="center">Proposed RMP/Final EIS Alternative B (Proposed Plan)</p>
<p align="center">LANDS AND REALTY (LR)</p>	
<p>and difficult-to-manage tracts would be disposed of. Zone 3 lands are potentially suitable for disposal by exchange; however, disposal of land through sales and R&PP patents would be allowed. Approximately 141,000 acres (23%) of public land would be identified in this zone.</p> <p>Zone 4 lands are small to medium-sized blocks of public lands that are isolated from one another and from other public lands. Public lands are available through all forms of disposal as appropriate. The land tenure adjustment emphasis in Zone 4 could result in a net decrease in public lands acreage within this zone. Approximately 56,300 acres (8%) of public land would be identified in this zone.</p> <p>NOTE: Within Zones 3 and 4, specific parcels may contain potentially high values for resources and land uses such as minerals, recreation, special status species, range, riparian, cultural resources, and wildlife habitat. These high-value parcels may not be suitable for disposal, except through exchange for equal or higher resource value lands</p> <p>Action B-LR-5.1.2 - Changes in the overall public lands acreage would be appropriate if land tenure adjustments meet one or more of the following criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Benefits the public. • Improves public lands administration. • Achieves desired resource conditions. • Contributes to tribal treaty rights. <p>Action B-LR-5.1.3 - Land tenure adjustments would consider the acquisition or disposal of lands based upon (but not limited to) the following factors:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Special status species habitat; • Improve habitat connectivity; • Improve or maintain access; • Riparian/wetland values; • Improves quality of recreation opportunities and/or experiences; • Improve public land administration; • Provide for local community needs; • Resolve trespass; • Parcels more suitable for administration by another agency; and • Parcels which are isolated or difficult to administer. 	<p>disposed of. Zone 3 lands are potentially suitable for disposal by exchange; however, disposal of land through sales and R&PP patents would be allowed. Approximately 141,000 acres (23%) of public land would be identified in this zone.</p> <p>Zone 4: public lands that are isolated from one another and from other public lands. Public lands are available through all forms of disposal as appropriate. The land tenure adjustment emphasis in Zone 4 could result in a net decrease in public lands acreage within this zone. Approximately 56,300 acres (8%) of public land would be identified in this zone.</p> <p>NOTE: Within Zones 3 and 4, specific parcels may contain potentially high values for resources and land uses such as minerals, recreation, special status species, range, riparian, cultural resources, and wildlife habitat. These high-value parcels may not be suitable for disposal, except through exchange for equal or higher resource value lands</p> <p>Action PP-LR-5.2.2 - Changes in the overall public lands acreage would be appropriate if land tenure adjustments meet one or more of the following criteria: (B-LR-5.1.2)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Benefits the public; • Improves public lands administration; • Achieves desired resource conditions; and/or • Supports tribal-reserved treaty rights. <p>Action PP-LR-5.2.3 - Land tenure adjustments would consider the acquisition or disposal of lands based upon (but not limited to) the following factors: (B-LR-5.1.3)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Open space; • Special status species habitat; • Improve habitat connectivity; • Improve or maintain access; • Riparian/wetland values; • Improves quality of recreation opportunities and/or experiences; • Improve public land administration; • Provide for local community needs; • Resolve trespass; • Parcels more suitable for administration by another agency; and • Parcels which are isolated or difficult to administer.
<p>Goal LR-6. Balance development of public land, such as ROW, utility corridors and alternative energy development (e.g., wind, solar, biomass) with the protection of natural resources and public enjoyment and recreation, consistent with natural resource values and uses</p>	<p>Goal LR-6. Balance development of public land, such as ROW, utility corridors and alternative energy development (e.g., wind, solar, biomass) with the protection of natural resources and public enjoyment and recreation, consistent with natural resource values and uses. (LR-6)</p>
<p>Objective B-LR-6.1. Issue land use authorizations consistent with following management actions.</p>	<p>Objective PP-LR-6.1. Issue land use authorizations consistent with following management actions. (B-LR-6.1)</p>
<p>Action B-LR-6.1.1 - Land use authorizations would require holders to apply appropriate</p>	<p>Action PP-LR-6.1.1 - Land use authorizations would require holders to apply appropriate</p>

<p style="text-align: center;">Draft RMP/EIS Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Proposed RMP/Final EIS Alternative B (Proposed Plan)</p>
LANDS AND REALTY (LR)	
<p>management techniques; practices or guidelines to protect vegetation, wildlife habitat and minimize soil disturbance (Appendix C).</p> <p>Action B-LR-6.1.2 - Short-term authorizations or permits to use public lands for the sole benefit of private farming practices (e.g., pivot lines, storage of farm equipment) would not be approved.</p> <p>Action B-LR-6.1.3 - New leases or permits that affect the value or nature of the land would not be allowed on those lands proposed for exchange or sale.</p> <p>Action B-LR-6.1.4 - No new land use permits or leases would be authorized to validate unauthorized use. Unauthorized use would be resolved according to priority using current laws, regulations, and policy.</p> <p>Action B-LR-6.1.5 - When a new or existing land use permit is authorized the following conditions would apply as appropriate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Privately-held water right places of use (POUs) on public land would either be removed from public land or transferred to the US through the BLM. • A privately-owned water right with a point of diversion on private property, but with one or more POUs on public land, would be split and transferred to the US in proportion to the amount of water used on public land. <p>Action B-LR-6.1.6 - To the extent possible, linear ROWs would be routed where impacts would be least disturbing, considering the point of origin, point of destination, resource values present, and purpose and need for the project.</p> <p>Action B-LR-6.1.7 - No BLM ROW corridors would be designated in this Pocatello RMP/EIS, however this plan may be amended to designate corridors upon completion of the West-wide Energy Corridor Programmatic EIS.</p> <p>Action B-LR-6.1.8 - ROW applicants would be encouraged to the extent possible, to use the existing corridors. The Pocatello RMP/EIS would adopt designated corridors upon completion of the West-wide Energy Corridor Programmatic EIS.</p> <p>Action B-LR-6.1.9 - For ROWs which include energy and non-energy related ROWs and land use authorizations, 590,000 acres would be managed as open areas; 21,900 acres would be managed as avoidance areas and 1,900 acres would be managed as exclusion areas (Figure 2-16) where these areas are defined as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Open Areas - These are areas not identified as avoidance or exclusion areas and are open to ROWs and land use authorization proposals. Proposals may require restrictions to protect resources such as wildlife (Appendix D), protected watersheds, erosive soils/steep slopes, cultural, historical, recreation, visual resources and other identified resources. • Avoidance Areas - These are areas to generally be avoided but may be available with special stipulations. Efforts would be made to work with the applicant to reroute proposals. Special stipulations would be required to protect resource values. Areas considered as “avoidance” would include developed recreation sites, historical trails, special status species habitat, ACECs, and WSAs. Special stipulations would consist of applying BMPs, management techniques or guidelines (Appendix C) and or be developed on a case by case 	<p>management techniques; practices or guidelines to protect vegetation, wildlife habitat and minimize soil disturbance (Appendix C). (B-LR-6.1.1)</p> <p>Action PP-LR-6.1.2 - When a new or existing land use permit is authorized the following conditions would apply as appropriate: (B-LR-6.1.5)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Privately-held water right places of use (POUs) on public land would either be removed from public land or transferred to the US through the BLM. • A privately-owned water right with a point of diversion on private property, but with one or more POUs on public land, would be split and transferred to the US in proportion to the amount of water used on public land. <p>Action PP-LR-6.1.3 - To the extent possible, linear ROWs would be routed where impacts would be least disturbing, considering the point of origin, point of destination, resource values present, and purpose and need for the project. (B-LR-6.1.6)</p> <p>Action PP-LR-6.1.4 - The BLM would adopt the utility corridors designated by the West-wide Energy Corridor Programmatic EIS when it is completed and approved. (B-LR-6.1.7)</p> <p>Action PP-LR-6.1.5 - ROW applicants would be encouraged to the extent possible, to use the existing corridors. (B-LR-6.1.8)</p> <p>Action PP-LR-6.1.6 - For ROWs which include energy and non-energy related ROWs and land use authorizations, 590,000 acres would be managed as open areas; 21,900 acres would be managed as avoidance areas and 1,900 acres would be managed as exclusion areas (Figure 2-16) where these areas are defined as follows: (B-LR-6.1.9)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Open Areas - These are areas not identified as avoidance or exclusion areas and are open to ROWs and land use authorization proposals. Proposals may require seasonal restrictions to protect resources such as wildlife habitat/ activities (Appendix D), protected watersheds, erosive soils/steep slopes, cultural, historical, recreation, visual resources and other identified resources. • Avoidance Areas - These are areas to generally be avoided but may be available with special stipulations. Efforts would be made to work with the applicant to reroute proposals. Special stipulations would be required to protect resource values. Areas considered as “avoidance” would include developed recreation sites, historical trails, special status species habitat, ACECs, and WSAs. Special stipulations would consist of applying BMPs, management techniques or guidelines (Appendix C) and or be developed on a case by case basis through the NEPA process. • Exclusion Areas - In these areas ROWs and land use authorizations would not be allowed. Areas considered as “exclusion” would be RNAs. <p>Action PP-LR-6.1.7 - Applications for wind energy site monitoring and testing and development would not be accepted in areas designated as part of the National Landscape Conservation System (e.g., WSAs, WSRs, National Historic and Scenic Trails) and ACECs. (B-LR-6.1.10)</p> <p>Action PP-LR-6.1.8 - Entities seeking to develop a wind energy project on public lands shall consult with appropriate federal, state, and local agencies regarding specific projects</p>

Draft RMP/EIS Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)	Proposed RMP/Final EIS Alternative B (Proposed Plan)
LANDS AND REALTY (LR)	
<p>basis through the NEPA process.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Exclusion Areas - In these areas ROWs and land use authorizations would not be allowed. Areas considered as “exclusion” would be RNAs. <p>Action B-LR-6.1.10 - Applications for wind energy site monitoring and testing and development would not be accepted in areas designated as part of the National Landscape Conservation System (e.g., WSAs, WSRs, National Historic and Scenic Trails) and ACECs.</p> <p>Action B-LR-6.1.11 - Entities seeking to develop a wind energy project on public lands shall consult with appropriate federal, state, and local agencies regarding specific projects as early in the planning process as appropriate to ensure that all potential construction, operation, and decommissioning issues and concerns are identified and adequately addressed.</p> <p>Action B-LR-6.1.12 - Entities seeking to develop a wind energy project on public lands in conjunction with BLM Washington Office and PFO staff, shall consult with the US Department of Defense (DoD) regarding the location of wind power projects and turbine siting as early in the planning process as appropriate. This consultation shall occur concurrently at both the installation/field level and the Pentagon/BLM Washington Office level. An interagency protocol agreement is being developed to establish a consultation process and to identify the scope of issues for consultation. Lands withdrawn for military purposes are under the administrative jurisdiction of the DoD or a military service and are not available for issuance of wind energy authorizations by the BLM.</p> <p>Action B-LR-6.1.13 - The BLM would require financial bonds for all wind energy development projects on BLM-administered public lands to ensure compliance with the terms and conditions of the ROW authorization and the requirements of applicable regulatory requirements, including reclamation costs. The amount of the required bond would be determined during the ROW authorization process on the basis of site-specific and project-specific factors. The BLM may also require financial bonds for site monitoring and testing authorizations.</p>	<p>as early in the planning process as appropriate to ensure that all potential construction, operation, and decommissioning issues and concerns are identified and adequately addressed. (B-LR-6.1.11)</p> <p>Action PP-LR-6.1.9 - Entities seeking to develop a wind energy project on public lands in conjunction with BLM Washington Office and PFO staff, shall consult with the US Department of Defense (DoD) regarding the location of wind power projects and turbine siting as early in the planning process as appropriate. This consultation shall occur concurrently at both the installation/field level and the Pentagon/BLM Washington Office level. An interagency protocol agreement is being developed to establish a consultation process and to identify the scope of issues for consultation. Lands withdrawn for military purposes are under the administrative jurisdiction of the DoD or a military service and are not available for issuance of wind energy authorizations by the BLM. (B-LR-6.1.12)</p> <p>Action PP-LR-6.1.10 - The BLM would require financial bonds for all wind energy development projects on BLM-administered public lands to ensure compliance with the terms and conditions of the ROW authorization and the requirements of applicable regulatory requirements, including reclamation costs. The amount of the required bond would be determined during the ROW authorization process on the basis of site-specific and project-specific factors. The BLM may also require financial bonds for site monitoring and testing authorizations. (B-LR-6.1.13)</p>

Draft RMP/EIS Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)	Proposed RMP/Final EIS Alternative B (Proposed Plan)
LIVESTOCK GRAZING (LG)	
<p>Goal LG-1. Provide forage for livestock grazing consistent with other resources/uses as part of an ecologically healthy system consistent with multiple use and sustained yield.</p> <p>Objective B-LG-1.1. Maintain approximately 560,000 acres available for livestock grazing and approximately 53,800 acres not available for livestock grazing.</p> <p>Action B-LG-1.1.1 - Applications for livestock grazing within allotments where grazing currently is not permitted/leased would be considered except for those allotments containing riparian areas as shown below:</p>	<p>Goal LG-1. Provide forage for livestock grazing consistent with other resources/uses as part of an ecologically healthy system consistent with multiple use and sustained yield. (LG-1)</p> <p>Objective PP-LG-1.1. Maintain approximately 560,000 acres available for livestock grazing and approximately 53,800 acres not available for livestock grazing. (B-LG-1.1)</p> <p>Action PP-LG-1.1.1 - Applications for livestock grazing within allotments where grazing currently is not permitted/leased would be considered except for those allotments containing riparian areas as shown below: (B-LG-1.1.1)</p>

Draft RMP/EIS Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)	Proposed RMP/Final EIS Alternative B (Proposed Plan)																												
LIVESTOCK GRAZING (LG)																													
<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Allotment Name Number</th> <th>Acres¹</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Bear River at Rose (14402)</td> <td>120</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Densmore Creek (10026)</td> <td>60</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Downata (10082)</td> <td>20</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Fox Hills (14088)</td> <td>40</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Inman Point (10061)</td> <td>40</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Walker Creek (10065)</td> <td>40</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>¹ Acreages rounded.</p>	Allotment Name Number	Acres ¹	Bear River at Rose (14402)	120	Densmore Creek (10026)	60	Downata (10082)	20	Fox Hills (14088)	40	Inman Point (10061)	40	Walker Creek (10065)	40	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Allotment Name Number</th> <th>Acres¹</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Bear River at Rose (14402)</td> <td>120</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Densmore Creek (10026)</td> <td>60</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Downata (10082)</td> <td>20</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Fox Hills (14088)</td> <td>40</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Inman Point (10061)</td> <td>40</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Walker Creek (10065)</td> <td>40</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>¹ Acreages rounded.</p>	Allotment Name Number	Acres ¹	Bear River at Rose (14402)	120	Densmore Creek (10026)	60	Downata (10082)	20	Fox Hills (14088)	40	Inman Point (10061)	40	Walker Creek (10065)	40
Allotment Name Number	Acres ¹																												
Bear River at Rose (14402)	120																												
Densmore Creek (10026)	60																												
Downata (10082)	20																												
Fox Hills (14088)	40																												
Inman Point (10061)	40																												
Walker Creek (10065)	40																												
Allotment Name Number	Acres ¹																												
Bear River at Rose (14402)	120																												
Densmore Creek (10026)	60																												
Downata (10082)	20																												
Fox Hills (14088)	40																												
Inman Point (10061)	40																												
Walker Creek (10065)	40																												
<p>Action B-LG-1.1.2 - The proper season of use, kind and class of livestock and stocking rate for allotments where grazing currently is not permitted/leased would be based upon best available information and analyzed through the NEPA process.</p>	<p>Action PP-LG-1.1.2 - The proper season of use, kind and class of livestock and stocking rate for allotments where grazing currently is not permitted/leased would be based upon best available information and analyzed through the NEPA process. (B-LG-1.1.2)</p>																												
<p>Objective B-LG-1.2. Consistent with maintaining a thriving ecological balance and multiple use relationships provide annually a total preference (active + suspended) of approximately 87,500 animal unit months (AUMs).</p>	<p>Objective B-LG-1.2. Consistent with maintaining a thriving ecological balance and multiple use relationships provide annually a total preference (active + suspended) of approximately 87,500 AUMs. (B-LG-1.2)</p>																												
<p>Action B-LG-1.2.1 - The appropriate number of livestock AUMs (active + suspended) would be permitted/leased based on the most current monitoring data and the Idaho Standards for Rangeland Health.</p> <p>Action B-LG-1.2.2 - Public lands would be managed to be as productive as feasible considering such grazing management practices as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proper use levels of key vegetation; • Grazing systems; • Range improvements including land treatments; and • Adjusting seasons of use, and stocking rates. <p>Action B-LG-1.2.3 - Livestock grazing would be managed to meet or make significant progress towards meeting Idaho Standards for Rangeland Health and Guidelines for Livestock Grazing Management, 1997 (Appendix A).</p> <p>Action B-LG-1.2.4 - Areas would be temporarily closed to livestock grazing after disturbances such as wildland fire, fire and non-fire vegetative treatments for a minimum of two growing seasons or progress is being made towards attaining identified vegetative objectives.</p> <p>Action B-LG-1.2.5 - The voluntary relinquishment of grazing preference would be accepted, in whole or part, and made available to qualified applicants following the most current policy and guidance. Grazing applications may be denied if one or more of the following criteria are met:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Failure to meet standards for rangeland health because of livestock grazing and meeting or moving towards standards is not economically feasible, • Isolated parcels of public land consisting of 640 acres or less, • No public or administrative access to allotment/parcel exists, • Public lands are identified for disposal or exchange (occur within Zones 3 or 4), • The proportion of unfenced public land to private land within the allotment is 	<p>Action PP-LG-1.2.1 - The appropriate number of livestock AUMs (active + suspended) would be permitted/leased based on the most current monitoring data and the Idaho Standards for Rangeland Health. (B-LG-1.2.1)</p> <p>Action PP-LG-1.2.2 - Public lands would be managed to be as productive as feasible considering such grazing management practices as: (B-LG-1.2.2)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proper use levels of key vegetation; • Grazing systems; • Range improvements including land treatments; and • Adjusting seasons of use, and stocking rates. <p>Action PP-LG-1.2.3 - Livestock grazing would be managed to meet or make significant progress towards meeting Idaho Standards for Rangeland Health and Guidelines for Livestock Grazing Management, 1997 (Appendix A). (B-LG-1.2.3)</p> <p>Action PP-LG-1.2.4 - Beginning the following year after a wildland fire, livestock would be excluded from burned areas until an evaluation is completed to determine if objectives specific to or potentially impacted by livestock grazing in site-specific ES&R plans have been met. Should it be determined that ES&R treatments failed (plan objectives not met), at the discretion of the authorized officer livestock grazing could resume provided that: (B-LG-1.2.4/new)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Livestock grazing be adjusted (e.g., number, season of use, kind) to compensate for the change in rangeland health and forage conditions; and b) Livestock grazing would not prevent meeting or moving towards meeting Standards of Rangeland Health and or ES&R objectives. <p>Action PP-LG-1.2.5 - Following fire and non-fire vegetation treatments, livestock would be excluded from these areas if grazing would jeopardize attaining restoration objectives. In these situations, the area would be closed to grazing until an evaluation is completed to determine if objectives specific to or potentially impacted by livestock grazing in site-</p>																												

Draft RMP/EIS Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)	Proposed RMP/Final EIS Alternative B (Proposed Plan)																												
LIVESTOCK GRAZING (LG)																													
<p>less than 20%,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Expanding urban development and subsequent activities adversely affects the ability to graze livestock on public land, Occurrence of special status species affected by livestock grazing or supporting activities (such as distributing salt blocks, range improvement maintenance) and management changes are not economically feasible, and Forage or water quality that can not be corrected with reasonable investment (e.g., elevated selenium levels). <p>Action B-LG-1.2.6 - Acquired lands (Land and Water Conservation Fund [LWCF]/BPA) within the Soda Hills Management Area would not be available for livestock grazing (Figure 2-17).</p> <p>Action B-LG-1.2.7 - If necessary, livestock grazing would be adjusted for the following allotments to ensure that the natural processes associated with an RNA, such as pristine vegetative and soil characteristics are maintained:</p> <table border="1" style="margin-left: auto; margin-right: auto;"> <thead> <tr> <th>Allotment Name/Number</th> <th>RNA Name</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Trout Creek Spring (04154)</td> <td>Cheatbeck Canyon</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Horse Hollow (04329)</td> <td>Dairy Hollow</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Lower Oneida Narrows (04310)</td> <td>Oneida Narrows</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Rocky Peak (04412)</td> <td>Oneida Narrows</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Twin Lakes (14115)</td> <td>Oneida Narrows</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Bancroft (06032)</td> <td>Petticoat Peak</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Action B-LG-1.2.8 - Although considered available for grazing, 1,328 acres within the following allotments would be closed indefinitely to sheep grazing (Figure 3-12) due to elevated levels of selenium in water and plants:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This closure would remain in place until such time selenium levels can be reduced to acceptable levels through containment or capping. 	Allotment Name/Number	RNA Name	Trout Creek Spring (04154)	Cheatbeck Canyon	Horse Hollow (04329)	Dairy Hollow	Lower Oneida Narrows (04310)	Oneida Narrows	Rocky Peak (04412)	Oneida Narrows	Twin Lakes (14115)	Oneida Narrows	Bancroft (06032)	Petticoat Peak	<p>specific restoration plans have been met. Should it be determined that restoration treatments failed (plan objectives not met), at the discretion of the authorized officer livestock grazing could resume provided that: (new)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Livestock grazing be adjusted (e.g., number, season of use, kind) to compensate for the change in rangeland health and forage conditions; and b) Livestock grazing would not prevent meeting or moving towards meeting Standards of Rangeland Health and or ES&R objectives. <p>Action PP-LG-1.2.6 - The voluntary relinquishment of grazing preference would be accepted, in whole or part, and made available to qualified applicants following the most current policy and guidance. Grazing applications may be denied if one or more of the following criteria are met: (B-LG-1.2.5)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Failure to meet standards for rangeland health because of livestock grazing and meeting or moving towards standards is not economically feasible, Isolated parcels of public land consisting of 640 acres or less, No public or administrative access to allotment/parcel exists, Public lands are identified for disposal or exchange (occur within Zones 3 or 4), The proportion of unfenced public land to private land within the allotment is less than 20%, Expanding urban development and subsequent activities adversely affects the ability to graze livestock on public land, Occurrence of special status species affected by livestock grazing or supporting activities (such as distributing salt blocks, range improvement maintenance) and management changes are not economically feasible, and Poor forage or water quality that can not be corrected with reasonable investment (e.g., elevated selenium levels). <p>Action PP-LG-1.2.7 - Acquired lands (Land and Water Conservation Fund [LWCF]/BPA) within the Soda Hills Management Area would be available for livestock grazing on a temporary non-renewable basis as a tool for maintaining or enhancing wildlife habitat (Figure 2-17). (B-LG-1.2.6)</p> <p>Action PP-LG-1.2.8 - If necessary, livestock grazing would be adjusted for the following allotments to ensure that the natural processes associated with an RNA, such as pristine vegetative and soil characteristics are maintained: (B-LG-1.2.7)</p> <table border="1" style="margin-left: auto; margin-right: auto;"> <thead> <tr> <th>Allotment Name/Number</th> <th>RNA Name</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Trout Creek Spring (04154)</td> <td>Cheatbeck Canyon</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Horse Hollow (04329)</td> <td>Dairy Hollow</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Lower Oneida Narrows (04310)</td> <td>Oneida Narrows</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Rocky Peak (04412)</td> <td>Oneida Narrows</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Twin Lakes (14115)</td> <td>Oneida Narrows</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Bancroft (06032)</td> <td>Petticoat Peak</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Allotment Name/Number	RNA Name	Trout Creek Spring (04154)	Cheatbeck Canyon	Horse Hollow (04329)	Dairy Hollow	Lower Oneida Narrows (04310)	Oneida Narrows	Rocky Peak (04412)	Oneida Narrows	Twin Lakes (14115)	Oneida Narrows	Bancroft (06032)	Petticoat Peak
Allotment Name/Number	RNA Name																												
Trout Creek Spring (04154)	Cheatbeck Canyon																												
Horse Hollow (04329)	Dairy Hollow																												
Lower Oneida Narrows (04310)	Oneida Narrows																												
Rocky Peak (04412)	Oneida Narrows																												
Twin Lakes (14115)	Oneida Narrows																												
Bancroft (06032)	Petticoat Peak																												
Allotment Name/Number	RNA Name																												
Trout Creek Spring (04154)	Cheatbeck Canyon																												
Horse Hollow (04329)	Dairy Hollow																												
Lower Oneida Narrows (04310)	Oneida Narrows																												
Rocky Peak (04412)	Oneida Narrows																												
Twin Lakes (14115)	Oneida Narrows																												
Bancroft (06032)	Petticoat Peak																												
Grazing Allotments Indefinitely Closed To Sheep Grazing																													
<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="text-align: center;">Allotment Name</th> <th style="text-align: center;">Public Land Total Acres</th> <th style="text-align: center;">Public Land Acres Affected by Selenium</th> <th style="text-align: center;">Percent Allotment Affected</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">Trail Canyon-1</td> <td style="text-align: center;">309</td> <td style="text-align: center;">123</td> <td style="text-align: center;">40</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">Trail Canyon-2</td> <td style="text-align: center;">190</td> <td style="text-align: center;">25</td> <td style="text-align: center;">13</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">Woodall Mountain</td> <td style="text-align: center;">1,670</td> <td style="text-align: center;">1,180</td> <td style="text-align: center;">71</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Allotment Name	Public Land Total Acres	Public Land Acres Affected by Selenium	Percent Allotment Affected	Trail Canyon-1	309	123	40	Trail Canyon-2	190	25	13	Woodall Mountain	1,670	1,180	71												
Allotment Name	Public Land Total Acres	Public Land Acres Affected by Selenium	Percent Allotment Affected																										
Trail Canyon-1	309	123	40																										
Trail Canyon-2	190	25	13																										
Woodall Mountain	1,670	1,180	71																										

Draft RMP/EIS Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)	Proposed RMP/Final EIS Alternative B (Proposed Plan)																																														
LIVESTOCK GRAZING (LG)																																															
	<p>Action PP-LG-1.2.9 - Although considered available for grazing, 1,328 acres within the following allotments would be closed indefinitely to sheep grazing (Figure 3-12) due to elevated levels of selenium in water and plants: (B-LG-1.2.8)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This closure would remain in place until such time selenium levels can be reduced to acceptable levels through containment or capping. 																																														
	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="4">Grazing Allotments Indefinitely Closed To Sheep Grazing</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Allotment Name</th> <th>Public Land Total Acres</th> <th>Public Land Acres Affected by Selenium</th> <th>Percent Allotment Affected</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Trail Canyon-1</td> <td>309</td> <td>123</td> <td>40</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Trail Canyon-2</td> <td>190</td> <td>25</td> <td>13</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Woodall Mountain</td> <td>1,670</td> <td>1,180</td> <td>71</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Grazing Allotments Indefinitely Closed To Sheep Grazing				Allotment Name	Public Land Total Acres	Public Land Acres Affected by Selenium	Percent Allotment Affected	Trail Canyon-1	309	123	40	Trail Canyon-2	190	25	13	Woodall Mountain	1,670	1,180	71																										
Grazing Allotments Indefinitely Closed To Sheep Grazing																																															
Allotment Name	Public Land Total Acres	Public Land Acres Affected by Selenium	Percent Allotment Affected																																												
Trail Canyon-1	309	123	40																																												
Trail Canyon-2	190	25	13																																												
Woodall Mountain	1,670	1,180	71																																												
<p>Objective B-LG-1.3. Implement the Secretarial Order (Congressional Withdrawal #157, Idaho #9) which established BSD.</p>	<p>Objective PP-LG-1.3. Implement the Secretarial Order (Congressional Withdrawal #157, Idaho #9) which established BSD. (B-LG-1.3)</p>																																														
<p>Action B-LG-1.3.1 – Livestock use within the BSD would be limited to “Trailing Only”. Action B-LG-1.3.2 – Allotments would be eliminated entirely or closed in part as identified below, totaling approximately 8,600 acres of public land.</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Allotment Name (Number)</th> <th>Status</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr><td>Beaver Creek (04316)</td><td>Closed</td></tr> <tr><td>Blackfoot River (04201)</td><td>Closed</td></tr> <tr><td>Blackfoot River (04320)</td><td>Closed</td></tr> <tr><td>Blackfoot River (04121)</td><td>Closed</td></tr> <tr><td>EIGA Blackfoot River (14112)</td><td>Closed</td></tr> <tr><td>Blackfoot River (14092)</td><td>Eliminated</td></tr> <tr><td>Blackfoot River (04430)</td><td>Eliminated</td></tr> <tr><td>Miner Creek (04413)</td><td>Eliminated</td></tr> <tr><td>Trail Creek-1 (04419)</td><td>Eliminated</td></tr> <tr><td>Government Dam (0010)</td><td>Eliminated</td></tr> <tr><td>Negro Creek (0006)</td><td>Eliminated</td></tr> <tr><td>Sagehen Campground (0007)</td><td>Eliminated</td></tr> </tbody> </table>	Allotment Name (Number)	Status	Beaver Creek (04316)	Closed	Blackfoot River (04201)	Closed	Blackfoot River (04320)	Closed	Blackfoot River (04121)	Closed	EIGA Blackfoot River (14112)	Closed	Blackfoot River (14092)	Eliminated	Blackfoot River (04430)	Eliminated	Miner Creek (04413)	Eliminated	Trail Creek-1 (04419)	Eliminated	Government Dam (0010)	Eliminated	Negro Creek (0006)	Eliminated	Sagehen Campground (0007)	Eliminated	<p>Action PP-LG-1.3.1 – The priority use for allotments (approximately 7,000 acres) associated with the BSD and identified below would be authorized for “Trailing” with up to 1,400 AUMs available for trailing purposes (BSD) for those permittees/lessees with a valid trailing permit or grazing permit that incorporates trailing. (B-LG-1.3.1)</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Allotment Name (Number)</th> <th>Status</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr><td>Beaver Creek (04316)</td><td>Partially within BSD</td></tr> <tr><td>Blackfoot River (04201)</td><td>Partially within BSD</td></tr> <tr><td>Blackfoot River (04320)</td><td>Partially within BSD</td></tr> <tr><td>Blackfoot River (04121)</td><td>Partially within BSD</td></tr> <tr><td>EIGA Blackfoot River (14112)</td><td>Partially within BSD</td></tr> <tr><td>Blackfoot River (14092)</td><td>Partially within BSD</td></tr> <tr><td>Blackfoot River (04430)</td><td>Partially within BSD</td></tr> <tr><td>Miner Creek (04413)</td><td>Partially within BSD</td></tr> <tr><td>Trail Creek-1 (04419)</td><td>Partially within BSD</td></tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Action PP-LG-1.3.2 – Permitted grazing would continue for those BSD allotments,</p>	Allotment Name (Number)	Status	Beaver Creek (04316)	Partially within BSD	Blackfoot River (04201)	Partially within BSD	Blackfoot River (04320)	Partially within BSD	Blackfoot River (04121)	Partially within BSD	EIGA Blackfoot River (14112)	Partially within BSD	Blackfoot River (14092)	Partially within BSD	Blackfoot River (04430)	Partially within BSD	Miner Creek (04413)	Partially within BSD	Trail Creek-1 (04419)	Partially within BSD
Allotment Name (Number)	Status																																														
Beaver Creek (04316)	Closed																																														
Blackfoot River (04201)	Closed																																														
Blackfoot River (04320)	Closed																																														
Blackfoot River (04121)	Closed																																														
EIGA Blackfoot River (14112)	Closed																																														
Blackfoot River (14092)	Eliminated																																														
Blackfoot River (04430)	Eliminated																																														
Miner Creek (04413)	Eliminated																																														
Trail Creek-1 (04419)	Eliminated																																														
Government Dam (0010)	Eliminated																																														
Negro Creek (0006)	Eliminated																																														
Sagehen Campground (0007)	Eliminated																																														
Allotment Name (Number)	Status																																														
Beaver Creek (04316)	Partially within BSD																																														
Blackfoot River (04201)	Partially within BSD																																														
Blackfoot River (04320)	Partially within BSD																																														
Blackfoot River (04121)	Partially within BSD																																														
EIGA Blackfoot River (14112)	Partially within BSD																																														
Blackfoot River (14092)	Partially within BSD																																														
Blackfoot River (04430)	Partially within BSD																																														
Miner Creek (04413)	Partially within BSD																																														
Trail Creek-1 (04419)	Partially within BSD																																														

<p align="center">Draft RMP/EIS Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)</p>	<p align="center">Proposed RMP/Final EIS Alternative B (Proposed Plan)</p>					
<p align="center">LIVESTOCK GRAZING (LG)</p>						
<p align="center"><u>Womack-Spring Creek (0005)</u> <u>Eliminated</u></p> <p>Action B-LG-1.3.3 – The grazing preferences for portions of allotments within the BSD closed to grazing would be adjusted accordingly.</p> <p>Action B-LG-1.3.4 – While maintaining or improving rangeland health conditions and PFC of the riparian areas, up to approximately 1,400 AUMs would be available for trailing purposes (BSD) for those permittees/lessees with a valid trailing permit.</p>	<p>identified in Action PP-LG-1.3.1 only if: (B-LG-1.3.2)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. There are no conflicts with trailing and the allotment is meeting or making significant progress towards meeting the Idaho Standards for Rangeland Health, or 2. Current livestock grazing management practices are not the cause for not meeting Idaho Standards for Rangeland Health. <p>Grazing preferences would be adjusted accordingly for those allotments or portions of allotments in the BSD not meeting Idaho Standards for Rangeland Health.</p> <p>Action PP-LG-1.3.3 – The following areas, approximately 1,600 acres, not currently under permit/lease would remain authorized as “Trailing” only. (B-LG-1.3.3)</p> <table border="1" style="margin-left: auto; margin-right: auto;"> <thead> <tr> <th align="center">Allotment Name (Number)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td align="center">Government Dam (0010)</td> </tr> <tr> <td align="center">Negro Creek (0006)</td> </tr> <tr> <td align="center">Sagehen Campground (0007)</td> </tr> <tr> <td align="center">Womack-Spring Creek (0005)</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Allotment Name (Number)	Government Dam (0010)	Negro Creek (0006)	Sagehen Campground (0007)	Womack-Spring Creek (0005)
Allotment Name (Number)						
Government Dam (0010)						
Negro Creek (0006)						
Sagehen Campground (0007)						
Womack-Spring Creek (0005)						
<p align="center">Draft RMP/EIS Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)</p>						
<p align="center">Proposed RMP/Final EIS Alternative B (Proposed Plan)</p>						
<p align="center">MINERALS AND ENERGY (ME)</p>						
<p>Goal ME-1. Develop mineral resources (oil and gas, geothermal, solid minerals) consistent with other resource and use direction.</p>	<p>Goal ME-1. Develop mineral resources (oil and gas, geothermal, solid minerals) consistent with other resource and use direction. (ME-1)</p>					
<p>Objective CA-ME-1.1. Fulfill Indian Trust responsibilities related to minerals management.</p>	<p>Objective PP-ME-1.1. Assist the BIA/Shoshone Bannock-Tribes with minerals management on the Fort Hall Indian Reservation. (CA-ME-1.1)</p>					
<p>Action CA-ME-1.1.1 – Technical expertise would be provided for minerals investigation and development on the Fort Hall Indian Reservation.</p> <p>Action CA-ME-1.1.2 – Mineral operations management on the Fort Hall Indian Reservation would be based on the most current Memorandums of Understanding.</p> <p>Action CA-ME-1.1.3 – All mineral investigation or development proposals for the Fort Hall Indian Reservation would be coordinated with the Shoshone-Bannock Tribes on a staff to staff, government to government basis.</p> <p>Action CA-ME-1.1.4 – Reclamation plans for minerals development operations would be designed to meet applicable Idaho Standards for Rangeland Health (Appendix A).</p> <p>Action CA-ME-1.1.5 – Reclamation at development sites would be determined successful/complete when requirements in the reclamation plan have been met considering site potential.</p>	<p>Action PP-ME-1.1.1 – Technical expertise would be provided for minerals investigation and development on the Fort Hall Indian Reservation. (CA-ME-1.1.1)</p> <p>Action PP-ME-1.1.2 – Mineral operations management on the Fort Hall Indian Reservation would be based on the most current Memorandums of Understanding. (CA-ME-1.1.2)</p> <p>Action PP-ME-1.1.3 – All mineral investigation or development proposals for the Fort Hall Indian Reservation would be coordinated with the Shoshone-Bannock Tribes on a staff to staff, government to government basis. (CA-ME-1.1.3)</p> <p>Action PP-ME-1.1.4 – Reclamation plans for minerals development operations would be designed to meet applicable Idaho Standards for Rangeland Health (Appendix A). (CA-ME-1.1.4)</p> <p>Action PP-ME-1.1.5 – Reclamation at development sites would be determined successful/complete when Action PP-ME-1.1.4 has been met and requirements in the</p>					

Draft RMP/EIS Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)	Proposed RMP/Final EIS Alternative B (Proposed Plan)																
MINERALS AND ENERGY (ME)																	
	reclamation plan have been met considering site potential. (CA-ME-1.1.5)																
Objective CA-ME-1.2. Coordinate with federal agencies (e.g., Bureau of Indian Affairs, BOR, Forest Service, and USFWS) on minerals development proposals related to the federal mineral estate where such agencies have surface management responsibilities.	Objective PP-ME-1.2. Coordinate with federal agencies (e.g., Bureau of Indian Affairs, BOR, Forest Service, and USFWS) on minerals development proposals related to the federal mineral estate where such agencies have surface management responsibilities. (CA-ME-1.2)																
Action CA-ME-1.2.1 – The federal mineral estate would be managed consistent with laws, policies and established requirements.	Action PP-ME-1.2.1 – The federal mineral estate would be managed consistent with laws, policies and established requirements. (CA-ME-1.2.1)																
Action CA-ME-1.2.2 – The following withdrawals (approximately 20,160 acres) would be maintained and managed as closed to locatable mineral entry.	Action PP-ME-1.2.2 – The following withdrawals (approximately 20,160 acres) would be maintained and managed as closed to locatable mineral entry.(CA-ME-1.2.2)																
<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Federal Agency</th> <th>Mineral Estate Withdrawn Acres ¹</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>USFWS - Bear Lake Refuge</td> <td>17,500</td> </tr> <tr> <td>USFWS - Minidoka Refuge</td> <td>760</td> </tr> <tr> <td>USFWS - Oxford Slough Waterfowl Production Area</td> <td>1,900</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>¹ These acres are not considered in the PFO public lands base of 613,800 acres. Acreages are rounded.</p>	Federal Agency	Mineral Estate Withdrawn Acres ¹	USFWS - Bear Lake Refuge	17,500	USFWS - Minidoka Refuge	760	USFWS - Oxford Slough Waterfowl Production Area	1,900	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Federal Agency</th> <th>Mineral Estate Withdrawn Acres ¹</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>USFWS - Bear Lake Refuge</td> <td>17,500</td> </tr> <tr> <td>USFWS - Minidoka Refuge</td> <td>760</td> </tr> <tr> <td>USFWS - Oxford Slough Waterfowl Production Area</td> <td>1,900</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>¹ These acres are not considered in the PFO public lands base of 613,800 acres. Acreages are rounded.</p>	Federal Agency	Mineral Estate Withdrawn Acres ¹	USFWS - Bear Lake Refuge	17,500	USFWS - Minidoka Refuge	760	USFWS - Oxford Slough Waterfowl Production Area	1,900
Federal Agency	Mineral Estate Withdrawn Acres ¹																
USFWS - Bear Lake Refuge	17,500																
USFWS - Minidoka Refuge	760																
USFWS - Oxford Slough Waterfowl Production Area	1,900																
Federal Agency	Mineral Estate Withdrawn Acres ¹																
USFWS - Bear Lake Refuge	17,500																
USFWS - Minidoka Refuge	760																
USFWS - Oxford Slough Waterfowl Production Area	1,900																
Action CA-ME-1.2.3 – Leasable and salable mineral resources would be available for development at the discretion of the BLM after full coordination with the surface management agency.	Action PP-ME-1.2.3 – Leasable and salable mineral resources would be available for development according to related laws and regulations and at the discretion of the BLM after full coordination with the surface management agency. (CA-ME-1.2.3)																
Action CA-ME 1.2.4 – Leasable minerals on the Caribou National Forest would be managed consistent with the Caribou National Forest Plan (Forest Service 1996).	Action PP-ME 1.2.4 – Leasable minerals on the Caribou National Forest would be managed consistent with the Caribou National Forest Plan (Forest Service 1996). (CA-ME-1.2.4)																
Action CA-ME 1.2.5 – Reclamation requirements for mineral development operations would be developed consistent with surface management agencies' recommendations.	Action PP-ME 1.2.5 – Reclamation requirements for mineral development operations would be developed consistent with surface management agencies' recommendations. (CA-ME-1.2.5)																
Goal ME-2. Develop mineral resources (oil and gas, geothermal, solid minerals) consistent with other resources and uses as part of an ecologically healthy ecosystem.	Goal ME-2. Develop mineral resources (oil and gas, geothermal, solid minerals) consistent with other resources and uses as part of an ecologically healthy ecosystem. (ME-2)																
Objective AA-ME-2.1. Coordinate with private surface owners on minerals development proposals related to federal mineral estates.	Objective PP-ME-2.1. Coordinate with private surface owners on minerals development proposals related to federal mineral estates. (AA-ME-2.1)																
Action AA-ME-2.1.1 – Split-estate locatable mineral resources (approximately 419,500 acres) would be available for development.	Action PP-ME-2.1.1 – Split-estate locatable mineral resources (approximately 419,500 acres) would be available for development. (AA-ME-2.1.1)																
Action AA-ME-2.1.2 – Split-estate leasable and salable mineral resources would be	Action PP-ME-2.1.2 – Split-estate leasable and salable mineral resources would be																

<p style="text-align: center;">Draft RMP/EIS Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Proposed RMP/Final EIS Alternative B (Proposed Plan)</p>
MINERALS AND ENERGY (ME)	
<p>available for development at the discretion of the BLM.</p> <p>Action AA-ME-2.1.3 – On split-estate lands where private land overlies BLM managed federal mineral estate, approval of any operations plan would be coordinated with the surface owner to mitigate impacts as practical and as required by established requirements.</p> <p>Action AA-ME-2.1.4 – Reclamation requirements of mineral development operations on split-estate lands would be set at the same levels required on similar federal lands and/or equivalent state standards.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Applicable Idaho Standards for Rangeland Health (Appendix A) would be employed to determine the successfulness of reclamation, rehabilitation or restoration activities following major surface disturbances on federal lands. <p>Action AA-ME 2.1.5 – Mineral lessee/permittee performance bonds required by BLM on split-estate lands may include a loss-of-land-use bond on behalf of the surface owner (e.g., an annual rental based upon grazing values, as appraised by BLM, may be due to the surface owner) in addition to reclamation and other components.</p>	<p>available for development at the discretion of the BLM. (AA-ME-2.1.2)</p> <p>Action PP-ME-2.1.3 – On split-estate lands where private land overlies BLM managed federal mineral estate, approval of any operations plan would be coordinated with the surface owner to mitigate impacts as practical and as required by established requirements. (AA-ME-2.1.3)</p> <p>Action PP-ME-2.1.4 – On split-estate lands, stipulations, mitigation, and reclamation requirements for mineral development operations would be the same as on public lands and/or equivalent to State standards. For example, on a split estate lease containing big game winter habitat, seasonal restrictions (Appendix D) would be applied. (AA-ME-2.1.4)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mitigation prescribed for federal mineral development on split estate lands (sub-surface) would apply only to the development of the federal minerals and would not dictate the surface owners' management of their private lands. Mitigations would be applied as restrictions to only those surface activities conducted for purposes of developing federal minerals that are permitted, licensed or otherwise approved by the BLM. • Exceptions to surface development restrictions could be granted if requested or agreed to by the surface landowner. • Applicable Idaho Standards for Rangeland Health (Appendix A) would be employed to determine the success of reclamation, rehabilitation or restoration activities following major surface disturbances on public lands. <p>Action PP-ME 2.1.5 – Mineral lessee/permittee performance bonds required by BLM on split-estate lands may include a loss-of-land-use bond on behalf of the surface owner (e.g., an annual rental based upon grazing values, as appraised by BLM, may be due to the surface owner) in addition to reclamation and other components. (AA-ME-2.1.5)</p>
<p>Objective AA-ME-2.2. Maintain or reestablish the hydrologic function, integrity, quality, and other surface resource values of lands affected by mining actions consistent with the disturbed site potential.</p>	<p>Objective PP-ME-2.2. Maintain or reestablish the hydrologic function, integrity, quality, and other surface resource values of lands affected by mining actions consistent with the disturbed site potential. (AA-ME-2.2)</p>
<p>Action AA-ME-2.2.1 – Reclamation Plans for mineral development operations would be designed to attain and final reclamation would meet applicable standards (Appendix A) consistent with the rehabilitation potential of the disturbed site. Standards applicable to mineral development operations are primarily 1 through 3 and 5 through 7, with secondary and future site management directed towards attaining Standards 4 and 8.</p> <p>Action AA-ME-2.2.2 – The following operation standards and guidelines would be applied as appropriate to reduce environmental impacts from mineral exploration and development operations:</p> <p>OPERATIONAL STANDARDS:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Locate surface disturbing activities, including support facilities, outside riparian zones (e.g., riparian habitat conservation areas or areas where surface disturbance would impact the PFC of the riparian areas) and fish bearing waters. 	<p>Action PP-ME-2.2.1 – Reclamation Plans for mineral development operations would be designed to attain and final reclamation would meet applicable standards (Appendix A) consistent with the rehabilitation potential of the disturbed site. Standards applicable to mineral development operations are primarily 1 through 3 and 5 through 7, with secondary and future site management directed towards attaining Standards 4 and 8. (AA-ME-2.2.1)</p> <p>Action PP-ME-2.2.2 – Within development areas, soils and native vegetation would be retained undisturbed when disturbance of the site is not necessary for minerals development or safety.</p> <p>The authorized officer may require that mine pits be backfilled in consideration of regulatory resource recovery mandates and mine operational constraints. (AA-ME-2.2.2)</p> <p>OPERATIONAL STANDARDS:</p>

<p align="center">Draft RMP/EIS Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)</p>	<p align="center">Proposed RMP/Final EIS Alternative B (Proposed Plan)</p>
<p align="center">MINERALS AND ENERGY (ME)</p>	
<p>Cutthroat trout guidance would be considered as identified in Appendix E. Where no feasible alternative site exists, operate and construct facilities in ways that would avoid or reduce impacts to riparian zone attributes.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Diversions to control surface flow and infiltration on overburden piles, pit backfill, and all disturbed areas would be designed to be self-maintaining or maintained by the lessee. If appropriate for reclamation design, soil resources would be inventoried following Order 2 National Resource Conservation Service, National Cooperative Soil Survey standards (or more detailed Order 1 survey for large mining projects). Volumes and suitability of soil resources for reclamation would be determined before disturbance. Topsoil and selected sub soils suitable for reclamation, as identified in the soil inventory, would be salvaged on slopes where equipment can safely operate. These soils would be immediately utilized for reclamation at the mine or placed in an approved stockpile for future use. Mineral exploration and development would include plans for concurrent or timely reclamation. Plans would be modified and updated as appropriate. In the event of a temporary shutdown of operations, interim reclamation and site stabilization would be conducted according to a plan submitted by the operator/lessee to the Authorized Officer. The lessee/operator would monitor reclamation work and report to the Authorized Officer annually until reclamation is accepted as adequate and the performance bond released. Mineral operations would replace or mitigate any loss of available surface water sources for uses such as wildlife or grazing as appropriate. This includes the loss of water quality sufficient to maintain post-mineral development uses. Within development areas, native vegetation would be retained undisturbed when disturbance of the site is not necessary for minerals development or safety. Mineral operations performance bonds would include an amount that reflects the actual cost to BLM (including current administration and overhead costs) to reclaim facilities and related surface disturbance. This amount would be determined by BLM and bonds secured by mineral operators prior to surface disturbance or project implementation. Water management would be designed and maintained to control water runoff, erosion, infiltration, sedimentation, and contamination as necessary. <p>OPERATIONAL GUIDELINES:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Selection of plant species for establishment would reflect the surrounding ecosystem and post development land use. Plant materials selected for reclamation use would be adapted to the climate of the site. Consideration and preference would be given to promoting natural succession, native plant species, and structural diversity. Reclaimed areas would be graded and shaped, where possible, to a stable topographic relief that conforms and blends in with the variability of surrounding 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Locate surface disturbing activities, including support facilities, outside riparian zones (e.g., riparian habitat conservation areas or areas where surface disturbance would impact the PFC of the riparian areas) and fish bearing waters. Cutthroat trout guidance would be considered as identified in Appendix E. Where no feasible alternative site exists, operate and construct facilities in ways that would avoid or reduce impacts to riparian zone attributes. Diversions to control surface flow and infiltration on overburden piles, pit backfill, and all disturbed areas would be designed to be self-maintaining or maintained by the lessee. If appropriate for reclamation design, soil resources would be inventoried following Order 2 National Resource Conservation Service, National Cooperative Soil Survey standards (or more detailed Order 1 survey for large mining projects). Volumes and suitability of soil resources for reclamation would be determined before disturbance. Topsoil and selected sub soils suitable for reclamation, as identified in the soil inventory, would be salvaged on slopes where equipment can safely operate. These soils would be immediately utilized for reclamation at the mine or placed in an approved stockpile for future use. Mineral exploration and development would include plans for concurrent or timely reclamation. Plans would be modified and updated as appropriate. In the event of a temporary shutdown of operations, interim reclamation and site stabilization would be conducted according to a plan submitted by the operator/lessee to the Authorized Officer. The lessee/operator would monitor reclamation work and report to the Authorized Officer annually until reclamation is accepted as adequate and the performance bond released. Mineral operations would replace or mitigate any loss of available surface water sources for uses such as wildlife or grazing as appropriate. This includes the loss of water quality sufficient to maintain post-mineral development uses. Within development areas, soils and native vegetation would be retained undisturbed when disturbance of the site is not necessary for minerals development or safety. Mineral operations performance bonds would include an amount that reflects the actual cost to BLM (including current administration and overhead costs) to reclaim facilities and related surface disturbance. This amount would be determined by BLM and bonds secured by mineral operators prior to surface disturbance or project implementation. Water management would be designed and maintained to control water runoff, erosion, infiltration, sedimentation, and contamination as necessary. <p>OPERATIONAL GUIDELINES:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Selection of plant species for establishment would reflect the surrounding ecosystem and post development land use. Plant materials selected for

<p style="text-align: center;">Draft RMP/EIS Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Proposed RMP/Final EIS Alternative B (Proposed Plan)</p>
<p>MINERALS AND ENERGY (ME)</p>	
<p>slopes. Final reclaimed slopes would not be steeper than 33% (3 horizontal : 1 vertical).</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. Before release of the performance bond, the site would be assessed to assure: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • minimum ground cover exists to attain long-term soil productivity requirements; • ground cover persists naturally, at minimum cover needs, without artificial assistance (e.g., irrigation, fertilizers, etc.); and • impacted lands are reclaimed and meet or suitably trend toward meeting applicable Standards (Appendix A) and post development land use objectives. 4. In reclaimed areas, vegetation would include species that meet wildlife habitat needs. Cover for wildlife would be incorporated into design plans (e.g., slash piles, logs, rock piles, etc.). 5. Roads, disturbed areas, and facilities no longer necessary for mineral exploration and development would be reclaimed as soon as practicable, normally within one year after the lands become available for reclamation. 6. To the maximum extent feasible, disturbed lands would be reclaimed to meet VRM objectives. 	<p>reclamation use would be adapted to the climate of the site. Consideration and preference would be given to promoting natural succession, native plant species, and structural diversity.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Reclaimed areas would be graded and shaped, where possible, to a stable topographic relief that conforms and blends in with the variability of surrounding slopes. Final reclaimed slopes would not be steeper than 33% (3 horizontal : 1 vertical). 3. Before release of the performance bond, the site would be assessed to assure: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • minimum ground cover exists to attain long-term soil productivity requirements; • ground cover persists naturally, at minimum cover needs, without artificial assistance (e.g., irrigation, fertilizers, etc.); and • impacted lands are reclaimed and meet or suitably trend toward meeting applicable Standards (Appendix A) and post development land use objectives. 4. In reclaimed areas, vegetation would include species that meet wildlife habitat needs. Cover for wildlife would be incorporated into design plans (e.g., slash piles, logs, rock piles, etc.). 5. Roads, disturbed areas, and facilities no longer necessary for mineral exploration and development would be reclaimed as soon as practicable, normally within one year after the lands become available for reclamation. 6. To the maximum extent feasible, disturbed lands would be reclaimed to meet VRM objectives. 7. The authorized officer may require that mine pits be backfilled in consideration of regulatory resource recovery mandates and mine operational constraints.

<p style="text-align: center;">Draft RMP/EIS Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Proposed RMP/Final EIS Alternative B (Proposed Plan)</p>
MINERALS AND ENERGY (ME)	
<p>Objective AA-ME-2.3. Regulate mineral development activities to prevent or control sediment and the release of contaminants such as selenium and metals into the environment.</p>	<p>Objective PP-ME-2.3. Regulate mineral development activities to prevent or control sediment and the release of contaminants such as selenium and metals into the environment. (AA-ME-2.3)</p>
<p>Action AA-ME-2.3.1 – Best Management Practices (BMPs) and/or other appropriate management techniques or guidelines (Appendix C) would be applied to control acid rock drainage, sedimentation, and release of contaminants.</p> <p>Action AA-ME-2.3.2 – Plans would be required for preventing or controlling adverse environmental impacts (e.g., water management, hazardous materials & spills, sediment control, contamination).</p> <p>Action AA-ME-2.3.3 – Hydrologic function and watershed health would be monitored at all active mineral operations and adjustments made to operations and reclamation as necessary to achieve PFC of watersheds, revegetation objectives and protection of resources.</p> <p>Action AA-ME-2.3.4 – Suitable topsoil/subsoil would be salvaged for reclamation use in a way that best supports biological diversity and prevents the release of hazardous substances.</p> <p>Action AA-ME-2.3.5 – In reclamation activities, plant species known to reduce the risk of bioaccumulation of hazardous substances, such as selenium, would be used if such risk is present.</p> <p>Action AA-ME-2.3.6 – Prior to release of any performance bond or relinquishment of a mineral lease/permit, reclamation vegetation would be monitored for bio-accumulation of hazardous substances for a period of time to be determined appropriate by the Authorized Officer.</p> <p>Action AA-ME-2.3.7 – Phosphate mine site plans would be designed to meet the following goals as identified in the <i>Interagency Area-Wide Investigation of Phosphate Mine Contamination and Final Risk Management Plan (IPMP)</i> (2004).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Protect southeast Idaho’s surface water resources. • Protect wildlife habitat and ecological resources in southeast Idaho. • Maintain and protect multiple beneficial uses of the southeast Idaho phosphate mining resource area. • Protect southeast Idaho’s ground water resources. <p>Action AA-ME-2.3.8 – In order to achieve the goals identified in Action AA-ME-2.3.7, the following action levels (Appendix I) (and any future modifications) for vegetation, surface waters and groundwater as identified in the IPMP would be used to design mine and reclamation plans. In addition, these levels would be used in determining the success of phosphate mine reclamation, rehabilitation and/or restoration activities.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appropriate follow-up actions (e.g., conduct further monitoring, conduct additional reclamation, conduct appropriate clean up activities) would be taken should these levels not be successfully met or exceeded. 	<p>Action PP-ME-2.3.1 – Best Management Practices (BMPs) and/or other appropriate management techniques or guidelines (Appendix C) would be applied to control acid rock drainage, sedimentation, and release of contaminants. (AA-ME-2.3.1)</p> <p>Action PP-ME-2.3.2 – Plans would be required for preventing or controlling adverse environmental impacts (e.g., water management, hazardous materials & spills, sediment control, contamination). (AA-ME-2.3.2)</p> <p>Action PP-ME-2.3.3 – Hydrologic function and watershed health would be monitored at all active mineral operations and adjustments made to operations and reclamation as necessary to achieve PFC of watersheds, revegetation objectives and protection of resources. (AA-ME-2.3.3)</p> <p>Action PP-ME-2.3.4 – Suitable topsoil/subsoil would be salvaged for reclamation use in a way that best supports biological diversity and prevents the release of hazardous substances. (AA-ME-2.3.4)</p> <p>Action PP-ME-2.3.5 – In reclamation activities, plant species known to reduce the risk of bioaccumulation of hazardous substances, such as selenium, would be used if such risk is present. (AA-ME-2.3.5)</p> <p>Action PP-ME-2.3.6 – Prior to release of any performance bond or relinquishment of a mineral lease/permit, reclamation vegetation would be monitored for bio-accumulation of hazardous substances for a period of time to be determined appropriate by the Authorized Officer. (AA-ME-2.3.6)</p> <p>Action PP-ME-2.3.7 – Phosphate mine site plans would be designed to meet the following goals as identified in the <i>Interagency Area-Wide Investigation of Phosphate Mine Contamination and Final Risk Management Plan (IPMP)</i> (2004). (AA-ME-2.3.7)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Protect southeast Idaho’s surface water resources. • Protect wildlife habitat and ecological resources in southeast Idaho. • Maintain and protect multiple beneficial uses of the southeast Idaho phosphate mining resource area. • Protect southeast Idaho’s ground water resources. <p>Action PP-ME-2.3.8 – In order to achieve the goals identified in Action PP-ME-2.3.7, the following action levels (Appendix I) for vegetation, surface waters and groundwater as identified in the current IPMP and or future updates or revisions would be used to design mine and reclamation plans. In addition, these levels would be used in determining the success of phosphate mine reclamation, rehabilitation, and/or restoration activities. (AA-ME-2.3.8)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appropriate follow-up actions (e.g., conduct further monitoring, conduct additional reclamation, conduct appropriate clean up activities) would be taken should these levels not be successfully met or exceeded.

Draft RMP/EIS Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)	Proposed RMP/Final EIS Alternative B (Proposed Plan)																																																																
MINERALS AND ENERGY (ME)																																																																	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> As appropriate, these action levels may be adjusted for future site specific projects through continued investigation/monitoring and analysis through the NEPA process. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> These action levels may be adjusted for future site specific situations after investigation/monitoring and analysis using an appropriate regulatory process such as FLPMA, the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act, or applicable federal and state water quality rules. 																																																																
Action Levels for Vegetation, Groundwater, Surface Water, and CWA																																																																	
<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="2">Mine Reclamation Vegetation Suitability Standards</th> <th colspan="2">Standards for Groundwater (Total Recoverable, Unfiltered)</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Contaminant</th> <th>(mg/kg dry weight)</th> <th>Contaminant</th> <th>(ug/L)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Selenium</td> <td>5.0</td> <td>Selenium</td> <td>50.0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Cadmium</td> <td>4.2</td> <td>Cadmium</td> <td>5.0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Chromium</td> <td>30.6</td> <td>Chromium</td> <td>100.0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Nickel</td> <td>35.5</td> <td>Nickel</td> <td>730.0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Vanadium</td> <td>55.9</td> <td>Vanadium</td> <td>260.0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Zinc</td> <td>615.0</td> <td>Zinc</td> <td>5000.0</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Selected constituents are shown. The Idaho Groundwater Protection Rule (IDAPA 58.01.11) contains the full constituent list and action levels for ground water.</p>	Mine Reclamation Vegetation Suitability Standards		Standards for Groundwater (Total Recoverable, Unfiltered)		Contaminant	(mg/kg dry weight)	Contaminant	(ug/L)	Selenium	5.0	Selenium	50.0	Cadmium	4.2	Cadmium	5.0	Chromium	30.6	Chromium	100.0	Nickel	35.5	Nickel	730.0	Vanadium	55.9	Vanadium	260.0	Zinc	615.0	Zinc	5000.0	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="2">Mine Reclamation Vegetation Suitability Standards</th> <th colspan="2">Standards for Groundwater (Total Recoverable, Unfiltered)</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Contaminant</th> <th>(mg/kg dry weight)</th> <th>Contaminant</th> <th>(ug/L)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Selenium</td> <td>5.0</td> <td>Selenium</td> <td>50.0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Cadmium</td> <td>4.2</td> <td>Cadmium</td> <td>5.0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Chromium</td> <td>30.6</td> <td>Chromium</td> <td>100.0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Nickel</td> <td>35.5</td> <td>Nickel</td> <td>730.0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Vanadium</td> <td>55.9</td> <td>Vanadium</td> <td>260.0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Zinc</td> <td>615.0</td> <td>Zinc</td> <td>5000.0</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Selected constituents are shown. The Idaho Groundwater Protection Rule (IDAPA 58.01.11) contains the full constituent list and action levels for ground water.</p>	Mine Reclamation Vegetation Suitability Standards		Standards for Groundwater (Total Recoverable, Unfiltered)		Contaminant	(mg/kg dry weight)	Contaminant	(ug/L)	Selenium	5.0	Selenium	50.0	Cadmium	4.2	Cadmium	5.0	Chromium	30.6	Chromium	100.0	Nickel	35.5	Nickel	730.0	Vanadium	55.9	Vanadium	260.0	Zinc	615.0	Zinc	5000.0
Mine Reclamation Vegetation Suitability Standards		Standards for Groundwater (Total Recoverable, Unfiltered)																																																															
Contaminant	(mg/kg dry weight)	Contaminant	(ug/L)																																																														
Selenium	5.0	Selenium	50.0																																																														
Cadmium	4.2	Cadmium	5.0																																																														
Chromium	30.6	Chromium	100.0																																																														
Nickel	35.5	Nickel	730.0																																																														
Vanadium	55.9	Vanadium	260.0																																																														
Zinc	615.0	Zinc	5000.0																																																														
Mine Reclamation Vegetation Suitability Standards		Standards for Groundwater (Total Recoverable, Unfiltered)																																																															
Contaminant	(mg/kg dry weight)	Contaminant	(ug/L)																																																														
Selenium	5.0	Selenium	50.0																																																														
Cadmium	4.2	Cadmium	5.0																																																														
Chromium	30.6	Chromium	100.0																																																														
Nickel	35.5	Nickel	730.0																																																														
Vanadium	55.9	Vanadium	260.0																																																														
Zinc	615.0	Zinc	5000.0																																																														

Draft RMP/EIS Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)		Proposed RMP/Final EIS Alternative B (Proposed Plan)																																																																													
MINERALS AND ENERGY (ME)																																																																															
<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="2">Surface Water Suitability Standards for Biota Standards (e.g., isolated artificial ponds, mine pit lakes, seeps, springs)</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Contaminant</th> <th>(Mg/L)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Selenium:</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td> Transitory wildlife drinking water use</td> <td>0.201</td> </tr> <tr> <td> Domestic animal drinking water use (e.g., livestock grazing)</td> <td>0.050</td> </tr> <tr> <td> Riparian habitat use</td> <td>0.005</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Cadmium</td> <td>0.245</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Chromium</td> <td>8.7</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Nickel</td> <td>0.614</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Vanadium</td> <td>0.972</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Zinc</td> <td>43.4</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Surface Water Suitability Standards for Biota Standards (e.g., isolated artificial ponds, mine pit lakes, seeps, springs)		Contaminant	(Mg/L)	Selenium:		Transitory wildlife drinking water use	0.201	Domestic animal drinking water use (e.g., livestock grazing)	0.050	Riparian habitat use	0.005	Cadmium	0.245	Chromium	8.7	Nickel	0.614	Vanadium	0.972	Zinc	43.4	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="2">Standards for CWA¹ Regulated Surface Waters</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Contaminant</th> <th>(ug/L)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Selenium (Total Recoverable)</td> <td>5.0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Cadmium</td> <td>1.0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Chromium (Total)²</td> <td>74.0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Nickel</td> <td>160.0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Vanadium (Dissolved)</td> <td>20.0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Zinc</td> <td>100.0</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>¹ Clean Water Act ² Assumes 6 to 1 partitioning of Cr III to CR VI. The surface water criteria for chromium were changed in 2005. Total Chromium has been replaced with Chromium (III) and Chromium (VI). Selected constituents are shown; the CWA contains the full constituent list and action levels for surface water.</p>	Standards for CWA ¹ Regulated Surface Waters		Contaminant	(ug/L)	Selenium (Total Recoverable)	5.0	Cadmium	1.0	Chromium (Total) ²	74.0	Nickel	160.0	Vanadium (Dissolved)	20.0	Zinc	100.0	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="2">Surface Water Suitability Standards for Biota Standards (e.g., isolated artificial ponds, mine pit lakes, seeps, springs)</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Contaminant</th> <th>(Mg/L)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Selenium:</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td> Transitory wildlife drinking water use</td> <td>0.201</td> </tr> <tr> <td> Domestic animal drinking water use (e.g., livestock grazing)</td> <td>0.050</td> </tr> <tr> <td> Riparian habitat use</td> <td>0.005</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Cadmium</td> <td>0.245</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Chromium</td> <td>8.7</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Nickel</td> <td>0.614</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Vanadium</td> <td>0.972</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Zinc</td> <td>43.4</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Surface Water Suitability Standards for Biota Standards (e.g., isolated artificial ponds, mine pit lakes, seeps, springs)		Contaminant	(Mg/L)	Selenium:		Transitory wildlife drinking water use	0.201	Domestic animal drinking water use (e.g., livestock grazing)	0.050	Riparian habitat use	0.005	Cadmium	0.245	Chromium	8.7	Nickel	0.614	Vanadium	0.972	Zinc	43.4	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="2">Standards for CWA¹ Regulated Surface Waters</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Contaminant</th> <th>(ug/L)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Selenium (Total Recoverable)</td> <td>5.0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Cadmium</td> <td>0.6</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Chromium (Total)²</td> <td>74.0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Nickel</td> <td>52.0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Vanadium (Dissolved)</td> <td>20.0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Zinc</td> <td>120.0</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>¹ Clean Water Act ² Assumes 6 to 1 partitioning of Cr III to CR VI. The surface water criteria for chromium were changed in 2005. Total Chromium has been replaced with Chromium (III) and Chromium (VI). Selected constituents are shown; the CWA contains the full constituent list and action levels for surface water.</p>	Standards for CWA ¹ Regulated Surface Waters		Contaminant	(ug/L)	Selenium (Total Recoverable)	5.0	Cadmium	0.6	Chromium (Total) ²	74.0	Nickel	52.0	Vanadium (Dissolved)	20.0	Zinc	120.0
Surface Water Suitability Standards for Biota Standards (e.g., isolated artificial ponds, mine pit lakes, seeps, springs)																																																																															
Contaminant	(Mg/L)																																																																														
Selenium:																																																																															
Transitory wildlife drinking water use	0.201																																																																														
Domestic animal drinking water use (e.g., livestock grazing)	0.050																																																																														
Riparian habitat use	0.005																																																																														
Cadmium	0.245																																																																														
Chromium	8.7																																																																														
Nickel	0.614																																																																														
Vanadium	0.972																																																																														
Zinc	43.4																																																																														
Standards for CWA ¹ Regulated Surface Waters																																																																															
Contaminant	(ug/L)																																																																														
Selenium (Total Recoverable)	5.0																																																																														
Cadmium	1.0																																																																														
Chromium (Total) ²	74.0																																																																														
Nickel	160.0																																																																														
Vanadium (Dissolved)	20.0																																																																														
Zinc	100.0																																																																														
Surface Water Suitability Standards for Biota Standards (e.g., isolated artificial ponds, mine pit lakes, seeps, springs)																																																																															
Contaminant	(Mg/L)																																																																														
Selenium:																																																																															
Transitory wildlife drinking water use	0.201																																																																														
Domestic animal drinking water use (e.g., livestock grazing)	0.050																																																																														
Riparian habitat use	0.005																																																																														
Cadmium	0.245																																																																														
Chromium	8.7																																																																														
Nickel	0.614																																																																														
Vanadium	0.972																																																																														
Zinc	43.4																																																																														
Standards for CWA ¹ Regulated Surface Waters																																																																															
Contaminant	(ug/L)																																																																														
Selenium (Total Recoverable)	5.0																																																																														
Cadmium	0.6																																																																														
Chromium (Total) ²	74.0																																																																														
Nickel	52.0																																																																														
Vanadium (Dissolved)	20.0																																																																														
Zinc	120.0																																																																														
<p>Objective B-ME-2.1. Manage approximately 602,600 acres of the federal mineral estate as open for fluid minerals leasing (e.g., oil, gas, and geothermal resources).</p>		<p>Objective PP-ME-2.4. Manage approximately 344,500 acres of the federal mineral estate as open for fluid minerals leasing (e.g., oil, gas, and geothermal resources). (B-ME-2.1)</p>																																																																													
<p>Action B-ME-2.1.1 – Fluid mineral leasing activities would be subject to standard lease terms, conditions, and applicable special stipulations identified in Appendix H.</p> <p>Action B-ME-2.1.2 – To protect WSAs, approximately 11,200 acres of public lands would be closed to fluid mineral leasing (Figure 2-18).</p> <p>Action B-ME-2.1.3 – On approximately 321,400 acres, the following areas would be leased with a fluid minerals NSO stipulation to protect resources (e.g., soils, wildlife, water, cultural resources) (Figure 2-18).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Withdrawal - Water/Power - Bear River Reclamation Project • Withdrawal - Water/Power - Soda Point • Withdrawal - Water/Power - Last Chance • Withdrawal - Water/Power - Fort Hall Irrigation Project • Withdrawal -Water/Power - Soda Springs Project • Withdrawal - Public Water Reserves - (107 and 125) • Withdrawal - Power Site Reserves, Generating Facilities, Dams • Malad Air Navigation Site • Water/Power - Minidoka Reclamation Project 		<p>Action PP-ME-2.4.1– Fluid mineral leasing activities would be subject to standard lease terms, conditions, and applicable special stipulations identified in Appendix H. (B-ME-2.1.1)</p> <p>Action PP-ME-2.4.2 – To protect WSAs 11,200 acres of public lands would be closed to fluid mineral leasing (Figure 2-18). (B-ME-2.1.2).</p> <p>Action PP-ME-2.4.3 – Approximately 258,100 acres of public lands in the Curlew area would be administratively unavailable (i.e., postponed from lease offering) (Figure 2-18) pending further National Environmental Policy Act analysis to demonstrate that the objectives for initially holding such public lands from lease offering can be alternatively met or no longer apply. Identified objectives are to maintain and protect important resources such as the sagebrush steppe ecosystem; sagebrush obligate species; sensitive species habitat, such as sage- and sharp-tailed grouse, and the globally important ferruginous hawk population and habitat. (new)</p> <p>Action PP-ME-2.4.4 – Any fluid mineral leasing on the following approximately 226,000 acres, would include an NSO stipulation to protect resources (e.g., soils, wildlife, water, cultural resources) (Figure 2-18). NSO stipulations may be waived on steep slopes or</p>																																																																													

Draft RMP/EIS Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)	Proposed RMP/Final EIS Alternative B (Proposed Plan)
MINERALS AND ENERGY (ME)	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Blackfoot Stock Driveway • Communication Sites • Recreation and Public Purpose Patents/Leases • Soda Springs Hills Management Area • Downey Watershed ACEC • Bowen Canyon Bald Eagle Sanctuary ACEC • Old Juniper Townsite ACEC • Indian Rocks ACEC • Travertine Park ACEC • Stump Creek ACEC • Van Komen Homestead ACEC • Dairy Hollow RNA • Formation Cave RNA • Oneida Narrows RNA • Travertine Park RNA • Pine Gap RNA • Robber's Roost RNA • Cheatback Canyon RNA • Historical Sites and Trails • Developed Recreation Sites/Campgrounds • Highly erosive soils on slopes greater than 20% • Steep Slopes, >30% • Riparian/Wetlands, Perennial Streams, Lakes <p>Action B-ME 2.1.4 – On approximately 439,000 acres, public lands would be leased with a seasonal occupancy stipulation to protect big game winter range, calving, fawning and/or nesting activities. (Note: Seasonal closure acreage amount may include other BLM lands closed to development.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fluid minerals exploration drilling and development would comply with the seasonal wildlife restrictions (Appendix D). • Seasonal wildlife restrictions would not be applicable to production activities. <p>Action B-ME 2.1.5 – Special stipulations would be changed only by waiver, exceptions, or modifications as outlined by specific criteria in Appendix H.</p> <p>Action B-ME 2.1.6 – Areas open for leasing would also be available for consideration of geophysical exploration activities subject to NSO and seasonal occupancy restrictions.</p> <p>Action B-ME 2.1.7– Lands acquired for special purposes or with special funding would be managed in a manner consistent with the purposes of the acquisition; typically an NSO stipulation.</p>	<p>erodible soils if adequate mitigation measures are incorporated into operations plans. (B-ME-2.1.3)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Withdrawal - Water/Power - Bear River Reclamation Project • Withdrawal - Water/Power - Soda Point • Withdrawal - Water/Power - Last Chance • Withdrawal - Water/Power - Fort Hall Irrigation Project • Withdrawal -Water/Power - Soda Springs Project • Withdrawal - Public Water Reserves - (107 and 125) • Withdrawal - Power Site Reserves, Generating Facilities, Dams • Malad Air Navigation Site • Water/Power - Minidoka Reclamation Project • Blackfoot Stock Driveway • Communication Sites • Recreation and Public Purpose Patents/Leases • Soda Springs Hills Management Area • Downey Watershed ACEC • Bowen Canyon Bald Eagle Sanctuary ACEC • Old Juniper Townsite ACEC • Indian Rocks ACEC • Travertine Park ACEC • Stump Creek ACEC • Dairy Hollow RNA • Formation Cave RNA • Oneida Narrows RNA • Travertine Park RNA • Pine Gap RNA • Robber's Roost RNA • Cheatback Canyon RNA • Historical Sites and Trails • Developed Recreation Sites/Campgrounds • Highly erosive soils on slopes greater than 20% • Steep Slopes, >30% • Riparian/Wetlands, Perennial Streams, Lakes • Bear Lake Plateau/Sheep Creek Hills (Sensitive Species Habitat - Flora and Fauna) <p>Action PP-ME-2.4.5 – Any fluid mineral leasing on the following approximately 83,700 acres, would include a seasonal occupancy stipulation to protect big game winter range, calving, fawning and/or nesting activities.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fluid minerals exploration drilling and development would comply with the seasonal restrictions as identified in Appendix D. These seasonal restrictions would not be applicable to production activities. <p>Action PP-ME-2.4.6 – Special stipulations would be changed only by waiver, exceptions, or modifications as outlined by specific criteria in Appendix H. (B-ME-2.1.5)</p>

<p style="text-align: center;">Draft RMP/EIS Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Proposed RMP/Final EIS Alternative B (Proposed Plan)</p>
<p>MINERALS AND ENERGY (ME)</p>	
	<p>Action PP-ME 2.4.7 – Areas open for leasing would also be available for consideration of geophysical exploration activities subject to NSO and seasonal occupancy restrictions. (B-ME-2.1.6)</p> <p>Action PP-ME-2.4.8 – Lands acquired for special purposes or with special funding would be managed in a manner consistent with the purposes of the acquisition; typically an NSO stipulation. (B-ME-2.1.7)</p> <p>Action PP-ME-2.4.9 – Where field drainage or mineral trespass of federally reserved minerals (e.g., oil and gas, geothermal) may occur from fluid mineral production adjacent to public lands closed or administratively unavailable to fluid mineral development, the minimum area of public lands may be made available for lease with NSO stipulations under the following circumstances: (new)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development on adjacent state or private mineral estate is determined to be draining federal fluid mineral resources to the extent a trespass situation has developed or could be expected to occur. • Drainage determinations would be made by a BLM minerals specialist. When determined that a drainage situation exists in closed or unavailable areas, a recommendation would be made to the Idaho BLM State Office, in consultation with the PFO, to offer the area for leasing. • The area offered for leasing would be the minimum needed to resolve the drainage issue. • Impacts on wildlife habitat, cultural resources, vegetation, and visual and recreational values would be adequately mitigated.
<p>Objective B-ME-2.2. Manage approximately 582,400 acres of the federal mineral estate (leasable minerals) as open to solid minerals leasing (e.g., phosphate) subject to standard lease terms, and conditions.</p>	<p>Objective PP-ME-2.5. Manage approximately 582,400 acres of the federal mineral estate (leasable minerals) as open to solid minerals leasing (e.g., phosphate) subject to standard lease terms, and conditions. (B-ME-2.2)</p>
<p>Action B-ME 2.2.1 – A nondiscretionary closure would be in effect for WSAs consisting of approximately 11,200 acres (Figure 2-19).</p> <p>Action B-ME 2.2.2 – Discretionary closures (agency administrative) would be in effect on approximately 20,200 acres as identified below (Figure 2-19):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Petticoat Peak RNA • Dairy Hollow RNA • Formation Cave RNA • Oneida Narrows RNA • Travertine Park RNA • Pine Gap RNA • Robber's Roost RNA • Cheatbeck Canyon RNA • Soda Springs Hills Management Area (LWCF/BPA and public lands portions) <p>Action B-ME 2.2.3 – Appropriate site specific mitigation measures, developed during BLM preparation or review of an operations plan, would be implemented as conditions of approval.</p>	<p>Action PP-ME-2.5.1 – A nondiscretionary closure would be in effect for WSAs consisting of approximately 11,200 acres (Figure 2-19). (B-ME 2.2.1)</p> <p>Action PP-ME-2.5.2 – Discretionary closures (agency administrative) would be in effect on approximately 20,200 acres as identified below (Figure 2-19): (B-ME-2.2.2)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Petticoat Peak RNA • Dairy Hollow RNA • Formation Cave RNA • Oneida Narrows RNA • Travertine Park RNA • Pine Gap RNA • Robber's Roost RNA • Cheatbeck Canyon RNA • Soda Springs Hills Management Area (LWCF/BPA and public lands portions) <p>Action PP-ME-2.5.3 – Appropriate site specific mitigation measures, developed during BLM preparation or review of an operations plan, would be implemented as conditions of approval. (B-ME-2.2.3)</p>

<p style="text-align: center;">Draft RMP/EIS Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Proposed RMP/Final EIS Alternative B (Proposed Plan)</p>
MINERALS AND ENERGY (ME)	
<p>Action B-ME 2.2.4 – Lands acquired for special purposes or with special funding would be managed in a manner consistent with the purposes of the acquisition; typically these lands would be closed to solid leasable minerals.</p> <p>Action B-ME 2.2.5 – Seasonal wildlife restrictions (Appendix D) would not apply to the operation and maintenance of solid leasable mineral production facilities unless the findings of analysis demonstrate the continued need for such mitigation and that less stringent, project-specific mitigation measures would be insufficient.</p>	<p>Action PP-ME-2.5.4 – Lands acquired for special purposes or with special funding would be managed in a manner consistent with the purposes of the acquisition; typically these lands would be closed to solid leasable minerals.(B-ME-2.2.4)</p> <p>Action PP-ME-2.5.5 – Seasonal restrictions as identified in Appendix D would not apply to the operation and maintenance of solid leasable mineral production facilities unless the findings of analysis demonstrate the continued need for such mitigation and that less stringent, project-specific mitigation measures would be insufficient.(B-ME-2.2.5)</p>
<p>Objective B-ME-2.3. Manage approximately 582,400 acres of the federal mineral estate (salable minerals) as open to mineral material disposal subject to standard permit terms, and conditions.</p>	<p>Objective PP-ME-2.6. Manage approximately 582,400 acres of the federal mineral estate (salable minerals) as open to mineral material disposal subject to standard permit terms, and conditions. (B-ME-2.3)</p>
<p>Action B-ME-2.3.1 – Nondiscretionary closures would be in effect for WSAs, consisting of approximately 11,200 acres (Figure 2-20).</p> <p>Action B-ME-2.3.2 – Discretionary closures (agency administrative) would be in effect on approximately 20,200 acres as identified below (Figure 2-20):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Petticoat Peak RNA • Dairy Hollow RNA • Formation Cave RNA • Oneida Narrows RNA • Travertine Park RNA • Pine Gap RNA • Robber’s Roost RNA • Cheatbeck Canyon RNA • Soda Springs Hills Management Area (LWCF/BPA and public lands portions) <p>Action B-ME-2.3.3 – Site specific mitigation measures would be developed through the NEPA process and applied to ensure that operations comply with applicable laws, land use plan guidance and do not result in unnecessary degradation.</p> <p>Action ME-2.3.4 – Lands acquired for special purposes or with special funding would be managed in a manner consistent with the purposes of the acquisition; typically these lands would be closed to salable minerals.</p>	<p>Action PP-ME-2.6.1 – Nondiscretionary closures would be in effect for WSAs, consisting of approximately 11,200 acres (Figure 2-20). (B-ME-2.3.1)</p> <p>Action PP-ME-2.6.2 – Discretionary closures (agency administrative) would be in effect on approximately 20,200 acres as identified below (Figure 2-20): (B-ME-2.3.2)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Petticoat Peak RNA • Dairy Hollow RNA • Formation Cave RNA • Oneida Narrows RNA • Travertine Park RNA • Pine Gap RNA • Robber’s Roost RNA • Cheatbeck Canyon RNA • Soda Springs Hills Management Area (LWCF/BPA and public lands portions) <p>Action PP-ME-2.6.3 – Site specific mitigation measures would be developed through the NEPA process and applied to ensure that operations comply with applicable laws, land use plan guidance and do not result in unnecessary degradation. (B-ME-2.3.3)</p> <p>Action PP-ME-2.6.4 – Lands acquired for special purposes or with special funding would be managed in a manner consistent with the purposes of the acquisition; typically these lands would be closed to salable minerals. (B-ME-2.3.4)</p>
<p>Objective B-ME-2.4. Manage approximately 564,900 acres of the federal mineral estate (locatable minerals) as open to location of mining claims.</p>	<p>Objective PP-ME-2.7. Manage approximately 564,900 acres of the federal mineral estate (locatable minerals) as open to location of mining claims. (B-ME-2.4)</p>
<p>Action B-ME-2.4.1 - Nondiscretionary closures would be in effect for approximately 29,700 acres as identified below (Figure 2-21):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Withdrawal - Bear River Reclamation Project • Withdrawal - Soda Point • Withdrawal - Last Chance • Withdrawal - Fort Hall Irrigation Project • Withdrawal - Soda Springs Project • Withdrawal - Downey Watershed • Withdrawals - Public Water Reserves (125 & 107) 	<p>Action PP-ME-2.7.1 - Nondiscretionary closures would be in effect for approximately 29,700 acres as identified below (Figure 2-21): (B-ME-2.4.1)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Withdrawal - Bear River Reclamation Project • Withdrawal - Soda Point • Withdrawal - Last Chance • Withdrawal - Fort Hall Irrigation Project • Withdrawal - Soda Springs Project • Withdrawal - Downey Watershed • Withdrawals - Public Water Reserves (125 & 107)

<p align="center">Draft RMP/EIS Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)</p>	<p align="center">Proposed RMP/Final EIS Alternative B (Proposed Plan)</p>
<p align="center">MINERALS AND ENERGY (ME)</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Withdrawals - Power Generating Facilities • Recreation and Public Purpose Patents • Recreation and Public Purpose Leases • Soda Springs Hills Management Area (Only LWCF/BPA acquired lands) <p>Action B-ME-2.4.2 - A mineral entry withdrawal (discretionary closure, agency administrative) would be pursued on approximately 19,200 acres for the following areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cheatbeck Canyon RNA • Dairy Hollow RNA • Formation Cave RNA • Oneida Narrow RNA • Pine Gap RNA • Robbers Roost RNA • Travertine Park RNA • Petticoat Peak RNA • Soda Springs Hills Management Area • Bowen Canyon Bald Eagle Sanctuary ACEC <p>Action B-ME-2.4.3 - Appropriate site specific mitigation measures, developed during BLM preparation or review of a Notice of Intent (NOI) or a PO, would be implemented as conditions of approval.</p> <p>Action B-ME-2.4.4 - Lands acquired for special purposes or with special funding would be managed in a manner consistent with the purposes of the acquisition and would not be open to mineral entry.</p> <p>Action B-ME-2.4.5 - Consistent with the purposes of future land acquisitions, public lands managed in conjunction with the acquired lands would be withdrawn from mineral entry.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Withdrawals - Power Generating Facilities • Recreation and Public Purpose Patents • Recreation and Public Purpose Leases • Soda Springs Hills Management Area (Only LWCF/BPA acquired lands) <p>Action PP-ME-2.7.2 - A mineral entry withdrawal (discretionary closure, agency administrative) would be pursued on approximately 19,200 acres for the following areas: (B-ME-2.4.2)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cheatbeck Canyon RNA • Dairy Hollow RNA • Formation Cave RNA • Oneida Narrow RNA • Pine Gap RNA • Robbers Roost RNA • Travertine Park RNA • Petticoat Peak RNA • Soda Springs Hills Management Area • Bowen Canyon Bald Eagle Sanctuary ACEC <p>Action PP-ME-2.7.3 - Appropriate site specific mitigation measures, developed during BLM preparation or review of a Notice of Intent (NOI) or a PO, would be implemented as conditions of approval. (B-ME-2.4.3)</p> <p>Action PP-ME-2.7.4 - Lands acquired for special purposes or with special funding would be managed in a manner consistent with the purposes of the acquisition and would not be open to mineral entry. (B-ME-2.4.4)</p> <p>Action PP-ME-2.7.5 - Consistent with the purposes of future land acquisitions, public lands managed in conjunction with the acquired lands would be withdrawn from mineral entry. (B-ME-2.4.5)</p>
<p align="center">Draft RMP/EIS Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)</p>	<p align="center">Proposed RMP/Final EIS Alternative B (Proposed Plan)</p>
<p align="center">RECREATION (RE)</p>	
<p>Goal RE-1. Manage lands for dispersed recreation.</p>	<p>Goal RE-1. Manage lands for dispersed recreation. (RE-1)</p>
<p>Objective B-RE-1.1. Manage lands for a variety of non-motorized, mechanized, and motorized opportunities.</p>	<p>Objective PP-RE-1.1. Manage lands for a variety of non-motorized, mechanized, and motorized opportunities. (B-RE-1.1)</p>
<p>Action B-RE-1.1.1 - Coordinate with Idaho Statewide Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation and Tourism Plan, other agencies, and the tribes with regard to recreational use of public land and for developing new recreation opportunities.</p> <p>Action B-RE-1.1.2 - Management tools such as Recreation Opportunity Spectrum (ROS), VRM, and Limits of Acceptable Change (LAC) would be used in managing recreation opportunities.</p>	<p>Action PP-RE-1.1.1 - Coordinate with Idaho Statewide Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation and Tourism Plan, other agencies, and the tribes with regard to recreational use of public land and for developing new recreation opportunities. (B-RE-1.1.1)</p> <p>Action PP-RE-1.1.2 - Management tools such as Recreation Opportunity Spectrum (ROS), VRM, and Limits of Acceptable Change (LAC) would be used in managing recreation opportunities. (B-RE-1.1.2)</p>

<p align="center">Draft RMP/EIS Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)</p>	<p align="center">Proposed RMP/Final EIS Alternative B (Proposed Plan)</p>
<p align="center">RECREATION (RE)</p>	
<p>Objective B-RE-1.2. Recreation facility development and permitted recreation activities would be consistent with other resource goals of the area in which they are located.</p>	<p>Objective PP-RE-1.2. Recreation facility development and permitted recreation activities would be consistent with other resource goals of the area in which they are located. (B-RE-1.2)</p>
<p>Action B-RE-1.2.1 - SRPs for commercial, non-commercial competitive events and organized groups would be issued consistent with the areas resource values and uses. Action B-RE-1.2.2 - Facility development and improvements would be focused on existing recreation sites and SRMAs.</p>	<p>Action PP-RE-1.2.1 - SRPs for commercial, non-commercial competitive events and organized groups would be issued consistent with the areas resource values and uses. (B-RE-1.2.1) Action PP-RE-1.2.2 - Facility development and improvements would be focused on existing recreation sites and SRMAs. (B-RE-1.2.2)</p>
<p>Goal RE-3: Provide for a variety of recreational opportunities and experiences.</p>	<p>Goal RE-3: Provide for a variety of recreational opportunities and experiences. (RE-3)</p>
<p>Objective B-RE-3.1. Recognize recreation as the principal use on approximately 58,800 acres of public lands within SRMAs.</p>	<p>Objective PP-RE-3.1. Recognize recreation as the principal use on approximately 59,230 acres of public lands within SRMAs. (B-RE-3.1)</p>
<p>Action B-RE-3.1.1 - SRMAs would be recognized as priority for recreation funding and personnel to fulfill commitments made to provide specific structured recreation opportunities (e.g., activity, experience, and benefit opportunities). Action B-RE-3.1.2 - The Blackfoot River SRMA (approximately 21,800 acres) would continue to be managed to maintain and/or enhance targeted recreational opportunities, experiences and benefits with a primary market based strategy being "Destination" for a market base of SE Idaho.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The SRMA would be managed to provide various recreational opportunities and outcomes (activities, experiences and benefits) based on a unique niche in each of the 5 Recreation Management Zones (RMZs) identified below: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Wolverine Canyon (approximately 4,300 acres) (Table 2-5a) ○ Campground (approximately 80 acres) (Table 2-5b) ○ Reservoir (approximately 7,200 acres) (Table 2-5c) ○ Mid River (approximately 7,800 acres) (Table 2-5d) ○ Lower River (approximately 2,400 acres) (Table 2-5e) • For each RMZ, management direction and the prescribed ROS setting would be followed as described in respective tables. • An SRMA management plan would be developed and implemented. <p>Action B-RE-3.1.3 - The Pocatello SRMA (approximately 33,400 acres) would continue to be managed to maintain and/or enhance targeted recreational opportunities, experiences and benefits with a primary market based strategy being "Community" for a market base of SE Idaho.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The SRMA would be managed to provide various recreational opportunities and outcomes (activities, experiences and benefits) based on a unique niche in each of the 5 RMZ identified below: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ West Bench (approximately 4,100 acres) (Table 2-5f) 	<p>Action PP-RE-3.1.1 - SRMAs would be recognized as priority for recreation funding and personnel to fulfill commitments made to provide specific structured recreation opportunities (e.g., activity, experience, and benefit opportunities). (B-RE-3.1.1) Action PP-RE-3.1.2 - The Blackfoot River SRMA (approximately 21,800 acres) would continue to be managed to maintain and/or enhance targeted recreational opportunities, experiences and benefits with a primary market based strategy being "Destination" for a market base of SE Idaho. (B-RE-3.1.2)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The SRMA would be managed to provide various recreational opportunities and outcomes (activities, experiences and benefits) based on a unique niche in each of the 5 Recreation Management Zones (RMZs) identified below: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Wolverine Canyon (approximately 4,300 acres) (Table 2-5a) ○ Campground (approximately 80 acres) (Table 2-5b) ○ Reservoir (approximately 7,200 acres) (Table 2-5c) ○ Mid River (approximately 7,800 acres) (Table 2-5d) ○ Lower River (approximately 2,400 acres) (Table 2-5e) • For each RMZ, management direction and the prescribed ROS setting would be followed as described in respective tables. • An SRMA management plan would be developed and implemented. <p>Action PP-RE-3.1.3 - The Pocatello SRMA (approximately 33,400 acres) would continue to be managed to maintain and/or enhance targeted recreational opportunities, experiences and benefits with a primary market based strategy being "Community" for a market base of SE Idaho. (B-RE-3.1.3)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The SRMA would be managed to provide various recreational opportunities and outcomes (activities, experiences and benefits) based on a unique niche in each of the 5 RMZ identified below: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ West Bench (approximately 4,100 acres) (Table 2-5f)

<p style="text-align: center;">Draft RMP/EIS Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Proposed RMP/Final EIS Alternative B (Proposed Plan)</p>
RECREATION (RE)	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Blackrock (approximately 15,100 acres) (Table 2-5g) ○ Papoose (approximately 3,400 acres) (Table 2-5h) ○ East Bench (approximately 1,400 acres) (Table 2-5i) ○ Dispersed (approximately 9,400 acres) (Table 2-5j) • For each RMZ, management direction and the prescribed ROS setting would be followed as described in respective tables. • An SRMA management plan would be developed and implemented. <p>Action B-RE-3.1.4 - The Oneida Narrows SRMA (approximately 3,600 acres) would be identified and managed to maintain and/or enhance targeted recreational opportunities, experiences and benefits with the primary market based strategy being “Destination” for a market base of SE Idaho and northern Utah.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The SRMA would be managed to provide various recreational opportunities and outcomes (activities, experiences and benefits) based on a unique niche in each of the 2 RMZ identified below: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ River (approximately 1,900 acres) (Table 2-5k) ○ Reservoir (approximately 1,700 acres) (Table 2-5l) • For each RMZ, management direction and the prescribed ROS setting would be followed as described in respective tables. • An SRMA management plan would be developed and implemented. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Blackrock (approximately 15,100 acres) (Table 2-5g) ○ Papoose (approximately 3,400 acres) (Table 2-5h) ○ East Bench (approximately 1,400 acres) (Table 2-5i) ○ Dispersed (approximately 9,400 acres) (Table 2-5j) • For each RMZ, management direction and the prescribed ROS setting would be followed as described in respective tables. • An SRMA management plan would be developed and implemented. <p>Action PP-RE-3.1.4 - The Oneida Narrows SRMA (approximately 3,600 acres) would be identified and managed to maintain and/or enhance targeted recreational opportunities, experiences and benefits with the primary market based strategy being “Destination” for a market base of SE Idaho and northern Utah. (B-RE-3.1.4)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The SRMA would be managed to provide various recreational opportunities and outcomes (activities, experiences and benefits) based on a unique niche in each of the 2 RMZ identified below: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ River (approximately 1,900 acres) (Table 2-5k) ○ Reservoir (approximately 1,700 acres) (Table 2-5l) • For each RMZ, management direction and the prescribed ROS setting would be followed as described in respective tables. • An SRMA management plan would be developed and implemented. <p>Action PP-RE-3.1.5 - The Campground SRMA (approximately 430 acres) would be identified and managed to maintain and/or enhance targeted recreational opportunities, experiences and benefits with the primary market based strategy being “Destination” for a market base of SE Idaho and northern Utah. (Action C-RE-3.1.5)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The SRMA would be managed to provide various recreational opportunities and outcomes (activities, experiences and benefits) based on a unique niche in each of the 3 RMZ identified below: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Hawkins Reservoir (approximately 120 acres) (Table 2-6a) ○ Goodenough (approximately 280 acres) (Table 2-6b) ○ Pipeline (approximately 30 acres) (Table 2-6c) • For each RMZ, management direction and the prescribed ROS setting would be followed as described in respective tables. • An SRMA management plan would be developed and implemented.
<p>Objective B-RE-3.2 - Continue to manage approximately 555,000 acres as an Extensive Recreation Management Area (ERMA).</p>	<p>Objective PP-RE-3.2 - Continue to manage approximately 554,600 acres as an Extensive Recreation Management Area (ERMA). (B-RE-3.2)</p>
<p>Action B-RE-3.2.1 - ERMAs would be managed in a custodial manner and provide for visitor health and safety. Basic recreation functions would use the following guidelines:</p>	<p>Action PP-RE-3.2.1 - ERMAs would be managed in a custodial manner and provide for visitor health and safety. Basic recreation functions would use the following guidelines: (B-RE-3.2.1)</p>

<p align="center">Draft RMP/EIS Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)</p>	<p align="center">Proposed RMP/Final EIS Alternative B (Proposed Plan)</p>
<p align="center">RECREATION (RE)</p>	
<p>Administrative Actions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SRPs would be issued if consistent with other resources and uses. • Law Enforcement presence would be limited. • Visitor services would be limited to basic information such as travel management signs, site specific restrictions, general maps, travel plan maps and very basic facilities may be utilized in high use areas. <p>Management:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Focus on minimizing user conflicts with other resources and uses. • Would be custodially managed, that is minimal physical facilities/ structures would be provided except if necessary to provide for visitor health and safety. <p>Marketing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide maps. • Provide road/trail maps. • Utilize the internet to provide recreation information. <p>Monitoring:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Visitor satisfaction through field contacts. • User conflict. • Visitor safety. • Resource damage. 	<p>Administrative Actions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SRPs would be issued if consistent with other resources and uses. • Law Enforcement presence would be limited. • Visitor services would be limited to basic information such as travel management signs, site specific restrictions, general maps, travel plan maps and very basic facilities may be utilized in high use areas. <p>Management:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Focus on minimizing user conflicts with other resources and uses. • Would be custodially managed, that is minimal physical facilities/ structures would be provided except if necessary to provide for visitor health and safety. <p>Marketing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide maps. • Provide road/trail maps. • Utilize the internet to provide recreation information. <p>Monitoring:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Visitor satisfaction through field contacts. • User conflict. • Visitor safety. • Resource damage.
<p>Goal RE-4: Establish a comprehensive approach to travel planning and management.</p>	<p>Goal RE-4: Establish a comprehensive approach to travel planning and management. (RE-4)</p>
<p>Objective AA-RE-4.1 Provide on-the-ground travel management operations and maintenance programs to sustain and enhance recreation opportunities and experiences, visitor access and safety, and resource conservation.</p>	<p>Objective PP-RE-4.1 Provide on-the-ground travel management operations and maintenance programs to sustain and enhance recreation opportunities and experiences, visitor access and safety, and resource conservation. (AA-RE-4.1)</p>
<p>Action AA-RE-4.1.1 - Establish maintenance standards for trails and conduct condition surveys to document maintenance, construction, reconstruction and rehabilitation needs.</p> <p>Action AA-RE-4.1.2 - Implement management practices to systematically address travel management (e.g., signs, maps, maintenance, construction, reconstruction, field presence, law enforcement, and education).</p> <p>Action AA-RE-4.1.3 - Monitor and evaluate social outcomes and environmental conditions on and along trails and associated areas influenced by trail-related visitation.</p> <p>Action AA-RE-4.1.4 - Develop simple, effective, and efficient monitoring plans and methods to measure the effectiveness of travel planning and management.</p> <p>Action AA-RE-4.1.5 - Travel management plans would consider the following criteria in designating routes and uses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environmental conditions • User conflicts • Administrative purposes • Public purposes 	<p>Action PP-RE-4.1.1 - Establish maintenance standards for trails and conduct condition surveys to document maintenance, construction, reconstruction and rehabilitation needs. (AA-RE-4.1.1)</p> <p>Action PP-RE-4.1.2 - Implement management practices to systematically address travel management (e.g., signs, maps, maintenance, construction, reconstruction, field presence, law enforcement, and education). (AA-RE-4.1.2)</p> <p>Action PP-RE-4.1.3 - Monitor and evaluate social outcomes and environmental conditions on and along trails and associated areas influenced by trail-related visitation. (AA-RE-4.1.3)</p> <p>Action PP-RE-4.1.4 - Develop simple, effective, and efficient monitoring plans and methods to measure the effectiveness of travel planning and management. (AA-RE-4.1.4)</p> <p>Action PP-RE-4.1.5 - Travel management plans would consider the following criteria in designating routes and uses: (AA-RE-4.1.5)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environmental conditions • User conflicts

<p align="center">Draft RMP/EIS Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)</p>	<p align="center">Proposed RMP/Final EIS Alternative B (Proposed Plan)</p>
<p align="center">RECREATION (RE)</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Route, vehicle type and size limitations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Administrative purposes Public purposes Route, vehicle type and size limitations
<p>Objective B-RE-4.1. Designate all public lands in the planning area as Open, Limited, or Closed.</p>	<p>Objective PP-RE-4.2. Designate all public lands in the planning area as Open, Limited, or Closed. (B-RE-4.1)</p>
<p>Action B-RE-4.1.1 - WSAs and RNAs (approximately 12,700 acres) would be designated Closed to OHV use and all remaining public lands (approximately 601,100 acres) would be designated as Limited for OHV use.</p> <p>Action B-RE-4.1.2 - Mechanized travel would be limited to designated routes.</p> <p>Action B-RE-4.1.3 - Non-motorized travel would not be restricted.</p> <p>Action B-RE-4.1.4 - OHV opportunities would be preserved by</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Maintaining existing routes. Providing moderate control on OHV use. <p>Action B-RE-4.1.5 - Until travel management planning/route designation is completed, travel would be managed in the following manner:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Limit travel to designated routes as identified in the Chinese Peak/Blackrock activity plan Recognize existing seasonal closures, Recognize site specific closures for WSA's, ACEC's, and RNA's, and Limit motorized and mechanized travel to existing routes in all other areas. <p>Action B-RE-4.1.6 - For the development of travel management plans, baseline and/or preliminary road/trail networks would be identified using any one of the following available sources:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Most current existing Digital Ortho Quads (DOQs) as of 2004, 2004 National Agricultural Imagery Program (NAIP) digital color aerial photos, Most current existing US Geological Survey (USGS) topographical maps as of January 1, 2005. <p>Action B-RE-4.1.7 - During travel management planning, provide intensive use areas for valid motorized activities (e.g., rock crawling, motocross riding) by designating appropriate routes for these activities in front country or rural settings. These areas would not exceed a "footprint" larger than 80 acres.</p> <p>Routes may be designated during travel management planning only if they are consistent with the following criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Area is suitable for intensive OHV use, No compelling resource issues or protection needs identified, No user conflicts or public safety issues to warrant restricting intensive use. <p>Action B-RE-4.1.8 - Cross country travel by motorized vehicles and/or the use of roads or trails not identified and/or designated during BLM travel management planning and which are associated with authorized/permitted activities (e.g., range improvement construction/</p>	<p>Action PP-RE-4.2.1 - WSAs and RNAs (approximately 12,700 acres) would be designated Closed to OHV use and all remaining public lands (approximately 601,100 acres) would be designated Limited for OHV use. Cross country travel would not be allowed on public lands, and upon completion of the travel management plans, motorized travel off designated routes (identified on travel maps) would not be allowed. (B-RE-4.1.1)</p> <p>Action PP-RE-4.2.2 - Within SRMAs and WSAs, mechanized travel would be limited to designated routes only. Cross country travel would not be allowed. (B-RE-4.1.2)</p> <p>Action PP-RE-4.2.3 - Non-motorized travel would not be restricted. (B-RE-4.1.3)</p> <p>Action PP-RE-4.2.4 - OHV opportunities would be preserved by: (B-RE-4.1.4)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Maintaining existing routes. Providing moderate control on OHV use. <p>Action PP-RE-4.2.5 - Until travel management planning/route designation is completed, travel would be managed in the following manner: (B-RE-4.1.5)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Limit motorized/mechanized travel to establish designated routes in the Chinese Peak/Blackrock area. Continue to recognize and implement existing seasonal closures. Continue to recognize and implement site specific closures for WSA's, ACEC's, and RNA's. Prohibit cross-country travel for motorized vehicles. Limit motorized travel to existing routes in areas where no designated routes have been established. Limit mechanized travel to existing roads and trails within SRMAs and WSAs. Recognize existing roads and trails that can be identified on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Most current Digital Ortho Quads (DOQs) as of 2004 2004 National Agricultural Imagery Program (NAIP) digital color aerial photos. Most current existing US Geological Survey (USGS) topographical maps as of January 1, 2005. <p>Action PP-RE-4.2.6 - For the development of travel management plans, baseline and/or preliminary road/trail networks would be identified using any one of the following available sources: (B-RE-4.1.6)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Most current existing DOQs as of 2004, 2004 NAIP digital color aerial photos, Most current existing USGS topographical maps as of January 1, 2005.

<p style="text-align: center;">Draft RMP/EIS Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Proposed RMP/Final EIS Alternative B (Proposed Plan)</p>
RECREATION (RE)	
<p>maintenance, land use authorizations, ROWs, mineral/energy exploration and/or agency administrative purposes) would be authorized only by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • obtaining prior written approval of the authorized officer, or • as stipulated in appropriate permits/authorizations. <p>Activities such as, but not limited to, wildland fire suppression, human health and safety, and cadastral survey would be exempt.</p> <p>Action B-RE-4.1.9 - Organized events would be compliant with established OHV designations and would be consistent with other resources and uses.</p> <p>Action B-RE-4.1.10 - Snowmobiling would be managed with the following area restrictions: (Figure 2-22):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WSAs - Not allowed • ACECs - Not allowed • RNAs - Not allowed • Pocatello SRMA - Not allowed • Soda Springs Hills Management Area - Not allowed • All other areas - Allowed Without Restriction <p>Action B-RE-4.1.11 - For the following four areas (Formation Cave RNA, Robbers Roost RNA, Oneida Narrows, and Soda Springs Hills Management Area) the identified routes would be designated for public use with motorized vehicles.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Formation Cave RNA (Figure 2-23) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Access road and parking area • Robbers Roost RNA (Figure 2-24) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Access route to FS • Oneida Narrows (Figure 2-25) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Power Plant Road ○ Bear River Ranches Road ○ Roads within Redpoint and Maple Grove Campgrounds • Soda Springs Hills Management Area (Figure 2-2) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Idaho Ranch Canyon ○ 90 Percent Canyon ○ Swenson Canyon ○ Ridgeline Road ○ Doe Alley 	<p>Action PP-RE-4.2.7 - During travel management planning, provide intensive use areas for valid motorized activities (e.g., rock crawling, motocross riding) by designating appropriate routes for these activities in front country or rural settings. These areas would not exceed a “footprint” larger than 80 acres. (B-RE-4.1.7)</p> <p>Routes may be designated during travel management planning only if they are consistent with the following criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Area is suitable for intensive OHV use, • No compelling resource issues or protection needs, as identified through the NEPA process, • No user conflicts or public safety issues to warrant restricting intensive use. <p>Action PP-RE-4.2.8 - Cross country travel using motorized vehicles is not allowed. Once travel management plans have been completed, motorized travel will be restricted to designated routes, travel on routes that have not been recognized as a designated route is not allowed. (B-RE-4.1.8)</p> <p>Authorized/permitted activities may have allowances for travel off designated routes if it is obtained in writing from the authorized officer in the form of a letter or specifically stipulated or identified in the terms and conditions of the permit/authorization.</p> <p>Activities such as wildland fire suppression and emergency services would not be limited to designated routes. Other activities related to public health and safety or cadastral survey may be exempt with approval of the authorized officer.</p> <p>Action PP-RE-4.2.9 - Organized events would be compliant with established OHV designations and would be consistent with other resources and uses. (B-RE-4.1.9)</p> <p>Action PP-RE-4.2.10 - Snowmobiling would be managed with the following area restrictions: (Figure 2-22): (B-RE-4.1.10)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WSAs - Not allowed • ACECs - Not allowed • RNAs - Not allowed • Pocatello SRMA - Not allowed • Soda Springs Hills Management Area - Not allowed • Big Game Winter Range - Limited to designated routes • All other areas - Allowed Without Restriction <p>Action PP-RE-4.2.11 - For the following four areas (Formation Cave RNA, Robbers Roost RNA, Oneida Narrows, and Soda Springs Hills Management Area) the identified routes would be designated for public use with motorized vehicles. (B-RE-4.1.11)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Formation Cave RNA (Figure 2-23) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Access road and parking area • Robbers Roost RNA (Figure 2-24) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Access route to FS • Oneida Narrows (Figure 2-25) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Power Plant Road ○ Bear River Ranches Road

Draft RMP/EIS Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)	Proposed RMP/Final EIS Alternative B (Proposed Plan)
RECREATION (RE)	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Roads within Redpoint and Maple Grove Campgrounds • Soda Springs Hills Management Area (Figure 2-2) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Idaho Ranch Canyon ○ 90 Percent Canyon ○ Swenson Canyon ○ Ridgeline Road ○ Doe Alley
Objective B-RE-4.2 Implement comprehensive travel management planning utilizing strategies for motorized, mechanized, and non-motorized recreation.	Objective B-RE-4.3 Implement comprehensive travel management planning utilizing strategies for motorized, mechanized, and non-motorized recreation. (B-RE-4.2)
<p>Action B-RE-4.2.1 - Roads, routes and trails would be inventoried and mapped using best available technology, such as global positioning systems (GPS) and GIS.</p> <p>Action B-RE-4.2.2 - Areas would be prioritized for travel management planning based upon the following criteria:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Known conflicts with other resources/uses, 2. Proximity of areas to population centers, 3. Special management areas and special designations, and 4. Areas of contiguous public land. <p>Action B-RE-4.2.3 - Travel management planning would use a collaborative approach and the NEPA process.</p> <p>Action B-RE-4.2.4 - Public involvement and coordination with tribes, agencies, and local governments would be encouraged.</p> <p>Action B-RE-4.2.5 - For each travel management planning area, the following would be identified as needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Designated routes for motorized vehicles. • Designated routes for mechanized vehicles. • Seasonal restrictions. • Route closures. • Exemptions for administrative and permitted activities. <p>Action B-RE-4.2.6 - Criteria that would be considered in travel management plans would include, but is not limited to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Environmental conditions, such as: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. soil stability b. wildlife habitat (e.g., winter range, nesting/brooding rearing habitat, calving/fawning areas) c. special status species habitat d. proximity to riparian areas and/or 303(d) streams e. visual resources 2. User conflicts, such as: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. motorized versus non-motorized, b. motorized/mechanized versus non-mechanized 3. Administrative purposes, such as: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. wildland fire suppression activities 	<p>Action PP-RE-4.3.1 - Roads, routes and trails would be inventoried and mapped using best available technology, such as global positioning systems (GPS) and GIS. (B-RE-4.2.1)</p> <p>Action PP-RE-4.3.2 - Areas would be prioritized for travel management planning based upon the following criteria: (B-RE-4.2.2)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Known conflicts with other resources/uses, 2. Proximity of areas to population centers, 3. Special management areas and special designations, 4. Areas of contiguous public lands, particularly those that have not been fragmented by motorized routes, and 5. Wildlife habitat, such as wintering habitat for ungulates or sage-grouse, or breeding habitat. <p>Action PP-RE-4.3.3 - Travel management planning would use a collaborative approach and the NEPA process. (B-RE-4.2.3)</p> <p>Action PP-RE-4.3.4 - Public involvement and coordination with tribes, agencies, and local governments would be encouraged. (B-RE-4.2.4)</p> <p>Action PP-RE-4.3.5 - For each travel management planning area, the following would be identified as needed: (B-RE-4.2.5)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Designated routes for motorized vehicles. • Designated routes for mechanized vehicles (within SRMAs and WSAs only). • Seasonal restrictions. • Routes needing to be redesigned, repaired, maintained, relocated, or closed. • Exemptions for administrative and permitted activities. • Allowance for parking/camping off designated routes. <p>Action PP-RE-4.3.6 - Criteria that would be considered in travel management plans would include, but is not limited to: (B-RE-4.2.6)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Environmental conditions, such as: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. soil stability b. wildlife habitat (e.g., winter range, nesting/brooding rearing habitat, calving/fawning areas) c. special status species habitat d. proximity to riparian areas and/or 303(d) streams e. visual resources

<p align="center">Draft RMP/EIS Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)</p>	<p align="center">Proposed RMP/Final EIS Alternative B (Proposed Plan)</p>
<p align="center">RECREATION (RE)</p>	
<p>b. safety c. resource management and permitted activities</p> <p>4. Public purposes, such as: a. accessing public or private land b. destinations for specific activities c. types of desired use (motorized, mechanized, non-motorized/non-mechanized)</p> <p>5. Route, vehicle type and size limitations, such as: a. > 50" wheel base for (full size vehicles) b. < 50" wheel base (all-terrain vehicles [ATV's]) c. single track (motorcycles/mountain bikes)</p> <p>Actions B-RE-4.2.7 - For each travel management planning area, products would be developed and made available through a variety of media sources (e.g., internet). Such products may include travel maps and brochures.</p>	<p>f. cultural resources (including historic trails) g. consistency with travel management direction on adjacent lands</p> <p>2. User conflicts, such as: a. motorized versus non-motorized, b. motorized/mechanized versus non-mechanized</p> <p>3. Administrative purposes, such as: a. wildland fire suppression activities b. safety c. resource management and permitted activities</p> <p>4. Public purposes, such as: a. accessing public or private land b. destinations for specific activities c. types of desired use (motorized, mechanized, non-motorized/non-mechanized)</p> <p>5. Route, vehicle type and size limitations, such as: a. > 50" wheel base for (full size vehicles) b. < 50" wheel base (ATV's) c. single track (motorcycles/mountain bikes)</p> <p>Actions PP-RE-4.3.7 - For each travel management planning area, products would be developed and made available through a variety of media sources (e.g., internet). Such products may include travel maps and brochures. (B-RE-4.2.17)</p>
<p align="center">Draft RMP/EIS Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)</p>	<p align="center">Proposed RMP/Final EIS Alternative B (Proposed Plan)</p>
<p align="center">ADMINISTRATIVE DESIGNATIONS (AD)</p>	
<p>Goal AD-1. Provide for public land areas suitable for administrative designations.</p>	<p>Goal AD-1. Provide for public land areas suitable for administrative designations. (AD-1)</p>
<p>Objective CA-AD-1.1. Continue to manage WSAs to maintain wilderness characteristics.</p>	<p>Objective PP-AD-1.1. Continue to manage WSAs to maintain wilderness characteristics. (CA-AD-1.1)</p>
<p>Action CA-AD-1.1.1 - Approximately 11,200 acres of the Petticoat Peak WSA and 40 acres of Worm Creek WSA would be managed under the BLM's Interim Management Policy for Lands Under Wilderness Review.</p>	<p>Action PP-AD-1.1.1 - Approximately 11,200 acres of the Petticoat Peak WSA and 40 acres of Worm Creek WSA would be managed under the BLM's Interim Management Policy for Lands Under Wilderness Review. (CA-AD-1.1.1)</p> <p>Action PP-AD-1.1.2 - Until released from Wilderness consideration by Congress, WSAs would be closed to OHV use. At that time, the designation would become "Limited" unless directed differently by the Congressional release language.</p> <p>Action PP-AD-1.1.3 - Should existing WSAs be released from Wilderness consideration by Congress, these areas would be managed under the general land laws similar to adjacent public lands or as directed by Congressional release language.</p> <p>Action PP-AD-1.1.4 - The Petticoat Peak and Worm Creek WSAs, approximately 11,200 acres, would be managed as VRM Class I. (PP-VR-1.1.1)</p>

<p align="center">Draft RMP/EIS Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)</p>	<p align="center">Proposed RMP/Final EIS Alternative B (Proposed Plan)</p>
<p align="center">ADMINISTRATIVE DESIGNATIONS (AD)</p>	
<p>Objective CA-AD-1.2. Continue to manage the 5 designated Watchable Wildlife Viewing Sites (Figure 2-3).</p>	<p>Objective PP-AD-1.2. Continue to manage the 5 designated Watchable Wildlife Viewing Sites (Figure 2-3). (CA-AD-1.2)</p>
<p>Action CA-AD-1.2.1 - As appropriate, work with partners to provide to the public interpretive materials through publications and local media for the following sites.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Juniper Rest Area • Oxford Slough/Twin Lakes/Swan Lake • Formation Springs RNA • Lower Blackfoot River from Blackfoot to Government Dam • American Falls Dam and vicinity 	<p>Action PP-AD-1.2.1 - As appropriate, work with partners to provide to the public interpretive materials through publications and local media for the following sites. (CA-AD-1.2.1)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Juniper Rest Area • Oxford Slough/Twin Lakes/Swan Lake • Formation Springs RNA • Lower Blackfoot River from Blackfoot to Government Dam • American Falls Dam and vicinity
<p>Objective CA-AD-1.3 Continue to manage Oregon/California historic trails and alternate routes for a meaningful historic recreational and educational experience (Figure 3-2).</p>	<p>Objective PP-AD-1.3 Continue to manage Oregon/California historic trails and alternate routes for a meaningful historic recreational and educational experience (Figure 3-2). (CA-AD-1.3)</p>
<p>Action CA-AD-1.3.1 - Historic trails would be promoted and maintained by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allowing potential uses which may include but are not limited to, hiking, bicycling, cross-country skiing, and activities related to the historic use of the trails (e.g., horseback riding, using a handcart or covered wagon). • Coordinating public and private funding to support historic trail activities. • Raising public awareness of historic trails and building public support for their protection through the use of exhibits, publications and outreach activities. • Developing and facilitating where applicable, interagency cooperation where historic trails cross jurisdictional boundaries. 	<p>Action PP-AD-1.3.1 - Historic trails would be promoted and maintained by: (CA-AD-1.3.1)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allowing potential uses which may include but are not limited to, hiking, bicycling, cross-country skiing, and activities related to the historic use of the trails (e.g., horseback riding, using a handcart or covered wagon). • Coordinating public and private funding to support historic trail activities. • Raising public awareness of historic trails and building public support for their protection through the use of exhibits, publications and outreach activities. • Developing and facilitating where applicable, interagency cooperation where historic trails cross jurisdictional boundaries.
<p>Objective AA-AD-1.1. Determine which eligible river segments are suitable for inclusion in the NWSRS.</p>	<p>Objective PP-AD-1.4. Determine which eligible river segments are suitable for inclusion in the NWSRS. (AA-AD-1.1)</p>
<p>Action AA-AD-1.1.1 - The WSR evaluation found two rivers (Figure 3-20 and Figure 3-21) eligible for inclusion in the NWSRS with no eligible segments found to be suitable; therefore, no river segments are being proposed for inclusion in the NWSRS (BLM 2003d).</p>	<p>Action PP-AD-1.4.1. No eligible river segments (Figure 3-20 and Figure 3-21) from the Final Resource Assessment, Blackfoot River and Bear River Wild and Scenic River Suitability Study (BLM 2003d) would be recommended as suitable for inclusion in the NWSRS. (AA-AD-1.1.1)</p>
<p>Objective B-AD-1.1. Designate approximately 400 acres (Figure 2-26) as the Petticoat Peak RNA due to the areas unique and undisturbed vegetative communities (Appendix K).</p>	<p>Objective PP-AD-1.5. Designate approximately 400 acres (Figure 2-26) as the Petticoat Peak RNA due to the areas unique and undisturbed vegetative communities (Appendix K). (B-AD-1.1)</p>
<p>Action B-AD-1.1.1 - The Petticoat Peak RNA (approximately 400 acres) would be managed to protect the undisturbed and abundant diversity of mountain sagebrush, mountain mahogany, Douglas-fir, sub-alpine fir, bigtooth maple, and aspen) by implementing the following management practices:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The area would be discretionarily closed for solid leasable minerals and salable minerals. • The OHV designation would be Closed • Wildland fire would be suppressed 	<p>Action PP-AD-1.5.1 - The Petticoat Peak RNA (approximately 400 acres) would be managed to protect the undisturbed and abundant diversity of mountain sagebrush, mountain mahogany, Douglas-fir, sub-alpine fir, bigtooth maple, and aspen) by implementing the following management practices: (Action B-AD-1.1.1)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The area would be discretionarily closed for solid leasable minerals and salable minerals. • The OHV designation would be Closed • Wildland fire would be suppressed

<p style="text-align: center;">Draft RMP/EIS Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Proposed RMP/Final EIS Alternative B (Proposed Plan)</p>
<p>ADMINISTRATIVE DESIGNATIONS (AD)</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Public lands would be retained • The area would be identified as an “Exclusion” area for ROWs. • Fluid minerals would be leased with a NSO stipulation. • If necessary, livestock grazing would be adjusted to maintain the values of the RNA (available). • A withdrawal for locatable minerals would be pursued. • Vegetation would be monitored to understand natural ecological processes and/or determine trends. • Vegetation would be inventoried to establish baseline information and identify threats. • The area would be a priority for weed control. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Public lands would be retained • The area would be identified as an “Exclusion” area for ROWs. • Fluid minerals would be leased with a NSO stipulation. • If necessary, livestock grazing would be adjusted to maintain the values of the RNA (available). • A withdrawal for locatable minerals would be pursued. • Vegetation would be monitored to understand natural ecological processes and/or determine trends. • Vegetation would be inventoried to establish baseline information and identify threats. • The area would be a priority for weed control.
<p>Objective B-AD-1.2. Continue to manage the 7 ACECs (approximately 9,900 acres) and 7 RNAs (approximately 1,500 acres) designated for the unique geological, vegetative, visual, cultural, historical and/or wildlife resource values.</p>	<p>Objective PP-AD-1.6. Continue to manage 6 ACECs (approximately 9,900 acres) and 7 RNAs (approximately 1,500 acres) designated for the unique geological, vegetative, visual, cultural, historical and/or wildlife resource values. (B-AD-1.2)</p>
<p>Action B-AD-1.2.1 The Stump Creek ACEC (approximately 2,500 acres) would be managed to protect crucial elk winter range by implementing the following management practices:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Snowmobile use would not be allowed. • The OHV designation would be Limited and OHV use would be limited to designated routes. • Public lands would be retained. • The area would be identified as an “Avoidance” area for ROWs. • Wildland fire would be suppressed. • Fluid minerals would be leased with a NSO stipulation. • The area would be discretionarily closed to phosphate leasing. • Livestock grazing would be managed to maintain or improve native vegetation conditions (LHC-A). • Winter range would be rehabilitated through burning or establishment of browse species • The area would be a priority for weed control (e.g., leafy spurge). • Key locations would be signed to explain resource values and area use restrictions. • The Stump Creek Habitat Management Plan (1980) would be revised/updated. <p>Action B-AD-1.2.2 - The Bowen Canyon Bald Eagle Sanctuary ACEC (approximately 2,300 acres) would be managed to protect and provide winter roosting habitat by implementing the following management practices:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Snowmobile use would not be allowed. • Public lands would be retained • The area would be identified as an “Avoidance” area for ROWs. • Fluid minerals would be leased with a NSO stipulation. • The OHV designation would be Limited and OHV use would be limited to designated routes. 	<p>Action PP-AD-1.6.1 The Stump Creek ACEC (approximately 2,500 acres) would be managed to protect crucial elk winter range by implementing the following management practices: (B-AD-1.2.1)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Snowmobile use would be allowed only on the county road that passes through the ACEC. On all other public lands within the ACEC, snowmobile use would not be allowed. • The OHV designation would be Limited and OHV use would be limited to designated routes. • Public lands would be retained. • The area would be identified as an “Avoidance” area for ROWs. • Wildland fire would be suppressed. • Fluid minerals would be leased with a NSO stipulation. • The area would be discretionarily closed to phosphate leasing. • Livestock grazing would be managed to maintain or improve native vegetation conditions (LHC-A). • Winter range would be rehabilitated through burning or establishment of browse species • The area would be a priority for weed control (e.g. leafy spurge). • Key locations would be signed to explain resource values and area use restrictions. • The Stump Creek Habitat Management Plan (1980) would be revised/updated. <p>Action PP-AD-1.6.2 - The Bowen Canyon Bald Eagle Sanctuary ACEC (approximately 2,300 acres) would be managed to protect and provide winter roosting habitat by implementing the following management practices: (B-AD-1.2.2)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Snowmobile use would not be allowed. • Public lands would be retained • The area would be identified as an “Avoidance” area for ROWs. • Fluid minerals would be leased with a NSO stipulation.

<p style="text-align: center;">Draft RMP/EIS Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Proposed RMP/Final EIS Alternative B (Proposed Plan)</p>
<p>ADMINISTRATIVE DESIGNATIONS (AD)</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Post pole, firewood or commercial timber sales would not be allowed. • Habitat would be protected with special stipulations (e.g., NSO) or restrictions (e.g., seasonal) on various permitted activities. • Wildland fire would be suppressed. • Livestock grazing would be managed to maintain or improve native vegetation conditions (LHC-A). • Acquire private lands from willing sellers in Bowen Canyon and develop a formal cooperative agreement with the private land owner(s). • Cooperative management of public lands with the Shoshone-Bannock Tribes' privately owned lands in Bowen Canyon would be pursued as opportunities exist. • A withdrawal of approximately 2,300 acres for locatable minerals would be pursued. <p>Action B-AD-1.2.3 - The Downy Watershed ACEC (approximately 1,900 acres) would be managed to maintain/improve vegetative condition and overall watershed health by implementing the following management practices:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wildland fire would be suppressed. • Public lands would be retained. • The area would be identified as an "Avoidance" area for ROWs. • Fluid minerals would be leased with a NSO stipulation. • Snowmobile use would not be allowed. • The OHV designation would be Limited and OHV use would be limited to designated routes. • A locatable mineral withdraw would be maintained. • Livestock grazing would be managed to maintain or improve native vegetation conditions (LHC-A). • The area would be discretionarily closed to phosphate leasing. <p>Action B-AD-1.2.4 - The Indian Rocks ACEC (approximately 3,100 acres) would be managed to protect relevant cultural resource sites by implementing the following management practices:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Snowmobile use would not be allowed. • Public lands would be retained • The area would be identified as an "Avoidance" area for ROWs. • Fluid minerals would be leased with a NSO stipulation. • The OHV designation would be Limited and OHV use would be limited to designated roads and trails. • Interested Indian tribes (e.g., Shoshone-Bannock Tribes, Northern Shoshone) would be coordinated with on management issues specific to the ACEC. • Livestock grazing would be managed to maintain or improve native vegetation conditions (LHC-A). • The area would be a priority for weed control. • Guidelines (e.g., areas closed to heavy equipment use, using fire retardant for fire lines) would be developed for wildland fire suppression activities. • Inventory and monitoring of cultural resources would continue. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The OHV designation would be Limited and OHV use would be limited to designated routes. • Post pole, firewood or commercial timber sales would not be allowed. • Habitat would be protected with special stipulations (e.g., NSO) or restrictions (e.g., seasonal) on various permitted activities. • Wildland fire would be suppressed. • Livestock grazing would be managed to maintain or improve native vegetation conditions (LHC-A). • Acquire private lands from willing sellers in Bowen Canyon and develop a formal cooperative agreement with the private land owner(s). • Cooperative management of public lands with the Shoshone-Bannock Tribes' privately owned lands in Bowen Canyon would be pursued as opportunities exist. • A withdrawal of approximately 2,300 acres for locatable minerals would be pursued. <p>Action PP-AD-1.6.3 - The Downy Watershed ACEC (approximately 1,900 acres) would be managed to maintain/improve vegetative condition and overall watershed health by implementing the following management practices: (B-AD-1.2.3)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wildland fire would be suppressed. • Public lands would be retained. • The area would be identified as an "Avoidance" area for ROWs. • Fluid minerals would be leased with a NSO stipulation. • Snowmobile use would not be allowed. • The OHV designation would be Limited and OHV use would be limited to designated routes. • A locatable mineral withdraw would be maintained. • Livestock grazing would be managed to maintain or improve native vegetation conditions (LHC-A). • The area would be discretionarily closed to phosphate leasing. <p>Action PP-AD-1.6.4 - The Indian Rocks ACEC (approximately 3,100 acres) would be managed to protect relevant cultural resource sites by implementing the following management practices: (B-AD-1.2.4)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Snowmobile use would not be allowed. • Public lands would be retained • The area would be identified as an "Avoidance" area for ROWs. • Fluid minerals would be leased with a NSO stipulation. • The OHV designation would be Limited and OHV use would be limited to designated roads and trails. • Interested Indian tribes (e.g., Shoshone-Bannock Tribes, Northern Shoshone) would be coordinated with on management issues specific to the ACEC. • Livestock grazing would be managed to maintain or improve native vegetation conditions (LHC-A). • The area would be a priority for weed control.

<p style="text-align: center;">Draft RMP/EIS Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Proposed RMP/Final EIS Alternative B (Proposed Plan)</p>
<p>ADMINISTRATIVE DESIGNATIONS (AD)</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interpretive sign(s) at key location(s) would be placed to explain resource values and/or site use restrictions. <p>Action B-AD-1.2.5 - The Juniper Townsite and Van Komen Homestead ACECs (approximately 6 acres) would be managed to protect cultural and historical resources by implementing the following management practices:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Snowmobile use would not be allowed. • Public lands would be retained. • The area would be identified as an "Avoidance" area for ROWs. • Fluid minerals would be leased with a NSO stipulation. • The OHV designation would be Limited and OHV use would be limited to designated routes. • Partnerships would be pursued with local historical interest groups to protect, maintain and interpret historic structures. • Ensure structures and improvements are safe for the public • Wildland fire would be suppressed. • The area would be signed to explain important cultural and historical values and the need to protect these values. <p>Action B-AD-1.2.6 - The Dairy Hollow RNA (approximately 40 acres) would be managed to protect the nearly pristine Wyoming sagebrush/needle-and-thread plant community and Ferruginous Hawk nesting habitat (conglomerate bluffs and columns) by implementing the following management practices:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The area would be discretionarily closed for solid leasable and salable minerals. • The OHV designation would be Closed • Wildland fire would be suppressed. • Public lands would be retained. • The area would be identified as an "Exclusion" area for ROWs. • Fluid minerals would be leased with a NSO stipulation. • Livestock grazing would be adjusted, if necessary, to maintain the values of the RNA. • A withdrawal for locatable minerals would be pursued. • Vegetation would be monitored to understand natural ecological processes and/or determine trends. • Vegetation would be inventoried to establish baseline information and identify threats. • The area would be a priority for weed control. • Interpretive sign(s) would be placed at key locations to explain resource values and area use restrictions. <p>Action B-AD-1.2.7 - The Formation Cave RNA (approximately 70 acres) would be managed to protect fragile travertine formation and pristine waterbirch, antelope bitterbrush/Nevada bluegrass, and barren plant communities by implementing the following management practices:</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Guidelines (e.g., areas closed to heavy equipment use, using fire retardant for firelines) would be developed for wildland fire suppression activities. • Inventory and monitoring of cultural resources would continue. • Interpretive sign(s) at key location(s) would be placed to explain resource values and/or site use restrictions. <p>Action PP-AD-1.6.5 - The Juniper Townsite ACEC (approximately 3 acres) would be managed to protect cultural and historical resources by implementing the following management practices: (B-AD-1.2.5)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Snowmobile use would not be allowed. • Public lands would be retained. • The area would be identified as an "Avoidance" area for ROWs. • Fluid minerals would be leased with a NSO stipulation. • The OHV designation would be Limited and OHV use would be limited to designated routes. • Partnerships would be pursued with local historical interest groups to protect, maintain and interpret historic structures. If interested or willing parties desire to restore or develop the townsite, the BLM would work with such parties to the extent practical. • Ensure structures and improvements are safe for the public. • Wildland fire would be suppressed. • The area would be signed to explain important cultural and historical values and the need to protect these values. <p>Action PP-AD-1.6.6 - The Dairy Hollow RNA (approximately 40 acres) would be managed to protect the nearly pristine Wyoming sagebrush/needle-and-thread plant community and Ferruginous Hawk nesting habitat (conglomerate bluffs and columns) by implementing the following management practices: (B-AD-1.2.6)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The area would be discretionarily closed for solid leasable and salable minerals. • The OHV designation would be Closed • Wildland fire would be suppressed. • Public lands would be retained. • The area would be identified as an "Exclusion" area for ROWs. • Fluid minerals would be leased with a NSO stipulation. • Livestock grazing would be adjusted, if necessary, to maintain the values of the RNA. • A withdrawal for locatable minerals would be pursued. • Vegetation would be monitored to understand natural ecological processes and/or determine trends. • Vegetation would be inventoried to establish baseline information and identify threats. • The area would be a priority for weed control. • Interpretive sign(s) would be placed at key locations to explain resource values and area use restrictions.

<p style="text-align: center;">Draft RMP/EIS Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Proposed RMP/Final EIS Alternative B (Proposed Plan)</p>
<p>ADMINISTRATIVE DESIGNATIONS (AD)</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The area would be discretionarily closed for solid leasable minerals and salable minerals. • The OHV designation would be Closed with the exception of the Formation Cave parking area and access road which would be a designated route. • Wildland fire would be suppressed. • Public lands would be retained. • The area would be identified as an “Exclusion” area for ROWs. • Fluid minerals would be leased with a NSO stipulation. • The area would be unavailable for livestock grazing. • A withdrawal for locatable minerals would be pursued. • Vegetation would be monitored to understand natural ecological processes and/or determine trends. • Vegetation would be inventoried to establish baseline information and identify threats. • The area would be a priority for weed control. • The fence, parking area/trailhead, trail system, footbridges, and interpretative signs would be maintained. • Management of the RNA would be coordinated with The Nature Conservancy. <p>Action B-AD-1.2.8 - The Oneida Narrows RNA (approximately 600 acres) would be managed to protect the nearly pristine plant communities (e.g., bigtooth maple, box-elder riparian, Rocky Mountain juniper, and bunchgrass), Bald Eagle and Rock Squirrel habitat by implementing the following management practices:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The area would be discretionarily closed for solid leasable minerals and salable minerals. • The OHV designation would be Closed with the exception of the Oneida Project Road which would be a designated route. • Wildland fire would be suppressed • Public lands would be retained. • The area would be identified as an “Exclusion” area for ROWs. • Fluid minerals would be leased with a NSO stipulation. • Livestock grazing would be adjusted, if necessary, to maintain the values of the RNA. • A withdrawal for locatable minerals would be pursued • Vegetation would be monitored to understand natural ecological processes and/or determine trends. • Vegetation would be inventoried to establish baseline information and identify threats. • The area would be a priority for weed control. • Interpretive sign(s) would be placed at key location(s) to explain resource values and area use restrictions. <p>Action B-AD-1.2.9 - The Pine Gap RNA (approximately 240 acres) would be managed to protect the nearly pristine black sagebrush/bluebunch wheatgrass plant community by implementing the following management practices:</p>	<p>Action PP-AD-1.6.7 - The Formation Cave RNA (approximately 70 acres) would be managed to protect fragile travertine formation and pristine waterbirch, antelope bitterbrush/Nevada bluegrass, and barren plant communities by implementing the following management practices: (B-AD-1.2.7)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The area would be discretionarily closed for solid leasable minerals and salable minerals. • The OHV designation would be Closed with the exception of the Formation Cave parking area and access road which would be a designated route. • Wildland fire would be suppressed. • Public lands would be retained. • The area would be identified as an “Exclusion” area for ROWs. • Fluid minerals would be leased with a NSO stipulation. • The area would be unavailable for livestock grazing. • A withdrawal for locatable minerals would be pursued. • Vegetation would be monitored to understand natural ecological processes and/or determine trends. • Vegetation would be inventoried to establish baseline information and identify threats. • The area would be a priority for weed control. • The fence, parking area/trailhead, trail system, footbridges, and interpretative signs would be maintained. • Management of the RNA would be coordinated with The Nature Conservancy. <p>Action PP-AD-1.6.8 - The Oneida Narrows RNA (approximately 600 acres) would be managed to protect the nearly pristine plant communities (e.g., bigtooth maple, box-elder riparian, Rocky Mountain juniper, and bunchgrass), Bald Eagle and Rock Squirrel habitat by implementing the following management practices: (B-AD-1.2.8)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The area would be discretionarily closed for solid leasable minerals and salable minerals. • The OHV designation would be Closed with the exception of the Oneida Project Road which would be a designated route. • Wildland fire would be suppressed • Public lands would be retained. • The area would be identified as an “Exclusion” area for ROWs. • Fluid minerals would be leased with a NSO stipulation. • Livestock grazing would be adjusted, if necessary, to maintain the values of the RNA. • A withdrawal for locatable minerals would be pursued • Vegetation would be monitored to understand natural ecological processes and/or determine trends. • Vegetation would be inventoried to establish baseline information and identify threats. • The area would be a priority for weed control.

<p style="text-align: center;">Draft RMP/EIS Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Proposed RMP/Final EIS Alternative B (Proposed Plan)</p>
<p>ADMINISTRATIVE DESIGNATIONS (AD)</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The area would be discretionarily closed for solid leasable minerals and salable minerals. • The OHV designation would be Closed. • Wildland fire would be suppressed. • Public lands would be retained. • The area would be identified as an “Exclusion” area for ROWs. • Fluid minerals would be leased with a NSO stipulation. • The area would be unavailable for livestock grazing. • A withdrawal for locatable minerals would be pursued. • Vegetation would be monitored to understand natural ecological processes and/or determine trends. • Vegetation would be inventoried to establish baseline information and identify threats. • The area would be a priority for weed control. • Interpretive sign(s) would be placed at key location(s) to explain resource values and area use restrictions. <p>Action B-AD-1.2.10 - The Robbers Roost RNA (approximately 400 acres) would be managed to protect the unique abundance of mountain shrub communities by implementing the following management practices:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The area would be discretionarily closed for solid leasable minerals and salable minerals. • The OHV designation would be Closed with the exception of the Robbers Roost Road which would be a designated route. • Wildland fire would be suppressed. • Public lands would be retained. • The area would be identified as an “Exclusion” area for ROWs. • Fluid minerals would be leased with a NSO stipulation. • The area would be unavailable for livestock grazing. • A withdrawal for locatable minerals would be pursued • Vegetation would be monitored to understand natural ecological processes and/or determine trends. • Vegetation would be inventoried to establish baseline information and identify threats. • The area would be a priority for weed control. • Interpretive sign(s) would be placed at key location(s) to explain resource values and area use restrictions. <p>Action B-AD-1.2.11 - The Cheatbeck RNA (approximately 100 acres) would be managed to protect the plant communities of boxelder/sweet cicley and bigtooth maple/sweet cicley by implementing the following management practices:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The area would be discretionarily closed for solid leasable minerals and salable minerals. • The OHV designation would be Closed. • Wildland fire would be suppressed. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interpretive sign(s) would be placed at key location(s) to explain resource values and area use restrictions. <p>Action PP-AD-1.6.9 - The Pine Gap RNA (approximately 240 acres) would be managed to protect the nearly pristine black sagebrush/bluebunch wheatgrass plant community by implementing the following management practices: (B-AD-1.2.9)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The area would be discretionarily closed for solid leasable minerals and salable minerals. • The OHV designation would be Closed. • Wildland fire would be suppressed. • Public lands would be retained. • The area would be identified as an “Exclusion” area for ROWs. • Fluid minerals would be leased with a NSO stipulation. • The area would be unavailable for livestock grazing. • A withdrawal for locatable minerals would be pursued. • Vegetation would be monitored to understand natural ecological processes and/or determine trends. • Vegetation would be inventoried to establish baseline information and identify threats. • The area would be a priority for weed control. • Interpretive sign(s) would be placed at key location(s) to explain resource values and area use restrictions. <p>Action PP-AD-1.6.10 - The Robbers Roost RNA (approximately 400 acres) would be managed to protect the unique abundance of mountain shrub communities by implementing the following management practices: (B-AD-1.2.10)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The area would be discretionarily closed for solid leasable minerals and salable minerals. • The OHV designation would be Closed with the exception of the Robbers Roost Road which would be a designated route. • Wildland fire would be suppressed. • Public lands would be retained. • The area would be identified as an “Exclusion” area for ROWs. • Fluid minerals would be leased with a NSO stipulation. • The area would be unavailable for livestock grazing. • A withdrawal for locatable minerals would be pursued • Vegetation would be monitored to understand natural ecological processes and/or determine trends. • Vegetation would be inventoried to establish baseline information and identify threats. • The area would be a priority for weed control. • Interpretive sign(s) would be placed at key location(s) to explain resource values and area use restrictions.

<p style="text-align: center;">Draft RMP/EIS Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Proposed RMP/Final EIS Alternative B (Proposed Plan)</p>
<p>ADMINISTRATIVE DESIGNATIONS (AD)</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Public lands would be retained. • The area would be identified as an “Exclusion” area for ROWs. • Fluid minerals would be leased with a NSO stipulation. • Livestock grazing would be adjusted, if necessary, to maintain the values of the RNA. • A withdrawal for locatable minerals would be pursued. • Vegetation would be monitored to understand natural ecological processes and/or determine trends. • Vegetation would be inventoried to establish baseline information and identify threats. • The area would be a priority for weed control. <p>Action B-AD-1.2.12 - The Travertine Park ACEC and RNA (approximately 200 acres) would be managed to protect fragile travertine formations and uncommon lichen species of by implementing the following management practices:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Snowmobile use would not be allowed. • Wildland fire would be suppressed • Public lands would be retained • The ACEC portion would be identified as an “Avoidance” area for ROWs. • The RNA portion would be identified as an “Exclusion” area for ROWs. • Fluid minerals would be leased with a NSO stipulation. • The area would be discretionarily closed for solid leasable and salable minerals. • The OHV designation would be Closed for the RNA portion only. • The OHV designation for the ACEC portion only would be Limited and OHV use would be limited to designated trails. • The area would be unavailable for livestock grazing. • A withdrawal for locatable minerals would be pursued. • Vegetation would be monitored to understand natural ecological processes and/or determine trends. • Vegetation would be inventoried to establish baseline information and identify threats. • The area would be a priority for weed control. • Interpretive sign(s) would be placed at key location(s) to explain resource values and area use restrictions. 	<p>Action PP-AD-1.6.11 - The Cheatbeck RNA (approximately 100 acres) would be managed to protect the plant communities of boxelder/sweet cicley and bigtooth maple/sweet cicley by implementing the following management practices: (B-AD-1.2.11)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The area would be discretionarily closed for solid leasable minerals and salable minerals. • The OHV designation would be Closed. • Wildland fire would be suppressed. • Public lands would be retained. • The area would be identified as an “Exclusion” area for ROWs. • Fluid minerals would be leased with a NSO stipulation. • Livestock grazing would be adjusted, if necessary, to maintain the values of the RNA. • A withdrawal for locatable minerals would be pursued. • Vegetation would be monitored to understand natural ecological processes and/or determine trends. • Vegetation would be inventoried to establish baseline information and identify threats. • The area would be a priority for weed control. <p>Action PP-AD-1.6.12 - The Travertine Park ACEC and RNA (approximately 200 acres) would be managed to protect fragile travertine formations and uncommon lichen species of by implementing the following management practices: (B-AD-1.2.12)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Snowmobile use would not be allowed. • Wildland fire would be suppressed • Public lands would be retained • The ACEC portion would be identified as an “Avoidance” area for ROWs. • The RNA portion would be identified as an “Exclusion” area for ROWs. • Fluid minerals would be leased with a NSO stipulation. • The area would be discretionarily closed for solid leasable and salable minerals. • The OHV designation would be Closed for the RNA portion only. • The OHV designation for the ACEC portion only would be Limited and OHV use would be limited to designated trails. • The area would be unavailable for livestock grazing. • A withdrawal for locatable minerals would be pursued. • Vegetation would be monitored to understand natural ecological processes and/or determine trends. • Vegetation would be inventoried to establish baseline information and identify threats. • The area would be a priority for weed control. • Interpretive sign(s) would be placed at key location(s) to explain resource values and area use restrictions.

Draft RMP/EIS Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)	Proposed RMP/Final EIS Alternative B (Proposed Plan)
ADMINISTRATIVE DESIGNATIONS (AD)	
No similar objective.	Objective PP-AD-1.7. The Van Komen ACEC (approximately 3 acres) designation would be removed and the area no longer managed as an ACEC. (New)
No similar management action.	Action PP-AD-1.7.1 - The Van Komen area would be managed as adjacent public lands under the general land laws. (new) Action PP-AD-1.7.2 - If interested or willing parties would desire to restore/develop the Van Komen Homestead, the BLM would work with such parties to the extent possible. (new)

2.7 MANAGEMENT GUIDANCE COMMON TO ALL ALTERNATIVES

The following sections (2.7 through 2.12) describe, by resources and uses, the management guidance that would be applicable to all four alternatives. All sections need to be reviewed in order to capture the full suite of management guidance offered for each alternative (see Section 2.2). The actions described in **Table 2-2** would be implemented regardless of which alternative is ultimately selected. Technical terms used are defined in the Glossary or are explained in detail in Chapter 3.

The management guidance described in this section includes many decisions required in a land use plan (BLM H-1601-1) and also brings forward relevant direction from existing land use plans (BLM 1988a, 1981a). Agencies frequently do not have much discretion to vary proposed management across alternatives and still comply with existing laws, regulations, and policies.

Table 2-2. Management Guidance Common to All Alternatives

GENERAL (GE)

Goal GE-1. Continuously update resource and use information/data in order to proactively address changing needs or conditions.

Management Objectives

Management Actions

Objective CA-GE-1.1. Inventories and surveys documenting the condition and extent of resources/uses are given sufficient emphasis to monitor changes in conditions, provide “measurements” of ecosystem health or baseline data/information, and enable specialists to respond to changes when needed.

Action CA-GE-1.1.1 - Resource inventory, survey and monitoring programs would be implemented as appropriate.

Action CA-GE-1.1.2 - Information gained through inventory, survey and monitoring programs would be used in making management decisions.

Action CA-GE-1.1.3 - Undertake proactive management of public land activities, including, but not limited to, mitigating potential adverse effects.

Goal GE-2. Consistent with multiple use management and sustained yield, achieve desired resource and use conditions while providing for an ecologically healthy environment.

Management Objectives

Management Actions

Objective CA-GE-2.1. Reduce adverse impacts from management actions, and maintain or improve resource conditions.

Action CA-GE-2.1.1 - As appropriate, management guidelines, techniques and practices (**Appendix C**) would be applied to proactively make progress towards desired resource and/or use conditions.

Action CA-GE-2.1.2 - As appropriate, the modification of existing or development of new guidelines, techniques and practices to reduce adverse effects or maintain/improve resource conditions would be analyzed through the NEPA process.

RESOURCES

Air Quality (AQ)

Goal AQ-1. Comply with existing laws and regulations to meet health and safety requirements.

Management Objectives

Management Actions

Objective CA-AQ-1.1. Reduce particulate impacts from uncontrolled wildland fires.

Action CA-AQ-1.1.1 - As appropriate, fuels management opportunities would be implemented to reduce particulate matter impacts.

Air Quality (AQ)

Objective CA-AQ-1.2. Control the particulate level impacts from permitted/authorized activities.

Action CA-AQ-1.2.1 -As appropriate, management techniques, practices or guidelines to control fugitive dust emissions would be implemented as identified in **Appendix C**.

Action CA-AQ-1.2.2 - Planned activities would be conducted in accordance with the Idaho State Implementation Plan of the CAA (upon completion).

Action CA-AQ-1.2.3 - Fire treatment activities (e.g., WFU, prescribed fire) would be consistent with the US Environmental Protection Agency, National Ambient Air Quality Standards for particulate matter (PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5}) and coordinated through the Montana/Idaho Airshed Group Smoke Management Program.

Cultural Resources (CR)

Goal CR-1. Provide for the identification, protection, and enhancement of historical and cultural sites to ensure scientific and socio-cultural values are maintained and are available for appropriate uses by present and future generations.

Management Objectives

Management Actions

Objective CA-CR-1.1. Manage important known and future identified cultural and historical sites to maintain and preserve their educational, scientific and public benefit.

Action CA-CR-1.1.1 - Federally recognized tribes (e.g., Shoshone-Bannock Tribes) would be consulted with on the evaluation, impact assessment and management of cultural resources and traditional cultural properties.

Action CA-CR-1.1.2 - In compliance with Section 106 of the NHPA, the effects of all actions or undertakings (as defined in the NHPA) on cultural resources including traditional cultural properties would be considered through appropriate identification, evaluation, assessment of effects, and implementation of appropriate management measures. This consideration would be conducted through appropriate consultation with the Idaho State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) and appropriate tribes.

Action CA-CR-1.1.3 - Archaeological collections from the PFO would be properly maintained in conformance with 36 Code of Federal Regulations 79 and Bureau policy and would be available for study by qualified researchers.

Action CA-CR-1.1.4 - Special management measures would be developed, enhanced and/or maintained for currently identified cultural resources:

- The Indian Rocks ACEC according to approved CRMP.
- The Van Komen Homestead and Juniper Town Site would be managed according to approved plans considering stabilization and rehabilitation of historic structures and interpretive signage.

Action CA-CR-1.1.5 - Manage identified cultural resource management areas in the following manner: approximately 2,100 acres (Historic Railroad Grade, Blackrock Canyon, and Historic Trail Segments) with an NSO stipulation for fluid minerals, and approximately 6,300 acres as sensitive areas (Prehistoric Areas A-G, Upper Valley, and Bear Lake Plateau).

Action CA-CR-1.1.6 - Maps of known cultural resources, cultural resource inventories and areas of cultural resource sensitivity would be reviewed and updated accordingly.

Action CA-CR-1.1.7 - Review and update current holdings for cultural resource site and survey records with Idaho SHPO and acquire any new or missing documents.

Action CA-CR-1.1.8 - Known or anticipated cultural resources would be allocated to the following uses according to their nature and relative preservation value.

- Scientific Use
 - Preserved until research potential is realized
- Conservation for Future Use
 - Preserved until conditions for use are met
- Traditional Use
 - Long-term preservation
- Public Use
 - Long-term preservation, on-site interpretation
- Experimental Use
 - Protected until used

Cultural Resources (CR)

- Discharged from Management
 - No use after recordation; not preserved

Action CA-CR-1.1.9 - Known or anticipated cultural uses would be subject to the following use actions.

- Scientific Use: Permit appropriate research, including data recovery
- Conservation for Future Use: Propose protective measures/designations
- Traditional Use: Consult with tribes; determine limitations
- Public Use: Determine limitations, permitted uses
- Experimental Use: Determine nature of experiment
- Discharged from Management: Remove protective measures

Action CA-CR-1.1.10 - Formal nominations for historic and traditional cultural properties that are eligible for the listing on the NRHP would be prepared as necessary.

Action CA-CR-1.1.11 - As the need is identified, CRMPs to provide more specific management direction for cultural resources, including NRHP-listed and eligible properties, classes of cultural resources or defined areas, Traditional Cultural Properties and historic trails (e.g., Blackfoot River, Oregon/California Trail and alternate routes) would be developed.

Action CA-CR-1.1.12 - Ethnographic, prehistoric and historic overviews would be prepared and maintained to guide future cultural resource compliance studies, research and resource allocation.

Objective CA-CR-1.2. Reduce imminent threats from natural or human-caused deterioration, or potential conflict with other resource uses.

Action CA-CR-1.2.1 - Proposed activities would only be authorized after compliance with Section 106 of NHPA has been completed and documented, including, where applicable, consultation with the SHPO and federally recognized Indian tribes (e.g., Shoshone-Bannock Tribes).

Action CA-CR-1.2.2 - Priority geographic areas to be inventoried for cultural resources would be closely coordinated with other field office programs and based upon a probability for unrecorded significant resources to be identified.

Action CA-CR-1.2.3 - Information on documented cultural resources and cultural resource investigations (e.g., cultural resource inventories) will continue to be maintained and updated with current information so that cultural resources are adequately considered in future planning and management actions.

Action CA-CR-1.2.4 - Cultural resource information would be made available to qualified researchers for study and use.

Special Status Species (SS)

Goal SS-1. Manage special status species and their habitats to provide for their continued presence and conservation as part of an ecologically healthy system.

Management Objectives

Management Actions

Objective CA-SS-1.1. Conserve, inventory and monitor special status species.

Action CA-SS-1.1.1- The USFWS would be consulted consistent with ESA requirements.

Action CA-SS-1.1.2 -The priorities for special status species conservation actions, inventory and monitoring based upon habitat risk, rarity, and endemism would be as follows:

- 1) Federally Threatened, Endangered, Candidate, and Proposed Species (Type 1).
- 2) Rangewide/Globally Imperiled Species – High Endangerment possibility (Type 2).
- 3) Rangewide/Globally Imperiled Species – Moderate Endangerment: Species of Concern (Types 3 and 4).

Action CA-SS-1.1.3 - Appropriate actions that contribute to the continued presence and conservation of SS species and which would not contribute to the listing of the species would be implemented.

Special Status Species (SS)

Objective CA-SS-1.2. Maintain or improve the quality of listed (threatened or endangered) species habitat by managing public land activities to support species recovery and the benefit of those species.

Action CA-SS-1.2.1 - Consistent with ESA requirements, the USFWS would be consulted regarding activities concerning Listed species.

Action CA-SS-1.2.2 - Identified actions to maintain or improve the quality of Listed species habitat would be modified through the ESA consultation process.

Action CA-SS-1.2.3 - Seasonal restrictions (**Appendix D**) would be implemented for Listed species.

Action CA-SS-1.2.4 - For the following Listed species (Bald Eagle, Gray Wolf, Utah Valvata Snail), conservation measures would be implemented to support species recovery as identified below by resources and uses:

BALD EAGLE:

Common to All Resources and Uses

- 1) In cooperation with Idaho IDFG, USFWS, and others:
 - Continue to cooperate in determining the distribution of populations and suitable habitats.
 - Following current monitoring protocols continue to cooperate in conducting systematic nest surveys and monitoring.
 - Cooperate in the management of nest sites and communal roost sites to promote species recovery.
 - Cooperate in the maintenance and improvement of habitat in key foraging areas, for example, mule deer winter range, and aquatic and riparian habitat for fish and waterfowl, where a need exists.
 - Cooperate to maintain and develop nesting and roosting habitat for future use by bald eagles.
- 2) Ensure that ongoing federal actions support or do not preclude species recovery.
- 3) Ensure that new federal actions support or do not preclude species recovery.
- 4) Protect bald eagles from disturbance that might result in displacement during critical periods.
- 5) Implement adaptive management as needed to achieve conservation objectives.
- 6) Support conservation easements, cooperative management efforts, and other programs on adjacent non-federal lands to support recovery of the bald eagle.
- 7) The following additional conservation measures would be implemented by respective resources and uses in addition to the six (6) conservation measures identified above:

Soil and Water (SW)

- 1) Projects involving the application of pesticides (herbicides, insecticides, etc.) that may affect the species would be analyzed at the project level and designed such that pesticide applications would support conservation and recovery and minimize risks of exposure.
- 2) Where needed and feasible, coordinate with adjacent land owners and local governments regarding control of invasive plants in riparian areas through cooperative weed management programs.
- 3) Conserve mature riparian forests (i.e., cottonwood galleries) in suitable habitat to maintain their integrity for use as bald eagle nesting, roosting, or perching substrate.

Vegetation (VE)

- 1) Projects involving the application of pesticides (herbicides, insecticides, etc.) that may affect the species would be analyzed at the project level and designed such that pesticide applications would support conservation and recovery and minimize risks of exposure.

Forestry (FO)

- 1) Projects involving the application of pesticides (herbicides, insecticides, etc.) that may affect the species would be analyzed at the project level and designed such that pesticide applications would support conservation and recovery and minimize risks of exposure.
- 2) Conserve mature upland forests in suitable habitat to maintain their integrity for use as bald eagle nesting, roosting, or perching substrate.

Special Status Species (SS)

Livestock Grazing (LG)

- 1) Manage livestock grazing and trailing to promote nesting and roosting tree growth and recruitment, healthy riparian communities, or a combination of these objectives. Maintain and promote suitable habitat and restore areas for the bald eagle while implementing Idaho Standards for Rangeland Health and Guidelines.
- 2) Promote suitable habitat following wildland fire, or other major disturbances.
- 3) Maintain regular compliance checks on grazing allotments with nest sites and communal roost sites to identify problems as soon as possible and take immediate corrective measures.
- 4) Manage livestock facilities to promote nesting and roosting tree growth and recruitment, healthy riparian communities, or a combination of these objectives. Maintain and promote suitable habitat and restore areas for the bald eagle while implementing Idaho Standards for Rangeland Health and Guidelines.

Recreation (RE)

- 1) Developed facilities (boat access, paved campgrounds, vault toilets, interpretive kiosks, etc.): Manage existing and new recreation facilities so as not to preclude species habitat conservation and recovery. This includes management of the physical facilities, as well as disturbances to the species resulting from human uses.
- 2) Dispersed use areas (informal areas, including camping areas and tie-up areas for pack animals and boats): Manage dispersed use sites so as not to preclude species habitat conservation and recovery. This includes limiting disturbances to the species resulting from human uses.
- 3) Commercial and noncommercial recreation permits, including outfitter camps: Issue commercial and noncommercial recreation permits so as not to preclude species habitat conservation and recovery. This includes management of physical facilities (such as camps), as well as disturbances to the species resulting from human uses.
- 4) Coordinate with the IDFG to educate recreation users at boat ramps and at designated camp areas about the need to conserve bald eagle habitat.
- 5) Manage roads, OHV routes and areas, as well as non-motorized trails, so as not to preclude species habitat conservation and recovery. This includes management of physical facilities, as well as disturbances to the species resulting from human uses.
- 6) Maintain regular compliance checks on OHV closures to protect suitable habitat and to identify problems as soon as possible and take immediate corrective measures.

Wildland Fire Management (WF)

- 1) Human life and firefighter safety and property take priority over species protection.
- 2) Fire suppression efforts would be conducted, as possible, to protect bald eagle habitat. Place a high priority on protecting suitable habitat.
- 3) Coordinate with Forest Service, IDL, or other applicable agency personnel regarding fire suppression activities in or near nest sites and communal roost areas.
- 4) Implement ES&R activities following wildland fire to promote bald eagle habitat.
- 5) ES&R projects involving the application of pesticides (herbicides, insecticides, etc.) that may affect the species would be analyzed at the project level and designed such that pesticide applications would support conservation and recovery and minimize risks of exposure.
- 6) WFU projects (where allowed) would be designed to conserve suitable bald eagle habitat.
- 7) Prescribed fire projects would be designed to conserve suitable bald eagle habitat.
- 8) Promote establishment of plant species needed to achieve suitable bald eagle habitat.

Lands and Realty (LR)

- 1) Where feasible and funding is available, acquire through land exchange or purchase private lands in suitable habitat areas that could enhance habitat for bald eagles.
- 2) Retain bald eagle habitat in federal ownership to the extent possible, while balancing other needs.
- 3) Issue new land use permits and leases and review existing permits and leases at renewal so as not to preclude species habitat conservation and recovery. This includes management of physical facilities, as well as disturbances to the species resulting from human uses.

Special Status Species (SS)

- 4) Review existing ROWs at renewal time and issue new ROWs so as not to preclude species habitat conservation and recovery. This includes management of physical facilities, as well as disturbances to the species resulting from human uses.

Minerals and Energy (ME)

- 1) Approve POs or allow notice level operations so as not to preclude species habitat conservation and recovery. This includes management of physical facilities, as well as disturbances to the species resulting from human uses.
- 2) Approve development of saleable or leasable minerals so as not to preclude species habitat conservation and recovery. This includes management of physical facilities, as well as disturbances to the species resulting from human uses.

GRAY WOLF:

Common to All Resources and Uses

1. In cooperation with IDFG, USFWS, and others:
 - Determine the distribution of wolves and key gray wolf habitat areas (dens, rendezvous sites, and crucial big game winter ranges).
 - Cooperate in maintaining and improving gray wolf habitat by focusing on reducing human/wolf interactions and improving big game winter range.
2. Ensure that ongoing federal actions support or do not preclude species recovery.
3. Ensure that new federal actions support or do not preclude species recovery.
4. Protect gray wolves from disturbance that might result in displacement during critical periods.
5. Support conservation easements, cooperative management efforts, and other programs on adjacent non-federal lands to support recovery of the gray wolf.
6. The following additional conservation measures would be implemented by respective resources and uses in addition to the five (5) conservation measures identified above:

Forestry (FO)

1. Projects involving the application of pesticides (herbicides, insecticides, etc.) in forested areas and woodlands that may affect the species would be analyzed at the project level and designed such that pesticide applications would support conservation and recovery and minimize risks of exposure.
2. Implement forest management actions that maintain the integrity of gray wolf habitat.

Fish and Wildlife (FW)

1. Coordinate with IDFG to improve big game winter range conditions.

Recreation (RE)

1. Developed facilities (boat access, paved campgrounds, vault toilets, interpretive kiosks, etc.): Manage existing and new recreation facilities so as not to preclude species habitat conservation and recovery. This includes management of the physical facilities, as well as disturbances to the species resulting from human uses.
2. Dispersed use areas (informal areas, including camping areas and tie-up areas for pack animals and boats): Manage dispersed use sites so as not to preclude species habitat conservation and recovery. This includes limiting disturbances to the species resulting from human uses.
3. Commercial and noncommercial recreation permits, including outfitter camps: Issue commercial and noncommercial recreation permits so as not to preclude species habitat conservation and recovery. This includes management of physical facilities (such as camps), as well as disturbances to the species resulting from human uses.
4. Manage roads, OHV routes and areas, as well as non-motorized trails, so as not to preclude species habitat conservation and recovery. This includes management of physical facilities, as well as disturbances to the species resulting from human uses.
5. Manage recreational travel towards reducing human/gray wolf interactions within and adjacent to key habitat areas to promote gray wolf recovery.
6. Maintain regular compliance checks on road and OHV closures to protect key gray wolf habitat areas and to identify problems as soon as possible and take immediate corrective measures.

Special Status Species (SS)

Wildland Fire Management (WF)

1. As possible fire suppression efforts would be conducted to protect gray wolf habitat, placing a high priority on enhancing key gray wolf habitat areas.
2. Coordinate with Forest Service, IDL, or other applicable agency personnel regarding fire suppression activities in or near key gray wolf habitat areas.
3. ES&R projects involving the application of pesticides (herbicides, insecticides, etc.) that may affect the species would be analyzed at the project level and designed such that pesticide applications would support conservation and recovery and minimize risks of exposure.
4. ES&R projects involving the application of pesticides would be analyzed and implemented in accordance with the approach described above in the Soil and Water (SW) section.
5. Where opportunities exist, prescribed fire projects would be designed to conserve and enhance gray wolf habitat.
6. Where opportunities exist, non-fire fuels management projects would be designed to conserve and enhance gray wolf habitat.

Lands and Realty (LR)

1. Where feasible and funding is available, acquire through land exchange or purchase private lands in or adjacent to key gray wolf habitat areas that could enhance habitat value for gray wolves.
2. Retain key gray wolf habitat areas in federal ownership to the extent possible, while balancing other needs.
3. Issue new land use permits and leases so as not to preclude species habitat conservation and recovery. This includes management of physical facilities, as well as disturbances to the species resulting from human uses.
7. Issue ROWs so as not to preclude species habitat conservation and recovery. This includes management of physical facilities, as well as disturbances to the species resulting from human uses.

Minerals and Energy (ME)

1. Approve POs or allow notice level operations so as not to preclude species habitat conservation and recovery. This includes management of physical facilities, as well as disturbances to the species resulting from human uses.
2. Approve development of saleable or leasable minerals so as not to preclude species habitat conservation and recovery. This includes management of physical facilities, as well as disturbances to the species resulting from human uses.

UTAH VALVATA SNAIL:

Common to All Resources and Uses

- 1) In cooperation with IDFG, USFWS, BOR, hydroelectric power companies, and others:
 - Cooperate in gathering existing information to understand the distribution of known populations, and contribute new information as opportunities arise.
- 2) Ensure that ongoing federal actions support or do not preclude species recovery.
- 3) Ensure that new federal actions support or do not preclude species recovery.
- 4) Implement adaptive management as needed to achieve conservation objectives.
- 5) Support conservation easements, cooperative management efforts, and other programs on adjacent non-federal lands to support recovery of the Snake River snails.
- 6) The following additional conservation measures would be implemented by respective resources and uses in addition to the five (5) conservation measures identified above:

Soil and Water (SW)

- 1) Projects involving the application of pesticides (herbicides, insecticides, etc.) that may affect the species would be analyzed at the project level and designed such that pesticide applications would support conservation and recovery and minimize risks of exposure.
- 2) Where needed and feasible, coordinate with adjacent landowners and local governments regarding control of invasive plants in riparian areas through cooperative weed management programs.

Special Status Species (SS)

- 3) Where needed, improve watershed conditions adjacent to suitable habitat to prevent soil erosion and negative water quality impacts. Conserve riparian vegetation near suitable habitat to minimize potential for erosion and sediment delivery to springs.

Vegetation (VE)

- 1) Projects involving the application of pesticides (herbicides, insecticides, etc.) that may affect the species would be analyzed at the project level and designed such that pesticide applications would support conservation and recovery and minimize risks of exposure.
- 2) Manage upland areas to minimize sediment delivery into suitable habitat.

Grazing (LG)

- 1) Manage livestock grazing and trailing adjacent to suitable Snake River snails' habitat to promote healthy watershed conditions while implementing Idaho Standards for Rangeland Health.
- 2) Promote restoration of areas adjacent to suitable habitat following fire, fire rehabilitation, restoration treatments, or other major disturbances.
- 3) Maintain regular compliance checks on grazing allotments adjacent to suitable habitat to identify problems as soon as possible and take immediate corrective measures.
- 4) Manage livestock facilities to promote healthy riparian communities or to prevent erosion, or a combination of these objectives, while implementing Idaho Standards for Rangeland Health.
- 5) Protect springs in or adjacent to suitable habitat to conserve and recover Snake River snails' habitat.

Recreation (RE)

- 1) Developed facilities (boat access, paved campgrounds, vault toilets, interpretive kiosks, etc.): Manage existing and new recreation facilities so as not to preclude species habitat conservation and recovery. This includes management of the physical facilities, as well as disturbances to the species resulting from human uses.
- 2) Dispersed use areas (informal areas, including camping areas, spring access, and tie-up areas for pack animals and boats): Manage dispersed use sites so as not to preclude species habitat conservation and recovery. This includes limiting disturbances to the species resulting from human uses.
- 3) Commercial and noncommercial recreation permits, including outfitter camps: Issue commercial and noncommercial recreation permits so as not to preclude species habitat conservation and recovery. This includes management of physical facilities (such as camps), as well as disturbances to the species resulting from human uses.
- 4) Protect springs with known populations to conserve Snake River snails habitat.
- 5) Educate the public on the Snake River snails' unique ecological requirements, sensitivity to habitat alteration, and need for habitat protection.
- 6) Manage roads, OHV routes and areas, and non-motorized trails, so as to not preclude species habitat conservation and recovery. This includes management of physical facilities, as well as disturbances to the species resulting from human uses.
- 7) Maintain regular compliance checks on OHV closures to protect known populations and to identify problems as soon as possible and take immediate corrective measures.

Wildland Fire Management (WF)

- 1) Fire suppression efforts would be conducted, as possible, to protect Snake River snails habitat. Place a high priority on protecting highly erosive areas adjacent to suitable habitat from wildfire.
- 2) Coordinate with Forest Service, IDL, or other applicable agency personnel regarding fire suppression activities in or near suitable habitat.
- 3) Implement ES&R activities to promote restoration of areas adjacent to suitable Snake River snails' habitat.

Special Status Species (SS)

- 4) Fire rehabilitation projects involving the application of pesticides would be analyzed and implemented in accordance with the approach described above in the Soil and Water (SW) section.
- 5) WFU projects (where allowed) would be designed to conserve suitable Snake River snails habitat.
- 6) Prescribed fire projects would be designed to conserve suitable Snake River snails' habitat.
- 7) Promote establishment of plant species needed to control erosion adjacent to suitable habitat.

Lands and Realty (LR)

- 1) Where feasible and funding is available, acquire through land exchange or purchase private lands that support known populations or could enhance habitat for Snake River snails.
- 2) Retain Snake River riparian habitat in federal ownership to the extent possible, while balancing other needs.
- 3) Issue new land use permits and leases and review existing permits and leases at renewal so as not to preclude species habitat conservation and recovery. This includes management of physical facilities, as well as disturbances to the species resulting from human uses.
- 4) Protect the watershed contributing to Snake River snails habitat.
- 5) Issue new ROWs and review existing ROWs at renewal so as not to preclude species habitat conservation and recovery. This includes management of physical facilities, as well as disturbances to the species resulting from human uses.

Minerals and Energy (ME)

- 1) Approve POs or allow notice level operations so as not to preclude species habitat conservation and recovery. This includes management of physical facilities, as well as disturbances to the species resulting from human uses.
- 2) Approve development of saleable or leasable minerals so as not to preclude species habitat conservation and recovery. This includes management of physical facilities, as well as disturbances to the species resulting from human uses.
- 3) Protect the watershed contributing to Snake River snail habit.

Objective CA-SS-1.3. Maintain or improve the quality of sensitive species habitat by managing public land activities to benefit those species.

Action CA-SS-1.3.1 - Public land activities would be managed to minimize the likelihood of sensitive species being listed as threatened or endangered under the ESA.
Action CA-SS-1.3.2 - Sensitive bat species habitat (e.g., caves, underground mine openings) would be protected by gating or restricting human access.

Fish and Wildlife (FW)

Goal FW-1. Manage wildlife habitats so vegetation composition and structure assures the continued presence of fish and wildlife as part of an ecologically healthy system.

Management Objectives

Management Actions

Objective CA-FW-1.1. Maintain and improve big game seasonal habitats to support IDFG management objectives.

Action CA-FW-1.1.1 - As appropriate and practicable, elk and deer habitat on public lands would be managed as identified below in order to generally support IDFG management objectives as described in the *White-Tailed Deer, Mule Deer, and Elk Management Plan - Status and Objectives of Idaho's White-Tailed Deer, Mule Deer, and Elk Resources* (IDFG 1999) for southeast (SE) Idaho management units.

- Riparian areas would be managed for habitat and population linkage areas by applying appropriate management techniques that include but are not limited to:
 - Fencing if practical,
 - Providing adjacent cover strips as appropriate
 - Controlling noxious weeds
- Aspen would be treated by applying appropriate management techniques that may include but are not limited to:

Fish and Wildlife (FW)

- Removing encroaching conifer in Aspen clones.
- Slashing old age aspen clones while leaving snags and some live trees.
- Fencing degraded aspen clones.
- Pursuing the use of prescribed fire.
- Plowing Aspen roots to release clones.
- Degraded riparian areas would be restored.
- Livestock grazing practices compatible with providing good mule deer habitat would be implemented.
- During travel management planning consider reducing the number of designated routes/roads within deer/elk winter range to avoid adverse impacts.
- Seasonal restrictions (**Appendix D**) would be implemented for:
 - Winter range closures.
 - Fawning habitat disturbances.

Action CA-FW-1.1.2 - The integrity of the elk calving areas would be protected by:

- Treating no more than 20% of any individual elk calving area during any 20 year period. Weed treatment in these areas would not account towards the 20% limitation.
- Implementing seasonal restrictions (**Appendix D**)

Action CA-FW-1.1.3 - Big game movement and safety would be enhanced through fence modifications using approved BLM fence designs.

Action CA-FW-1.1.4 - Big game winter ranges would be wildland fire suppression and ES&R priority areas.

Action CA-FW-1.1.5 - During travel management planning reducing the number of designated routes/roads would be considered in big game habitats (calving/fawning areas, winter range) to avoid adverse impacts.

Action CA-FW-1.1.6 - The management of deer winter range in the Soda Springs Hills Management Area would be coordinated with various partners such as the Shoshone-Bannock Tribes, IDFG, BPA, and Caribou County.

Action CA-FW-1.1.8 - The introduction or re-introduction of wildlife or fish species on public lands would be coordinated with IDFG and other agencies.

Action CA-FW-1.1.9 - Seasonal restrictions (**Appendix D**) would be applied to protect wildlife. The Authorized Officer may waive or adjust seasonal restrictions when appropriate conditions exist. Examples of such conditions may include, but are not limited to:

- Snow conditions,
- Soil moisture,
- Weather,
- When young of the year birds have fledged occupied nests.

Action CA-FW-1.1.10 - Livestock grazing would be managed in big game winter range (**Figure 3-5**) to ensure sufficient shrub forage for wildlife utilizing such tools as:

- Provide 80% of annual growth for wildlife
- Adjust season of use
- Adjust kind of livestock
- Adjust stocking rates.

Action CA-FW-1.1.11 - For the following big game summer/winter range areas (**Figure 2-1**), management guidance would be as follows to enhance and/or prevent the loss of habitat:

Soda Spring Hills Management Area - (approximately 18,700 acres)

(Big game winter range and sagebrush obligate species)

- Native vegetation conditions (LHC-A) would be maintained or improved.
- Seasonal closures for motorized vehicles would be implemented.
- Snowmobiling would not be allowed.
- Designated routes for OHV use would be Idaho Ranch Canyon, 90 Percent Canyon, Swenson Canyon, Ridgeline Road, Doe Alley (**Figure 2-2**).
- Aspen regeneration (e.g., cutting/harvesting, prescribed fire) would be enhanced as appropriate.

Pleasantview Hills/Samaria Mountains - (approximately 101,100 acres)

(Big game summer range)

Fish and Wildlife (FW)

- Native vegetation conditions (LHC-A) would be maintained or improved.
- Aspen regeneration (e.g., cutting/harvesting, prescribed fire) would be enhanced as appropriate.

Blackrock Canyon - (approximately 10,700 acres)
(Big game winter range)

- Native vegetation conditions (LHC-A) would be maintained or improved.
- Seasonal closures for motorized and mechanized vehicles would be implemented.
- Designated routes for OHV use would be maintained.
- Private land in holdings would be acquired from willing sellers as appropriate.

Goal FW-2. Provide for the diversity of native and desired non-native species as part of an ecologically healthy system.

Management Objectives

Management Actions

Objective CA-FW- 2.1. Maintain or improve native and desired non-native species habitat and the connectivity among habitats.

Action CA-FW-2.1.1 - Efforts to reintroduce or augment populations of native and/or historic species would be coordinated with IDFG.

Action CA-FW-2.1.2 - The following snag retention guidelines would be implemented during forestry project implementation (forest management) to maintain adequate availability and distribution of snags.

- Human safety would be considered and provided for in selecting the arrangement of retained snags and trees.
- Snags with existing cavities or nests would be priority for retention.
- Snag diameter breast height would be the equivalent of the largest class on site and would be retained in clusters where possible.
- If site potential allows, would retain 5-7 snags per acre, preferably in a clumped configuration.
- If possible, would retain at least 15 live trees per acre for future snag recruitment. Recruitment snags would not have to be structurally superior; live trees with forked and broken tops may be preferred.
- Do not disturb or destroy active or inactive nests of raptors which are reused.

Action CA-FW-2.1.3 - Opportunities would be considered to improve habitat connectivity and reduce fragmentation through land actions (exchanges, acquisitions, and easements), partnerships, habitat improvement projects and wildland fire ES&R and restoration projects.

Soil and Water (SW)

Goal SW-1. Provide for soil quality, productivity and hydrological function within naturally sustainable limits.

Management Objectives

Management Actions

Objective CA-SW-1.1. Incorporate resource protections to minimize soil loss when the long-term health of soil function and productivity is at risk.

Action CA-SW-1.1.1 - Appropriate management techniques, guidelines or practices (**Appendix C**) would be implemented to limit soil loss to an amount (generally 5 tons per acre per year (5 ton/acre/yr)) that would not affect its long term quality, productivity or hydrological function.

Action CA-SW-1.1.2 - Reclamation of disturbed sites would be done as soon as conditions (e.g., soil moisture, weather) would support or promote success.

Action CA-SW-1.1.3 - Surface-disturbing activities (e.g., Oil and Gas/Geothermal leasing stipulations) on erosive soils would be stipulated/mitigated as appropriate.

Goal SW-2. Protect and maintain watersheds so that they appropriately capture, retain and release water of quality that meets state and national standards and do not impair source water protection areas.

Management Objectives

Management Actions

Objective CA-SW-2.1. Manage public land activities to maintain or contribute to the long term improvement of surface and ground water quality.

Action CA-SW- 2.1.1 - Appropriate management techniques, guidelines or practices (**Appendix C**) would be applied to promote:

- The delisting of water quality impaired water bodies as identified by the State of Idaho,
- The protection of groundwater,
- Designated beneficial uses (e.g., cold water biota).

Soil and Water (SW)

Action CA-SW-2.1.2 - Cooperate with adjacent landowners, state agencies, Tribes, communities, municipalities, other agencies, and other individuals and organizations to meet beneficial use criteria.

Action CA-SW-2.1.3 - Priority areas for stream management and restoration would be based upon the presence of sensitive species.

Action CA-SW-2.1.4 - Stream crossings, if necessary, would be designed to minimize adverse impacts on soils, water quality and riparian vegetation.

Paleontological Resources (PR)

Goal PR-1. Provide for the identification, protection, and management of paleontological resources for the preservation, interpretation and scientific uses by present and future generations.

Management Objectives

Management Actions

Objective CA-PR-1.1. Maintain and protect paleontological resources for their educational and scientific benefits.

Action CA-PR-1.1.1 - Areas would be identified that may contain significant paleontological resources.

Action CA-PR-1.1.2 - Areas would be identified that may have potential conflicts with authorized activities and resources/uses.

Action CA-PR-1.1.3 - Significant paleontological resources (generally rare or vertebrate fossils, as determined by current BLM policy) would be protected from disturbance, or the effects of disturbance mitigated to conserve scientific, interpretive, and legacy values.

Action CA-PR-1.1.4 - In areas where the potential for paleontological values exist (e.g., alluvial valleys) inventories would be conducted (e.g., literature search, field surveys) prior to authorizing activities or as appropriate, protective measures/protocols would be developed to be followed should paleontological resources be found.

Action CA-PR-1.1.5 - Any persons/entities authorized to conduct activities with the potential to alter, damage or destroy paleontological resources of significant interest on the public lands would be required to immediately bring to the attention of the Authorized Officer any discovery of paleontological resources. Activities affecting the discovery would be suspended immediately with the discovery left intact until the Authorized Officer is able to evaluate the discovery and take appropriate action to protect or remove the resource.

Action CA-PR-1.1.6 - Permits would be required for commercial and non-commercial removal of paleontological resources from public lands. However, permits would not be required for non-commercial removal of small amounts of common or non-significant fossils (generally plants and common invertebrates) for personal hobby and enjoyment uses.

Vegetation (VE)

Goal VE-1. Provide for the proper functioning condition (PFC) of riparian areas.

Management Objectives

Management Actions

Objective CA-VE-1.1. Maintain properly functioning riparian areas and restore/improve those areas that are not at PFC.

Action CA-VE-1.1.1 - Appropriate management guidelines, techniques or practices (**Appendix C**) would be implemented to control erosion, stabilize streambanks, shade/reduce water temperature, and encourage a diversity of desirable riparian vegetation.

Action CA-VE-1.1.2 - Idaho Standards for Rangeland Health (**Appendix A**) would be implemented to maintain or improve riparian areas.

Action CA-VE-1.1.3 - Mitigation measures would be identified to reduce visual contrasts with rehabilitation/restoration actions identified to address landscape modifications on a case-by-case basis.

Action CA-VE-1.1.4 - Stream crossings, if necessary, would be designed to minimize adverse impacts on soils, water quality and riparian vegetation.

Vegetation (VE)

Goal VE-2. Prevent the establishment of invasive species/noxious weeds.

Management Objectives	Management Actions
<p>Objective CA-VE-2 1. Treat invasive species/noxious weeds to decrease or control the total number of acres occupied.</p>	<p>Action CA-VE-2.1.1 -Species would be treated based upon the following priority:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Idaho Noxious Weeds list 2. Invasive species <p>Action CA-VE-2.1.2 - Priority treatment areas would be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RNAs • Riparian areas • Springs/Seeps • Developed Recreation Sites/Campgrounds/Campsites • Heavily used roads/trails • Big game winter range • Special Status Species (flora habitat area) • WUIs • Mine reclamation sites • New areas identified: treat smallest populations first <p>Action CA-VE-2.1.3 - Where applicable, stipulations would be incorporated for the prevention and treatment of noxious weeds when authorizing new permitted/authorized activities. Examples of such stipulations to consider would promote:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The replacement of weeds by perennial plant cover which includes purchasing and planting of desirable seeds or plants to replace invasive species. • The use of perennial green fire breaks rather than brown fire breaks so these areas do not harbor or disperse weedy species if and when maintenance efforts are incomplete. • Weed management into all forms of restoration • Vegetation management and minimal perennial grass cover as requirements in any new or renewal of permitted/authorized activities resulting in major surface disturbance. <p>Action CA-VE-2.1.4 - Priority treatment areas would be coordinated with Counties and other land management agencies.</p> <p>Action CA-VE-2.1.5 - As appropriate, Chemical, Biological, Mechanical and Manual methods would be used in treating invasive species/noxious weeds. The use of biological control agents would be promoted when reasonable rather than chemical control as identified through current BLM policy.</p> <p>Action CA-VE-2.1.6 - Herbicides used would be consistent with current BLM policy (e.g., Draft Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement Vegetation Treatments Using Herbicides On Bureau Of Land Management Lands In 17 Western States [BLM 2005c]).</p>

Goal VE-3. Provide for old growth characteristics where forest treatments are implemented.

Management Objectives	Management Actions
<p>Objective CA-VE-3.1. Maintain or contribute towards the restoration of old growth structure and composition in areas where forest treatments, including Healthy Forests Restoration Acts, are proposed.</p>	<p>Action CA-VE-3.1.1 - Structure and composition characteristics for old growth forest/woodland types would be used as defined in <i>Characteristics of Old-Growth Forests in the Intermountain Region, Forest Service Intermountain Region, Ogden Utah (1993)</i> or if amended or revised (Hamilton 1993).</p> <p>Action CA-VE-3.1.2 - Current literature would be researched and used to describe old growth characteristics of Rocky Mountain Juniper.</p>

Visual Resources (VR)

Goal VR-1. Maintain scenic qualities consistent with the management of resources and uses.

Management Objectives	Management Actions
<p>Objective CA-VR-1.1. Manage visual resources according to established guidelines for VRM classes.</p>	<p>Action CA-VR-1.1.1 - Public lands would continue to be managed according to the following VRM class designations:</p> <p>Class I - 11,200 acres</p> <p>Class II - 78,600 acres</p>

Visual Resources (VR)

Class III - 221,000 acres

Class IV - 303,000 acres

Action CA-VR-1.1.2 - The visual resource contrast rating system would be used during project level planning to determine whether or not proposed activities meet VRM objectives.

Action CA-VR-1.1.3 - Mitigation measures would be identified to reduce visual contrasts with rehabilitation actions identified to address landscape modifications on a case-by-case basis.

Wildland Fire Management (WF)

Goal WF-1. Minimize impacts to natural and human resources from various fire related practices, including both wildland fire suppression and fuels management activities.

Management Objectives

Management Actions

Objective CA-WF-1.1. Utilize the AMR for fire suppression activities to protect natural and cultural resource values.

Action CA-WF-1.1.1 - While recognizing that wildland fire suppression is an emergency action, appropriate fire suppression restrictions would be implemented as identified below. The Authorized Officer could suspend any or all of these restrictions as necessary in order to protect human life, property or valuable resources as determined by the Authorized Officer.

Cultural Resources and Historic Trails

1. Through the Authorized Officer or Resource Advisor an archaeologist would be notified to: 1) provide technical expertise, 2) identify cultural resources that may be encountered, and 3) identify best cultural protection practices to be used during fire suppression activities. Examples of cultural protection practices may include but are not limited to:
 - Manually reduce fuels from vulnerable sites/features; dispose of debris away from cultural features.
 - Create fire breaks near or around sites.
 - Wrap structures in fire proof materials or use retardant/foam to protect structures.
 - Flush cut and cover stumps with dirt, foam, or retardant, where subsurface cultural resources could be affected.
 - Identify and reduce hazard trees next to structures.
 - Use low intensity backing fire in areas near historic features.
 - Saturate ground/grass adjacent to vulnerable structures with water, foam, or gel before burning.
 - Cover rock art or wrap carved trees, dendroglyphs, and other such features in fire retardant fabric.
 - Limb carved trees to reduce ladder fuels.
 - Minimize fuels and smoke near rock art
 - Cover fuels near rock art with foam, water, or retardant, avoiding the rock art.
2. No dozer blading would occur within 300 feet of playas or dry lakebeds to protect cultural resources. Buffer zones greater than 300 feet from playas and dry lake beds would be preferable.
3. No dozer blading would occur within 300 feet of known historic trails and cultural sites.

Special Status Species (Federally Threatened, Endangered and Sensitive Species)

1. Establishment of base camps and support facilities would be avoided in known habitat of Listed species and sensitive plants unless life, property or resource values are threatened.
2. Unless life and property are threatened, suppression techniques (e.g., foaming agents, fire retardant, handlines, and dozer lines) that negatively affect Listed species and sensitive plant and fish habitat would be avoided.

Wildland Fire Management (WF)

Riparian Areas

1. Dozer blading would not occur within 150 feet of perennial fish bearing streams, 100 feet of perennial non fish bearing streams, and 50 feet of ephemeral streams. Buffer zones greater than 300 feet from riparian areas would be preferable. Dozer blading would be allowed on existing roads.

Vegetation

1. Unburned islands within the fire perimeter would be retained whenever their presence does not constitute a threat to life, property or valuable resource values
2. Dozer blading would occur on existing roads where possible. Dozer blading through undisturbed areas, especially those supporting native plant communities would be avoided unless necessary to protect life, property or resource values.
3. Burnouts would be limited to the smallest acreage possible and avoided in sagebrush communities unless public health and safety and firefighter safety is at risk.
4. Suppression equipment would be washed for invasive species/noxious weeds at designated sites.

Soils and Water Quality

1. Dozer blading would not occur within 150 feet of perennial fish bearing streams, 100 feet of perennial non fish bearing streams, and 50 feet of ephemeral streams. Buffer zones greater than 300 feet from riparian areas would be preferable.
2. No use of retardant or foam would occur within 300 feet of waterways.
3. As appropriate, during suppression activities soils would be stabilized by :
 - Revegetating control lines (e.g., dozer, handlines) and safety zones.
 - Utilizing erosion control structures on control lines (e.g., water bars, contour drainages, remove berms).

Hazardous Materials and Abandoned Mine Sites

1. Hazardous materials and abandoned mine sites that could pose a threat to firefighter health and safety would be identified to allow firefighters to avoid these sites.

Special Designations

1. Within WSAs, fuels and vegetation treatments and wildland fire management activities would follow H-8550-1 (Interim Policy for Lands under Wilderness Review). The use of earth-moving equipment within these areas would require approval of the Authorized Officer.
2. Specific guidelines would include:
 - Placement of fire camps and staging areas would be outside of WSA boundaries.
 - Use whenever feasible natural firebreaks and existing roads to contain wildland fires.
 - Conduct wildland fire suppression activities in designated ACEC and RNA areas to maintain and protect identified resource values.

Objective CA-WF-1.2. Assure fire and non-fire vegetation treatments maintain, restore or improve natural or cultural resource values.

Action CA-WF-1.2.1 - Fire and non-fire vegetation treatment restrictions would be implemented as identified below:

Air Quality

1. All fire activities would be done in coordination with the MAIG Smoke Management Program. Under this program prescribed fire and WFU could be restricted when regional or local air quality is compromised, or if the project would negatively affect visual quality in Class 1 Airsheds (Yellowstone and Grand Teton National Parks, Bridger Wilderness, Teton Wilderness, and Craters of the Moon Wilderness) Non Attainment Areas (PM₁₀), and sensitive receptors.

Wildland Fire Management (WF)

Cultural Resources and Historic Trails

1. Cultural resource inventories/surveys would be completed prior to implementing site-specific fuels projects.
2. A Class II or Class III inventory would be conducted for all proposed prescribed fire areas unless previous inventory has been deemed adequate in consultation with the SHPO. Areas supporting historic, prehistoric, or ethno-historic sites would be demarcated and avoided if at all possible.
3. All prescribed fires and fuels projects would be subject to further site-specific analyses and Section 106 of the NHPA compliance and consultation.
4. All proposed fire and non-fire (mechanical, chemical and seeding) vegetation treatment actions would be assessed in consultation with the SHPO for their potential to effect cultural resources. Where previous inventory has been sufficient to identify vulnerable cultural resources, no inventory should be needed. However, where adequate inventory is lacking, appropriate and required inventory of the area as determined in consultation with the SHPO would be conducted.
5. Fire project planners would coordinate with the archeologist to incorporate as appropriate cultural protection practices in burn plans as identified in **Appendix C**.
6. No dozer blading would occur within 300 feet of known historic trails and cultural sites.

Fish and Wildlife

1. Seasonal guidelines would be applied as appropriate to mitigate adverse impacts of planned fuels management and vegetation treatments for the following areas:
 - Crucial Big Game Winter Ranges -Activities would be limited from November 15 through April 30. Pile burning permitted on a case-by-case basis. Fuels projects occurring on crucial winter range would be coordinated with IDFG.
 - Elk Calving Areas - Activities would be limited from May 15 through June 30. Fuels projects occurring in elk calving areas would be coordinated with IDFG.
 - Pronghorn And Mule Deer Fawning Grounds -Treatments occurring in fawning areas would be coordinated with IDFG with limited activities occurring from May 15 through June 30.
2. No more than 20% of any individual big game winter range (shrub species) would be treated during any 20 year period. Weed treatment in these areas would not account towards the 20% limitation.
3. To reduce potential wildlife impacts from chemical treatments, herbicide use would conform to all label restrictions and recommendations, and to all applicable laws, policies, standards, and guidelines. In addition, the prescription for herbicide application (desired, optimum environmental conditions) would evaluate wind speed and direction, temperature, precipitation forecast, soil infiltration potential, constraints on overland water transport due to precipitation or flooding, establishment of riparian buffer strips, and risk to special status species. Fishery and/or wildlife biologists would assist project planners in selecting appropriate herbicides approved for aquatic use, when applicable, or for use among or near terrestrial fauna sensitive to herbicides.

Special Status Species (Federally Threatened, Endangered and Sensitive Species)

1. Follow the guidelines in **Appendix D** for implementing fuels management and vegetation treatment projects in areas that would disturb nesting raptors, greater sage-grouse and Columbian sharp-tailed grouse breeding and wintering habitats. Treatment proposals would be coordinated with IDFG.
2. Fire and non-fire vegetation treatments which would disturb areas supporting Greater Sage- and Columbian sharp-tailed grouse would be coordinated with IDFG.

Wildland Fire Management (WF)

- Greater sage-grouse Key and Source Habitats would be maintained and enhanced within the Low- and Mid-Elevation Shrub types. Treatments would generally be limited in habitats supporting live sagebrush communities. Treatments to enhance and restore habitat would be focused in areas where the sagebrush component is lost or dead and the understory degraded.
- Seeding would be avoided in occupied habitat unless seeding is clearly beneficial for the species of concern.
- Guidelines accepted by BLM to protect sensitive species such as pygmy rabbits, Northern goshawk, Cooper's rubberweed, etc. would be utilized.
- All fuels management and vegetation treatment activities in areas supporting "Listed" species would be conducted in consultation with USFWS, complying with provisions in current interagency streamlined consultation agreements.
- Fuels management and vegetation treatment activities in bald eagle areas would be conducted according to **Action B-SS-1.1.1**
- Fuels management and vegetation treatment activities in areas of gray wolf den areas or near rendezvous sites would be conducted according to **Action B-SS-1.1.2**
- Planning would be conducted in consultation with USFWS for fuels management and vegetation treatments with potential to decrease dissolved oxygen concentrations, and increase water temperature and turbidity in portions of the Snake River that support populations of threatened and endangered Utah Valvatat snail.

Riparian Areas

- Dozer blading would not occur within 150 feet of perennial fish bearing streams, 100 feet of perennial non-fish bearing streams, and 50 feet of ephemeral streams. Buffer zones greater than 300 feet from riparian areas would be preferable. Dozer blading would be allowed on existing roads.

Vegetation

- Plant materials used in revegetation actions would be predominately native. However, non-native species may be used in re-vegetation actions on harsh or degraded sites where they are needed to structurally mimic the natural plant community and prevent soil loss and invasion by undesirable plant species. The species used would be those that have the highest probability of establishment on these sites. These "placeholders" would maintain the area for future native restoration. Native seed would be used more frequently and at larger scales as species adapted to local areas become more available.

Visual Resources

- Wherever possible, landscape modifications would replicate a natural line, form, color and texture found in the surrounding area. Treatments that result in long-term disruption of natural visual qualities (e.g., drill seeding that establishes vegetation rows) would be avoided or hidden by design.

Water Quality

- Dozer blading would not occur within 150 feet of perennial fish bearing streams, 100 feet of perennial non-fish bearing streams, and 50 feet of ephemeral streams. Buffer zones greater than 300 feet from riparian areas would be preferable. Dozer blading would be allowed on existing roads.
- The use of retardant or foam would not occur within 300 feet of waterways.

Livestock Grazing

- All areas burned by wildfire, treated under ES&R, or proactively treated under restoration would be rested from livestock grazing for a minimum of two growing seasons or until vegetation establishment and resource objectives are achieved. Monitoring criteria typically include soil stability and desired vegetation cover. Site specific plans would address specific monitoring criteria.

Wildland Fire Management (WF)

Hazardous Materials and Abandoned Mine Sites

1. Hazardous materials and abandoned mine sites would be identified and avoided within any fuels management or vegetation treatment project area.

Recreation

1. Treatments in developed or high-use recreation areas would be designed to minimize impacts on the recreational resource or users.

Special Designations

1. Within WSAs, fuels and vegetation treatments and wildland fire management activities would follow H-8550-1 (Interim Policy for Lands Under Wilderness Review). The use of earth-moving equipment within these areas would require the approval of the Authorized Officer.

RESOURCE USES

Forestry (FO)

Goal FO-1. Use a variety of silvicultural techniques and harvest systems to provide for an ecologically healthy system while offering products and services.

Management Objectives

Management Actions

Objective CA-FO-1.1. Maintain a sustainable forest management program.

Action CA-FO-1.1.1 - For tree planting projects, tree seedlings used would be native species grown from seed from the appropriate seed zone, matched to site and elevation.

Action CA-FO-1.1.2 - All activities normally associated with reforestation would be used (e.g., bare root or containerized seedlings, hand or machine scalping, hand or machine planting, auger or hoedad planting, rodent and/or brush control using appropriate measures such as herbicide, machine or hand removal.)

Action CA-FO-1.1.3 - Forest management projects would be designed to simulate natural patch sizes, shapes, connectivity, and species composition and age-class diversity in accordance with silvicultural prescription.

Action CA-FO 1.1.4 - Silvicultural prescriptions would provide for stand health through the management of insects and disease, animal damage, and vegetation competition to promote regeneration of tree growth.

Action CA-FO-1.1.5 - Appropriate management guidelines, techniques or practices (**Appendix C**) would be utilized to stabilize soils, protect watersheds and streams and control soil erosion.

Goal FO-2. Provide the Tribes and public opportunities for the use of forest/vegetal products to promote an ecologically healthy system.

Management Objectives

Management Actions

Objective CA-FO-2.1. Maintain approximately 45,700 acres of commercial forest land in order to offer on a yearly basis 600-900 thousand board feet as a “not to exceed” probable sale quantity.

Action CA-FO-2.1.1 - A full complement of harvest systems and other treatment methods and techniques would be used unless specifically prohibited or limited by individual prescription direction.

Action CA-FO-2.1.2 - All activities normally associated with reforestation would be used (e.g., bare root or containerized seedlings, hand or machine scalping, hand or machine planting, auger or hoedad planting, gopher and/or brush control using appropriate measures such as herbicide, machine or hand removal.)

Action CA-FO-2.1.3 - The following mitigation measures would be applied for all harvest activities to reduce adverse impacts on wildlife habitat, streams and riparian areas.

- Provide for a minimum no cutting buffer of 66 feet along all forest shrub ecotones.
- In Douglas fir stands, leave no fewer than 5 snags per acre and recruit an additional 15 trees per acre of live trees. The size of snags and snag recruitment should be the equivalent of the largest size class on site. Recruitment snags would not have to be structurally superior. Live trees with forked and broken tops may be preferred.

Forestry (FO)

- Maintain all snags and dead topped trees along 50 foot perimeters of wet meadows.
- Prescribe and maintain site specific levels of down/dead woody materials to balance the needs for nutrient recycling, wildlife habitat and wildfire protection.
- No harvest activities in known ungulate fawning or calving areas until after July 1st in any given year.
- No harvest activities in ungulate winter range areas from November 15th to April 30th in any given year.
- No harvest or yarding activities within 150 feet of perennial fish bearing streams.
- No harvest or yarding activities within 100 feet of perennial streams without fish.
- No harvest or yarding activities within 50 feet of intermittent and ephemeral channels.

Action CA-FO-2.1.4 - As appropriate, management guidelines, techniques and practices (**Appendix C**, see Forestry - Road Construction, Reconstruction and Maintenance) would be applied for road construction activities near stream channels. All stream alterations would be regulated by the Idaho Stream Protection Act, Title 42, Chapter 38, Idaho Code.

Objective CA-FO-2.2. Based upon tribal and public demand allow for the collection of forest and vegetal products.

Action CA-FO-2.2.1 - Areas available for collection of forest products (e.g., post/poles, fuelwood, Christmas trees) would be identified based upon the following criteria such as but not limited to:

- Public access,
- Insects and disease
- Fuel load conditions
- Wildlife habitat improvement

Action CA-FO-2.2.2 - Vegetal collection of reasonable amounts of commonly available renewable resources (e.g., seeds, cones, wildlings, berries, mushrooms, flowers, nuts, and leaves) from public lands for non-commercial use would be allowed in the amounts identified below consistent with other resource goals/objectives.

Vegetal Product	Reasonable Amount (Allowed per Person per year)
Berries	5 gal/species
Boughs, All Coniferous Species	15 lbs
Cones - Ornamental	2 bushels
Cones - Seed - Nuts	1 bushels
Leaves - Greenery - All types	15 lbs
Moss	15 lbs
Mushrooms	5 gal/species
Wildlings	5

Action CA-FO-2.2.3 - The use of limbs, branches, or other woody debris for campfire use on public lands would be allowed. Any other firewood collections would require a free-use or fuelwood permit.

Minerals and Energy (ME)

Goal ME-1. Develop mineral resources (oil and gas, geothermal, solid minerals) consistent with other resource and use direction.

Management Objectives

Management Actions

Objective CA-ME-1.1. Fulfill Indian Trust responsibilities related to minerals management.

Action CA-ME-1.1.1 - Technical expertise would be provided for minerals investigation and development on the Fort Hall Indian Reservation.

Action CA-ME-1.1.2 - Mineral operations management on the Fort Hall Indian Reservation would be based on the most current Memorandums of Understanding.

Action CA-ME-1.1.3 - All mineral investigation or development proposals for the Fort Hall Indian Reservation would be coordinated with the Shoshone-Bannock Tribes on a staff to staff, government to government basis.

Minerals and Energy (ME)

Action CA-ME-1.1.4 - Reclamation plans for minerals development operations would be designed to meet applicable Idaho Standards for Rangeland Health (**Appendix A**).

Action CA-ME-1.1.5 - Reclamation at development sites would be determined successful/complete when requirements in the reclamation plan have been met considering site potential.

Objective CA-ME-1.2. Coordinate with federal agencies (e.g., Bureau of Indian Affairs, BOR, Forest Service, and USFWS) on minerals development proposals related to the federal mineral estate where such agencies have surface management responsibilities.

Action CA-ME-1.2.1 - The federal mineral estate would be managed consistent with laws, policies and established requirements.

Action CA-ME-1.2.2 - The following withdrawals (approximately 20,160 acres) would be maintained and managed as closed to locatable mineral entry.

Federal Agency	Mineral Estate Withdrawn Acres ¹
USFWS - Bear Lake Refuge	17,500
USFWS - Minidoka Refuge	760
USFWS - Oxford Slough Production Area	1,900

¹ These acres are not considered in the PFO public lands base of 613,800 acres. Acreages are rounded.

Action CA-ME-1.2.3 - Leasable and salable mineral resources would be available for development at the discretion of the BLM after full coordination with the surface management agency.

Action CA-ME 1.2.4 - Leasable minerals on the Caribou National Forest would be managed consistent with the Caribou National Forest Plan (Forest Service 2003a).

Action CA-ME 1.2.5 - Reclamation requirements for mineral development operations would be developed consistent with surface management agencies'

SPECIAL DESIGNATIONS

Administrative Designations (AD)

Goal AD-1. Provide for public land areas suitable for administrative designations.

Management Objectives

Management Actions

Objective CA-AD-1.1. Continue to manage WSAs to maintain wilderness characteristics.

Action CA-AD-1.1.1 - Approximately 11,200 acres of the Petticoat Peak WSA and 40 acres of Worm Creek WSA would be managed under the BLM's Interim Management Policy for Lands Under Wilderness Review.

Objective CA-AD-1.2. Continue to manage the 5 designated Watchable Wildlife Viewing Sites (Figure 2-3).

Action CA-AD-1.2.1 - As appropriate, work with partners to provide to the public interpretive materials through publications and local media for the following sites.

- Juniper Rest Area
- Oxford Slough/Twin Lakes/Swan Lake
- Formation Springs RNA
- Lower Blackfoot River from Blackfoot to Government Dam
- American Falls Dam and vicinity

Objective CA-AD-1.3 Continue to manage Oregon/California historic trails and alternate routes for a meaningful historic recreational and educational experience (Figure 3-2).

Action CA-AD-1.3.1 - Historic trails would be promoted and maintained by:

- Allowing potential uses which may include but are not limited to, hiking, bicycling, cross-country skiing, and activities related to the historic use of the trails (e.g., horseback riding, using a handcart or covered wagon).
- Coordinating public and private funding to support historic trail activities.
- Raising public awareness of historic trails and building public support for their protection through the use of exhibits, publications and outreach activities.
- Developing and facilitating where applicable, interagency cooperation where historic trails cross jurisdictional boundaries.

2.8 MANAGEMENT GUIDANCE FOR ALTERNATIVE A (NO ACTION)

Table 2-3 describes the management guidance that would be applicable to Alternative A, the No Action Alternative. The actions described would generally continue the current management under the Pocatello RMP (BLM 1988a) and the Malad MFP (BLM 1981a). This alternative is also the baseline to compare management objectives and actions developed for all other alternatives.

Key components to Alternative A are as follows:

- Continuation of the current management based upon existing direction and direction resulting from changes in policy and regulations.
- Management of special status species and their vegetation habitats to provide for their continued presence in accordance with applicable laws and regulations.
- Management of land tenure adjustments to protect resources while supporting appropriate development and improved public access to public lands.
- Management of minerals and energy resources, and recreation to balance development and protect resources.
- OHV designations would remain the same.

Table 2-3. Management Guidance for Alternative A (No Action)

RESOURCES

Special Status Species (SS)

Goal SS-1. Manage special status species and their habitats to provide for their continued presence and conservation as part of an ecologically healthy system.

<i>Management Objectives</i>	<i>Management Actions</i>
<p>Objective A-SS-1.1. Maintain or improve the quality of listed (threatened or endangered) species habitat by managing public land activities to benefit those species.</p>	<p>Action A-SS-1.1.1 - Activities that disturb bald eagle nesting from February 1 to August 15, or winter roosting trees from December 1 to March 1 would not be allowed.</p> <p>Action A-SS-1.1.2 - Roosting bald eagle habitat would be protected within the Bowen Canyon Bald Eagle Sanctuary ACEC by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No post/pole, firewood, or commercial timber sales would be allowed. • To protect eagle habitat, applicable stipulations would be placed on locatable minerals, leasable minerals and fluid mineral leases (NSO). • Commercial road operations would not be allowed from November 15 through April 15. • Snowmobile use (except that needed for research and the administration of public lands within the ACEC) would not be allowed from November 15 to April 15 • Wildland fire would be suppressed. • As opportunities exist, cooperatively manage public lands with Shoshone-Bannock Tribes' privately owned lands within Bowen Canyon. <p>Action A-SS-1.1.3 - Utah valvata snail quality shoreline habitats on public lands adjacent to the Snake River would be maintained by not allowing shore-disturbing activities if determined to be detrimental to snail populations.</p> <p>Action A-SS-1.1.4 - Activities on public lands within the Yellowstone Nonessential Experimental Population Area (east of I-15) or the Central Idaho Nonessential Experimental Population Area (west of I-15) which would disturb within one mile of active gray wolf den sites and rendezvous sites between April 1 and June 30 when five or fewer breeding pairs are present would not be allowed. (USFWS 1994a and 1994b).</p>

Special Status Species (SS)

Objective A-SS-1.2. Maintain or improve the quality of sensitive species habitat by managing public land activities to benefit those species.

Action A-SS-1.2.1 - On-going efforts to locate populations of pygmy rabbit would be supported. When populations are located, the habitat would be managed using current scientific information so as not to contribute to the species listing.

Action A-SS-1.2.2 - On-going efforts to locate populations of boreal toads and Northern leopard frogs would be supported. Where populations are located, permitted activities would be managed to maintain the quality of frog or toad habitat.

Action A-SS-1.2.3 - The following guidelines for greater sage-grouse habitats would be implemented:

- Maintain and enhance existing greater sage-grouse habitats used during each stage of the life cycle.
- Minimize human activities that disrupt greater sage-grouse habitats during their seasons of use particularly during the breeding and winter seasons.
- Minimize undesired habitat modifications resulting from authorized activities such as land-tenure adjustments, road and facility construction, etc.
- Minimize undesired habitat modifications from adverse natural disturbances (wildland fire, insects, disease, etc.)

Action A-SS-1.2.4 - For Bear Lake endemic fish (Bear Lake cutthroat trout, Bonneville cisco, Bonneville whitefish, Bear Lake whitefish and Bear Lake sculpin) water degrading activities on public lands with streams connecting to Bear Lake would be reduced.

Action A-SS-1.2.5 - Nesting and brood rearing habitat would be maintained in suitable condition for approximately 1.2 miles from known leks for Columbian sharp-tailed grouse. When assessing the condition of the habitat, adjacent land uses within two miles of these areas would be considered. (Adapted from Giesen and Connelly, 1993).

Action A-SS-1.2.6 - The following guidelines would be implemented for the globally important ferruginous hawk habitat in the Curlew Valley as adapted from Chipley 1998:

- Restricting activities which would disturb within ½ mile of active nests from March 1 to July 15.
- Monitoring populations in Curlew Valley and on the Bear Lake Plateau.
- Maintaining existing scattered juniper trees for nesting
- Maintaining or improving habitat suitable for prey populations such as jackrabbits.

Action A-SS-1.2.7 - Where populations of American white pelicans are located on public lands, the quality of nesting habitat would be managed as a priority for the benefit of the pelican.

Action A-SS-1.2.8 - Conservation strategies would be implemented for Yellowstone and Bonneville cutthroat trout to provide for their continued presence as identified below.

- Where species exist in functioning at risk or non-functioning streams management priority would be to bring these streams to PFC.
- High quality cutthroat trout habitat would be managed for as described in **Appendix E**.
- Strive to connect fragmented habitats and reconnect streams to migratory corridors through land tenure adjustments,

Action A-SS-1.2.9 - The following general management actions would be considered to promote healthy, naturally functioning ecosystems in sensitive plant habitat:

- Avoid actions that cause concentrated use or disturbance (e.g., trampling, OHVs, dozer lines, range improvements) in habitat.
- Avoid spraying of pesticides within a 1/4 mile of occupied habitat unless clearly beneficial to sensitive plants.
- Avoid seeding within occupied habitat unless clearly beneficial to sensitive plants.
- Methods of weed spraying within or near (1/4 mile) habitat would be formulated on site specific and species specific basis.
- Promote healthy naturally functioning ecosystem components within a 1/4 mile of habitat to support a viable population.
- Inventory potential habitat.
- Monitor flora sensitive species population trends.

Vegetation (VE)

Goal VE-4: Manage vegetation as part of an ecologically healthy system to provide livestock and wildlife with essential habitat components.

<i>Management Objectives</i>	<i>Management Actions</i>
Objective A-VE-4.1. Maintain or increase forage production for wildlife and livestock.	<p>Action A-VE-4.1.1 - Native vegetation types and crested wheatgrass seedings would be treated (e.g., prescribed fire, mechanical) to maintain forage production.</p> <p>Action A-VE-4.1.2 - Areas of weed infestations would be treated to minimize effects on forage production.</p> <p>Action A-VE-4.1.3 - Following wildfire, ES&R and restoration efforts would be conducted to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Control invasion/spread of noxious weeds • Stabilize soils • Maintain forage production, using native or placeholder species. <p>Action A-VE-4.1.4 - Degraded ecosystems would be managed to make progress towards achieving Idaho Standards for Rangeland Health.</p>

Goal VE-5: Manage rangeland seedings (e.g., crested wheatgrass) for maximum forage production.

<i>Management Objectives</i>	<i>Management Actions</i>
Objective A-VE-5.1. Maintain or improve rangeland seeding forage production.	<p>Action A-VE-5.1.1 - Treatments which would increase production while moving toward or meeting Idaho Standards for Rangeland Health would be applied utilizing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Drilling Spraying Fertilizing Prescribed fire Chaining

Wildland Fire Management (WF)

Goal WF-2: Provide for the protection of life and property and suppression of wildland fires for the protection of natural resources.

<i>Management Objectives</i>	<i>Management Actions</i>
Objective A-WF-2.1. Emphasize protection from wildland fire and ES&R within the WUI.	<p>Action A-WF-2.1.1 - Suppression would be used to safely manage and suppress wildland fires.</p> <p>Action A-WF-2.1.2 - Mechanical, chemical, and seeding treatments would be used for ES&R following wildland fire.</p> <p>Action A-WF-2.1.3 - In cooperation with state, county and local governments and fire departments, develop mitigation plans and implement plan action including fuel reduction projects, rural fire department assistance and public education.</p>
Objective A-WF-2.2. Reduce fine fuels and invasive species/ noxious weeds to create perennial vegetation communities so that wildland fire occurs less frequently than currently and at a smaller scale on the landscape.	<p>Action A-WF-2.2.1 - AMR in Low-Elevation Shrub to protect existing sagebrush communities would be suppression of all wildland fire starts.</p> <p>Action A-WF-2.2.2 - Following wildland fire, chemical, mechanical, and seeding treatments would be utilized with appropriate plant materials to provide the best opportunity to stabilize sites and prevent dominance of invasive annual vegetation and noxious weeds. The use of native plant materials would be emphasized.</p> <p>Action A-WF-2.2.3 - Prescribed fire may be used to prepare areas for subsequent chemical, mechanical, and/or seeding treatments.</p>
Objective A-WF-2.3. Conduct vegetation treatments for resource benefits in Mid-Elevation Shrub, Juniper, Dry Conifer, Aspen/Conifer, and Mountain Shrub.	<p>Action A-WF-2.3.1 - Mechanical, chemical, or prescribed fire treatments would be used to meet resource management objectives.</p> <p>Action A-WF-2.3.2 - Encroaching or mature juniper would be removed using chemical, mechanical, and prescribed fire treatments to re-establish, maintain or enhance Mid-Elevation Shrub communities.</p>

Wildland Fire Management (WF)

Objective A-WF-2.4. Manage 0.0 acres as suitable for WFU (Figure 2-4).

Action A-WF-2.4.1 - WFU would not be appropriate on approximately 613,800 acres of public lands.

Action A-WF-2.4.2 - All wildland fires would be suppressed.

Objective A-WF-2.5. For the vegetation types identified, implement over 10 years approximately 3,400 footprint acres of treatment using various treatment methods (i.e. wildland fire, mechanical, chemical, seeding, and prescribed fire), as appropriate.

Action A-WF-2.5.1 - By vegetation type, the following approximate footprint acres would be treated.

Vegetation Type	Footprint Acres
Low-Elevation Shrub	0.0
Mid-Elevation Shrub	0.0
Mountain Shrub	0.0
Perennial Grass/Seeding	0.0
Juniper (Natural Only)	0.0
Aspen/Aspen Conifer Mix/Dry Conifer	3,400
Wet/Cold Conifer	0.0
Riparian	0.0
Other/Vegetated Lava	0.0
Total	3,400

Objective A-WF-2.6. Implement priorities for wildland fire ignitions, suppression and fire and non-fire treatments.

Action A-WF-2.6.1 - When multiple wildland fire ignitions occur, suppression priorities would be:

- 1) Protect the WUI and communities-at-risk where public and firefighter health and safety are a concern.
- 2) Minimize risks to life and property.
- 3) Minimize risks to resources.
 - Generally, the highest suppression priorities would be in Low- and Mid-Elevation Shrub cover types unless life and/or property are at risk. On an annual basis, Fire Management Plan's would re-visit priorities for resources.

Action A-WF-2.6.2 - Priorities for establishing fire and non-fire vegetation treatments would be:

- 1) In areas dominated by cheatgrass or other annual species, conduct wildfire ES&R or proactive restoration.
- 2) Accomplish resource-related objectives.

Action A-WF-2.6.3 - For all vegetation types, the AMR would be a "FULL" suppression emphasis with initial attack to stop fire spread and put out wildland fire at least cost.

RESOURCE USES

Lands and Realty (LR)

Goal LR-1: Consolidate public land to retain and acquire land that is important to the public and protection of resources and to dispose of parcels that are small, isolated and unmanageable.

Management Objectives

Management Actions

Objective A-LR-1.1. Implement land tenure adjustments through exchange or sale.

Action A-LR-1.1.1 - A public land base of approximately 581,600 acres would be retained for long-term management in federal ownership and approximately 32,200 acres could be considered for disposal actions.

- Land acquisitions would occur through exchanges with private landowners and the State of Idaho (**Figure 2-5**). Proceeds from the sale or exchange of public lands identified for disposal as of July 25, 2000 (**Appendix F**) may be used to purchase additional public lands within the planning area, as provided for in the Federal Land Transaction Facilitation Act.

Lands and Realty (LR)

- Land tenure adjustments within the Fort Hall Indian Reservation boundary of 1898 and off-Reservation would be coordinated with the Shoshone-Bannock Tribes.

Action A-LR-1.1.2 - Management direction for acquired lands would be consistent with adjacent or nearby public lands, or those lands with similar values, goals, objectives and/or standards and appropriate designations such as but not limited to OHV, SRMAs, VRM, livestock grazing and mining (leasable, saleable).

Goal LR-2. Balance development of public land, such as ROWs and utility corridors, with the protection of natural resources and public enjoyment and recreation, consistent with natural resource values and uses.

Management Objective	Management Actions
Objective A-LR-2.1. Implement management actions for ROWs and utility corridors (Figure 2-6).	<p>Action A-LR-2.1.1 - For ROWs which include energy and non-energy related ROWs and land use authorizations, 562,900 acres would be managed as "Open"; 20,200 acres would be managed as "Avoidance"; and 30,700 acres would be managed as "Exclusion" for ROW development (Figure 2-6).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposals in "Open" areas could require minimal restrictions/stipulations to assure protection of resources/uses. Impacts would generally be minimal to resources/ uses. • Proposals in "Avoidance" areas would consider rerouting if impacts on resources are likely. Restrictions/stipulations would be applied to ensure protection of resources (e.g., wildlife habitat, watersheds, erosive soils/steep slopes, cultural, historical, recreation). • No proposals would be considered in "Exclusion" areas. Areas considered as "exclusion" include RNAs, WSAs, and the Blackfoot River area. <p>Action A-LR-2.1.2 - No BLM ROW corridors would be designated due to the scattered (non-contiguous) public land pattern within the planning area.</p> <p>Action A-LR-2.1.3 To the extent possible, linear ROWs would be routed where impacts would be least disturbing, considering the point of origin, point of destination, resource values present, and purpose and need for the project.</p>

Goal LR-3. Maintain and acquire legal access to public land.

Management Objectives	Management Actions
Objective A-LR-3.1. Implement management actions for public access.	<p>Action A-LR-3.1.1 - Approximately 44 miles of road and trail legal access as identified in Appendix G would be acquired to open approximately 37,300 acres to the public primarily for recreation purposes and to support other resource programs.</p> <p>Action A-LR-3.1.2 - All existing public access routes would be reserved if the lands are transferred out of public ownership.</p>

Goal LR-4. Assure land classifications and withdrawals of public lands are appropriate to protect important resource values.

Management Objectives	Management Actions
Objective A-LR-4.1 Manage approximately 67,060 acres of land classified as withdrawn from the general land laws for specific purposes intended.	<p>Action A-LR-4.1.1 - Continue to manage approximately 45,400 acres of public land as withdrawn (e.g., power sites, public water reserves, power projects, administrative sites, Blackfoot Stock Driveway [BSD]).</p> <p>Action A-LR-4.1.2 - The following withdrawals (approximately 20,160 acres) would be maintained and managed as closed to locatable mineral entry.</p>

Federal Agency	Mineral Estate Withdrawn Acres ¹
USFWS - Bear Lake Refuge	17,500
USFWS - Minidoka Refuge	760
USFWS - Oxford Slough Production Area	1,900

Lands and Realty (LR)

Action A-LR-4.1.3 - Withdrawal of public lands from mineral entry would be pursued on approximately 1,500 acres for the following RNAs:

- Cheatbeck Canyon RNA
- Dairy Hollow RNA
- Formation Cave RNA
- Oneida Narrow RNA
- Pine Gap RNA
- Robbers Roost RNA
- Travertine Park RNA

Action A-LR-4.1.4 - Withdrawals which no longer serve the purpose for which they were established would be modified, revoked or terminated. Prior to revocation, withdrawn lands would be reviewed to determine if any other resource values require withdrawal protection.

Action A-LR-4.1.5 - Lands currently under review by the Washington Office for the revocation of withdrawal status and which are approved for revocation would be managed as adjacent public lands per the final decision.

Livestock Grazing (LG)

Goal LG-1. Provide forage for livestock grazing consistent with other resources/uses as part of an ecologically healthy system consistent with multiple use and sustained yield.

Management Objectives

Management Actions

Objective A-LG-1.1. Maintain approximately 556,300 acres available for livestock grazing and approximately 57,500 acres not available for livestock grazing (Figure 2-7).

Action A-LG-1.1.1 - Applications for livestock grazing within allotments where grazing currently is not permitted/leased would be considered.

Action A-LG-1.1.2 - The proper season of use, kind and class of livestock and stocking rate for allotments where grazing currently is not permitted/leased would be based upon best available information and analyzed through the NEPA process.

Objective A-LG-1.2. Consistent with Idaho Standards for Rangeland Health and maintaining a thriving ecological balance and multiple use relationships provide annually a total preference (active + suspended) of approximately 86,900 AUMs.

Action A-LG-1.2.1 - The appropriate number of livestock AUMs (active + suspended) would be permitted/leased based on the most current monitoring data and Idaho Standards for Rangeland Health.

Action A-LG-1.2.2 - Public lands would be managed to be as productive as feasible considering such grazing management practices as:

- proper use levels of key vegetation,
- grazing systems,
- range improvements including land treatments, and
- adjusting seasons of use, and stocking rates.

Action A-LG-1.2.3 - Livestock grazing would be managed to meet or make significant progress towards meeting Idaho Standards for Rangeland Health and Guidelines for Livestock Grazing Management, 1997 (**Appendix A**).

Action A-LG-1.2.4 - Areas would be temporarily closed to livestock grazing after disturbances such as wildland fire, fire and non-fire vegetative treatments for a minimum of two growing seasons or progress is being made towards attaining identified vegetative objectives.

Action A-LG-1.2.5 - Acquired lands (LWCF/BPA) within the Soda Hills Management Area would not be available for livestock grazing (**Figure 2-7**).

Action A-LG-1.2.6 - If necessary, livestock grazing would be adjusted for the following allotments to ensure that the natural processes associated with an RNA, such as pristine vegetative and soil characteristics are maintained:

Allotment Name/Number	RNA Name
Trout Creek Spring (04154)	Cheatbeck Canyon
Horse Hollow (04329)	Dairy Hollow
Lower Oneida Narrows (04310)	Oneida Narrows
Rocky Peak (04412)	Oneida Narrows
Twin Lakes (14115)	Oneida Narrows

Livestock Grazing (LG)

Action A-LG-1.2.7 - Although considered available for grazing, 1,328 acres within the following allotments would be closed indefinitely to sheep grazing (**Figure 3-12**) due to elevated levels of selenium in water and plants:

- This closure would remain in place until such time selenium levels can be reduced to acceptable levels through containment or capping.

Allotment Name	Public Land Total Acres	Public Land Acres Affected by Selenium	Percent Allotment Affected
Trail Canyon-1	309	123	40
Trail Canyon-2	190	25	13
Woodall Mountain	1,670	1,180	71

Action A-LG-1.2.8 - The following grazing allotments would be identified as available/allotted (6,800 acres) and unavailable/unallotted (1,600 acres) comprising approximately 8,400 acres, within the BSD established by Secretarial Order (Congressional Withdrawal #157, Idaho #9).

Allotments Available/Allotted	Allotments Unavailable/Unallotted
Beaver Creek (04316)	Government Dam (0010)
Blackfoot River (04201)	Negro Creek (0006)
Blackfoot River (04320)	Sagehen Campground (0007)
Blackfoot River (04121)	Womack-Spring Creek (0005)
EIGA Blackfoot River (04112)	
Blackfoot River (04092)	
Blackfoot River (04430)	
Miner Creek (04413)	
Trail Creek (04419)	

Minerals and Energy (ME)

Goal ME-2. Develop mineral resources (oil and gas, geothermal, solid minerals) consistent with other resources and uses as part of an ecologically healthy ecosystem.

Management Objectives	Management Actions
<p>Objective A-ME-2.1. Manage approximately 602,600 acres of the federal mineral estate as open for fluid minerals leasing (e.g., oil, gas, and geothermal resources).¹</p>	<p>Action A-ME-2.1.1- Fluid mineral leasing activities would be subject to standard lease terms, conditions, and applicable special stipulations identified in Appendix H.</p> <p>Action A-ME-2.1.2- Approximately 11,200 acres would be closed to fluid minerals leasing to protect WSAs (Figure 2-8).</p> <p>Action A-ME-2.1.3- On approximately 314,000 acres, the following areas would be leased with a fluid minerals NSO stipulation to protect resources (e.g., soils, wildlife, water, cultural resources) (Figure 2-8).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Withdrawal - Water/Power - Bear River Reclamation Project • Withdrawal - Water/Power - Soda Point • Withdrawal - Water/Power - Last Chance • Withdrawal - Water/Power - Fort Hall Irrigation Project

¹ In the PFO planning area, oil and gas leasing is currently conducted programmatically within the boundaries of the former Pocatello Resource Area under a 1988 Decision Record. Actions under Objective A-ME-2.1 reflect the Decision Record mandates. Oil and gas leasing within the former Deep Creek Resource Area and geothermal leasing within the entire PFO planning area is not conducted on a programmatic bases, but is conducted on a site specific, case by case basis using appropriate individual NEPA analyses and decisions. Actions under Objective A-ME-2.1 would be the typical project restrictions considered in developing leasing stipulations aimed at providing the framework of environmental mitigation measures. Action items under this Objective were standardized to reflect the existing approach for oil and gas leasing within the PFO planning area within the former Pocatello Resource Area and the general approach for fluid minerals leasing elsewhere. This allows for easier comparison between the alternatives on a relative basis.

Minerals and Energy (ME)

- Withdrawal - Water/Power - Soda Springs Project
- Withdrawals - Public Water Reserves - (107 and 125)
- Withdrawals - Power Site Reserves, Generating Facilities, Dams
- Malad Air Navigation Site
- Water/Power - Minidoka Reclamation Project
- Blackfoot Stock Driveway
- Communication Sites
- Recreation and Public Purpose Patents/Leases
- Downey Watershed ACEC
- Bowen Canyon Bald Eagle Sanctuary ACEC
- Old Juniper Townsite ACEC
- Indian Rocks ACEC
- Travertine Park ACEC
- Stump Creek ACEC
- Van Komen Homestead ACEC
- Dairy Hollow RNA
- Formation Cave RNA
- Oneida Narrows RNA
- Travertine Park RNA
- Pine Gap RNA
- Robber's Roost RNA
- Cheatbeck Canyon RNA
- Historical Sites and Trails
- Developed Recreation Sites/Campgrounds
- Highly erosive soils on slopes greater than 20%
- Steep Slopes, >30%
- Riparian/Wetland areas
- Perennial Streams, Lakes

Action A-ME-2.1.4- On approximately 439,000 acres, public lands would be leased with a seasonal occupancy stipulation to protect big game winter range, calving, fawning, and/or nesting activities. (Note: Seasonal closure acreage amount may include other BLM lands closed to development.)

- Fluid minerals exploration drilling and development would comply with the seasonal restrictions (**Appendix D**).
- Seasonal restrictions would not be applicable to production activities.

Action A-ME-2.1.5 - Special stipulations would only be changed by waiver, exceptions, or modifications as outlined by specific criteria in **Appendix H**.

Action A-ME-2.1.6 - Areas open for leasing would also be available for consideration of geophysical exploration activities subject to NSO and seasonal occupancy restrictions.

Objective A-ME-2.2. Manage approximately 591,200 acres of the federal mineral estate (leasable minerals) as open to solid minerals leasing (e.g., phosphate) subject to standard lease terms, and conditions.

Action A-ME-2.2.1 - A nondiscretionary closure would be in effect for WSAs, consisting of approximately 11,200 acres (**Figure 2-9**).

Action A-ME-2.2.2 - Discretionary closures (agency administrative) consisting of approximately 11,400 acres would be in effect for ACECs and RNAs (**Figure 2-9**):

- Downey Watershed ACEC
- Juniper Town Site ACEC
- Indian Rocks ACEC
- Bowen Canyon Bald Eagle Sanctuary ACEC
- Downey Watershed ACEC
- Travertine Park ACEC
- Stump Creek ACEC
- Van Komen Homestead ACEC
- Dairy Hollow RNA
- Formation Cave RNA
- Oneida Narrows RNA
- Travertine Park RNA
- Pine Gap RNA
- Robber's Roost RNA
- Cheatbeck Canyon RNA

Action A-ME-2.2.3 - Appropriate site specific mitigation measures, developed during BLM preparation or review of an operations plan, would be implemented as conditions of approval.

Minerals and Energy (ME)

Action A-ME-2.2.4 - Seasonal wildlife restrictions (**Appendix D**) would not apply to the operation and maintenance of solid leasable mineral production facilities unless the findings of analysis demonstrate the continued need for such mitigation and that less stringent, project-specific mitigation measures would be insufficient.

Objective A-ME-2.3. Manage approximately 581,100 acres of the federal mineral estate (salable minerals) as open to mineral material disposal subject to standard permit terms, and conditions.

Action A-ME-2.3.1 - A nondiscretionary closure would be in effect for WSAs, consisting of approximately 11,200 acres (**Figure 2-10**).

Action A-ME-2.3.2 - Discretionary closures (agency administrative) consisting of approximately 21,500 acres would be in effect for all water and power withdrawals, communication sites, RNAs, and historical sites/trails as identified (**Figure 2-10**):

- Withdrawal - Bear River Reclamation Project
- Withdrawal - Soda Point
- Withdrawal - Last Chance
- Withdrawal - Fort Hall Irrigation Project
- Withdrawal - Soda Springs Project
- Withdrawals - Public Water Reserves (125 & 107)
- Withdrawals - Power Sites and Generating Facilities
- Communications sites
- Downey Watershed ACEC
- Dairy Hollow RNA
- Formation Cave RNA
- Oneida Narrows RNA
- Travertine Park RNA
- Pine Gap RNA
- Robber's Roost RNA
- Cheatbeck Canyon RNA
- Historical Sites/Trails

Action A-ME-2.3.3 - Site specific mitigation measures would be developed through the NEPA process and applied to ensure that operations comply with applicable laws, land use plan guidance and do not result in unnecessary degradation.

Objective A-ME-2.4. Manage approximately 582,600 acres of the federal mineral estate (locatable minerals) managed as open to location of mining claims.

Action A-ME-2.4.1 - Nondiscretionary closures of approximately 29,700 acres would be in effect for the following areas (**Figure 2-11**):

- Withdrawal - Bear River Reclamation Project
- Withdrawal - Soda Point
- Withdrawal - Last Chance
- Withdrawal - Fort Hall Irrigation Project
- Withdrawal - Soda Springs Project
- Withdrawal - Downey Watershed
- Withdrawals - Public Water Reserves (125 & 107)
- Withdrawals - Power Generating Facilities
- Recreation and Public Purpose Patents
- Recreation and Public Purpose Leases
- Soda Springs Hills Management Area (only LWCF/BPA acquired lands)

Action A-ME-2.4.2 - A mineral entry withdrawal (discretionary closure, agency administrative) would be pursued on approximately 1,500 acres for the following RNAs.

- Dairy Hollow RNA
- Formation Cave RNA
- Oneida Narrows RNA
- Travertine Park RNA
- Pine Gap RNA
- Robber's Roost RNA
- Cheatbeck Canyon RNA

Action A-ME-2.4.3 - Appropriate site specific mitigation measures, developed during BLM preparation or review of an NOI or a PO, would be implemented as conditions of approval.

Action A-ME-2.4.4 - Lands acquired for special purposes or with special funding would be managed in a manner consistent with the purpose of the acquisition and would not be opened to mineral entry.

Recreation (RE)

Goal RE-1: Manage lands for dispersed recreation.

Management Objectives	Management Actions
Objective A-RE-1.1. Continue to manage for dispersed recreation.	Action A-RE-1.1.1 - Recreation would be managed in accordance with the existing ROS.

Goal RE-2: Manage motorized vehicular (OHV) use.

Management Objectives	Management Actions
Objective A-RE-2.1. Manage BLM-administered lands as Open, Limited, or Closed for OHV use.	<p>Action A-RE-2.1.1 -Public lands would continue to be managed according to existing OHV designations (Figure 2-12):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Approximately 61,300 acres: Open to all vehicles. • Approximately 71,900 acres: All vehicles Limited to designated routes. • Approximately 11,500 acres: Wheeled vehicles Limited to existing roads and trails; Closed to over-snow vehicles. • Approximately 68,000 acres: Wheeled vehicles Limited to existing roads and trails; Open to over-snow vehicles. • Approximately 4,900 acres: Wheeled vehicles Limited to designate routes; Closed to over-snow vehicles. • Approximately 28,000 acres: Wheeled vehicles Limited to existing roads and trails; over-snow vehicles Limited to designated routes. • Approximately 3,700 acres: Open to wheeled vehicles; Closed to over-snow vehicles. • Approximately 5,700 acres: Open to wheeled vehicles; over-snow vehicles Limited to designated routes. • Approximately 5,300 acres: Vehicles over 40 inches wide Limited to designated routes; wheeled vehicles less than 40 inches wide Limited to existing roads and trails; Open to over-snow vehicles. • Approximately 1,300 acres: Closed to all vehicles. • Approximately 352,200 acres would remain as not designated.

Goal RE-3: Provide for a variety of recreational opportunities and experiences.

Management Objectives	Management Actions
Objective A-RE-3.1. Continue to recognize recreation as the principal use on approximately 55,200 acres of public lands within existing SRMAs.	<p>Action A-RE-3.1.1 - The Blackfoot River SRMA (approximately 21,800 acres) (Figure 2-3) would continue to be managed to maintain existing physical, social and administrative settings as described in Table 2-3a providing various recreational activities, experiences and benefits for a “Destination” market base of SE Idaho.</p> <p>Action A-RE-3.1.2 - The Pocatello SRMA (approximately 33,400 acres) (Figure 2-3) would continued to be managed to maintain existing physical, social and administrative settings as described in Table 2-3b providing various recreational activities, experiences and benefits for a “Community” market base of SE Idaho.</p>

Recreation (RE)

Objective A-RE-3.2 - Continue to manage approximately 558,600 acres as an ERMA.

Action A-RE-3.2.1 - The ERMA would be managed in a custodial manner and provide for visitor health and safety. Basic recreation functions would use the following guidelines:

1. Administrative Actions:

- Special Recreation Permits (SRPs) would be issued if consistent with other resources and uses.
- Law Enforcement presence would be limited.
- Visitor services would be limited to basic information such as travel management signs, site specific restrictions, general maps, travel plan maps and very basic facilities may be utilized in high use areas.

2. Management:

- Focus on minimizing user conflicts with other resources and uses.
- Would be custodially managed, that is minimal physical facilities/ structures would be provided except if necessary to provide for visitor health and safety.

3. Marketing:

- Provide maps.
- Provide road/trail maps.
- Utilize the internet to provide recreation information.

4. Monitoring:

- Visitor satisfaction through field contacts.
- User conflict.
- Visitor safety.
- Resource damage.

Table 2-3a. Existing Physical, Social, and Administrative Settings for the Pocatello SRMA

PHYSICAL SETTING - Describes the character of the natural landscape. Existing setting is identified by the shaded portions within the table.							
Land & Facilities	Primitive Pristine Transition		Back Country	Middle Country	Front Country	Rural	Urban
Remoteness	More than 10 miles from any road	More than 3 miles from any road	More than ½ mile from any kind of road, but less than 3 miles. No road in sight.	On or near 4 Wheel Drive (WD) roads, less than ½ mile from all improved roads. Roads may be in sight.	On or near improved roads, but at least ½ mile from highways.	On or near primary highways, but still within a rural area.	Municipal streets and roads within towns or cities.
Naturalness	Undisturbed natural landscape.		Naturally-appearing landscape having modifications not readily noticeable.	Naturally appearing landscape except for obvious primitive roads.	Landscape partially modified by roads, utility lines, etc., but none overpower natural landscape features.	Natural landscape substantially modified by agriculture or industrial development.	Urbanized development dominates landscape.
Facilities	None		Some primitive trails made of native materials, log bridges, wooden signs.	Maintained and marked trails, simple trailhead developments, improved signs, and very basic toilets.	Improved yet modest, rustic facilities such as campsites, restrooms, trails, and interpretive signs.	Modern facilities such as campgrounds, group shelters, boat launches, and occasional exhibits.	Elaborate full-service facilities such as laundry, restaurants, and groceries.

SOCIAL SETTING - Describes the character of recreation and tourism use. Existing setting is identified by the shaded portions within the table.						
Visitor Use & Users	Primitive Pristine Transition	Back Country	Middle Country	Front Country	Rural	Urban
Contacts	Fewer than 3 encounters/day and fewer than 6 encounters per day on travel routes.	3-6 encounters/day off travel routes (e.g., campsites) and 7-15 encounters per day on travel routes.	7-14 encounters/day off travel routes (e.g., staging areas) and 15-29 encounters/day en route.	15-29 encounters/day off travel routes (e.g., campgrounds) and 30 or more encounters/day en route.	People seem to be generally everywhere.	Busy place with other people constantly in view.
Group Size (Other Than Your Own)	Fewer than or equal to 3 people per group.	4-6 people per group.	7-12 people per group.	13-25 people per group.	26-50 people per group.	Greater than 50 people per group.
Evidence of Use	Only foot prints observed. No noise or litter.	Footprints and bicycle tracks observed. Noise and litter infrequent. Slight vegetation trampling at campsites and popular areas. Fire rings seen.	Vehicle tracks observed. Occasional noise and litter. Vegetation and soils becoming worn at campsites, along travel routes, at popular areas.	Vehicle tracks common. Some noise and litter. Vegetation and soils commonly worn at campsites, along travel routes and popular areas.	Frequent noise and litter. Large, localized vegetation damage & soil compaction.	Unavoidable noise & litter. Widespread vegetation damage & soil compaction.

ADMINISTRATIVE SETTING - Describes how public land managers, county commissioners/municipal governments and local businesses care for area and serve local residents. The existing setting is identified by the shaded portion.						
Administration & Services	Primitive Pristine Transition	Back Country	Middle Country	Front Country	Rural	Urban
Mechanized Use	None whatsoever.	Mountain bikes and perhaps other mechanized use, but all is non-motorized.	4WD vehicles, ATVs, dirt bikes, or snowmobiles, in addition to non-motorized, mechanized use.	2WD vehicles predominant, but also 4WDs and non-motorized, mechanized use.	Ordinary highway auto and truck traffic is characteristic.	Wide variety of street vehicles and highway traffic is ever-present.
Visitor Services	None is available on-site.	Basic maps, but area personnel seldom available to provide on-site assistance.	Area brochures and maps, plus area personnel occasional present to provide on-site assistance.	Information materials describe recreation areas and activities. Area personnel are periodically available.	Information to the left, plus experience and benefit descriptions. Area personnel do on-site education.	Information to the left, plus regularly scheduled on-site outdoor skills demonstrations clinics.
Management Controls	No visitor controls apparent. No use limits. Enforcement presence very rare.	Signs at key access points on basic user ethics. May have back country use restrictions.	Occasional regulatory signing. Motorized and mechanized use restrictions. Random enforcement presence.	Rules clearly posted with some seasonal or day-of-week restrictions. Periodic enforcement presence.	Regulations prominent. Total use limited by permit, reservation, etc. Routine enforcement presence.	Continuous enforcement presence to redistribute use and reduce user conflicts, hazards, and resource damage.

Table 2-3b. Existing Physical, Social, and Administrative Settings for the Blackfoot River SRMA

PHYSICAL SETTING - Describes the character of the natural landscape. The existing setting is identified by the shaded portion.							
Land & Facilities	Primitive Pristine Transition		Back Country	Middle Country	Front Country	Rural	Urban
	More than 10 miles from any road	More than 3 miles from any road					
Remoteness	More than 10 miles from any road	More than 3 miles from any road	More than ½ mile from any kind of road, but less than 3 miles. No road in sight.	On or near 4WD roads, less than ½ mile from all improved roads. Roads may be in sight.	On or near improved roads, but at least ½ mile from highways.	On or near primary highways, but still within a rural area.	Municipal streets and roads within towns or cities.
Naturalness	Undisturbed natural landscape.		Naturally-appearing landscape having modifications not readily noticeable.	Naturally appearing landscape except for obvious primitive roads.	Landscape partially modified by roads, utility lines, etc., but none overpower natural landscape features.	Natural landscape substantially modified by agriculture or industrial development.	Urbanized development dominates landscape.
Facilities	None		Some primitive trails made of native materials, log bridges, wooden signs.	Maintained and marked trails, simple trailhead developments, improved signs, and very basic toilets.	Improved yet modest, rustic facilities such as campsites, restrooms, trails, and interpretive signs.	Modern facilities such as campgrounds, group shelters, boat launches, and occasional exhibits.	Elaborate full-service facilities such as laundry, restaurants, and groceries.

SOCIAL SETTING - Describes the character of recreation and tourism use. The existing setting is identified by the shaded portions.						
Visitor Use & Users	Primitive Pristine Transition	Back Country	Middle Country	Front Country	Rural	Urban
Contacts	Fewer than 3 encounters/day and fewer than 6 encounters per day on travel routes.	3-6 encounters/day off travel routes (e.g., campsites) and 7-15 encounters per day on travel routes.	7-14 encounters/day off travel routes (e.g., staging areas) and 15-29 encounters/day en route.	15-29 encounters/day off travel routes (e.g., campgrounds) and 30 or more encounters/day en route.	People seem to be generally everywhere.	Busy place with other people constantly in view.
Group Size (Other Than Your Own)	Fewer than or equal to 3 people per group.	4-6 people per group.	7-12 people per group.	13-25 people per group.	26-50 people per group.	Greater than 50 people per group.
Evidence of Use	Only foot prints observed. No noise or litter.	Footprints and bicycle tracks observed. Noise and litter infrequent. Slight vegetation trampling at campsites and popular areas. Fire rings seen.	Vehicle tracks observed. Occasional noise and litter. Vegetation and soils becoming worn at campsites, along travel routes, at popular areas.	Vehicle tracks common. Some noise and litter. Vegetation and soils commonly worn at campsites, along travel routes and popular areas.	Frequent noise and litter. Large, localized vegetation damage & soil compaction.	Unavoidable noise & litter. Widespread vegetation damage & soil compaction.

ADMINISTRATIVE SETTING - Describes how public land managers, county commissioners/municipal governments and local businesses care for area and serve local residents. The existing setting is identified by the shaded portions.						
Administration & Services	Primitive Pristine Transition	Back Country	Middle Country	Front Country	Rural	Urban
Mechanized Use	None whatsoever.	Mountain bikes and perhaps other mechanized use, but all is non-motorized.	4WD's, ATV's, dirt bikes, or snowmobiles, in addition to non-motorized, mechanized use.	2WD vehicles predominant, but also 4WD's and non-motorized, mechanized use.	Ordinary highway auto and truck traffic is characteristic.	Wide variety of street vehicles and highway traffic is ever-present
Visitor Services	None is available on-site.	Basic maps, but area personnel seldom available to provide on-site assistance.	Area brochures and maps, plus area personnel occasional present to provide on-site assistance.	Information materials describe recreation areas and activities. Area personnel are periodically available.	Information to the left, plus experience and benefit descriptions. Area personnel do on-site education.	Information to the left, plus regularly scheduled on-site outdoor skills demonstrations clinics.
Management Controls	No visitor controls apparent. No use limits. Enforcement presence very rare.	Signs at key access points on basic user ethics. May have back country use restrictions.	Occasional regulatory signing. Motorized and mechanized use restrictions. Random enforcement presence.	Rules clearly posted with some seasonal or day-of-week restrictions. Periodic enforcement presence.	Regulations prominent. Total use limited by permit, reservation, etc. Routine enforcement presence.	Continuous enforcement presence to redistribute use and reduce user conflicts, hazards, and resource damage.

SPECIAL DESIGNATIONS

Administrative Designations (AD)

Goal AD-1. Provide for public land areas suitable for administrative designations.

<i>Management Objectives</i>	<i>Management Actions</i>
<p>Objective A-AD-1.1. Manage eligible river segments for the values identified in the WSR evaluation.</p>	<p>Action A-AD-1.1.1 - As appropriate, management would be implemented to protect eligible river segments (Figure 3-20 and Figure 3-21) until suitability determinations are completed and determinations made if segments are suitable for inclusion in the NWSRS.</p>
<p>Objective A-AD-1.2. Continue to manage the 7 ACECs (approximately 9,900 acres) and 7 RNAs (approximately 1,500 acres) designated for the unique geological, vegetative, visual, cultural, historical and/or wildlife resource values.</p>	<p>Action A-AD-1.2.1 - The Stump Creek ACEC (approximately 2,500 acres) would be managed to protect crucial elk winter range by implementing the following management practices:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Winter forage for elk would be enhanced by developing grazing management systems. • A common use allotment would be proposed by combing some or all of the allotments overlapping with the ACEC boundary. • Fluid minerals would be leased with a NSO stipulation. • Snowmobile use would not be allowed. • Winter range habitat would be rehabilitated using prescribed fire and/or establishment of browse species. • The area would be discretionarily closed to phosphate development. • Locatable minerals claimants would be required to file a PO for mining related activities. <p>Action A-AD-1.2.2 - The Bowen Canyon Bald Eagle Sanctuary ACEC (approximately 2,300 acres) would be managed to protect and provide winter roosting habitat by implementing the following management practices:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No post/pole, firewood or commercial timber sales would be allowed. • To protect eagle habitat, applicable stipulations would be placed on locatable minerals, leasable minerals and fluid mineral leases (NSO). • Commercial road operations would not be allowed from November 15 through April 15. • Snowmobile use would not be allowed from November 15 to March 15 except for research and administration. • Wildland fire suppression would be a high priority. • Acquire private lands from willing sellers in Bowen Canyon and develop a formal cooperative agreement with the private land owner(s). <p>Action A-AD-1.2.3 - The Downy Watershed ACEC (approximately 1,900 acres) would be managed to maintain/improve vegetative condition and overall watershed health by implementing the following management practices:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Livestock grazing would be managed to maintain or improve native vegetation conditions. • Fluid minerals would be leased with a NSO stipulation. • A locatable mineral withdraw would be maintained. • The area would be discretionarily closed to phosphate leasing. <p>Action A-AD-1.2.4 - The Indian Rocks ACEC (approximately 3,100 acres) would be managed to protect relevant cultural resource sites by implementing the following management practices:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Public lands would be unavailable for disposal. • ROWs would not be granted across identified sensitive cultural areas. • The OHV designation would be Limited and OHV use would be limited to designated roads and trails. • Annual monitoring of cultural resources would be conducted to determine the extent of impacts caused by livestock grazing. If deemed necessary, fences would be built to protect sensitive cultural areas. • Fluid minerals would be leased with a NSO stipulation. • Guidelines (e.g., areas closed to heavy equipment use, using fire retardant for firelines) would be developed for wildland fire suppression activities. • Locatable minerals claimants would be required to file a PO for mining related activities. <p>Action A-AD-1.2.5 - The Juniper Townsite and Van Komen Homestead ACECs (approximately 6 acres) would be managed to protect cultural and historical resources by implementing the following management practices:</p>

Administrative Designations (AD)

- The area would be signed to explain important cultural and historical values and the need to protect these values.
 - Historical structures would be protected.
 - Partnerships would be pursued with local historical interest groups to protect, maintain and interpret historic structures.
 - Areas would be made safe for the public.
- Action A-AD-1.2.6** -The Dairy Hollow RNA (approximately 40 acres) would be managed to protect the nearly pristine Wyoming sagebrush/needle-and-thread plant community and Ferruginous Hawk nesting habitat (conglomerate bluffs and columns) by implementing the following management practices:
- Livestock grazing would be eliminated through fencing.
 - Fluid minerals would be leased with a NSO stipulation.
 - The area would be withdrawn from locatable mineral entry.
 - The area would be designated as Closed to OHV use.
- Action A-AD-1.2.7** - The Formation Cave RNA (approximately 70 acres) would be managed to protect fragile travertine formation and pristine waterbirch, antelope bitterbrush/Nevada bluegrass, and barren plant communities by implementing the following management practices :
- Discretionary closure for solid leasable and salable minerals.
 - This area would be designated as Closed to OHV use.
 - Fluid minerals would be leased with a NSO stipulation.
 - The area would be withdrawn from locatable mineral entry.
 - The area would be unavailable for livestock grazing.
- Action A-AD-1.2.8** - The Oneida Narrows RNA (approximately 600 acres) would be managed to protect the nearly pristine plant communities (e.g., bigtooth maple, box-elder riparian, Rocky Mountain juniper, and bunchgrass), Bald Eagle and Rock Squirrel habitat by implementing the following management practices:
- The area would be designated as Closed to OHV use.
 - Fluid minerals would be leased with a NSO stipulation.
 - The area would be withdrawn from locatable mineral entry.
- Action A-AD-1.2.9** - The Pine Gap RNA (approximately 240 acres) would be managed to protect the nearly pristine black sagebrush/bluebunch wheatgrass plant community by implementing the following management practices:
- The area would be designated as Closed to OHV use.
 - Fluid minerals would be leased with a NSO stipulation.
 - The area would be withdrawn from locatable mineral entry.
 - The area would be unavailable to livestock grazing.
- Action A-AD-1.2.10** - The Robbers Roost RNA (approximately 400 acres) would be managed to protect the unique abundance of mountain shrub communities by implementing the following management practices:
- The area would be designated as Closed to OHV use.
 - Fluid minerals would be leased with a NSO stipulation.
 - The area would be withdrawn from locatable mineral entry.
 - The area would be unavailable for livestock grazing.
- Action A-AD-1.2.11** - The Cheatbeck RNA (approximately 100 acres) would be managed to protect the plant communities of boxelder/sweet cicely and bigtooth maple/sweet cicely by implementing the following management practices:
- The area would be designated as Closed to OHV use.
 - Fluid minerals would be leased with a NSO stipulation.
 - The area would be withdrawn from locatable mineral entry.
- Action A-AD-1.2.12** - The Travertine Park ACEC and RNA (approximately 200 acres) would be managed to protect fragile travertine formations and uncommon lichen species of by implementing the following management practices:
- Livestock grazing would be excluded through fencing.
 - The area would be signed to explain values and the need to protect these values.
 - The area would be discretionarily closed to phosphate leasing.
 - Fluid minerals would be leased with a NSO stipulation.
 - Locatable minerals claimants would be required to file a PO for mining related activities.
 - Only the RNA portion would be designated as Closed to OHV use.

2.9 MANAGEMENT GUIDANCE COMMON TO ACTION ALTERNATIVES (ALTERNATIVES B, C, AND D)

Table 2-4 describes the management guidance that would be applicable to Alternatives B, C, and D. The actions described in this section would be implemented if any of these alternatives are ultimately selected.

Table 2-4. Management Guidance Common to Action Alternatives (Alternatives B, C, and D)

GENERAL (GE)

Goal GE-3. Provide for proper nutrient cycling, hydrological cycling and energy flow consistent with multiple use management and sustained productivity.

Management Objectives	Management Actions
Objective AA-GE-3.1. Restore or improve the public lands adversely affected by major surface disturbance resulting from activities such as but not limited to mineral and energy development, wildland fire, and ROW development.	Action AA-GE-3.1.1 - Applicable Idaho Standards for Rangeland Health and indicators (Appendix A) would be employed to determine the successfulness of reclamation, rehabilitation or restoration activities following major surface disturbance.

RESOURCES

Vegetation (VE)

Goal VE-2. Prevent the establishment of invasive species/noxious weeds.

Management Objectives	Management Actions
Objective AA-VE-2.1. Treat invasive species/noxious weeds to decrease or control the total number of acres occupied.	Action AA-VE-2.1.1 - Where hay or straw would be used on public lands for permitted/authorized and internal BLM activities, state-certified weed free hay/straw would be required. Action AA-VE-2.1.2 - Public awareness concerning invasive species/noxious weeds control would be promoted including partnerships with other agencies and the Tribes.

Wildland Fire Management (WF)

Goal: WF-3. Protect life, property, and resources.

Management Objectives	Management Actions
Objective AA-WF-3.1. Manage public land in and around the WUI areas to reduce fire hazards.	Action AA-WF-3.1.1 - Appropriate treatment methods to reduce/remove hazardous fuels would be used. Action AA-WF-3.1.2 - Treatment activities would be coordinated and conducted in conjunction with community participation, partners and stakeholders. Action AA-WF-3.1.3 - AMR would be utilized on all wildland fires commensurate with values at risk and to protect public/firefighter safety.
Objective AA-WF-3.2. Manage public lands to protect, improve or enhance resources /values at risk.	Action AA-WF-3.2.1 - Appropriate treatment methods to improve FRCC/LHC. Action AA-WF-3.2.2 - AMR commensurate with values at risk.

RESOURCE USES

Lands and Realty (LR)

Goal LR-3. Maintain and acquire legal access to public land.

Management Objectives	Management Actions
Objective AA-LR-3.1. Maintain existing access and acquire public and administrative access consistent	Action AA-LR-3.1.1 - Access to public lands would be acquired with an emphasis on priority areas (Figure 2-13).

Lands and Realty (LR)

with resource values and to ensure efficient administration of public lands.

Action AA-LR-3.1.2 - Public access would be secured or acquired through all land tenure adjustments.

Action AA-LR-3.1.3 - The Cooperative Rights-of-Way Agreement (2002) between the BLM and the State of Idaho would be followed to acquire access across state lands as needed.

Action AA-LR-3.1.4 - Access to public lands would be acquired, from willing parties, through easements, fee purchase, donation, conservation easements or other means.

Action AA-LR-3.1.5 - New route construction, route alignment or maintenance to improve access to public lands would be allowed.

Action AA-LR-3.1.6 - Counties would be coordinated with to identify legal access to public lands.

Action AA-LR-3.1.7 - Legal access routes to public lands would be recognized during the development of travel management plans.

Goal: LR-5. Improve administrative management efficiency, natural resources management and protection, and public benefit.

Management Objectives

Management Actions

Objective AA-LR-5.1. Adjust and consolidate public land ownership patterns through land tenure adjustments.

Action AA-LR-5.1.1 - Lands acquired would be managed in a manner consistent with adjacent or nearby public lands or managed for the goals, objectives and standards for which they were acquired.

Action AA-LR-5.1.2 - Management direction, including designations for such programs as OHV, SRMA, VRM, Livestock Grazing, Lands & Realty, Mining (leasable, saleable) would be applied to acquired lands consistent with adjacent or nearby public lands, or those with similar values, goals and objectives for which they were acquired.

Action AA-LR-5.1.3 - The following screening and criteria process would be considered for all land tenure adjustment proposals.

Step 1: Land Tenure Adjustment Proposal Submitted.

Does the proposal meet the intent of FLPMA? Is there a federal interest (e.g., public benefit) to implementing the proposal? If the proposal is a land exchange, are the monetary values of the offered and selected lands relatively similar?

YES - Continue to **Step 2**.

NO - No further consideration of the action as presently proposed.

Step 2: Proposal Screened by Zone Definition.

*Does the proposal fit within the guidelines of the zone definitions (see **Action LR-5.1.1**)?*

YES - Continue to **Step 3**.

NO - No further consideration of the action as presently proposed.

Step 3: Proposal Screened by Land Ownership Adjustment Criteria.

*Is the proposed action a high priority based on the land ownership adjustment **criteria and factors** as identified in **Actions LR-5.1.2 and LR-5.1.3**?*

Lands and Realty (LR)

YES - Continue to **Step 4**.
NO - No further consideration of the action as presently proposed.

Step 4: Likelihood of Proposal Receiving Public Support.

Is it likely the proposal will receive public support during the NEPA process?

YES - Continue to **Step 5**.
NO - No further consideration of the action as presently proposed

Step 5: Schedule the Proposal for Appropriate Public Involvement and NEPA.

This proposal's priority for completing the NEPA work would be based upon other workload, current and anticipated public and private funding and staffing, and the extent to which the proposal would benefit the public.

Action AA-LR-5.1.4 - Proceeds from the sale or exchange of public lands identified for disposal as of July 25, 2000 (**Appendix F**) may be used to purchase additional public lands within the planning area, as provided for in the Federal Land Transaction Facilitation Act through July 25, 2010 unless extended by Congress.

Action AA-LR-5.1.5 - Work with willing parties to acquire land that is in the public interest to improve administrative efficiencies or based upon priorities to acquire land with unique resources values such as but not limited to special status species habitat, riparian, and/or access to public lands.

Action AA-LR-5.1.6 - The Shoshone-Bannock Tribes would be coordinated with regarding land tenure adjustments within the ceded land boundary.

Action AA-LR-5.1.7 - Disposal of lands would be allowed under Sec 203 and 206 of FLPMA and would be classified for disposal under Section 7 of the Taylor Grazing Act of 1934, as amended (43 USC 315f).

Action AA-LR-5.1.8 - Lands would be made available, as appropriate, to support local community and development needs.

Action AA-LR-5.1.9 - All public lands would be classified as unsuitable for entry under the Desert Land Entry Act (1877, as amended) or the Carey Act (1894, as amended) due to one or more factors such as, unsuitable soils, lack of available water or valid water right, topography or economic feasibility.

Action AA-LR-5.1.10 - Public access to public lands would be retained when lands are transferred out of federal ownership.

Action AA-LR-5.1.11 - Coordination with the Shoshone-Bannock Tribes would occur when BLM considers land tenure adjustments on lands involving Tribal-reserved rights.

Minerals and Energy (ME)

Goal ME-2. Develop mineral resources (oil and gas, geothermal, solid minerals) consistent with other resources and uses as part of an ecologically healthy ecosystem.

<i>Management Objectives</i>	<i>Management Actions</i>
<p>Objective AA-ME-2.1. Coordinate with private surface owners on minerals development proposals related to federal mineral estates.</p>	<p>Action AA-ME-2.1.1 - Split-estate locatable mineral resources (approximately 419,500 acres would be available for development.</p> <p>Action AA-ME-2.1.2 - Split-estate leasable and salable mineral resources would be available for development at the discretion of the BLM.</p> <p>Action AA-ME-2.1.3 - On split-estate lands where private land overlies BLM managed federal mineral estate, approval of any operations plan would be coordinated with the surface owner to mitigate impacts as practical and as required by established requirements.</p> <p>Action AA-ME-2.1.4 - Reclamation requirements of mineral development operations on split-estate lands would be set at the same levels required on similar federal lands and/or equivalent state standards.</p>

Minerals and Energy (ME)

- Applicable Idaho Standards for Rangeland Health (**Appendix A**) would be employed to determine the successfulness of reclamation, rehabilitation or restoration activities following major surface disturbances on federal lands.

Action AA-ME 2.1.5 - Mineral lessee/permittee performance bonds required by BLM on split-estate lands may include a loss-of-land-use bond on behalf of the surface owner (e.g., an annual rental based upon grazing values, as appraised by BLM, may be due to the surface owner) in addition to reclamation and other components.

Objective AA-ME-2.2. Maintain or reestablish the hydrologic function, integrity, quality, and other surface resource values of lands affected by mining actions consistent with the disturbed site potential.

Action AA-ME-2.2.1 - Reclamation Plans for mineral development operations would be designed to attain and final reclamation would meet applicable standards (**Appendix A**) consistent with the rehabilitation potential of the disturbed site. Standards applicable to mineral development operations are primarily 1 through 3 and 5 through 7, with secondary and future site management directed towards attaining Standards 4 and 8.

Action AA-ME-2.2.2 - The following operation standards and guidelines would be applied as appropriate to reduce environmental impacts from mineral exploration and development operations:

OPERATIONAL STANDARDS:

1. Locate surface disturbing activities, including support facilities, outside riparian zones (e.g., riparian habitat conservation areas or areas where surface disturbance would impact the PFC of the riparian areas) and fish bearing waters. Cutthroat trout guidance would be considered as identified in **Appendix E**. Where no feasible alternative site exists, operate and construct facilities in ways that would avoid or reduce impacts on riparian zone attributes.
2. Diversions to control surface flow and infiltration on overburden piles, pit backfill, and all disturbed areas would be designed to be self-maintaining or maintained by the lessee.
3. If appropriate for reclamation design, soil resources would be inventoried following Order 2 National Resource Conservation Service, National Cooperative Soil Survey standards (or more detailed Order 1 survey for large mining projects). Volumes and suitability of soil resources for reclamation would be determined before disturbance.
4. Topsoil and selected sub soils suitable for reclamation, as identified in the soil inventory, would be salvaged on slopes where equipment can safely operate. These soils would be immediately utilized for reclamation at the mine or placed in an approved stockpile for future use.
5. Mineral exploration and development would include plans for concurrent or timely reclamation. Plans would be modified and updated as appropriate.
6. In the event of a temporary shutdown of operations, interim reclamation and site stabilization would be conducted according to a plan submitted by the operator/lessee to the Authorized Officer.
7. The lessee/operator would monitor reclamation work and report to the Authorized Officer annually until reclamation is accepted as adequate and the performance bond released.
8. Mineral operations would replace or mitigate any loss of available surface water sources for uses such as wildlife or grazing as appropriate. This includes the loss of water quality sufficient to maintain post-mineral development uses.
9. Within development areas, native vegetation would be retained undisturbed when disturbance of the site is not necessary for minerals development or safety.
10. Mineral operations performance bonds would include an amount that reflects the actual cost to BLM (including current administration and overhead costs) to reclaim facilities and related surface disturbance. This amount would be determined by BLM and bonds secured by mineral operators prior to surface disturbance or project implementation.
11. Water management would be designed and maintained to control water runoff, erosion, infiltration, sedimentation, and contamination as necessary.

OPERATIONAL GUIDELINES:

1. Selection of plant species for establishment would reflect the surrounding ecosystem and post development land use. Plant materials selected for reclamation use would be adapted to the climate of the site. Consideration and preference would be given to promoting natural succession, native plant species, and structural diversity.

Minerals and Energy (ME)

2. Reclaimed areas would be graded and shaped, where possible, to a stable topographic relief that conforms and blends in with the variability of surrounding slopes. Final reclaimed slopes would not be steeper than 33% (3 horizontal : 1 vertical).
3. Before release of the performance bond, the site would be assessed to assure:
 - minimum ground cover exists to attain long-term soil productivity requirements;
 - ground cover persists naturally, at minimum cover needs, without artificial assistance (e.g., irrigation, fertilizers, etc.); and
 - impacted lands are reclaimed and meet or suitably trend toward meeting applicable Standards (**Appendix A**) and post development land use objectives.
4. In reclaimed areas, vegetation would include species that meet wildlife habitat needs. Cover for wildlife would be incorporated into design plans (e.g., slash piles, logs, rock piles, etc.).
5. Roads, disturbed areas, and facilities no longer necessary for mineral exploration and development would be reclaimed as soon as practicable, normally within one year after the lands become available for reclamation.
6. To the maximum extent feasible, disturbed lands would be reclaimed to meet VRM objectives.

Objective AA-ME 2.3. Regulate mineral development activities to prevent or control sediment and the release of contaminants such as selenium and metals into the environment.

Action AA-ME-2.3.1 - BMPs and/or other appropriate management techniques or guidelines (**Appendix C**) would be applied to control acid rock drainage, sedimentation, and release of contaminants.

Action AA-ME-2.3.2 - Plans would be required for preventing or controlling adverse environmental impacts (e.g., water management, hazardous materials & spills, sediment control, contamination).

Action AA-ME-2.3.3 - Hydrologic function and watershed health would be monitored at all active mineral operations and adjustments made to operations and reclamation as necessary to achieve PFC of watersheds, revegetation objectives and protection of resources.

Action AA-ME-2.3.4 - Suitable topsoil/subsoil would be salvaged for reclamation use in a way that best supports biological diversity and prevents the release of hazardous substances.

Action AA-ME-2.3.5 - In reclamation activities, plant species known to reduce the risk of bioaccumulation of hazardous substances, such as selenium, would be used if such risk is present.

Action AA-ME-2.3.6 - Prior to release of any performance bond or relinquishment of a mineral lease/permit, reclamation vegetation would be monitored for bio-accumulation of hazardous substances for a period of time to be determined appropriate by the Authorized Officer.

Action AA-ME-2.3.7 - Phosphate mine site plans would be designed to meet the following goals as identified in the *IPMP* (2004).

- Protect southeast Idaho's surface water resources.
- Protect wildlife habitat and ecological resources in southeast Idaho.
- Maintain and protect multiple beneficial uses of the southeast Idaho phosphate mining resource area.
- Protect southeast Idaho's ground water resources.

Action AA-ME-2.3.8 - In order to achieve the goals identified in **Action AA-ME-2.3.7**, the following action levels (**Appendix I**) (and any future modifications) for vegetation, surface waters and groundwater as identified in the *IPMP* would be used to design mine and reclamation plans. In addition, these levels would be used in determining the success of phosphate mine reclamation, rehabilitation and/or restoration activities.

- Appropriate follow-up actions (e.g., conduct further monitoring, conduct additional reclamation, conduct appropriate clean up activities) would be taken should these levels not be successfully met or exceeded.
- As appropriate, these action levels may be adjusted for future site specific projects through continued investigation/monitoring and analysis through the NEPA process.

Minerals and Energy (ME)

Action Levels for Vegetation, Groundwater, Surface Water, and CWA

Mine Reclamation Vegetation Suitability Standards		Standards for Groundwater (Total Recoverable, Unfiltered)	
Contaminant	(mg/kg dry weight)	Contaminant	(µg/L)
Selenium	5.0	Selenium	50.0
Cadmium	4.2	Cadmium	5.0
Chromium	30.6	Chromium	100.0
Nickel	35.5	Nickel	730.0
Vanadium	55.9	Vanadium	260.0
Zinc	615.0	Zinc	5000.0

Surface Water Suitability Standards for Biota Standards (e.g., isolated artificial ponds, mine pit lakes, seeps, springs)		Standards for CWA ¹ Regulated Surface Waters	
Contaminant	(Mg/L)	Contaminant	(µg /L)
Selenium:		Selenium (Total Recoverable)	5.0
Transitory wildlife drinking water use	0.201	Cadmium	1.0
Domestic animal drinking water use (e.g., livestock grazing)	0.050	Chromium (Total) ²	74.0
Riparian habitat use	0.005	Nickel	160.0
Cadmium	0.245	Vanadium (Dissolved)	20.0
Chromium	8.7	Zinc	100.0
Nickel	0.614		
Vanadium	0.972		
Zinc	43.4		

¹ Clean Water Act
² Assumes 6 to 1 partitioning of Cr III to CR VI. The surface water criteria for chromium were changed in 2005. Total Chromium has been replaced with Chromium(III) and Chromium(VI). Selected constituents are shown; the CWA contains the full constituent list and action levels for surface water.

Recreation (RE)

Goal RE-4: Establish a comprehensive approach to travel planning and management.

Management Objective	Management Actions
Objective AA-RE-4.1 Provide on-the-ground travel management operations and maintenance programs to sustain and enhance recreation opportunities and experiences, visitor access and safety, and resource conservation.	<p>Action AA-RE-4.1.1 - Establish maintenance standards for trails and conduct condition surveys to document maintenance, construction, reconstruction and rehabilitation needs.</p> <p>Action AA-RE-4.1.2 - Implement management practices to systematically address travel management (e.g., signs, maps, maintenance, construction, reconstruction, field presence, law enforcement, and education).</p> <p>Action AA-RE-4.1.3 - Monitor and evaluate social outcomes and environmental conditions on and along trails and associated areas influenced by trail-related visitation.</p> <p>Action AA-RE-4.1.4 - Develop simple, effective, and efficient monitoring plans and methods to measure the effectiveness of travel planning and management.</p> <p>Action AA-RE-4.1.5 - Travel management plans would consider the following criteria in designating routes and uses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environmental conditions,

Recreation (RE)

- User conflicts,
- Administrative purposes,
- Public purposes,
- Route, vehicle type and size limitations,

SPECIAL DESIGNATIONS

Administrative Designations (AD)

Goal AD-1. Provide for public land areas suitable for administrative designations.

<i>Management Objectives</i>	<i>Management Actions</i>
Objective AA-AD-1.1. Determine which eligible river segments are suitable for inclusion in the NWSRS.	Action AA-AD-1.1.1 - The WSR evaluation found two rivers (Figure 3-20 and Figure 3-21) eligible for inclusion in the NWSRS with no eligible segments found to be suitable; therefore, no river segments are being proposed for inclusion in the NWSRS (BLM 2003d).

2.10 MANAGEMENT GUIDANCE FOR ALTERNATIVE B (PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE)

Table 2-5 describes the management guidance that was applicable to Alternative B (Preferred Alternative) as identified in the Draft EIS/RMP. The actions described in this section focused on a balanced combination of resource protection and resource use to provide benefits for the broadest range of public uses. This table has been purposely shaded gray to indicate that Alternative B (Preferred Alternative) in the Draft RMP/EIS has been revised according to public comment and agency action. The Proposed RMP resulting from these changes, as identified in Chapter 1, Section 1.13, is listed in its entirety² in **Table 2-1** at the beginning of Chapter 2.

- Key components to Alternative B (Proposed RMP) have not changed in content or purpose from the Draft EIS/RMP and remain the same as follows: Management of special status species and vegetation with an emphasis on maintaining and improving important vegetation habitats (such as sagebrush steppe ecosystem) to provide for species’ continued presence and conservation
- Management of land tenure adjustments to improve administrative efficiency and protect resources while supporting appropriate development and improved public access to public lands with some emphasis on acquiring nonfederal lands.
- Management of minerals and energy resources to balance development and protect resources.
- Management of OHV opportunities and use by designating public lands as “Limited” to existing routes, maintaining existing routes, limiting mechanized travel to designated routes, moderate control of OHVs and minimal intensive use routes.
- Management of fire to include treatments with an emphasis on a broad range of vegetation types (such as encroached Juniper, Low-Elevation Shrub, Mid-Elevation Shrub, Mountain Shrub, and Wet/Cold Conifer) to move toward FRCC 1.

²The Proposed Plan is a combination of the Common to All Alternatives, Action Alternatives, and Alternative B from the Draft RMP/EIS with the revisions made in Table 2-1.

Table 2-5. Management Guidance for Alternative B

RESOURCES	
Special Status Species (SS)	
<i>Goal SS-1. Manage special status species and their habitats to provide for their continued presence and conservation as part of an ecologically healthy system.</i>	
Management Objectives	Management Actions
<p>Objective B-SS-1.1. Maintain or improve the quality of listed (threatened or endangered) species habitat by managing public land activities to benefit those species.</p>	<p>Action B-SS-1.1.1 - The following guidelines would be implemented to maintain and protect nesting and roosting sites for bald eagles as adapted from the Greater Yellowstone Bald Eagle Management Plan (Wyoming Game and Fish Department 1996):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New permitted activities which would cause disturbance within the vicinity of occupied nests and primary use areas (Zones I and II) would not be allowed from February 1 to August 15, or winter roosting trees from December 1 to March 1. • New structures, such as powerlines and wind turbines, would be designed to minimize the potential to cause direct mortality to eagles. Existing lines posing potential problems would be modified to minimize collision or electrocution upon renewal of the ROW. • Mature trees would be maintained and recruited for suitable nesting, perching and roosting sites. • Within the 2.5-mile home range (Zone III) follow management direction to maintain adequate foraging conditions and aid in maintaining the integrity of Zones I and II. • Stipulate that proposed projects would not lower prey availability. • Maintain trees and snags for perching and visual screening (interrupt the line of sight between the perched eagle and human activity) • Within the home range of nesting eagles to avoid indirect impacts, pesticides/herbicides would be used in accordance with label instructions. <p>Action B-SS-1.1.2 - Gray wolf habitat (e.g., reproductive, rearing) would be conserved/managed in the following manner by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Analyzing habitat characteristics of public lands adjacent to the Caribou NF in conjunction with the planned Caribou National Forest evaluation to determine if suitable wolf habitat exists. • Activities on public lands within the Yellowstone Nonessential Experimental Population Area (east of I-15) or the Central Idaho Nonessential Experimental Population Area (west of I-15) which would disturb within one mile of active gray wolf den sites and rendezvous sites between April 1 and June 30 when five or fewer breeding pairs are present would not be allowed. (USFWS 1994a and 1994b). • If and when wolves are de-listed coordinate habitat management with IDFG. <p>Action B-SS-1.1.3 - Quality shoreline habitats would be maintained on all public lands adjacent to the Snake River used by Utah valvata snail. No shore-disturbing activities would be allowed if found to be detrimental to snail populations.</p>
<p>Objective B-SS-1.2. Maintain or improve the quality of sensitive species habitat by managing public land activities to benefit those species.</p>	<p>FAUNA ONLY:</p> <p>Action B-SS-1.2.1 - On-going efforts to locate populations of pygmy rabbits would be supported.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Survey all potential habitats. • When populations are located, manage sagebrush habitats for suitable pygmy rabbit conditions. • Suitable and potential pygmy rabbit habitat should be managed to allow for the expansion of populations into areas where they might not be currently found. <p>Action B-SS-1.2.2 - Populations of boreal toads and Northern leopard frogs would be identified and inventoried and where populations are located, permitted activities would be managed to maintain quality frog and or toad habitat by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Managing riparian areas to make progress towards or achieving PFC. • Increasing pool habitat based upon site potential. • Mitigating or adjusting activities having adverse effects on boreal toad and Northern leopard frog habitats. • Managing Lane and Lander Creeks as priority areas for boreal toad and Northern leopard frog habitat.

Special Status Species (SS)

Action B-SS-1.2.3 - The following guidelines for Greater sage-grouse habitats would be implemented as adapted from Connelly et al (2000):

- Continue efforts to map populations and habitat for greater sage-grouse. Map seasonal (lek, nesting, brood-rearing and winter) habitats along with source and isolated populations.
- Establish goals for greater sage-grouse habitat conservation at the local level in conjunction with IDFG and local working groups for protection and maintenance of existing populations and restoration goals.
- Protect and maintain suitable habitats and reconnect separated populations based upon the following priorities:
 1. Source habitats (S1)
 2. Restoration areas (R1, R2)
 3. Areas that link isolated populations
- Manage key habitat for a range of sagebrush canopy cover averaging 15 to 25 percent (11 to 31 inches in height); at least 15 percent grass cover; and 10 percent cover of a diversity of forbs or commensurate with site potential.
- Monitor progress and adjust activities to make progress towards greater sage-grouse goals and objectives.
- In areas where grouse habitats are fragmented by land ownership pattern, cooperate with IDFG and local working groups to identify and maintain long-term habitat by acquiring conservation easements or bringing crucial habitats into public ownership.
- In cooperation with IDFG identify areas where application of pesticides for grasshopper or Mormon cricket control may negatively affect grouse broods. Identify a cooperative strategy to review requests for pesticide application in these identified locations.
- As appropriate based upon a site specific habitat assessment, protect leks from disturbances from permitted activities for 0.6 mile from Mar 1 to May 31.
- Restore shrub-steppe habitats in the following priority:
 1. source areas,
 2. restoration areas
 3. areas that link isolated populations

Action B-SS-1.2.4 - The following guidelines for Columbian sharp-tailed grouse habitats would be implemented as adapted from Giesen and Connelly (1993):

- As appropriate based upon a site specific habitat assessment, maintain vegetation in suitable condition (LHC-A) for nesting and brood rearing for 1.5 miles from known leks. Any manipulation of habitats must not be greater than 10 percent of the 1.5 mile radius (**Figure 3-6**).
- As appropriate based upon a site specific habitat assessment, maintain availability of deciduous shrubs (e.g., serviceberry, chokecherry) within 4 miles of leks to protect winter habitat.
- Coordinate with IDFG as population targets and monitoring locations are established for Columbian sharp-tailed grouse. Monitoring would be conducted for populations in key or source areas and restorations areas in that order.
- In areas where grouse habitats are fragmented by land ownership pattern, cooperate with IDFG and local working groups to identify and maintain long-term habitat by acquiring conservation easements or bringing crucial habitats into public ownership.
- In cooperation with IDFG identify areas where application of pesticides for grasshopper or Mormon cricket control may negatively affect grouse broods. Identify a cooperative strategy to review requests for pesticide application in these identified locations.
- As appropriate based upon a site specific habitat assessment, protect leks from disturbances from permitted activities for 0.6 mile from Mar 1 to May 31.

Action B-SS-1.2.5 - The following guidelines for the globally important ferruginous hawk habitat in the Curlew Valley would be implemented as adapted from Chipley 1998:

- As appropriate based upon a site specific habitat assessment, Activities which would disturb within ½ mi. of active nests from Mar 1 to July 15 would not be allowed.
- Monitor the populations in Curlew Valley and on the Bear Lake Plateau (**Figure 3-6**).
- Maintain existing scattered juniper trees for nesting substrate and maintain or improve habitat suitable for prey populations such as jackrabbits.

Special Status Species (SS)

Action B-SS-1.2.6 - The following conservation actions (Utah Division of Wildlife Resources [UDWR] 2000, Montana Department of Fish, Wildlife, and Parks [MDFWP] et al. 2000, IDFG 2003) would be implemented to ensure the continued presence of native cutthroat trout within their historic range:

- Support cooperative work with IDFG to determine cutthroat trout life histories, protect the genetic integrity of cutthroat trout populations, expand those populations within their historic range through reintroduction in those areas where restoration is practicable after reintroduction protocols have been established with federal agencies and monitor populations as they are restored.
- Cooperate with IDFG to selectively control non-native salmonid species and discontinue non-native fish stocking in native cutthroat trout drainages.
- Enhance and maintain channel integrity, channel processes, water quality, salmonid habitat and habitat connectivity.
- Monitor populations, habitat quantity and habitat quality.
- Cooperate with adjacent landowners and/or other agencies when opportunities for watershed scale improvements are possible.
- All streams known to hold either of these species would be fenced to exclude livestock use unless it is already in PFC condition.
- Strive to eliminate or significantly reduce threats to present or potential cutthroat trout distribution within their historic range and to habitat quality and quantity.
- Strive to achieve the criteria for highest quality trout habitats as described in the Cutthroat Trout Matrix (**Appendix E**).
- Consider land tenure adjustments which would provide for reconnecting streams in migratory corridors. Disposition of trout-bearing streams would be allowed if habitat with more potential for stream reconnection is acquired.
- Coordinate with IDFG and other agencies to implement an information/education/outreach program.
- Participate in coordination and data sharing meetings between state, private and federal jurisdictions.

Action B-SS-1.2.7 - Where populations of American white pelicans are located on public lands, manage the quality of nesting habitat as a priority for the benefit of the pelican.

Action B-SS-1.2.8 - For Bear Lake endemic fish (Bear Lake cutthroat trout, Bonneville cisco, Bonneville whitefish, Bear Lake whitefish and Bear Lake sculpin) water degrading activities on public lands with streams connecting to Bear Lake would be reduced.

FLORA ONLY:

Action B-SS-1.2.8 - Site/project specific assessments for special status plants would be required prior to authorizing activities to determine:

1. The presence or absence of special status species, and
2. Appropriate mitigation/guidelines (e.g., avoidance of occupied areas, distances from occupied habitat). Examples of mitigation/guidelines to be considered may include:
 - Reducing adverse impacts on special status plant habitats from permitted/authorized activities.
 - Limiting water developments and mineral supplements near special status plant populations sufficient to protect these species.
 - Avoiding pesticide and herbicide applications near occupied habitat to preserve pollinators and non-target species.
 - Promoting seeding within occupied habitat only when clearly beneficial for special status plants.
 - Formulate methods of weed spraying near special status habitat on site specific and species specific basis.
 - Special status plant areas would be priority for weed treatment.
 - Inventory and evaluate areas for special status plants while conducting land health standards evaluations.
 - Inventory and monitor potential special status plant habitats.

Action B-SS-1.2.9 - Meet or make significant progress towards meeting Idaho Standards for Rangeland Health (**Appendix A**) for special status plant habitat.

Action B-SS-1.2.10 - Special status plant known occurrence's maps would be updated regularly.

Special Status Species (SS)

Action B-SS-1.2.11 - To conserve starveling milkvetch (*Astragalus jejunus* var. *jejunus*) and silky cryptantha (*Cryptantha sericea*).

- Consider plant habitat protection during route designation process.
- Inventory and monitor habitat in Bear Lake County.
- Promote Idaho Standards for Rangeland Health (**Appendix A**) to maintain species populations.

Action B-SS-1.2.12 - Where special status species can be conserved and habitat connectivity improved, lands would be acquired through land tenure adjustments, easements, and inter-agency cooperation.

Vegetation

Goal VE-6. Manage vegetation types to provide for their continued presence as part of an ecologically healthy system.

Management Objectives

Management Actions

Objective B-VE-6.1. In Low- and Mid-Elevation Shrub and Mountain Shrub types, maintain or increase LHC-A acres as described below so the landscape is composed of a diversity of desirable/native herbaceous and shrub/woody species consisting of at least 15-25% sagebrush canopy cover in greater sage-grouse habitat in the Low- and Mid-Elevation Shrub types and at least 25% shrub cover in the Mountain Shrub type. (Appendix J, Section III)

Desired LHC Description	Percent LHC Desired
LHC-A - All key components are present as identified in land health standards and as described in the definition of FRCC 1.	> 60%
LHC-B - Some or all of the key components as identified in land health standards are present and as described in the definition of FRCC 2.	20-25%
LHC-C - Key components are absent as identified in land health standards and as described in the definition of FRCC 3.	< 20%

Action B-VE-6.1.1. Activities would be permitted/authorized in a manner consistent with Idaho Standards for Rangeland Health (**Appendix A**).

Action B-VE-6.1.2. Priority areas for treatment and restoration would be:

1. Greater Sage- and Columbian sharp-tailed grouse Source and Key habitat:
 - a. Enhance source habitat,
 - b. Treat areas of low resilience
 - c. Treat areas that pose a fire risk to source habitats,
 - d. Enhance key habitat areas,
 - e. Treat areas that pose a fire risk to key habitats,
 - f. Enhance restoration habitat
2. Habitats for the conservation and recovery of special status species.
3. Areas with hazardous fuels or potential for catastrophic wildland fire.
4. Areas infested by invasive species/noxious weeds.
5. Areas at risk of loss of key ecosystem components/functions (structure, diversity, composition, hydrological function, nutrient cycling, energy flow).
6. Areas adversely impacted/degraded by uses or activities (e.g., recreation, OHV, grazing, mining)
7. Crested wheatgrass seedings.

Criteria to treat and maintain the crested wheatgrass forage base are as follows:

 - Suppress wildland fires until sagebrush canopy cover exceeds 25%.
 - Consider various treatment methods (e.g., mechanical, chemical, and prescribed fire) as areas exceed 25% sagebrush canopy cover.
 - As areas are treated allow for no less than 15% sagebrush canopy cover.
 - Interseed desirable species that add diversity while not displacing crested wheatgrass.
 - Treat areas to discourage invasive species/noxious weeds.
8. Juniper encroached areas

Objective B-VE-6.2. In the Aspen/Aspen Conifer Mix and Dry Conifer types, maintain or increase LHC-A acres as described below so the landscape is composed of an even mix of Aspen and Dry Conifer resulting in a distribution of age classes of <30 years (40%), 31-80 years (40%), and >80 years (20%)

Action B-VE-6.2.1- Aspen/Conifer sites would be treated using appropriate treatment methods and harvest rotation cycles to achieve desired age classes. Appropriate methods may include but are not limited to regeneration and partial cuts.

Action B-VE-6.2.2 - Within the Aspen/Aspen Conifer Mix and Dry Conifer vegetation types, treatment and restoration priority areas would be:

- Areas with greater than 50% mature conifer composition.
- Areas adjacent to deer/elk summer range.
- Areas significant to special status species.
- Areas impacted by insects or disease.

Vegetation

Desired LHC Description	Percent LHC Desired
LHC-A - All key components are present as identified in land health standards and as described in the definition of FRCC 1.	>30
LHC-B - Some or all of the key components as identified in land health standards are present and as described in the definition of FRCC 2.	25-30
LHC-C - Key components are absent as identified in land health standards and as described in the definition of FRCC 3.	<45

Objective B-VE-6.3. In the Wet/Cold Conifer type, maintain or increase LHC-A and B acres as described below primarily through natural processes so the landscape is comprised of a distribution of age classes of 0-80 years (30%) and > 80 years (70%).

Action B-VE-6.3.1- Appropriate treatment methods and harvest rotation cycles would be used to achieve desired age classes.

Action B-VE-6.3.2 - Treatment/restoration priority areas would be:

- Areas impacted by insects or disease.
- Wildlife ranges (summer/winter).
- Areas significant to special status species.

Desired LHC Description	Percent LHC Desired
LHC-A - All key components are present as identified in land health standards and as described in the definition of FRCC 1.	>5
LHC-B - Some or all of the key components as identified in land health standards are present and as described in the definition of FRCC 2.	95-100
LHC-C - Key components are absent as identified in land health standards and as described in the definition of FRCC 3.	<5

Vegetation

Objective B-VE-6.4. Maintain or increase natural occurring Juniper LHC-A and B acres as described below through primarily natural processes so the landscape is dominated by widely spaced old juniper trees greater than 300 years.

Action B-VE-6.4.1 - Appropriate methods (e.g., fire suppression) would be used to maintain or promote juniper dominated range sites.

Desired LHC Description	Percent LHC Desired
LHC-A - All key components are present as identified in land health standards and as described in the definition of FRCC 1.	>5
LHC-B - Some or all of the key components as identified in land health standards are present and as described in the definition of FRCC 2.	95-100
LHC-C - Key components are absent as identified in land health standards and as described in the definition of FRCC 3.	<5

Wildland Fire Management (WF)

Goal WF-4. Return fire to a more natural role in the ecosystem to improve FRCC and achieve desired LHC.

Management Objectives	Management Actions
Objective B-WF-4.1. Manage the Low-Elevation Shrub and Perennial Grass vegetation types in order to move towards FRCC 1 (LHC-A) so wildland fire occurs less frequently and at a smaller scale on the landscape.	<p>Action B-WF-4.1.1 - The AMR would be used to safely manage wildland fires, reducing acres burned to a rate similar to historic. AMR in Low-Elevation Shrub would be suppression of all wildland fire starts to protect existing sagebrush communities.</p> <p>Action B-WF-4.1.2 - Fuels and restoration projects would be conducted in areas invaded by or at risk of invasion by invasive species/noxious weeds.</p> <p>Action B-WF-4.1.3 - Following wildland fire and prescribed fire treatments, chemical, mechanical, and revegetation treatments would utilize appropriate plant materials to provide the best opportunity to stabilize sites and prevent dominance of invasive annual vegetation and noxious weeds. The use of native plant materials would be emphasized.</p> <p>Action B-WF-4.1.4 - Fire use would be allowed in annual grass dominated areas following site specific NEPA analysis.</p> <p>Action B-WF-4.1.5 - Prescribed fire may be used to prepare areas for subsequent chemical, mechanical, and/or revegetation treatments, or, if needed, for disposal of vegetation (i.e., roadside burning, pile burning).</p> <p>Action B-WF-4.1.6 - Sagebrush would be seeded on appropriate sites where natural recovery is unlikely in 10 to 20 years.</p> <p>Action B-WF-4.1.7 - Projects would be strategically placed on a landscape scale to protect and restore sagebrush steppe.</p>
Objective B-WF-4.2. Manage the Mid-Elevation Shrub, Juniper, Dry Conifer, Aspen/Conifer, and Mountain Shrub vegetation types in order to move towards FRCC 1 (LHC-A) so wildland fire mimics historical conditions	<p>Action B-WF-4.2.1 -The AMR would be used to safely manage wildland fires.</p> <p>Action B-WF-4.2.2 - Fire use would be allowed following site-specific NEPA analysis.</p> <p>Action B-WF-4.2.3 - Vegetation treatments would be designed to simulate the effect of historic fire on vegetation structure and composition.</p> <p>Action B-WF-4.2.4 - In Mid-Elevation Shrub prescribed fire, chemical, mechanical, and revegetation treatments would be conducted in all areas invaded by or at risk of invasion by invasive and noxious weeds.</p> <p>Action B-WF-4.2.5 - Encroaching juniper in the Mid-Elevation Shrub type would be removed using chemical, mechanical, and prescribed fire treatments.</p>

Wildland Fire Management (WF)																							
<p>Objective B-WF-4.3. Maintain Wet/Cold Conifer, Riparian and Other/Vegetated Lava vegetation types fire frequencies within the historical range of variability, FRCC 1 (LHC-A).</p>	<p>Action B-WF-4.3.1 -The AMR would be used to safely manage wildland fires.</p> <p>Action B-WF-4.3.2 - WFU would be allowed in Other/Vegetated Lava following site-specific NEPA analysis.</p> <p>Action B-WF-4.3.3 - Projects in Other/Vegetated Lava and Wet/Cold Conifer communities would generally be limited to chemical treatments to control noxious weeds and invasive species.</p>																						
<p>Objective B-WF-4.4. Manage for WFU on approximately 265,000 acres identified as suitable (Figure 2-14).</p>	<p>Action B-WF-4.4.1 - WFU may be used in Mid-Elevation Shrub, Perennial Grass/Seedings, Mountain Shrub, Aspen/Aspen Conifer Mix and Dry Conifer vegetation types.</p> <p>Action B-WF-4.4.2 - WFU would not be appropriate on approximately 348,600 acres due to social, economic, political or resource constraints (e.g., which may include wildlife habitats, areas previously rehabilitated or small tracts of public land)</p> <p>Action B-WF-4.4.3 - Should social, economic, political or resource constraints be resolved, it would be possible to use WFU in areas identified as not appropriate.</p>																						
<p>Objective B-WF-4.5. For the vegetation types identified, implement over 10 years approximately 124,250 footprint acres of treatment using various treatment methods (e.g., WFU, mechanical, chemical, revegetation, and prescribed fire), as appropriate.</p>	<p>Action B-WF-4.5.1 - By vegetation type, the following approximate footprint acres would be treated.</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Vegetation Type</th> <th>Footprint Acres</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Low-Elevation Shrub</td> <td>18,950</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Mid-Elevation Shrub ¹</td> <td>25,400</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Mountain Shrub</td> <td>16,500</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Perennial Grass/Seeding</td> <td>50,200</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Juniper (Natural Only)</td> <td>0.0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Aspen/Aspen Conifer Mix/Dry Conifer</td> <td>13,200</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Wet/Cold Conifer</td> <td>0.0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Riparian</td> <td>0.0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Other/Vegetated Lava</td> <td>0.0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total</td> <td>124,250</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>¹ Acres identified include encroached juniper.</p>	Vegetation Type	Footprint Acres	Low-Elevation Shrub	18,950	Mid-Elevation Shrub ¹	25,400	Mountain Shrub	16,500	Perennial Grass/Seeding	50,200	Juniper (Natural Only)	0.0	Aspen/Aspen Conifer Mix/Dry Conifer	13,200	Wet/Cold Conifer	0.0	Riparian	0.0	Other/Vegetated Lava	0.0	Total	124,250
Vegetation Type	Footprint Acres																						
Low-Elevation Shrub	18,950																						
Mid-Elevation Shrub ¹	25,400																						
Mountain Shrub	16,500																						
Perennial Grass/Seeding	50,200																						
Juniper (Natural Only)	0.0																						
Aspen/Aspen Conifer Mix/Dry Conifer	13,200																						
Wet/Cold Conifer	0.0																						
Riparian	0.0																						
Other/Vegetated Lava	0.0																						
Total	124,250																						
<p>Objective B-WF-4.6. Implement priorities for wildland fire suppression and vegetation treatments.</p>	<p>Action B-WF-4.6.1 - When multiple wildland fire ignitions occur, the criteria for establishing suppression priorities would be:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Protect the WUI and communities-at-risk where public and firefighter health and safety are a concern. 2. Minimize risks to sagebrush steppe. 3. Minimize risks to Dry Conifer. <p>Action B-WF-4.6.2 - Priority areas for establishing vegetation treatments would be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sagebrush steppe protection/maintenance. Prioritize treatment to areas that are adjacent to existing sagebrush cover types. • Sagebrush steppe restoration. • Aspen/Conifer, Mountain Shrub, Dry Conifer restoration. • Protection of areas of key ecosystem components that are at high risk of loss. <p>Action B-WF-4.6.3 - For the Low-Elevation Shrub, Wet/Cold Conifer and Natural Juniper vegetation types, the AMR would be a "FULL" suppression emphasis with initial attack to stop fire spread and put out wildland fire at least cost.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For Perennial Grass/Seedings vegetation types the AMR would be a "Limited" emphasis of monitoring and confinement actions commensurate with the values at risk and public/firefighter safety. <p>Action B-WF-4.6.4 - For the Mid-Elevation Shrub (including juniper encroachment) Mountain Shrub and Aspen/Aspen Conifer Mix/Dry Conifer vegetation types, the AMR would be a "Limited" emphasis of monitoring and confinement actions commensurate with the values at risk and public/firefighter safety.</p>																						

RESOURCE USES

Lands and Realty

Goal LR-4. Assure land classifications and withdrawals of public lands are appropriate to protect important resource values.

Management Objectives

Objective B-LR-4.1. Continue to manage approximately 84,760 acres of land classified as withdrawn from the general land laws for the specific purposes intended.

Management Actions

Action B-LR-4.1.1 - Continue to manage approximately 45,400 acres of public land as withdrawn (e.g., power sites, public water reserves, power projects, administrative sites, BSD).
Action B-LR-4.1.2 - The following withdrawals (approximately 20,160 acres) would be maintained and managed as closed to locatable mineral entry.

Federal Agency	Mineral Estate Withdrawn Acres ¹
USFWS - Bear Lake Refuge	17,500
USFWS - Minidoka Refuge	760
USFWS - Oxford Slough Production Area	1,900

¹ These acres are not considered in the PFO public lands base of 613,800 acres. Acreages are rounded.

Action B-LR-4.1.3 - Withdrawal of public lands from mineral entry would be pursued on approximately 19,200 acres for the following areas:

- Cheatbeck Canyon RNA
- Dairy Hollow RNA
- Formation Cave RNA
- Oneida Narrow RNA
- Pine Gap RNA
- Robbers Roost RNA
- Travertine Park RNA
- Petticoat Peak RNA
- Soda Springs Hills Management Area (public lands portion only)
- Bowen Canyon Bald Eagle Sanctuary ACEC

Action B-LR-4.1.4 - Withdrawals which no longer serve the purpose for which they were established would be modified, revoked or relinquished. Prior to modification, revocation or relinquishment, withdrawn lands would be reviewed to determine if any other resource values require withdrawal protection.

Action B-LR-4.1.5 - Lands currently under review by the Washington Office for the revocation of withdrawal status and which are approved for revocation would be managed the same as adjacent public lands per the final decision.

Goal LR-5. Improve administrative management efficiency, natural resources management and protection, and public benefit.

Management Objectives

Objective B-LR-5.1. Maintain the overall public land base, acquire nonfederal lands or interest in nonfederal lands through exchange, purchase, easement or donation which enhance multiple-use, protect significant resource values and which improve the management and administration of the public lands.

Management Actions

Action B-LR-5.1.1 - A land tenure adjustment program would be implemented based upon a four zone concept where zones (areas that contain common issues or planned actions) and respective priorities are described below (**Figure 2-15**). Land tenure adjustments would be considered across FO and District boundaries.

Zone 1 lands are public lands with special designations because of significant resource values. Zone 1 lands would be retained in public ownership. Examples of Zone 1 lands include WSAs, ACECs and RNAs, special status species habitat, and crucial wildlife habitat. BLM's priority for Zone 1 is to seek to acquire all private and State land in-holdings. Public access would be considered in all land tenure actions. Approximately **50,800 acres** (9%) of public land would be identified in this zone.

Lands and Realty

Zone 2 lands are public lands that have a fairly well-consolidated ownership pattern and contain potentially high values for resources and land uses such as minerals, recreation, range, riparian, cultural resources, and wildlife habitat. The priorities within Zone 2 are to retain existing large blocks of high value public lands, consolidate public land ownership according to identified priority resources, and acquire lands with high resource values which improve efficiencies in public lands administration. Public lands within ½ mile of either side of the Zone 2 boundary would be considered potentially suitable for disposal primarily by exchange (secondarily by sale or R&PP patents) unless that ½ mile extends into a Zone 1 (retention) area. Approximately **365,700 acres** (60%) of public land would be identified in this zone.

Zone 3 lands are small to medium-sized blocks of public lands which are interspersed with state and private lands or are adjacent to National Forest boundaries. The priority emphasis for Zone 3 is to consolidate ownership, which would maximize public values, provide public access and improve efficiencies in public lands administration. Overall public land acreage would be maintained. Acquisition, primarily through exchange, would be done to add high resource value lands that improve the manageability of public lands; lower resource value and difficult-to-manage tracts would be disposed of. Zone 3 lands are potentially suitable for disposal by exchange; however, disposal of land through sales and R&PP patents would be allowed. Approximately **141,000 acres** (23%) of public land would be identified in this zone.

Zone 4 lands are small to medium-sized blocks of public lands that are isolated from one another and from other public lands. Public lands are available through all forms of disposal as appropriate. The land tenure adjustment emphasis in Zone 4 could result in a net decrease in public lands acreage within this zone. Approximately **56,300 acres** (8%) of public land would be identified in this zone.

***NOTE:** Within Zones 3 and 4, specific parcels may contain potentially high values for resources and land uses such as minerals, recreation, special status species, range, riparian, cultural resources, and wildlife habitat. These high-value parcels may not be suitable for disposal, except through exchange for equal or higher resource value lands*

Action B-LR-5.1.2 - Changes in the overall public lands acreage would be appropriate if land tenure adjustments meet one or more of the following criteria:

- Benefits the public.
- Improves public lands administration.
- Achieves desired resource conditions.
- Contributes to tribal treaty rights.

Action B-LR-5.1.3 - Land tenure adjustments would consider the acquisition or disposal of lands based upon (but not limited to) the following factors:

- Special status species habitat,
- Improve habitat connectivity,
- Improve or maintain access,
- Riparian/wetland values
- Improves quality of recreation opportunities and/or experiences ,
- Improve public land administration.
- Provide for local community needs,
- Resolve trespass,
- Parcels more suitable for administration by another agency
- Parcels which are isolated or difficult to administer

Goal LR-6. Balance development of public land, such as ROW, utility corridors and alternative energy development (e.g., wind, solar, biomass) with the protection of natural resources and public enjoyment and recreation, consistent with natural resource values and uses

Objective B-LR-6.1. Issue land use authorizations consistent with following management actions.

Action B-LR-6.1.1 - Land use authorizations would require holders to apply appropriate management techniques; practices or guidelines to protect vegetation, wildlife habitat and minimize soil disturbance (**Appendix C**).

Action B-LR-6.1.2 - Short-term authorizations or permits to use public lands for the sole

Lands and Realty

benefit of private farming practices (e.g., pivot lines, storage of farm equipment) would not be approved.

Action B-LR-6.1.3 - New leases or permits that affect the value or nature of the land would not be allowed on those lands proposed for exchange or sale.

Action B-LR-6.1.4 - No new land use permits or leases would be authorized to validate unauthorized use. Unauthorized use would be resolved according to priority using current laws, regulations, and policy.

Action B-LR-6.1.5 - When a new or existing land use permit is authorized the following conditions would apply as appropriate:

- Privately-held water right places of use (POUs) on public land would either be removed from public land or transferred to the US through the BLM.
- A privately-owned water right with a point of diversion on private property, but with one or more POUs on public land, would be split and transferred to the US in proportion to the amount of water used on public land.

Action B-LR-6.1.6 - To the extent possible, linear ROWs would be routed where impacts would be least disturbing, considering the point of origin, point of destination, resource values present, and purpose and need for the project.

Action B-LR-6.1.7 - No BLM ROW corridors would be designated in this Pocatello RMP/EIS, however this plan may be amended to designate corridors upon completion of the West-wide Energy Corridor Programmatic EIS.

Action B-LR-6.1.8 - ROW applicants would be encouraged to the extent possible, to use the existing corridors. The Pocatello RMP/EIS would adopt designated corridors upon completion of the West-wide Energy Corridor Programmatic EIS.

Action B-LR-6.1.9 - For ROWs which include energy and non-energy related ROWs and land use authorizations, 590,000 acres would be managed as open areas; 21,900 acres would be managed as avoidance areas and 1,900 acres would be managed as exclusion areas (**Figure 2-16**) where these areas are defined as follows:

- **Open Areas** - These are areas not identified as avoidance or exclusion areas and are open to ROWs and land use authorization proposals. Proposals may require restrictions to protect resources such as wildlife (**Appendix D**), protected watersheds, erosive soils/steep slopes, cultural, historical, recreation, visual resources and other identified resources.
- **Avoidance Areas** - These are areas to generally be avoided but may be available with special stipulations. Efforts would be made to work with the applicant to reroute proposals. Special stipulations would be required to protect resource values. Areas considered as "avoidance" would include developed recreation sites, historical trails, special status species habitat, ACECs, and WSAs. Special stipulations would consist of applying BMPs, management techniques or guidelines (**Appendix C**) or be developed on a case by case basis through the NEPA process.
- **Exclusion Areas** - In these areas ROWs and land use authorizations would not be allowed. Areas considered as "exclusion" would be RNAs.

Action B-LR-6.1.10 - Applications for wind energy site monitoring and testing and development would not be accepted in areas designated as part of the National Landscape Conservation System (e.g., WSAs, WSRs, National Historic and Scenic Trails) and ACECs.

Action B-LR-6.1.11 - Entities seeking to develop a wind energy project on public lands shall consult with appropriate federal, state, and local agencies regarding specific projects as early in the planning process as appropriate to ensure that all potential construction, operation, and decommissioning issues and concerns are identified and adequately addressed.

Action B-LR-6.1.12 - Entities seeking to develop a wind energy project on public lands in conjunction with BLM Washington Office and PFO staff, shall consult with the DoD regarding the location of wind power projects and turbine siting as early in the planning process as appropriate. This consultation shall occur concurrently at both the installation/field level and the Pentagon/BLM Washington Office level. An interagency protocol agreement is being developed to establish a consultation process and to identify the scope of issues for consultation. Lands withdrawn for military purposes are under the administrative jurisdiction of the DoD or a military service and are not available for

Lands and Realty

Action B-LR-6.1.13 - The BLM would require financial bonds for all wind energy development projects on BLM-administered public lands to ensure compliance with the terms and conditions of the ROW authorization and the requirements of applicable regulatory requirements, including reclamation costs. The amount of the required bond would be determined during the ROW authorization process on the basis of site-specific and project-specific factors. The BLM may also require financial bonds for site monitoring and testing authorizations.

Livestock Grazing (LG)

Goal LG-1. Provide forage for livestock grazing consistent with other resources/uses as part of an ecologically healthy system consistent with multiple use and sustained yield.

Management Objectives

Management Actions

Objective B-LG-1.1. Maintain approximately 560,000 acres available for livestock grazing and approximately 53,800 acres not available for livestock grazing.

Action B-LG-1.1.1 - Applications for livestock grazing within allotments where grazing currently is not permitted/leased would be considered except for those allotments containing riparian areas as shown below:

Allotment Name Number	Acres ¹
Bear River at Rose (14402)	120
Densmore Creek (10026)	60
Downata (10082)	20
Fox Hills (14088)	40
Inman Point (10061)	40
Walker Creek (10065)	40

¹ Acreages rounded.

Action B-LG-1.1.2 - The proper season of use, kind and class of livestock and stocking rate for allotments where grazing currently is not permitted/leased would be based upon best available information and analyzed through the NEPA process.

Objective B-LG-1.2. Consistent with maintaining a thriving ecological balance and multiple use relationships provide annually a total preference (active + suspended) of approximately 87,500 AUMs.

Action B-LG-1.2.1 - The appropriate number of livestock AUMs (active + suspended) would be permitted/leased based on the most current monitoring data and the Idaho Standards for Rangeland Health.

Action B-LG-1.2.2 - Public lands would be managed to be as productive as feasible considering such grazing management practices as:

- proper use levels of key vegetation,
- grazing systems,
- range improvements including land treatments, and
- adjusting seasons of use, and stocking rates.

Action B-LG-1.2.3 - Livestock grazing would be managed to meet or make significant progress towards meeting Idaho Standards for Rangeland Health and Guidelines for Livestock Grazing Management, 1997 (**Appendix A**).

Action B-LG-1.2.4 - Areas would be temporarily closed to livestock grazing after disturbances such as wildland fire, fire and non-fire vegetative treatments for a minimum of two growing seasons or progress is being made towards attaining identified vegetative objectives.

Action B-LG-1.2.5 - The voluntary relinquishment of grazing preference would be accepted, in whole or part, and made available to qualified applicants following the most current policy and guidance. Grazing applications may be denied if one or more of the following criteria are met:

- Failure to meet standards for rangeland health because of livestock grazing and meeting or moving towards standards is not economically feasible,
- Isolated parcels of public land consisting of 640 acres or less,
- No public or administrative access to allotment/parcel exists,
- Public lands are identified for disposal or exchange (occur within Zones 3 or 4),
- The proportion of unfenced public land to private land within the allotment is less than 20%,
- Expanding urban development and subsequent activities adversely affects the

Livestock Grazing (LG)

- ability to graze livestock on public land,
- Occurrence of special status species affected by livestock grazing or supporting activities (such as distributing salt blocks, range improvement maintenance) and management changes are not economically feasible, and
- Forage or water quality that can not be corrected with reasonable investment (e.g., elevated selenium levels).

Action B-LG-1.2.6 - Acquired lands (LWCF/BPA) within the Soda Hills Management Area would not be available for livestock grazing (**Figure 2-17**).

Action B-LG-1.2.7 - If necessary, livestock grazing would be adjusted for the following allotments to ensure that the natural processes associated with an RNA, such as pristine vegetative and soil characteristics are maintained:

Allotment Name/Number	RNA Name
Trout Creek Spring (04154)	Cheatbeck Canyon
Horse Hollow (04329)	Dairy Hollow
Lower Oneida Narrows (04310)	Oneida Narrows
Rocky Peak (04412)	Oneida Narrows
Twin Lakes (14115)	Oneida Narrows
Bancroft (06032)	Petticoat Peak

Action B-LG-1.2.8 - Although considered available for grazing, 1,328 acres within the following allotments would be closed indefinitely to sheep grazing (**Figure 3-12**) due to elevated levels of selenium in water and plants:

- This closure would remain in place until such time selenium levels can be reduced to acceptable levels through containment or capping.

Grazing Allotments Indefinitely Closed To Sheep Grazing

Allotment Name	Public Land Total Acres	Public Land Acres Affected by Selenium	Percent Allotment Affected
Trail Canyon-1	309	123	40
Trail Canyon-2	190	25	13
Woodall Mountain	1,670	1,180	71

Objective B-LG-1.3. Implement the Secretarial Order (Congressional Withdrawal #157, Idaho #9) which established BSD and did not include the creation of grazing allotments within the driveway.

Action B-LG-1.3.1 - Livestock use within the BSD would be limited to “Trailing Only”.

Action B-LG-1.3.2 - Allotments would be eliminated entirely or closed in part as identified below, totaling approximately 8,600 acres of public land.

Allotment Name (Number)	Status
Beaver Creek (04316)	Closed
Blackfoot River (04201)	Closed
Blackfoot River (04320)	Closed
Blackfoot River (04121)	Closed
EIGA Blackfoot River (14112)	Closed
Blackfoot River (14092)	Eliminated
Blackfoot River (04430)	Eliminated
Miner Creek (04413)	Eliminated
Trail Creek-1 (04419)	Eliminated
Government Dam (0010)	Eliminated
Negro Creek (0006)	Eliminated
Sagehen Campground (0007)	Eliminated
Womack-Spring Creek (0005)	Eliminated

Livestock Grazing (LG)

closed to grazing would be adjusted accordingly.

Action B-LG-1.3.4 - While maintaining or improving rangeland health conditions and PFC of the riparian areas, up to approximately 1,400 AUMs would be available for trailing purposes (BSD) for those permittees/lessees with a valid trailing permit.

Minerals and Energy (ME)

Goal ME-2. Develop mineral resources (oil and gas, geothermal, solid minerals) consistent with other resources and uses as part of an ecologically healthy ecosystem.

Management Objectives

Objective B-ME-2.1. Manage approximately 602,600 acres of the federal mineral estate as open for fluid minerals leasing (e.g., oil, gas, and geothermal resources).

Management Actions

Action B-ME-2.1.1- Fluid mineral leasing activities would be subject to standard lease terms, conditions, and applicable special stipulations identified in **Appendix H**.

Action B-ME-2.1.2 - To protect WSAs, approximately 11,200 acres of public lands would be closed to fluid mineral leasing (**Figure 2-18**).

Action B-ME-2.1.3 - On approximately 321,400 acres, the following areas would be leased with a fluid minerals NSO stipulation to protect resources (e.g., soils, wildlife, water, cultural resources) (**Figure 2-18**).

- Withdrawal - Water/Power - Bear River Reclamation Project
- Withdrawal - Water/Power - Soda Point
- Withdrawal - Water/Power - Last Chance
- Withdrawal - Water/Power - Fort Hall Irrigation Project
- Withdrawal -Water/Power - Soda Springs Project
- Withdrawal - Public Water Reserves - (107 and 125)
- Withdrawal - Power Site Reserves, Generating Facilities, Dams
- Malad Air Navigation Site
- Water/Power - Minidoka Reclamation Project
- Blackfoot Stock Driveway
- Communication Sites
- Recreation and Public Purpose Patents/Leases
- Soda Springs Hills Management Area
- Downey Watershed ACEC
- Bowen Canyon Bald Eagle Sanctuary ACEC
- Old Juniper Townsite ACEC
- Indian Rocks ACEC
- Travertine Park ACEC
- Stump Creek ACEC
- Van Komen Homestead ACEC
- Dairy Hollow RNA
- Formation Cave RNA
- Oneida Narrows RNA
- Travertine Park RNA
- Pine Gap RNA
- Robber's Roost RNA
- Cheatbeck Canyon RNA
- Historical Sites and Trails
- Developed Recreation Sites/Campgrounds
- Highly erosive soils on slopes greater than 20%
- Steep Slopes, >30%
- Riparian/Wetlands, Perennial Streams, Lakes

Action B-ME 2.1.4 - On approximately 439,000 acres, public lands would be leased with a seasonal occupancy stipulation to protect big game winter range, calving, fawning and/or nesting activities. (Note: Seasonal closure acreage amount may include other BLM lands closed to development.)

- Fluid minerals exploration drilling and development would comply with the seasonal wildlife restrictions (**Appendix D**).
- Seasonal wildlife restrictions would not be applicable to production activities.

Action B-ME 2.1.5 - Special stipulations would be changed only by waiver, exceptions, or modifications as outlined by specific criteria in **Appendix H**.

Action B-ME 2.1.6 - Areas open for leasing would also be available for consideration of geophysical exploration activities subject to NSO and seasonal occupancy restrictions.

Minerals and Energy (ME)	
	<p>Action B-ME 2.1.7- Lands acquired for special purposes or with special funding would be managed in a manner consistent with the purposes of the acquisition; typically an NSO stipulation.</p>
<p>Objective B-ME-2.2. Manage approximately 582,400 acres of the federal mineral estate (leasable minerals) as open to solid minerals leasing (e.g., phosphate) subject to standard lease terms, and conditions.</p>	<p>Action B-ME 2.2.1 - A nondiscretionary closure would be in effect for WSAs consisting of approximately 11,200 acres (Figure 2-19).</p> <p>Action B-ME 2.2.2 - Discretionary closures (agency administrative) would be in effect on approximately 20,200 acres as identified below (Figure 2-19):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Petticoat Peak RNA Dairy Hollow RNA Formation Cave RNA Oneida Narrows RNA Travertine Park RNA Pine Gap RNA Robber's Roost RNA Cheatbeck Canyon RNA Soda Springs Hills Management Area (LWCF/BPA and public lands portions) <p>Action B-ME 2.2.3 - Appropriate site specific mitigation measures, developed during BLM preparation or review of an operations plan, would be implemented as conditions of approval.</p> <p>Action B-ME 2.2.4 - Lands acquired for special purposes or with special funding would be managed in a manner consistent with the purposes of the acquisition; typically these lands would be closed to solid leasable minerals.</p> <p>Action B-ME 2.2.5 - Seasonal wildlife restrictions (Appendix D) would not apply to the operation and maintenance of solid leasable mineral production facilities unless the findings of analysis demonstrate the continued need for such mitigation and that less stringent, project-specific mitigation measures would be insufficient.</p>
<p>Objective B-ME-2.3. Manage approximately 582,400 acres of the federal mineral estate (salable minerals) as open to mineral material disposal subject to standard permit terms, and conditions.</p>	<p>Action B-ME-2.3.1 - Nondiscretionary closures would be in effect for WSAs, consisting of approximately 11,200 acres (Figure 2-20).</p> <p>Action B-ME-2.3.2 - Discretionary closures (agency administrative) would be in effect on approximately 20,200 acres as identified below (Figure 2-20):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Petticoat Peak RNA Dairy Hollow RNA Formation Cave RNA Oneida Narrows RNA Travertine Park RNA Pine Gap RNA Robber's Roost RNA Cheatbeck Canyon RNA Soda Springs Hills Management Area (LWCF/BPA and public lands portions) <p>Action B-ME-2.3.3 - Site specific mitigation measures would be developed through the NEPA process and applied to ensure that operations comply with applicable laws, land use plan guidance and do not result in unnecessary degradation.</p> <p>Action ME-2.3.4 - Lands acquired for special purposes or with special funding would be managed in a manner consistent with the purposes of the acquisition; typically these lands would be closed to salable minerals.</p>
<p>Objective B-ME-2.4. Manage approximately 564,900 acres of the federal mineral estate (locatable minerals) as open to location of mining claims.</p>	<p>Action B-ME-2.4.1 - Nondiscretionary closures would be in effect for approximately 29,700 acres as identified below (Figure 2-21):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Withdrawal - Bear River Reclamation Project Withdrawal - Soda Point Withdrawal - Last Chance Withdrawal - Fort Hall Irrigation Project Withdrawal - Soda Springs Project Withdrawal - Downey Watershed Withdrawals - Public Water Reserves (125 & 107) Withdrawals - Power Generating Facilities Recreation and Public Purpose Patents Recreation and Public Purpose Leases

Minerals and Energy (ME)

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Soda Springs Hills Management Area (Only LWCF/BPA acquired lands) <p>Action B-ME-2.4.2 - A mineral entry withdrawal (discretionary closure, agency administrative) would be pursued on approximately 19,200 acres for the following areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cheatbeck Canyon RNA • Dairy Hollow RNA • Formation Cave RNA • Oneida Narrow RNA • Pine Gap RNA • Robbers Roost RNA • Travertine Park RNA • Petticoat Peak RNA • Soda Springs Hills Management Area • Bowen Canyon Bald Eagle Sanctuary ACEC <p>Action B-ME-2.4.3 - Appropriate site specific mitigation measures, developed during BLM preparation or review of an NOI or a PO, would be implemented as conditions of approval.</p> <p>Action B-ME-2.4.4 - Lands acquired for special purposes or with special funding would be managed in a manner consistent with the purposes of the acquisition and would not be open to mineral entry.</p> <p>Action B-ME-2.4.5 - Consistent with the purposes of future land acquisitions, public lands managed in conjunction with the acquired lands would be withdrawn from mineral entry.</p>
--

Recreation (RE)

Goal RE-1. Manage lands for dispersed recreation.

<i>Management Objectives</i>	<i>Management Actions</i>
<p>Objective B-RE-1.1. Manage lands for a variety of non-motorized, mechanized, and motorized opportunities.</p>	<p>Action B-RE-1.1.1 - Coordinate with Idaho Statewide Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation and Tourism Plan, other agencies, and the tribes with regard to recreational use of public land and for developing new recreation opportunities.</p> <p>Action B-RE-1.1.2 - Management tools such as ROS, VRM, and LAC would be used in managing recreation opportunities.</p>
<p>Objective B-RE-1.2. Recreation facility development and permitted recreation activities would be consistent with other resource goals of the area in which they are located.</p>	<p>Action B-RE-1.2.1 - SRPs for commercial, non-commercial competitive events and organized groups would be issued consistent with the areas resource values and uses.</p> <p>Action B-RE-1.2.2 - Facility development and improvements would be focused on existing recreation sites and SRMAs.</p>

Goal RE-3: Provide for a variety of recreational opportunities and experiences.

<i>Management Objectives</i>	<i>Management Actions</i>
<p>Objective B-RE-3.1. Recognize recreation as the principal use on approximately 58,800 acres of public lands within SRMAs.</p>	<p>Action B-RE-3.1.1 - SRMAs would be recognized as priority for recreation funding and personnel to fulfill commitments made to provide specific structured recreation opportunities (e.g., activity, experience, and benefit opportunities).</p> <p>Action B-RE-3.1.2 - The Blackfoot River SRMA (approximately 21,800 acres) would continue to be managed to maintain and/or enhance targeted recreational opportunities, experiences and benefits with a primary market based strategy being “Destination” for a market base of SE Idaho.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The SRMA would be managed to provide various recreational opportunities and outcomes (activities, experiences and benefits) based on a unique niche in each of the 5 RMZs identified below: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Wolverine Canyon (approximately 4,300 acres) (Table 2-5a) ○ Campground (approximately 80 acres) (Table 2-5b) ○ Reservoir (approximately 7,200 acres) (Table 2-5c) ○ Mid River (approximately 7,800 acres) (Table 2-5d) ○ Lower River (approximately 2,400 acres) (Table 2-5e)

Recreation (RE)

- For each RMZ, management direction and the prescribed ROS setting would be followed as described in respective tables.
- An SRMA management plan would be developed and implemented.

Action B-RE-3.1.3 - The Pocatello SRMA (approximately 33,400 acres) would continue to be managed to maintain and/or enhance targeted recreational opportunities, experiences and benefits with a primary market based strategy being “**Community**” for a market base of southeast Idaho.

- The SRMA would be managed to provide various recreational opportunities and outcomes (activities, experiences and benefits) based on a unique niche in each of the 5 RMZ identified below:
 - West Bench (approximately 4,100 acres) (**Table 2-5f**)
 - Blackrock (approximately 15,100 acres) (**Table 2-5g**)
 - Papoose (approximately 3,400 acres) (**Table 2-5h**)
 - East Bench (approximately 1,400 acres) (**Table 2-5i**)
 - Dispersed (approximately 9,400 acres) (**Table 2-5j**)
- For each RMZ, management direction and the prescribed ROS setting would be followed as described in respective tables.
- An SRMA management plan would be developed and implemented.

Action B-RE-3.1.4 - The Oneida Narrows SRMA (approximately 3,600 acres) would be identified and managed to maintain and/or enhance targeted recreational opportunities, experiences and benefits with the primary market based strategy being “**Destination**” for a market base of southeast Idaho and northern Utah.

- The SRMA would be managed to provide various recreational opportunities and outcomes (activities, experiences and benefits) based on a unique niche in each of the 2 RMZ identified below:
 - River (approximately 1,900 acres) (**Table 2-5k**)
 - Reservoir (approximately 1,700 acres) (**Table 2-5l**)
- For each RMZ, management direction and the prescribed ROS setting would be followed as described in respective tables.
- An SRMA management plan would be developed and implemented.

Objective B-RE-3.2 - Continue to manage approximately 555,000 acres as an ERMA).

Action B-RE-3.2.1 - ERMAs would be managed in a custodial manner and provide for visitor health and safety. Basic recreation functions would use the following guidelines:

Administrative Actions:

- SRPs would be issued if consistent with other resources and uses.
- Law Enforcement presence would be limited.
- Visitor services would be limited to basic information such as travel management signs, site specific restrictions, general maps, travel plan maps and very basic facilities may be utilized in high use areas.

Management:

- Focus on minimizing user conflicts with other resources and uses.
- Would be custodially managed, that is minimal physical facilities/ structures would be provided except if necessary to provide for visitor health and safety.

Marketing:

- Provide maps.
- Provide road/trail maps.
- Utilize the internet to provide recreation information.

Monitoring:

- Visitor satisfaction through field contacts.
- User conflict.
- Visitor safety.
- Resource damage.

This page intentionally left blank

Table 2-5a. General Management Guidance and Targeted Outcomes for the Wolverine RMZ, Blackfoot River SRMA

GENERAL MANAGEMENT GUIDANCE

Niche: Wolverine Canyon - dispersed recreation and snowmobiling.

Management Objective: Dispersed recreation, manage to provide visitor safety and minimize user conflicts. Install basic improvements necessary to reduce impacts from recreation activities.

Targeted Outcomes

Primary Activities: Snowmobiling, camping, big game hunting, driving for pleasure, OHV use, picnicking, rock climbing.

Experiences: Developing outdoor recreation skills, exploring, spending time with family/friends, enjoying nature/natural landscape, exercise/physical fitness, physical rest, escape personal/social pressure.

Benefits:

Personal - Improved physical and mental health, improved skills for outdoor enjoyment with others, improve relationship with family/friends, improved awareness of public and private lands, more outdoor oriented lifestyle.

Community/Social - Greater family bonding, more productive opportunities for youth.


Environmental - Increased awareness and protection of distinctive natural landscape features, reduce negative human impacts such as litter, vegetative trampling, and unplanned trails.

Economic - Increase local tourism revenue, provide food.

NATURAL RESOURCE RECREATION SETTINGS

Existing Setting: _____

Prescribed/Desired Setting: Gray shaded area.



PHYSICAL SETTING - Describes the character of the natural landscape.

LAND & FACILITIES	PRIMITIVE PRISTINE TRANSITION	BACK COUNTRY	MIDDLE COUNTRY	FRONT COUNTRY	RURAL	URBAN
REMOVEDNESS	More than 10 miles from any road More than 3 miles from any road	More than 1/2 mile from any kind of road, but less than 3 miles. No road in sight.	On or near 4WD roads, less than 1/2 mile from all improved roads. Roads may be in sight	On or near improved roads, but at least 1/2 mile from highways.	On or near primary highways, but still within a rural area.	Municipal streets and roads within towns or cities.
NATURALNESS	Undisturbed natural landscape.	Naturally-appearing landscape having modifications not readily noticeable.	Naturally appearing landscape except for obvious primitive roads.	Landscape partially modified by roads, utility lines, etc., but none overpower natural landscape features.	Natural landscape substantially modified by agriculture or industrial development.	Urbanized development dominates landscape.
FACILITIES	None	Some primitive trails made of native materials, log bridges, wooden signs.	Maintained and marked trails, simple trailhead developments, improved signs, and very basic toilets.	Improved yet modest, rustic facilities such as campsites, restrooms, trails, and interpretive signs.	Modern facilities such as campgrounds, group shelters, boat launches, and occasional exhibits.	Elaborate full-service facilities such as laundry, restaurants, and groceries.

SOCIAL SETTING - Describes the character of recreation and tourism use.

VISITOR USE & USERS	PRIMITIVE PRISTINE TRANSITION	BACK COUNTRY	MIDDLE COUNTRY	FRONT COUNTRY	RURAL	URBAN
CONTACTS	Fewer than 3 encounters/day and fewer than 6 encounters per day on travel routes.	3-6 encounters/day off travel routes (e.g. campsites) and 7-15 encounters per day on travel routes.	7-14 encounters/day off travel routes (e.g. staging areas) and 15-29 encounters/day en route.	15-29 encounters/day off travel routes (e.g. campgrounds) and 30 or more encounters/day en route.	People seem to be generally everywhere.	Busy place with other people constantly in view.
GROUP SIZE (OTHER THAN YOUR OWN)	Fewer than or equal to 3 people per group.	4-6 people per group.	7-12 people per group.	13-25 people per group.	26-50 people per group.	Greater than 50 people per group.
EVIDENCE OF USE	Only foot prints observed. No noise or litter.	Footprints and bicycle tracks observed. Noise and litter infrequent. Slight vegetation trampling at campsites and popular areas. Fire rings seen.	Vehicle tracks observed. Occasional noise and litter. Vegetation and soils becoming worn at campsites, along travel routes, at popular areas.	Vehicle tracks common. Some noise and litter. Vegetation and soils commonly worn at campsites, along travel routes and popular areas.	Frequent noise and litter. Large, localized vegetation damage & soil compaction	Unavoidable noise & litter. Widespread vegetation damage & soil compaction.

ADMINISTRATIVE SETTING - Describes how public land managers, county commissioners/municipal governments and local businesses care for area and serve local residents.

ADMINISTRATION & SERVICES	PRIMITIVE PRISTINE TRANSITION	BACK COUNTRY	MIDDLE COUNTRY	FRONT COUNTRY	RURAL	URBAN
MECHANIZED USE	None whatsoever.	Mountain bikes and perhaps other mechanized use, but all is non-motorized.	4WD's, ATV's, dirt bikes, or snowmobiles, in addition to non-motorized, mechanized use.	2WD vehicles predominant, but also 4WD's and non-motorized, mechanized use.	Ordinary highway auto and truck traffic is characteristic.	Wide variety of street vehicles and highway traffic is ever-present
VISITOR SERVICES	None is available on-site.	Basic maps, but area personnel seldom available to provide on-site assistance.	Area brochures and maps, plus area personnel occasional present to provide on-site assistance.	Information materials describe recreation areas and activities. Area personnel are periodically available.	Information to the left, plus experience and benefit descriptions. Area personnel do on-site education.	Information to the left, plus regularly scheduled on-site outdoor skills demonstrations clinics.
MANAGEMENT CONTROLS	No visitor controls apparent. No use limits. Enforcement presence very rare.	Signs at key access points on basic user ethics. May have back country use restrictions.	Occasional regulatory signing. Motorized and mechanized use restrictions. Random enforcement presence	Rules clearly posted with some seasonal or day-of-week restrictions. Periodic enforcement presence.	Regulations prominent. Total use limited by permit, reservation, etc. Routine enforcement presence.	Continuous presence to redistribute use and reduce user conflicts, hazards, and resource damage.

Table 2-5b. General Management Guidance and Targeted Outcomes for the Campground RMZ, Blackfoot River SRMA.

GENERAL MANAGEMENT GUIDANCE

Niche: Developed Campground/Blackfoot Reservoir Access

Management Objective: By the end of fiscal year 2008, complete phase 1 of Blackfoot Reservoir Campground, which includes all improvements identified in loop 1 (16 camp sites, 6 day-use sites) of site plans. Develop loops 2 & 3 as visitor use consistently meets or exceeds the capacity of developments within loop 1. Use recreation use permits to supplement funding for maintenance of facilities and maintain proper use levels, consistent with guidance included in the federal land recreation enhancement act.

Targeted Outcomes

Primary Activities: Fishing, camping, picnicking, boating, social gathering.

Experiences: Enjoying nature/outdoors, togetherness with family/friends, participate in desired activities, escape personal/social pressure, enjoy peace and quiet.


Benefits:

Personal - Reduce stress, improve mental and physical health, personal satisfaction, and stronger relationships with family/friends, and enhance lifestyle.

Community/Social - Greater family bonding, more productive opportunities for youth.

Environmental - Reduce negative human impacts from uncontrolled camping.

Economic - Increase local tourism, provide food, and increase desirability as a place to live or retire.



NATURAL RESOURCE RECREATION SETTINGS

Existing Setting:

Prescribed/Desired Setting:

PHYSICAL SETTING - Describes the character of the natural landscape.

LAND & FACILITIES	PRIMITIVE PRISTINE TRANSITION	BACK COUNTRY	MIDDLE COUNTRY	FRONT COUNTRY	RURAL	URBAN	
REMOTENESS	More than 10 miles from any road	More than 3 miles from any road	More than 1/2 mile from any kind of road, but less than 3 miles. No road in sight.	On or near 4WD roads, less than 1/2 mile from all improved roads. Roads may be in sight	On or near improved roads, but at least 1/2 mile from highways.	On or near primary highways, but still within a rural area.	Municipal streets and roads within towns or cities.
NATURALNESS	Undisturbed natural landscape.	Naturally-appearing landscape having modifications not readily noticeable.	Naturally appearing landscape except for obvious primitive roads.	Landscape partially modified by roads, utility lines, etc., but none overpower natural landscape features.	Natural landscape substantially modified by agriculture or industrial development.	Urbanized development dominates landscape.	
FACILITIES	None	Some primitive trails made of native materials, log bridges, wooden signs.	Maintained and marked trails, simple trailhead developments, improved signs, and very basic toilets.	Improved yet modest, rustic facilities such as campsites, restrooms, trails, and interpretive signs.	Modern facilities such as campgrounds, group shelters, boat launches, and occasional exhibits.	Elaborate full-service facilities such as laundry, restaurants, and groceries.	

SOCIAL SETTING - Describes the character of recreation and tourism use.

VISITOR USE & USERS	PRIMITIVE PRISTINE TRANSITION	BACK COUNTRY	MIDDLE COUNTRY	FRONT COUNTRY	RURAL	URBAN
CONTACTS	Fewer than 3 encounters/day and fewer than 6 encounters per day on travel routes.	3-6 encounters/day off travel routes (e.g. campsites) and 7-15 encounters per day on travel routes.	7-14 encounters/day off travel routes (e.g. staging areas) and 15-29 encounters/day en route.	15-29 encounters/day off travel routes (e.g. campgrounds) and 30 or more encounters/day en route.	People seem to be generally everywhere.	Busy place with other people constantly in view.
GROUP SIZE (Other than your own)	Fewer than or equal to 3 people per group.	4-6 people per group.	7-12 people per group.	13-25 people per group.	26-50 people per group.	Greater than 50 people per group.
EVIDENCE OF USE	Only foot prints observed. No noise or litter.	Footprints and bicycle tracks observed. Noise and litter infrequent. Slight vegetation trampling at campsites and popular areas. Fire rings seen.	Vehicle tracks observed. Occasional noise and litter. Vegetation and soils becoming worn at campsites, along travel routes, at popular areas.	Vehicle tracks common. Some noise and litter. Vegetation and soils commonly worn at campsites, along travel routes and popular areas.	Frequent noise and litter. Large, localized vegetation damage & soil compaction	Unavoidable noise & litter. Widespread vegetation damage & soil compaction.

ADMINISTRATIVE SETTING - Describes how public land managers, county commissioners/municipal governments and local businesses care for area and serve local residents.

ADMINISTRATION & SERVICES	PRIMITIVE PRISTINE TRANSITION	BACK COUNTRY	MIDDLE COUNTRY	FRONT COUNTRY	RURAL	URBAN
MECHANIZED USE	None whatsoever.	Mountain bikes and perhaps other mechanized use, but all is non-motorized.	4WD's, ATV's, dirt bikes, or snowmobiles, in addition to non-motorized, mechanized use.	2WD vehicles predominant, but also 4WD's and non-motorized, mechanized use.	Ordinary highway auto and truck traffic is characteristic.	Wide variety of street vehicles and highway traffic is ever-present
VISITOR SERVICES	None is available on-site.	Basic maps, but area personnel seldom available to provide on-site assistance.	Area brochures and maps, plus area personnel occasional present to provide on-site assistance.	Information materials describe recreation areas and activities. Area personnel are periodically available.	Information to the left, plus experience and benefit descriptions. Area personnel do on-site education.	Information to the left, plus regularly scheduled on-site outdoor skills demonstrations clinics.
MANAGEMENT CONTROLS	No visitor controls apparent. No use limits. Enforcement presence very rare.	Signs at key access points on basic user ethics. May have back country use restrictions.	Occasional regulatory signing. Motorized and mechanized use restrictions. Random enforcement presence	Rules clearly posted with some seasonal or day-of-week restrictions. Periodic enforcement presence.	Regulations prominent. Total use limited by permit, reservation, etc. Routine enforcement presence.	Continuous presence to redistribute use and reduce user conflicts, hazards, and resource damage.

Table 2-5c. General Management Guidance and Targeted Outcomes for the Blackfoot Reservoir RMZ, Blackfoot River SRMA.

GENERAL MANAGEMENT GUIDANCE

Niche: Dispersed Recreation/Blackfoot Reservoir Access

Management Objective: Custodial management - provide for user safety and minimize conflicts.

Targeted Outcomes

Primary Activities: Fishing, camping, waterfowl hunting, upland game hunting, big game hunting, driving for pleasure, OHV use, hiking, boating, viewing scenery.

Experiences: Developing outdoor recreation skills and abilities, spending time with family/friends, enjoying nature, exercise/physical fitness, escaping personal/social pressure, physical rest.


Benefits:

Personal - Reduce stress, improve physical and mental health, improve outdoor recreation skills, and improve relationships with family/friends.

Community/Social - Increase sense of ownership in public lands in local area, heightened sense of appreciation of benefits of public lands, increase awareness of community dependency on public lands.

Environmental - Increased awareness and protection of natural landscapes.

Economic - Increase local tourism revenue, Maintenance of area's recreation-tourism market niche or character, Increased desirability as a place to live, provide food.



NATURAL RESOURCE RECREATION SETTINGS

Existing Setting: —————

Prescribed/Desire Setting: Gray shaded area.

PHYSICAL SETTING - Describes the character of the natural landscape.

LAND & FACILITIES	PRIMITIVE PRISTINE TRANSITION	BACK COUNTRY	MIDDLE COUNTRY	FRONT COUNTRY	RURAL	URBAN
RE MOTENESS	More than 10 miles from any road More than 3 miles from any road	More than ½ mile from any kind of road, but less than 3 miles. No road in sight.	On or near 4WD roads, less than ½ mile from all improved roads. Roads may be in sight	On or near improved roads, but at least ½ mile from highways.	On or near primary highways, but still within a rural area.	Municipal streets and roads within towns or cities.
NATURALNESS	Undisturbed natural landscape.	Naturally-appearing landscape having modifications not readily noticeable.	Naturally appearing landscape except for obvious primitive roads.	Landscape partially modified by roads, utility lines, etc., but none overpower natural landscape features.	Natural landscape substantially modified by agriculture or industrial development.	Urbanized development dominates landscape.
FACILITIES	None	Some primitive trails made of native materials, log bridges, wooden signs.	Maintained and marked trails, simple trailhead developments, improved signs, and very basic toilets.	Improved yet modest, rustic facilities such as campsites, restrooms, trails, and interpretive signs.	Modern facilities such as campgrounds, group shelters, boat launches, and occasional exhibits.	Elaborate full-service facilities such as laundry, restaurants, and groceries.

SOCIAL SETTING - Describes the character of recreation and tourism use.

VISITOR USE & USERS	PRIMITIVE PRISTINE TRANSITION	BACK COUNTRY	MIDDLE COUNTRY	FRONT COUNTRY	RURAL	URBAN
CONTACTS	Fewer than 3 encounters/day and fewer than 6 encounters per day on travel routes.	3-6 encounters/day off travel routes (e.g. campsites) and 7-15 encounters per day on travel routes.	7-14 encounters/day off travel routes (e.g. staging areas) and 15-29 encounters/day en route.	15-29 encounters/day off travel routes (e.g. campgrounds) and 30 or more encounters/day en route.	People seem to be generally everywhere.	Busy place with other people constantly in view.
GROUP SIZE (Other than your own)	Fewer than or equal to 3 people per group.	4-6 people per group.	7-12 people per group.	13-25 people per group.	26-50 people per group.	Greater than 50 people per group.
EVIDENCE OF USE	Only foot prints observed. No noise or litter.	Footprints and bicycle tracks observed. Noise and litter infrequent. Slight vegetation trampling at campsites and popular areas. Fire rings seen.	Vehicle tracks observed. Occasional noise and litter. Vegetation and soils becoming worn at campsites, along travel routes, at popular areas.	Vehicle tracks common. Some noise and litter. Vegetation and soils commonly worn at campsites, along travel routes and popular areas.	Frequent noise and litter. Large, localized vegetation damage & soil compaction	Unavoidable noise & litter. Widespread vegetation damage & soil compaction.

ADMINISTRATIVE SETTING - Describes how public land managers, county commissioners/municipal governments and local businesses care for area and serve local residents.

ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES	PRIMITIVE PRISTINE TRANSITION	BACK COUNTRY	MIDDLE COUNTRY	FRONT COUNTRY	RURAL	URBAN
MECHANIZED USE	None whatsoever.	Mountain bikes and perhaps other mechanized use, but all is non-motorized.	4WD's, ATV's, dirt bikes, or snowmobiles, in addition to non-motorized, mechanized use.	2WD vehicles predominant, but also 4WD's and non-motorized, mechanized use.	Ordinary highway auto and truck traffic is characteristic.	Wide variety of street vehicles and highway traffic is ever-present
VISITOR SERVICES	None is available on-site.	Basic maps, but area personnel seldom available to provide on-site assistance.	Area brochures and maps, plus area personnel occasional present to provide on-site assistance.	Information materials describe recreation areas and activities. Area personnel are periodically available.	Information to the left, plus experience and benefit descriptions. Area personnel do on-site education.	Information to the left, plus regularly scheduled on-site outdoor skills demonstrations clinics.
MANAGEMENT CONTROLS	No visitor controls apparent. No use limits. Enforcement presence very rare.	Signs at key access points on basic user ethics. May have back country use restrictions.	Occasional regulatory signing. Motorized and mechanized use restrictions. Random enforcement presence	Rules clearly posted with some seasonal or day-of-week restrictions. Periodic enforcement presence.	Regulations prominent. Total use limited by permit, reservation, etc. Routine enforcement presence.	Continuous presence to redistribute use and reduce user conflicts, hazards, and resource damage.

Table 2-5d. General Management Guidance and Targeted Outcomes for the **Mid-River RMZ**, Blackfoot River SRMA.

GENERAL MANAGEMENT GUIDANCE

Niche: Semi-Developed Campgrounds/Blackfoot River Access

Management Objective: By the end of fiscal year 2012, complete facility improvements such as vault toilets, picnic tables, fire rings, horse shoe pits, fences, and parking barriers at the following sites: Trail Creek Bridge (North & South), Graves Creek, Morgan's Bridge, Cutthroat Trout, and Sagehen Flats.

Targeted Outcomes

Primary Activities: Camping, rafting, kayaking/canoeing, OHV use, horseback riding, social gathering, hiking, viewing scenery, driving for pleasure, big game hunting.

Experiences: Developing skills & abilities, experiencing a greater sense of independence, enjoying risk-taking adventure, spending time with family/friends, enjoying nature, exercise/physical fitness, escape personal/social pressure, learning/teaching about the outdoors.


Benefits:

Personal - Personal development and growth, improve physical and mental health, greater self-reliance, improve outdoor recreation skills, and improve relationship with family/friends, personal appreciation and satisfaction.

Community/Social - Lifestyle improvement, Increase awareness of community dependency on public lands.

Environmental - Increased awareness and protection of natural landscapes.

Economic - Increased local tourism revenue, maintenance of area's recreation-tourism market niche or character, increased desirability as a place to live, provide food.



NATURAL RESOURCE RECREATION SETTINGS

Existing Setting: _____

Prescribed/Desired Setting: Gray shaded area.

PHYSICAL SETTING - Describes the character of the natural landscape.

LAND & FACILITIES	PRIMITIVE PRISTINE TRANSITION	BACK COUNTRY	MIDDLE COUNTRY	FRONT COUNTRY	RURAL	URBAN	
REMOTENESS	More than 10 miles from any road	More than 3 miles from any road	More than 1/2 mile from any kind of road, but less than 3 miles. No road in sight.	On or near 4WD roads, less than 1/2 mile from all improved roads. Roads may be in sight	On or near improved roads, but at least 1/2 mile from highways.	On or near primary highways, but still within a rural area.	Municipal streets and roads within towns or cities.
NATURALNESS	Undisturbed natural landscape.	Naturally-appearing landscape having modifications not readily noticeable.	Naturally appearing landscape except for obvious primitive roads.	Landscape partially modified by roads, utility lines, etc., but none overpower natural landscape features.	Natural landscape substantially modified by agriculture or industrial development.	Urbanized development dominates landscape.	
FACILITIES	None	Some primitive trails made of native materials, log bridges, wooden signs.	Maintained and marked trails, simple trailhead developments, improved signs, and very basic toilets.	Improved yet modest, rustic facilities such as campsites, restrooms, trails, and interpretive signs.	Modern facilities such as campgrounds, group shelters, boat launches, and occasional exhibits.	Elaborate full-service facilities such as laundry, restaurants, and groceries.	

SOCIAL SETTING - Describes the character of recreation and tourism use.

VISITOR USE & USERS	PRIMITIVE PRISTINE TRANSITION	BACK COUNTRY	MIDDLE COUNTRY	FRONT COUNTRY	RURAL	URBAN
CONTACTS	Fewer than 3 encounters/day and fewer than 6 encounters per day on travel routes.	3-6 encounters/day off travel routes (e.g. campsites) and 7-15 encounters per day on travel routes.	7-14 encounters/day off travel routes (e.g. staging areas) and 15-29 encounters/day en route.	15-29 encounters/day off travel routes (e.g. campgrounds) and 30 or more encounters/day en route.	People seem to be generally everywhere.	Busy place with other people constantly in view.
GROUP SIZE (Other than your own)	Fewer than or equal to 3 people per group.	4-6 people per group.	7-12 people per group.	13-25 people per group.	26-50 people per group.	Greater than 50 people per group.
EVIDENCE OF USE	Only foot prints observed. No noise or litter.	Footprints and bicycle tracks observed. Noise and litter infrequent. Slight vegetation trampling at campsites and popular areas. Fire rings seen.	Vehicle tracks observed. Occasional noise and litter. Vegetation and soils becoming worn at campsites, along travel routes, at popular areas.	Vehicle tracks common. Some noise and litter. Vegetation and soils commonly worn at campsites, along travel routes and popular areas.	Frequent noise and litter. Large, localized vegetation damage & soil compaction	Unavoidable noise & litter. Widespread vegetation damage & soil compaction.

ADMINISTRATIVE SETTING - Describes how public land managers, county commissioners/municipal governments and local businesses care for area and serve local residents.

ADMINISTRATION & SERVICES	PRIMITIVE PRISTINE TRANSITION	BACK COUNTRY	MIDDLE COUNTRY	FRONT COUNTRY	RURAL	URBAN
MECHANIZED USE	None whatsoever.	Mountain bikes and perhaps other mechanized use, but all is non-motorized.	4WD's, ATV's, dirt bikes, or snowmobiles, in addition to non-motorized, mechanized use.	2WD vehicles predominant, but also 4WD's and non-motorized, mechanized use.	Ordinary highway auto and truck traffic is characteristic.	Wide variety of street vehicles and highway traffic is ever-present
VISITOR SERVICES	None is available on-site.	Basic maps, but area personnel seldom available to provide on-site assistance.	Area brochures and maps, plus area personnel occasional present to provide on-site assistance.	Information materials describe recreation areas and activities. Area personnel are periodically available.	Information to the left, plus experience and benefit descriptions. Area personnel do on-site education.	Information to the left, plus regularly scheduled on-site outdoor skills demonstrations clinics.
MANAGEMENT CONTROLS	No visitor controls apparent. No use limits. Enforcement presence very rare.	Signs at key access points on basic user ethics. May have back country use restrictions.	Occasional regulatory signing. Motorized and mechanized use restrictions. Random enforcement presence	Rules clearly posted with some seasonal or day-of-week restrictions. Periodic enforcement presence.	Regulations prominent. Total use limited by permit, reservation, etc. Routine enforcement presence.	Continuous presence to redistribute use and reduce user conflicts, hazards, and resource damage.

Table 2-5e. General Management Guidance and Targeted Outcomes for Lower-River RMZ, Blackfoot River SRMA.

GENERAL MANAGEMENT GUIDANCE

Niche: Blackfoot River Canyon/Whitewater

Management Objective: Maintain natural landscape and character of canyon section of river.

Targeted Outcomes

Primary Activities: Kayaking, fishing, hiking, viewing scenery, driving for pleasure, primitive camping, big game hunting, rock climbing, viewing wildlife.

Experiences: Developing skills and abilities, experiencing a greater sense of independence, enjoying risk-taking adventure, spending time with family/friends, enjoying nature, exercise/physical fitness, escape personal/social pressure, learning/teaching about the outdoors, enjoy peace and quiet.


Benefits:

Personal - Personal development and growth, improve physical and mental health, greater self-reliance, improve outdoor recreation skills, and improve relationship with family/friends, personal appreciation and satisfaction.

Community/Social - Lifestyle improvement, Heightened sense of appreciation for public lands in local area.

Environmental - Increased awareness and protection of natural landscapes.

Economic - Increase local tourism revenue, maintenance of area's recreation-tourism market niche or character, increased desirability as a place to live, provide food.



NATURAL RESOURCE RECREATION SETTINGS

Existing Setting: _____

Prescribed/Desired Setting: Gray shaded area.

PHYSICAL SETTING - Describes the character of the natural landscape.

LAND & FACILITIES	PRIMITIVE PRISTINE TRANSITION	BACK COUNTRY	MIDDLE COUNTRY	FRONT COUNTRY	RURAL	URBAN	
REMOTENESS	More than 10 miles from any road	More than 3 miles from any road	More than ½ mile from any kind of road, but less than 3 miles. No road in sight.	On or near 4WD roads, less than ½ mile from all improved roads. Roads may be in sight	On or near improved roads, but at least ½ mile from highways.	On or near primary highways, but still within a rural area.	Municipal streets and roads within towns or cities.
NATURALNESS	Undisturbed natural landscape.	Naturally-appearing landscape having modifications not readily noticeable.	Naturally appearing landscape except for obvious primitive roads.	Landscape partially modified by roads, utility lines, etc., but none overpower natural landscape features.	Natural landscape substantially modified by agriculture or industrial development.	Urbanized development dominates landscape.	
FACILITIES	None	Some primitive trails made of native materials, log bridges, wooden signs.	Maintained and marked trails, simple trailhead developments, improved signs, and very basic toilets.	Improved yet modest, rustic facilities such as campsites, restrooms, trails, and interpretive signs.	Modern facilities such as campgrounds, group shelters, boat launches, and occasional exhibits.	Elaborate full-service facilities such as laundry, restaurants, and groceries.	

SOCIAL SETTING - Describes the character of recreation and tourism use.

VISITOR USE & USERS	PRIMITIVE PRISTINE TRANSITION	BACK COUNTRY	MIDDLE COUNTRY	FRONT COUNTRY	RURAL	URBAN
CONTACTS	Fewer than 3 encounters/day and fewer than 6 encounters per day on travel routes.	3-6 encounters/day off travel routes (e.g. campsites) and 7-15 encounters per day on travel routes.	7-14 encounters/day off travel routes (e.g. staging areas) and 15-29 encounters/day en route.	15-29 encounters/day off travel routes (e.g. campgrounds) and 30 or more encounters/day en route.	People seem to be generally everywhere.	Busy place with other people constantly in view.
GROUP SIZE (Other than your own)	Fewer than or equal to 3 people per group.	4-6 people per group.	7-12 people per group.	13-25 people per group.	26-50 people per group.	Greater than 50 people per group.
EVIDENCE OF USE	Only foot prints observed. No noise or litter.	Footprints and bicycle tracks observed. Noise and litter infrequent. Slight vegetation trampling at campsites and popular areas. Fire rings seen.	Vehicle tracks observed. Occasional noise and litter. Vegetation and soils becoming worn at campsites, along travel routes, at popular areas.	Vehicle tracks common. Some noise and litter. Vegetation and soils commonly worn at campsites, along travel routes and popular areas.	Frequent noise and litter. Large, localized vegetation damage & soil compaction	Unavoidable noise & litter. Widespread vegetation damage & soil compaction.

ADMINISTRATIVE SETTING - Describes how public land managers, county commissioners/municipal governments and local businesses care for area and serve local residents.

ADMINISTRATION & SERVICES	PRIMITIVE PRISTINE TRANSITION	BACK COUNTRY	MIDDLE COUNTRY	FRONT COUNTRY	RURAL	URBAN
MECHANIZED USE	None whatsoever.	Mountain bikes and perhaps other mechanized use, but all is non-motorized.	4WD's, ATV's, dirt bikes, or snowmobiles, in addition to non-motorized, mechanized use.	2WD vehicles predominant, but also 4WD's and non-motorized, mechanized use.	Ordinary highway auto and truck traffic is characteristic.	Wide variety of street vehicles and highway traffic is ever-present
VISITOR SERVICES	None is available on-site.	Basic maps, but area personnel seldom available to provide on-site assistance.	Area brochures and maps, plus area personnel occasional present to provide on-site assistance.	Information materials describe recreation areas and activities. Area personnel are periodically available.	Information to the left, plus experience and benefit descriptions. Area personnel do on-site education.	Information to the left, plus regularly scheduled on-site outdoor skills demonstrations clinics.
MANAGEMENT CONTROLS	No visitor controls apparent. No use limits. Enforcement presence very rare.	Signs at key access points on basic user ethics. May have back country use restrictions.	Occasional regulatory signing. Motorized and mechanized use restrictions. Random enforcement presence	Rules clearly posted with some seasonal or day-of-week restrictions. Periodic enforcement presence.	Regulations prominent. Total use limited by permit, reservation, etc. Routine enforcement presence.	Continuous presence to redistribute use and reduce user conflicts, hazards, and resource damage.

Table 2-5f. General Management Guidance and Targeted Outcomes for the West Bench RMZ, Pocatello SRMA.

GENERAL MANAGEMENT GUIDANCE

Niche: Multiple use recreation opportunities in the Pocatello urban interface environment.

Management Objective: Provide motorized, mechanized, and non-motorized recreation opportunities. Minimize use conflicts. Pursue partnership opportunities with local agencies, user groups, and private landowners. Continue to enforce seasonal closures to protect Pocatello Watershed.

Targeted Outcomes

Primary Activities: OHV use, mountain biking, hiking/running, driving for pleasure, big game hunting, upland game hunting, cross country skiing, dispersed camping.

Experiences: Developing skills & abilities, experiencing a greater sense of independence, enjoying risk-taking adventure, spending time with family/friends, enjoying nature, exercise/physical fitness, escape personal/social pressure, learning/teaching about the outdoors.


Benefits:

Personal - Personal development and growth, improve physical and mental health, greater self-reliance, improve outdoor recreation skills, and improve relationship with family/friends, personal appreciation and satisfaction.

Community/Social - Lifestyle improvement, Heightened sense of appreciation for public lands in local area.

Environmental - Increased awareness and protection of natural landscapes.

Economic - Increased local tourism revenues, maintenance of area's recreation-tourism market niche or character, increased desirability as a place to live.



NATURAL RESOURCE RECREATION SETTINGS

Existing Setting: _____

Prescribed/Desired Setting: Gray shaded area.

PHYSICAL SETTING - Describes the character of the natural landscape.

LAND & FACILITIES	PRIMITIVE PRISTINE TRANSITION		BACK COUNTRY	MIDDLE COUNTRY	FRONT COUNTRY	RURAL	URBAN
	More than 10 miles from any road	More than 3 miles from any road					
REMOTENESS	More than 10 miles from any road	More than 3 miles from any road	More than 1/2 mile from any kind of road, but less than 3 miles. No road in sight.	On or near 4WD roads, less than 1/2 mile from all improved roads. Roads may be in sight	On or near improved roads, but at least 1/2 mile from highways.	On or near primary highways, but still within a rural area.	Municipal streets and roads within towns or cities.
NATURALNESS	Undisturbed natural landscape.		Naturally-appearing landscape having modifications not readily noticeable.	Naturally appearing landscape except for obvious primitive roads.	Landscape partially modified by roads, utility lines, etc., but none overpower natural landscape features.	Natural landscape substantially modified by agriculture or industrial development.	Urbanized development dominates landscape.
FACILITIES	None		Some primitive trails made of native materials, log bridges, wooden signs.	Maintained and marked trails, simple trailhead developments, improved signs, and very basic toilets.	Improved yet modest, rustic facilities such as campsites, restrooms, trails, and interpretive signs.	Modern facilities such as campgrounds, group shelters, boat launches, and occasional exhibits.	Elaborate full-service facilities such as laundry, restaurants, and groceries.

SOCIAL SETTING - Describes the character of recreation and tourism use.

VISITOR USE & USERS	PRIMITIVE PRISTINE TRANSITION		BACK COUNTRY	MIDDLE COUNTRY	FRONT COUNTRY	RURAL	URBAN
	Fewer than 3 encounters/day and fewer than 6 encounters per day on travel routes.	3-6 encounters/day off travel routes (e.g. campsites) and 7-15 encounters per day on travel routes.					
CONTACTS	Fewer than 3 encounters/day and fewer than 6 encounters per day on travel routes.	3-6 encounters/day off travel routes (e.g. campsites) and 7-15 encounters per day on travel routes.	3-6 encounters/day off travel routes (e.g. campsites) and 7-15 encounters per day on travel routes.	7-14 encounters/day off travel routes (e.g. staging areas) and 15-29 encounters/day en route.	15-29 encounters/day off travel routes (e.g. campgrounds) and 30 or more encounters/day en route.	People seem to be generally everywhere.	Busy place with other people constantly in view.
GROUP SIZE (Other than your own)	Fewer than or equal to 3 people per group.	4-6 people per group.	4-6 people per group.	7-12 people per group.	13-25 people per group.	26-50 people per group.	Greater than 50 people per group.
EVIDENCE OF USE	Only foot prints observed. No noise or litter.	Footprints and bicycle tracks observed. Noise and litter infrequent. Slight vegetation trampling at campsites and popular areas. Fire rings seen.	Footprints and bicycle tracks observed. Noise and litter infrequent. Slight vegetation trampling at campsites and popular areas. Fire rings seen.	Vehicle tracks observed. Occasional noise and litter. Vegetation and soils becoming worn at campsites, along travel routes, at popular areas.	Vehicle tracks common. Some noise and litter. Vegetation and soils commonly worn at campsites, along travel routes and popular areas.	Frequent noise and litter. Large, localized vegetation damage & soil compaction	Unavoidable noise & litter. Widespread vegetation damage & soil compaction.

ADMINISTRATIVE SETTING - Describes how public land managers, county commissioners/municipal governments and local businesses care for area and serve local residents.

ADMINISTRATION & SERVICES	PRIMITIVE PRISTINE TRANSITION		BACK COUNTRY	MIDDLE COUNTRY	FRONT COUNTRY	RURAL	URBAN
	None whatsoever.	None is available on-site.					
MECHANIZED USE	None whatsoever.	Mountain bikes and perhaps other mechanized use, but all is non-motorized.	Mountain bikes and perhaps other mechanized use, but all is non-motorized.	4WD's, ATV's, dirt bikes, or snowmobiles, in addition to non-motorized, mechanized use.	2WD vehicles predominant, but also 4WD's and non-motorized, mechanized use.	Ordinary highway auto and truck traffic is characteristic.	Wide variety of street vehicles and highway traffic is ever-present
VISITOR SERVICES	None is available on-site.	Basic maps, but area personnel seldom available to provide on-site assistance.	Basic maps, but area personnel seldom available to provide on-site assistance.	Area brochures and maps, plus area personnel occasional present to provide on-site assistance.	Information materials describe recreation areas and activities. Area personnel are periodically available.	Information to the left, plus experience and benefit descriptions. Area personnel do on-site education.	Information to the left, plus regularly scheduled on-site outdoor skills demonstrations clinics.
MANAGEMENT CONTROLS	No visitor controls apparent. No use limits. Enforcement presence very rare.	Signs at key access points on basic user ethics. May have back country use restrictions.	Signs at key access points on basic user ethics. May have back country use restrictions.	Occasional regulatory signing. Motorized and mechanized use restrictions. Random enforcement presence	Rules clearly posted with some seasonal or day-of-week restrictions. Periodic enforcement presence.	Regulations prominent. Total use limited by permit, reservation, etc. Routine enforcement presence.	Continuous presence to redistribute use and reduce user conflicts, hazards, and resource damage.

Table 2-5g. General Management Guidance and Targeted Outcomes for the **Blackrock RMZ**, Pocatello SRMA.

GENERAL MANAGEMENT GUIDANCE

Niche: Developed trail system, trailheads, picnic sites, and dispersed camping. Multiple access points adjacent to urban interface settings.

Management Objective: Manage network of designated trails to provide a variety of trail opportunities (e.g. degree of difficulty and modes of travel). Maintain facilities in good condition. Continue to implement and enforce seasonal closure for motorized and mechanized travel and shooting restrictions in Blackrock Canyon.

Targeted Outcomes

Primary Activities: OHV use, mountain biking, horseback riding, driving for pleasure, hiking/running, big game hunting, upland game hunting, picnicking, cross country skiing, hang gliding.

Experiences: Developing skills & abilities, experiencing a greater sense of independence, enjoying risk-taking adventure, spending time with family/friends, enjoying nature, exercise/physical fitness, escape personal/social pressure, learning/teaching about the outdoors.


Benefits:

Personal - Personal development and growth, improve physical and mental health, greater self-reliance, improve outdoor recreation skills, and improve relationship with family/friends, personal appreciation and satisfaction.

Community/Social - Lifestyle improvement, Heightened sense of appreciation for public lands in local area.

Environmental - Increased awareness and protection of natural landscapes.

Economic - Increased local tourism revenues, maintenance of area's recreation-tourism market niche or character, increased desirability as a place to live, provide food.



NATURAL RESOURCE RECREATION SETTINGS

Existing Setting: _____

Prescribed/Desired Setting: Gray shaded area.

PHYSICAL SETTING - Describes the character of the natural landscape.

LAND & FACILITIES	PRIMITIVE PRISTINE TRANSITION		BACK COUNTRY	MIDDLE COUNTRY	FRONT COUNTRY	RURAL	URBAN
REMOVEDNESS	More than 10 miles from any road	More than 3 miles from any road	More than 1/2 mile from any kind of road, but less than 3 miles. No road in sight.	On or near 4WD roads, less than 1/2 mile from all improved roads. Roads may be in sight	On or near improved roads, but at least 1/2 mile from highways.	On or near primary highways, but still within a rural area.	Municipal streets and roads within towns or cities.
NATURALNESS	Undisturbed natural landscape.		Naturally-appearing landscape having modifications not readily noticeable.	Naturally appearing landscape except for obvious primitive roads.	Landscape partially modified by roads, utility lines, etc., but none overpower natural landscape features.	Natural landscape substantially modified by agriculture or industrial development.	Urbanized development dominates landscape.
FACILITIES	None		Some primitive trails made of native materials, log bridges, wooden signs.	Maintained and marked trails, simple trailhead developments, improved signs, and very basic toilets.	Improved yet modest, rustic facilities such as campsites, restrooms, trails, and interpretive signs.	Modern facilities such as campgrounds, group shelters, boat launches, and occasional exhibits.	Elaborate full-service facilities such as laundry, restaurants, and groceries.

SOCIAL SETTING - Describes the character of recreation and tourism use.

VISITOR USE & USERS	PRIMITIVE PRISTINE TRANSITION	BACK COUNTRY	MIDDLE COUNTRY	FRONT COUNTRY	RURAL	URBAN
CONTACTS	Fewer than 3 encounters/day and fewer than 6 encounters per day on travel routes.	3-6 encounters/day off travel routes (e.g. campsites) and 7-15 encounters per day on travel routes.	7-14 encounters/day off travel routes (e.g. staging areas) and 15-29 encounters/day en route.	15-29 encounters/day off travel routes (e.g. campgrounds) and 30 or more encounters/day en route.	People seem to be generally everywhere.	Busy place with other people constantly in view.
GROUP SIZE (OTHER THAN YOUR OWN)	Fewer than or equal to 3 people per group.	4-6 people per group.	7-12 people per group.	13-25 people per group.	26-50 people per group.	Greater than 50 people per group.
EVIDENCE OF USE	Only foot prints observed. No noise or litter.	Footprints and bicycle tracks observed. Noise and litter infrequent. Slight vegetation trampling at campsites and popular areas. Fire rings seen.	Vehicle tracks observed. Occasional noise and litter. Vegetation and soils becoming worn at campsites, along travel routes, at popular areas.	Vehicle tracks common. Some noise and litter. Vegetation and soils commonly worn at campsites, along travel routes and popular areas.	Frequent noise and litter. Large, localized vegetation damage & soil compaction	Unavoidable noise & litter. Widespread vegetation damage & soil compaction.

ADMINISTRATIVE SETTING - Describes how public land managers, county commissioners/municipal governments and local businesses care for area and serve local residents.

ADMINISTRATION & SERVICES	PRIMITIVE PRISTINE TRANSITION	BACK COUNTRY	MIDDLE COUNTRY	FRONT COUNTRY	RURAL	URBAN
MECHANIZED USE	None whatsoever.	Mountain bikes and perhaps other mechanized use, but all is non-motorized.	4WD's, ATV's, dirt bikes, or snowmobiles, in addition to non-motorized, mechanized use.	2WD vehicles predominant, but also 4WD's and non-motorized, mechanized use.	Ordinary highway auto and truck traffic is characteristic.	Wide variety of street vehicles and highway traffic is ever-present
VISITOR SERVICES	None is available on-site.	Basic maps, but area personnel seldom available to provide on-site assistance.	Area brochures and maps, plus area personnel occasional present to provide on-site assistance.	Information materials describe recreation areas and activities. Area personnel are periodically available.	Information to the left, plus experience and benefit descriptions. Area personnel do on-site education.	Information to the left, plus regularly scheduled on-site outdoor skills demonstrations clinics.
MANAGEMENT CONTROLS	No visitor controls apparent. No use limits. Enforcement presence very rare.	Signs at key access points on basic user ethics. May have back country use restrictions.	Occasional regulatory signing. Motorized and mechanized use restrictions. Random enforcement presence	Rules clearly posted with some seasonal or day-of-week restrictions. Periodic enforcement presence.	Regulations prominent. Total use limited by permit, reservation, etc. Routine enforcement presence.	Continuous presence to redistribute use and reduce user conflicts, hazards, and resource damage.

Table 2-5h. General Management Guidance and Targeted Outcomes for the Papoose RMZ, Pocatello SRMA.

GENERAL MANAGEMENT GUIDANCE

Niche: Non-motorized trails and access to U.S. Forest Service lands.

Management Objective: Maintain back country to front country physical settings. Provide basic amenities in support of non-motorized activities. Protect area from unauthorized OHV use due to erosive soils, aesthetics, user conflicts, and safety. Pursue partnership opportunities with local agencies, user groups, and private landowners.

Targeted Outcomes

Primary Activities: Hiking, horseback riding, big game hunting, upland game hunting.

Experiences: Developing skills & abilities, experiencing a greater sense of independence, enjoying risk-taking adventure, spending time with family/friends, enjoying nature, exercise/physical fitness, escape personal/social pressure.


Benefits:

Personal - Personal development and growth, improve physical and mental health, greater self-reliance, improve outdoor recreation skills, and improve relationship with family/friends, personal appreciation and satisfaction.

Community/Social - Lifestyle improvement, Heightened sense of appreciation for public lands in local area.

Environmental - Increased awareness and protection of natural landscapes.

Economic - Increased local tourism revenues, maintenance of area's recreation-tourism market niche or character, increased desirability as a place to live, provide food.



NATURAL RESOURCE RECREATION SETTINGS

Existing Setting:

Prescribed/Desired Setting:

PHYSICAL SETTING - Describes the character of the natural landscape.

LAND & FACILITIES	PRIMITIVE PRISTINE TRANSITION	BACK COUNTRY	MIDDLE COUNTRY	FRONT COUNTRY	RURAL	URBAN	
REMOTENESS	More than 10 miles from any road	More than 3 miles from any road	More than 1/2 mile from any kind of road, but less than 3 miles. No road in sight.	On or near 4WD roads, less than 1/2 mile from all improved roads. Roads may be in sight	On or near improved roads, but at least 1/2 mile from highways.	On or near primary highways, but still within a rural area.	Municipal streets and roads within towns or cities.
NATURALNESS	Undisturbed natural landscape.	Naturally-appearing landscape having modifications not readily noticeable.	Naturally appearing landscape except for obvious primitive roads.	Landscape partially modified by roads, utility lines, etc., but none overpower natural landscape features.	Natural landscape substantially modified by agriculture or industrial development.	Urbanized development dominates landscape.	
FACILITIES	None	Some primitive trails made of native materials, log bridges, wooden signs.	Maintained and marked trails, simple trailhead developments, improved signs, and very basic toilets.	Improved yet modest, rustic facilities such as campsites, restrooms, trails, and interpretive signs.	Modern facilities such as campgrounds, group shelters, boat launches, and occasional exhibits.	Elaborate full-service facilities such as laundry, restaurants, and groceries.	

SOCIAL SETTING - Describes the character of recreation and tourism use.

VISITOR USE & USERS	PRIMITIVE PRISTINE TRANSITION	BACK COUNTRY	MIDDLE COUNTRY	FRONT COUNTRY	RURAL	URBAN
CONTACTS	Fewer than 3 encounters/day and fewer than 6 encounters per day on travel routes.	3-6 encounters/day off travel routes (e.g. campsites) and 7-15 encounters per day on travel routes.	7-14 encounters/day off travel routes (e.g. staging areas) and 15-29 encounters/day en route.	15-29 encounters/day off travel routes (e.g. campgrounds) and 30 or more encounters/day en route.	People seem to be generally everywhere.	Busy place with other people constantly in view.
GROUP SIZE (OTHER THAN YOUR OWN)	Fewer than or equal to 3 people per group.	4-6 people per group.	7-12 people per group.	13-25 people per group.	26-50 people per group.	Greater than 50 people per group.
EVIDENCE OF USE	Only foot prints observed. No noise or litter.	Footprints and bicycle tracks observed. Noise and litter infrequent. Slight vegetation trampling at campsites and popular areas. Fire rings seen.	Vehicle tracks observed. Occasional noise and litter. Vegetation and soils becoming worn at campsites, along travel routes, at popular areas.	Vehicle tracks common. Some noise and litter. Vegetation and soils commonly worn at campsites, along travel routes and popular areas.	Frequent noise and litter. Large, localized vegetation damage & soil compaction	Unavoidable noise & litter. Widespread vegetation damage & soil compaction.

ADMINISTRATIVE SETTING - Describes how public land managers, county commissioners/municipal governments and local businesses care for area and serve local residents.

ADMINISTRATION & SERVICES	PRIMITIVE PRISTINE TRANSITION	BACK COUNTRY	MIDDLE COUNTRY	FRONT COUNTRY	RURAL	URBAN
MECHANIZED USE	None whatsoever.	Mountain bikes and perhaps other mechanized use, but all is non-motorized.	4WD's, ATV's, dirt bikes, or snowmobiles, in addition to non-motorized, mechanized use.	2WD vehicles predominant, but also 4WD's and non-motorized, mechanized use.	Ordinary highway auto and truck traffic is characteristic.	Wide variety of street vehicles and highway traffic is ever-present
VISITOR SERVICES	None is available on-site.	Basic maps, but area personnel seldom available to provide on-site assistance.	Area brochures and maps, plus area personnel occasional present to provide on-site assistance.	Information materials describe recreation areas and activities. Area personnel are periodically available.	Information to the left, plus experience and benefit descriptions. Area personnel do on-site education.	Information to the left, plus regularly scheduled on-site outdoor skills demonstrations clinics.
MANAGEMENT CONTROLS	No visitor controls apparent. No use limits. Enforcement presence very rare.	Signs at key access points on basic user ethics. May have back country use restrictions.	Occasional regulatory signing. Motorized and mechanized use restrictions. Random enforcement presence	Rules clearly posted with some seasonal or day-of-week restrictions. Periodic enforcement presence.	Regulations prominent. Total use limited by permit, reservation, etc. Routine enforcement presence.	Continuous presence to redistribute use and reduce user conflicts, hazards, and resource damage.

Table 2-5i. General Management Guidance and Targeted Outcomes for the East Bench RMZ, Pocatello SRMA.

GENERAL MANAGEMENT GUIDANCE

Niche: Multiple use recreation opportunities in the Pocatello urban interface environment.

Management Objective: Provide motorized, mechanized, and non-motorized recreation opportunities. Minimize use conflicts. Pursue partnership opportunities with local agencies, user groups, and private landowners.

Targeted Outcomes

Primary Activities: OHV use, mountain biking, hiking/running, cross country skiing.

Experiences: Developing skills & abilities, experiencing a greater sense of independence, enjoying risk-taking adventure, spending time with family/friends, enjoying nature, exercise/physical fitness, escape personal/social pressure, learning/teaching about the outdoors.


Benefits:

Personal - Personal development and growth, improve physical and mental health, greater self-reliance, improve outdoor recreation skills, and improve relationship with family/friends, personal appreciation and satisfaction.

Community/Social - Lifestyle improvement, heightened sense of appreciation for public lands in local area.

Environmental - Increased awareness and protection of natural landscapes.

Economic - Increased local tourism revenues, maintenance of area's recreation-tourism market, increased desirability as a place to live.



NATURAL RESOURCE RECREATION SETTINGS

Existing Setting: _____

Prescribed/Desired Setting: Gray shaded area.

PHYSICAL SETTING - Describes the character of the natural landscape.

LAND & FACILITIES	PRIMITIVE PRISTINE TRANSITION		BACK COUNTRY	MIDDLE COUNTRY	FRONT COUNTRY	RURAL	URBAN
REMOVEDNESS	More than 10 miles from any road	More than 3 miles from any road	More than ½ mile from any kind of road, but less than 3 miles. No road in sight.	On or near 4WD roads, less than ½ mile from all improved roads. Roads may be in sight	On or near improved roads, but at least ½ mile from highways.	On or near primary highways, but still within a rural area.	Municipal streets and roads within towns or cities.
NATURALNESS	Undisturbed natural landscape.		Naturally-appearing landscape having modifications not readily noticeable.	Naturally appearing landscape except for obvious primitive roads.	Landscape partially modified by roads, utility lines, etc., but none overpower natural landscape features.	Natural landscape substantially modified by agriculture or industrial development.	Urbanized development dominates landscape.
FACILITIES	None		Some primitive trails made of native materials, log bridges, wooden signs.	Maintained and marked trails, simple trailhead developments, improved signs, and very basic toilets.	Improved yet modest, rustic facilities such as campsites, restrooms, trails, and interpretive signs.	Modern facilities such as campgrounds, group shelters, boat launches, and occasional exhibits.	Elaborate full-service facilities such as laundry, restaurants, and groceries.

SOCIAL SETTING - Describes the character of recreation and tourism use.

VISITOR USE & USERS	PRIMITIVE PRISTINE TRANSITION	BACK COUNTRY	MIDDLE COUNTRY	FRONT COUNTRY	RURAL	URBAN
CONTACTS	Fewer than 3 encounters/day and fewer than 6 encounters per day on travel routes.	3-6 encounters/day off travel routes (e.g. campsites) and 7-15 encounters per day on travel routes.	7-14 encounters/day off travel routes (e.g. staging areas) and 15-29 encounters/day en route.	15-29 encounters/day off travel routes (e.g. campgrounds) and 30 or more encounters/day en route.	People seem to be generally everywhere.	Busy place with other people constantly in view.
GROUP SIZE (Other than your own)	Fewer than or equal to 3 people per group.	4-6 people per group.	7-12 people per group.	13-25 people per group.	26-50 people per group.	Greater than 50 people per group.
EVIDENCE OF USE	Only foot prints observed. No noise or litter.	Footprints and bicycle tracks observed. Noise and litter infrequent. Slight vegetation trampling at campsites and popular areas. Fire rings seen.	Vehicle tracks observed. Occasional noise and litter. Vegetation and soils becoming worn at campsites, along travel routes, at popular areas.	Vehicle tracks common. Some noise and litter. Vegetation and soils commonly worn at campsites, along travel routes and popular areas.	Frequent noise and litter. Large, localized vegetation damage & soil compaction	Unavoidable noise & litter. Widespread vegetation damage & soil compaction.

ADMINISTRATIVE SETTING - Describes how public land managers, county commissioners/municipal governments and local businesses care for area and serve local residents.

ADMINISTRATION & SERVICES	PRIMITIVE PRISTINE TRANSITION	BACK COUNTRY	MIDDLE COUNTRY	FRONT COUNTRY	RURAL	URBAN
MECHANIZED USE	None whatsoever.	Mountain bikes and perhaps other mechanized use, but all is non-motorized.	4WD's, ATV's, dirt bikes, or snowmobiles, in addition to non-motorized, mechanized use.	2WD vehicles predominant, but also 4WD's and non-motorized, mechanized use.	Ordinary highway auto and truck traffic is characteristic.	Wide variety of street vehicles and highway traffic is ever-present
VISITOR SERVICES	None is available on-site.	Basic maps, but area personnel seldom available to provide on-site assistance.	Area brochures and maps, plus area personnel occasional present to provide on-site assistance.	Information materials describe recreation areas and activities. Area personnel are periodically available.	Information to the left, plus experience and benefit descriptions. Area personnel do on-site education.	Information to the left, plus regularly scheduled on-site outdoor skills demonstrations clinics.
MANAGEMENT CONTROLS	No visitor controls apparent. No use limits. Enforcement presence very rare.	Signs at key access points on basic user ethics. May have back country use restrictions.	Occasional regulatory signing. Motorized and mechanized use restrictions. Random enforcement presence	Rules clearly posted with some seasonal or day-of-week restrictions. Periodic enforcement presence.	Regulations prominent. Total use limited by permit, reservation, etc. Routine enforcement presence.	Continuous presence to redistribute use and reduce user conflicts, hazards, and resource damage.

Table 2-5j. General Management Guidance and Targeted Outcomes for the Dispersed RMZ, Pocatello SRMA.

GENERAL MANAGEMENT GUIDANCE

Niche: Dispersed recreation in urban interface environment.

Management Objective: Manage to provide visitor safety and minimize user conflicts. Provide visitor information on web site and printed materials. Pursue partnership opportunities with local agencies and user groups. Maintain middle country to front country physical settings.

Targeted Outcomes

Primary Activities: Hiking/running, mountain biking, horseback riding, driving for pleasure, OHV use, dispersed camping.

Experiences: Developing skills & abilities, experiencing a greater sense of independence, enjoying risk-taking adventure, spending time with family/friends, enjoying nature, exercise/physical fitness, escape personal/social pressure, learning/teaching about the outdoors.


Benefits:

Personal - Personal development and growth, improve physical and mental health, greater self-reliance, improve outdoor recreation skills, and improve relationship with family/friends, personal appreciation and satisfaction.

Community/Social - Lifestyle improvement, Heightened sense of appreciation for public lands in local area.

Environmental - Increased awareness and protection of natural landscapes

Economic - Increased local tourism revenues, maintenance of area's recreation-tourism market niche or character, increased desirability as a place to live, provide food.



NATURAL RESOURCE RECREATION SETTINGS

Existing Setting: _____

Prescribed Setting: Gray shaded area.

PHYSICAL SETTING - Describes the character of the natural landscape.

LAND & FACILITIES	PRIMITIVE PRISTINE TRANSITION	BACK COUNTRY	MIDDLE COUNTRY	FRONT COUNTRY	RURAL	URBAN	
REMOTENESS	More than 10 miles from any road	More than 3 miles from any road	More than ½ mile from any kind of road, but less than 3 miles. No road in sight.	On or near 4WD roads, less than ½ mile from all improved roads. Roads may be in sight	On or near improved roads, but at least ½ mile from highways.	On or near primary highways, but still within a rural area.	Municipal streets and roads within towns or cities.
NATURALNESS	Undisturbed natural landscape.	Naturally-appearing landscape having modifications not readily noticeable.	Naturally appearing landscape except for obvious primitive roads.	Landscape partially modified by roads, utility lines, etc., but none overpower natural landscape features.	Natural landscape substantially modified by agriculture or industrial development.	Urbanized development dominates landscape.	
FACILITIES	None	Some primitive trails made of native materials, log bridges, wooden signs.	Maintained and marked trails, simple trailhead developments, improved signs, and very basic toilets.	Improved yet modest, rustic facilities such as campsites, restrooms, trails, and interpretive signs.	Modern facilities such as campgrounds, group shelters, boat launches, and occasional exhibits.	Elaborate full-service facilities such as laundry, restaurants, and groceries.	

SOCIAL SETTING - Describes the character of recreation and tourism use.

VISITOR USE & USERS	PRIMITIVE PRISTINE TRANSITION	BACK COUNTRY	MIDDLE COUNTRY	FRONT COUNTRY	RURAL	URBAN
CONTACTS	Fewer than 3 encounters/day and fewer than 6 encounters per day on travel routes.	3-6 encounters/day off travel routes (e.g. campsites) and 7-15 encounters per day on travel routes.	7-14 encounters/day off travel routes (e.g. staging areas) and 15-29 encounters/day en route.	15-29 encounters/day off travel routes (e.g. campgrounds) and 30 or more encounters/day en route.	People seem to be generally everywhere.	Busy place with other people constantly in view.
GROUP SIZE (Other than your own)	Fewer than or equal to 3 people per group.	4-6 people per group.	7-12 people per group.	13-25 people per group.	26-50 people per group.	Greater than 50 people per group.
EVIDENCE OF USE	Only foot prints observed. No noise or litter.	Footprints and bicycle tracks observed. Noise and litter infrequent. Slight vegetation trampling at campsites and popular areas. Fire rings seen.	Vehicle tracks observed. Occasional noise and litter. Vegetation and soils becoming worn at campsites, along travel routes, at popular areas.	Vehicle tracks common. Some noise and litter. Vegetation and soils commonly worn at campsites, along travel routes and popular areas.	Frequent noise and litter. Large, localized vegetation damage & soil compaction	Unavoidable noise & litter. Widespread vegetation damage & soil compaction.

ADMINISTRATIVE SETTING - Describes how public land managers, county commissioners/municipal governments and local businesses care for area and serve local residents.

ADMINISTRATION & SERVICES	PRIMITIVE PRISTINE TRANSITION	BACK COUNTRY	MIDDLE COUNTRY	FRONT COUNTRY	RURAL	URBAN
MECHANIZED USE	None whatsoever.	Mountain bikes and perhaps other mechanized use, but all is non-motorized.	4WD's, ATV's, dirt bikes, or snowmobiles, in addition to non-motorized, mechanized use.	2WD vehicles predominant, but also 4WD's and non-motorized, mechanized use.	Ordinary highway auto and truck traffic is characteristic.	Wide variety of street vehicles and highway traffic is ever-present
VISITOR SERVICES	None is available on-site.	Basic maps, but area personnel seldom available to provide on-site assistance.	Area brochures and maps, plus area personnel occasional present to provide on-site assistance.	Information materials describe recreation areas and activities. Area personnel are periodically available.	Information to the left, plus experience and benefit descriptions. Area personnel do on-site education.	Information to the left, plus regularly scheduled on-site outdoor skills demonstrations clinics.
MANAGEMENT CONTROLS	No visitor controls apparent. No use limits. Enforcement presence very rare.	Signs at key access points on basic user ethics. May have back country use restrictions.	Occasional regulatory signing. Motorized and mechanized use restrictions. Random enforcement presence	Rules clearly posted with some seasonal or day-of-week restrictions. Periodic enforcement presence.	Regulations prominent. Total use limited by permit, reservation, etc. Routine enforcement presence.	Continuous presence to redistribute use and reduce user conflicts, hazards, and resource damage.

Table 2-5k. General Management Guidance and Targeted Outcomes for the River RMZ, Oneida Narrows SRMA.

GENERAL MANAGEMENT GUIDANCE

Niche: Oneida Narrows - Bear River Access

Management Objective: Maintain existing facilities in Redpoint Campground. Pursue opportunities for land tenure adjustment providing settings appropriate for future recreation development. Use recreation use permits to supplement funding for maintenance of facilities and maintain proper use levels, consistent with guidance included in the Federal Land Recreation Enhancement Act.

Targeted Outcomes

Primary Activities: Camping, fishing, non-motorized boating, social gathering, picnicking, turkey/upland game hunting, big game hunting, swimming, viewing scenery, driving for pleasure.

Experiences: Spending time with family/friends, enjoying nature/natural landscape, developing outdoor recreation skills, exercise/physical fitness, physical rest, escape personal/social pressure.


Benefits:

Personal: Improve physical and mental health, improved skills for outdoor enjoyment with others; improve relationship with family/friends, greater sense of personal accountability for acting responsibly on public lands, more outdoor oriented lifestyle.

Community/Social: Greater family bonding, More productive opportunities for youth.

Environmental: Maintenance of distinctive free-flowing river recreation setting character, improved maintenance of developed sites and surrounding areas, reduce unplanned/non-designated trails.

Economic: Increase local tourism revenue, positive contributions to local economic stability, provide food, and increase desirability as a place to live or retire.



NATURAL RESOURCE RECREATION SETTINGS

Existing Setting:

Prescribed Setting:

PHYSICAL SETTING - Describes the character of the natural landscape.

LAND & FACILITIES	PRIMITIVE PRISTINE TRANSITION		BACK COUNTRY	MIDDLE COUNTRY	FRONT COUNTRY	RURAL	URBAN
	More than 10 miles from any road	More than 3 miles from any road					
REMOTENESS	More than 10 miles from any road	More than 3 miles from any road	More than 1/2 mile from any kind of road, but less than 3 miles. No road in sight.	On or near 4WD roads, less than 1/2 mile from all improved roads. Roads may be in sight	On or near improved roads, but at least 1/2 mile from highways.	On or near primary highways, but still within a rural area.	Municipal streets and roads within towns or cities.
NATURALNESS	Undisturbed natural landscape.		Naturally-appearing landscape having modifications not readily noticeable.	Naturally appearing landscape except for obvious primitive roads.	Landscape partially modified by roads, utility lines, etc., but none overpower natural landscape features.	Natural landscape substantially modified by agriculture or industrial development.	Urbanized development dominates landscape.
FACILITIES	None		Some primitive trails made of native materials, log bridges, wooden signs.	Maintained and marked trails, simple trailhead developments, improved signs, and very basic toilets.	Improved yet modest, rustic facilities such as campsites, restrooms, trails, and interpretive signs.	Modern facilities such as campgrounds, group shelters, boat launches, and occasional exhibits.	Elaborate full-service facilities such as laundry, restaurants, and groceries.

SOCIAL SETTING - Describes the character of recreation and tourism use.

VISITOR USE & USERS	PRIMITIVE PRISTINE TRANSITION		BACK COUNTRY	MIDDLE COUNTRY	FRONT COUNTRY	RURAL	URBAN
	Fewer than 3 encounters/day and fewer than 6 encounters per day on travel routes.	More than 3 encounters/day and fewer than 6 encounters per day on travel routes.					
CONTACTS	Fewer than 3 encounters/day and fewer than 6 encounters per day on travel routes.	More than 3 encounters/day and fewer than 6 encounters per day on travel routes.	3-6 encounters/day off travel routes (e.g. campsites) and 7-15 encounters per day on travel routes.	7-14 encounters/day off travel routes (e.g. staging areas) and 15-29 encounters/day en route.	15-29 encounters/day off travel routes (e.g. campgrounds) and 30 or more encounters/day en route.	People seem to be generally everywhere.	Busy place with other people constantly in view.
GROUP SIZE (Other than your own)	Fewer than or equal to 3 people per group.	More than 3 people per group.	4-6 people per group.	7-12 people per group.	13-25 people per group.	26-50 people per group.	Greater than 50 people per group.
EVIDENCE OF USE	Only foot prints observed. No noise or litter.	Footprints and bicycle tracks observed. Noise and litter infrequent. Slight vegetation trampling at campsites and popular areas. Fire rings seen.	Footprints and bicycle tracks observed. Noise and litter infrequent. Slight vegetation trampling at campsites and popular areas. Fire rings seen.	Vehicle tracks observed. Occasional noise and litter. Vegetation and soils becoming worn at campsites, along travel routes, at popular areas.	Vehicle tracks common. Some noise and litter. Vegetation and soils commonly worn at campsites, along travel routes and popular areas.	Frequent noise and litter. Large, localized vegetation damage & soil compaction	Unavoidable noise & litter. Widespread vegetation damage & soil compaction.

ADMINISTRATIVE SETTING - Describes how public land managers, county commissioners/municipal governments and local businesses care for area and serve local residents.

ADMINISTRATION & SERVICES	PRIMITIVE PRISTINE TRANSITION		BACK COUNTRY	MIDDLE COUNTRY	FRONT COUNTRY	RURAL	URBAN
	None whatsoever.	Some mechanized use, but all is non-motorized.					
MECHANIZED USE	None whatsoever.	Some mechanized use, but all is non-motorized.	Mountain bikes and perhaps other mechanized use, but all is non-motorized.	4WD's, ATV's, dirt bikes, or snowmobiles, in addition to non-motorized, mechanized use.	2WD vehicles predominant, but also 4WD's and non-motorized, mechanized use.	Ordinary highway auto and truck traffic is characteristic.	Wide variety of street vehicles and highway traffic is ever-present
VISITOR SERVICES	None is available on-site.	Basic maps, but area personnel seldom available to provide on-site assistance.	Basic maps, but area personnel seldom available to provide on-site assistance.	Area brochures and maps, plus area personnel occasional present to provide on-site assistance.	Information materials describe recreation areas and activities. Area personnel are periodically available.	Information to the left, plus experience and benefit descriptions. Area personnel do on-site education.	Information to the left, plus regularly scheduled on-site outdoor skills demonstrations clinics.
MANAGEMENT CONTROLS	No visitor controls apparent. No use limits. Enforcement presence very rare.	Signs at key access points on basic user ethics. May have back country use restrictions.	Signs at key access points on basic user ethics. May have back country use restrictions.	Occasional regulatory signing. Motorized and mechanized use restrictions. Random enforcement presence	Rules clearly posted with some seasonal or day-of-week restrictions. Periodic enforcement presence.	Regulations prominent. Total use limited by permit, reservation, etc. Routine enforcement presence.	Continuous presence to redistribute use and reduce user conflicts, hazards, and resource damage.

Table 2-5I. General Management Guidance and Targeted Outcomes for the Oneida Reservoir RMZ, Oneida Narrows SRMA.

GENERAL MANAGEMENT GUIDANCE

Niche: Developed Campground/Oneida Narrows Reservoir Access

Management Objective: Maintain opportunities within Maple Grove Campgrounds at existing level of development. Manage fees based on fair market value. Maintain facilities in good condition. Discourage camping along the reservoir - direct to developed sites within the SRMA.

Targeted Outcomes

Primary Activities: Camping, fishing, boating, water skiing, social gathering, picnicking, turkey/upland game hunting, big game hunting, swimming, jet skiing, viewing scenery, driving for pleasure.

Experiences: Spending time with family/friends, enjoying nature/natural landscape, developing outdoor recreation skills, exercise/physical fitness, physical rest, escape personal/social pressure.


Benefits:

Personal - Improve physical and mental health, improved skills for outdoor enjoyment with others; improve relationship with family/friends, greater sense of personal accountability for acting responsibly on public lands, more outdoor oriented lifestyle.

Community/Social - Greater family bonding, More productive opportunities for youth.

Environmental - Maintenance of distinctive recreation setting character, improved maintenance of developed sites and surrounding areas, reduce unplanned/non-designated trails.

Economic - Increase local tourism revenue, positive contributions to local economic stability, provide food, increase desirability as a place to live or retire.



NATURAL RESOURCE RECREATION SETTINGS

Existing Setting: _____

Prescribed/Desired Setting: Gray shaded area.

PHYSICAL SETTING - Describes the character of the natural landscape.

LAND & FACILITIES	PRIMITIVE PRISTINE TRANSITION	BACK COUNTRY	MIDDLE COUNTRY	FRONT COUNTRY	RURAL	URBAN	
REMOTENESS	More than 10 miles from any road	More than 3 miles from any road	More than ½ mile from any kind of road, but less than 3 miles. No road in sight.	On or near 4WD roads, less than ½ mile from all improved roads. Roads may be in sight	On or near improved roads, but at least ½ mile from highways.	On or near primary highways, but still within a rural area.	Municipal streets and roads within towns or cities.
NATURALNESS	Undisturbed natural landscape.	Naturally-appearing landscape having modifications not readily noticeable.	Naturally appearing landscape except for obvious primitive roads.	Landscape partially modified by roads, utility lines, etc., but none overpower natural landscape features.	Natural landscape substantially modified by agriculture or industrial development.	Urbanized development dominates landscape.	
FACILITIES	None	Some primitive trails made of native materials, log bridges, wooden signs.	Maintained and marked trails, simple trailhead developments, improved signs, and very basic toilets.	Improved yet modest, rustic facilities such as campsites, restrooms, trails, and interpretive signs.	Modern facilities such as campgrounds, group shelters, boat launches, and occasional exhibits.	Elaborate full-service facilities such as laundry, restaurants, and groceries.	

SOCIAL SETTING - Describes the character of recreation and tourism use.

VISITOR USE & USERS	PRIMITIVE PRISTINE TRANSITION	BACK COUNTRY	MIDDLE COUNTRY	FRONT COUNTRY	RURAL	URBAN
CONTACTS	Fewer than 3 encounters/day and fewer than 6 encounters per day on travel routes.	3-6 encounters/day off travel routes (e.g. campsites) and 7-15 encounters per day on travel routes.	7-14 encounters/day off travel routes (e.g. staging areas) and 15-29 encounters/day en route.	15-29 encounters/day off travel routes (e.g. campgrounds) and 30 or more encounters/day en route.	People seem to be generally everywhere.	Busy place with other people constantly in view.
GROUP SIZE (Other than your own)	Fewer than or equal to 3 people per group.	4-6 people per group.	7-12 people per group.	13-25 people per group.	26-50 people per group.	Greater than 50 people per group.
EVIDENCE OF USE	Only foot prints observed. No noise or litter.	Footprints and bicycle tracks observed. Noise and litter infrequent. Slight vegetation trampling at campsites and popular areas. Fire rings seen.	Vehicle tracks observed. Occasional noise and litter. Vegetation and soils becoming worn at campsites, along travel routes, at popular areas.	Vehicle tracks common. Some noise and litter. Vegetation and soils commonly worn at campsites, along travel routes and popular areas.	Frequent noise and litter. Large, localized vegetation damage & soil compaction	Unavoidable noise & litter. Widespread vegetation damage & soil compaction.

ADMINISTRATIVE SETTING - Describes how public land managers, county commissioners/municipal governments and local businesses care for area and serve local residents.

ADMINISTRATION & SERVICES	PRIMITIVE PRISTINE TRANSITION	BACK COUNTRY	MIDDLE COUNTRY	FRONT COUNTRY	RURAL	URBAN
MECHANIZED USE	None whatsoever.	Mountain bikes and perhaps other mechanized use, but all is non-motorized.	4WD's, ATV's, dirt bikes, or snowmobiles, in addition to non-motorized, mechanized use.	2WD vehicles predominant, but also 4WD's and non-motorized, mechanized use.	Ordinary highway auto and truck traffic is characteristic.	Wide variety of street vehicles and highway traffic is ever-present
VISITOR SERVICES	None is available on-site.	Basic maps, but area personnel seldom available to provide on-site assistance.	Area brochures and maps, plus area personnel occasional present to provide on-site assistance.	Information materials describe recreation areas and activities. Area personnel are periodically available.	Information to the left, plus experience and benefit descriptions. Area personnel do on-site education.	Information to the left, plus regularly scheduled on-site outdoor skills demonstrations clinics.
MANAGEMENT CONTROLS	No visitor controls apparent. No use limits. Enforcement presence very rare.	Signs at key access points on basic user ethics. May have back country use restrictions.	Occasional regulatory signing. Motorized and mechanized use restrictions. Random enforcement presence	Rules clearly posted with some seasonal or day-of-week restrictions. Periodic enforcement presence.	Regulations prominent. Total use limited by permit, reservation, etc. Routine enforcement presence.	Continuous enforcement presence to redistribute use and reduce user conflicts, hazards, and resource damage.

Recreation (RE)	
Goal RE-4. Establish a comprehensive approach to travel planning and management.	
<i>Management Objectives</i>	<i>Management Actions</i>
<p>Objective B-RE-4.1. Designate all public lands in the planning area as Open, Limited, or Closed.</p>	<p>Action B-RE-4.1.1 - WSAs and RNAs (approximately 12,700 acres) would be designated Closed to OHV use and all remaining public lands (approximately 601,100 acres) would be designated as Limited for OHV use.</p> <p>Action B-RE-4.1.2 - Mechanized travel would be limited to designated routes.</p> <p>Action B-RE-4.1.3 - Non-motorized travel would not be restricted.</p> <p>Action B-RE-4.1.4 - OHV opportunities would be preserved by</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Maintaining existing routes. 2. Providing moderate control on OHV use. <p>Action B-RE-4.1.5 - Until travel management planning/route designation is completed, travel would be managed in the following manner:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Limit travel to designated routes as identified in the Chinese Peak/Blackrock activity plan 2. Recognize existing seasonal closures, 3. Recognize site specific closures for WSA's, ACEC's, and RNA's, and 4. Limit motorized and mechanized travel to existing routes in all other areas. <p>Action B-RE-4.1.6 - For the development of travel management plans, baseline and/or preliminary road/trail networks would be identified using any one of the following available sources:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Most current existing DOQs as of 2004, • 2004 NAIP digital color aerial photos, • Most current existing USGS topographical maps as of January 1, 2005. <p>Action B-RE-4.1.7 - During travel management planning, provide intensive use areas for valid motorized activities (e.g., rock crawling, motocross riding) by designating appropriate routes for these activities in front country or rural settings. These areas would not exceed a "footprint" larger than 80 acres.</p> <p>Routes may be designated during travel management planning only if they are consistent with the following criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Area is suitable for intensive OHV use, • No compelling resource issues or protection needs identified, • No user conflicts or public safety issues to warrant restricting intensive use. <p>Action B-RE-4.1.8 - Cross country travel by motorized vehicles and/or the use of roads or trails not identified and/or designated during BLM travel management planning and which are associated with authorized/permitted activities (e.g., range improvement construction/ maintenance, land use authorizations, ROWs, mineral/energy exploration) and/or agency administrative purposes would be authorized only by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Obtaining prior written approval of the authorized officer, or • As stipulated in appropriate permits/authorizations. <p>Activities such as, but not limited to, wildland fire suppression, human health and safety, and cadastral survey would be exempt.</p> <p>Action B-RE-4.1.9 - Organized events would be compliant with established OHV designations and would be consistent with other resources and uses.</p> <p>Action B-RE-4.1.10 - Snowmobiling would be managed with the following area restrictions: (Figure 2-22):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WSAs - Not allowed • ACECs - Not allowed • RNAs - Not allowed • Pocatello SRMA - Not allowed • Soda Springs Hills Management Area - Not allowed • All other areas - Allowed Without Restriction <p>Action B-RE-4.1.11 - For the following four areas (Formation Cave RNA, Robbers Roost RNA, Oneida Narrows, and Soda Springs Hills Management Area) the identified routes would be designated for public use with motorized vehicles.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Formation Cave RNA (Figure 2-23)

Recreation (RE)

- Access road and parking area
- Robbers Roost RNA (**Figure 2-24**)
 - Access route to FS
- Oneida Narrows (**Figure 2-25**)
 - Power Plant Road
 - Bear River Ranches Road
 - Roads within Redpoint and Maple Grove Campgrounds
- Soda Springs Hills Management Area (**Figure 2-2**)
 - Idaho Ranch Canyon
 - 90 Percent Canyon
 - Swenson Canyon
 - Ridgeline Road
 - Doe Alley

Objective B-RE-4.2 Implement comprehensive travel management planning utilizing strategies for motorized, mechanized, and non-motorized recreation.

Action B-RE-4.2.1 - Roads, routes, and trails would be inventoried and mapped using best available technology, such as GPS and GIS.

Action B-RE-4.2.2 - Areas would be prioritized for travel management planning based upon the following criteria:

1. Known conflicts with other resources/uses,
2. Proximity of areas to population centers,
3. Special management areas and special designations, and
4. Areas of contiguous public land.

Action B-RE-4.2.3 - Travel management planning would use a collaborative approach and the NEPA process.

Action B-RE-4.2.4 - Public involvement and coordination with tribes, agencies, and local governments would be encouraged.

Action B-RE-4.2.5 - For each travel management planning area, the following would be identified as needed:

- Designated routes for motorized vehicles.
- Designated routes for mechanized vehicles.
- Seasonal restrictions.
- Route closures.
- Exemptions for administrative and permitted activities.

Action B-RE-4.2.6 - Criteria that would be considered in travel management plans would include, but is not limited to:

1. Environmental conditions, such as:
 - a. soil stability
 - b. wildlife habitat (e.g., winter range, nesting/brooding rearing habitat, calving/fawning areas)
 - c. special status species habitat
 - d. proximity to riparian areas and/or 303(d) streams
 - e. visual resources
2. User conflicts, such as:
 - a. motorized versus non-motorized,
 - b. motorized/mechanized versus non-mechanized
3. Administrative purposes, such as:
 - a. wildland fire suppression activities
 - b. safety
 - c. resource management and permitted activities
4. Public purposes, such as:
 - a. accessing public or private land
 - b. destinations for specific activities
 - c. types of desired use (motorized, mechanized, non-motorized/non-mechanized)
5. Route, vehicle type and size limitations, such as:
 - a. > 50" wheel base for (full size vehicles)
 - b. < 50" wheel base (ATV's)
 - c. single track (motorcycles/mountain bikes)

Actions B-RE-4.2.7 - For each travel management planning area, products would be developed and made available through a variety of media sources (e.g., internet). Such products may include travel maps and brochures.

1

SPECIAL DESIGNATIONS

Administrative Designations (AD)

Goal AD-1. Provide for public land areas suitable for administrative designations.

<i>Management Objectives</i>	<i>Management Actions</i>
<p>Objective B-AD-1.1. Designate approximately 400 acres (Figure 2-26) as the Petticoat Peak RNA due to the areas unique and undisturbed vegetative communities (Appendix K).</p>	<p>Action B-AD-1.1.1 - The Petticoat Peak RNA (approximately 400 acres) would be managed to protect the undisturbed and abundant diversity of mountain sagebrush, mountain mahogany, Douglas-fir, sub-alpine fir, bigtooth maple, and aspen by implementing the following management practices:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The area would be discretionarily closed for solid leasable minerals and salable minerals. • The OHV designation would be Closed. • Wildland fire would be suppressed. • Public lands would be retained. • The area would be identified as an “Exclusion” area for ROWs. • Fluid minerals would be leased with a NSO stipulation. • If necessary, livestock grazing would be adjusted to maintain the values of the RNA (available). • A withdrawal for locatable minerals would be pursued. • Vegetation would be monitored to understand natural ecological processes and/or determine trends. • Vegetation would be inventoried to establish baseline information and identify threats. • The area would be a priority for weed control.
<p>Objective B-AD-1.2. Continue to manage the 7 ACECs (approximately 9,900 acres) and 7 RNAs (approximately 1,500 acres) designated for the unique geological, vegetative, visual, cultural, historical and/or wildlife resource values.</p>	<p>Action B-AD-1.2.1 The Stump Creek ACEC (approximately 2,500 acres) would be managed to protect crucial elk winter range by implementing the following management practices:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Snowmobile use would not be allowed. • The OHV designation would be Limited and OHV use would be limited to designated routes. • Public lands would be retained. • The area would be identified as an “Avoidance” area for ROWs. • Wildland fire would be suppressed. • Fluid minerals would be leased with a NSO stipulation. • The area would be discretionarily closed to phosphate leasing. • Livestock grazing would be managed to maintain or improve native vegetation conditions (LHC-A). • Winter range would be rehabilitated through burning or establishment of browse species. • The area would be a priority for weed control (e.g., leafy spurge). • Key locations would be signed to explain resource values and area use restrictions. • The Stump Creek Habitat Management Plan (1980) would be revised/updated. <p>Action B-AD-1.2.2 - The Bowen Canyon Bald Eagle Sanctuary ACEC (approximately 2,300 acres) would be managed to protect and provide winter roosting habitat by implementing the following management practices:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Snowmobile use would not be allowed. • Public lands would be retained. • The area would be identified as an “Avoidance” area for ROWs. • Fluid minerals would be leased with a NSO stipulation. • The OHV designation would be Limited and OHV use would be limited to designated routes. • Post pole, firewood or commercial timber sales would not be allowed. • Habitat would be protected with special stipulations (e.g., NSO) or restrictions (e.g., seasonal) on various permitted activities. • Wildland fire would be suppressed. • Livestock grazing would be managed to maintain or improve native vegetation conditions (LHC-A). • Acquire private lands from willing sellers in Bowen Canyon and develop a formal cooperative agreement with the private land owner(s). • Cooperative management of public lands with the Shoshone-Bannock Tribes’ privately owned lands in Bowen Canyon would be pursued as opportunities exist. • A withdrawal of approximately 2,300 acres for locatable minerals would be pursued.

Administrative Designations (AD)

Action B-AD-1.2.3 - The Downy Watershed ACEC (approximately 1,900 acres) would be managed to maintain/improve vegetative condition and overall watershed health by implementing the following management practices:

- Wildland fire would be suppressed.
- Public lands would be retained.
- The area would be identified as an "Avoidance" area for ROWs.
- Fluid minerals would be leased with a NSO stipulation.
- Snowmobile use would not be allowed.
- The OHV designation would be Limited and OHV use would be limited to designated routes.
- A locatable mineral withdraw would be maintained.
- Livestock grazing would be managed to maintain or improve native vegetation conditions (LHC-A).
- The area would be discretionarily closed to phosphate leasing.

Action B-AD-1.2.4 - The Indian Rocks ACEC (approximately 3,100 acres) would be managed to protect relevant cultural resource sites by implementing the following management practices:

- Snowmobile use would not be allowed.
- Public lands would be retained.
- The area would be identified as an "Avoidance" area for ROWs.
- Fluid minerals would be leased with a NSO stipulation.
- The OHV designation would be Limited and OHV use would be limited to designated roads and trails.
- Interested Indian tribes (e.g., Shoshone-Bannock Tribes, Northern Shoshone) would be coordinated with on management issues specific to the ACEC.
- Livestock grazing would be managed to maintain or improve native vegetation conditions (LHC-A).
- The area would be a priority for weed control.
- Guidelines (e.g., areas closed to heavy equipment use, using fire retardant for firelines) would be developed for wildland fire suppression activities.
- Inventory and monitoring of cultural resources would continue.
- Interpretive sign(s) at key location(s) would be placed to explain resource values and/or site use restrictions.

Action B-AD-1.2.5 - The Juniper Townsite and Van Komen Homestead ACECs (approximately 6 acres) would be managed to protect cultural and historical resources by implementing the following management practices:

- Snowmobile use would not be allowed.
- Public lands would be retained.
- The area would be identified as an "Avoidance" area for ROWs.
- Fluid minerals would be leased with a NSO stipulation.
- The OHV designation would be Limited and OHV use would be limited to designated routes.
- Partnerships would be pursued with local historical interest groups to protect, maintain and interpret historic structures.
- Ensure structures and improvements are safe for the public.
- Wildland fire would be suppressed.
- The area would be signed to explain important cultural and historical values and the need to protect these values.

Action B-AD-1.2.6 - The Dairy Hollow RNA (approximately 40 acres) would be managed to protect the nearly pristine Wyoming sagebrush/needle-and-thread plant community and Ferruginous Hawk nesting habitat (conglomerate bluffs and columns) by implementing the following management practices:

- The area would be discretionarily closed for solid leasable and salable minerals.
- The OHV designation would be Closed.
- Wildland fire would be suppressed.
- Public lands would be retained.
- The area would be identified as an "Exclusion" area for ROWs.
- Fluid minerals would be leased with a NSO stipulation.
- Livestock grazing would be adjusted, if necessary, to maintain the values of the RNA.
- A withdrawal for locatable minerals would be pursued.
- Vegetation would be monitored to understand natural ecological processes and/or determine trends.
- Vegetation would be inventoried to establish baseline information and identify threats.

Administrative Designations (AD)

- The area would be a priority for weed control.
- Interpretive sign(s) would be placed at key locations to explain resource values and area use restrictions.

Action B-AD-1.2.7 - The Formation Cave RNA (approximately 70 acres) would be managed to protect fragile travertine formation and pristine waterbirch, antelope bitterbrush/Nevada bluegrass, and barren plant communities by implementing the following management practices:

- The area would be discretionarily closed for solid leasable minerals and salable minerals.
- The OHV designation would be Closed with the exception of the Formation Cave parking area and access road which would be a designated route.
- Wildland fire would be suppressed.
- Public lands would be retained.
- The area would be identified as an "Exclusion" area for ROWs.
- Fluid minerals would be leased with a NSO stipulation.
- The area would be unavailable for livestock grazing.
- A withdrawal for locatable minerals would be pursued.
- Vegetation would be monitored to understand natural ecological processes and/or determine trends.
- Vegetation would be inventoried to establish baseline information and identify threats.
- The area would be a priority for weed control.
- The fence, parking area/trailhead, trail system, footbridges, and interpretative signs would be maintained.
- Management of the RNA would be coordinated with The Nature Conservancy.

Action B-AD-1.2.8 - The Oneida Narrows RNA (approximately 600 acres) would be managed to protect the nearly pristine plant communities (e.g., bigtooth maple, box-elder riparian, Rocky Mountain juniper, and bunchgrass), Bald Eagle and Rock Squirrel habitat by implementing the following management practices:

- The area would be discretionarily closed for solid leasable minerals and salable minerals.
- The OHV designation would be Closed with the exception of the Oneida Project Road which would be a designated route.
- Wildland fire would be suppressed.
- Public lands would be retained.
- The area would be identified as an "Exclusion" area for ROWs.
- Fluid minerals would be leased with a NSO stipulation.
- Livestock grazing would be adjusted, if necessary, to maintain the values of the RNA.
- A withdrawal for locatable minerals would be pursued.
- Vegetation would be monitored to understand natural ecological processes and/or determine trends.
- Vegetation would be inventoried to establish baseline information and identify threats.
- The area would be a priority for weed control.
- Interpretive sign(s) would be placed at key location(s) to explain resource values and area use restrictions.

Action B-AD-1.2.9 - The Pine Gap RNA (approximately 240 acres) would be managed to protect the nearly pristine black sagebrush/bluebunch wheatgrass plant community by implementing the following management practices:

- The area would be discretionarily closed for solid leasable minerals and salable minerals.
- The OHV designation would be Closed.
- Wildland fire would be suppressed.
- Public lands would be retained.
- The area would be identified as an "Exclusion" area for ROWs.
- Fluid minerals would be leased with a NSO stipulation.
- The area would be unavailable for livestock grazing.
- A withdrawal for locatable minerals would be pursued.
- Vegetation would be monitored to understand natural ecological processes and/or determine trends.
- Vegetation would be inventoried to establish baseline information and identify threats.
- The area would be a priority for weed control.

Administrative Designations (AD)

- Interpretive sign(s) would be placed at key location(s) to explain resource values and area use restrictions.

Action B-AD-1.2.10 - The Robbers Roost RNA (approximately 400 acres) would be managed to protect the unique abundance of mountain shrub communities by implementing the following management practices:

- The area would be discretionarily closed for solid leasable minerals and salable minerals.
- The OHV designation would be Closed with the exception of the Robbers Roost Road which would be a designated route.
- Wildland fire would be suppressed.
- Public lands would be retained.
- The area would be identified as an "Exclusion" area for ROWs.
- Fluid minerals would be leased with a NSO stipulation.
- The area would be unavailable for livestock grazing.
- A withdrawal for locatable minerals would be pursued.
- Vegetation would be monitored to understand natural ecological processes and/or determine trends.
- Vegetation would be inventoried to establish baseline information and identify threats.
- The area would be a priority for weed control.
- Interpretive sign(s) would be placed at key location(s) to explain resource values and area use restrictions.

Action B-AD-1.2.11 - The Cheatbeck RNA (approximately 100 acres) would be managed to protect the plant communities of boxelder/sweet cicely and bigtooth maple/sweet cicely by implementing the following management practices:

- The area would be discretionarily closed for solid leasable minerals and salable minerals.
- The OHV designation would be Closed.
- Wildland fire would be suppressed.
- Public lands would be retained.
- The area would be identified as an "Exclusion" area for ROWs.
- Fluid minerals would be leased with a NSO stipulation.
- Livestock grazing would be adjusted, if necessary, to maintain the values of the RNA.
- A withdrawal for locatable minerals would be pursued.
- Vegetation would be monitored to understand natural ecological processes and/or determine trends.
- Vegetation would be inventoried to establish baseline information and identify threats.
- The area would be a priority for weed control.

Action B-AD-1.2.12 - The Travertine Park ACEC and RNA (approximately 200 acres) would be managed to protect fragile travertine formations and uncommon lichen species of by implementing the following management practices:

- Snowmobile use would not be allowed.
- Wildland fire would be suppressed.
- Public lands would be retained.
- The ACEC portion would be identified as an "Avoidance" area for ROWs.
- The RNA portion would be identified as an "Exclusion" area for ROWs.
- Fluid minerals would be leased with a NSO stipulation.
- The area would be discretionarily closed for solid leasable and salable minerals.
- The OHV designation would be Closed for the RNA portion only.
- The OHV designation for the ACEC portion only would be Limited and OHV use would be limited to designated trails.
- The area would be unavailable for livestock grazing.
- A withdrawal for locatable minerals would be pursued.
- Vegetation would be monitored to understand natural ecological processes and/or determine trends.
- Vegetation would be inventoried to establish baseline information and identify threats.
- The area would be a priority for weed control.
- Interpretive sign(s) would be placed at key location(s) to explain resource values and area use restrictions.

2.11 MANAGEMENT GUIDANCE FOR ALTERNATIVE C

Table 2-6 describes the management guidance that would be applicable to Alternative C, which generally focuses on the protection and enhancement of resources. This alternative emphasizes fish, wildlife and special status species and their habitats and provides fewer opportunities for the production of goods and services from the public lands.

Key components to Alternative C are as follows:

- Management of special status species and vegetation with an emphasis on maintaining and improving important habitats and managing habitats for both flora and fauna in identified priority areas.
- Management of land tenure adjustments to improve administrative efficiency and protect resources while supporting appropriate development and improved public access to public lands and with a greater emphasis on acquiring nonfederal lands.
- Management of minerals and energy resources to provide for development, but with an increased emphasis on conservation and protection of resources.
- Management of OHV opportunities and use by designating public lands as “Limited” to existing routes, limiting mechanized travel to designated routes, moderate to high control of OHVs and expanding non-motorized opportunities by reducing the number of designated routes. Controls and restrictions would be implemented to emphasize the conservation and protection of resources (such as wildlife, special status species, vegetation, soils, and riparian areas).
- Management of fire to include treatments with an emphasis on a broad range of vegetation types (such as Seeding, Encroached Juniper, Low-Elevation Shrub, Mid-Elevation Shrub, Mountain Shrub, and Wet/Cold Conifer) to move toward FRCC 1, with an emphasis on actions to improve and restore greater sage-grouse habitat.

Table 2-6. Management Guidance for Alternative C

RESOURCES	
Special Status Species (SS)	
<i>Goal SS-1. Manage special status species and their habitats to provide for their continued presence and conservation as part of an ecologically healthy system.</i>	
<i>Management Objectives</i>	<i>Management Actions</i>
<p>Objective C-SS-1.1. Maintain or improve the quality of listed (threatened or endangered) species habitat by managing public land activities to benefit those species.</p>	<p>Action C-SS-1.1.1 - The following guidelines would be implemented to maintain and protect nesting and roosting sites for bald eagles as adapted from the Greater Yellowstone Bald Eagle Management Plan (Wyoming Game and Fish Department 1996).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Avoid new permitted activities within the vicinity of occupied nests (Zones I & II), restrict human activity from February 1 to August 15, or winter roosting trees from December 1 to March 1. • New structures, such as powerlines and wind turbines, would be designed to minimize the potential to cause direct mortality to eagles. Existing lines posing potential problems would be modified to minimize collision or electrocution upon renewal of the ROW. • Maintain and recruit mature trees for suitable nesting, perching and roosting sites. • Within the 2.5 mile home range (Zone III) follow management direction to maintain adequate foraging conditions and aid in maintaining the integrity of zones I and II. • Stipulate that proposed projects would not lower prey availability. • Maintain trees and snags for perching and visual screening (interrupt the line

Special Status Species (SS)

of sight between the perched eagle and human activity).

- If necessary, develop and implement site-specific management plans for bald eagle nest sites where public land falls within a 2.5 mile radius.
- Within the home range of nesting eagles, pesticides/herbicides would be used in accordance with label instructions to avoid indirect impacts.

Action C-SS-1.1.2 - Gray wolf habitat (e.g., reproductive, rearing) would be conserved/managed in the following manner by:

- Analyzing habitat characteristics of public lands adjacent to the Caribou NF in conjunction with the planned Caribou NF evaluation to determine if suitable wolf habitat exists.
- Activities on public lands within the Yellowstone Nonessential Experimental Population Area (east of I-15) or the Central Idaho Nonessential Experimental Population Area (west of I-15) which would disturb within one mile of active gray wolf den sites and rendezvous sites between April 1 and June 30 when five or fewer breeding pairs are present would not be allowed. (USFWS 1994a and 1994b).
- If wolves are de-listed they would be managed under guidance developed by IDFG management plans.

Action C-SS-1.1.3 - Maintain quality shoreline habitats on all public lands adjacent to the Snake River used by Utah valvata snail. Allow no shore-disturbing activities if they would be detrimental to snail populations.

Objective C-SS-1.2. Maintain or improve the quality of sensitive species habitat by managing public land activities to benefit those species.

FAUNA ONLY:

Action C-SS-1.2.1 - Management guidance to enhance and/or prevent the loss of special status species habitat for the following priority areas (**Figure 2-27**) would be as follows:

Curlew Valley - (approximately 37,000 acres)

(Columbian sharp-tailed and greater sage-grouse and other sagebrush obligate species)

- Livestock grazing would be managed to maintain or improve native vegetation conditions (LHC-A).
- On an annual basis, 1/3 of the area would provide adequate Columbian sharp-tailed/greater sage-grouse nesting habitat. Adequate nesting habitat requires one year of undisturbed annual growth.
- Activities would be managed to maintain or enhance Columbian sharp-tailed grouse winter range habitat - availability of deciduous shrubs (e.g., chokecherry, serviceberry) above snow level.
- ROWs would be routed at minimum of ¼ mile from special status species (fauna) habitat components (e.g., nesting, brood rearing, leks, and escape cover). Seasonal restrictions (**Appendix D**) would be stipulated as necessary (e.g., during ROW construction phases, maintenance of ROWs).
- Where possible new linear ROWs would be sited below ground.
- Where practicable, ROW development would be restricted to within or adjacent to existing ROWs and/or corridors.
- When authorizing new ROWs seasonal restrictions (**Appendix D**) would be applied.
- When a new road ROW is proposed, the proponent would be required (where practicable, according to the proposal) to rehabilitate (e.g., place large boulders or dig a tank trap at either end/terminus; ripping and seeding; gating) an unauthorized route as identified by the BLM to prevent further habitat fragmentation and improve habitat connectivity. All rehabilitation would be done according to BLM direction.
- Public lands with high-value special status species (fauna) habitat would be retained.

Bear Lake Plateau/Sheep Creek Hills - (approximately 44,000 acres)

(Greater sage-grouse and sagebrush obligate species)

- Livestock grazing would be managed to maintain or improve native vegetation conditions (LHC-A).
- On an annual basis, 1/3 of the area would provide adequate greater sage-grouse nesting habitat. Adequate nesting habitat requires one year of undisturbed annual growth.
- Activities would be managed to maintain or enhance Greater sage grouse nesting habitat (15-25% canopy cover of sagebrush).
- Where possible new linear ROWs would be sited below ground.
- Where practicable, ROW development would be restricted to within or

Special Status Species (SS)

adjacent to existing ROWs and/or corridors.

- When authorizing new ROWs seasonal restrictions (**Appendix D**) would be applied.
- When a new road ROW is proposed, the proponent would be required (where practicable, according to the proposal) to rehabilitate (e.g., place large boulders or dig a tank trap at either end/terminus; ripping and seeding; gating) an unauthorized route as identified by the BLM to prevent further habitat fragmentation and improve habitat connectivity. All rehabilitation would be done according to BLM direction.
- Public lands with high-value special status species (fauna) habitat would be retained.
- An NSO stipulation for fluid minerals would be applied.

Pleasantview Hills/Samaria Mountains - (approximately 101,100 acres)
(Columbian sharp-tailed and greater sage-grouse and other sagebrush obligates)

- Livestock grazing would be managed to maintain or improve native vegetation conditions (LHC-A).
- On an annual basis, 1/3 of the area would provide adequate Columbian sharp-tailed/greater sage-grouse nesting habitat. Adequate nesting habitat requires one year of undisturbed annual growth.
- Activities would be managed to maintain or enhance greater sage-grouse nesting habitat (15-25% canopy cover of sagebrush).
- Where possible new linear ROWs would be sited below ground.
- Where practicable, ROW development would be restricted to within or adjacent to existing ROWs and/or corridors.
- When authorizing new ROWs seasonal restrictions (**Appendix D**) would be applied.
- When a new road ROW is proposed, the proponent would be required (where practicable, according to the proposal) to rehabilitate (e.g., place large boulders or dig a tank trap at either end/terminus; ripping and seeding; gating) an unauthorized route as identified by the BLM to prevent further habitat fragmentation and improve habitat connectivity. All rehabilitation would be done according to BLM direction.
- Public lands with high-value special status species (fauna) habitat would be retained.

Lower Blackfoot River - (approximately 10,900 acres)
(greater sage-grouse, raptors, riparian associated species and sagebrush obligates)

- Limit livestock use in the Blackfoot River Stock Driveway (Blackfoot Stock Driveway) would be limited to trailing only.
- Livestock grazing would be managed to maintain or improve native vegetation conditions (LHC-A).
- On an annual basis, 1/3 of the area would provide adequate Columbian sharp-tailed/greater sage-grouse nesting habitat. Adequate nesting habitat requires one year of undisturbed annual growth.
- Properly functioning riparian areas would be maintained and those areas that are not at PFC would be restored/improved.
- Activities would be managed to maintain or enhance greater sage-grouse nesting habitat (15-25% canopy cover of sagebrush).
- Where possible new linear ROWs would be sited below ground.
- Where practicable, ROW development would be restricted to within or adjacent to existing ROWs and/or corridors.
- When authorizing new ROWs seasonal restrictions (**Appendix D**) would be applied.
- When a new road ROW is proposed, the proponent would be required (where practicable, according to the proposal) to rehabilitate (e.g., place large boulders or dig a tank trap at either end/terminus; ripping and seeding; gating) an unauthorized route as identified by the BLM to prevent further habitat fragmentation and improve habitat connectivity. All rehabilitation would be done according to BLM direction.
- Public lands with high-value special status species (fauna) habitat would be retained.

Deep Creek Mountains - (approximately 74,400 acres)
(Columbian sharp-tailed and greater sage-grouse)

- Native vegetation conditions would be maintained or improved (LHC-A).
- On an annual basis, 1/3 of the area would provide adequate Columbian sharp-tailed/greater sage-grouse nesting habitat. Adequate nesting habitat

Special Status Species (SS)

- requires one year of undisturbed annual growth.
- Properly functioning riparian areas would be maintained and those areas that are not at PFC would be restored/improved.
- Activities would be managed to maintain or enhance greater sage-grouse nesting habitat (15-25% canopy cover of sagebrush).
- Where possible new linear ROWs would be sited below ground.
- Where practicable, ROW development would be restricted to within or adjacent to existing ROWs and/or corridors.
- When authorizing new ROWs seasonal restrictions (**Appendix D**) would be applied.
- When a new road ROW is proposed, the proponent would be required (where practicable, according to the proposal) to rehabilitate (e.g., place large boulders or dig a tank trap at either end/terminus; ripping and seeding; gating) an unauthorized route as identified by the BLM to prevent further habitat fragmentation and improve habitat connectivity. All rehabilitation would be done according to BLM direction.
- Public lands with high-value special status species (fauna) habitat would be retained.
- Aspen regeneration (e.g., cutting/harvesting, prescribed fire) would be enhanced as appropriate.

Action C-SS-1.2.2 - On-going efforts would be supported to locate populations of pygmy rabbits by:

- Surveying all potential habitats.
- When populations are located, manage sagebrush habitats for suitable pygmy rabbit conditions using current scientific information.
- Suitable and potential pygmy rabbit habitat would be managed to allow for the expansion of populations into areas where they might not be currently found.

Action C-SS-1.2.3 - Populations of boreal toads and Northern leopard frogs would be inventoried and identify. Where populations are located, permitted activities would be managed to maintain quality frog or toad habitat by:

- Managing riparian areas to make progress towards or achieving PFC.
- Increasing pool habitat based upon site potential.
- Mitigating or adjusting activities having adverse effects on boreal toad and Northern leopard frog habitats.
- Managing Lane and Lander Creeks as priority areas for boreal toad and Northern leopard frog habitat.

Action C-SS-1.2.4 - The following guidelines would be implemented for greater sage-grouse habitats as adapted from Connelly et al (2000):

- Continue efforts to map populations and habitat for greater sage-grouse. Map seasonal (lek, nesting, brood-rearing and winter) habitats along with source and isolated populations.
- Establish goals for greater sage-grouse habitat conservation at the local level in conjunction with IDFG for protection and maintenance of existing populations and restoration goals.
- Protect and maintain suitable habitats and reconnect separated populations based upon the following priorities:
 - 1) Source habitats (S1)
 - 2) Restoration areas (R1, R2)
 - 3) Areas that link isolated populations
- Manage key habitat for a range of sagebrush canopy cover averaging 15 to 25 percent (11 to 31 inches in height); at least 15 percent grass cover; and 10 percent cover of a diversity of forbs or commensurate with site potential.
- Monitor progress and adjust activities to make progress towards greater sage-grouse goals and objectives.
- In areas where grouse habitats are fragmented by land ownership pattern, cooperate with IDFG and local working groups to identify and maintain long-term habitat by acquiring conservation easements or bringing crucial habitats into public ownership.
- In cooperation with IDFG identify areas where application of pesticides for grasshopper or Mormon cricket control may negatively affect grouse broods. Identify a cooperative strategy to review requests for pesticide application in these identified locations.
- As appropriate based upon a site specific habitat assessment, protect leks from disturbances from permitted activities for 0.6 mile from Mar 1 to May 31.
- Restore shrub-steppe habitats in the following priority:

Special Status Species (SS)

- 1) source areas,
- 2) restoration areas
- 3) areas that link isolated populations

Action C-SS-1.2.5 - The following guidelines would be implemented for Columbian sharp-tailed grouse habitats as adapted from Giesen and Connelly (1993):

- Maintain vegetation in suitable condition (LHC-A) for nesting and brood rearing for 1.5 miles from known leks.
- Within source, key or connective habitats (**Figure 3-6**) manipulation of sagebrush habitats must not be greater than 10 percent of the total sagebrush community within a 1.5 mile radius of leks.
- Minimize disturbance of deciduous shrubs within 4 miles of leks to protect winter habitat.
- Cooperate with IDFG to establish population targets and monitoring routes for Columbian sharp-tailed grouse. Monitoring would be conducted for populations in key or source areas and restorations areas in that order.
- In areas where grouse habitats are fragmented by land ownership pattern, cooperate with IDFG and local working groups to identify and maintain long-term habitat by acquiring conservation easements or bringing crucial habitats into public ownership.
- In cooperation with IDFG identify areas where application of pesticides for grasshopper or Mormon cricket control may negatively affect grouse broods. Identify a cooperative strategy to review requests for pesticide application in these identified locations.
- Protect leks from disturbances from permitted activities for 0.6 mile from March 1 to May 31.

Action C-SS-1.2.6 - The following guidelines would be implemented for the globally important ferruginous hawk habitat in the Curlew Valley as adapted from Chipley 1998:

- As appropriate based upon a site specific habitat assessment, restrict activities within 0.5-mile of active nests from March 1 to July 15.
- Monitor the populations in Curlew Valley and on the Bear Lake Plateau.
- Maintain existing scattered juniper trees for nesting substrate and maintain or improve habitat suitable for prey populations such as jackrabbits.

Action C-SS-1.2.7 - Where populations of American white pelicans are located on public lands, manage the quality of nesting habitat as a priority for the benefit of the pelican.

Action C-SS-1.2.8 - During restoration and rehabilitation of migratory bird species habitat, emphasis would be placed on riparian, non-riverine wetlands, sagebrush and Douglas fir habitats and the following management guidelines would be implemented as appropriate based upon site specific characteristics.

- Improve both the canopy cover and understory health of sagebrush.
- At minimum, maintain 30 to 50 percent of sagebrush habitat in a 5th code Hydrologic Unit Code (includes all lands) in contiguous blocks greater than 320 acres to support sagebrush obligate species and greater sage-grouse (Page and Ritter 1999).
- Use practices that stabilize or increase native grass and forb cover in sagebrush habitats with 5 to 25 percent sagebrush canopy cover (Page and Ritter 1999).
- In sagebrush habitats manage herbaceous cover to conceal nests throughout the first incubation period for ground and low shrub-nesting birds.
- Restore shrub-steppe habitats in restoration or corridor areas.
- Use native species where appropriate/practical for ES&R and restoration treatments to shorten recovery time and prevent establishment of invasive species/noxious weeds.
- Maintain multiple vegetation layers in woody riparian habitats that are stable or increasing with all age classes (seedlings, young plants, mature and decadent) represented to support native bird communities and other wildlife.
- Improve aspen stands by reducing conifer invasion and overall reduction of average stand age to <40 years.
- Improve dry conifer with reductions of stand density.

Action C-SS-1.2.9 - Large spring systems (e.g., Heart Mountain, Formation Springs) would be managed to prevent possible extirpation of spring-dependent species such as Springsnails. Examples of such actions to maintain or improve spring systems habitat may include but are not limited to:

- Manage riparian areas of spring systems in accordance with PFC guidelines.

Special Status Species (SS)

- As appropriate, develop and implement conservation agreements with federal and state agencies, Tribes and other interested parties on a site specific or species specific basis.
- As appropriate and in cooperation with other interested parties, evaluate the status of springsnails and recommend actions to protect species habitat if need be.
- As appropriate and in cooperation with other interested parties, provide educational materials explaining the ecology and diversity of springsnails and the need to conserve spring habitats.

Action C-SS-1.2.10 -The following conservation actions (Utah Division of Wildlife Resources 2000; Montana Department of Fish, Wildlife, and Parks, et al. 2000; IDFG 2003a) would be implemented to ensure the continued presence of native cutthroat trout within their historic:

- Support cooperative work with IDFG to determine cutthroat trout life histories, protect the genetic integrity of cutthroat trout populations, expand those populations within their historic range through reintroduction in those areas where restoration is practicable after reintroduction protocols have been established with federal agencies and monitor populations as they are restored.
- Cooperate with IDFG to selectively control non-native salmonid species and discontinue non-native fish stocking in native cutthroat trout drainages.
- Enhance and maintain channel integrity, channel processes, water quality, salmonid habitat and habitat connectivity.
- Monitor populations, habitat quantity and habitat quality.
- Cooperate with adjacent landowners and/or other agencies when opportunities for watershed scale improvements are possible.
- All streams known to hold either of these species would be fenced to exclude livestock use unless it is already in PFC condition.
- Strive to eliminate or significantly reduce threats to present or potential cutthroat trout distribution within their historic range and to habitat quality and quantity.
- Strive to achieve the criteria for highest quality trout habitats as described in the Cutthroat Trout Matrix (**Appendix E**).
- In any land tenure adjustment, the primary goal of acquisitions or disposal would be directed to connecting disjointed habitats and reconnecting streams to migratory corridors. Disposition of trout-bearing streams would be allowed on this basis if habitat with more potential is acquired.
- Cooperate with IDFG and other agencies to implement an information/ education/outreach program.
- Hold annual coordination and data sharing meeting between state, private and federal jurisdictions.

Action C-SS-1.2.11 - Public lands around Bear Lake would be managed to ensure habitat quality for Bear Lake endemic fish (Bear Lake cutthroat trout, Bonneville cisco, Bonneville whitefish, Bear Lake whitefish and Bear Lake sculpin) is not impaired by:

- Reducing or eliminating water degrading activities on streams connecting public lands with the lake.
- In Fish Haven Canyon, working with water right holders and IDFG to screen fish from irrigation ditches.

FLORA ONLY:

Action C-SS-1.2.12 - Management guidance to enhance and/or restore flora sensitive species habitat within the following priority geographical areas (**Figure 2-27**) would be as follows:

Bear Lake Plateau/Sheep Creek Hills - (approximately 170 acres)
(Starveling milkvetch & silky cryptantha)

- An NSO stipulation for fluid minerals would be applied at a minimum of ¼ mile around special status plant habitat.
- ROWs would be routed at minimum of ¼ mile from special status species habitat (flora).
- Livestock grazing would be managed to maintain or improve native vegetation conditions (LHC-A).
- Public lands with high-value special status species habitat (flora) would be retained.

Special Status Species (SS)

Malad River - (approximately 80 acres)
(iodinebush and red glasswort)

- A natural hydrological regime would be maintained.
- Key locations would be signed to prevent cross-country travel.
- ROWs would be routed at minimum of ¼ mile from special status species habitat (flora).
- An NSO stipulation for fluid minerals would be applied at a minimum of ¼ mile around special status habitat (flora).
- Solid leasable and salable minerals would be discretionarily closed.
- Public lands with high-value special status species plant habitat would be retained.

Deep Creek Mountains - (approximately 20 acres)
(Cooper's hymenoxys)

- Key locations would be signed to prevent cross-country travel.
- ROWs would be routed at minimum of ¼ mile from special status species habitat (flora).
- Public lands with high-value special status plant habitat would be retained.
- An NSO stipulation for fluid minerals would be applied at a minimum of ¼ mile around special status habitat (flora).
- Livestock grazing would be managed to maintain or improve native vegetation conditions (LHC-A).

Stump Creek - (approximately 2 acres)
(red glasswort)

- A natural hydrological regime would be maintained.
- Key locations would be signed to prevent cross-country travel.
- ROWs would be routed at minimum of ¼ mile from special status species habitat (flora).
- Public lands with high-value special status plant habitat would be retained.
- An NSO stipulation for fluid minerals would be applied at a minimum of ¼ mile around special status habitat (flora).
- Solid leasable and salable minerals would be discretionarily closed.

Pleasantview Hills/Samaria Mountain - (approximately 10 acres)
(Cooper's hymenoxys)

- Key locations would be signed to prevent cross-country travel.
- ROWs would be routed at minimum of ¼ mile from special status species habitat (flora).
- Public lands with high-value special status species plant habitat would be retained.
- An NSO stipulation for fluid minerals would be applied at a minimum of ¼ mile around special status habitat (flora).
- Livestock grazing would be managed to maintain or improve native vegetation conditions (LHC-A).

Action C-SS-1.2.13 - The conservation and restoration of sensitive plant species would be promoted through the implementation of management actions that include but are not limited to:

- Promoting public education and outreach.
- Controlling invasive species/noxious weeds.
- Pursuing conservation easements.
- Fencing areas if necessary.
- Maintaining the natural hydrological function subject to valid water rights.

Action C-SS-1.2.14 - Site/project specific assessments for special status plants would be required prior to authorizing activities to determine:

1. The presence or absence of special status species, and
2. Appropriate mitigation/guidelines (e.g., avoidance of occupied areas, distances from occupied habitat). Examples of mitigation/guidelines to be considered may include:
 - Reducing adverse impacts on special status plant habitats from permitted/authorized actions.
 - Limiting water developments and mineral supplements near special status plant populations sufficient to protect these species.
 - Avoiding pesticide and herbicide applications near occupied habitat to preserve pollinators and non-target species.
 - Promoting seeding within occupied habitat only when clearly beneficial

Special Status Species (SS)

for special status plants.

- Formulate methods of weed spraying near special status habitat on site specific and species specific basis.
- Special status plant areas would be priority for weed treatment.
- Inventory and evaluate areas for special status plants while conducting Idaho Standards for Rangeland Health evaluations.
- Inventory and monitor potential special status plant habitats.

Action C-SS-1.2.15 - Special status plant known occurrences' maps would be updated regularly.

Action C-SS-1.2.16 - Meet or make significant progress towards meeting Idaho Standards for Rangeland Health (**Appendix A**) for special status plant habitat.

Action C-SS-1.2.17 - Where special status plant species can be conserved and habitat connectivity improved through inter-agency cooperation, acquire lands through land tenure adjustments, easements, and inter-agency cooperation.

Vegetation (VE)

Goal VE-6. Manage vegetation types to provide for their continued presence as part of an ecologically healthy system.

Management Objectives

Management Actions

Objective C-VE-6.1. In Low- and Mid-Elevation Shrub and Mountain Shrub types, maintain or increase LHC-A acres as described below so the landscape is composed of a diversity of desirable/native herbaceous and shrub/woody species consisting of at least 15-25% sagebrush canopy cover in greater sage-grouse habitat in the Low- and Mid-Elevation Shrub type and at least 25% shrub cover in the Mountain Shrub type. (Appendix J, Section III)

Desired LHC Description	Percent LHC Desired
LHC-A - All key components are present as identified in land health standards and as described in the definition of FRCC 1.	> 50%
LHC-B - Some or all of the key components as identified in land health standards are present and as described in the definition of FRCC 2.	25-30%
LHC-C - Key components are absent as identified in land health standards and as described in the definition of FRCC 3.	< 25%

Action C-VE-6.1.1 - Activities would be permitted/authorized in a manner consistent with Idaho Standards for Rangeland Health (**Appendix A**).

Action C-VE-6.1.2 - Priority areas for treatment and restoration would be:

1. Protection and maintenance of habitats significant for Greater Sage-grouse and Columbian sharp-tailed grouse.
2. Protection and maintenance of special status species habitat to promote conservation and recovery.
3. Areas currently infested with invasive species/noxious weeds.
4. Areas having high potential for invasive species/noxious weeds infestation.
5. Areas with hazardous fuels or potential for catastrophic wildland fire.
6. Areas at risk of loss of key ecosystem components/functions (structure, diversity, composition, hydrological function, nutrient cycling, energy flow).
7. Areas impacted/degraded by other uses or activities (e.g., recreation, OHV, grazing).
8. Treat juniper outside of juniper dominated range site areas using appropriate methods, e.g., Mechanical, Chemical, or Prescribed fire.
9. In crested wheatgrass seedings treatment/restoration priorities are:
 - a. Suppress wildland fires until canopy cover exceeds 25% canopy cover.
 - b. Consider various treatment methods (e.g., Mechanical, Chemical, and Prescribed fire) as areas exceed 25% canopy cover.
 - c. As areas are treated, allow for no less than 15% canopy cover.
 - d. Inter-seed desirable species that add diversity while not displacing crested wheatgrass.
 - e. Treat areas to discourage invasive species.

Action C-VE-6.1.3 - Areas would be identified and/or established which can serve as sources for native seed to be used in restoration/rehabilitation and reclamation efforts.

Objective C-VE-6.2. In the Aspen/ Aspen Conifer Mix and Dry Conifer types, maintain or increase LHC-A and B acres as described below so the landscape is composed of 40% mixed Aspen/Dry Conifer and 60% Aspen dominate areas consisting of 500-1,000

Action C-VE-6.2.1 - Aspen/Aspen Conifer Mix and Dry Conifer types would be treated using prescribed fire.

Action C-VE-6.2.2 - Activities would be limited to maximize sucker establishment.

Action C-VE-6.2.3 - Within the Aspen/Aspen Conifer Mix and Dry Conifer vegetation types, treatment and restoration priority areas would be:

1. Areas with greater than 50% conifer composition.
2. Areas adjacent to deer/elk summer range.
3. Areas significant to special status species.

Vegetation (VE)

stems/acre w/ 5-15 ft. height resulting in the distribution of age classes of <30 years (40%), 31-80 years (40%), and >80 years (20%).

4. Areas impacted by insects or disease.

Action C-VE-6.2.4 - To maximize the Aspen component regeneration/harvest type cuts or other methods would be considered as deemed appropriate.

Desired LHC Description	Percent LHC Desired
LHC-A - All key components are present as identified in land health standards and as described in the definition of FRCC 1.	>30
LHC-B - Some or all of the key components as identified in land health standards are present and as described in the definition of FRCC 2.	35-40
LHC-C - Key components are absent as identified in land health standards and as described in the definition of FRCC 3.	<35

Objective C-VE-6.3. In the Wet/Cold Conifer type, increase LHC-A acres as described below so the landscape is comprised of a distribution of age classes of 0-80 years (30%) and > 80 years (70%).

Action C-VE-6.3.1 - Allow for natural processes to occur to achieve desired age classes.

Action C-VE-6.3.2 - As appropriate minimal treatments would be conducted in this Wet/Cold Conifer vegetation type.

Desired LHC Description	Percent LHC Desired
LHC-A - All key components are present as identified in land health standards and as described in the definition of FRCC 1.	>10
LHC-B - Some or all of the key components as identified in land health standards are present and as described in the definition of FRCC 2.	85-90
LHC-C - Key components are absent as identified in land health standards and as described in the definition of FRCC 3.	<5

Objective C-VE-6.4. Maintain or increase natural occurring Juniper LHC-A and B acres as described below through primarily natural processes so the landscape is dominated by widely spaced old juniper trees greater than 300 years.

Action C-VE-6.4.1 - Appropriate methods (e.g., fire suppression) would be used to maintain or promote juniper dominated range sites.

Vegetation (VE)

Desired LHC Description	Percent LHC Desired
LHC-A - All key components are present as identified in land health standards and as described in the definition of FRCC 1.	>5
LHC-B - Some or all of the key components as identified in land health standards are present and as described in the definition of FRCC 2.	95-100
LHC-C - Key components are absent as identified in land health standards and as described in the definition of FRCC 3.	<5

Wildland Fire Management (WF)

Goal WF-4 : Return fire to a more natural role in the ecosystem to improve FRCC and achieve desired LHC.

Management Objectives

Management Actions

Objective C-WF-4.1. Manage the Low-Elevation Shrub and Perennial Grass vegetation types in order to move towards FRCC 1 (LHC-A) so wildland fire occurs less frequently and at a smaller scale on the landscape.

Action C-WF-4.1.1 - Chemical, mechanical, seeding, prescribed fire and WFU treatments would be used as appropriate.
Action C-WF-4.1.2 - In Perennial Grass and Juniper encroached vegetation types, the sagebrush steppe would be restored with an aggressive sagebrush seeding effort, utilizing the appropriate sagebrush species for treatment areas.

Objective C-WF-4.2. Maintain, protect, and expand Greater sage grouse Source Habitats.

Action C-WF-4.2.1 - Wildland fires would be suppressed in Source Habitats except where WFU could benefit the habitat.
Action C-WF-4.2.2 - WFU would be used in sage grouse Source Habitats for the benefit of the habitat only after site specific project level coordination with IDFG.
Action C-WF-4.2.3 - Vegetation treatments would be conducted in areas that pose a wildland fire risk to Source Habitats.
Action C-WF-4.2.4 - The areas to be treated within Source Habitats would be those that have low resiliency characterized by low species diversity, undesirable composition, and dead or decadent sagebrush.

Objective C-WF-4.3. Maintain and improve Greater sage grouse Restoration and Key Habitats.

Action C-WF-4.3.1 - Use AMR to safely manage and suppress wildland fires.
Action C-WF-4.3.2 - WFU may be used in greater sage-grouse Restoration and Key Habitats for the benefit of the habitat only after site specific project level coordination with IDFG.
Action C-WF-4.3.3 - Vegetation treatments would be conducted to reduce risk of wildland fire and reconnect Restoration and Key Habitats.
Action C-WF-4.3.4 - Areas treated would be those that that have low resiliency characterized by low species diversity.

Objective C-WF-4.4 Manage the Aspen/Aspen Dry Conifer Mix, Dry Conifer, Wet/Cold Conifer, Riparian, and Other/Vegetated Lava vegetation types in order to maintain vegetation conditions and wildland fire regimes similar to historical conditions (FRCC 1 [LHC-A]).

Action C-WF 4.4.1 - Appropriate treatments (e.g., mechanical, chemical, seeding, prescribed fire, or WFU) would be used to maintain or make progress towards landscapes in FRCC 1.

Wildland Fire Management (WF)

Objective C-WF-4.5. Manage for WFU on approximately 212,600 acres identified as suitable (Figure 2-28).

Action C-WF-4.5.1 - WFU would be used in natural occurring Juniper, Mountain Shrub and Wet/Cold Conifer vegetation types.

Action C-WF-4.5.2 - WFU would not be appropriate on approximately 401,200 acres which may include wildlife habitat, previously rehabilitated areas, and small tracts of public land.

Action C-WF-4.5.3 - Should social, economic, political or resource constraints be resolved, it would be possible to use WFU in areas identified as not appropriate.

Objective C-WF-4.6. For the vegetation types identified, implement over 10 years approximately 54,920 footprint acres of treatment using various treatment methods (i.e. WFU, mechanical, chemical, seeding, and prescribed fire), as appropriate.

Action C-WF-4.6.1- By vegetation type, the following approximate footprint acres would be treated.

Vegetation Type	Footprint Acres
Low-Elevation Shrub	0.0
Mid-Elevation Shrub	16,650
Mountain Shrub ¹	16,600
Perennial Grass/Seeding	1,300
Juniper (Natural Only)	0.0
Aspen/Aspen Conifer Mix/ Dry Conifer	20,000
Wet/Cold Conifer	70
Riparian	100
Other/Vegetated Lava	200
Total	54,920

¹ Acres identified include encroached juniper.

Objective C-WF-4.7. Implement priorities for wildland fire suppression and vegetation treatments.

Action C-WF-4.7.1 - When multiple wildland fire ignitions occur, the criteria for establishing suppression priorities would be:

1. Protect the WUI and communities-at-risk where public and firefighter health and safety are a concern.
2. Minimize risks to greater sage-grouse Source Habitats.
3. Minimize risks to greater sage-grouse Key Habitats.
4. Minimize risks to greater sage-grouse Restoration Habitats.

Action C-WF-4.7.2 - Criteria for establishing vegetation treatments would be:

1. Within greater sage-grouse Source Habitat, treat areas of low resilience.
2. Within Key and Restoration Habitat:
 - a. Treat areas adjacent to Source Habitat.
 - b. Enhance Key Habitat.
 - c. Treat areas that pose a fire risk to Source and Key Habitats.
 - d. Treat areas adjacent to Key Habitat.

Action C-WF-4.7.3 - For all vegetation types, the AMR would be a "FULL" suppression emphasis with initial attack to stop fire spread and put out wildland fire at least cost.

- For greater sage-grouse restoration and key habitat in Low- and Mid-Elevation vegetation types, the AMR would be a "Limited" emphasis of monitoring and confinement actions commensurate with the values at risk and public/firefighter safety.

RESOURCE USES

Lands and Realty (LR)

Goal LR-4. Assure land classifications and withdrawals of public lands are appropriate to protect important resource values.

Management Objectives

Management Actions

Objective C-LR-4.1. Continue to manage approximately 84,760 acres of land classified as withdrawn from the general land laws for the specific purposes intended.

Action C-LR-4.1.1- Continue to manage approximately 45,400 acres of public land as withdrawn (e.g., power sites, public water reserves, power projects, administrative sites, BSD).

Action C-LR-4.1.2 - The following withdrawals (approximately 20,160 acres) would be maintained and managed as closed to locatable mineral entry.

	Federal Agency	Mineral Estate Withdrawn Acres ¹
	USFWS - Bear Lake Refuge	17,500
	USFWS - Minidoka Refuge	760
	USFWS - Oxford Slough Production Area	1,900

¹ These acres are not considered in the PFO public lands base of 613,800 acres. Acreages are rounded.

Action C-LR-4.1.3 - Withdrawal of public lands from mineral entry would be pursued on approximately 19,200 acres for the following areas:

- Cheatbeck Canyon RNA
- Dairy Hollow RNA
- Formation Cave RNA
- Oneida Narrow RNA
- Pine Gap RNA
- Robbers Roost RNA
- Travertine Park RNA
- Petticoat Peak RNA
- Soda Springs Hills Management Area (public lands portion only)
- Bowen Canyon Bald Eagle Sanctuary ACEC

Action C-LR-4.1.4 - Withdrawals which no longer serve the purpose for which they were established would be modified, revoked or relinquished. Prior to modification, revocation or relinquishment, withdrawn lands would be reviewed to determine if any other resource values require withdrawal protection.

Action C-LR-4.1.5 - Lands currently under review by the Washington Office for the revocation of withdrawal status and which are approved for revocation would be managed the same as adjacent public lands per the final decision.

Goal LR-5. Improve administrative management efficiency, natural resources management and protection, and public benefit.

Management Objectives

Management Actions

Objective C-LR-5.1. Maintain the overall public land base, acquire nonfederal lands or interest in nonfederal lands through exchange, purchase, easement or donation which enhance multiple-use, protect significant resource values and improve the management and administration of the public lands.

Action C-LR-5.1.1 - A land tenure adjustment program would be implemented based upon a four zone concept where zones (areas that contain common issues or planned actions) and respective priorities are described below (**Figure 2-29**). Land tenure adjustments would be considered across FO and District boundaries.

Zone 1 lands are public lands with special designations because of significant resource values. Zone 1 lands would be retained in public ownership. Examples of Zone 1 lands include WSAs, ACECs and RNAs, special status species habitat, and crucial wildlife habitat. BLM's priority for Zone 1 is to seek to acquire all private and State land in-holdings. Public access would be considered in all land tenure actions. Approximately **50,800 acres** (8%) of public land are identified in this zone.

Zone 2 lands are public lands that have a fairly well-consolidated ownership pattern and contain potentially high values for resources and land uses such as minerals, recreation, range, riparian, cultural resources, and wildlife habitat. The

Lands and Realty (LR)

priorities within Zone 2 are to retain existing large blocks of high value public lands, consolidate public land ownership according to identified priority resources, and acquire lands with high resource values which improve efficiencies in public lands administration. Public lands within ½ mile of either side of the Zone 2 boundary would be considered potentially suitable for disposal primarily by exchange (secondarily by sale or R&PP patents) unless that ½ mile extends into a Zone 1 (retention) area. Approximately **418,900 acres** (68%) of public land are identified in this zone.

Zone 3 lands are small to medium-sized blocks of public lands which are interspersed with state and private lands or are adjacent to National Forest boundaries. The priority emphasis for Zone 3 is to consolidate ownership, which would maximize public values, provide public access and improve efficiencies in public lands administration. Overall public land acreage would be maintained within this zone. Acquisition, primarily through exchange, would be done to add acquire high resource value lands that improve the manageability of public lands; lower resource value and difficult-to-manage administer tracts would be disposed. Zone 3 lands are potentially suitable for disposal by exchange; however, disposal of land through sales and R&PP patents would be allowed. Approximately **94,200 acres** (15%) of public land are identified in this zone.

Zone 4 lands are small to medium-sized blocks of public lands that are isolated from one another and from other public lands tracts in the Field Office area. Public lands are available through all forms of disposal as appropriate. The land tenure adjustment emphasis in Zone 4 could result in a net decrease in public lands acreage within this zone. Approximately **49,900 acres** (8%) of public land are identified in this zone.

***NOTE:** Within Zones 3 and 4 specific parcels may contain potentially high values for resources and land uses such as minerals, recreation, special status species, range, riparian, cultural resources, and wildlife habitat. These high-value parcels may not be suitable for disposal, except through exchange for equal or higher resource value lands.*

Action C-LR-5.1.2 - Changes in the overall public lands acreage would be appropriate if land tenure adjustments meet one or more of the following criteria:

- Benefits the public.
- Improves public lands administration.
- Achieves desired resource conditions.
- Contributes to tribal treaty rights.

Action C-LR 5.1.3 - Land tenure adjustments would consider the acquisition or disposal of lands based upon (but not limited to) the following factors:

- Special status species habitat,
- Improve habitat connectivity,
- Riparian/wetlands
- Resolve trespass,
- Improve public land administration.

Goal LR-6. Balance development of public land, such as ROWs, utility corridors and alternative energy development (e.g., wind, solar, biomass) with the protection of natural resources and public enjoyment and recreation, consistent with natural resource values and uses.

Management Objectives

Management Actions

Objective C-LR-6.1. Issue land use authorizations consistent with following management actions.

Action C-LR-6.1.1 - Land use authorizations would require holders to apply appropriate management techniques, practices or guidelines to protect vegetation, wildlife habitat and minimize soil disturbance (**Appendix C**).

Action C-LR-6.1.2 - Short-term authorizations or permits to use public lands for the sole benefit of private farming practices (such as pivot lines, storage of farm equipment) would not be approved.

Action C-LR-6.1.3 - New leases or permits that affect the value or nature of the land would not be allowed on those lands proposed for exchange or sale.

Action C-LR-6.1.4 - No new land use permits or leases would be authorized to validate unauthorized use. Unauthorized use would be resolved according to priority using current laws, regulations, and policy.

Action C-LR-6.1.5 - When a new or existing land use permit is authorized the following

Lands and Realty (LR)

conditions would apply as appropriate:

- Privately-held water right POUs on public land would either be removed from public land or transferred to the US through the BLM.
- A privately-owned water right with a point of diversion on private property, but with one or more POUs on public land, would be split and transferred to the US in proportion to the amount of water used on public land.

Action C-LR-6.1.6 - To the extent possible, linear ROWs would be routed where impacts would be least disturbing, considering the point of origin, point of destination, resource values present, and purpose and need for the project.

Action C-LR-6.1.7- No BLM ROW corridors would be designated in this Pocatello RMP/EIS, however this plan may be amended to designate corridors upon completion of the West-wide Energy Corridor Programmatic EIS.

Action C-LR-6.1.8 - ROW applicants would be encouraged to the extent possible, to use the existing corridors. The Pocatello RMP /EIS would adopt designated corridors upon completion of the West-wide Energy Corridor Programmatic EIS.

Action C-LR-6.1.9 - For ROWs which include energy and non-energy related ROWs and land use authorizations, 590,000 acres would be managed as open areas; 21,900 acres would be managed as avoidance areas and 1,900 acres would be managed as exclusion areas (**Figure 2-16**) where these areas are defined as follows:

- **Open Areas** - These are areas not identified as avoidance or exclusion areas and are open to ROWs and land use authorization proposals. Proposals may require restrictions to protect resources such as wildlife (**Appendix D**), protected watersheds, erosive soils/steep slopes, cultural, historical, recreation, visual resources and other identified resources.
- **Avoidance Areas** - These are areas to generally be avoided but may be available with special stipulations. Efforts would be made to work with the applicant to reroute proposals. Special stipulations would be required to protect resource values. Areas considered as "avoidance" would include developed recreation sites, historical trails, special status species habitat, ACECs, and WSAs. Special stipulations would consist of applying BMPs, management techniques or guidelines (**Appendix C**) or be developed on a case by case basis through the NEPA process.
- **Exclusion Areas** - In these areas ROWs and land use authorizations would not be allowed. Areas considered as "exclusion" would be RNAs.

Action C-LR-6.1.10 - Applications for wind energy site monitoring and testing and development would not be accepted in areas designated as part of the National Landscape Conservation System (e.g., WSAs, WSRs, National Historic and Scenic Trails) and ACECs.

Action C-LR-6.1.11 - Entities seeking to develop a wind energy project on public lands shall consult with appropriate federal, state, and local agencies regarding specific projects as early in the planning process as appropriate to ensure that all potential construction, operation, and decommissioning issues and concerns are identified and adequately addressed.

Action C-LR-6.1.12 - Entities seeking to develop a wind energy project on public lands in conjunction with BLM Washington Office and PFO staff, shall consult with the US DoD regarding the location of wind power projects and turbine siting as early in the planning process as appropriate. This consultation shall occur concurrently at both the installation/field level and the Pentagon/BLM Washington Office level. An interagency protocol agreement is being developed to establish a consultation process and to identify the scope of issues for consultation. Lands withdrawn for military purposes are under the administrative jurisdiction of the DoD or a military service and are not available for issuance of wind energy authorizations by the BLM.

Action C-LR-6.1.13 - The BLM would require financial bonds for all wind energy development projects on BLM-administered public lands to ensure compliance with the terms and conditions of the ROW authorization and the requirements of applicable regulatory requirements, including reclamation costs. The amount of the required bond would be determined during the ROW authorization process on the basis of site-specific and project-specific factors. The BLM may also require financial bonds for site monitoring and testing authorizations.

Livestock Grazing (LG)

Goal LG-1. Provide forage for livestock grazing consistent with other resources/uses as part of an ecologically healthy system consistent with multiple use and sustained yield.

Management Objectives

Management Actions

Objective C-LG-1.1. Maintain approximately 555,300 acres available for livestock grazing and approximately 58,500 acres not available for livestock grazing.

Action C-LG-1.1.1 - Allotments not being permitted/leased would not be available for livestock grazing.
Action C-LG-1.1.2 - Public lands not available for livestock grazing are identified in **Figure 2-30**.

Objective C-LG-1.2. Consistent with maintaining a thriving ecological balance and multiple use relationships provide annually a total preference (active + suspended) of approximately 86,600 AUMs.

Action C-LG-1.2.1 - The appropriate number of livestock AUMs (active + suspended) would be permitted/leased based on the most current monitoring data and Idaho Standards for Rangeland Health.

Action C-LG-1.2.2 - Public lands would be managed to be as productive as feasible considering such grazing management practices as:

- proper use levels of key vegetation,
- grazing systems,
- range improvements including land treatments, and
- adjusting seasons of use, and stocking rates.

Action C-LG-1.2.3 - Livestock grazing would be managed to meet or make significant progress towards meeting Idaho Standards for Rangeland Health and Guidelines for Livestock Grazing Management, 1997 (**Appendix A**).

Action C-LG-1.2.4 - Areas would be temporarily closed to livestock grazing after disturbances such as wildland fire, fire and non-fire vegetative treatments for a minimum of two growing seasons or progress is being made towards attaining identified vegetative objectives.

Action C-LG-1.2.5 - The voluntary relinquishment of grazing preference would be accepted, in whole or part, and made available to qualified applicants following the most current policy and guidance. Grazing applications may be denied if one or more of the following criteria are met:

- Failure to meet standards for rangeland health because of livestock grazing and meeting or moving towards standards is not economically feasible,
- Isolated parcels of public land consisting of 640 acres or less,
- No public or administrative access to allotment/parcel exists,
- Public lands are identified for disposal or exchange (occur within Zones 3 or 4),
- The proportion of unfenced public land to private land within the allotment is less than 20%,
- Expanding urban development and subsequent activities adversely affects the ability to graze livestock on public land,
- Occurrence of special status species affected by livestock grazing or supporting activities (such as distributing salt blocks, range improvement maintenance) and management changes are not economically feasible, and
- Forage or water quality that can not be corrected with reasonable investment (e.g., elevated selenium levels).

Action C-LG-1.2.6 - Acquired lands (LWCF/BPA) within the Soda Hills Management Area would not be available for livestock grazing (**Figure 2-30**).

Action C-LG-1.2.7 - Close all or part of the following allotments containing RNA's to livestock grazing:

Allotment Name/Number	RNA Name
Trout Creek Spring (04154)	Cheatbeck Canyon
Horse Hollow (04329)	Dairy Hollow
Lower Oneida Narrows (04310)	Oneida Narrows
Rocky Peak (04412)	Oneida Narrows
Twin Lakes (14115)	Oneida Narrows
Bancroft (06032)	Petticoat Peak

Action C-LG-1.2.8 - Although considered available for grazing, 1,328 acres within the following allotments would be closed indefinitely to sheep grazing (**Figure 3-12**) due to elevated levels of selenium in water and plants:

Livestock Grazing (LG)

- This closure would remain in place until such time selenium levels can be reduced to acceptable levels through containment or capping.

Grazing Allotments Indefinitely Closed To Sheep Grazing			
Allotment Name	Public Land Total Acres	Public Land Acres Affected by Selenium	Percent Allotment Affected
Trail Canyon-1	309	123	40
Trail Canyon-2	190	25	13
Woodall Mountain	1,670	1,180	71

Objective C-LG-1.3. Implement the Secretarial Order (Congressional Withdrawal #157, Idaho #9) which established the BSD.

Action C-LG-1.3.1 - Livestock use within the BSD would be limited to “Trailing Only”.

Action C-LG-1.3.2 - Allotments would be eliminated entirely or partially closed as identified below, totaling approximately 8,400 acres of public land.

Allotment Name (Number)	Status
Beaver Creek (04316)	Partially Closed
Blackfoot River (04201)	Partially Closed
Blackfoot River (04320)	Partially Closed
Blackfoot River (04121)	Partially Closed
EIGA Blackfoot River (14112)	Partially Closed
Blackfoot River (14092)	Eliminated
Blackfoot River (04430)	Eliminated
Miner Creek (04413)	Eliminated
Trail Creek-1 (04419)	Eliminated
Government Dam (0010)	Eliminated
Negro Creek (0006)	Eliminated
Sagehen Campground (0007)	Eliminated
Womack-Spring Creek (0005)	Eliminated

Action C--LG-1.3.3 - The grazing preferences for portions of allotments within the BSD closed to grazing would be adjusted accordingly.

Action C-LG-1.3.4 - While maintaining or improving rangeland health conditions and PFC of the riparian areas, up to approximately 1,400 AUMs would be available for trailing purposes (BSD) for those permittees/lessees with a valid trailing permit.

Minerals and Energy (ME)

Goal ME-2. Develop mineral resources (oil and gas, geothermal, solid minerals) consistent with other resources and uses as part of an ecologically healthy ecosystem.

Management Objectives

Objective C-ME-2.1. Manage approximately 602,600 acres of the federal mineral estate as open for fluid minerals leasing (e.g., oil, gas, and geothermal resources).

Management Actions

Action C-ME-2.1.1- Fluid mineral leasing activities would be subject to standard lease terms, conditions, and applicable special stipulations identified in **Appendix H**.

Action C-ME-2.1.2 - To protect WSAs, approximately 11,200 acres would be closed to fluid mineral leasing (**Figure 2-31**).

Action C-ME-2.1.3 - On approximately 347,300 acres, the following areas would be leased with a fluid minerals NSO stipulation to protect resources (e.g., soils, wildlife, water, cultural resources) (**Figure 2-31**).

- Withdrawal - Bear River Reclamation Project
- Withdrawal - Soda Point
- Withdrawal - Last Chance
- Withdrawal - Fort Hall Irrigation Project
- Withdrawal - Soda Springs Project

Minerals and Energy (ME)

- Withdrawals - Public Water Reserves (125 & 107)
- Withdrawals - Power Sites and Generating Facilities
- Communications Sites
- Recreation and Public Purpose Patents/Leases
- Malad Air Navigation Site
- Water/Power - Minidoka Reclamation Project
- Blackfoot Stock Driveway
- Communication Sites
- Downey Watershed ACEC
- Juniper Town Site ACEC
- Indian Rocks ACEC
- Bowen Canyon Bald Eagle Sanctuary ACEC
- Travertine Park ACEC
- Stump Creek ACEC
- Van Komen Homestead ACEC
- Dairy Hollow RNA
- Formation Cave RNA
- Oneida Narrows RNA
- Travertine Park RNA
- Pine Gap RNA
- Robber's Roost RNA
- Cheatbeck Canyon RNA
- Soda Springs Hills Management Area
- Historical Sites and Trails
- Developed Recreation Sites/Campgrounds
- Highly erosive soils on slopes greater than 20%
- Steep Slopes, >30%
- Riparian/Wetlands, Perennial Streams, Lakes
- Bear Lake Plateau/Sheep Creek Hills (Sensitive Species Habitat - Flora and Fauna)

Action C-ME 2.1.4 - On approximately 439,000 acres, public lands would be leased with a seasonal occupancy stipulation to protect big game winter range, calving, fawning; and/or nesting activities. (Note: Seasonal closure acreage amount may include other BLM lands closed to development.)

- Fluid minerals exploration drilling and development would comply with the seasonal wildlife restrictions (**Appendix D**).
- Seasonal wildlife restrictions would not be applicable to production activities.

Action C-ME 2.1.5 - Special stipulations would be changed only by waiver, exceptions, or modifications as outlined by specific criteria in **Appendix H**.

Action C-ME 2.1.6 - Areas open for leasing would also be available for consideration of geophysical exploration activities subject to NSO and seasonal occupancy restrictions.

Action C-ME-2.1.7- Lands acquired for special purposes or with special funding and adjacent public lands in conjunction with the acquired lands would be managed in a manner consistent with the purpose of the acquisition; typically an NSO stipulation.

Objective C-ME-2.2. Manage approximately 582,400 acres of the federal mineral estate (leasable minerals) as open to solid minerals leasing (e.g., phosphate) subject to standard lease terms, and conditions.

Action C-ME-2.2.1 - A nondiscretionary closure would be in effect for WSAs, consisting of approximately 11,200 acres (**Figure 2-19**).

Action C-ME-2.2.2 - Discretionary closures (agency administrative) would be in effect on approximately 20,200 acres as identified below (**Figure 2-19**):

- Petticoat Peak RNA
- Dairy Hollow RNA
- Formation Cave RNA
- Oneida Narrows RNA
- Travertine Park RNA
- Pine Gap RNA
- Robber's Roost RNA
- Cheatbeck Canyon RNA
- Soda Springs Hills Management Area (LWCF/BPA and public lands portions)

Action C-ME-2.2.3 - Appropriate site specific mitigation measures, developed during BLM preparation or review of an operations plan, would be implemented as conditions of approval.

Minerals and Energy (ME)

Action C-ME-2.2.4 - Lands acquired for special purposes or with special funding and adjacent public lands managed in conjunction with the acquired lands would be managed in a manner consistent with the purpose of the acquisition; typically these lands would be closed to solid leasable minerals.

Action C-ME-2.2.5 - Seasonal wildlife restrictions (**Appendix D**) would not apply to the operation and maintenance of solid leasable mineral production facilities unless the findings of analysis demonstrate the continued need for such mitigation and that less stringent, project-specific mitigation measures would be insufficient.

Objective C-ME-2.3. Manage approximately 544,800 acres of the federal mineral estate (salable minerals) as open to mineral material disposal subject to standard permit terms, and conditions.

Action C-ME-2.3.1 - A nondiscretionary closure would be in effect for WSAs, consisting of approximately 11,200 acres (**Figure 2-32**).

Action C-ME-2.3.2 - Discretionary closures (agency administrative) would be in effect on approximately 57,800 acres as listed below (**Figure 2-32**):

- Withdrawal - Bear River Reclamation Project
- Withdrawal - Soda Point
- Withdrawal - Last Chance
- Withdrawal - Fort Hall Irrigation Project
- Withdrawal - Soda Springs Project
- Withdrawals - Public Water Reserves (125 & 107)
- Withdrawals - Power Sites and Generating Facilities
- Malad Air Navigation Site
- Water/Power - Minidoka Reclamation Project
- Communications sites
- Downey Watershed ACEC
- Dairy Hollow RNA
- Formation Cave RNA
- Oneida Narrows RNA
- Travertine Park RNA
- Pine Gap RNA
- Robber's Roost RNA
- Petticoat Peak RNA
- Cheatbeck Canyon RNA
- Soda Springs Hills Management Area
- Rare and Sensitive Plant Habitat
- Blackfoot Stock Driveway

Action C-ME-2.3.3 - Site specific mitigation measures would be developed through the NEPA process and applied to ensure that operations comply with applicable laws, land use plan guidance and do not result in unnecessary degradation.

Action C-ME-2.2.4 - Lands acquired for special purposes or with special funding and adjacent public lands managed in conjunction with the acquired lands would be managed in a manner consistent with the purpose of the acquisition; typically these lands would be closed to salable minerals.

Objective C-ME-2.4. Manage approximately 564,900 acres of the federal mineral estate (locatable minerals) as open to location of mining claims.

Action C-ME-2.4.1 - Nondiscretionary closures would be in effect for approximately 29,700 acres as identified below (**Figure 2-21**):

- Withdrawal - Bear River Reclamation Project
- Withdrawal - Soda Point
- Withdrawal - Last Chance
- Withdrawal - Fort Hall Irrigation Project
- Withdrawal - Soda Springs Project
- Withdrawal - Downey Watershed (also an ACEC)
- Withdrawals - Public Water Reserves (125 & 107)
- Withdrawals - Power Sites and Generating Facilities
- Recreation and Public Purpose Patents
- Recreation and Public Purpose Leases
- Soda Springs Hills Management (Only LWCF/BPA acquired lands)

Action C-ME-2.4.2 - A mineral entry withdrawal (discretionary closure, agency administrative) would be pursued on approximately 19,200 for the following areas:

- Cheatbeck Canyon RNA
- Dairy Hollow RNA
- Formation Cave RNA
- Oneida Narrow RNA
- Pine Gap RNA

Minerals and Energy (ME)

- Robbers Roost RNA
- Travertine Park RNA
- Petticoat Peak RNA
- Soda Springs Hills Management Area
- Bowen Canyon Bald Eagle Sanctuary ACEC

Action C-ME-2.4.3 - Appropriate site specific mitigation measures, developed during BLM preparation or review of an NOI or a PO, would be implemented as conditions of approval.

Action C-ME 2.4.4 - Lands acquired for special purposes or with special funding would be managed in a manner consistent with the purpose of the acquisition and would not be opened to mineral entry.

Action C-ME-2.4.5 - Consistent with the purposes of future land acquisitions, public lands managed in conjunction with the acquired lands would be withdrawn from mineral entry.

Recreation (RE)

Goal RE-1: Manage lands for dispersed recreation.

Management Objectives

Management Actions

Objective C-RE-1.1. Manage lands for a variety of non-motorized, mechanized, and motorized opportunities, with an emphasis on non-motorized and mechanized opportunities.

Action C-RE-1.1.1 - Coordinate with the Idaho Statewide Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation and Tourism Plan (Idaho State Parks and Recreation 2003), other agencies, and the tribes with regard to recreational use of public lands and for developing new recreation opportunities.

Action C-RE-1.1.2- Management tools such as ROS, VRM, and LAC would be used in managing recreation opportunities.

Objective C-RE-1.2. Recreation facility development and permitted recreation activities would be consistent with other resource goals of the area in which they are located.

Action C-RE-1.2.1 - SRPs for commercial, non-commercial competitive events and organized groups would be issued consistent with the areas resource values and uses.

Action C-RE-1.2.2 - Facility development and improvements would be focused on existing recreation sites and SRMAs.

Goal RE-3: Provide for a variety of recreational opportunities and experiences.

Management Objectives

Management Actions

Objective C-RE-3.1. Recognize recreation as the principal use on approximately 59,200 acres of public lands within SRMAs.

Action C-RE-3.1.1 - SRMAs would be recognized as priority for recreation funding and personnel to fulfill commitments made to provide specific structured recreation opportunities (e.g., activity, experience, and benefit opportunities).

Action C-RE-3.1.2 - The Blackfoot River SRMA (approximately 21,800 acres) would continue to be managed to maintain and/or enhance targeted recreational opportunities, experiences and benefits with a primary market based strategy being “**Destination**” for a market base of southeast Idaho.

- The SRMA would be managed to provide various recreational opportunities and outcomes (activities, experiences and benefits) based on a unique niche in each of the 5 RMZ identified below:
 - Wolverine Canyon (approximately 4,300 acres) (**Table 2-5a**)
 - Campground (approximately 80 acres) (**Table 2-5b**)
 - Reservoir (approximately 7,200 acres) (**Table 2-5c**)
 - Mid River (approximately 7,800 acres) (**Table 2-5d**)
 - Lower River (approximately 2,400 acres) (**Table 2-5e**)
- For each RMZ, management direction and the prescribed ROS setting would be followed as described in respective tables.
- An SRMA management plan would be developed and implemented.

Action C-RE-3.1.3 - The Pocatello SRMA (approximately 33,400 acres) would continue to be managed to maintain and/or enhance targeted recreational opportunities, experiences and benefits with a primary market based strategy being “**Community**” for a market base of southeast Idaho.

- The SRMA would be managed to provide various recreational opportunities and outcomes (activities, experiences and benefits) based on a unique niche in each of the 5 RMZ identified below:
 - West Bench (approximately 4,100 acres) (**Table 2-5f**)

Recreation (RE)

- Blackrock (approximately 15,100 acres) (Table 2-5g)
- Papoose (approximately 3,400 acres) (Table 2-5h)
- East Bench (approximately 1,400 acres) (Table 2-5i)
- Dispersed (approximately 9,400 acres) (Table 2-5j)
- For each RMZ, management direction and the prescribed ROS setting would be followed as described in respective tables.
- An SRMA management plan would be developed and implemented.

Action C-RE-3.1.4 - The Oneida Narrows SRMA (approximately 3,600 acres) would be identified and managed to maintain and/or enhance targeted recreational opportunities, experiences and benefits with the primary market based strategy being “Destination” for a market base of SE Idaho and northern Utah.

- The SRMA would be managed to provide various recreational opportunities and outcomes (activities, experiences and benefits) based on a unique niche in each of the 2 RMZ identified below:
 - River (approximately 1,900 acres) (Table 2-5k)
 - Reservoir (approximately 1,700 acres) (Table 2-5l)
- For each RMZ, management direction and the prescribed ROS setting would be followed as described in respective tables.
- An SRMA management plan would be developed and implemented.

Action C-RE-3.1.5 - The Campground SRMA (approximately 430 acres) would be identified and managed to maintain and/or enhance targeted recreational opportunities, experiences and benefits with the primary market based strategy being “Destination” for a market base of southeast Idaho and northern Utah.

- The SRMA would be managed to provide various recreational opportunities and outcomes (activities, experiences and benefits) based on a unique niche in each of the 3 RMZ identified below:
 - Hawkins Reservoir (approximately 120 acres) (Table 2-6a)
 - Goodenough (approximately 280 acres) (Table 2-6b)
 - Pipeline (approximately 30 acres) (Table 2-6c)
- For each RMZ, management direction and the prescribed ROS setting would be followed as described in respective tables.
- An SRMA management plan would be developed and implemented.

Objective C-RE-3.2 - Continue to manage approximately 554,600 acres as an ERMA.

Action C-RE-3.2.1 - ERMAs would be managed in a custodial manner and provide for visitor health and safety. Basic recreation functions would use the following guidelines:

1. **Administrative Actions:**
 - SRPs would be issued if consistent with other resources and uses.
 - Law Enforcement presence would be limited.
 - Visitor services would be limited to basic information such as travel management signs, site specific restrictions, general maps, travel plan maps and very basic facilities may be utilized in high use areas.
2. **Management:**
 - Focus on minimizing user conflicts with other resources and uses.
 - Would be custodially managed, that is minimal physical facilities/ structures would be provided except if necessary to provide for visitor health and safety.
3. **Marketing:**
 - Provide maps.
 - Provide road/trail maps.
 - Utilize the internet to provide recreation information.
4. **Monitoring:**
 - Visitor satisfaction through field contacts.
 - User conflict.
 - Visitor safety.
 - Resource damage.

Table 2-6a. General Management Guidance and Targeted Outcomes for the **Hawkins Reservoir RMZ** of the Campground SRMA.

GENERAL MANAGEMENT GUIDANCE

Niche: Semi-Developed Camping/Hawkins Reservoir Access

Management Objective: Maintain opportunities within the Hawkins Recreation Site at existing level of development and maintain facilities in good condition.

Targeted Outcomes

Primary Activities: Fishing, camping, picnicking, boating, social gathering, wildlife viewing, viewing scenery.

Experiences: Developing skills & abilities, experiencing a greater sense of independence, spending time with family/friends, enjoying nature, exercise/physical fitness, escape personal/social pressure, learning/teaching about the outdoors.


Benefits:

Personal - Personal development and growth, improve physical and mental health, greater self-reliance, improve outdoor recreation skills, and improve relationship with family/friends, personal appreciation and satisfaction.

Community/Social - Lifestyle improvement, heightened sense of appreciation for public lands in local area.

Environmental - Increased awareness and protection of natural landscapes.

Economic - Increased local tourism revenues, maintenance of area's recreation-tourism market niche or character, increased desirability as a place to live, provide food.



NATURAL RESOURCE RECREATION SETTINGS

Existing Setting: _____

Prescribed/Desired Setting: Gray shaded area.

PHYSICAL SETTING - Describes the character of the natural landscape.

LAND & FACILITIES	PRIMITIVE PRISTINE TRANSITION		BACK COUNTRY	MIDDLE COUNTRY	FRONT COUNTRY	RURAL	URBAN
REMOVEDNESS	More than 10 miles from any road	More than 3 miles from any road	More than ½ mile from any kind of road, but less than 3 miles. No road in sight.	On or near 4WD roads, less than ½ mile from all improved roads. Roads may be in sight	On or near improved roads, but at least ½ mile from highways.	On or near primary highways, but still within a rural area.	Municipal streets and roads within towns or cities.
NATURALNESS	Undisturbed natural landscape.		Naturally-appearing landscape having modifications not readily noticeable.	Naturally appearing landscape except for obvious primitive roads.	Landscape partially modified by roads, utility lines, etc., but none overpower natural landscape features.	Natural landscape substantially modified by agriculture or industrial development.	Urbanized development dominates landscape.
FACILITIES	None		Some primitive trails made of native materials, log bridges, wooden signs.	Maintained and marked trails, simple trailhead developments, improved signs, and very basic toilets.	Improved yet modest, rustic facilities such as campsites, restrooms, trails, and interpretive signs.	Modern facilities such as campgrounds, group shelters, boat launches, and occasional exhibits.	Elaborate full-service facilities such as laundry, restaurants, and groceries.

SOCIAL SETTING - Describes the character of recreation and tourism use.

VISITOR USE & USERS	PRIMITIVE PRISTINE TRANSITION	BACK COUNTRY	MIDDLE COUNTRY	FRONT COUNTRY	RURAL	URBAN
CONTACTS	Fewer than 3 encounters/day and fewer than 6 encounters per day on travel routes.	3-6 encounters/day off travel routes (e.g. campsites) and 7-15 encounters per day on travel routes.	7-14 encounters/day off travel routes (e.g. staging areas) and 15-29 encounters/day en route.	15-29 encounters/day off travel routes (e.g. campgrounds) and 30 or more encounters/day en route.	People seem to be generally everywhere.	Busy place with other people constantly in view.
GROUP SIZE (Other than your own)	Fewer than or equal to 3 people per group.	4-6 people per group.	7-12 people per group.	13-25 people per group.	26-50 people per group.	Greater than 50 people per group.
EVIDENCE OF USE	Only foot prints observed. No noise or litter.	Footprints and bicycle tracks observed. Noise and litter infrequent. Slight vegetation trampling at campsites and popular areas. Fire rings seen.	Vehicle tracks observed. Occasional noise and litter. Vegetation and soils becoming worn at campsites, along travel routes, at popular areas.	Vehicle tracks common. Some noise and litter. Vegetation and soils commonly worn at campsites, along travel routes and popular areas.	Frequent noise and litter. Large, localized vegetation damage & soil compaction	Unavoidable noise & litter. Widespread vegetation damage & soil compaction.

ADMINISTRATIVE SETTING - Describes how public land managers, county commissioners/municipal governments and local businesses care for area and serve local residents.

ADMINISTRATION & SERVICES	PRIMITIVE PRISTINE TRANSITION	BACK COUNTRY	MIDDLE COUNTRY	FRONT COUNTRY	RURAL	URBAN
MECHANIZED USE	None whatsoever.	Mountain bikes and perhaps other mechanized use, but all is non-motorized.	4WD's, ATV's, dirt bikes, or snowmobiles, in addition to non-motorized, mechanized use.	2WD vehicles predominant, but also 4WD's and non-motorized, mechanized use.	Ordinary highway auto and truck traffic is characteristic.	Wide variety of street vehicles and highway traffic is ever-present
VISITOR SERVICES	None is available on-site.	Basic maps, but area personnel seldom available to provide on-site assistance.	Area brochures and maps, plus area personnel occasionally present to provide on-site assistance.	Information materials describe recreation areas and activities. Area personnel are periodically available.	Information to the left, plus experience and benefit descriptions. Area personnel do on-site education.	Information to the left, plus regularly scheduled on-site outdoor skills demonstrations clinics.
MANAGEMENT CONTROLS	No visitor controls apparent. No use limits. Enforcement presence very rare.	Signs at key access points on basic user ethics. May have back country use restrictions.	Occasional regulatory signing. Motorized and mechanized use restrictions. Random enforcement presence	Rules clearly posted with some seasonal or day-of-week restrictions. Periodic enforcement presence.	Regulations prominent. Total use limited by permit, reservation, etc. Routine enforcement presence.	Continuous presence to redistribute use and reduce user conflicts, hazards, and resource damage.

Table 2-6b. General Management Guidance and Targeted Outcomes for the Goodenough RMZ of the Campground SRMA.

GENERAL MANAGEMENT GUIDANCE

Niche: Semi-Developed Camping/Goodenough Creek Campground Access

Management Objective: Maintain opportunities within the Goodenough Creek Campground at existing level of development. Facilities would be maintained in good condition.

Targeted Outcomes

Primary Activities: Camping, picnicking, OHV use, horseback riding, mountain biking, social gathering, driving for pleasure, viewing scenery.

Experiences: Developing skills & abilities, experiencing a greater sense of independence, spending time with family/friends, enjoying nature, exercise/ physical fitness, escape personal/social pressure, learning/teaching about the outdoors.


Benefits:

Personal - Personal development and growth, improve physical and mental health, greater self-reliance, improve outdoor recreation skills, improve relationship with family/friends, personal appreciation and satisfaction.

Community/Social - Lifestyle improvement, heightened sense of appreciation for public lands in local area.

Environmental - Increased awareness and protection of natural landscapes

Economic - Increased local tourism revenues, maintenance of area's recreation-tourism market niche or character, increased desirability as a place to live.



NATURAL RESOURCE RECREATION SETTINGS

Existing Setting: _____

Prescribed/Desired Setting: Gray shaded area.

PHYSICAL SETTING - Describes the character of the natural landscape.

LAND & FACILITIES	PRIMITIVE PRISTINE TRANSITION		BACK COUNTRY	MIDDLE COUNTRY	FRONT COUNTRY	RURAL	URBAN
REMOTENESS	More than 10 miles from any road	More than 3 miles from any road	More than 1/2 mile from any kind of road, but less than 3 miles. No road in sight.	On or near 4WD roads, less than 1/2 mile from all improved roads. Roads may be in sight	On or near improved roads, but at least 1/2 mile from highways.	On or near primary highways, but still within a rural area.	Municipal streets and roads within towns or cities.
NATURALNESS	Undisturbed natural landscape.		Naturally-appearing landscape having modifications not readily noticeable.	Naturally appearing landscape except for obvious primitive roads.	Landscape partially modified by roads, utility lines, etc., but none overpower natural landscape features.	Natural landscape substantially modified by agriculture or industrial development.	Urbanized development dominates landscape.
FACILITIES	None		Some primitive trails made of native materials, log bridges, wooden signs.	Maintained and marked trails, simple trailhead developments, improved signs, and very basic toilets.	Improved yet modest, rustic facilities such as campsites, restrooms, trails, and interpretive signs.	Modern facilities such as campgrounds, group shelters, boat launches, and occasional exhibits.	Elaborate full-service facilities such as laundry, restaurants, and groceries.

SOCIAL SETTING - Describes the character of recreation and tourism use.

VISITOR USE & USERS	PRIMITIVE PRISTINE TRANSITION	BACK COUNTRY	MIDDLE COUNTRY	FRONT COUNTRY	RURAL	URBAN
CONTACTS	Fewer than 3 encounters/day and fewer than 6 encounters per day on travel routes.	3-6 encounters/day off travel routes (e.g. campsites) and 7-15 encounters per day on travel routes.	7-14 encounters/day off travel routes (e.g. staging areas) and 15-29 encounters/day en route.	15-29 encounters/day off travel routes (e.g. campgrounds) and 30 or more encounters/day en route.	People seem to be generally everywhere.	Busy place with other people constantly in view.
GROUP SIZE (OTHER THAN YOUR OWN)	Fewer than or equal to 3 people per group.	4-6 people per group.	7-12 people per group.	13-25 people per group.	26-50 people per group.	Greater than 50 people per group.
EVIDENCE OF USE	Only foot prints observed. No noise or litter.	Footprints and bicycle tracks observed. Noise and litter infrequent. Slight vegetation trampling at campsites and popular areas. Fire rings seen.	Vehicle tracks observed. Occasional noise and litter. Vegetation and soils becoming worn at campsites, along travel routes, at popular areas.	Vehicle tracks common. Some noise and litter. Vegetation and soils commonly worn at campsites, along travel routes and popular areas.	Frequent noise and litter. Large, localized vegetation damage & soil compaction	Unavoidable noise & litter. Widespread vegetation damage & soil compaction.

ADMINISTRATIVE SETTING - Describes how public land managers, county commissioners/municipal governments and local businesses care for area and serve local residents.

ADMINISTRATION & SERVICES	PRIMITIVE PRISTINE TRANSITION	BACK COUNTRY	MIDDLE COUNTRY	FRONT COUNTRY	RURAL	URBAN
MECHANIZED USE	None whatsoever.	Mountain bikes and perhaps other mechanized use, but all is non-motorized.	4WD's, ATV's, dirt bikes, or snowmobiles, in addition to non-motorized, mechanized use.	2WD vehicles predominant, but also 4WD's and non-motorized, mechanized use.	Ordinary highway auto and truck traffic is characteristic.	Wide variety of street vehicles and highway traffic is ever-present
VISITOR SERVICES	None is available on-site.	Basic maps, but area personnel seldom available to provide on-site assistance.	Area brochures and maps, plus area personnel occasional present to provide on-site assistance.	Information materials describe recreation areas and activities. Area personnel are periodically available.	Information to the left, plus experience and benefit descriptions. Area personnel do on-site education.	Information to the left, plus regularly scheduled on-site outdoor skills demonstrations clinics.
MANAGEMENT CONTROLS	No visitor controls apparent. No use limits. Enforcement presence very rare.	Signs at key access points on basic user ethics. May have back country use restrictions.	Occasional regulatory signing. Motorized and mechanized use restrictions. Random enforcement presence	Rules clearly posted with some seasonal or day-of-week restrictions. Periodic enforcement presence.	Regulations prominent. Total use limited by permit, reservation, etc. Routine enforcement presence.	Continuous presence to redistribute use and reduce user conflicts, hazards, and resource damage.

Table 2-6c. General Management Guidance and Targeted Outcomes for the Pipeline RMZ of the Campground SRMA.

GENERAL MANAGEMENT GUIDANCE

Niche: Semi-Developed Camping/Snake River Access

Management Objective: Maintain opportunities within the Pipeline Recreation Site at existing level of development. Facilities would be maintained in good condition.

Targeted Outcomes

Primary Activities: Fishing, camping, picnicking, boating, social gathering wildlife viewing, viewing scenery.

Experiences: Developing skills & abilities, experiencing a greater sense of independence, spending time with family/friends, enjoying nature, exercise/physical fitness, escape personal/social pressure, learning/teaching about the outdoors.


Benefits:

Personal - Personal development and growth, improve physical and mental health, greater self-reliance, improve outdoor recreation skills, and improve relationship with family/friends, personal appreciation and satisfaction.

Community/Social - lifestyle improvement, heightened sense of appreciation for public lands in local area.

Environmental - Increased awareness and protection of natural landscapes.

Economic - Increased local tourism revenues, maintenance of area's recreation-tourism market niche or character, increased desirability as a place to live, provide food.



NATURAL RESOURCE RECREATION SETTINGS

Existing Setting:

Prescribed/Desired Setting:

PHYSICAL SETTING - Describes the character of the natural landscape.

LAND & FACILITIES	PRIMITIVE PRISTINE TRANSITION		BACK COUNTRY	MIDDLE COUNTRY	FRONT COUNTRY	RURAL	URBAN
REMOVEDNESS	More than 10 miles from any road	More than 3 miles from any road	More than 1/2 mile from any kind of road, but less than 3 miles. No road in sight.	On or near 4WD roads, less than 1/2 mile from all improved roads. Roads may be in sight	On or near improved roads, but at least 1/2 mile from highways.	On or near primary highways, but still within a rural area.	Municipal streets and roads within towns or cities.
NATURALNESS	Undisturbed natural landscape.		Naturally-appearing landscape having modifications not readily noticeable.	Naturally appearing landscape except for obvious primitive roads.	Landscape partially modified by roads, utility lines, etc., but none overpower natural landscape features.	Natural landscape substantially modified by agriculture or industrial development.	Urbanized development dominates landscape.
FACILITIES	None		Some primitive trails made of native materials, log bridges, wooden signs.	Maintained and marked trails, simple trailhead developments, improved signs, and very basic toilets.	Improved yet modest, rustic facilities such as campsites, restrooms, trails, and interpretive signs.	Modern facilities such as campgrounds, group shelters, boat launches, and occasional exhibits.	Elaborate full-service facilities such as laundry, restaurants, and groceries.

SOCIAL SETTING - Describes the character of recreation and tourism use.

VISITOR USE & USERS	PRIMITIVE PRISTINE TRANSITION	BACK COUNTRY	MIDDLE COUNTRY	FRONT COUNTRY	RURAL	URBAN
CONTACTS	Fewer than 3 encounters/day and fewer than 6 encounters per day on travel routes.	3-6 encounters/day off travel routes (e.g. campsites) and 7-15 encounters per day on travel routes.	7-14 encounters/day off travel routes (e.g. staging areas) and 15-29 encounters/day en route.	15-29 encounters/day off travel routes (e.g. campgrounds) and 30 or more encounters/day en route.	People seem to be generally everywhere.	Busy place with other people constantly in view.
GROUP SIZE (OTHER THAN YOUR OWN)	Fewer than or equal to 3 people per group.	4-6 people per group.	7-12 people per group.	13-25 people per group.	26-50 people per group.	Greater than 50 people per group.
EVIDENCE OF USE	Only foot prints observed. No noise or litter.	Footprints and bicycle tracks observed. Noise and litter infrequent. Slight vegetation trampling at campsites and popular areas. Fire rings seen.	Vehicle tracks observed. Occasional noise and litter. Vegetation and soils becoming worn at campsites, along travel routes, at popular areas.	Vehicle tracks common. Some noise and litter. Vegetation and soils commonly worn at campsites, along travel routes and popular areas.	Frequent noise and litter. Large, localized vegetation damage & soil compaction	Unavoidable noise & litter. Widespread vegetation damage & soil compaction.

ADMINISTRATIVE SETTING - Describes how public land managers, county commissioners/municipal governments and local businesses care for area and serve local residents.

ADMINISTRATION & SERVICES	PRIMITIVE PRISTINE TRANSITION	BACK COUNTRY	MIDDLE COUNTRY	FRONT COUNTRY	RURAL	URBAN
MECHANIZED USE	None whatsoever.	Mountain bikes and perhaps other mechanized use, but all is non-motorized.	4WD's, ATV's, dirt bikes, or snowmobiles, in addition to non-motorized, mechanized use.	2WD vehicles predominant, but also 4WD's and non-motorized, mechanized use.	Ordinary highway auto and truck traffic is characteristic.	Wide variety of street vehicles and highway traffic is ever-present
VISITOR SERVICES	None is available on-site.	Basic maps, but area personnel seldom available to provide on-site assistance.	Area brochures and maps, plus area personnel occasional present to provide on-site assistance.	Information materials describe recreation areas and activities. Area personnel are periodically available.	Information to the left, plus experience and benefit descriptions. Area personnel do on-site education.	Information to the left, plus regularly scheduled on-site outdoor skills demonstrations clinics.
MANAGEMENT CONTROLS	No visitor controls apparent. No use limits. Enforcement presence very rare.	Signs at key access points on basic user ethics. May have back country use restrictions.	Occasional regulatory signing. Motorized and mechanized use restrictions. Random enforcement presence	Rules clearly posted with some seasonal or day-of-week restrictions. Periodic enforcement presence.	Regulations prominent. Total use limited by permit, reservation, etc. Routine enforcement presence.	Continuous presence to redistribute use and reduce user conflicts, hazards, and resource damage.

This page intentionally left blank

Recreation (RE)

Goal RE-4: Establish a comprehensive approach to travel planning and management.

Management Objectives

Management Actions

Objective C-RE-4.1. Designate all public lands in the planning area as Open, Limited, or Closed.

Action C-RE-4.1.1 - WSAs and RNA's (approximately 12,700 acres) would be designated Closed to OHV use and all remaining public lands (approximately 601,100 acres) would be designated as Limited for OHV use.

Action C-RE-4.1.2 - Mechanized travel would be limited to designated routes.

Action C-RE-4.1.3 - Non-motorized travel would not be restricted.

Action C-RE-4.1.4 - Non-motorized opportunities would be expanded by:

1. Reducing the number of designated routes for motor vehicles.
2. Providing moderate to high control on OHV use.

Action C-RE-4.1.5 - Until travel management planning/route designation is completed, travel would be managed in the following manner:

1. Limit travel to designated routes as identified in the Chinese Peak/Blackrock activity plan
2. Recognize existing seasonal closures,
3. Recognize site specific closures for WSAs, ACECs, and RNAs, and
4. Limit motorized and mechanized travel to existing routes in all other areas.

Action C-RE-4.1.6 - For the development of travel management plans, baseline and/or preliminary road/trail networks would be identified using any one of the following available sources:

- Most current existing DOQs as of 2004,
- 2004 NAIP digital color aerial photos,
- Most current existing USGS topographical maps as of January 1, 2005.

Action C-RE-4.1.7 - During travel management planning, intensive use areas for valid motorized activities (e.g., rock crawling, motocross riding) would not be provided.

Action C-RE-4.1.8 - Cross country travel by motorized vehicles and/or the use of roads or trails not identified and/or designated during BLM travel management planning and which are associated with authorized/permitted activities (e.g., range improvement construction/ maintenance, land use authorizations, ROWs, mineral/energy exploration) and/or agency administrative purposes would be authorized only by:

- obtaining prior written approval of the authorized officer, or
- as stipulated in appropriate permits/authorizations.

Activities such as, but not limited to, wildland fire suppression, human health and safety, and cadastral survey would be exempt.

Action C-RE-4.1.9 - Organized events would be compliant with established OHV designations and would be consistent with other resources and uses.

Action C-RE-4.1.10 - Snowmobiling would be managed with the following area restrictions: (**Figure 2-22**):

1. WSAs - Not allowed
2. ACECs - Not allowed
3. RNAs - Not allowed
4. Pocatello SRMA - Not allowed
5. Soda Springs Hills Management Area - Not allowed
6. Big Game Winter Range - Limited to designated routes
7. All other areas - Allowed Without Restriction

Action C-RE-4.1.11 - For the following four areas (Formation Cave RNA, Robbers Roost RNA, Oneida Narrows, and Soda Springs Hills Management Area) the identified routes would be designated for public use with motorized vehicles.

- Formation Cave RNA (**Figure 2-23**)
 - Access road and parking area
- Robbers Roost RNA (**Figure 2-24**)
 - Access route to FS
- Oneida Narrows (**Figure 2-25**)
 - Power Plant Road
 - Bear River Ranches Road
 - Roads within Redpoint and Maple Grove Campgrounds
- Soda Springs Hills Management Area (**Figure 2-2**)
 - Idaho Ranch Canyon
 - 90 Percent Canyon
 - Swenson Canyon
 - Ridgeline Road
 - Doe Alley

Recreation (RE)

Objective C-RE-4.2 Implement comprehensive travel management planning utilizing strategies for motorized, mechanized, and non-motorized recreation.

Action C-RE-4.2.1 - Roads, routes and trails would continue to be inventoried and mapped using best available technology, such as GPS and GIS.

Action C-RE- 4.2.2 - Areas would be prioritized for travel management planning based upon the following criteria:

1. Known conflicts with other resources/uses.
2. Proximity of areas to population centers.
3. Special management areas, special designations, and special status species,
4. Areas of contiguous public land.

Action C-RE-4.2.3 - Travel management planning would use a collaborative approach and the NEPA process.

Action C-RE-4.2.4 - Public involvement and coordination with tribes, agencies, and local governments would be encouraged.

Action C-RE-4.2.5 - For each travel management planning area, the following would be identified as needed:

- Designated routes for motorized vehicles.
- Designated routes for mechanized vehicles.
- Seasonal restrictions.
- Route closures.
- Exemptions for administrative and permitted activities.

Action C-RE-4.2.6 - Criteria that would be considered in travel management plans would include, but is not limited to:

1. Environmental conditions, such as:
 - a. soil stability
 - b. wildlife habitat (e.g., winter range, nesting/brooding rearing habitat, calving/fawning areas)
 - c. special status species habitat
 - d. proximity to riparian areas and/or 303(d) streams
 - e. visual resources
2. User conflicts, such as:
 - a. motorized versus non-motorized
 - b. motorized/mechanized versus non-mechanized
3. Administrative purposes, such as:
 - a. wildland fire suppression activities
 - b. safety
 - c. resource management and permitted activities
4. Public purposes, such as:
 - a. accessing public or private land
 - b. destinations for specific activities
 - c. types of desired use (motorized, mechanized, non-motorized/non-mechanized)
5. Route, vehicle type and size limitations, such as:
 - a. > 50" wheel base (full size vehicles)
 - b. < 50" wheel base (ATVs)
 - c. single track (motorcycles/mountain bikes)

Actions C-RE 4.2.7 - For each travel management planning area, products would be developed and made available through a variety of media sources (e.g., internet). Such products may include travel maps and brochures.

SPECIAL DESIGNATIONS

Administrative Designations (AD)

Goal AD-1. Provide for public land areas suitable for administrative designations.

Management Objectives

Management Actions

Objective C-AD-1.1 - Designate approximately 400 acres (Figure 2-33) as the Petticoat Peak RNA due to the areas unique and undisturbed vegetative communities (Appendix K).

Action C-AD-1.1.1 - The Petticoat Peak RNA (approximately 400 acres) would be managed to protect the undisturbed and abundant diversity of mountain sagebrush, mountain mahogany, Douglas-fir, sub-alpine fir, bigtooth maple, and aspen) by implementing the following management practices:

- The area would be discretionarily closed for solid leasable minerals and salable minerals.
- The OHV designation would be Closed.
- Wildland fire would be suppressed.
- Public lands would be retained
- The area would be identified as an "Exclusion" area for ROWs.
- Fluid minerals would be leased with a NSO stipulation.
- The area would be unavailable for livestock grazing.
- A withdrawal for locatable minerals would be pursued.
- Vegetation would be monitored to understand natural ecological processes and/or determine trends.
- Vegetation would be inventoried to establish baseline information and identify threats.
- The area would be a priority for weed control.

Objective C-AD-1.2. Continue to manage the 7 ACECs (approximately 9,900 acres) and 7 RNAs (approximately 1,500 acres) designated for the unique geological, vegetative, visual, cultural, historical and/or wildlife resource.

Action C-AD-1.2.1 - The Stump Creek ACEC (approximately 2,500 acres) would be managed to protect crucial elk winter range by implementing the following management practices:

- Snowmobile use would not be allowed.
- The OHV designation would be Limited and OHV use would be limited to designated routes.
- Public lands would be retained.
- The area would be identified as an "Avoidance" area for ROWs.
- Wildland fire would be suppressed.
- Fluid minerals would be leased with a NSO stipulation.
- The area would be discretionarily closed to phosphate leasing.
- Livestock grazing would be managed to maintain or improve native vegetation conditions (LHC-A).
- Winter range would be rehabilitated through burning or establishment of browse species.
- The area would be a priority for weed control (e.g., leafy spurge).
- Interpretive sign(s) would be placed at key locations to explain resource values and area use restrictions.
- The Stump Creek Habitat Management Plan (1980) would be updated/revised.

Action C-AD1.2.2 - The Bowen Canyon Bald Eagle Sanctuary ACEC (approximately 2,300 acres) would be managed to protect and provide winter roosting habitat by implementing the following management practices:

- Snowmobile use would not be allowed.
- Public lands would be retained.
- The area would be identified as an "Avoidance" area for ROWs.
- Fluid minerals would be leased with a NSO stipulation.
- The OHV designation would be Limited and OHV use would be limited to designated routes.
- Post pole, firewood or commercial timber sales would not be allowed.
- Habitat would be protected with special stipulations (e.g., NSO) or restrictions (e.g., seasonal wildlife) on various permitted activities.
- Wildland fire would be suppressed.
- Livestock grazing would be managed to maintain or improve native vegetation conditions (LHC-A).
- Acquire private lands from willing sellers in Bowen Canyon and develop a formal cooperative agreement with the private land owner(s).
- Cooperative management of public lands with the Shoshone-Bannock Tribes' privately owned lands in Bowen Canyon would be pursued as opportunities exist.
- A withdrawal of 2300 acre for locatable minerals would be pursued.

Administrative Designations (AD)

Action C-AD-1.2.3 - The Downy Watershed ACEC (approximately 1,900 acres) would be managed to maintain/improve vegetative condition and overall watershed health by implementing the following management practices:

- Wildland fire would be suppressed.
- Public lands would be retained.
- The area would be identified as an "Avoidance" area for ROWs.
- Fluid minerals would be leased with a NSO stipulation.
- Snowmobile use would not be allowed.
- The OHV designation would be Limited and OHV use would be limited to designated routes.
- A withdraw for locatable minerals would be maintained.
- Livestock grazing would be managed to maintain or improve native vegetation conditions (LHC-A).
- The area would be discretionarily closed to phosphate leasing.

Action C-AD-1.2.4 - The Indian Rocks ACEC (approximately 3,100 acres) would be managed to protect relevant cultural resource sites by implementing the following management practices:

- Snowmobile use would not be allowed.
- Public lands would be retained.
- Avoidance area for ROWs.
- Fluid minerals would be leased with a NSO stipulation.
- The OHV designation would be Limited and OHV use would be limited to designated roads and trails.
- Interested Indian Tribes (e.g., Shoshone-Bannock Tribes, Northern Shoshone) would be coordinated with on management issues specific to the ACEC.
- Livestock grazing would be managed to maintain or improve native vegetation conditions (LHC-A).
- Priority area for weed control.
- Guidelines (e.g., areas closed to heavy equipment use, using fire retardant for firelines) would be developed for wildland fire suppression activities.
- Inventory and monitoring of cultural resources would continue.
- Interpretive sign(s) at key location(s) would be placed to explain resource values and/or site use restrictions.

Action C-AD-1.2.5 - The Juniper Townsite and Van Komen Homestead ACECs (approximately 6 acres) would be managed to protect cultural and historical resources by implementing the following management practices:

- Snowmobile use would not be allowed.
- Public lands would be retained.
- Avoidance area for ROWs.
- Fluid minerals would be leased with a NSO stipulation.
- The OHV designation would be Limited and OHV use would be limited to designated routes.
- Partnerships would be pursued with local historical interest groups to protect, maintain and interpret historic structures.
- Structures and improvements would be ensured to be safe for the public.
- Wildland fire would be suppressed.
- The area would be signed to explain important cultural and historical values and the need to protect these values.

Action C-AD-1.2.6 - The Dairy Hollow RNA (approximately 40 acres) would be managed to protect the nearly pristine Wyoming sagebrush/needle-and-thread plant community and Ferruginous Hawk nesting habitat (conglomerate bluffs and columns) by implementing the following management practices:

- The area would be discretionarily closed for solid leasable minerals and salable minerals.
- The OHV designation would be Closed.
- Wildland fire would be suppressed.
- Public lands would be retained.
- The area would be identified as an "Exclusion" area for ROWs.
- Fluid minerals would be leased with a NSO stipulation.
- The area would be unavailable for livestock grazing.
- A withdrawal for locatable minerals would be pursued.
- Vegetation would be monitored to understand natural ecological processes and/or determine trends.

Administrative Designations (AD)

- Vegetation would be inventoried to establish baseline information and identify threats.
- The area would be a priority for weed control.
- Interpretive sign(s) would be placed at key locations to explain resource values and area use restrictions.

Action C-AD-1.2.7 - The Formation Cave RNA (approximately 70 acres) would be managed to protect fragile travertine formation and pristine waterbirch, antelope bitterbrush/Nevada bluegrass, and barren plant communities by implementing the following management practices :

- The area would be discretionarily closed for solid leasable minerals and salable minerals.
- The OHV designation would be Closed with the exception of the Formation Cave parking area and access road which would be a designated route.
- Wildland fire would be suppressed.
- Public lands would be retained.
- The area would be identified as an "Exclusion" area for ROWs.
- Fluid minerals would be leased with a NSO stipulation.
- The area would be unavailable for livestock grazing.
- A withdrawal for locatable minerals would be pursued.
- Vegetation would be monitored to understand natural ecological processes and/or determine trends.
- Vegetation would be inventoried to establish baseline information and identify threats.
- The area would be a priority for weed control.
- The fence, parking area/trailhead, trail system, footbridges, and interpretative signs would be maintained.
- Coordinate with The Nature Conservancy on the management of the RNA.

Action C-AD-1.2.8 - The Oneida Narrows RNA (approximately 600 acres) would be managed to protect the nearly pristine plant communities (e.g., bigtooth maple, box-elder riparian, Rocky Mountain juniper, and bunchgrass), Bald Eagle and Rock Squirrel habitat by implementing the following management practices:

- The area would be discretionarily closed for solid leasable minerals and salable minerals.
- The OHV designation would be Closed with the exception of the Oneida Project Road which would be a designated route.
- Wildland fire would be suppressed.
- Public lands would be retained.
- The area would be identified as and "Exclusion" area for ROWs.
- Fluid minerals would be leased with a NSO stipulation.
- The area would be unavailable for livestock grazing.
- A withdrawal for locatable minerals would be pursued.
- Vegetation would be monitored to understand natural ecological processes and/or determine trends.
- Vegetation would be inventoried to establish baseline information and identify threats.
- The area would be a priority for weed control.
- Interpretive sign(s) would be placed at key location(s) to explain resource values and area use restrictions.

Action C-AD-1.2.9 - - The Pine Gap RNA (approximately 240 acres) would be managed to protect the nearly pristine black sagebrush/bluebunch wheatgrass plant community by implementing the following management practices:

- The area would be discretionarily closed for solid leasable minerals and salable minerals.
- The OHV designation would be Closed.
- Wildland fire would be suppressed.
- Public lands would be retained.
- The area would be identified as an "Exclusion" area for ROWs.
- Fluid minerals would be leased with a NSO stipulation.
- The area would be unavailable for livestock grazing.
- A withdrawal for locatable minerals would be pursued.
- Vegetation would be monitored to understand natural ecological processes and/or determine trends.
- Vegetation would be inventoried to establish baseline information and identify threats.

Administrative Designations (AD)

- The area would be a priority for weed control.
- Interpretive sign(s) would be placed at key location(s) to explain resource values and area use restrictions.

Action C-AD-1.2.10 - The Robbers Roost RNA (approximately 400 acres) would be managed to protect the unique abundance of mountain shrub communities by implementing the following management practices:

- The area would be discretionarily closed for solid leasable minerals and salable minerals.
- The OHV designation would be Closed with the exception of the Robbers Roost Road which would be a designated route.
- Wildland fire would be suppressed.
- Public lands would be retained.
- The area would be identified as an "Exclusion" area for ROWs.
- Fluid minerals would be leased with a NSO stipulation.
- The area would be unavailable for livestock grazing.
- A withdrawal for locatable minerals would be pursued.
- Vegetation would be monitored to understand natural ecological processes and/or determine trends.
- Vegetation would be inventoried to establish baseline information and identify threats.
- The area would be priority for weed control.
- Interpretive sign(s) would be placed at key location(s) to explain resource values and area use restrictions.

Action C-AD-1.2.11 - The Cheatbeck RNA (approximately 100 acres) would be managed protect the plant communities of boxelder/sweet cicely and bigtooth maple/sweet cicely by implementing the following management practices:

- The area would be discretionarily closed for solid leasable minerals and salable minerals.
- The OHV designation would be Closed.
- Wildland fire would be suppressed.
- Public lands would be retained.
- The area would be identified as an "Exclusion" area for ROWs.
- Fluid minerals would be leased with a NSO stipulation.
- The area would be unavailable to livestock grazing.
- A withdrawal for locatable minerals would be pursued.
- Vegetation would be monitored to understand natural ecological processes and/or determine trends.
- Vegetation would be inventoried to establish baseline information and identify threats.
- The area would be a priority for weed control.

Action C-AD-1.2.12 - The Travertine Park ACEC and RNA (approximately 200 acres) would be managed to protect fragile travertine formations and uncommon lichen species of by implementing the following management practices:

- Snowmobile use would not be allowed.
- Wildland fire would be suppressed.
- Public lands would be retained.
- Avoidance area for ROWs (outside of the RNA portion).
- Exclusion area for ROWs (RNA portion only).
- Fluid minerals would be leased with a NSO stipulation.
- The area would be discretionarily closed for solid leasable minerals and salable minerals.
- The OHV designation would be Closed for the RNA portion only.
- The OHV designation for the ACEC portion only would be Limited and OHV use would be limited to designated trails.
- The area would be unavailable for livestock grazing.
- A withdrawal for locatable minerals would be pursued.
- Vegetation would be monitored to understand natural ecological processes and/or determine trends.
- Vegetation would be inventoried to establish baseline information and identify threats.
- The area would be a priority for weed control.
- Interpretive sign(s) would be placed at key location(s) to explain resource values and area use restrictions.

2.12 MANAGEMENT GUIDANCE FOR ALTERNATIVE D

Table 2-7 describes the management guidance that would be applicable to Alternative D, which generally focuses on the production of goods and services from public lands. Protection and enhancement of resources would be secondary except as mandated by laws, regulations, and policies.

Key components to Alternative D are as follows:

- Management of special status species and vegetation with an emphasis on maintaining and improving important native vegetation habitats but at a lower level than either Alternative B or C. Management treatments would emphasize fiber and biomass production in the forested habitat types.
- Management of land tenure adjustments to improve administrative efficiency and protect resources while supporting appropriate development and improved public access to public lands with a greater emphasis on acquiring nonfederal lands but only when necessary to enhance multiple use, to protect significant resource values, and to improve public lands administration.
- Management of minerals and energy resources to emphasize development, but also to meet the minimal needs for the conservation and protection of resources.
- Management of OHV opportunities and use by designating public lands as “Limited” through maintaining and expanding designated OHV routes using existing trails and routes, minimal control of OHVs, and not restricting non-motorized uses.
- Management of fire to include treatments with an emphasis on the broad range of vegetation types in the PFO to move toward FRCC 1, but with an emphasis on actions to mimic historical conditions but reducing wildland fire by one-half.

Table 2-7. Management Guidance for Alternative D

RESOURCES	
Special Status Species (SS)	
<i>Goal SS-1. Manage special status species and their habitats to provide for their continued presence and conservation as part of an ecologically healthy system.</i>	
<i>Management Objectives</i>	<i>Management Actions</i>
<p>Objective D-SS-1.1. Maintain or improve the quality of listed (threatened or endangered) species habitat by managing public land activities to benefit those species.</p>	<p>Action D-SS-1.1.1 - Activities would not be allowed that disturb bald eagle nesting from February 1 to August 15, or winter roosting trees from December 1 to March 1.</p> <p>Action D-SS-1.1.2 - Roosting bald eagle habitat would be protected within the Bowen Canyon Bald Eagle Sanctuary ACEC by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No post/pole, firewood, or commercial timber sales would be allowed. • To protect eagle habitat, applicable stipulations would be placed on locatable minerals, leasable minerals and fluid mineral leases (NSO). • Commercial road operations would not be allowed from November 15 through April 15. • Snowmobile use (except that needed for research and the administration of public lands within the ACEC) would not be allowed from November 15 to April 15. • Wildland fire would be suppressed. • Cooperatively managing, as opportunities exist, public lands with Shoshone-Bannock Tribes' privately owned lands within Bowen Canyon.

Special Status Species (SS)

	<p>Action D-SS-1.1.3 - Utah valvata snail quality shoreline habitats on public lands adjacent to the Snake River would be maintained by not allowing shore-disturbing activities if determined to be detrimental to snail populations.</p> <p>Action D-SS-1.1.4 - Activities on public lands within the Yellowstone Nonessential Experimental Population Area (east of I-15) or the Central Idaho Nonessential Experimental Population Area (west of I-15) which would disturb within one mile of active gray wolf den sites and rendezvous sites between April 1 and June 30 when five or fewer breeding pairs are present would not be allowed. (USFWS 1994a and 1994b).</p>
<p>Objective D-SS-1.2. Maintain or improve the quality of sensitive species habitat by managing public land activities to benefit those species.</p>	<p>Action D-SS-1.2.1 - On-going efforts to locate populations of pygmy rabbit would be supported. When populations are located, the habitat would be managed using current scientific information so as not to contribute to the species listing.</p> <p>Action D-SS-1.2.2 - On-going efforts to locate populations of boreal toads and Northern leopard frogs would be supported. Where populations are located, permitted activities would be managed to maintain the quality of frog or toad habitat.</p> <p>Action D-SS-1.2.3 - The following guidelines for greater sage-grouse habitats would be implemented adapted from Giesen and Connelly (1993):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Maintain and enhance existing greater sage-grouse habitats used during each stage of the life cycle.• Minimize human activities that disrupt greater sage-grouse habitats during their seasons of use particularly during the breeding and winter seasons.• Minimize undesired habitat modifications resulting from authorized activities such as land-tenure adjustments, road and facility construction, etc.• Minimize undesired habitat modifications from adverse natural disturbances (wildland fire, insects, disease, etc.). <p>Action D-SS-1.2.4 - For Bear Lake endemic fish (Bear Lake cutthroat trout, Bonneville cisco, Bonneville whitefish, Bear Lake whitefish and Bear Lake sculpin) water degrading activities on public lands with streams connecting to Bear Lake would be reduced.</p> <p>Action D-SS-1.2.5 - Nesting and brood rearing habitat would be maintained in suitable condition for approximately 1.2 miles from known leks for Columbian sharp-tailed grouse. When assessing the condition of the habitat, adjacent land uses within two miles of these areas would be considered (adapted from Giesen and Connelly 1993).</p> <p>Action D-SS-1.2.6 - The following guidelines would be implemented for the globally important ferruginous hawk habitat in the Curlew Valley as adapted from Chipley 1998:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Restricting activities which would disturb within ½ mile of active nests from March 1 to July 15.• Monitoring populations in Curlew Valley and on the Bear Lake Plateau.• Maintaining existing scattered juniper trees for nesting.• Maintaining or improving habitat suitable for prey populations such as jackrabbits. <p>Action D-SS-1.2.7 - Where populations of American white pelicans are located on public lands, the quality of nesting habitat would be managed as a priority for the benefit of the pelican.</p> <p>Action D-SS-1.2.8 - Conservation strategies would be implemented for Yellowstone and Bonneville cutthroat trout to provide for their continued presence as identified below.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Where species exist in functioning at risk or non-functioning streams management priority would be to bring these streams to PFC.• High quality cutthroat trout habitat would be managed for as described in Appendix E.• Strive to connect fragmented habitats and reconnect streams to migratory corridors through land tenure adjustments. <p>Action D-SS-1.2.9 - The following general management actions would be considered to promote healthy, naturally functioning ecosystems in sensitive plant habitat:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Avoid actions that cause concentrated use or disturbance (e.g., trampling, OHVs, dozer lines, range improvements) in habitat.• Avoid spraying of pesticides within a 1/4 mile of occupied habitat unless clearly beneficial to sensitive plants.• Avoid seeding within occupied habitat unless clearly beneficial to sensitive plants.• Methods of weed spraying within or near (1/4 mile) habitat would be

Special Status Species (SS)

- formulated on site specific and species specific basis.
- Promote healthy naturally functioning ecosystem components within a 1/4 mile of habitat to support a viable population.
- Inventory potential habitat for flora sensitive species monitor population trends.

Vegetation (VE)

Goal VE-6. Manage vegetation types to provide for their continued presence as part of an ecologically healthy system.

Management Objectives

Management Actions

Objective D-VE-6.1. In Low- and Mid-Elevation Shrub and Mountain Shrub types maintain or increase LHC-A acres as described below so the landscape is composed of a diversity of desirable/native herbaceous and shrub/woody species consisting of at least 15-25% sagebrush canopy cover in greater sage-grouse habitat in the Low- and Mid-Elevation Shrub type and at least 25% shrub cover in the Mountain Shrub type. (Appendix J, Section III)

Action D-VE-6.1.1 - Activities would be permitted/authorized in a manner consistent with Idaho Standards for Rangeland Health (**Appendix A**).

Action D-VE-6.1.2 - Criteria for treatment/restoration would be:

1. Landscape-scale projects designed to reduced the COMBINED risk to human life/property and resources (i.e. where WUI and ecosystems at risk coincide).
2. Interagency planning at the landscape level in conjunction with active community participation and the development of partnerships with stakeholders.

Action D-VE-6.1.3 - Treatment/restoration priorities would be:

1. Areas with potential to increase perennial grass and forbs.
 - a. In crested wheatgrass seedings, treatments (e.g., rangeland drilling, spraying, fertilizing, prescribed fire, chaining) may be used to improve seeding production while moving toward or maintaining land health standards.
2. Areas being impacted/degraded by uses or activities (e.g., recreation, OHV, grazing).
3. Areas infested by noxious weeds.
4. Habitat for Greater Sage-grouse and sharp-tailed grouse and special status species.

Desired LHC Description	Percent LHC Desired
LHC-A - All key components are present as identified in land health standards and as described in the definition of FRCC 1.	> 65%
LHC-B - Some or all of the key components as identified in land health standards are present and as described in the definition of FRCC 2.	15-20%
LHC-C - Key components are absent as identified in land health standards and as described in the definition of FRCC 3.	< 15%

Objective D-VE-6.2. In the Aspen/Aspen Conifer Mix and Dry Conifer types, maintain or increase LHC-A and B acres as described below so the landscape is composed of 80% Dry Conifer dominate and 20% Aspen/Dry Conifer mix resulting in a distribution of age classes of <30 years (20%), 31-80 years (40%), and >81 years (40%).

Action D-VE-6.2.1 -The harvesting of conifer species and Aspen would be increased while considering partial cuts or other appropriate methods would be to maintain the conifer component as needed.

Action D-VE-6.2.2 - Harvesting of conifers would focus on an age class of >60 years.

Action D-VE-6.2.3 - Areas would be treated for biomass production.

Action D-VE-6.2.4 - Criteria for the treatment/restoration of the Aspen/Aspen Conifer Mix and Dry Conifer types would be:

1. Landscape-scale projects designed to reduced the COMBINED risk to human life/property and resources (e.g., where WUI and ecosystems at risk coincide).
2. Interagency planning at the landscape level in conjunction with active community participation and the development of partnerships with stakeholders.

Action D-VE-6.2.5 - In the Aspen/Aspen Conifer Mix and Dry Conifer type, treatment/restoration priorities would be:

1. Areas with greater then 50% conifer composition.
2. Areas adjacent to deer/elk summer range.

Vegetation (VE)

Desired LHC Description	Percent LHC Desired
LHC-A - All key components are present as identified in land health standards and as described in the definition of FRCC 1.	>25
LHC-B - Some or all of the key components as identified in land health standards are present and as described in the definition of FRCC 2.	35-40
LHC-C - Key components are absent as identified in land health standards and as described in the definition of FRCC 3.	<40

3. Areas significant to special status species.
4. Areas impacted by insects or disease.

Objective D-VE-6.3. In the Wet/Cold Conifer increase LHC-A acres as described below so the landscape is comprised of a distribution of age classes of 0-80 years (30%) and > 80 years (70%).

Action D-VE-6.3.1 - The production of Engelmann spruce would be emphasized.

- Action D-VE-6.3.2** - Criteria for vegetation treatment/restoration would be:
1. Landscape-scale projects designed to reduced the COMBINED risk to human life/property and resources (i.e. where WUI and ecosystems at risk coincide).
 2. Interagency planning at the landscape level in conjunction with active community participation and the development of partnerships with stakeholders.

Action D-VE-6.3.3 - To obtain desired age class distribution areas would be treated using mechanical treatments or prescribed fire.

Desired LHC Description	Percent LHC Desired
LHC-A - All key components are present as identified in land health standards and as described in the definition of FRCC 1.	>10
LHC-B - Some or all of the key components as identified in land health standards are present and as described in the definition of FRCC 2.	85-90
LHC-C - Key components are absent as identified in land health standards and as described in the definition of FRCC 3.	<5

Vegetation (VE)

Objective D-VE-6.4. Maintain or increase natural occurring Juniper LHC-A and B acres as described below through primarily natural processes so the landscape is dominated by widely spaced old juniper trees greater than 300 years.

Action D-VE-6.4.1 - Appropriate methods (e.g., fire suppression) would be used to maintain or promote natural occurring juniper dominated range sites.

Desired LHC Description	Percent LHC Desired
LHC-A - All key components are present as identified in land health standards and as described in the definition of FRCC 1.	>5
LHC-B - Some or all of the key components as identified in land health standards are present and as described in the definition of FRCC 2.	95-100
LHC-C - Key components are absent as identified in land health standards and as described in the definition of FRCC 3.	<5

Wildland Fire Management (WF)

Goal WF-4. Return fire to a more natural role in the ecosystem to improve FRCC and achieve desired LHC.

Management Objectives

Management Actions

Objective D-WF-4.1. Manage the Low-Elevation Shrub and Perennial Grass vegetation types in order to move towards FRCC 1 (LHC-A) so wildland fire occurs less frequently and at a smaller scale on the landscape.

Action D-WF-4.1.1 - Prescribed fire would be used to prepare areas for chemical, mechanical, and/or seeding treatments, or, if needed, for disposal of vegetation or accumulated litter.

Action D-WF 4.1.2 - Treatments would be strategically placed on a landscape scale to prevent fire from spreading toward WUI areas, Low-Elevation Shrub communities, or other resources at risk using the entire array of mechanical, chemical, and small-scale prescribed fire operations to thin, reduce and control hazardous fuels.

Objective D-WF-4.2. Manage the Mid-Elevation Shrub, Juniper, Dry Conifer, Aspen/Conifer, and Mountain Shrub vegetation types by increasing the use of wildland fire and prescribed fire in order to mimic historical conditions (FRCC 1 [LHC-A]).

Action D-WF-4.2.1 - Mechanical and chemical treatments would be used to prepare areas in Fire Condition Class 2 and 3 for prescribed fire and WFU.

Action D-WF-4.2.2 - Where prescriptive parameters, resource conditions, and vegetation conditions allow, WFU or prescribed fire would be use to increase annual average wildland fire acres to a rate similar to historical conditions. Site-specific NEPA analysis would be completed prior to implementation.

Objective D-WF-4.3. In Wet/Cold Conifer, Riparian, and Other/Vegetated Lava vegetation types and/or areas in Fire Condition Class 1, (LHC-A) maintain vegetation conditions using mechanical, chemical, prescribed fire, or WFU treatments, such that wildland fire regimes are similar to historical conditions (FRCC 1) (i.e., maintain the

Action D-WF-4.3.1 - As appropriate, various treatments (e.g., mechanical, prescribed fire, WFU) would be used to maintain landscapes in Fire Condition Class 1.

Wildland Fire Management (WF)

current level of fire in these vegetation types).

Objective D-WF-4.4. Manage for WFU on approximately 468,900 acres identified as suitable (Figure 2-34).

Action D-WF-4.4.1 - WFU may be used in Mid-Elevation Shrub, Juniper (encroached), Mountain Shrub, Aspen/Aspen Conifer Mix, Dry Conifer, Wet/Cold Conifer and Other/Vegetated Lava vegetation types.

Action D-WF-4.4.2 - WFU would not be appropriate on approximately 144,900 acres which may include wildlife habitat, previously rehabilitated areas, and small tracts of public land.

Action D-WF 4.4.3 - Should social, economic, political or resource constraints be resolved, it would be possible to use WFU in areas identified as not appropriate.

Objective D-WF-4.5. For the vegetation types identified, implement over 10 years approximately 162,170 footprint acres of treatment using various treatment methods (i.e. WFU, mechanical, chemical, seeding, and Prescribed fire), as appropriate.

Action D-WF-4.5.1 - By vegetation type, the following approximate footprint acres would be treated.

Vegetation Type	Footprint Acres
Low-Elevation Shrub	9,500
Mid-Elevation Shrub	64,000
Mountain Shrub ¹	15,000
Perennial Grass/Seeding	53,300
Juniper (Natural Only)	0.0
Aspen/Aspen Conifer Mix/Dry Conifer	20,000
Wet/Cold Conifer	70
Riparian	100
Other/Vegetated Lava	200
Total	162,170

¹ Acres identified include encroached juniper.

Objective D-WF-4.6. Implement priorities for wildland fire ignitions, suppression and vegetation treatments.

Action D-WF-4.6.1 - When multiple wildland fire ignitions occur, suppression priorities would be:

1. Protect the WUI and communities-at-risk, where public and firefighter health and safety are a concern.
2. Minimize risks to Low-Elevation Shrub, and Perennial Grass, vegetation types, where large fires typically occur.
3. Minimize risks to other vegetation types, where changes in fuel accumulation and fire occurrence have occurred (i.e., FRCC 2 and FRCC 3 areas).

Action D-WF-4.6.2 - Criteria for establishing vegetation treatments would be:

1. Landscape-scale projects designed to reduce the *combined* risk to human life/property and resources (e.g., where WUI and ecosystems at risk coincide).
2. Projects designed through interagency planning performed at the landscape level in conjunction with active community participation and development of stakeholder partnerships in the planning and monitoring processes.

Action D-WF-4.6.3 - For all vegetation types except Low-Elevation, the AMR would be a "Limited" emphasis of monitoring and confinement actions commensurate with the values at risk and public/firefighter safety. For Low-Elevation Shrub, the AMR would be FULL suppression with initial attack to stop fire spread and put out wildland fire at least cost.

RESOURCE USES

Lands and Realty (LR)

Goal LR-4. Assure land classifications and withdrawals of public lands are appropriate to protect important resource values.

Management Objectives

Management Actions

Objective D-LR-4.1. Continue to manage approximately 67,060 acres of land classified as withdrawn from the general land laws for the specific purposes intended.

Action D-LR-4.1.1- Continue to manage approximately 45,400 acres of public land as withdrawn (e.g., power sites, public water reserves, power projects, administrative sites, BSD).

Action D-LR-4.1.2 - The following withdrawals (approximately 20,160 acres) would be maintained and managed as closed to locatable mineral entry.

Federal Agency	Mineral Estate Withdrawn Acres ¹
USFWS - Bear Lake Refuge	17,500
USFWS - Minidoka Refuge	760
USFWS - Oxford Slough Production Area	1,900

¹ These acres are not considered in the PFO public lands base of 613,800 acres. Acreages are rounded.

Action D-LR-4.1.3 - Withdrawal of public lands from mineral entry would be pursued on approximately 1,500 acres for the following areas:

- Cheatbeck Canyon RNA
- Dairy Hollow RNA
- Formation Cave RNA
- Oneida Narrow RNA
- Pine Gap RNA
- Robbers Roost RNA
- Travertine Park RNA

Action D-LR-4.1.4 - Withdrawals which no longer serve the purpose for which they were established would be modified, revoked or relinquished. Prior to modification, revocation or relinquishment, withdrawn lands would be reviewed to determine if any other resource values require withdrawal protection.

Action D-LR-4.1.5 - Lands currently under review by the Washington Office for the revocation of withdrawal status and which are approved for revocation would be managed the same as adjacent public lands per the final decision.

Goal LR-5. Improve administrative management efficiency, natural resources management and protection, and public benefit.

Management Objectives

Management Actions

Objective D-LR-5.1. Maintain the overall public land base, acquire nonfederal lands or interest in nonfederal lands through exchange, purchase, easement or donation which enhance multiple-use, protect significant resource values and improve the management and administration of the public lands.

Action D-LR-5.1.1 - A land tenure adjustment program would be implemented based upon a four zone concept where zones (areas that contain common issues or planned actions) and respective priorities are described below (**Figure 2-35**). Land tenure adjustments could be considered across FO and District boundaries.

Zone 1 lands are public lands with special designations because of significant resource values. Zone 1 lands would be retained in public ownership. Examples of Zone 1 lands include WSAs, ACECs and RNAs, special status species habitat, and crucial wildlife habitat. BLM's priority for Zone 1 is to seek to acquire all private and State land in-holdings. Public access would be considered in all land tenure actions. Approximately **50,800** acres (8%) are identified in this zone.

Zone 2 lands are public lands that have a fairly well-consolidated ownership pattern and contain potentially high values for resources and land uses such as minerals, recreation, range, riparian, cultural resources, and wildlife habitat. The priorities within Zone 2 are to retain existing large blocks of high value public lands, consolidate public land ownership according to identified priority resources, and acquire lands with high resource values which improve efficiencies in public land management. Public lands within ½ mile of either side of the Zone 2 boundary would be considered potentially suitable for disposal primarily by exchange (secondarily by sale or R&PP patents) unless that ½ mile extends into a Zone 1 (retention) area. Approximately **18,400** acres (3%) are identified in this zone.

Lands and Realty (LR)

Zone 3 lands are small to medium-sized blocks of public lands which are interspersed with state and private lands or are adjacent to National Forest boundaries. The priority emphasis for Zone 3 is to consolidate ownership, which would maximize public values, provide public access and improve efficiencies in public land management. Overall public land acreage would be maintained. Acquisition, primarily through exchange, would be done to add high resource value lands that improve the manageability of public lands; lower resource value and difficult-to-manage tracts would be disposed of. Zone 3 lands are potentially suitable for disposal by exchange; however, disposal of land through sales and R&PP patents would be allowed. Approximately **423,200** acres (69%) are identified in this zone.

Zone 4 lands are small to medium-sized blocks of public lands that are isolated from one another and from other public lands tracts in the Field Office area. Public lands are available through all forms of disposal as appropriate. The land tenure adjustment emphasis in Zone 4 could result in a net decrease in public lands acreage within this zone. Approximately **121,400** acres (20%) are identified in this zone.

NOTE: Within **Zones 3 and 4** specific parcels may contain potentially high values for resources and land uses such as minerals, recreation, special status species, range, riparian, cultural resources, and wildlife habitat. These high-value parcels may not be suitable for disposal, except through exchange for equal or higher resource value lands.

Action D-LR-5.1.2 - Changes in the overall public lands acreage would be appropriate if land tenure adjustments meet one or more of the following criteria:

- Benefits the public.
- Improves public lands administration.
- Achieves desired resource conditions.
- Contributes to tribal treaty rights.

Action D-LR- 5.1.3 - Land tenure adjustments would consider the acquisition or disposal of lands based upon (but not limited to) the following factors:

- Improve or maintain access.
- Lands with high recreation values.
- Improve public land administration.
- Provide for local community needs.
- Resolve trespass.
- Parcels more suitable for administration by another agency.
- Parcels which are difficult or hard to administer (isolated).

Goal LR-6. Balance development of public land, such as ROWs, utility corridors and alternative energy development (e.g., wind, solar, biomass) with the protection of natural resources and public enjoyment and recreation, consistent with natural resource values and uses.

Management Objectives

Management Actions

Objective D-LR-6.1. Issue land use authorizations consistent with following management actions.

Action D-LR-6.1.1 - Land use authorizations would require holders to apply appropriate management techniques, practices or guidelines to protect vegetation, wildlife habitat and minimize soil disturbance (**Appendix C**).

Action D-LR-6.1.2 - Short-term authorizations or permits to use public lands for the sole benefit of private farming practices (such as pivot lines, storage of farm equipment) would not be approved.

Action D-LR-6.1.3 - New leases or permits that affect the value or nature of the land would not be allowed on those lands proposed for exchange or sale.

Action D-LR-6.1.4 - No new land use permits or leases would be authorized to validate unauthorized use. Unauthorized use would be resolved according to priority using current laws, regulations, and policy.

Action D-LR-6.1.5 - When a new or existing land use permit is authorized the following conditions would apply as appropriate:

- Privately-held water right POUs on public land would either be removed from public land or transferred to the US through the BLM.
- A privately-owned water right with a point of diversion on private property, but

Lands and Realty (LR)

with one or more POUs on public land, would be split and transferred to the US in proportion to the amount of water used on public land.

Action D-LR-6.1.6 - To the extent possible, linear ROWs would be routed where impacts would be least disturbing, considering the point of origin, point of destination, resource values present, and purpose and need for the project.

Action D-LR-6.1.7 - No BLM ROW corridors would be designated in this Pocatello RMP/EIS, however this plan may be amended to designate corridors upon completion of the West-wide Energy Corridor Programmatic EIS.

Action D-LR-6.1.8 - ROW applicants would be encouraged to the extent possible, to use the existing corridors. The Pocatello RMP /EIS would adopt designated corridors upon completion of the West-wide Energy Corridor Programmatic EIS.

Action D-LR-6.1.9 - For ROWs which include energy and non-energy related ROWs and land use authorizations, 590,000 acres would be managed as open areas; 23,800 acres would be managed as avoidance areas (**Figure 2-36**) where these areas are defined as follows:

- **Open Areas** - These are areas not identified as avoidance or exclusion areas and are open to ROWs and land use authorization proposals. Proposals may require restrictions to protect resources such as wildlife (**Appendix D**), protected watersheds, erosive soils/steep slopes, cultural, historical, recreation, visual resources and other identified resources.
- **Avoidance Areas** - These are areas to generally be avoided but may be available with special stipulations. Efforts would be made to work with the applicant to reroute proposals. Special stipulations would be required to protect resource values. Areas considered as "avoidance" would include developed recreation sites, historical trails, special status species habitat, ACECs, RNAs and WSAs. Special stipulations would consist of applying BMPs, management techniques or guidelines (**Appendix C**) or be developed on a case by case basis through the NEPA process.

Action D-LR-6.1.10 - Applications for wind energy site monitoring and testing and development would not be accepted in areas designated as part of the National Landscape Conservation System (e.g., WSAs, WSRs, National Historic and Scenic Trails) and ACECs.

Action D-LR-6.1.11 - Entities seeking to develop a wind energy project on public lands shall consult with appropriate federal, state, and local agencies regarding specific projects as early in the planning process as appropriate to ensure that all potential construction, operation, and decommissioning issues and concerns are identified and adequately addressed.

Action D-LR-6.1.12 - Entities seeking to develop a wind energy project on public lands in conjunction with BLM Washington Office and PFO staff, shall consult with the US DoD regarding the location of wind power projects and turbine siting as early in the planning process as appropriate. This consultation shall occur concurrently at both the installation/field level and the Pentagon/BLM Washington Office level. An interagency protocol agreement is being developed to establish a consultation process and to identify the scope of issues for consultation. Lands withdrawn for military purposes are under the administrative jurisdiction of the DoD or a military service and are not available for issuance of wind energy authorizations by the BLM.

Action D-LR-6.1.13 - The BLM would require financial bonds for all wind energy development projects on BLM-administered public lands to ensure compliance with the terms and conditions of the ROW authorization and the requirements of applicable regulatory requirements, including reclamation costs. The amount of the required bond would be determined during the ROW authorization process on the basis of site-specific and project-specific factors. The BLM may also require financial bonds for site monitoring and testing authorizations.

Livestock Grazing (LG)

Goal LG-1. Provide forage for livestock grazing consistent with other resources/uses as part of an ecologically healthy system consistent with multiple use and sustained yield.

Management Objectives

Management Actions

Objective D-LG-1.1. Maintain approximately 527,800 acres available for livestock grazing and approximately 86,000 acres not available for livestock grazing Figure 2-7.

Action D-LG-1.1.1- Applications for livestock grazing within allotments where grazing currently is not permitted/leased would be considered.

Action D-LG-1.1.2 - The proper season of use, kind and class of livestock and stocking rate for allotments where grazing currently is not permitted/leased would be based upon best available information and analyzed through the NEPA process.

Objective D-LG-1.2. Consistent with maintaining a thriving ecological balance and multiple use relationships provide annually a total preference (active + suspended) of approximately 82,200 AUMs.

Action D-LG-1.2.1- The appropriate number of livestock AUMs (active + suspended) would be permitted/leased based on the most current monitoring data and Idaho Standards for Rangeland Health.

Action D-LG-1.2.2 - Public lands would be managed to be as productive as feasible considering such grazing management practices as:

- proper use levels of key vegetation,
- grazing systems,
- range improvements including land treatments, and
- adjusting seasons of use, and stocking rates.

Action D-LG-1.2.3 - Livestock grazing would be managed to meet or make significant progress towards meeting Idaho Standards for Rangeland Health and Guidelines for Livestock Grazing Management, 1997 (**Appendix A**).

Action D-LG-1.2.4 - Areas would be temporarily closed to livestock grazing after disturbances such as wildland fire, fire and non-fire vegetative treatments for a minimum of two growing seasons or progress is being made towards attaining identified vegetative objectives.

Action D-LG-1.2.5 - Acquired lands (LWCF/BPA) within the Soda Hills Management Area would not be available for livestock grazing (**Figure 2-7**).

Action D-LG-1.2.6 - If necessary, livestock grazing would be adjusted for the following allotments to ensure that the natural processes associated with an RNA, such as pristine vegetative and soil characteristics are maintained:

Allotment Name/Number	RNA Name
Trout Creek Spring (04154)	Cheatbeck Canyon
Horse Hollow (04329)	Dairy Hollow
Lower Oneida Narrows (04310)	Oneida Narrows
Rocky Peak (04412)	Oneida Narrows
Twin Lakes (14115)	Oneida Narrows

Action D-LG-1.2.7- Although considered available for grazing, approximately 1,328 acres within the following allotments would be closed to sheep grazing (**Figure 3-12**) indefinitely due to elevated levels of selenium in water and plants:

- This closure would be in place until such time selenium levels can be reduced to acceptable levels through containment or capping.

Allotments Indefinitely Closed To Sheep Grazing			
Allotment Name	Public Land Total Acres	Public Land Acres Affected by Selenium	Percent Allotment Affected
Trail Canyon-1	309	123	40
Trail Canyon-2	190	25	15
Woodall Mountain	1,670	1,180	71

Acreages are rounded.

Objective D-LG-1.3. Implement the Secretarial Order (Congressional Withdrawal #157, Idaho #9) which established the BSD and did

Action D-LG-1.3.1 - Livestock use within the BSD would be limited to "Trailing Only".

Action D-LG-1.3.2 - Allotments would be eliminated entirely or closed in part as identified below, totaling approximately 8,400 acres of public land.

Livestock Grazing (LG)

not include the creation of grazing allotments within the driveway.

Allotment Name (Number)	Status
Beaver Creek (04316)	Closed
Blackfoot River (04201)	Closed
Blackfoot River (04320)	Closed
Blackfoot River (04121)	Closed
EIGA Blackfoot River (14112)	Closed
Blackfoot River (14092)	Eliminated
Blackfoot River (04430)	Eliminated
Miner Creek (04413)	Eliminated
Trail Creek-1 (04419)	Eliminated
Government Dam (0010)	Eliminated
Negro Creek (0006)	Eliminated
Sagehen Campground (0007)	Eliminated
Womack-Spring Creek (0005)	Eliminated

Action D-LG-1.3.3 - The grazing preferences for portions of allotments within the BSD closed to grazing would be adjusted accordingly.

Action D-LG-1.3.4 - While maintaining or improving rangeland health conditions and PFC of the riparian areas, up to approximately 1,400 AUMs would be available for trailing purposes (BSD) for those permittees/lessees with a valid trailing permit.

Minerals and Energy (ME)

Goal ME-2. Develop mineral resources (oil and gas, geothermal, solid minerals) consistent with other resources and uses as part of an ecologically healthy ecosystem.

Management Objectives

Management Actions

Objective D-ME-2.1. Manage approximately 602,600 acres of the federal mineral estate as open for fluid minerals leasing (e.g., oil, gas, and geothermal resources).

Action D-ME-2.1.1- Fluid mineral leasing activities would be subject to standard lease terms, conditions, and applicable special stipulations identified in **Appendix H**.

Action D-ME-2.1.2 - To protect WSAs, approximately 11,200 acres of public lands would be closed to fluid mineral leasing (**Figure 2-37**).

Action D-ME-2.1.3 - On approximately 315,400 acres, the following areas would be leased with a fluid minerals NSO stipulation to protect resources (e.g., soils, wildlife, water, cultural resources) (**Figure 2-37**). NSO's may be waived on steep slopes or erodible soils if adequate mitigation measures are incorporated into operations plans.

- Withdrawal - Bear River Reclamation Project
- Withdrawal - Soda Point
- Withdrawal - Last Chance
- Withdrawal - Fort Hall Irrigation Project
- Withdrawal - Soda Springs Project
- Withdrawals - Public Water Reserves (125 & 107)
- Withdrawals - Power Sites and Generating Facilities
- Communications sites
- Malad Air Navigation Site
- Water/Power - Minidoka Reclamation Project
- Blackfoot Stock Driveway
- Downey Watershed ACEC
- Juniper Town Site ACEC
- Indian Rocks ACEC
- Bowen Canyon Bald Eagle Sanctuary ACEC
- Travertine Park ACEC
- Stump Creek ACEC
- Van Komen Homestead ACEC
- Dairy Hollow RNA
- Formation Cave RNA
- Oneida Narrows RNA

Minerals and Energy (ME)

- Travertine Park RNA
- Pine Gap RNA
- Robber's Roost RNA
- Cheatbeck Canyon RNA
- Soda Springs Hills Management Area (Only LWCF/BPA acquired lands)
- Historical Sites and Trails
- Recreation and Public Purpose Patents
- Recreation and Public Purpose Leases
- Developed Recreation Sites/Campgrounds
- Highly erosive soils on slopes greater than 20%
- Steep Slopes, >30%
- Riparian and Wetland areas
- Water bodies

Action D-ME-2.1.4 - On approximately 439,000 acres, public lands would be leased with a seasonal occupancy stipulation to protect big game winter range, calving, fawning; and/or nesting activities. (Note: Seasonal closure acreage amount may include other BLM lands closed to development.)

- Fluid minerals exploration drilling and development would comply with the seasonal wildlife restrictions (**Appendix D**).
- Seasonal wildlife restrictions would not be applicable to production activities.

Action D-ME-2.1.5 - Special stipulations would be changed only by waiver, exceptions, or modifications as outlined by specific criteria in **Appendix H**.

Action D-ME-2.1.6 - Areas open for leasing would also be available for consideration of geophysical exploration activities subject to NSO and seasonal occupancy restrictions.

Action D-ME-2.1.7-Lands acquired for special purposes or with special funding would be managed in a manner consistent with the purpose of the acquisition; typically an NSO stipulation.

Objective D-ME-2.2. Manage approximately 597,500 acres of the federal mineral estate (leasable minerals) as open for solid minerals leasing (e.g., phosphate) subject to standard lease terms, and conditions.

Action D-ME-2.2.1 - A nondiscretionary closure would be in effect for WSAs, consisting of approximately 11,200 acres (**Figure 2-38**)

Action D-ME-2.2.2 - Discretionary closures (agency administrative) would be in effect on approximately 5,100 acres as identified below (**Figure 2-38**).

- Dairy Hollow RNA
- Formation Cave RNA
- Oneida Narrows RNA
- Travertine Park RNA
- Pine Gap RNA
- Robber's Roost RNA
- Cheatbeck Canyon RNA
- Soda Springs Hills Management Area (Only LWCF/BPA acquired lands)

Action D-ME-2.2.3 - Appropriate site specific mitigation measures, developed during BLM preparation or review of an operations plan, would be implemented as conditions of approval.

Action D-ME-2.2.4 - Lands acquired for special purposes or with special funding would be managed in a manner consistent with the purpose of the acquisition; typically these lands would be closed to solid leasable minerals.

Action D-ME-2.2.5 - Seasonal wildlife restrictions (**Appendix D**) would not apply to the operation and maintenance of solid leasable mineral production facilities unless the findings of analysis demonstrate the continued need for such mitigation and that less stringent, project-specific mitigation measures would be insufficient.

Objective D-ME-2.3. Manage approximately 597,500 acres of the federal mineral estate (salable minerals) as open for mineral material disposal subject to standard permit terms, and conditions.

Action D-ME-2.3.1 - A nondiscretionary closure would be in effect for WSAs, consisting of approximately 11,200 acres, (**Figure 2-39**).

Action D-ME-2.3.2 - Discretionary closures (agency administrative) would be in effect on approximately 5,100 acres as identified listed below (**Figure 2-39**):

- Dairy Hollow RNA
- Formation Cave RNA
- Oneida Narrows RNA
- Travertine Park RNA
- Pine Gap RNA
- Robber's Roost RNA

Minerals and Energy (ME)

- Cheatbeck Canyon RNA
- Soda Springs Hills Management Area (Only LWCF/BPA acquired lands)

Action D-ME-2.3.3 - Site specific mitigation measures would be developed through the NEPA process and applied to ensure that operations comply with applicable laws, land use plan guidance and do not result in unnecessary degradation.

Action D-ME-2.3.4-Lands acquired for special purposes or with special funding would be managed in a manner consistent with the purpose of the acquisition; typically these lands would be closed to salable minerals.

Objective D-ME-2.4. Manage approximately 582,600 acres of the federal mineral estate (locatable minerals) as open to the location of mining claims.

Action D-ME-2.4.1 - A nondiscretionary closure of approximately 29,700 acres would be in effect on the following identified areas (**Figure 2-11**):

- Water/Power - Minidoka Reclamation Project
- Withdrawal - Bear River Reclamation Project
- Withdrawal - Soda Point
- Withdrawal - Last Chance
- Withdrawal - Fort Hall Irrigation Project
- Withdrawal - Soda Springs Project
- Withdrawal - Downey Watershed (also an ACEC)
- Withdrawals - Public Water Reserves (125 & 107)
- Withdrawals - Power Sites and Generating Facilities
- Recreation and Public Purpose Patents
- Recreation and Public Purpose Leases

Action D-ME-2.4.2 - A mineral entry withdrawal (discretionary closure, agency administrative) would be pursued on approximately 1,500 acres, for the following RNAs: areas:

- Dairy Hollow RNA
- Formation Cave RNA
- Oneida Narrows RNA
- Travertine Park RNA
- Pine Gap RNA
- Robber's Roost RNA
- Cheatbeck Canyon RNA

Action D-ME-2.4.3 - Appropriate site specific mitigation measures, developed during BLM preparation or review of an NOI or a PO, would be implemented as conditions of approval.

Action D-ME-2.4.4-Lands acquired for special purposes or with special funding would not be opened to mineral entry.

Recreation (RE)

Goal RE-1: Manage lands for dispersed recreation opportunities.

Management Objectives

Management Actions

Objective D-RE-1.1. Manage lands for non-motorized, mechanized, and motorized activities in a variety of settings, with an emphasis on motorized activities.

Action D-RE-1.1.1 - Coordinate with Idaho Statewide Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation and Tourism Plan, other agencies, and the tribes with regard to recreational use of public lands and for developing new recreation opportunities.

Action D-RE-1.1.2 - Management tools such as ROS, VRM, and LAC would be used in managing recreation opportunities.

Objective D-RE-1.2. Recreation facility development and permitted recreation activities would be consistent with other resource goals of the area in which they are located.

Action D-RE-1.2.1 - SRPs for commercial, non-commercial competitive events and organized groups would be issued consistent with the areas resource values and uses.

Recreation (RE)

Goal RE-3. Provide for a variety of recreational opportunities and experiences.

Management Objectives	Management Actions
<p>Objective D-RE-3.1. Recognize recreation as the principal use on approximately 55,200 acres of public lands within SRMAs.</p>	<p>Action D-RE-3.1.1 - SRMAs would be recognized as priority for recreation funding and personnel to fulfill commitments made to provide specific structured recreation opportunities (e.g., activity, experience, and benefit opportunities).</p> <p>Action D-RE-3.1.2 - The Blackfoot River SRMA (approximately 21,800 acres) would be managed to maintain and/or enhance targeted recreational opportunities, experiences and benefits with a primary market based strategy being “Destination” for a market base of SE Idaho.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The SRMA would be managed to provide various recreational opportunities and outcomes (activities, experiences and benefits) based on a unique niche in each of the 5 RMZ identified below: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Wolverine Canyon (approximately 4,300 acres) (Table 2-5a) ○ Campground (approximately 80 acres) (Table 2-5b) ○ Reservoir (approximately 7,200 acres) (Table 2-5c) ○ Mid River (approximately 7,800 acres) (Table 2-5d) ○ Lower River (approximately 2,400 acres) (Table 2-5e) • For each RMZ, management direction and the prescribed ROS setting would be followed as described in respective tables. • An SRMA management plan would be developed and implemented. <p>Action D-RE-3.1.3 - The Pocatello SRMA (approximately 33,400 acres) would be managed to maintain and/or enhance targeted recreational opportunities, experiences and benefits with a primary market based strategy being “Community” for a market base of SE Idaho.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The SRMA would be managed to provide various recreational opportunities and outcomes (activities, experiences and benefits) based on a unique niche in each of the 5 RMZ identified below: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ West Bench (approximately 4,100 acres) (Table 2-5f) ○ Blackrock (approximately 15,100 acres) (Table 2-5g) ○ Papoose (approximately 3,400 acres) (Table 2-5h) ○ East Bench (approximately 1,400 acres) (Table 2-5i) ○ Dispersed (approximately 9,400 acres) (Table 2-5j) • For each RMZ, management direction and the prescribed ROS setting would be followed as described in respective tables. • An SRMA management plan would be developed and implemented.
<p>Objective D-RE-3.2. Continue to manage approximately 558,600 acres as an ERMA.</p>	<p>Action D-RE-3.2.1 - ERMAs would be managed in a custodial manner and provide for visitor health and safety. Basic recreation functions would use the following guidelines:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Administrative Actions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SRPs would be issued if consistent with other resources and uses. • Law Enforcement presence would be limited. • Visitor services would be limited to basic information such as travel management signs, site specific restrictions, general maps, travel plan maps and very basic facilities may be utilized in high use areas. 2. Management: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Focus on minimizing user conflicts with other resources and uses. • Would be custodially managed, that is minimal physical facilities/ structures would be provided except if necessary to provide for visitor health and safety. 3. Marketing: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide maps. • Provide road/trail maps. • Utilize the internet to provide recreation information. 4. Monitoring: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Visitor satisfaction through field contacts. • User conflict. • Visitor safety. • Resource damage.

Recreation (RE)

Goal RE-4: Establish a comprehensive approach to travel planning and management.

Management Objectives

Management Actions

Objective D-RE-4.1. Designate all public lands in the planning area as Open, Limited, or Closed.

Action D-RE-4.1.1- WSAs and RNA's (approximately 12,700 acres) would be designated Closed to OHV use and all remaining public lands (approximately 601,100 acres) would be designated as Limited for OHV use.

Action D-RE-4.1.2 - Mechanized travel would be limited to designated routes.

Action D-RE-4.1.3 - Non-motorized travel would not be restricted.

Action D-RE-4.1.4 - OHV opportunities would be expanded by:

1. Promoting development of OHV trails primarily using existing routes, however some new routes could be constructed.
2. Increasing the number of designated routes.
3. Providing minimal control on OHV use.

Action D-RE-4.1.5 - Until travel management planning/route designation is completed, travel would be managed in the following manner:

1. Limit travel to designated routes as identified in the Chinese Peak/Blackrock activity plan.
2. Recognize existing seasonal closures.
3. Recognize site specific closures for WSAs, ACECs, and RNAs, and
4. Limit motorized and mechanized travel to existing routes in all other areas.

Action D-RE-4.1.6 - For the development of travel management plans, baseline and/or preliminary road/trail networks would be identified using any one of the following available sources:

- Most current existing DOQs as of 2004.
- 2004 NAIP digital color aerial photos.
- Most current existing USGS topographical maps as of January 1, 2005.

Action D-RE-4.1.7 - During travel management planning, provide intensive use areas for valid motorized activities (e.g., rock crawling, motocross riding) by designating appropriate routes for these activities in front country or rural settings. These areas would not exceed a "footprint" larger than 320 acres.

Routes may be designated during travel management planning only if they are consistent with the following criteria:

- Area is suitable for intensive OHV use.
- No compelling resource issues or protection needs identified.
- No user conflicts or public safety issues to warrant restricting intensive use.

Action D-RE-4.1.8 - Cross country travel by motorized vehicles and/or the use of roads or trails not identified and/or designated during BLM travel management planning and which are associated with authorized/permitted activities (e.g., range improvement construction/ maintenance, land use authorizations, ROWs, mineral/energy exploration) and/or agency administrative purposes would be authorized only by:

- obtaining prior written approval of the authorized officer, or
- as stipulated in appropriate permits/authorizations.

Activities such as, but not limited to, wildland fire suppression, human health and safety, and cadastral survey would be exempt.

Action D-RE-4.1.9 - Organized events would be compliant with established OHV designations and would be consistent with other resources and uses.

Action D-RE-4.1.10 - Snowmobiling would be managed with the following area restrictions (**Figure 2-40**):

1. WSAs - Not allowed
2. ACECs - Not allowed
3. RNAs - Not allowed
4. All other areas - Allowed Without Restriction

Action D-RE-4.1.11 - For the following four areas (Formation Cave RNA, Robbers Roost RNA, Oneida Narrows, and Soda Springs Hills Management Area) the identified routes would be designated for public use with motorized vehicles.

- Formation Cave RNA (**Figure 2-23**)
 - Access road and parking area
- Robbers Roost RNA (**Figure 2-24**)
 - Access route to FS
- Oneida Narrows (**Figure 2-25**)
 - Power Plant Road

Recreation (RE)

- Bear River Ranches Road
- Roads within Redpoint and Maple Grove Campgrounds
- Soda Springs Hills Management Area (**Figure 2-2**)
 - Idaho Ranch Canyon
 - 90 Percent Canyon
 - Swenson Canyon
 - Ridgeline Road
 - Doe Alley

Objective D-RE-4.2 Implement comprehensive travel management planning utilizing strategies for motorized, mechanized, and non-motorized recreation.

Action D-RE-4.2.1 - Roads, routes and trails would continue to be inventoried and mapped using best available technology, such as GPS and GIS.

Action D-RE-4.2.2 - Areas would be prioritized for travel management planning based upon the following criteria:

1. Known conflicts with other resources/uses.
2. Proximity of areas to population centers.
3. High Use Areas.
4. Areas of contiguous public land.

Action D-RE-4.2.3 - Travel management planning would use a collaborative approach and the NEPA process.

Action D-RE-4.2.4 - Public involvement and coordination with tribes, agencies, and local governments would be encouraged.

Action D-RE-4.2.5 - For each travel management planning area, the following would be identified as needed:

- Designated routes for motorized vehicles.
- Designated routes for mechanized vehicles.
- Seasonal restrictions.
- Route closures.
- Exemptions for administrative and permitted activities.

Action D-RE-4.2.6 - Criteria that would be considered in travel management plans would include, but is not limited to:

1. Environmental conditions, such as:
 - a. soil stability
 - b. wildlife habitat (e.g., winter range, nesting/brooding rearing habitat, calving/fawning areas)special status species habitat
 - c. proximity to riparian areas and/or 303(d) streams
 - d. visual resources
2. User conflicts, such as:
 - a. motorized versus non-motorized,
 - b. motorized/mechanized versus non-mechanized
3. Administrative purposes, such as:
 - a. wildland fire suppression activities
 - b. safety
 - c. resource management and permitted activities
4. Public purposes, such as:
 - a. accessing public or private land
 - b. destinations for specific activities
 - c. types of desired use (motorized, mechanized, non-motorized/non-mechanized)
5. Route, vehicle type and size limitations, such as:
 - a. 50" wheel base (full size vehicles)
 - b. < 50" wheel base (ATVs)
 - c. single track (motorcycles/mountain bikes)

Action D-RE 4.2.7 - For each travel management planning area products would be developed and made available through a variety of media sources (e.g., internet). Such products may include travel maps and various brochures.

SPECIAL DESIGNATIONS

Administrative Designations (AD)

Goal AD-1. Provide for public land areas suitable for administrative designations.

Management Objectives

Management Actions

Objective D-AD-1.1. Continue to manage the 7 ACECs (approximately 9,900 acres) and 7 RNAs (approximately 1,500 acres) designated for the unique geological, vegetative, visual, cultural, historical and/or wildlife resource values (Figure 2-41).

Action D-AD-1.1.1 - The Stump Creek ACEC (approximately 2,500 acres) would be managed to protect crucial elk winter range by implementing the following management practices:

- Snowmobile use would not be allowed.
- The OHV designation would be Limited and OHV use would be limited to designated routes.
- Public lands would be retained.
- The area would be identified as an "Avoidance" area for ROWs.
- Wildland fire would be suppressed.
- Fluid minerals would be leased with a NSO stipulation.
- The area would be discretionarily closed to phosphate leasing.
- Livestock grazing would be managed to maintain or improve native vegetation conditions (LHC-A).
- Winter range would be rehabilitated through burning or establishment of browse species.
- The area would be a priority for weed control (e.g., leafy spurge).
- Interpretive sign(s) would be placed at key locations to explain resource values and area use restrictions.
- The Stump Creek Habitat Management Plan (1980) would be updated/ revised.

Action D-AD-1.1.2 - The Bowen Canyon Bald Eagle Sanctuary ACEC (approximately 2,300 acres) would be managed to protect and provide winter roosting habitat by implementing the following management practices:

- Snowmobile use would not be allowed.
- Public lands would be retained.
- The area would be identified as an "Avoidance" area for ROWs.
- Fluid minerals would be leased with a NSO stipulation.
- The OHV designation would be Limited and OHV use would be limited to designated routes.
- Post pole, firewood or commercial timber sales would not be allowed.
- Habitat would be protected with special stipulations (e.g., NSO) or restrictions (e.g., seasonal wildlife) on various permitted activities.
- Livestock grazing would be managed to maintain or improve native vegetation conditions (LHC-A).
- Wildland fire would be suppressed.
- Acquire private lands from willing sellers in Bowen Canyon and develop a formal cooperative agreement with the private land owner(s).
- Cooperative management of public lands with the Shoshone-Bannock Tribes' privately owned lands in Bowen Canyon would be pursued as opportunities exist.
- A withdrawal of approximately 2,300 acres for locatable minerals would be pursued.

Action D-AD-1.1.3 - The Downy Watershed ACEC (approximately 1,900 acres) would be managed to maintain/improve vegetative condition and overall watershed health by implementing the following management practices:

- Wildland fire would be suppressed.
- Public lands would be retained.
- The area would be identified as an "Avoidance" area for ROWs.
- Fluid minerals would be leased with a NSO stipulation.
- Snowmobile use would not be allowed.
- The OHV designation would be Limited and OHV use would be limited to designated routes.
- A withdraw for locatable minerals would be maintained.
- Livestock grazing would be managed to maintain or improve native vegetation conditions (LHC-A).
- The area would be discretionarily closed to phosphate leasing.

Action D-AD-1.1.4 - The Indian Rocks ACEC (approximately 3,100 acres) would be

Administrative Designations (AD)

managed to protect relevant cultural resource sites by implementing the following management practices:

- Snowmobile use would not be allowed.
- Public lands would be retained.
- The area would be identified as an "Avoidance" area for ROWs.
- Fluid minerals would be leased with a NSO stipulation.
- The OHV designation would be Limited and OHV use would be limited to designated roads and trails.
- Interested Indian Tribes (e.g., Shoshone-Bannock Tribes, Northern Shoshone) would be coordinated with on management issues specific to the ACEC.
- Livestock grazing would be managed to maintain or improve native vegetation conditions (LHC-A).
- The area would be identified as a priority for weed control.
- Guidelines (e.g., areas closed to heavy equipment use, using fire retardant for firelines) would be developed for wildland fire suppression activities.
- Inventory and monitoring of cultural resources would continue.
- Interpretive sign(s) would be placed at key location(s) to explain resource values and/or site use restrictions.

Action D-AD-1.1.5 - The Juniper Townsite and Van Komen Homestead ACECs (approximately 6 acres) would be managed to protect cultural and historical resources by implementing the following management practices:

- Snowmobile use would not be allowed.
- Public lands would be retained.
- The area would be identified as an "Avoidance" area for ROWs.
- Fluid minerals would be leased with a NSO stipulation.
- The OHV designation would be Limited and OHV use would be limited to designated routes.
- Partnerships would be pursued with local historical interest groups to protect, maintain and interpret historic structures.
- Structures and improvements would be safe for the public.
- Wildland fire would be suppressed.
- The area would be signed to explain important cultural and historical values and the need to protect these values.

Action D-AD-1.1.6 - The Dairy Hollow RNA (approximately 40 acres) would be managed to protect the nearly pristine Wyoming sagebrush/needle-and-thread plant community and Ferruginous Hawk nesting habitat (conglomerate bluffs and columns) by implementing the following management practices:

- The area would be discretionarily closed for solid leasable minerals and salable minerals.
- The OHV designation would be Closed.
- Wildland fire would be suppressed.
- Public lands would be retained.
- The area would be identified as an "Avoidance" area for ROWs.
- Fluid minerals would be leased with a NSO stipulation.
- Livestock grazing would be adjusted, if necessary, to maintain the values of the RNA.
- A withdrawal for locatable minerals would be pursued.
- Vegetation would be monitored to understand natural ecological processes and/or determine trends.
- Vegetation would be inventoried to establish baseline information and identify threats.
- The area would be identified as a priority for weed control.
- Interpretive sign(s) would be placed at key locations to explain resource values and area use restrictions.

Action D-AD-1.1.7 - The Formation Cave RNA (approximately 70 acres) would be managed to protect fragile travertine formation and pristine waterbirch, antelope bitterbrush/Nevada bluegrass, and barren plant communities by implementing the following management practices:

- The area would be discretionarily closed for solid leasable minerals and salable minerals.
- The OHV designation would be Closed with the exception of the Formation Cave parking area and access road which would be a designated route.
- Wildland fire would be suppressed.

Administrative Designations (AD)

- Public lands would be retained.
- The area would be identified as an "Avoidance" area for ROWs.
- Fluid minerals would be leased with a NSO stipulation.
- The area would be unavailable for livestock grazing.
- A withdrawal for locatable minerals would be pursued.
- Vegetation would be monitored to understand natural ecological processes and/or determine trends.
- Vegetation would be inventoried to establish baseline information and identify threats.
- The area would be identified as a priority for weed control.
- The fence, parking area/trailhead, trail system, footbridges, and interpretative signs would be maintained.
- The Nature Conservancy would be coordinated with on the management of the RNA.

Action D-AD-1.1.8 - The Oneida Narrows RNA (approximately 600 acres) would be managed to protect the nearly pristine plant communities (e.g., bigtooth maple, box-elder riparian, Rocky Mountain juniper, and bunchgrass), Bald Eagle and Rock Squirrel habitat by implementing the following management practices:

- The area would be discretionarily closed for solid leasable minerals and salable minerals.
- The OHV designation is Closed with the exception of the Oneida Project Road which would be designated as a route.
- Wildland fire would be suppressed.
- Public lands would be retained.
- The area would be identified as an "Avoidance" area for ROWs.
- Fluid minerals would be leased with a NSO stipulation.
- Livestock grazing would be adjusted, if necessary, to maintain the values of the RNA.
- A withdrawal for locatable minerals would be pursued.
- Vegetation would be monitored to understand natural ecological processes and/or determine trends.
- Vegetation would be inventoried to establish baseline information and identify threats.
- The area would be identified as a priority for weed control.
- Interpretive sign(s) would be placed at key location(s) to explain resource values and area use restrictions.

Action D-AD-1.1.9 - The Pine Gap RNA (approximately 240 acres) would be managed to protect the nearly pristine black sagebrush/bluebunch wheatgrass plant community by implementing the following management practices:

- The area would be discretionarily closed for solid leasable minerals and salable minerals.
- The OHV designation would be Closed.
- Wildland fire would be suppressed.
- Public lands would be retained.
- The area would be identified as an "Avoidance" area for ROWs.
- Fluid minerals would be leased with a NSO stipulation.
- The area would be unavailable for livestock grazing.
- A withdrawal for locatable minerals would be pursued.
- Vegetation would be monitored to understand natural ecological processes and/or determine trends.
- Vegetation would be inventoried to establish baseline information and identify threats.
- The area would be identified as a priority for weed control.
- Interpretive sign(s) would be placed at key location(s) to explain resource values and area use restrictions.

Action D-AD-1.1.10 - The Robbers Roost RNA (approximately 400 acres) would be managed to protect the unique abundance of mountain shrub communities by implementing the following management practices:

- The area would be discretionarily closed for solid leasable minerals and salable minerals.
- The OHV designation would be Closed with the exception of the Robbers Roost Road which would be a designated route.
- Wildland fire would be suppressed.
- Public lands would be retained.

Administrative Designations (AD)

- The area would be identified as an "Avoidance" area for ROWs.
- Fluid minerals would be leased with a NSO stipulation.
- The area would be unavailable for livestock grazing.
- A withdrawal for locatable minerals would be pursued.
- Vegetation would be monitored to understand natural ecological processes and/or determine trends.
- Vegetation would be inventoried to establish baseline information and identify threats.
- The area would be identified as a priority for weed control.
- Interpretive sign(s) would be placed at key location(s) to explain resource values and area use restrictions.

Action D-AD-1.1.11 - The Cheatbeck RNA (approximately 100 acres) would be managed to protect the plant communities of boxelder/sweet cicely and bigtooth maple/sweet cicely by implementing the following management practices:

The area would be discretionarily closed for solid leasable minerals and salable minerals.

- The OHV designation would be Closed.
- Wildland fire would be suppressed.
- Public lands would be retained.
- The area would be identified as an "Avoidance" area for ROWs.
- Fluid minerals would be leased with a NSO stipulation.
- Livestock grazing would be adjusted, if necessary, to maintain the values of the RNA.
- A withdrawal for locatable minerals would be pursued.
- Vegetation would be monitored to understand natural ecological processes and/or determine trends.
- Vegetation would be inventoried to establish baseline information and identify threats.
- The area would be identified as a priority for weed control.

Action D-AD-1.1.12 - The Travertine Park ACEC and RNA (approximately 200 acres) would be managed to protect fragile travertine formations and uncommon lichen species of by implementing the following management practices:

- Snowmobile use would not be allowed.
- Wildland fire would be suppressed.
- Public lands would be retained.
- The area would be identified as an "Avoidance" area for ROWs.
- Fluid minerals would be leased with a NSO stipulation.
- The area would be discretionarily closed for solid leasable and salable minerals.
- The OHV designation would be Closed for the RNA portion only.
- The OHV designation for the ACEC portion only would be Limited and OHV use would be limited to designated trails.
- The area would be unavailable for livestock grazing.
- A withdrawal for locatable minerals would be pursued.
- Vegetation would be monitored to understand natural ecological processes and/or determine trends.
- Vegetation would be inventoried to establish baseline information and identify threats.
- The area would be identified as a priority for weed control.
- Interpretive sign(s) would be placed at key location(s) to explain resource values and area use restrictions.

2.13 RATIONALE FOR THE IDENTIFICATION OF THE PROPOSED RMP – (ALTERNATIVE B)

Alternative A, the No Action Alternative, minimally addresses relevant issues identified through public scoping and required components of the land use planning document. Thus Alternative A was dismissed because it did not adequately address issues/concerns identified by the public, required planning components, and concerns of the planning team.

Alternatives C and D address both the identified relevant issues and required components necessary in a land use planning document with varying degrees of flexibility, protection, conservation and establishment of allowable uses. Alternatives C and D address the public's issues/concerns through identified management direction, as well as the purpose and need (Section 1.2), but lack a balance between resources and resource use allocations.

Alternative B, Proposed RMP, after tribal and public comments were analyzed and changes incorporated (see Chapter 1, Section 1.13, and Chapter 2, Section 2.6) provides the most reasonable and practical approach to managing the public lands resources and resource uses while addressing the issues and the purpose and need (Section 1.2). The Proposed RMP provides a balanced approach to management with an appropriate level of flexibility to meet the overall needs of the resources and allocation of various uses. The Proposed RMP represents a mix of management actions (proactive and prescriptive) that best resolve identified issues while emphasizing a level of protection, restoration, enhancement, and use of resources and services to meet ongoing programs and land uses into the future.

2.14 ADDRESSING RELEVANT ISSUES IN THE ALTERNATIVES

Public comments received during the public scoping open houses helped to identify issues that shaped the formulation and development of the action alternatives. In turn, the alternatives may address one or more specific relevant issues to varying degrees, or an action alternative may simply be silent for a particular issue. Section 1.4.3 in Chapter 1 provides more detail on issue identification.

Following is a general discussion of how each of the six “relevant issues” identified for this planning process may or may not be addressed by the action alternatives.

Issue 1: How would increasing OHV use and associated conflicts be managed?

The BLM proposes to actively manage OHVs in order to provide a quality OHV experience while protecting resources and providing opportunities for other user groups (e.g., primitive recreation). Under the action alternatives, the BLM would close about 12,700 acres to protect resources and prevent user conflicts and would limit OHV use on public lands throughout the planning area. These limitations may include restricting the number or types of vehicles, limiting the time or season of use, restricting to permitted or licensed use only, limiting use to existing and designated roads and trails. The BLM may place other limitations to protect resources, particularly in areas that OHV enthusiasts use intensively or where they participate in competitive events. To avoid conflicts between winter users and to protect sensitive habitats, the alternatives vary in how and where snowmobiling can take place.

Table 2-8 summarizes the OHV designations by alternative identifying those acreages that are “Open,” “Limited,” “Closed,” or “Not Designated.”

Table 2-8. Summary of OHV Designations by Alternative

OHV Designation	Alternative (acres)			
	A	B	C	D
Open	61,300	0.0	0.0	0.0
Limited	199,000	601,100	601,100	601,100
All vehicles limited to designated routes snowmobiling not allowed	N/A	62,100	62,100	28,700
All vehicles limited to designated routes, including snowmobiles	N/A	0.0	286,500	0.0
All vehicles limited to designated routes, except snowmobiles, which would not be restricted	N/A	252,500	252,500	572,400
Closed	1,300	12,700	12,700	12,700
Not Designated	352,200	0.0	0.0	0.0

After the RMP is implemented, the BLM would conduct a public travel management planning process to further define how OHV use would be managed in the “Limited” areas. Each alternative provides a different emphasis regarding motorized, non-motorized, and mechanized type travel.

- Alternative A would maintain a passive management approach, favoring open travel. While providing the most unencumbered OHV experience, it would not protect resources or resolve user conflicts;
- Alternative B provides for legitimate intensive uses such as rock crawling, motocross riding, or any other valid motorized activities by emphasizing designating appropriate routes for these activities in front country or rural settings. Intensive use routes would not exceed a “footprint” larger than 80 acres;
- Alternative C emphasizes establishing fewer designated routes for motorized vehicles, especially in important sensitive species habitat, winter range, and calving/fawning areas; and
- Alternative D provides for legitimate intensive uses, such as rock crawling, motocross riding, or any other valid motorized activities, by emphasizing designating appropriate routes for these activities in front country or rural settings. Intensive use routes would not exceed a “footprint” larger than 320 acres.

Issue 2: How would mining/reclamation efforts be managed to ensure containment of hazardous substances (e.g., selenium) and other contaminants?

Under all alternatives the BLM would implement a number of objectives and actions to address this issue. Below is a representative sample of such actions (see Management Guidance Common to Action Alternatives, Minerals and Energy for more information);

- Operational Standards and Guidelines are proposed and would be implemented to reduce impacts from mineral exploration and development;
- Idaho Standards for Rangeland Health would be used to determine success of reclamation efforts;
- Interagency contaminant levels for groundwater, surface water, and vegetation are established for reclamation efforts;
- BMPs or other appropriate techniques would be applied to control sedimentation and release of contaminants;
- In reclamation, plants known to reduce the risk of bioaccumulation would be used if a hazard is present;
- Sites would be monitored and vegetation would be tested for bioaccumulation; and
- Phosphate mine site plans would be designed to meeting the goals of the IPMP.

Issue 3: How would the need for acquiring and maintaining access to public lands be addressed, while protecting private property rights?

Under all action alternatives, the BLM would implement a goal focused specifically on maintaining and acquiring access to public lands. A variety of realty tools (e.g., fee acquisition, easements, conservation easements, and donation) would be used to acquire access from willing sellers. The BLM would focus on priority acquisition areas, which include known access conflicts. All land tenure adjustments (including acquisition and disposal) would include public access as part of the proposed screening process. Access to public lands would be retained across lands transferred out of federal ownership. The BLM would coordinate with other entities, such as counties, to identify legal access and use the Cooperative Rights-of-Way Agreement between the BLM and the State of Idaho to acquire access across state lands, as needed.

Issue 4: How would increasing use of and demand for quality recreation opportunities be balanced with other resources and uses?

Under all alternatives, SRMAs would be proposed to provide specific structured recreational opportunities, such as activity, experience, and benefit opportunities. SRMAs would be priority areas for recreational funding and would be managed to target specific activities, thereby controlling user conflicts. As shown on **Table 2-9**, Alternative C proposes the most SRMAs (four) and Alternatives A and D the fewest (two).

The remaining public lands in the planning area would be managed as an ERMA, which generally provides a less developed, primitive experience. Under all alternatives, management of ERMAs is clarified and focuses on minimizing user conflicts and monitoring for visitor satisfaction.

As discussed above, the BLM proposes to actively manage OHV use to protect resources and minimize conflicts with other user groups. Future travel management planning would incorporate the intent and purpose of the SRMAs to maximize user experiences and protect resources.

Table 2-9. Comparison of Special Recreation Management Areas and Extensive Recreation Management Areas (ERMAs)

SRMA/ERMA	Alternative (acres)			
	A	B	C	D
Pocatello SRMA	33,400	33,400	33,400	33,400
Blackfoot River SRMA	21,800	21,800	21,800	21,800
Oneida Narrows SRMA	N/A	3,600	3,600	N/A
Campgrounds SRMA	N/A	N/A	430	N/A
Pocatello ERMA	558,600	555,000	554,570	558,600

Issue 5: How would the sagebrush ecosystem be managed to balance resources and use demands with greater sage-grouse and sagebrush obligate species?

All alternatives focus on managing shrub steppe vegetation to achieve LHC-A, which represents a healthy and diversified sagebrush ecosystem. Among the alternatives, the BLM is proposing a variety of fire and non-fire vegetation treatments to achieve LHC-A. **Table 2-10** provides the expected acreage of the public lands Shrub Steppe type, achieving the different LHCs at year 30 post treatments.

Table 2-10. Projected Acres of Shrub Steppe by Land Health Condition Class at Year 30

LHC	Current	Alternative (acres)			
		A	B	C	D
A	295,972	344,500	359,000	344,500	368,700
B	111,596	63,100	0.0	0.0	0.0
C	77,632	77,600	126,200	140,700	116,500

In addition to vegetation treatments, all action alternatives propose closing and limiting OHV travel. This would help protect remaining healthy sagebrush ecosystems. Management of ACECs and RNAs, most notably the Dairy Hollow RNA, would help protect sagebrush from conflicting uses.

Issue 6: How would social and economic benefits of commodity and amenity uses be balanced?

As discussed in Chapter 1, the vision of the RMP is to sustain healthy and functional ecosystems, while meeting the multiple use mandate of FLPMA. All alternatives follow this vision and meet all federal laws, but they vary to some degree in the level of resource protection, opportunities for resource extraction, and recreational benefits. None of the action alternatives are expected to notably alter local population trends, employment levels, demands for public services, or other demographics. There would be intrinsic tradeoffs between market-based economic benefits and non-market social benefits among the alternatives. For example, Alternatives B and D would provide the greatest long-term economic opportunities because they contain the fewest encumbrances to development and resource extraction, while Alternative C provides more non-

market values, such as preserving sensitive areas and promoting primitive nonmotorized experiences. Under Alternatives B and C, up to five percent of public lands may be disposed of, while up to 10 percent may be disposed of under Alternative D. Most of these lands are in fragmented ownership patterns, so any market-based activities, such as grazing, would likely continue. **Table 2-11** provides some indicators to highlight some of the social and economic benefits and tradeoffs. Due to the personal preference of assessing benefits, these indicators should be considered only as examples.

Table 2-11. Comparison of Alternatives by Example Social and Economic Tradeoff Indicators

Indicator	Alternative (approximate acres ¹)			
	A	B	C	D
Acres available for livestock grazing	556,300	560,000	555,300	527,800
Open to Solid Minerals Leasing	591,200	582,400	582,400	597,500
Discretionary closure for solid leasable minerals	11,400	20,200	20,200	5,100
Discretionary closure for mineral materials	21,500	20,200	57,800	5,100
Discretionary closure for locatable minerals	1,500	19,200	19,200	1,500
Wildlife habitat protected by fluid mineral NSO stipulation	80,600	98,000	143,500	84,100
Proposed acres for disposal	32,000	28,150	24,950	60,700
Acres excluded to land use authorizations (e.g., ROWs)	30,700	1,900	1,900	0.0
Acres in WSAs, ACECs and RNAs	22,600	22,100	22,100	22,600

¹ All acre figures rounded to nearest 100 acres.


2.15 PLAN MONITORING, IMPLEMENTATION AND ADAPTIVE MANAGEMENT

The success of the Proposed RMP would be measured by the degree to which it is implemented and the degree to which goals and objectives are met. This section is a framework for implementing, monitoring, and evaluating the Proposed RMP, as described in **Chapter 2, Section 2.1**, through an adaptive management process.

2.15.1 ADAPTIVE MANAGEMENT

Adaptive management (**Diagram 2-2**) is a continual process of planning, implementing, monitoring, evaluating, and assessing land to adjust management strategies. The systematic process of adaptive

Diagram 2-2: The Systematic Process of Adaptive Management to be Used to Evaluate How Well Management Actions Meet Objectives of the RMP



management can be used to determine the success of management actions in obtaining the goals and objectives (plan decisions), as described in the Proposed RMP. The Proposed RMP is based on current scientific knowledge and the best available data. For the plan to be successful, it must respond to new information and changing conditions.

Adaptive management enables managers to monitor and evaluate the success of land use plan decisions and to determine what steps are necessary to modify management actions to improve success and to make progress toward or achieve goals and objectives. Under the process, once the plan is implemented and monitoring data is collected or obtained, this information would be evaluated as to the effectiveness of achieving the plan's goals and objectives. On evaluation, a decision would be made whether to make adjustments or changes. Adaptive management improves the effectiveness of the plan by permitting dynamic responses to new data and changes in public expectations and desires and a changing landscape.

2.15.2 IMPLEMENTATION

Implementation is the process of putting the plan's management decisions into effect. Following the adoption of the Final RMP, many of the management actions identified would require implementation plans, such as designating routes within areas identified as limited to designated routes, producing management plans for a SRMA, or identifying treatments to reduce hazardous fuels. These implementation plans would provide the site-specific management emphasis necessary to achieve the objectives for that particular area and in turn would work toward achieving the plan's goals and objectives for identified resources and resource uses.

As the final plan is implemented, priority projects for each major workload area (resource or resource use) would be identified, and then priority projects across the major workload areas would be identified. Through this process, implementation would help to focus budget and staff on the highest priorities and issues determined to have the greatest significance in meeting the needs of resources and resource uses.

Implementation decisions represent the final approval of the on-the-ground actions needed to implement the decisions identified in the RMP and generally require site-specific planning and NEPA analysis.

2.15.3 MONITORING

Plan monitoring differs from activity or program-specific monitoring in that it looks at progress on a

Implementation monitoring is the most basic type of monitoring and simply determines whether planned activities have been implemented in the manner prescribed by the plan. This monitoring documents BLM's progress toward full implementation of the land use plan decisions. There are no specific thresholds or indicators required for this type of monitoring.

Effectiveness monitoring is aimed at determining if the implementation of activities has achieved the desired goals and objectives. Effectiveness monitoring asks the question: **Was the specified activity successful in achieving the objective?** This requires knowledge of the objectives established in the Plan as well as indicators that can be measured. Parameters to monitor are established by resource specialists in order to address specific questions. Success is measured against the benchmark of achieving the goals and objectives established by the plan.

landscape basis and focuses on trends in achieving the plan decisions. Plan monitoring focuses on how the plan is implemented (**implementation monitoring**) and the effectiveness of the actions implemented (**effectiveness monitoring**). Because land use plan monitoring is the process of tracking the implementation of land use planning decisions and of collecting and assessing data and information to evaluate the effectiveness of land use planning decisions, most monitoring related to the plan consists of implementation and effectiveness monitoring.

Table 2-12 identifies data and information that resource specialists could use to determine the effectiveness of the RMP’s management decisions (goals and objectives) and to address if the specified activity was successful in achieving the objectives. The RMP would be monitored annually.

2.15.4 EVALUATION

Under plan evaluation, the plan and information obtained through effectiveness monitoring is reviewed to determine if goals and objectives are being met and if management direction is sound.

Land use plans are evaluated to determine if 1) decisions remain relevant to current issues, 2) if decisions are effective in achieving (or making progress toward achieving) desired outcomes, 3) if any decisions need to be revised, (4) if any decisions need to be dropped from further consideration, and (5) if any areas require new decisions. Plan evaluation would occur every five years.

Evaluations may identify resource needs and means for correcting deficiencies and addressing issues through plan maintenance, amendments, or new starts. They should also identify where new and emerging resource issues and other values have surfaced.

Table 2-12. Parameters (Data/Information) by Resource or Resource Use to Be Collected to Determine Effectiveness of the Plan’s Management Decisions (Goals and Objectives)

Proposed RMP Goals and Objectives	Possible Parameters Considered for Effectiveness Monitoring
Natural, Biological and Cultural Resources:	
Air Quality	
Comply with existing laws and regulations to meet health and safety requirements.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Effectiveness of BMPs (Appendix C) to control fugitive dust emissions related to authorized or permitted activities. • Coordination of fire management-related activities through the Montana/Idaho Airshed Group Smoke Management Program.
Cultural Resources	
Provide for the identification, protection, and enhancement of historical and cultural sites to ensure scientific and socio-cultural values are maintained and are available for appropriate uses by present and future generations.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Effectiveness of management actions in protecting known or newly identified cultural resources. • Coordinating activities with the SHPO to determine appropriate action or stop the deterioration of the site.
Soils and Water	

Table 2-12. Parameters (Data/Information) by Resource or Resource Use to Be Collected to Determine Effectiveness of the Plan’s Management Decisions (Goals and Objectives)

Proposed RMP Goals and Objectives	Possible Parameters Considered for Effectiveness Monitoring
<p>Provide for the PFC of riparian areas.</p> <p>Provide for soil quality, productivity, and hydrological function within naturally sustainable limits.</p> <p>Protect and maintain watersheds so that they appropriately capture, retain, and release water of quality that meets state and national standards and do not impair source water protection areas.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Management actions maintain and make progress toward achieving PFC of riparian and streams. • Management actions improve quality for waters identified on the State of Idaho 303 (d) list. • Effectiveness of BMPs (Appendix C) and project specific mitigation measures to reduce or control soil movement/erosion related to authorized/permitted activities and reclamation activities. • Establishment of vegetative ground cover to reduce or control soil movement. • Progress made toward achieving Idaho Standards of Rangeland Health in reclamation, restoration, and rehabilitation following major surface disturbances.
Paleontological Resources	
<p>Provide for the identification, protection, and management of paleontological resources for the preservation, interpretation, and scientific uses by present and future generations.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Effectiveness of management actions to determine if site conditions are stable and mitigation measures reduce deteriorating conditions.
Vegetation (Including Invasive Species and Noxious Weeds)	
<p>Manage vegetation types to provide for their continued presence as part of an ecologically healthy system.</p> <p>Prevent the establishment of invasive species/noxious weed species.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Progress made toward achieving desired future conditions - FRCC or LHC - by major vegetation types. • Progress made toward achieving Idaho Standards of Rangeland Health. • Effectiveness of management actions evaluated for control of invasive species/noxious weeds.
Fish and Wildlife	
<p>Manage wildlife habitats so vegetation composition and structure ensures the continued presence of fish and wildlife as part of an ecologically healthy system.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Effectiveness of seasonal and spatial requirements (Appendix D) in maintaining or improving habitat qualities for wildlife. • Effectiveness of cutthroat trout actions (Appendix E) to achieve desired aquatic and riparian conditions.
Special Status Species	
<p>Manage special status species and their habitats to provide for their continued presence and conservation as part of an ecologically healthy system.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Coordination of activities with tribal, private, state, or federal agencies monitoring known populations of special status species. • Effectiveness of conservation measures for listed and sensitive species in meeting management objectives on a landscape level.
Visual Resources	
<p>Provide for scenic qualities consistent with the management of resources and uses.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Effectiveness of mitigation measures to ensure compliance with established visual resource management classes.
Wildland Fire Management	
<p>Return fire to a more natural role in the ecosystem as a management tool to improve FRCC and achieve desired LHC.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Effectiveness of management actions to make progress towards achieving desired future conditions (FRCC 1) or LHC by major vegetation types.
Resource Uses:	
Forestry	
<p>Use a variety of silvicultural techniques and harvest</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Effectiveness of management actions to maintain

Table 2-12. Parameters (Data/Information) by Resource or Resource Use to Be Collected to Determine Effectiveness of the Plan’s Management Decisions (Goals and Objectives)

Proposed RMP Goals and Objectives	Possible Parameters Considered for Effectiveness Monitoring
systems to provide for an ecologically healthy system, while offering products and services.	approximately 45,700 acres of commercial forest land in order to offer annually 600-900 thousand board feet (MFB), using a variety of silvicultural techniques and harvest systems. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Effectiveness of management actions to achieve vegetation objectives for forested vegetation types (e.g., Aspen/Aspen Conifer, Dry Conifer, and Wet/Cold Conifer). • Effectiveness of management actions to maintain forest and vegetal products on a sustained basis.
Lands and Realty	
Provide for the balanced development of public lands, such as ROW, utility corridors, and alternative energy development (e.g. wind, solar, biomass) with the protection of natural resources and public enjoyment and recreation, consistent with natural resource values and uses.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Effectiveness of BMPs (Appendix C) minimizing impacts of land use authorizations and rights-of-way on resources and uses. • Effectiveness of open, avoidance, and exclusion areas in minimizing impacts of rights-of-way to resources and uses. • Effectiveness of land tenure zones (4) in facilitating potential land tenure adjustments. • Progress made toward achieving Idaho Standards of Rangeland Health in reclamation, restoration, and rehabilitation following major surface disturbances.
Livestock Grazing	
Provide forage for livestock grazing consistent with other resources and resource uses as part of an ecologically healthy system consistent with multiple use and sustained yield.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Effectiveness of management actions in making significant progress toward Idaho Standards for Rangeland Health. • Effectiveness of management actions in making available annually a total preference of 87,800 AUMs.
Minerals	
Develop fluid leasable minerals, salable and locatable mineral resources, consistent with other resources and uses in an ecologically healthy ecosystem.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Effectiveness of seasonal and spatial requirements (Appendix D) in maintaining or improving habitat qualities for wildlife. • Effectiveness of management actions to minimize adverse impacts on resources and resource uses, while making public lands available for fluid, leasable minerals, salable and locatable minerals.
Recreation (SRMAs and Travel Management)	
Provide for a variety of recreational opportunities and experiences. Establish a comprehensive approach to travel planning and management.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Monitoring SRMAs to ensure that structured recreation opportunities are available. • Effectiveness of “limited” or “closed” designations in protecting resources and reducing adverse impacts. • Travel management plans are developed and consider road closures and designated routes to minimize adverse impacts on resources and uses (e.g., soils, water, vegetation, fish and wildlife).
Special Designations:	
Administrative Designations	
Provide for public land areas suitable for administrative designations with unique geological, vegetative, visual, cultural, historical and/or wildlife values.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Effectiveness of management actions implemented to ensure that resource values for which the area was designated are stable.

2.16 COMPARISON OF ALTERNATIVES

Table 2-13 has been revised for the Proposed RMP/Final EIS. Specifically, the column originally identified as Alternative B (Preferred Alternative, Draft RMP/EIS) is now identified as the Proposed RMP. The goals and objectives for the Proposed RMP are identical to that found in **Table 2-1**, Comparison of Management Guidance Specific to Alternative B and the Proposed RMP, at the beginning of Chapter 2. The unique alpha-numeric codes used to help the reader understand and compare differences between each alternative have been retained from the Draft RMP/EIS (October 2006) for this table. Additionally, goals, objectives, and management actions carried forward from the Draft RMP to the Proposed RMP are followed with a unique alpha-numeric code, beginning with PP to indicate Proposed Plan. An example of this coding structure is provided below:

EXAMPLE:

Goal GE-1. Continuously update resource and use information/data in order to proactively address changing needs and or conditions.

The diagram consists of a rectangular box at the top containing the text 'Goal GE-1. Continuously update resource and use information/data in order to proactively address changing needs and or conditions.' Below this box is a line that slopes upward and then levels off horizontally, ending at a second rectangular box. Below the horizontal line is a bullet point: '➤ Objective CA-GE-1.1. Inventories and surveys documenting the condition and extent of resources/uses are given sufficient emphasis to monitor changes in conditions, provide "measurements" of ecosystem health or baseline data/information, and enable specialists to respond to changes when needed. (PP-GE-1.1)'. A line extends from the bottom right of this objective text to a third rectangular box.

Table 2-13. Summary Comparison of Alternatives

General (GE)			
ALTERNATIVE A	PROPOSED RMP	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
<p>Goal GE-1. Continuously update resource and use information/data in order to proactively address changing needs and or conditions. (GE-1)</p> <p>Objective CA-GE-1.1. Inventories and surveys documenting the condition and extent of resources/uses are given sufficient emphasis to monitor changes in conditions, provide "measurements" of ecosystem health or baseline data/information, and enable specialists to respond to changes when needed. (PP-GE-1.1)</p>			
<p>Goal GE-2. Consistent with multiple use management and sustained yield, achieve desired resource and use conditions while providing for an ecologically healthy environment. (GE-2)</p> <p>Objective CA-GE-2.1. Reduce impacts from management actions, and maintain or improve resource conditions. (PP-GE-2.1)</p>			
<p>Goal GE-3. Provide for proper nutrient cycling, hydrological cycling and energy flow consistent with multiple use management and sustained productivity. (GE-3)</p> <p>Objective AA-GE- 3.1. Restore or improve the public lands adversely affected by major surface disturbance resulting from activities such as but not limited to mineral and energy development, wildland fire, and rights-of way (ROW) development. (PP-GE-3.1)</p>			
RESOURCES			
Air Quality (AQ)			
ALTERNATIVE A	PROPOSED RMP	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
<p>Goal AQ-1. Comply with existing laws and regulations to meet health and safety requirements.</p>			
Objective CA-AQ-1.1. Reduce particulate impacts from uncontrolled wildland fires.	No similar objective	Objective CA-AQ-1.1. Reduce particulate impacts from uncontrolled wildland fires.	Objective CA-AQ-1.1. Reduce particulate impacts from uncontrolled wildland fires.
Objective CA-AQ-1.2. Control the particulate level impacts from permitted/ authorized activities. (PP-AQ-1.1)			

Cultural Resources (CR)			
ALTERNATIVE A	PROPOSED RMP	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
<p>Goal CR-1. Provide for the identification, protection, and enhancement of historical and cultural sites to ensure scientific and socio-cultural values are maintained and are available for appropriate uses by present and future generations. (CR-1)</p> <p>Objective CA-CR-1.1. Manage important known and future identified cultural and historical sites to maintain and preserve their educational, scientific and public benefit. (PP-CR-1.1.)</p> <p>Objective CA-CR-1.2. Reduce imminent threats from natural or human-caused deterioration, or potential conflict with other resource uses. (PP-CR-1.2.)</p>			
Tribal Treaty Rights and Interests (TR)			
ALTERNATIVE A	PROPOSED RMP	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
<p>New Goal. Provide for Tribal Treaty Rights and Interests on unoccupied public lands and public lands with the ceded reservation boundary. (TR-1)</p> <p>New Objective: Maintain traditional/cultural use values and the health of land and water resources so treaty rights and interests can be fulfilled by tribal members on unoccupied public lands and those public lands within the ceded reservation boundary. (PP-TR-1.1)</p>			
Soil and Water (SW)			
ALTERNATIVE A	PROPOSED RMP	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
<p>Goal SW-1. Provide for soil quality, productivity and hydrological function within naturally sustainable limits. (SW-1)</p> <p>Objective CA-SW-1.1. Incorporate resource protections to minimize soil loss when the long-term health of soil function and productivity is at risk. (PP-SW-1.1)</p>			
<p>Goal SW-2. Protect and maintain watersheds so that they appropriately capture, retain and release water of quality that meets state and national standards and do not impair source water protection areas. (SW-2)</p> <p>Objective CA-SW-2.1. Manage public land activities to maintain or contribute to the long term improvement of surface and ground water quality. (PP-SW-1.2)</p>			
Paleontological Resources (PR)			
ALTERNATIVE A	PROPOSED RMP	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
<p>Goal PR-1. Provide for the identification, protection, and management of paleontological resources for the preservation, interpretation and scientific uses by present and future generations. (PR-1)</p> <p>Objective CA-PR-1.1. Maintain and protect paleontological resources for their educational and scientific benefits. (PP-PR-1.1)</p>			

Vegetation (VE)			
ALTERNATIVE A	PROPOSED RMP	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
<p>Goal VE-1. Provide for the PFC of riparian areas. (VE-1) Objective CA-VE-1.1. Maintain properly functioning riparian areas and restore/improve those areas that are not at PFC. (PP-VE-1.1)</p>			
<p>Goal VE-2. Prevent the establishment of invasive and/or noxious weed species. (VE-2) Objective CA-VE-2.1. Treat invasive/noxious weed species to decrease or control the total number of acres occupied. (PP-VE-2.1)</p>			
	<p>Objective AA-VE-2.1. Treat invasive/noxious weed species to decrease or control the total number of acres occupied. (PP-VE-2.1)</p> <p>Where hay or straw would be used on public lands for permitted/authorized and internal BLM activities, state-certified weed free hay/straw would be required.</p> <p>Public awareness concerning invasive species/noxious weeds control would be promoted including partnerships with other agencies and the Tribes.</p>		
<p>Goal VE-3. Provide for old growth characteristics where forest treatments are implemented. (VE-3) Objective CA-VE-3.1. Maintain or contribute towards the restoration of old growth structure and composition in areas where forest treatments, including those authorized under the Healthy Forests Restoration Act, are proposed. (PP-VE-3.1)</p>			
<p>Goal VE-4: Manage vegetation as part of an ecologically healthy system to provide livestock and wildlife with essential habitat components.</p>	<p>Goal VE-6. Manage vegetation types to provide for their continued presence as part of an ecologically healthy system. (VE-4)</p>		
<p>Objective A-VE-4.1. Maintain or increase forage production for wildlife and livestock.</p>	<p>Objective B-VE-6.1. In Low- and Mid-Elevation Shrub and Mountain Shrub types, commensurate with site potential, maintain or increase LHC-A acres as described below so the landscape is composed of a diversity of desirable/native herbaceous and shrub/woody species consisting of at least 15-25% sagebrush canopy cover in greater sage-grouse habitat in the Low- and Mid-Elevation Shrub types and at least 25% shrub cover in the Mountain Shrub type. (PP-VE-4.1)</p>	<p>Objective C-VE-6.1. In Low- and Mid-Elevation Shrub and Mountain Shrub types, maintain or increase LHC-A acres as described below so the landscape is composed of a diversity of desirable/native herbaceous and shrub/woody species consisting of at least 15-25% sagebrush canopy cover in greater sage-grouse habitat in the Low- and Mid-Elevation Shrub type and at least 25% shrub cover in the Mountain Shrub type.</p>	<p>Objective D-VE-6.1. In Low- and Mid-Elevation Shrub and Mountain Shrub types maintain or increase LHC-A acres as described below so the landscape is composed of a diversity of desirable/native herbaceous and shrub/woody species consisting of at least 15-25% sagebrush canopy cover in greater sage-grouse habitat in the Low- and Mid-Elevation Shrub type and at least 25% shrub cover in the Mountain Shrub type.</p>

Vegetation (VE)							
ALTERNATIVE A		PROPOSED RMP		ALTERNATIVE C		ALTERNATIVE D	
	Desired LHC Description	Percent LHC Desired		Desired LHC Description	Percent LHC Desired		Desired LHC Description
	LHC-A -All key components are present as identified in land health standards and as described in the definition of FRCC 1.	> 60%		LHC-A -All key components are present as identified in land health standards and as described in the definition of FRCC 1.	> 50%		LHC-A -All key components are present as identified in land health standards and as described in the definition of FRCC 1.
	LHC-B - Some or all of the key components as identified in land health standards are present and as described in the definition of FRCC 2.	20-25%		LHC-B - Some or all of the key components as identified in land health standards are present and as described in the definition of FRCC 2.	25-30%		LHC-B - Some or all of the key components as identified in land health standards are present and as described in the definition of FRCC 2.
	LHC-C - Key components are absent as identified in land health standards and as described in the definition of FRCC 3.	< 20%		LHC-C - Key components are absent as identified in land health standards and as described in the definition of FRCC 3.	< 25%		LHC-C - Key components are absent as identified in land health standards and as described in the definition of FRCC 3.
No similar objective	Objective VE-6.2. In the Aspen/Aspen Conifer Mix and Dry Conifer types, commensurate with site potential, maintain or increase LHC-A and B acres as described below so the landscape is composed of 40% mixed Aspen/Dry Conifer and 60% Aspen dominate areas consisting of 500-1,000 stems/acre w/ 5-15 ft. height resulting in the distribution of age classes of <30 years (40%), 31-80 years (40%), and >80 years (20%). (Carried forward from Alternative C.) (PP-VE-4.2)		Objective C-VE-6.2. In the Aspen/Aspen Conifer Mix and Dry Conifer types, maintain or increase LHC-A and B acres as described below so the landscape is composed of 40% mixed Aspen/Dry Conifer and 60% Aspen dominate areas consisting of 500-1,000 stems/acre w/ 5-15 ft. height resulting in the distribution of age classes of <30 years (40%), 31-80 years (40%), and >80 years (20%).		Objective D-VE-6.2. In the Aspen/Aspen Conifer Mix and Dry Conifer types, maintain or increase LHC-A and B acres as described below so the landscape is composed of 80% Dry Conifer dominate and 20% Aspen/Dry Conifer mix resulting in a distribution of age classes of <30 years (20%), 31-80 years (40%), and >81 years (40%).		

Vegetation (VE)							
ALTERNATIVE A		PROPOSED RMP		ALTERNATIVE C		ALTERNATIVE D	
	Desired LHC Description	Percent LHC Desired		Desired LHC Description	Percent LHC Desired	Desired LHC Description	Percent LHC Desired
	LHC-A -All key components are present as identified in land health standards and as described in the definition of FRCC 1.	>30		LHC-A -All key components are present as identified in land health standards and as described in the definition of FRCC 1.	>30	LHC-A -All key components are present as identified in land health standards and as described in the definition of FRCC 1.	>25
	LHC-B - Some or all of the key components as identified in land health standards are present and as described in the definition of FRCC 2.	35-40		LHC-B - Some or all of the key components as identified in land health standards are present and as described in the definition of FRCC 2.	35-40	LHC-B - Some or all of the key components as identified in land health standards are present and as described in the definition of FRCC 2.	35-40
	LHC-C - Key components are absent as identified in land health standards and as described in the definition of FRCC 3.	<35		LHC-C - Key components are absent as identified in land health standards and as described in the definition of FRCC 3.	<35	LHC-C - Key components are absent as identified in land health standards and as described in the definition of FRCC 3.	<40
<i>No similar management action</i>	Treat Aspen/ Aspen Conifer sites using appropriate treatment methods and harvest rotation cycles to achieve desired age classes.			Treat Aspen/Aspen Conifer Mix and Dry Conifer types using prescribed fire.		Increase harvest of conifer species and Aspen	
<i>No similar objective</i>	Objective B-VE-6.3. In the Wet/Cold Conifer type, commensurate with site potential, maintain or increase LHC-A and B acres as described below primarily through natural processes so the landscape is comprised of a distribution of age classes of 0-80 years (30%) and > 80 years (70%). (PP-VE-4.3)			Objective C-VE-6.3. In the Wet/Cold Conifer type, increase LHC-A acres as described below so the landscape is comprised of a distribution of age classes of 0-80 years (30%) and > 80 years (70%).		Objective D-VE-6.3. Same as Objective C-VE-6.3.	

Vegetation (VE)					
ALTERNATIVE A	PROPOSED RMP		ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D	
	Desired LHC Description	Percent LHC Desired	Desired LHC Description	Percent LHC Desired	
	LHC-A -All key components are present as identified in land health standards and as described in the definition of FRCC 1.	>5	LHC-A -All key components are present as identified in land health standards and as described in the definition of FRCC 1.	>10	
	LHC-B - Some or all of the key components as identified in land health standards are present and as described in the definition of FRCC 2.	95-100	LHC-B - Some or all of the key components as identified in land health standards are present and as described in the definition of FRCC 2.	85-90	
	LHC-C - Key components are absent as identified in land health standards and as described in the definition of FRCC 3.	<5	LHC-C - Key components are absent as identified in land health standards and as described in the definition of FRCC 3.	<5	
<i>No similar management action</i>	Use appropriate treatment methods and harvest rotation cycles to achieve desired age classes.		Allow for the natural processes to occur to achieve desired age classes. Minimal treatments would be conducted.	Emphasizes the production of Engelmann spruce. Treat areas to obtain desired age class distribution using mechanical or prescribed fire.	

Vegetation (VE)											
ALTERNATIVE A	PROPOSED RMP	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D								
<i>No similar objective</i>	<p>Objective B-VE-6.4. Maintain or increase natural occurring Juniper LHC-A and B acres, commensurate with site potential, as described below through primarily natural processes so the landscape is dominated by widely spaced old juniper trees greater than 300 years. (PP-VE-4.4)</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Desired LHC Description</th> <th>Percent LHC Desired</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>LHC-A -All key components are present as identified in land health standards and as described in the definition of FRCC 1.</td> <td>>5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>LHC-B - Some or all of the key components as identified in land health standards are present and as described in the definition of FRCC 2.</td> <td>95-100</td> </tr> <tr> <td>LHC-C - Key components are absent as identified in land health standards and as described in the definition of FRCC 3.</td> <td><5</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Desired LHC Description	Percent LHC Desired	LHC-A -All key components are present as identified in land health standards and as described in the definition of FRCC 1.	>5	LHC-B - Some or all of the key components as identified in land health standards are present and as described in the definition of FRCC 2.	95-100	LHC-C - Key components are absent as identified in land health standards and as described in the definition of FRCC 3.	<5	<p>Objective C-VE-6.4. Same as Objective B-VE-6.4.</p>	<p>Objective D-VE-6.4. Same as Objective B-VE-6.4.</p>
Desired LHC Description	Percent LHC Desired										
LHC-A -All key components are present as identified in land health standards and as described in the definition of FRCC 1.	>5										
LHC-B - Some or all of the key components as identified in land health standards are present and as described in the definition of FRCC 2.	95-100										
LHC-C - Key components are absent as identified in land health standards and as described in the definition of FRCC 3.	<5										
<i>No similar management action</i>	Use appropriate methods to maintain or promote juniper dominated range sites.	Same as Alternative B	Same as Alternative B								
Goal VE-5. Manage rangeland seedings (e.g. crested wheatgrass) for maximum forage production.	<i>No similar goal</i>	<i>No similar goal</i>	<i>No similar goal</i>								
Objective A-VE-5.1. Maintain or improve rangeland seeding forage production.	<i>No similar objective</i>	<i>No similar objective</i>	<i>No similar objective</i>								

Fish and Wildlife (FW)			
ALTERNATIVE A	PROPOSED RMP	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
<p>Goal FW-1. Manage the wildlife habitats so vegetation composition and structure assures the continued presence of fish and wildlife as part of an ecologically healthy system.</p> <p>Objective CA-FW-1.1. Maintain and improve wildlife habitats to support IDFG management objectives.</p>			
<p>Goal FW-2. Provide for the diversity of native and desired non-native species as part of an ecologically healthy system.</p> <p>Objective CA-FW- 2.1. Maintain or improve native and desired non-native species habitat and the connectivity among habitats.</p>			

Special Status Species (SS)			
ALTERNATIVE A	PROPOSED RMP	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
<p>Goal SS-1. Manage special status species and their habitats to provide for their continued presence and conservation as part of an ecologically healthy system.</p> <p>Objective CA-SS-1.1. Conserve, inventory and monitor special status species. (PP-SS-1.1.)</p> <p>Objective CA-SS-1.2. Maintain or improve the quality of listed (threatened or endangered) species habitat by managing public land activities to support species recovery and the benefit of those species. (PP-SS-1.2.)</p> <p>Objective CA-SS-1.3. Maintain or improve the quality of sensitive species habitat by managing public land activities to support species recovery and the benefit of those species. (PP-SS-1.3.)</p>			
<p>Objective A-SS-1.1. Maintain or improve the quality of listed (threatened or endangered) species habitat by managing public land activities to support species recovery and the benefit of those species.</p> <p>See Chapter 2 for a complete list of management actions for the following listed species:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bald eagle • Gray wolf • Utah valvata snail 	<p>Objective B-SS-1.1. (PP-SS-1.2.)</p> <p>Same as Objective A-SS-1.1.</p>	<p>Objective C-SS-1.1.</p> <p>Same as Objective A-SS-1.1.</p>	<p>Objective D-SS-1.1.</p> <p>Same as Objective A-SS-1.1.</p>
<p>Objective A-SS-1.2. Maintain or improve the quality of sensitive species habitat by managing public land activities to support species recovery and the benefit of those species.</p>	<p>Objective B-SS-1.2. (PP-SS-1.3)</p> <p>Same as Objective A-SS-1.2</p>	<p>Objective C-SS-1.2.</p> <p>Same as Objective A-SS-1.2.</p>	<p>Objective D-SS-1.2.</p> <p>Same as Objective A-SS-1.2</p>

Special Status Species (SS)			
ALTERNATIVE A	PROPOSED RMP	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
Special Status Species: FAUNA			
<p>For Objective A-SS-1.2 see Chapter 2 for a complete list of management actions for the following fauna species:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Pygmy rabbits Boreal toads/leopard frogs Bear Lake endemic fish Ferruginous hawk American white pelican Yellowstone/Bonneville cutthroat trout 	<p>For Objective B-SS-1.2. (PP-SS-1.3) see Chapter 2 for a complete list of management actions for the following fauna species:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Pygmy rabbits (Same as Alternative A) Boreal toads/leopard frogs Bear Lake endemic fish (Same as Alternative A) Ferruginous hawk (Same as Alternative A) American white pelican Yellowstone/Bonneville cutthroat trout Springsnails (<i>Carried forward from Alternative C.</i>) Migratory birds (<i>Carried forward from Alternative C.</i>) 	<p>For Objective C-SS-1.2 see Chapter 2 for a complete list of management actions for the following fauna species:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pygmy rabbits (Same as Alternative A) • Boreal toads/leopard frogs (Same as Alternative B) • Bear Lake endemic fish • Ferruginous hawk (Same as Alternative A) • American white pelican (Same as Alternative A) • Yellowstone/Bonneville cutthroat trout (Same as Alternative B) • Springsnails • Migratory birds 	<p>For Objective D-SS-1.2 see Chapter 2 for a complete list of management actions for the following fauna species:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Pygmy rabbits (Same as Alternative A) Boreal toads/leopard frogs (Same as Alternative A) Bear Lake endemic fish (Same as Alternative A) Ferruginous hawk (Same as Alternative A) American white pelican (Same as Alternative A) Yellowstone/Bonneville cutthroat trout (Same as Alternative A)
<p><i>No similar management action</i></p>	<p><i>No similar management action</i></p>	<p>Management guidance to enhance and/or prevent the loss of special status species habitat for the following priority areas and identified species would be as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Curlew Valley - Columbian sharp-tailed and Greater sage-grouse and other sagebrush obligate species Bear Lake Plateau/Sheep Creek Hills - Greater sage-grouse and sagebrush obligate species Pleasantview Hills/Samaria Mountains - Columbian sharp-tailed and greater sage-grouse and other sagebrush obligates Lower Blackfoot River - Greater sage-grouse, raptors, riparian associated species and sagebrush obligates Deep Creek Mountains - Columbian sharp-tailed and greater sage-grouse 	<p><i>No similar management action</i></p>

Special Status Species (SS)			
ALTERNATIVE A	PROPOSED RMP	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
		(See Chapter 2 for a complete list of management actions for the above priority areas.)	
<p>The following guidelines for greater sage-grouse habitats would be implemented as adapted from Giesen and Connelly (1993):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maintain and enhance existing greater sage-grouse habitats used during each stage of the life cycle. • Minimize human activities that disrupt greater sage-grouse habitats during their seasons of use particularly during the breeding and winter seasons. • Minimize undesired habitat modifications resulting from authorized activities such as land-tenure adjustments, road and facility construction, etc. • Minimize undesired habitat modifications from adverse natural disturbances (wildland fire, insects, disease, etc.) 	<p>To the extent possible and to promote conservation, sage-grouse would be managed consistent with the intent of the Conservation Plan for Greater Sage-grouse in Idaho (Idaho Sage-grouse Advisory Committee, 2006) or any future revisions/amendments and or current BLM guidance. Appropriate actions, conservation measures and guidelines that may be considered include, but are not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continue efforts to map populations and habitat for greater sage-grouse. Map seasonal (lek, nesting, brood-rearing and winter) habitats along with source and isolated populations. • Establish goals for greater sage-grouse habitat conservation at the local level in conjunction with IDFG and local working groups for protection and maintenance of existing populations and restoration goals. • Protect and maintain suitable habitats and reconnect separated populations based upon the following priorities: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Key habitats 2. Source habitats (S1) 3. Restoration areas (R1, R2) 4. Areas that link isolated populations • Commensurate with site potential, manage key habitat for a range of sagebrush canopy cover averaging 15 to 25 percent (11 to 31 inches in height); at least 15 percent grass cover; and 10 percent cover of a diversity of forbs. 	Same as Alternative B.	Same as Alternative A.

Special Status Species (SS)			
ALTERNATIVE A	PROPOSED RMP	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Monitor progress and adjust activities to make progress towards greater sage-grouse goals and objectives. • In areas where grouse habitats are fragmented by land ownership pattern, cooperate with IDFG and local working groups to identify and maintain long-term habitat by acquiring conservation easements or bringing crucial habitats into public ownership. • In cooperation with IDFG identify areas where application of pesticides for grasshopper or Mormon cricket control may negatively affect grouse broods. Identify a cooperative strategy to review requests for pesticide application in these identified locations • Sage-grouse habitat (e.g. leks) would be protected from potential threats (e.g. human disturbance, infrastructure, and wildfire) with a minimum 0.3 mile buffer (Appendix D) from March 1 to May 31. Future permitted/authorized activities would be evaluated on a site specific basis for potential threats consistent with the Conservation Plan for Greater Sage-grouse in Idaho (Idaho Sage-grouse Advisory Committee, 2006) and mitigated through the NEPA process. • Restore shrub-steppe habitats in the following priority: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. source areas, 2. restoration areas 3. areas that link isolated populations 		

Special Status Species (SS)			
ALTERNATIVE A	PROPOSED RMP	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
<p>Nesting and brood rearing habitat would be maintained in suitable condition for approximately 1.2 miles from known leks for Columbian sharp-tailed grouse. When assessing the condition of the habitat, adjacent land uses within two miles of these areas would be considered. (Adapted from Giesen and Connelly, 1993).</p>	<p>As appropriate, the following guidelines (as adapted from Geisen and Connelly 1993), or the most current management document and/or BLM policy, would be used in the management of the Columbian sharp-tailed grouse habitat.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As appropriate based upon a site specific habitat assessment, maintain vegetation in suitable condition (LHC-A) for nesting and brood rearing for 2.0 miles from known leks. Any manipulation of habitats must not be greater than 10 percent of the 2.0 mile radius. • As appropriate based upon a site specific habitat assessment, maintain availability of deciduous shrubs (e.g. serviceberry, chokecherry) within 4 miles of leks to protect winter habitat. • Coordinate with IDFG as population targets and monitoring locations are established for Columbian sharp-tailed grouse. Monitoring would be conducted for populations in key or source areas and restorations areas in that order. • In areas where grouse habitats are fragmented by land ownership pattern, cooperate with IDFG and local working groups to identify and maintain long-term habitat by acquiring conservation easements or bringing crucial habitats into public ownership. • In cooperation with IDFG identify areas where application of pesticides for grasshopper or Mormon cricket control may negatively affect grouse broods. Identify a cooperative strategy to review requests for pesticide application in these identified 	<p>Guidelines would be implemented for Columbian sharp-tailed grouse habitats as adapted from Giesen and Connelly (1993):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maintain vegetation in suitable condition (LHC-A) for nesting and brood rearing for 1.5 miles from known leks. • Within source, key or connective habitats manipulation of sagebrush habitats must be not be greater than 10 percent of the total sagebrush community within a 1.5 mile radius of leks. • Minimize disturbance of deciduous shrubs within 4 miles of leks to protect winter habitat. • Cooperate with IDFG to establish population targets and monitoring routes for Columbian sharp-tailed grouse. Monitoring would be conducted for populations in key or source areas and restorations areas in that order. • In areas where grouse habitats are fragmented by land ownership pattern, cooperate with IDFG and local working groups to identify and maintain long-term habitat by acquiring conservation easements or bringing crucial habitats into public ownership. • In cooperation with IDFG identify areas where application of pesticides for grasshopper or Mormon cricket control may negatively affect grouse broods. Identify a cooperative strategy to review requests for pesticide application in these identified locations. • Protect leks from disturbances from permitted activities for 0.6 	<p>Same as Alternative A.</p>

Special Status Species (SS)			
ALTERNATIVE A	PROPOSED RMP	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
	locations. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> As appropriate based upon a site specific habitat assessment, protect leks from disturbances from permitted activities for 0.3 mile from Mar 1 to May 31. 	mile from Mar 1 to May 31.	
Special Status Species: FLORA			
The following general management actions would be considered to promote healthy, naturally functioning ecosystems in sensitive plant habitat: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Avoid actions that cause concentrated use or disturbance (e.g. trampling, OHVs, dozer lines, range improvements) in habitat. Avoid spraying of pesticides within a 1/4 mile of occupied habitat unless clearly beneficial to sensitive plants. Avoid seeding within occupied habitat unless clearly beneficial to sensitive plants. Methods of weed spraying within or near (1/4 mile) habitat would be formulated on site specific and species specific basis. Promote healthy naturally functioning ecosystem components within a 1/4 mile of habitat to support a viable population. Inventory potential habitat. Monitor flora sensitive species population trends. 	Site/project specific assessments for special status plants would be required prior to authorizing activities to determine: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The presence or absence of special status species, and Appropriate mitigation/guidelines (e.g. avoidance of occupied areas, distances from occupied habitat). Examples of mitigation/guidelines to be considered may include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reducing adverse impacts to special status plant habitats from permitted/authorized activities. Limiting water developments and mineral supplements near special status plant populations sufficient to protect these species. Avoiding pesticide and herbicide applications near occupied habitat to preserve pollinators and non-target species. Promoting seeding within occupied habitat only when clearly beneficial for special status plants. Formulate methods of weed spraying near special status habitat on site specific and species specific basis. Special status plant areas would be priority for weed treatment. 	Site/project specific assessments for special status plants would be identical to Alternative B.	The following general management actions would be considered to promote healthy, naturally functioning ecosystems in sensitive plant habitat: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Avoid actions that cause concentrated use or disturbance (e.g. trampling, OHVs, dozer lines, range improvements) in habitat. Avoid spraying of pesticides within a 1/4 mile of occupied habitat unless clearly beneficial to sensitive plants. Avoid seeding within occupied habitat unless clearly beneficial to sensitive plants. Methods of weed spraying within or near (1/4 mile) habitat would be formulated on site specific and species specific basis. Promote healthy naturally functioning ecosystem components within a 1/4 mile of habitat to support a viable population. Inventory potential habitat for flora sensitive species monitor population trends.

Special Status Species (SS)			
ALTERNATIVE A	PROPOSED RMP	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inventory and monitor special status plant habitats. 		
Visual Resources (VR)			
ALTERNATIVE A	PROPOSED RMP	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
<p>Goal VR-1. Maintain scenic qualities consistent with the management of resources and uses.</p> <p>Objective CA-VR-1.1. Manage visual resources according to established guidelines for VRM classes. (PP-VR-1.1.)</p>			
Wildland Fire Management (WF)			
ALTERNATIVE A	PROPOSED RMP	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
<p>Goal WF-1. Minimize impacts to natural and human resources from various fire related practices, including both wildland fire suppression and fuels management activities.</p> <p>Objective CA-WF-1.1. Utilize the AMR for fire suppression activities to protect natural and cultural resource values. (PP-WF-1.1.)</p> <p>Objective CA-WF-1.2. Assure fire and non-fire vegetation treatments maintain, restore or improve natural or cultural resource values. (PP-WF-1.3.)</p>			
No similar objective	New Objective: Choose the AMR when suppressing wildfire to protect Listed Species and related habitat. (PP-WF-1.2)	No similar objective	No similar objective
	<p>Goal WF-3: Protect life, property, and resources. (WF-2)</p> <p>Objective AA-WF-3.1. Manage public land in and around WUI areas to reduce fire hazards. (PP-WF-2.1)</p> <p>Objective AA-WF-3.2. Manage public lands to protect, improve or enhance resources /values at risk. (PP-WF-2.2)</p>		
Goal WF-2: Provide for the protection of life and property and suppression of wildland fires for the protection of natural resources.	Goal WF- 4: Return fire to a more natural role in the ecosystem to improve FRCC and achieve desired LHC.		
Objective A-WF-2.1. Emphasize protection from wildland fire and ES&R within the WUI.	Objective B-WF-4.1. Manage the Low-Elevation Shrub and Perennial Grass vegetation types in order to move towards FRCC 1 (LHC-A) so wildland fire occurs less frequently and at a smaller scale on the landscape. (PP-WF-3.1)	Objective C-WF-4.1. Same as Objective B-WF-4.1.	Objective D-WF-4.1. Same as Objective B-WF-4.1

Wildland Fire Management (WF)			
ALTERNATIVE A	PROPOSED RMP	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
<i>No similar management action</i>	The AMR would be used to safely manage wildland fires, reducing acres burned to a rate similar to historic. AMR in Low-Elevation Shrub would be suppression of all wildland fire starts to protect existing sagebrush communities.	Chemical, mechanical, seeding, prescribed fire and WFU treatments would be used as appropriate. In Perennial Grass and Juniper encroached vegetation types, the sagebrush steppe would be restored with an aggressive sagebrush seeding effort, utilizing the appropriate sagebrush species for treatment areas.	Use prescribed fires. Treatments would be strategically placed on a landscape scale to prevent fire from spreading toward WUI areas, Low-Elevation Shrub communities, or other resources at risk using the entire array of mechanical, chemical, and small-scale prescribed fire operations to thin, reduce and control hazardous fuels.
Objective A-WF-2.2. Reduce fine fuels and invasive exotic plants to create perennial vegetation communities so that wildland fire occurs less frequently than currently and at a smaller scale on the landscape.	Objective B-WF-4.2. Manage the Mid-Elevation Shrub, Juniper, Dry Conifer, Aspen/Conifer, and Mountain Shrub vegetation types in order to move towards FRCC 1 (LHC-A) so wildland fire mimics historical conditions. (PP-WF-3.2)	<i>No similar objective</i>	Objective D-WF-4.2. Manage the Mid-Elevation Shrub, Juniper, Dry Conifer, Aspen/Conifer, and Mountain Shrub vegetation types by increasing the use of wildland fire and prescribed fire in order to mimic historical conditions (FRCC 1 [LHC-A]).
AMR in Low-Elevation Shrub to protect existing sagebrush communities would be suppression of all wildland fire starts. Following wildland fire, utilize chemical, mechanical, and seeding treatments with appropriate plant materials to provide the best opportunity to stabilize sites and prevent dominance of invasive annual vegetation and noxious weeds. The use of native plant materials would be emphasized. Prescribed fire may be used to prepare areas for subsequent chemical, mechanical, and/or seeding treatments.	The AMR would be used to safely manage wildland fires.	<i>No similar objective</i>	Mechanical and chemical treatments would be used to prepare areas in Fire Condition Class 2 and 3 for prescribed fire and WFU. Where prescriptive parameters, resource conditions, and vegetation conditions allow, WFU or prescribed fire would be used to increase annual average wildland fire acres to a rate similar to historical conditions. Site-specific NEPA analysis would be completed prior to implementation.
<i>No similar objective</i>	Objective C-WF-4.2. Maintain, protect, and expand greater sage-grouse Source Habitats. (Carried forward from Alternative C.) (PP-WF-3.7)	Objective C-WF-4.2. Maintain, protect, and expand greater sage-grouse Source Habitats.	<i>No similar objective</i>

Wildland Fire Management (WF)			
ALTERNATIVE A	PROPOSED RMP	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
<i>No similar management action</i>	<p>Wildland fires would be suppressed in Source Habitats except where WFU could benefit the habitat, which would require site specific project level coordination with IDFG.</p> <p>Vegetation treatments would be conducted in areas that pose a wildland fire risk to Source Habitats, and areas to be treated within Source Habitats would be those that have low resiliency characterized by low species diversity, undesirable composition, and dead or decadent sagebrush. <i>(Carried forward from Alternative C.)</i></p>	<p>Wildland fires would be suppressed in Source Habitats except where WFU could benefit the habitat, which would require site specific project level coordination with IDFG.</p> <p>Vegetation treatments would be conducted in areas that pose a wildland fire risk to Source Habitats, and areas to be treated within Source Habitats would be those that have low resiliency characterized by low species diversity, undesirable composition, and dead or decadent sagebrush.</p>	<i>No similar management action</i>
	Objective B-WF-4.3. Maintain Wet/Cold Conifer, Riparian and Other/Vegetated Lava vegetation types fire frequencies within the historical range of variability, FRCC 1 (LHC-A). (PP-WF-3.3)		
<i>No similar objective</i>	Objective C-WF-4.3. Maintain and improve greater sage-grouse Restoration and Key Habitats. <i>(Carried forward from Alternative C.)</i> (PP-WF-3.8)	Objective C-WF-4.3. Maintain and improve greater sage-grouse Restoration and Key Habitats.	<i>No similar objective</i>
<i>No similar management action</i>	<p>WFU may be used in greater sage-grouse Restoration and Key Habitats for the benefit of the habitat only after site specific project level coordination with IDFG.</p> <p>Vegetation treatments would be conducted to reduce risk of wildland fire and reconnect Restoration and Key Habitats, and areas treated would be those that that have low resiliency characterized by low species diversity. <i>(Carried forward from Alternative C.)</i></p>	<p>WFU may be used in greater sage-grouse Restoration and Key Habitats for the benefit of the habitat only after site specific project level coordination with IDFG.</p> <p>Vegetation treatments would be conducted to reduce risk of wildland fire and reconnect Restoration and Key Habitats, and areas treated would be those that that have low resiliency characterized by low species diversity.</p>	<i>No similar management action</i>

Wildland Fire Management (WF)							
ALTERNATIVE A		PROPOSED RMP		ALTERNATIVE C		ALTERNATIVE D	
Objective A-WF-2.3. Conduct vegetation treatments for resource benefits in Mid-Elevation Shrub, Juniper, Dry Conifer, Aspen/Conifer, and Mountain Shrub.		Objective C-WF-4.4 – Manage the Aspen/Aspen Dry Conifer Mix, Dry Conifer, Wet/Cold Conifer, Riparian, and Other/Vegetated Lava vegetation types in order to maintain vegetation conditions and wildland fire regimes similar to historical conditions (FRCC 1 [LHC-A]). (Carried forward from Alternative C.) (PP-WF-3.9)		Objective C-WF-4.4 – Manage the Aspen/Aspen Dry Conifer Mix, Dry Conifer, Wet/Cold Conifer, Riparian, and Other/Vegetated Lava vegetation types in order to maintain vegetation conditions and wildland fire regimes similar to historical conditions (FRCC 1 [LHC-A]).		Objective D-WF-4.3. In Wet/Cold Conifer, Riparian, and Other/Vegetated Lava vegetation types and/or areas in Fire Condition Class 1, (LHC-A) maintain vegetation conditions using mechanical, chemical, prescribed fire, or WFU treatments, such that wildland fire regimes are similar to historical conditions (FRCC 1) (i.e., maintain the current level of fire in these vegetation types).	
Objective A-WF-2.4. Manage 0.0 acres as suitable for WFU.		Objective B-WF-4.4. Manage for WFU on approximately 265,000 acres identified as suitable. (PP-WF-3.4)		Objective C-WF-4.5. Manage for WFU on approximately 212,600 acres identified as suitable.		Objective D-WF-4.4. Manage for WFU on approximately 468,900 acres identified as suitable.	
Objective A-WF-2.5. For the vegetation types identified, implement over 10 years approximately 3,400 footprint acres of treatment using various treatment methods (e.g. mechanical, chemical, seeding, and prescribed fire), as appropriate.		Objective B-WF-4.5. For the vegetation types identified, implement over 10 years approximately 124,250 footprint acres of treatment using various treatment methods (e.g. WFU, mechanical, chemical, seeding, and prescribed fire), as appropriate. (PP-WF-3.5)		Objective C-WF-4.6. For the vegetation types identified, implement over 10 years approximately 54,920 footprint acres of treatment using various treatment methods (e.g. WFU, mechanical, chemical, seeding, and prescribed fire), as appropriate.		Objective D-WF-4.5. For the vegetation types identified, implement over 10 years approximately 162,170 footprint acres of treatment using various treatment methods (e.g. WFU, mechanical, chemical, seeding, and Prescribed fire), as appropriate.	
Low-Elevation Shrub	0.0	Low-Elevation Shrub	18,950	Low-Elevation Shrub	0.0	Low-Elevation Shrub	9,500
Mid-Elevation Shrub	0.0	Mid-Elevation Shrub	25,400	Mid-Elevation Shrub	16,650	Mid-Elevation Shrub	64,000
Mountain Shrub	0.0	Mountain Shrub	16,500	Mountain Shrub	16,600	Mountain Shrub	15,000
Perennial Grass/Seeding	0.0	Perennial Grass/Seeding	50,200	Perennial Grass/Seeding	1,300	Perennial Grass/Seeding	53,300
Juniper (Natural Only)	0.0	Juniper (Natural Only)	0.0	Juniper (Natural Only)	0.0	Juniper (Natural Only)	0.0
Aspen/Aspen Conifer Mix/Dry Conifer	3,400	Aspen/Aspen Conifer Mix/Dry Conifer	20,000	Aspen/Aspen Conifer Mix/Dry Conifer	20,000	Aspen/Aspen Conifer Mix/Dry Conifer	20,000
Wet/Cold Conifer	0.0	Wet/Cold Conifer	0.0	Wet/Cold Conifer	70	Wet/Cold Conifer	70
Riparian	0.0	Riparian	0.0	Riparian	100	Riparian	100
Other/Vegetated Lava	0.0	Other/Vegetated Lava	0.0	Other/Vegetated Lava	200	Other/Vegetated Lava	200
Total footprint acres	3,400	Total footprint acres	131,050	Total footprint acres	54,920	Total footprint acres	162,170

Wildland Fire Management (WF)			
ALTERNATIVE A	PROPOSED RMP	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
Objective A-WF-2.6. Implement priorities for wildland fire ignitions, suppression and fire and non-fire treatments.	Objective B-WF-4.6. Implement priorities for wildland fire suppression and vegetation treatments. (PP-WF-3.6)	Objective C-WF-4.7. Same as Objective B-WF-4.6	Objective D-WF-4.6. Same as Objective B-WF-4.6

RESOURCE USES

Forestry (FO)			
ALTERNATIVE A	PROPOSED RMP	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
Goal FO-1. Use a variety of silvicultural techniques and harvest systems to provide for an ecologically healthy system while offering products and services. (FO-1) Objective CA-FO-1.1. Maintain a sustainable forest management program. (PP-FO-1.1)			
Goal FO-2. Provide the Tribes and public opportunities for the use of forest/vegetal products to promote an ecologically healthy system. (FO-2) Objective CA-FO-2.1. Maintain approximately 45,700 acres of commercial forest land in order to offer on a yearly basis 600-900 thousand board feet as a “not to exceed” annual probable sale quantity. (PP-FO-2.1) Objective CA-FO-2.2. Based upon tribal and public demand allow for the collection of forest and vegetal products. (PP-FO-2.2)			

Lands and Realty (LR)			
ALTERNATIVE A	PROPOSED RMP	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
Goal LR-1. Consolidate public land to retain and acquire land that is important to the public and protection of resources and to dispose of parcels that are small, isolated and unmanageable.	Goal: LR-5. Improve administrative management efficiency, natural resources management and protection, and public benefit. (LR-5) Objective AA-LR-5.1. Adjust and consolidate public lands ownership patterns through land tenure adjustments. (PP-LR-5.1)		
Objective A-LR-1.1. Implement land tenure adjustments through exchange or sale. A public land base of approximately 581,600 acres would be retained for long-term management in federal ownership and approximately 32,200 acres considered for disposal actions.	Objective B-LR-5.1. Maintain the overall public land base, acquire nonfederal lands or interest in nonfederal lands through exchange, purchase, easement or donation which enhance multiple-use, protect significant resource values and which improve the management and administration of the public lands. (PP-LR-5.2)	Objective C-LR-5.1. Maintain the overall public land base, acquire nonfederal lands or interest in nonfederal lands through exchange, purchase, easement or donation which enhance multiple-use, protect significant resource values and improve the management and administration of the public lands.	Objective D-LR-5.1. Maintain the overall public land base, acquire nonfederal lands or interest in nonfederal lands through exchange, purchase, easement or donation which enhance multiple-use, protect significant resource values and improve the management and administration of the public lands.

Lands and Realty (LR)			
ALTERNATIVE A	PROPOSED RMP	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
<i>No similar management action</i>	A land tenure adjustment program would be implemented based upon a four zone concept. Zone 1: Approximately 50,800 acres Zone 2: Approximately 365,700 acres Zone 3: Approximately 141,000 acres Zone 4: Approximately 56,300 acres	A land tenure adjustment program would be implemented based upon a four zone concept. Zone 1: Approximately 50,800 acres Zone 2: Approximately 418,900 acres Zone 3: Approximately 94,200 acres Zone 4: Approximately 49,900 acres	A land tenure adjustment program would be implemented based upon a four zone concept. Zone 1: Approximately 50,800 acres Zone 2: Approximately 18,400 acres Zone 3: Approximately 423,200 acres Zone 4: Approximately 121,400 acres
Goal LR-2. Balance development of public land, such as ROWs and utility corridors, with the protection of natural resources and public enjoyment and recreation, consistent with natural resource values and uses.	Goal LR-6. Balance development of public land, such as ROW, utility corridors and alternative energy development (e.g. wind, solar, biomass) with the protection of natural resources and public enjoyment and recreation, consistent with natural resource values and uses. (LR-6)		
Objective A-LR-2.1. Implement management actions for ROWs and utility corridors.	Objective B-LR-6.1. Issue land use authorizations consistent with following management actions (See Chapter 2 for complete list of management actions) (PP-LR-6.1)	Objective C-LR-6.1. Same as Objective B-LR-6.1	Objective D-LR-6.1. Same as Objective B-LR-6.1
For ROWs which include energy and non-energy related ROWs and land use authorizations, 562,900 acres would be managed as Open; 20,200 acres would be managed as Avoidance; and 30,700 acres would be managed as Exclusion areas.	For ROWs which include energy and non-energy related ROWs and land use authorizations, 590,000 acres would be managed as open areas; 21,900 acres would be managed as avoidance areas and 1,900 acres would be managed as exclusion areas.	Same as Alternative B	For ROWs which include energy and non-energy related ROWs and land use authorizations, 590,000 acres would be managed as open areas; 23,800 acres would be managed as avoidance areas. No areas would be managed as exclusion area acres.
Goal LR-3. Maintain and acquire legal access to public land. (LR-3)			
Objective A-LR-3.1. Implement management actions for public access.	Objective AA-LR-3.1. Maintain existing access and acquire public and administrative access consistent with resource values and to ensure efficient administration of public lands. (PP-LR-3.1)		
Goal LR-4. Assure land classifications and withdrawals of public lands are appropriate to protect important resource values. (LR-4)			
Objective A-LR-4.1 Manage approximately 60,700 acres of land classified as withdrawn from the general land laws for the specific purposes intended.	Objective B-LR-4.1. Continue to manage approximately 84,760 acres of land classified as withdrawn from the general land laws for the specific purposes intended. (PP-LR-4.1)	Objective C-LR-4.1. Same as Objective B-LR-4.1	Objective D-LR-4.1. Continue to manage approximately 67,060 acres of land classified as withdrawn from the general land laws for the specific purposes intended.

Lands and Realty (LR)			
ALTERNATIVE A	PROPOSED RMP	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
<p>Withdrawal of public lands from mineral entry would be pursued on approximately 1,500 acres for the following areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cheatbeck Canyon RNA • Dairy Hollow RNA • Formation Cave RNA • Oneida Narrows RNA • Pine Gap RNA • Robbers Roost RNA • Travertine Park RNA 	<p>Finalize the withdrawal classification process for the following areas consisting of approximately 19,200 acres:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cheatbeck Canyon RNA • Dairy Hollow RNA • Formation Cave RNA • Oneida Narrows RNA • Pine Gap RNA • Robbers Roost RNA • Travertine Park RNA • Petticoat Peak RNA • Soda Springs Hills Management Area • Bowen Canyon Bald Eagle Sanctuary ACEC 	<p>Same as Alternative B</p>	<p>Finalize the withdrawal classification process for the following RNA's consisting of approximately 1,500 acres:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cheatbeck Canyon RNA • Dairy Hollow RNA • Formation Cave RNA • Oneida Narrows RNA • Pine Gap RNA • Robbers Roost RNA • Travertine Park RNA

Livestock Grazing (LG)			
ALTERNATIVE A	PROPOSED RMP	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
Goal LG-1. Provide forage for livestock grazing consistent with other resources/uses as part of an ecologically healthy system consistent with multiple use and sustained yield. (LG-1)			
<p>Objective A-LG-1.1. Maintain approximately 556,300 acres available for livestock grazing and approximately 57,500 acres not available for livestock grazing.</p>	<p>Objective B-LG-1.1. Maintain approximately 560,000 acres available for livestock grazing and approximately 53,800 acres not available for livestock grazing. (PP-LG-1.1)</p>	<p>Objective C-LG-1.1. Maintain approximately 555,300 acres available for livestock grazing and approximately 58,500 acres not available for livestock grazing.</p>	<p>Objective D-LG-1.1. Maintain approximately 527,800 acres available for livestock grazing and approximately 86,000 acres not available for livestock grazing.</p>
<p>Objective A-LG-1.2. Consistent with Idaho Standards for Rangeland Health and maintaining a thriving ecological balance and multiple use relationships provide annually a total preference (active + suspended) of approximately 86,900 AUMs.</p>	<p>Objective B-LG-1.2. Consistent with maintaining a thriving ecological balance and multiple use relationships provide annually a total preference (active + suspended) of approximately 87,500 AUMs. (PP-LG-1.2)</p>	<p>Objective C-LG-1.2. Consistent with maintaining a thriving ecological balance and multiple use relationships provide annually a total preference (active + suspended) of approximately 86,600 AUMs.</p>	<p>Objective D-LG-1.2. Consistent with maintaining a thriving ecological balance and multiple use relationships provide annually a total preference (active + suspended) of approximately 82,200 AUMs.</p>

Livestock Grazing (LG)			
ALTERNATIVE A	PROPOSED RMP	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
<i>No similar objective</i>	Objective B-LG-1.3. Implement the Secretarial Order (Congressional Withdrawal #157, Idaho #9) which established the BSD. (PP-LG-1.3)	Objective C-LG-1.3. Implement the Secretarial Order (Congressional Withdrawal #157, Idaho #9) which established the BSD and which did not provide for grazing allotments within the driveway.	Objective D-LG-1.3. Implement the Secretarial Order (Congressional Withdrawal #157, Idaho #9) which established the BSD and did not include the creation of grazing allotments within the driveway.

Minerals and Energy (ME)			
ALTERNATIVE A	PROPOSED RMP	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
Goal ME-1. Develop mineral resources (oil and gas, geothermal, solid minerals) consistent with other resource and use direction. (ME-1)			
Objective CA-ME-1.1. Fulfill Indian Trust Responsibilities related to minerals management. (PP-ME-1.1)			
Objective CA-ME-1.2. Coordinate with federal agencies (e.g. Bureau of Indian Affairs, BOR, Forest Service, and USFWS on minerals development proposals related to the federal mineral estate where such agencies have surface management responsibilities. (PP-ME-1.2)			
Goal ME-2. Develop mineral resources (oil and gas, geothermal, solid minerals) consistent with other resources and uses as part of an ecologically healthy ecosystem. (ME-2)			
	Objective AA-ME-2.1. Coordinate with private surface owners on minerals development proposals related to federal mineral estates. (PP-ME-2.1)		
	Objective AA-ME-2.2. Maintain or reestablish the hydrologic function, integrity, quality, and other surface resource values of lands affected by mining actions consistent with the disturbed site potential. (PP-ME-2.2)		
	Objective AA-ME 2.3. Regulate mineral development activities to prevent or control sediment and the release of contaminants such as selenium and metals into the environment. (PP-ME-2.3)		
Objective A-ME-2.1. Manage approximately 602,600 acres of the federal mineral estate as open for fluid minerals leasing (e.g. oil, gas, and geothermal resources).	Objective B-ME-2.1. Manage approximately 344,500 acres of the federal mineral estate as open for fluid minerals leasing (e.g. oil, gas, and geothermal resources). (PP-ME-2.4)	Objective C-ME-2.1. Same as Objective A-ME-2.1	Objective D-ME-2.1. Same as Objective A-ME-2.1
On approximately 314,000 acres , lease with an NSO stipulation.	On approximately 226,000 acres , lease with a NSO stipulation. Approximately 258,100 acres of public lands in the Curlew area would be administratively unavailable for fluid mineral leasing.	On approximately 347,300 acres lease with a NSO stipulation.	On approximately 315,400 acres , lease with a NSO stipulation.

Minerals and Energy (ME)			
ALTERNATIVE A	PROPOSED RMP	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
Objective A-ME-2.2. Manage approximately 591,200 acres of the federal mineral estate (leasable minerals) as open to solid minerals leasing (e.g. phosphate) subject to standard lease terms, and conditions.	Objective B-ME-2.2. Manage approximately 582,400 acres of the federal mineral estate (leasable minerals) as open to solid minerals leasing (e.g. phosphate) subject to standard lease terms, and conditions. (PP-ME-2.5)	Objective C-ME-2.2. Manage approximately 582,400 acres of the federal mineral estate (leasable minerals) as open to solid minerals leasing (e.g. phosphate) subject to standard lease terms, and conditions.	Objective D-ME-2.2. Manage approximately 597,500 acres of the federal mineral estate (leasable minerals) as open for solid minerals leasing (e.g. phosphate) subject to standard lease terms, and conditions.
<p>Discretionary closures (agency administrative) consisting of approximately 11,400 acres would be in effect for ACECs and RNAs :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Downey Watershed ACEC Juniper Town Site ACEC Indian Rocks ACEC Bowen Canyon Bald Eagle Sanctuary ACEC Travertine Park ACEC Stump Creek ACEC Van Komen Homestead ACEC Dairy Hollow RNA Formation Cave RNA Oneida Narrows RNA Travertine Park RNA Pine Gap RNA Robber's Roost RNA Cheatbeck Canyon RNA 	<p>Discretionary closures (agency administrative) would be in effect on approximately 20,200 acres as identified below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Petticoat Peak RNA Dairy Hollow RNA Formation Cave RNA Oneida Narrows RNA Travertine Park RNA Pine Gap RNA Robber's Roost RNA Cheatbeck Canyon RNA Soda Springs Hills Management Area (LWCF/BPA and public lands portions) 	<p>Discretionary closures (agency administrative) would be in effect on approximately 20,200 acres as identified below:</p> <p>Identified areas are identical to Alternative B.</p>	<p>Discretionary closures (agency administrative) would be in effect on approximately 5,100 acres as identified below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Dairy Hollow RNA Formation Cave RNA Oneida Narrows RNA Travertine Park RNA Pine Gap RNA Robber's Roost RNA Cheatbeck Canyon RNA Soda Springs Hills Management Area (Only LWCF/BPA acquired lands)
Objective A-ME-2.3 Manage approximately 581,100 acres of the federal mineral estate (salable minerals) as open to mineral material disposal subject to standard permit terms, and conditions.	Objective B-ME-2.3. Manage approximately 582,400 acres of the federal mineral estate (salable minerals) as open to mineral material disposal subject to standard permit terms, and conditions. (PP-ME-2.6)	Objective C-ME-2.3. Manage approximately 544,800 acres of the federal mineral estate (salable minerals) as open to mineral material disposal subject to standard permit terms, and conditions.	Objective D-ME-2.3. Manage approximately 597,500 acres of the federal mineral estate (salable minerals) as open for mineral material disposal subject to standard permit terms, and conditions.
<p>Discretionary closures (agency administrative) consisting of approximately 21,500 acres would be in effect for all water and power withdrawals, communication sites, RNAs, and historical sites/trails as identified:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Withdrawal - Bear River Reclamation Project Withdrawal - Soda Point Withdrawal - Last Chance Withdrawal - Fort Hall Irrigation 	<p>Discretionary closures (agency administrative) would be in effect on approximately 20,200 acres as identified below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Petticoat Peak RNA Dairy Hollow RNA Formation Cave RNA Oneida Narrows RNA Travertine Park RNA Pine Gap RNA 	<p>Discretionary closures (agency administrative) would be in effect on approximately 57,800 acres as listed below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Withdrawal - Bear River Reclamation Project Withdrawal - Soda Point Withdrawal - Last Chance Withdrawal - Fort Hall Irrigation Project 	<p>Discretionary closures (agency administrative) would be in effect on approximately 5,100 acres as identified listed below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Dairy Hollow RNA Formation Cave RNA Oneida Narrows RNA Travertine Park RNA Pine Gap RNA Robber's Roost RNA

Minerals and Energy (ME)			
ALTERNATIVE A	PROPOSED RMP	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project • Withdrawal - Soda Springs Project • Withdrawals - Public Water Reserves (125 & 107) • Withdrawals - Power Sites and Generating Facilities • Communications sites • Downey Watershed ACEC • Dairy Hollow RNA • Formation Cave RNA • Oneida Narrows RNA • Travertine Park RNA • Pine Gap RNA • Robber's Roost RNA • Cheatbeck Canyon RNA • Historical Sites/Trails 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Robber's Roost RNA • Cheatbeck Canyon RNA • Soda Springs Hills Management Area (LWCF/BPA and public lands portions) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Withdrawal - Soda Springs Project • Withdrawals - Public Water Reserves (125 & 107) • Withdrawals - Power Sites and Generating Facilities • Malad Air Navigation Site • Water/Power - Minidoka Reclamation Project • Communications sites • Downey Watershed ACEC • Dairy Hollow RNA • Formation Cave RNA • Oneida Narrows RNA • Travertine Park RNA • Pine Gap RNA • Robber's Roost RNA • Petticoat Peak RNA • Cheatbeck Canyon RNA • Soda Springs Hills Management Area • Rare and Sensitive Plant Habitat • Blackfoot Stock Driveway 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cheatbeck Canyon RNA • Soda Springs Hills Management Area (Only LWCF/BPA acquired lands)
<p>Objective A-ME-2.4 Manage approximately 582,600 acres of the federal mineral estate (locatable minerals) managed as open to location of mining claims.</p>	<p>Objective B-ME-2.4. Manage approximately 564,900 acres of the federal mineral estate (locatable minerals) as open to location of mining claims. (PP-ME-2.7)</p>	<p>Objective C-ME-2.4. Same as Objective B-ME-2.4</p>	<p>Objective D-ME-2.4 Same as Objective A-ME-2.4</p>
<p>A mineral entry withdrawal (discretionary closure, agency administrative) would be pursued on approximately 1,500 acres for the following RNAs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cheatbeck Canyon RNA • Dairy Hollow RNA • Formation Cave RNA • Oneida Narrows RNA • Pine Gap RNA • Robbers Roost RNA • Travertine Park RNA 	<p>A mineral entry withdrawal (discretionary closure, agency administrative) would be pursued on approximately 19,200 acres for the following areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cheatbeck Canyon RNA • Dairy Hollow RNA • Formation Cave RNA • Oneida Narrows RNA • Pine Gap RNA • Robbers Roost RNA • Travertine Park RNA • Petticoat Peak RNA 	<p>A mineral entry withdrawal (discretionary closure, agency administrative) would be pursued on approximately 19,200 acres for the following areas:</p> <p>Identified areas are identical to Alternative B.</p>	<p>A mineral entry withdrawal (discretionary closure, agency administrative) would be pursued on approximately 1,500 acres for the following areas:</p> <p>Identified areas are identical to Alternative B.</p>

Minerals and Energy (ME)			
ALTERNATIVE A	PROPOSED RMP	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Soda Springs Hills Management Area Bowen Canyon Bald Eagle Sanctuary ACEC 		
<p>Nondiscretionary closures of approximately 29,700 acres would be in effect for the following areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Withdrawal - Bear River Reclamation Project Withdrawal - Soda Point Withdrawal - Last Chance Withdrawal - Fort Hall Irrigation Project Withdrawal - Soda Springs Project Withdrawal - Downey Watershed Withdrawals - Public Water Reserves (125 & 107) Withdrawals - Power Generating Facilities Recreation and Public Purpose Patents Recreation and Public Purpose Leases Soda Springs Hills Management Area (only LWCF/BPA acquired lands) 	<p>Nondiscretionary closures would be in effect for approximately 29,700 acres as identified below:</p> <p>Identified areas are identical to those under Alternative A.</p>	<p>Nondiscretionary closures would be in effect for approximately 29,700 acres as identified below</p> <p>Identified areas are identical to those under Alternative A.</p>	<p>A nondiscretionary closure of approximately 29,700 acres would be in effect on the following identified areas:</p> <p>Identified areas are identical to those under Alternative A.</p>

Recreation (RE)			
ALTERNATIVE A	PROPOSED RMP	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
Goal RE-1: Manage lands for dispersed recreation. (RE-1)			
Objective A-RE-1.1. Continue to manage for dispersed recreation.	Objective B-RE-1.1. Manage lands for a variety of non-motorized, mechanized, and motorized opportunities. (PP-RE-1.1)	Objective C-RE-1.1. Manage lands for a variety of non-motorized, mechanized, and motorized opportunities, with an emphasis on non-motorized and mechanized opportunities.	Objective D-RE-1.1. Manage lands for non-motorized, mechanized, and motorized activities in a variety of settings, with an emphasis on motorized activities.
<i>No similar objective</i>	Objective B-RE-1.2. Recreation facility development and permitted recreation activities would be consistent with other resource goals	Objective C-RE-1.2. Same as Alternative B.	Objective D-RE-1.2. Same as Alternative B.

Recreation (RE)			
ALTERNATIVE A	PROPOSED RMP	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
	of the area in which they are located. (PP-RE-1.2)		
<i>No similar management action</i>	Facility development and improvements would be focused on existing recreation sites and SRMAs.	Same as Alternative B.	No focus on facility development and improvements in existing recreation sites and SRMAs.
Goal RE-2. Manage motorized vehicular (OHV) use.	Goal RE-4: Establish a comprehensive approach to travel planning and management (RE-4) Objective AA-RE-4.1 Provide on-the-ground travel management operations and maintenance programs to sustain and enhance recreation opportunities and experiences, visitor access and safety, and resource conservation. (PP-RE-4.1)		
Objective A-RE-2.1. Manage BLM-administered lands as Open, Limited, or Closed for OHV use.	Objective B-RE-4.1. Designate all public lands in the planning area as Open, Limited, or Closed. (PP-RE-4.2)	Objective C-RE-4.1. Same as Alternative B	Objective D-RE-4.1. Same as Alternative B
<u>OHV acreage designations:</u> Approximately 61,300 acres: Open to all vehicles. Approximately 1,300 acres: Closed to all vehicles. Approximately 199,000 acres: All vehicles limited to designated/existing routes. Approximately 352,200 acres not yet designated	<u>OHV acreage designations:</u> WSAs and RNAs (approximately 12,700 acres) would be designated Closed to OHV use and all remaining public lands (approximately 601,100 acres) would be designated Limited for OHV use. Cross country travel would not be allowed on public lands, and upon completion of the travel management plans, motorized travel off designated routes (identified on travel maps) would not be allowed.	<u>OHV acreage designations:</u> WSAs and RNA's (approximately 12,700 acres) would be designated Closed to OHV use and all remaining public lands (approximately 601,100 acres) would be designated as Limited for OHV use.	<u>OHV acreage designations:</u> WSAs and RNA's (approximately 12,700 acres) would be designated Closed to OHV use and all remaining public lands (approximately 601,100 acres) would be designated as Limited for OHV use.
<i>No similar management action</i>	During travel management planning, provide intensive use areas for valid motorized activities (e.g., rock crawling, motocross riding) by designating appropriate routes for these activities in front country or rural settings. These areas would not exceed a "footprint" larger than 80 acres.	During travel management planning, intensive use areas for valid motorized activities (e.g., rock crawling, motocross riding) would not be provided.	During travel management planning, provide intensive use areas for valid motorized activities (e.g. rock crawling, motocross riding) by designating appropriate routes for these activities in front country or rural settings. These areas would not exceed a "footprint" larger than 320 acres
<i>No similar objective</i>	Objective B-RE-4.2 Implement comprehensive travel management planning utilizing strategies for motorized, mechanized, and non-motorized recreation. (PP-RE-4.3)	Objective C-RE-4.2 Same as Objective B-RE-4.2	Objective D-RE-4.2 Same as Objective B-RE-4.2
<i>No similar management action</i>	Roads, routes and trails would be inventoried and mapped using best available technology, such as GPS and GIS.	Same as Alternative B	Same as Alternative B

Recreation (RE)			
ALTERNATIVE A	PROPOSED RMP	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
	<p>Areas would be prioritized for travel management planning based upon the following criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Known conflicts with other resources/uses, • Proximity of areas to population centers, • Special management areas and special designations, and • Areas of contiguous public land, particularly those that have not been fragmented by motorized routes, and • Wildlife habitat, such as wintering habitat for ungulates or sage-grouse, or breeding habitat. 		
Goal RE-3. Provide for a variety of recreational opportunities and experiences. (RE-3)			
Objective A-RE-3.1. Continue to recognize recreation as the principal use on approximately 55,200 acres of public lands within existing SRMAs.	Objective B-RE-3.1. Recognize recreation as the principal use on approximately 59,230 acres of public lands within SRMAs. (PP-RE-3.1)	Objective C-RE-3.1. Recognize recreation as the principal use on approximately 59,200 acres of public lands within SRMAs.	Objective D-RE-3.1. Recognize recreation as the principal use on approximately 55,200 acres of public lands within SRMAs.
The Blackfoot River SRMA (approximately 21,800 acres) would continue to be managed to maintain existing physical, social and administrative settings, providing various recreational activities, experiences and benefits for a "Destination" market base of southeast Idaho.	<p>The Blackfoot River SRMA (approximately 21,800 acres) would continue to be managed to maintain and/or enhance targeted recreational opportunities, experiences and benefits with a primary market based strategy being "Destination" for a market base of SE Idaho.</p> <p>The SRMA would be managed to provide various recreational opportunities and outcomes (activities, experiences and benefits) based on a unique niche in each of the 5 RMZs identified below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wolverine Canyon (approximately 4,300 acres) • Campground (approximately 80 acres) • Reservoir (approximately 7,200 acres) 	Same as Alternative B	Same as Alternative B

Recreation (RE)			
ALTERNATIVE A	PROPOSED RMP	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mid River (approximately 7,800 acres) • Lower River (approximately 2,400 acres) 		
The Pocatello SRMA (approximately 33,400 acres) would continued to be managed to maintain existing physical, social and administrative settings, providing various recreational activities, experiences and benefits for a "Community" market base of southeast Idaho.	<p>The Pocatello SRMA (approximately 33,400 acres) would continue to be managed to maintain and/or enhance targeted recreational opportunities, experiences and benefits with a primary market based strategy being "Community" for a market base of SE Idaho.</p> <p>The SRMA would be managed to provide various recreational opportunities and outcomes (activities, experiences and benefits) based on a unique niche in each of the 5 RMZ identified below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • West Bench (approximately 4,100 acres) • Blackrock (approximately 15,100 acres) • Papoose (approximately 3,400 acres) • East Bench (approximately 1,400 acres) • Dispersed (approximately 9,400 acres) 	Same as Alternative B	Same as Alternative B
<i>No similar management action</i>	<p>The Oneida Narrows SRMA (approximately 3,600 acres) would be identified and managed to maintain and/or enhance targeted recreational opportunities, experiences and benefits with the primary market based strategy being "Destination" for a market base of SE Idaho and northern Utah.</p> <p>The SRMA would be managed to provide various recreational opportunities and outcomes (activities, experiences and benefits) based on a unique niche in each of the 2 RMZ identified below:</p>	Same as Alternative B	<i>No similar management action</i>

Recreation (RE)			
ALTERNATIVE A	PROPOSED RMP	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • River (approximately 1,900 acres) • Reservoir (approximately 1,700 acres) 		
<i>No similar management action</i>	<p>The Campground SRMA (approximately 430 acres) would be identified and managed to maintain and/or enhance targeted recreational opportunities, experiences and benefits with the primary market based strategy being "Destination" for a market base of SE Idaho and northern Utah.</p> <p>The SRMA would be managed to provide various recreational opportunities and outcomes (activities, experiences and benefits) based on a unique niche in each of the 3 RMZ identified below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hawkins Reservoir (approximately 120 acres) • Goodenough (approximately 280 acres) • Pipeline (approximately 30 acres) (<i>Carried forward from Alternative C.</i>) 	<p>The Campground SRMA (approximately 430 acres) would be identified and managed to maintain and/or enhance targeted recreational opportunities, experiences and benefits with the primary market based strategy being "Destination" for a market base of SE Idaho and northern Utah.</p> <p>The SRMA would be managed to provide various recreational opportunities and outcomes (activities, experiences and benefits) based on a unique niche in each of the 3 RMZ identified below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hawkins Reservoir (approximately 120 acres) • Goodenough (approximately 280 acres) • Pipeline (approximately 30 acres) 	<i>No similar management action</i>
Objective A-RE-3.2 - Continue to manage approximately 558,600 acres as an ERMA.	Objective B-RE-3.2 - Continue to manage approximately 554,600 acres as an ERMA. (PP-RE-3.2)	Objective C-RE-3.2 - Continue to manage approximately 554,600 acres as an ERMA.	Objective D-RE-3.2 - Continue to manage approximately 558,600 acres as an ERMA.

SPECIAL DESIGNATIONS

ADMINISTRATIVE DESIGNATIONS (AD)

ALTERNATIVE A	PROPOSED RMP	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
<p>Goal AD-1. Provide for public land areas suitable for administrative designations. (AD-1)</p> <p>Objective CA-AD-1.1. Continue to manage WSAs to maintain wilderness characteristics. (PP-AD-1.1)</p> <p>Objective CA-AD-1.2. Continue to manage the 5 designed Watchable Wildlife Viewing Sites. (PP-AD-1.2)</p> <p>Objective CA-AD-1.3. Continue to manage Oregon/California historic trails and alternate routes for a meaningful historic recreational and educational experience. (PP-AD-1.3)</p>			

ADMINISTRATIVE DESIGNATIONS (AD)			
ALTERNATIVE A	PROPOSED RMP	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
Objective A-AD-1.1. Manage eligible river segments for the values identified in the wild and scenic river evaluation.	Objective AA-AD-1.1. Determine which eligible river segments are suitable for inclusion in the NWSRS. (PP-AD-1.4)		
<i>No similar management action</i>	Objective B-AD-1.1 - Designate approximately 400 acres as the Petticoat Peak RNA due to the areas unique and undisturbed vegetative communities. (PP-AD-1.5)	Objective C-AD-1.1 Same as Objective B-AD-1.1	<i>No similar management action</i>
Objective A-AD-1.2. Continue to manage the 7 ACECs (approximately 9,900 acres) and 7 RNAs (approximately 1,500 acres) designated for the unique geological, vegetative, visual, cultural, historical and/or wildlife resource values.	Objective B-AD-1.2. Continue to manage the 6 ACECs (approximately 9,900 acres) and 7 RNAs (approximately 1,500 acres) designated for the unique geological, vegetative, visual, cultural, historical and/or wildlife resource values. (PP-AD-1.6)	Objective C-AD-1.2. Continue to manage the 7 ACECs (approximately 9,900 acres) and 7 RNAs (approximately 1,500 acres) designated for the unique geological, vegetative, visual, cultural, historical and/or wildlife resource.	Objective D-AD-1.1. Continue to manage the 7 ACECs (approximately 9,900 acres) and 7 RNAs (approximately 1,500 acres) designated for the unique geological, vegetative, visual, cultural, historical and/or wildlife resource values.
See Chapter 2 for management actions specific to Alternative A for each ACEC and RNA.	See Chapter 2 for management actions specific to Alternative B for each ACEC and RNA.	See Chapter 2 for management actions specific to Alternative C for each ACEC and RNA.	See Chapter 2 for management actions specific to Alternative D for each ACEC and RNA.
<i>No similar objective</i>	New Objective: The Van Komen ACEC (approximately 3 acres) designation would be removed with the area no longer managed as an ACEC. (PP-AD-1.7)	<i>No similar objective</i>	<i>No similar objective</i>
<i>No similar management action</i>	The Van Komen area would be managed as adjacent public lands under the general land laws. If interested or willing parties would desire to restore/develop the Van Komen Homestead, BLM would work with such parties to the extent possible.	<i>No similar management action</i>	<i>No similar management action</i>

This page intentionally left blank

2.17 SUMMARY COMPARISON OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES

Table 2-14 has been revised for the Proposed RMP/Final EIS. Specifically, the column originally identified as Alternative B (Preferred Alternative, Draft RMP/EIS) is now identified as the Proposed RMP. This table provides a summary of the impacts on the human and natural environment in terms of environmental, social and economic consequences that are proposed to occur from implementing the proposed alternatives presented in Chapter 2.

This page intentionally left blank

Table 2-14. Summary Comparison of Environmental Consequences

RESOURCES

Air Quality (AQ)			
ALTERNATIVE A	PROPOSED RMP	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
Approximately 968 tons of PM ₁₀ and approximately 821 tons of PM _{2.5} would result from fire treatments and slash pile burning during the first 10 years of plan implementation. Since fire suppression would be emphasized, zero emissions would result from WFU.	Approximately 9,953 tons of PM ₁₀ and 8,417 tons of PM _{2.5} would be produced by fire treatments, such as prescribed burns and WFU, and slash pile burning, during the first 10 years of plan implementation.	Approximately 12,603 tons of PM ₁₀ and 10,680 tons of PM _{2.5} would be produced by fire treatments, such as prescribed burns and WFU, and slash pile burning, during the first 10 years of plan implementation.	Approximately 13,546 tons of PM ₁₀ and 11,451 tons of PM _{2.5} would be produced by fire treatments, such as prescribed burns and WFU, and slash pile burning, during the first 10 years of plan implementation.
Current particulate emissions resulting from phosphate mining in the planning area are estimated to average 30,555 tons of PM ₁₀ and 6,110 tons of PM _{2.5} over a ten year period.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.
Sand and gravel quarrying on public lands are estimated to produce approximately 10 tons of PM ₁₀ and 2 tons of PM _{2.5} emissions over a ten year period.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.
Approximately 1 ton of PM ₁₀ and approximately 0.15 ton of PM _{2.5} would result from fluid mineral development over a ten year period.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.
Particulate emissions (fugitive dust) from activities associated with recreation, forestry, grazing and range improvement projects, and ROW development are anticipated to continue at current levels.	Same as Alternative A, however, impacts on air quality due to OHV use may decrease due to the designation of all BLM-administered lands as "limited" for OHV use.	Same as Alternative B.	Substantially increased acreages (compared to all other alternatives) of lands available for sale or exchange under this alternative could result in various impacts (negative or positive) on air quality, depending on the current or intended future use of the lands.

Cultural Resources (CR)			
ALTERNATIVE A	PROPOSED RMP	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
Current management would result in the least risk of direct impacts on cultural resources from land tenure adjustments, ROW development, and vegetation treatments. Risks to cultural resources from open or undesignated OHV use would be the greatest under this Alternative as would the long-term risk to cultural resources from catastrophic wildland fire resulting from limited vegetation treatment.	The risk of impacts on cultural resources would be reduced by limiting OHV use to designated routes. This Alternative would also increase the acres withdrawn and acres closed to locatable minerals.	The risk of impacts on cultural resources would be the least by limiting OHV use to designated routes, increasing the acres withdrawn and acres closed to locatable minerals, disposing the least amount of federal land while increasing NSO or closure provisions for mineral and energy development to the greatest area of land. These actions would provide indirect protection to cultural resources from surface-disturbing or other incompatible activities.	This Alternative would result in the greatest risk to cultural resources because it anticipates the most surface disturbance and provides the fewest constraints on potentially incompatible activities. This Alternative would limit OHV use to designated routes reducing the risk of impacts. However, it would dispose of the most acres of public lands, treat the most area of vegetation, allow WFU on the most acreage, and close the smallest area of land to locatable minerals, mineral material disposal, and non-energy leasing.

Fish And Wildlife (FW)			
ALTERNATIVE A	PROPOSED RMP	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
An estimated 4,200 acres of deer winter range would potentially be lost due to specific public land parcels identified for sale and/or exchange. This would be the least acres of all alternatives.	An estimated 15,700 acres of deer winter range would potentially be lost due to zone concept land tenure adjustment program (sale/exchange). This would be approximately 4 times greater than Alternative A.	Same as Alternative B.	An estimated 46,000 acres of deer winter range would potentially be lost due to zone concept land tenure adjustment program (sale/exchange). This would be approximately 11 times greater than Alternative A.
An estimated 80,600 acres of wildlife habitat would be protected by fluid minerals NSO stipulation which would be the least acres of all alternatives.	An estimated 98,000 acres of wildlife habitat would be protected by fluid minerals NSO stipulation.	An estimated 143,500 acres of wildlife habitat would be protected by fluid minerals NSO stipulation which would be approximately 2 times greater than Alternative A and the greatest number of acres of all alternatives.	An estimated 84,100 acres of wildlife habitat would be protected by fluid minerals NSO stipulation.
Seasonal occupancy restrictions would protect an estimated 439,000 acres of wildlife habitat.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.
An estimated 36 riparian-stream miles would be maintained in PFC.	Management actions would result in a likely increase in total riparian-stream miles in proper function condition over Alternative A.	Same as Alternative B.	Same as Alternative B.

Fish And Wildlife (FW)			
ALTERNATIVE A	PROPOSED RMP	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
Acres achieving desired canopy cover (15-25%) for key wildlife vegetation types at 30 years following fire and non-fire vegetation treatments are displayed below:			
Low-Elevation Shrub 37,500	Low-Elevation Shrub 27,800	Low-Elevation Shrub 36,400	Low-Elevation Shrub 37,500
Mid-Elevation Shrub 29,600	Mid-Elevation Shrub 41,500	Mid-Elevation Shrub 37,400	Mid-Elevation Shrub 51,600
Mountain Shrub 187,000	Mountain Shrub 187,000	Mountain Shrub 187,000	Mountain Shrub 187,000
Crested wheatgrass Seedings 0.0	Crested wheatgrass Seedings 34,600	Crested wheatgrass Seedings 1,300	Crested wheatgrass Seedings 42,100

Soil and Water (SW)			
ALTERNATIVE A	PROPOSED RMP	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
Greatest potential long-term impacts to sensitive (wind and water erodible) soils from catastrophic wildland fire compared to Alternatives B, C, and D. No acres identified as suitable for WFU. Identifies the fewest number of acres (3,400) as suitable for fire and non-fire vegetation treatments following suppression.	Vegetation treatments, including prescribed burning and WFU, would have a short term impact by increasing erosion potential. As sites become revegetated, long term potential for improving soil conditions from existing conditions. 124,250 acres are proposed for vegetation treatments and 265,000 acres as suitable for WFU.	Same as Alternative B. 54,920 acres identified for fire and non-fire vegetation treatment and 212,600 acres identified as suitable for WFU.	Same as Alternative B. 162,170 acres identified for fire and non-fire vegetation treatment and 468,900 acres identified as suitable for WFU.
Greatest risk of impacts from OHV use. Erosion and compaction impacts would continue to occur at current rates. Approximately 1,300 acres would be closed to all vehicles; 61,300 acres would be open to all vehicles; 352,000 acres would be undesignated, and 199,000 acres would be limited to designated routes.	Would likely result in fewer impacts than Alternative A. Approximately 12,700 acres would be closed to all vehicles; 0.0 acres would be open to all vehicles; and all vehicles would be limited to designated routes on 601,100 acres .	Same as Alternative B.	Same as Alternative B.
Greatest risk of impacts from OHV use; 361,572 acres of wind erodible soils and 215,830 acres of water erodible soils would occur in open, undesignated, and limited OHV use areas.	Lower risk than Alternative A for impacts from OHV use; 361,572 acres of wind erodible soils and 215,830 acres of water erodible soils would occur in open, undesignated, and limited OHV use areas.	Same as Alternative B.	Same as Alternative B.
Soils would be indirectly protected from minerals development. Fluid leasable minerals; 314,000 acres would have an NSO stipulation. Solid leasable minerals;	Fluid leasable minerals; 226,000 acres would have an NSO stipulation and 258,100 acres would be administratively unavailable. Solid leasable minerals;	Fluid leasable minerals; 347,300 acres would have an NSO stipulation. Solid leasable minerals; 31,400 acres subject to discretionary and nondiscretionary	Fluid leasable minerals; 315,300 acres would have an NSO stipulation. Solid leasable minerals; 16,300 acres subject to discretionary and nondiscretionary

Soil and Water (SW)			
ALTERNATIVE A	PROPOSED RMP	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
22,600 acres subject to discretionary and nondiscretionary closure. Mineral materials; 32,700 acres subject to discretionary and nondiscretionary closure. Locatable mineral claims; 31,200 acres subject to discretionary and non-discretionary closure.	31,400 acres subject to discretionary and nondiscretionary closure. Mineral materials; 31,400 acres subject to discretionary and nondiscretionary closure. Locatable mineral claims; 48,900 acres subject to discretionary and non-discretionary closures.	closure. Mineral materials; 69,000 acres subject to discretionary and nondiscretionary closure. Locatable mineral claims; 48,900 acres subject to discretionary and non-discretionary closure.	closure. Mineral materials; 16,300 acres subject to discretionary and nondiscretionary closure. Locatable mineral claims; 31,200 acres subject to withdrawal.
Livestock grazing has the potential to reduce vegetation cover, disturb the surface, and compact soil in areas of concentrated use such as salting and watering areas. Livestock grazing could also contribute to nutrient loading in surface runoff in localized areas. Under Alternative A 556,300 acres would be available for grazing.	Under Alternative B 560,000 acres would be available for grazing, the most of any of the alternatives.	Under Alternative C 555,300 acres would be available for grazing. Six allotments would specifically be closed to benefit riparian areas.	Under Alternative D 527,800 acres would be available for grazing, the least of any of the alternatives.
An estimated 36 riparian-stream miles would be maintained in PFC. Riparian areas in PFC generally support stable stream banks and desirable vegetative cover; therefore, their condition is not contributing to sedimentation and they may serve as a filter to control pollutants from adjacent lands	Management actions would result in a likely increase in total riparian-stream miles over Alternative A.	Same as Alternative B.	Same as Alternative B.

Paleontological Resources (PR)			
ALTERNATIVE A	PROPOSED RMP	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
Presence or potential for paleontological resources would remain unchanged from current conditions.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.
The extent of change associated with management, the potential for ground-disturbing activities, and increases in access or activity areas to modify the risk of impacts on scientifically important paleontological resources would remain unchanged from current conditions.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.

Special Status Species (SS)			
ALTERNATIVE A	PROPOSED RMP	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
Fauna			
No SS Species geographical areas identified. Management of SS species habitat would continue to maintain existing habitat and not contribute to the potential listing of SS species.	Same as Alternative A.	An estimated 267,400 acres (SS Species geographical areas) would benefit from enhanced management of habitat (e.g., nesting, brood rearing) for SS species. Management of geographical areas would enhance habitat reducing the potential listing of SS species.	Same as Alternative A.
Least risk of potential impacts from public lands disposal resulting in an estimated potential loss of 8,100 acres of combined Colombian sharp-tailed grouse winter/ nesting habitat and greater sage-grouse habitat.	Risk of potential impacts from public lands disposal resulting in an estimated potential loss of 49,400 acres of combined Colombian sharp-tailed grouse winter/ nesting habitat and greater sage-grouse habitat. Risk is greater than Alternatives A and C, but less than Alternatives D.	Risk of potential impacts from public lands disposal resulting in an estimated potential loss of 44,300 acres of combined Colombian sharp-tailed grouse winter/ nesting habitat and greater sage-grouse habitat. Risk is greater than Alternative A, but less than Alternatives B and D.	Risk is greatest with potential impacts from public lands disposal, resulting in an estimated potential loss of 102,200 acres of combined Colombian sharp-tailed grouse winter/ nesting habitat and greater sage-grouse habitat.
At 30 years following fire and non-fire vegetation treatments, an estimated 254,100 acres of Shrub Steppe (Low-, Mid- and Mountain Shrub) would achieve a desired canopy cover of 15-25%.	At 30 years following fire and non-fire vegetation treatments, an estimated 256,300 acres of Shrub Steppe (Low-, Mid- and Mountain Shrub) would achieve a desired canopy cover of 15-25%.	At 30 years following fire and non-fire vegetation treatments, an estimated 260,800 acres of Shrub Steppe (Low-, Mid- and Mountain Shrub) would achieve a desired canopy cover of 15-25%.	At 30 years following fire and non-fire vegetation treatments, an estimated 276,100 acres of Shrub Steppe (Low-, Mid- and Mountain Shrub) would achieve a desired canopy cover of 15-25%.
An estimated 36 riparian-stream miles would be maintained in PFC.	Management actions would result in a likely increase in total riparian-stream miles in PFC over Alternative A.	Same as Alternative B.	Same as Alternative B.
Flora			
Least risk of potential direct impacts from fire and non-fire vegetation treatment, and WFU.	Increased risk of potential direct impacts from fire and non-fire vegetation treatment and WFU. More than Alternatives A and C, but less than Alternative D.	Increased risk of potential direct impacts from fire and non-fire vegetation treatments, and WFU. Greater than Alternative A, but less than Alternatives B and C.	Greatest risk of potential direct impacts from fire and non-fire vegetation treatment, and WFU.
Impacts to SS plant species would be potentially greater than Alternative C from surface disturbing activities. Site specific inventory and mitigation measures would be implemented as appropriate to avoid potential impacts or disturbance.	Same as Alternative A.	Impacts to SS plant species would be the least from surface disturbing activities. A ¼ mile buffer zone around SS plant species habitat would minimize potential impacts or disturbance.	Same as Alternative A.

Special Status Species (SS)			
ALTERNATIVE A	PROPOSED RMP	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
		Establishment of priority areas for SS plants (approximately 280 acres) would provide additional protective measures to improve/enhance SS plants/habitats while minimizing surface disturbing activities.	
Due to surface disturbing activities (e.g., OHV use, mineral resource development, livestock grazing, and fire and non-fire vegetation treatments), the threat of noxious/invasive weeds impacting SS plant habitat would remain unchanged. Alternative A poses the greatest risks to SS plants with the most acres open/ undesignated to motorized OHVs.	Due to surface disturbing activities (e.g., OHV use, mineral resource development, livestock grazing, and fire and non-fire vegetation treatments), the threat of noxious/invasive weeds impacting SS plant habitat would be the same as Alternative A, less than Alternative D, but greater than Alternative C.	Due to surface disturbing activities (e.g., OHV use, mineral resource development, livestock grazing, and fire and non-fire vegetation treatments), the threat of noxious/invasive weeds impacting SS plant habitat would be less than Alternative A. Non-motorized use would be emphasized under this alternative and would put SS plants at the lowest risk compared to alternatives.	Due to surface disturbing activities (e.g., OHV use, mineral resource development, livestock grazing, and fire and non-fire vegetation treatments), the threat of noxious/invasive weeds impacting SS plant habitat would be greatest. Motorized use would be emphasized under this alternative and would put SS plants at higher risk than Alternatives B and C.

Vegetation (VE)			
ALTERNATIVE A	PROPOSED RMP	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
Treatment footprint acres would be 3,400. However, the long term LHC and distribution of vegetation classes within all vegetation types would be comparable to the more intensively treated Alternatives. Vegetation treatments focus on stabilizing, restoring, and rehabilitating vegetation resources using chemical and mechanical treatments and biological control agents. Wildland fire suppression would continue to be emphasized.	Treatment footprint acres would be 124,250. Vegetation treatments would focus on stabilizing, restoring, and rehabilitating vegetation resources, and similar to Alternative A, they would be more reactive than proactive responses to wildland fire as wildfire suppression would continue to be emphasized.	Treatment footprint acres would be 54,920. Treatments would focus on stabilizing, restoring, and rehabilitating vegetation resources with minimal human intervention. Treatments would occur on one-third of the acres treated under Alternative B and one-quarter of those acres treated under Alternative D. This alternative would de-emphasize wildfire suppression.	Treatment footprint acres would be 162,200. Treatments would focus on stabilizing, restoring, and rehabilitating vegetation resources and are more proactive rather than reactive responses to wildland fire. Wildfire suppression would be emphasized and priority would be placed on protecting, maintaining, and providing resources and resource uses for commercial use.
No acreage in Shrub Steppe (Low-Elevation Shrub, Mid-Elevation Shrub, and Mountain Shrub) types would be treated. The lack of proactive restorative treatment to reestablish sagebrush in the Low Elevation Shrub type under Alternative A would increase the risk of losing this vegetation type.	Approximately 111,000 acres in the Shrub Steppe are proposed for treatment. This Alternative would have a greater effect on restoring vegetation types in the Shrub Steppe than under Alternatives A, but the long-term beneficial effect for representative Shrub Steppe species would be less than under Alternatives C or D.	Approximately 35,000 acres in the Shrub Steppe are proposed for treatment. This Alternative would emphasize maintenance of sagebrush structure within Shrub Steppe to maximally protect greater sage-grouse and Colombian sharp-tailed grouse nesting and brooding habitats and other representative sagebrush species.	Approximately 142,000 acres in the Shrub Steppe are proposed for treatment. This Alternative would have about the same long-term effect on restoring vegetation cover types in the Shrub Steppe as well as improving habitat conditions for representative sagebrush species as Alternatives A and C.

Vegetation (VE)			
ALTERNATIVE A	PROPOSED RMP	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
3,400 acres of vegetation treatment is proposed in the Aspen/Aspen-conifer Mix/Dry Conifer type.	Greater emphasis on pure aspen management and over the long term maintains the second most acreage (42,400 acres) in LHC class A. Impacts from treatments within the Aspen/Aspen-Conifer Mix/Dry Conifer type would be similar to Alternatives A and C and likely would be greater than under Alternative D.	Greater emphasis on pure aspen management and over the long term, maintains the most acreage (56,900 acres) in LHC class A. Impacts from treatments within the Aspen/Aspen-Conifer Mix/Dry Conifer type would be similar to those under Alternatives A and B and likely would be greater than under Alternative D. This alternative also calls for a very minimal amount of treatment in the Wet/Cold Conifer, Riparian, and Other types, totaling approximately 400 acres.	Less emphasis on pure aspen management and, over the long term, maintains the least acreage (12,600 acres) in LHC class A. Impacts from treatments within the Aspen/Aspen-Conifer Mix/Dry Conifer type would be less than under the other three alternatives. This alternative also calls for a very minimal amount of treatment in the Wet/Cold Conifer, Riparian, and Other types, totaling 400 acres.
Land Health Condition Class Acres Achieved Following Fire and Non-Fire Vegetation Treatments at 30 Years			
Low-Elevation Shrub LHC-A: 102,800 LHC-B: 0.0 LHC-C: 41,900	Low-Elevation Shrub LHC-A: 111,500 LHC-B: 0.0 LHC-C: 33,300	Low-Elevation Shrub LHC-A: 102,800 LHC-B: 0.0 LHC-C: 41,900	Low-Elevation Shrub LHC-A: 112,900 LHC-B: 0.0 LHC-C: 31,900
Mid-Elevation Shrub LHC-A: 52,500 LHC-B: 56,800 LHC-C: 32,700	Mid-Elevation Shrub LHC-A: 58,200 LHC-B: 0.0 LHC-C: 83,800	Mid-Elevation Shrub LHC-A: 49,700 LHC-B: 0.0 LHC-C: 92,300	Mid-Elevation Shrub LHC-A: 63,900 LHC-B: 0.0 LHC-C: 78,100
Mountain Shrub LHC-A: 187,100 LHC-B: 0.0 LHC-C: 0.0	Mountain Shrub LHC-A: 187,100 LHC-B: 0.0 LHC-C: 0.0	Mountain Shrub LHC-A: 187,100 LHC-B: 0.0 LHC-C: 0.0	Mountain Shrub LHC-A: 187,100 LHC-B: 0.0 LHC-C: 0.0
Naturally-occurring Juniper LHC-A: 0.0 LHC-B: 14,100 LHC-C: 0.0	Naturally-occurring Juniper LHC-A: 0.0 LHC-B: 14,100 LHC-C: 0.0	Naturally-occurring Juniper LHC-A: 0.0 LHC-B: 14,100 LHC-C: 0.0	Naturally-occurring Juniper LHC-A: 0.0 LHC-B: 14,100 LHC-C: 0.0
Shrub Steppe (includes Low-Elevation, Mid-Elevation, and Mountain Shrub) LHC-A: 344,500 LHC-B: 63,100 LHC-C: 77,600	Shrub Steppe (includes Low-Elevation, Mid-Elevation, and Mountain Shrub.) LHC-A: 359,000 LHC-B: 0.0 LHC-C: 126,200	Shrub Steppe (includes Low-Elevation, Mid-Elevation, and Mountain Shrub) LHC-A: 344,500 LHC-B: 0.0 LHC-C: 140,700	Shrub Steppe (includes Low-Elevation, Mid-Elevation, and Mountain Shrub) LHC-A: 368,700 LHC-B: 0.0 LHC-C: 116,500

Vegetation (VE)			
ALTERNATIVE A	PROPOSED RMP	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
Aspen/Aspen-Conifer Mix/Dry Conifer LHC-A: 38,800 LHC-B: 0.0 LHC-C: 51,500	Aspen/Aspen-Conifer Mix/Dry Conifer LHC-A: 42,400 LHC-B: 0.0 LHC-C: 47,900	Aspen/Aspen-Conifer Mix/Dry Conifer LHC-A: 56,900 LHC-B: 0.0 LHC-C: 33,400	Aspen/Aspen-Conifer Mix/Dry Conifer LHC-A: 12,600 LHC-B: 36,100 LHC-C: 41,500
Wet/Cold Conifer LHC-A: 0.0 LHC-B: 700 LHC-C: 0.0	Wet/Cold Conifer LHC-A: 0.0 LHC-B: 700 LHC-C: 0.0	Wet/Cold Conifer LHC-A: 0.0 LHC-B: 700 LHC-C: 0.0	Wet/Cold Conifer LHC-A: 0.0 LHC-B: 700 LHC-C: 0.0
Approximate acres dominated by juniper due to juniper encroachment.			
Approximate acres dominated by juniper due to juniper encroachment would be 11,300 acres.	Approximate acres dominated by juniper due to juniper encroachment would be 5,650 acres.	Approximate acres dominated by juniper due to juniper encroachment would be 0.0 acres.	Approximate acres dominated by juniper due to juniper encroachment would be 0.0 acres.
An estimated 36 riparian-stream miles would be maintained in PFC.	Management actions would result in a likely increase in total riparian-stream miles in PFC over Alternative A.	Same as Alternative B.	Same as Alternative B.

Visual Resources (VR)			
ALTERNATIVE A	PROPOSED RMP	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
ROW exclusion areas and withdrawn areas would remain the same. Approximately 5 % of public lands would continue to be closed to ROW development and approximately 11% would continue to be withdrawn from mineral entry.	Approximately 3% of public lands would be closed to ROW development resulting in greater ROW development than Alternative A. Approximately 14% of lands would be withdrawn from mineral entry, resulting in less mineral entry access than Alternative A.	ROW exclusion areas and mineral entry withdrawals would be the same as Alternative B. However, greater protection to visual resources would be provided by routing ROW development at minimum of ¼ mile from known special status species (flora and fauna) habitat.	There would be no ROW exclusion areas. Mineral entry withdrawals would be the same as Alternative A
Ongoing recreation actions that affect visual resources would remain the same. Visual resources on lands without OHV use designations may deteriorate from the continuation of route pioneering in "Open" and undesignated areas.	With the exception of potential individual areas no larger than 80 acres that may be identified and designated "Open" during travel management planning, all public lands would be designated as "Limited" for motorized and mechanized travel.	All public lands would be designated as "Limited" for motorized and mechanized travel.	With the exception of potential individual areas no larger than 320 acres that may be identified and designated "Open" during travel management planning, all public lands would be designated as "Limited" for motorized and mechanized travel.

Wildland Fire Management (WF)			
ALTERNATIVE A	PROPOSED RMP	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
Acquiring 44 miles of ROW and opening 37,300 acres to public recreation would contribute to human caused fire but would also provide easier access for fire suppression.	Would not acquire additional ROWs or open additional acres to public recreation for fire suppression.	Same as Alternative B.	Same as Alternative B.
64,400 acres identified as isolated tracts available for disposal (Zone 4); however of these identified lands, disposal of 50% would result in improved fire management planning and suppression activities on 32,200 acres.	56,300 acres identified as isolated tracts available for disposal (Zone 4); however, disposal of 50% of these identified lands would result in improved fire management planning and suppression activities on 28,150 acres.	49,900 acres identified as isolated tracts available for disposal (Zone 4); however, disposal of 50% of these lands would result in improved fire management planning and suppression activities on 24,950 acres.	121,400 acres identified as isolated tracts available for disposal (Zone 4); however, disposal of 50% of these lands would result in improved fire management planning and suppression activities on 60,700 acres.
Maintaining and enhancing existing greater sage-grouse habitat would eliminate planned fire management actions in Low-elevation Shrub. Restrictions on activities for protection of wolves would not affect fire management.	Maintaining and enhancing existing greater sage-grouse habitat could restrict some planned fire management actions. Over 10 years, approximately 69,150 acres in Low-Elevation Shrub would be treated. Restrictions on activities for protection of wolves would not affect fire management.	Greater sage-grouse habitat requirements would limit fire management actions in Low-Elevation Shrub (Perennial Grass/Seeding) (1,300 acres) and Mid-Elevation Shrub (16,650 acres). Restrictions on activities for wolf protection may limit springtime fuel reduction in denning areas.	Maintaining and enhancing existing greater sage-grouse habitat could restrict some planned fire management actions. Approximately 62,800 acres in Low-Elevation Shrub would be treated. Restrictions on activities for wolf protection may limit springtime fuel reduction in denning areas.
Current fire management direction would continue suppression of all wildland fires. No treatments would occur in any vegetation types with the exception of Aspen/Aspen Conifer Mix/Dry Conifer (3,400 acres).	Over a period of 10 years, footprint fire and non-fire vegetation treatments are planned on 69,150 acres Low-Elevation Shrub/ Perennial Grass/Seedings, 25,400 acres Mid-Elevation Shrub, 16,500 acres Mountain Shrub, 7,000 acres Aspen/ Aspen Conifer Mix and 6,200 acres Dry Conifer.	Over a period of 10 years, footprint fire and non-fire vegetation treatments are planned on 1,300 acres Low-Elevation Shrub/ Perennial Grass/Seedings, 16,650 acres Mid-Elevation Shrub, 16,600 acres Mountain Shrub, 20,000 acres Dry Conifer, 70 acres Wet/Cold Conifer, 100 acres Riparian, and 200 acres Other/Vegetated Lava.	Over a period of 10 years, footprint fire and non-fire vegetation treatments are planned on 62,800 acres Low-Elevation Shrub/ Perennial Grass/Seedings, 64,000 acres Mid-Elevation Shrub, 15,000 acres Mountain Shrub, 20,000 acres Dry Conifer, 70 acres Wet/Cold Conifer, 100 acres Riparian, and 200 acres Other/Vegetated Lava.
Full-scale suppression would continue to be the primary tool in reacting to wildland fires. The least amount of acreage in WUI areas would be treated (1,980) under Alternative A. Risk from unwanted wildland fire is moderate in 3 of the 11 WUI polygons.	Alternative B treats 55 times more acres in the WUI areas than Alternative A. Potential risk from unwanted wildland fire would be low in all of the 11 WUI polygons.	Alternative C treats the fewest acres of all the action alternatives (42% as many as Alternative B); however it has low potential risks in WUI polygons.	Alternative D treats 35% more acres in the WUI areas than Alternative B. Potential risk from unwanted wildland fire would be low in all of the 11 WUI polygons.
FRCC in 30 years (all vegetation types currently FRCC 2, except the Aspen/Aspen-Conifer Mix/Dry Conifer type is FRCC 3)			
Low- Elevation Shrub: 1	Low- Elevation Shrub: 1	Low- Elevation Shrub: 1	Low- Elevation Shrub: 1
Mid-Elevation Shrub: 2	Mid-Elevation Shrub: 2	Mid-Elevation Shrub: 2	Mid-Elevation Shrub: 2
Mountain Shrub: 2	Mountain Shrub: 1	Mountain Shrub: 1	Mountain Shrub: 1
Naturally-occurring Juniper: 2	Naturally-occurring Juniper: 2	Naturally-occurring Juniper: 2	Naturally-occurring Juniper: 2

Wildland Fire Management (WF)			
ALTERNATIVE A	PROPOSED RMP	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
Aspen/Aspen-Conifer Mix/Dry Conifer: 3	Aspen/Aspen-Conifer Mix/Dry Conifer: 2	Aspen/Aspen-Conifer Mix/Dry Conifer: 2	Aspen/Aspen-Conifer Mix/Dry Conifer: 2
Wet/Cold Conifer: 2	Wet/Cold Conifer: 2	Wet/Cold Conifer: 2	Wet/Cold Conifer: 2

RESOURCE USES			
Forestry (FO)			
ALTERNATIVE A	PROPOSED RMP	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
Commercial Forestry			
The probable sale quantity would remain unchanged, approximately 600-900 thousand board feet per year.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.
Commercial forest lands would remain unchanged, approximately 45,700 acres .	Commercial forest lands would potentially be reduced by approximately 3,700 acres through land tenure adjustments (Zone 4 disposal).	Same as Alternative A.	Commercial forest lands would potentially be reduced by approximately 13,700 acres through land tenure adjustments (Zone 4 disposal).
Proposed fuel reduction and fire management activities are planned for a total of 3,400 footprint acres of forested vegetation types (Aspen/Aspen-Conifer/Dry Conifer types) within a 10-year period (340 acres per year).	Proposed fuel reduction and fire management activities are planned for a total of 13,200 footprint acres of forested vegetation types (Aspen/Aspen-Conifer/Dry Conifer and Wet Cold Conifer vegetation types) within a 10-year period (1,320 acres per year).	Proposed fuel reduction and fire management activities are planned for a total of 20,000 footprint acres of forested vegetation types (Aspen/Aspen-Conifer/Dry Conifer and Wet Cold Conifer vegetation types) within a 10-year period (2,070 acres per year).	Same as Alternative C.
Commercial timber harvesting could account for a portion (120 to 180 acres annually) of fuel reduction and fire management treatments within this 10-year period.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.
Minerals and Energy development (oil and gas, geothermal and phosphate leasing) could potentially impact approximately 15,070 acres of commercial forest lands.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.

Forestry (FO)			
ALTERNATIVE A	PROPOSED RMP	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
Non-Commercial Forestry			
Fire and non-fire vegetation treatments would annually treat approximately 160-220 acres of Aspen/Aspen Conifer Mix/Dry Conifer non-commercial forest lands.	Fire and non-fire vegetation treatments would annually treat approximately 1140-1200 acres of Aspen/Aspen Conifer Mix/Dry Conifer non-commercial forest lands.	Fire and non-fire vegetation treatments would annually treat approximately 1820-1880 acres of Aspen/Aspen Conifer Mix/Dry Conifer non-commercial forest lands.	Same as Alternative A.
The least amount, approximately 2,300 acres of non-commercial forest lands, would potentially be disposed through land tenure adjustments (Zone 4 disposal).	Approximately 8,000 acres of non-commercial forest lands would potentially be disposed through land tenure adjustments (Zone 4 disposal).	Approximately 7,000 acres of non-commercial forest lands would potentially be disposed through land tenure adjustments (Zone 4 disposal).	The greatest amount, approximately 22,100 acres non-commercial forest lands, would potentially be disposed through land tenure adjustments (Zone 4 disposal).
Minerals and Energy development (oil and gas, geothermal and phosphate leasing) could potentially impact approximately 31,200 acres of non-commercial forest lands.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.

Lands and Realty (LR)			
ALTERNATIVE A	PROPOSED RMP	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
Approximately 5% (32,200 acres) of public lands would be disposed of while retaining a public lands base of approximately 581,600 acres . Specific parcels currently identified for land tenure adjustment would not change.	Approximately 5% (28,150 acres) of public lands would be disposed based upon a zone concept while retaining a public lands base of approximately 585,650 acres .	Approximately 4% (24,950 acres) of public lands would be disposed based upon a zone concept while retaining a public lands base of approximately 588,850 acres .	Approximately 10% (60,700 acres) of public lands would be disposed based upon a zone concept while retaining a public lands base of approximately 553,100 acres .
Current classification of public lands identified as "Open", "Avoidance", or "Exclusion" areas for land use authorizations (e.g., ROW) would not change.	Public lands would be identified as "Open", "Avoidance", or "Exclusion" areas for land use authorizations (e.g., ROW). Acres for these three areas would change in comparison to Alternative A. Acres of "Open and Avoidance" areas would increase approximately 5 and 8% respectively and "Exclusion" areas would decrease by approximately 94%.	Same as Alternative B. In addition to the "Avoidance and Exclusion" areas a 1/4 mile buffer around SS plant habitat would be observed.	Public lands would be identified as "Open" or "Avoidance" areas for land use authorizations (e.g., ROW). Acres for these three areas would change in comparison to Alternatives A, B and C. Acres of "Open" areas would be the same as Alternatives B and C. Acres of "Avoidance" areas would increase approximately 18%.
"Open" – 562,900 acres "Avoidance" - 20,200 acres "Exclusion" - 30,700 acres	"Open" - 590,000 acres "Avoidance" - 21,900 acres "Exclusion" - 1,900 acres	"Open" - 590,000 acres "Avoidance" - 21,900 acres "Exclusion" - 1,900 acres	"Open" – 590,000 acres "Avoidance" - 23,800 acres

Lands and Realty (LR)			
ALTERNATIVE A	PROPOSED RMP	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
Land withdrawal management would not change. Seven RNAs, totaling 1,500 acres (< 1% of public lands) would be withdrawn from locatable mineral entry.	Approximately 19,200 acres of public land (approximately 3%) consisting of eight RNAs and the Soda Springs Hills Management Area would be withdrawn from locatable mineral entry.	Same as Alternative B.	Same as Alternative A.
Approximately 44 miles of specific road and trail legal access would be acquired to open approximately 37,300 acres to the public primarily for recreation purposes and to support other resource programs.	Key priority areas are identified for acquisition of legal road and trail access to public lands. Public access would be retained in all land tenure adjustments.	Same as Alternative B.	Same as Alternative B.

Livestock Grazing (LG)			
ALTERNATIVE A	PROPOSED RMP	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
Current grazing management would remain unchanged. Approximately 556,300 acres would be available for livestock grazing and 57,500 acres would not be available with a preference/ permitted use of 86,900 AUMS .	Approximately 560,000 acres would be available for livestock grazing and 53,800 acres would not be available with a preference/permitted use of 87,500 AUMS .	Approximately 555,300 acres would be available for livestock grazing and 58,500 acres would not be available with a preference/permitted use of 86,600 AUMS .	Approximately 527,800 acres would be available for livestock grazing and 86,000 acres would not be available with a preference/permitted use of 82,200 AUMS .
Acres unavailable to livestock grazing resulting from specific resources and uses management actions include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land Tenure Adjustments (32,200 acres) • Minerals and Energy Development (480 acres) • Fluid Minerals Development (300 acres) 	Acres unavailable to livestock grazing resulting from specific resources and uses management actions include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land Tenure Adjustments (28,150 acres) • Minerals and Energy Development (480 acres) • Fluid Minerals Development (300 acres) • Available acres not permitted/ leased would be reclassified as unavailable acres (330 acres) 	Acres unavailable to livestock grazing resulting from specific resources and uses management actions include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land Tenure Adjustments (24,950 acres) • Minerals and Energy Development (480 acres) • Fluid Minerals Development (300 acres) • Available acres not permitted/ leased would be reclassified as unavailable acres (7,500 acres) 	Acres unavailable to livestock grazing resulting from specific resources and uses management actions include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land Tenure Adjustments (60,700 acres) • Minerals and Energy Development (480 acres) • Fluid Minerals Development (300 acres)
Fire and non-fire vegetation treatments (3,400 acres) would temporarily reduce preference/permitted use annually by 120 AUMS during the 10 year treatment period.	Fire and non-fire vegetation treatments (124,300 acres) would temporarily reduce preference/permitted use annually by 4,200 AUMS during the 10 year treatment period.	Fire and non-fire vegetation treatments (54,900 acres) would temporarily reduce preference/permitted use annually by 1,800 AUMS during the 10 year treatment period.	Fire and non-fire vegetation treatments (162,200 acres) would temporarily reduce preference/permitted use annually by 5,400 AUMS during the 10 year treatment period.

Livestock Grazing (LG)			
ALTERNATIVE A	PROPOSED RMP	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
Long-term forage quality and quantity due to limited vegetation treatments would not improve.	Long-term forage quality and quantity as a result of increased fire and non-fire vegetation treatments would improve compared to Alternative A.	Long-term forage quality and quantity as a result of increased fire and non-fire vegetation treatments would improve more than Alternative A but less than Alternative B.	Long-term forage quality and quantity as a result of fire and non-fire vegetation treatments would improve the greatest.
Livestock grazing within the BSD would remain unchanged.	Livestock use within the BSD would be limited to trailing only. Approximately 1,400 AUMS would be available for trailing purposes. Allotments within the BSD would be closed entirely and portions of allotments within the BSD would be closed.	Same as Alternative B.	Same as Alternative B.

Minerals and Energy (ME)			
ALTERNATIVE A	PROPOSED RMP	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
Reclamation conducted in accordance with current regulations and approved site specific operations plan.	Idaho Standards for Rangeland Health would be incorporated into reclamation requirements for all Minerals and Energy development to provide clear reclamation direction and objective criteria from which to design reclamation activities and measure the adequacy of final reclamation. Long term reclamation costs may be reduced by having clear reclamation direction and avoiding situations where reclamation would be judged inadequate and have to be revisited in the future.	Same as Alternative B.	Same as Alternative B.
No similar action under Alternative A.	For all Minerals and Energy operations, operational standards and guidelines would be implemented to protect hydrologic function and surface resource values and to prevent the release of contaminants into the environment resulting in operators having to expand or modify reclamation activities and possibly adding to overall operational costs and complexity of Minerals and Energy development.	Same as Alternative B.	Same as Alternative B.

Minerals and Energy (ME)			
ALTERNATIVE A	PROPOSED RMP	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
Non-discretionary closures for Solid Leasable Minerals, Mineral Materials and Locatable Minerals would be in effect for approximately 11,200 – 29,700 acres (1.8 – 4.8% of total public lands) depending on type of mineral.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.
Seasonal timing restrictions to protect special status species and wildlife habitat would be in effect for approximately 439,000 acres (72% of total public lands).	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.
The following acreages would be discretionarily closed under this alternative <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Solid Leasable Minerals - 11,400 acres • Mineral Materials - 21,500 acres • Locatable Minerals – 1,500 acres 	The following acreages would be discretionarily closed under this alternative. Number in parentheses indicates percent increase/decrease from Alternative A: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Solid Leasable Minerals - 20,200 acres (77%) • Mineral Materials - 20,200 acres (-11%) • Locatable Minerals - 19,200 acres (155.3%) 	The following acreages would be discretionarily closed under this alternative. Number in parentheses indicates percent increase/decrease from Alternative A: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Solid Leasable Minerals - 20,200 acres (0.0%) • Mineral Materials - 57,800 acres (330%) • Locatable Minerals - 19,200 acres (0.0%) 	The following acreages would be discretionarily closed under this alternative. Number in parentheses indicates percent increase/decrease from Alternative A: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Solid Leasable Minerals - 5,100 acres (133%) • Mineral Materials - 5,100 acres (462%) • Locatable Minerals - 1,500 acres (155%)
Fluid Leasable Minerals			
Approximately 602,600 acres (98%) would be “open” to fluid mineral leasing and 11,200 acres would be closed.	Approximately 344,500 acres (98%) would be “open” to fluid mineral leasing. 258,100 acres would be “administratively unavailable” and 11,200 acres would be “closed” for fluid mineral leasing.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.
Approximately 314,000 acres (51%) open to leasing (Oil and Gas and Geothermal resources) would be managed with an NSO stipulation to protect resources, wildlife habitat, special status species, and special designations.	Approximately 226,000 acres (37%) open to leasing (Oil and Gas and Geothermal resources) would be managed with an NSO stipulation to protect resources, wildlife habitat, special status species, and special designations.	Approximately 347,300 acres (57%) open to leasing (Oil and Gas and Geothermal resources) would be managed with an NSO stipulation to protect resources, wildlife habitat, special status species, and special designations.	Approximately 315,400 acres (51%) open to leasing (Oil and Gas and Geothermal resources) would be managed with an NSO stipulation to protect resources, wildlife habitat, special status species, and special designations.
Approximately 66,800 acres open to leasing in the “ High ” potential <u>Oil and Gas</u> area would be leased with an NSO stipulation to protect resources, wildlife	Approximately 74,200 acres open to leasing in the “ High ” potential <u>Oil and Gas</u> area would be leased with an NSO stipulation to protect resources, wildlife	Approximately 99,700 acres open to leasing in the “ High ” potential <u>Oil and Gas</u> area would be leased with an NSO stipulation to protect resources, wildlife	Same as Alternative A.

Minerals and Energy (ME)			
ALTERNATIVE A	PROPOSED RMP	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
habitat, special status species, and special designated areas.	habitat, special status species, and special designated areas. This is an 11% increase over Alternative A.	habitat, special status species, and special designated areas. This is a 49% increase over Alternative A.	
Approximately 8,200 acres open to leasing in " High " <u>Geothermal</u> potential areas would be leased with an NSO stipulation to protect resources, wildlife habitat, special status species, and special designated areas.	Same as Alternative A.	Approximately 11,400 acres open to leasing in " High " <u>Geothermal</u> potential areas would be leased with an NSO stipulation to protect resources, wildlife habitat, special status species, and special designated areas. This is a 39% increase over Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.
Over the next 20 years under a reasonably foreseeable development scenario approximately 185 acres would be developed for Oil and Gas and 129 acres for Geothermal resources.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.
Solid Leasable Minerals			
Approximately 591,200 acres (96%) would be "open" for leasing.	Approximately 582,400 acres (95%) would be "open" for leasing. This is a 1% decrease in acres from Alternative A.	Same as Alternative B.	Approximately 597,500 acres (97%) would be "open" for leasing. This is a 1% increase in acres from Alternative A.
No similar action under Alternative A.	Where selenium and other contaminants are known to be problematic, action levels would be established as concentration release standards for reclamation of phosphate mines.	Same as Alternative B.	Same as Alternative B.
Mineral Materials			
Approximately 581,100 acres (95%) would be "open".	Approximately 582,400 acres (95%) would be "open". This is a slight increase in acres from Alternative A.	Approximately 544,800 acres (89%) would be "open". This is a 6% decrease in acres from Alternative A.	Approximately 597,500 acres (97%) would be "open". This is a 2% increase in acres from Alternative A.
Locatable Minerals			
Approximately 582,600 acres (95%) would be "open".	Approximately 564,900 acres (92%) would be "open". This is a 3% decrease in acres from Alternative A.	Same as Alternative B.	Same as Alternative A

Recreation (RE)			
ALTERNATIVE A	PROPOSED RMP	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
Developed recreational opportunities would remain the same with two SRMAs totaling approximately 55,200 acres .	Developed recreational opportunities would be increase over Alternative A with the identification of the Oneida Narrows SRMA (approximately 3,600 acres) and the identification of the Campground SRMA (approximately 430 acres). Recreation would be recognized as the principle use providing opportunities and experiences on approximately 59,230 acres .	Same as Alternative B.	Same as Alternative A.
Dispersed recreation opportunities would remain the same. Approximately 558,600 acres would be available for recreational purposes.	Dispersed recreation opportunities would decrease slightly from Alternative A. Approximately 555,000 acres would be available for such purposes.	Dispersed recreation opportunities would decrease slightly from Alternative A. Approximately 554,570 acres would be available for such purposes.	Same as Alternative A.
Travel management would be the least restrictive.	Travel management would have more restrictions in comparison to Alternative A.	Travel management restrictions would further increase in comparison to Alternative B.	Travel management would have fewer restrictions that Alternative B and C, but more than Alternative A.
There would be no changes in current conditions and OHV designations would remain unchanged.	12,700 acres would be designated as "Closed" to OHVs. All remaining public lands (601,100 acres) would be designated as "Limited" – restricting motorized and mechanized travel to designated routes which would reduce surface disturbance impacts to vegetation, wildlife habitat, erosive soils and water quality.	Same as Alternative B	Same as Alternative B
"Open/Undesignated" - 413,500 acres "Limited" - 199,000 acres "Closed" - 1,300 acres	"Open/Undesignated" - 0.0 acres "Limited" - 601,100 acres "Closed" - 12,700 acres	Same as Alternative B	Same as Alternative B
No similar action under Alternative A.	Within areas designated as "Limited" to OHVs, snowmobiling would not be allowed on 62,100 acres to protect winter range habitat.	Same as Alternative B	Within areas designated as "Limited" to OHVs, snowmobiling would not be allowed on 28,700 acres to protect winter range habitat.
No similar action under Alternative A.	Snowmobiling would be restricted to designated routes on 286,500 acres within big game winter range.	Snowmobiling would be restricted to designated routes on 286,500 acres within big game winter range.	No similar action under Alternative D.
No similar action under Alternative A.	Snowmobiling would be unrestricted on 252,500 acres .	Snowmobiling would be unrestricted on 252,500 acres .	Snowmobiling would be unrestricted on 572,400 acres .

Recreation (RE)			
ALTERNATIVE A	PROPOSED RMP	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
No similar action under Alternative A.	Travel management planning would provide for legitimate intensive use routes not to exceed a “footprint” larger than 80 acres .	Travel management planning would not provide for legitimate intensive use routes.	Travel management planning would provide for legitimate intensive use routes not to exceed a “footprint” larger than 320 acres .

SPECIAL DESIGNATIONS			
ADMINISTRATIVE DESIGNATIONS (AD)			
ALTERNATIVE A	PROPOSED RMP	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
Wilderness Study Areas			
Current WSA designations of approximately 11,200 acres would be retained. No activities are anticipated to impact WSA management.	Current WSA designations of approximately 11,200 acres would be retained. No activities are anticipated to impact WSA management. WSAs would be “Closed” to OHV.	Same as Alternative B.	Same as Alternative B.
National Wild and Scenic Rivers System (NWSRS)			
Current Bear River and Blackfoot River eligible segments, totaling approximately 17 miles , would be managed to protect the values for which they were identified. Management would be applied to protect values when activities are proposed.	Of the 10 eligible river segments identified for the Bear River and the one eligible river segment identified for the Blackfoot River, none would be recommended for inclusion in the NWSRS.	Same as Alternative B.	Same as Alternative B.
Areas of Critical Environmental Concern and Research Natural Areas			
Seven established ACECs (approximately 9,900 acres) would continue to be managed for the values for which they were established. Management would be applied to protect relevant and important values when activities are proposed.	Six established ACECs (approximately 9,900 acres) would continue to be managed for the values for which they were established. Management would be applied to protect relevant and important values when activities are proposed.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.
No similar action under Alternative A.	The Van Komen ACEC (approximately 3 acres) designation would be removed and the area no longer managed as an ACEC.	No similar action under Alternative C.	No similar action under Alternative D.

ADMINISTRATIVE DESIGNATIONS (AD)			
ALTERNATIVE A	PROPOSED RMP	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
Seven established RNAs (approximately 1,500 acres) would continue to be managed for the values for which they were established. All RNAs would be "Closed" to OHV. Management would be applied to protect relevant and important values when activities are proposed.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A. In addition, all public lands within established RNAs would be unavailable to livestock grazing.	Same as Alternative A.
No new RNAs would be designated.	One area, approximately 400 acres , would be designated as the Petticoat Peak RNA. The RNA would be closed to OHV, Solid Leasable, Mineral Materials and Locatable Materials with an NSO stipulation for Fluid Minerals. ROWs would be excluded from the RNA.	Same as Alternative B. In addition, all public lands within the designated Petticoat Peak RNA would be unavailable to livestock grazing.	Same as Alternative A.

Socio-Economics (SO)			
ALTERNATIVE A	PROPOSED RMP	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
No changes in population trends, local housing market, demand for public services and facilities, employment rates, and total income or earnings.	Same as Alternative A except for the following. Decreasing the lands available for minerals and energy entry could decrease minerals and energy employment, income, and earnings if actual minerals and energy activity were to decrease as a result. Reductions in available AUMS could increase costs and decrease incomes of permittees.	Same as Alternative A except for the following. Decreasing the lands available for minerals and energy entry could decrease minerals and energy employment, income, and earnings; however this is not expected because actual minerals and energy activity is not expected to change. Greater reductions in available AUMS than in Alternative B could increase costs and decrease incomes of permittees to a greater extent.	Same as Alternative A except for the following. Increasing the lands available for minerals and energy entry could increase minerals and energy employment, income, and earnings; however this is not expected because actual minerals and energy activity is not expected to change. The greatest reduction in available AUMS could increase costs and decrease incomes of permittees to the greatest extent of all of the alternatives.
Land tenure adjustments over the period of full implementation of the RMP would result in a potential reduction in the Payment In Lieu of Taxes (PILT) of \$38,640 and a potential increase in property taxes of \$16,905.	Land tenure adjustments over the period of full implementation of the RMP would result in a potential reduction in the PILT of \$33,780 and a potential increase in property taxes of \$14,910.	Land tenure adjustments over the period of full implementation of the RMP would result in a potential reduction in the PILT of \$29,940 and a potential increase in property taxes of \$13,100.	Land tenure adjustments over the period of full implementation of the RMP would result in a potential reduction in the PILT of \$72,840 and a potential increase in property taxes of \$31,870.

Socio-Economics (SO)			
ALTERNATIVE A	PROPOSED RMP	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
Potential temporary loss to BLM in livestock grazing fee receipts (\$1,672) and increased cost to ranchers (\$13,405 to \$45,600) to replace forage temporarily lost over the first 10 years during vegetation and fuel treatments. Direct expenditures within the local economy by BLM for fuels treatments would provide an additional indirect annual economic stimulus of \$24,990.	Potential temporary loss to BLM in livestock grazing fee receipts (\$58,653) and increased cost to ranchers (\$469,224 to \$1,596,000) to replace forage temporarily lost over the first 10 years during vegetation and fuel treatments. Direct expenditures within the local economy by BLM for fuels treatments would provide an additional indirect annual economic stimulus of \$913,238.	Potential temporary loss to BLM in livestock grazing fee receipts (\$25,137) and increased cost to ranchers (\$201,096 to \$684,000) to replace forage temporarily lost over the first 10 years during vegetation and fuel treatments. Direct expenditures within the local economy by BLM for fuels treatments would provide an additional indirect annual economic stimulus of \$403,662.	Potential temporary loss to BLM in livestock grazing fee receipts (\$75,411) and increased cost to ranchers (\$603,288 to \$2,052,000) to replace forage temporarily lost over the first 10 years during vegetation and fuel treatments. Direct expenditures within the local economy by BLM for fuels treatments would provide an additional indirect annual economic stimulus of \$1,191,950.
Management actions would not result in a change in the number of available AUMs. No changes in potential loss to BLM in livestock grazing fee receipts and no potential increased cost to ranchers due to loss of AUMs over the first 10 years of the plan.	Management actions would result in changes in the number of available of AUMs (a reduction of 3,505). Compared to Alternatives A and D, greater potential loss to BLM in livestock grazing fee receipts (\$5,152) and potential increased cost to ranchers (\$41,219 to \$140,200) over the first 10 years of the plan.	Management actions would result in changes in the number of available of AUMs (200). Compared to Alternatives B and D, smallest potential loss to BLM in livestock grazing fee receipts (\$294) and potential increased cost to ranchers (\$2,352 to \$8,000) over the first 10 years of the plan.	Management actions would result in changes in the number of available of AUMs (8,800). Compared to Alternatives A, B, and C, greatest potential loss to BLM in livestock grazing fee receipts (\$12,936) and potential increased cost to ranchers (\$103,488 to \$352,000) over the first 10 years of the plan.
Greatest number of acres available for minerals and energy development without surface occupancy restrictions). 292,700 acres would be available for minerals energy or development. More lands available for minerals entry and development could result in greater employment, income, and overall local economic activity, depending on the level of minerals development activity and future interest in minerals development.	122,700 acres would be open to mineral resource development.	259,500 acres would be open to mineral resource development.	291,400 acres would be open to mineral resource development.
Potential revenues from power plant operation due the reasonably foreseeable development of fluid minerals would be \$19.7 million annually. Potential loss in grazing fees over 10 years of \$460 and potential increased cost to ranchers) to replace forage in areas of development of \$3,650 to \$12,400 over 10 years.	Potentially reduced revenues from power plant operation from the reasonably foreseeable development of fluid minerals, as a result of a 58 percent decrease in total lands available to fluid minerals activities with no NSO restrictions	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.
No change in environmental justice issues, possible effects on tribal uses due to land disposal potentially lower than Alternative D.	Low-income and minority groups would not be disproportionately affected; possible effects on tribal uses due to land disposal potentially lower than Alternatives A and D.	Low-income and minority groups would not be disproportionately affected; possible effects on tribal uses due to land disposal potentially lower than all alternatives.	Low-income and minority groups would not be disproportionately affected; possible effects on tribal uses due to land disposal potentially higher than all alternatives.

This page intentionally left blank

CHAPTER 3 – AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT

3.1 INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this chapter is to provide a description of the existing biological, physical, and socioeconomic characteristics, including human uses, which could be affected as a result of implementing the action alternatives for this Resource Management Plan/Environmental Impact Statement (RMP/EIS) as described in Chapter 2. Information from broad-scale assessments were used to help set the context for the planning area. The information and direction for United States (US) Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management (BLM) resources has been further broken down into fine-scale assessments and information. Specific aspects of each resource discussed in this section (e.g., greater sage-grouse, fire, off-highway vehicle [OHV] use) were raised during the public and agency scoping process. The level of information presented in this chapter is commensurate with and sufficient to assess potential effects of the action alternatives in Chapter 4 of this RMP/EIS. Also presented are general trends that have been occurring to a given resource as a result of the existing Pocatello RMP (1988a) and Malad Management Framework Plan (MFP) (BLM 1981a) that the BLM uses for land management in the BLM, Idaho Falls District, Pocatello Field Office (PFO) area. Risks to individual resources as a result of management action (or inaction) are discussed; and finally, opportunities to manage individual resources under the planning process are presented.

3.2 RESOURCES

This section contains a description of the existing biological and physical resources of the PFO area and follows the order of topics addressed in Chapter 3. These topics are:

- Air Quality
- Cultural Resources
- Soils
- Paleontological Resources
- Vegetation
- Fish and Wildlife
- Special Status Species
- Visual Resources
- Water Resources
- Wildland Fire Management
- Forestry
- Lands and Realty
- Livestock Grazing
- Minerals and Energy
- Recreation
- Special Designations
- Socioeconomic Resources
- Environmental Justice

3.2.1 AIR QUALITY

In considering the impacts on air quality of activities within the PFO area, the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) air quality permitting system suggests that the analysis of air impacts should include all areas within 62 miles (100 kilometers) of proposed facilities and projects (EPA 1992). To be consistent with this directive, the area of consideration for air quality impacts includes airsheds over lands within the PFO area, as well as lands within a 62-mile radius of the PFO area (**Figure 3-1**).

While most BLM programs in the planning area are not generally considered to appreciably affect air quality, the increased emphasis on prescribed fire must be evaluated for its impact on air quality. Both wildland and prescribed fire are major issues that have the potential to cause impacts that appreciably affect air quality. Other ongoing activities occurring on public lands that may affect air quality include mining and mineral processing, forestry, construction, motorized travel, OHV use, and other recreation activities.

An air quality assessment technical report was prepared to assist the PFO with its overall RMP/EIS planning effort (**Appendix L**¹). The report provides a collaborative community-based planning approach to updating management decisions and resource allocation; as such decisions pertain to air quality. The document also contains significant information and references on air quality within the PFO area.

3.2.1.1 Regional Climate

Climate in the PFO planning area varies widely. Regionally, the amount of precipitation received in the PFO area is directly influenced by the Cascade and Sierra Mountains to the west and the Bitterroot and Rocky Mountains to the north. These features reduce the amount of Pacific moisture available as precipitation and effectively create a semi-arid climate in the PFO area. In the summer, the arid Great Basin area of Utah and Nevada modify monsoonal moisture flows, which occur infrequently. While the amount of precipitation falling across the PFO area limits dryland agriculture, the relatively large precipitation amounts received in headwater mountains supplies reservoirs and canal systems, and recharges deep irrigation wells. Such precipitation and storage permits for a greater range of agricultural production in certain areas.

Winter temperatures can be well below 0 degrees Fahrenheit (°F), but frequent southwest winds can moderate cold winter conditions. Spring and fall temperatures can vary widely, with daytime temperatures typically ranging between 30°F and 70°F. Summer temperatures frequently rise into the 90°F range, but long spells of extremely hot weather are not common. Summer night temperatures frequently drop into the 50°F to 60°F range. The growing season (freeze-free duration) is about 125 days in the Pocatello area and shorter in other higher elevation areas, including the eastern PFO area valleys.

More than 50 percent of the observed wind directions are from the quadrant between south and west (Idaho Department of Environmental Quality [IDEQ] 1999). The strongest winds generally

¹Since publication of the Draft RMP/EIS, one nonattainment area (Portneuf Valley) has been redesignated as being in attainment for the PM10 National Ambient Air Quality Standards as of August 14, 2006.

are associated with the thunderstorms that occur in spring and summer. These events are generally limited in duration, but 40 to 60 mile per hour gusts are possible.

3.2.1.2 Air Quality Standards

The EPA has authorized the State of Idaho to administer federal air quality laws within the PFO boundaries. The framework for the Idaho air quality program is based on the federal Clean Air Act (CAA), as amended in 1990.

National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) are defined in the CAA as levels of pollutants above which detrimental effects on human health and welfare may result. The EPA established NAAQS for six criteria pollutants. These include carbon monoxide (CO), nitrogen dioxide (NO₂), ozone, lead, sulphur dioxide (SO₂), and two categories of particulate matter: fine particulates with an aerodynamic diameter of 10 micrometers or less (PM₁₀) and fine particulates with an aerodynamic diameter of 2.5 micrometers or less (PM_{2.5}).

When an area within a state exceeds an ambient air quality standard, it may be designated as a non-attainment area (NAA). It is possible for a geographic area to be an attainment area for one criteria pollutant and a NAA for another. Air monitoring networks have been established to determine whether an area meets the ambient air quality standard (IDEQ 2003a). If an area falls into a non-attainment status the IDEQ is required to prepare a state implementation plan (SIP) to describe how the area will be brought into attainment status.

Another provision of the CAA is the prevention of significant deterioration. There are different permissible increments for criteria pollutants for different areas (termed “classes”). There are several classes that are used to designate an area.

Class I areas are composed of a) International Parks; b) National Wilderness Areas that exceed 5,000 acres; c) National Memorial Parks that exceed 5,000 acres; d) National Parks that exceed 6,000 acres, and d) National Wildlife Refuges (NWRs) and National Wild and Scenic Rivers that exceed 10,000 acres.

All other areas of Idaho have been designated as Class II.

Class I areas afford the highest protection to air quality by restricting the level of further degradation allowed. In addition to the further degradation limits applied to Class I areas, 1999 amendments to the CAA set forth a national goal for visibility. The rule, referred to as the Regional Haze Rule, calls for states to establish goals and emission reduction strategies for improving visibility in all mandatory Class I national parks and wilderness areas.

In April 1998, the EPA, in cooperation with other federal land managers, states and tribes, issued the Interim Air Quality Policy on wildland and prescribed fires. One of the goals of the policy is to allow fire to function as a disturbance process on federally managed wildlands, while protecting public health and welfare. Smoke emissions from forest and range prescribed burning are managed by the Montana/Idaho Airshed Group (MIAG). Group participants include landowners and managers (federal, state, tribal, and private) IDEQ, and the National Weather Service. The program is voluntary in Idaho. Burn plans written under this program must include

actions to minimize fire emissions, a smoke dispersion evaluation, public notification, exposure reduction procedures, and an air quality monitoring plan.

Additional regulations govern the emissions of hazardous air pollutants, defined as pollutants that cause or may cause cancer or other serious health impacts, such as reproductive effects or birth defects, or adverse environmental and ecological effects (IDEQ 2003b). Idaho's Air Toxics Program regulates approximately 350 toxic air pollutants, while EPA's federal CAA program regulates approximately 188 hazardous air pollutants.

Idaho air quality regulations also stipulate that "all reasonable precautions shall be taken to prevent particulate matter from becoming airborne." IDEQ has developed a fugitive dust best management practices (BMPs) document to help manage and minimize fugitive dust at facilities where fugitive dust has been identified as an issue (IDEQ 2003c).

3.2.1.3 Current Air Quality

Particulate matter (PM₁₀, PM_{2.5}) is currently the most common pollutant identified in the PFO area. Common sources of particulate matter include windblown dust, re-entrained road dust, smoke (residential, agricultural, and wildland fires), industrial emissions, and motor vehicle emissions. Localized sources (primarily large industrial sources in Pocatello and Soda Springs) of NO₂ and SO₂ are also a concern due to their role in secondary aerosol formation (IDEQ 2001).

The predominant (generally greater than 90 percent) particulate matter sources within the counties in the PFO area are categorized as "fugitive dust" and "agricultural and forestry activities. The exceptions are Power and Caribou counties. In Power County, mineral product processing accounts for approximately 21 percent of PM₁₀ emissions and 50 percent of PM_{2.5} emissions. In Caribou County, inorganic chemical manufacturing accounts for 19 percent of PM_{2.5} emissions. All of the counties within the PFO area show an improving (decreasing annual emissions) trend from 1995 to 1999 for both PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5} concentrations (Trinity Consultants 2003).

One PM₁₀ NAA is designated in the PFO planning area. The Fort Hall PM₁₀ NAA (**Figure 3-1**) lies within the Fort Hall Indian Reservation and is managed by the Shoshone-Bannock Tribes with environmental program direction provided by the EPA. The Portneuf Valley was redesignated as being in attainment for the PM₁₀ NAAQS on August 14, 2006 (71 FR 39574). The EPA has determined that the area is attaining and maintaining the PM₁₀ standards. The Portneuf Valley is under the jurisdiction of the IDEQ.

3.2.1.4 Sensitive Areas

Areas that have been identified as sensitive to air quality include NAAQS nonattainment areas, impact zones, Class I visibility areas, hospitals, airports, major transportation corridors, as well as population centers.

The Federal Fort Hall PM₁₀ NAA is under the jurisdiction of the Shoshone-Bannock Tribes. An EPA Federal Implementation Plan for the area was completed in August 2000 (EPA 2000). A primary source for PM₁₀ emissions in the Fort Hall was identified as the Astaris, LLP (formerly FMC) elemental phosphorous plant, located west of the NAA. The Astaris plant closed in

December 2001. Ogden City in Weber County, Utah, has also been identified as a CO and PM₁₀ NAA within the 62-mile area of consideration.

IDEQ and MIAG consider impact zones to be areas where smoke is likely to be a problem because of local topography, meteorology, existing air quality problems, or other factors (MIAG 2003). The PFO area and area of consideration contain the Pocatello and Idaho Falls impact zones.

It is likely the Cache Valley (Logan, Utah, along with Franklin and Preston, Idaho) will become an NAA for PM_{2.5}. IDEQ and Utah Department of Environmental Quality recommended the Cache Valley to EPA as a PM_{2.5} NAA in December 2007.

There are no Class I visibility areas designated within the PFO area (EPA 2002). There are portions of four Class I areas identified within the area of consideration: Craters of the Moon National Monument and Preserve Wilderness Area, Grand Teton National Park, the Teton Wilderness area, and the Bridger Wilderness Area.

There are several transportation corridors that run through the PFO area and the area of consideration including: US Interstate 15, US Interstate 84, US Interstate 86, US Interstate 80, and US Highways 20, 26, 30, 89, 91, 93, 189, and 191. There are also numerous hospitals, medical centers, and airports within the PFO area and the area of consideration. A detailed listing of these sensitive areas is presented in the Air Quality Assessment Technical Report (**Appendix L**).

3.2.1.5 *Climate Change*

The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) defines climate change as “a change of climate which is attributed directly or indirectly to human activity that alters the composition of the global atmosphere and is in addition to natural climate variability observed over comparable time periods” (IPCC 1995).

Ongoing scientific research has identified the potential impacts of climate changing pollutants on global climate. These pollutants are commonly called greenhouse gases and include carbon dioxide (CO₂), methane, nitrous oxide, water vapor, and several trace gas emissions. Through complex interactions on a regional and global scale, these emissions cause a net warming effect of the atmosphere, primarily by decreasing the amount of heat energy radiated by the Earth back into space. Although climate changing pollutant levels have varied for millennia (along with corresponding variations in climatic conditions), industrialization and burning fossil carbon sources have caused CO₂ concentrations to increase dramatically, and are likely to contribute to overall climatic changes, typically referred to as global warming. Increasing CO₂ concentrations also lead to preferential fertilization and growth of specific plant species (IPCC 2007a, 2007b).

Global mean surface temperatures have increased nearly 1.8°F from 1890 to 2006 (Goddard Institute for Space Studies 2007). However, observations and predictive models indicate that average temperature changes are likely to be greater in the Northern Hemisphere. Northern latitudes (above 24° N) have exhibited temperature increases of nearly 2.1°F since 1900, with nearly a 1.8°F increase since 1970 (Goddard Institute for Space Studies 2007). Without additional meteorological monitoring systems, it is difficult to determine the spatial and temporal

variability and change of climatic conditions, but increasing concentrations of these greenhouse gases are likely to accelerate the rate of climate change.

The IPCC has recently completed a comprehensive report assessing the current state of knowledge on climate change, its potential impacts, and options for adaptation and mitigation. When this PRMP/FEIS was printed, this assessment was available on the IPCC Web site at www.ipcc.ch/. According to this report, global climate change may ultimately contribute to a rise in sea level, destruction of estuaries and coastal wetlands, and changes in regional temperature and rainfall patterns, with major implications to agricultural and coastal communities. The IPCC has suggested that the average global surface temperature could rise 1 to 4.5 degrees Fahrenheit (°F) in the next 50 years, with significant regional variation. The National Academy of Sciences (2008) has confirmed these findings but also indicated that there are uncertainties regarding how climate change may affect different regions. Computer models indicate that such increases in temperature would not be equally distributed globally but would be likely to be accentuated at higher latitudes, such as in the Arctic, where the temperature increase may be more than double the global average (BLM 2007). Also, warming during the winter is expected to be greater than during the summer, and increases in daily minimum temperatures are more likely than increases in daily maximum temperatures. Vulnerabilities to climate change depend considerably on specific geographic and social contexts.

The BLM recognizes the importance of climate change and the potential effects it may have on the natural environment. Several activities occur within the planning area that may generate emissions of greenhouse gases. For example, wildland fires, and any activity that depends on combustion engines (e.g., OHV use and minerals and energy development), can generate CO₂. Wind erosion and fugitive dust from the use of roads and trails within the planning area, along with entrained atmospheric dust, has the potential to darken snowpacks, resulting in faster snowmelt. Other activities may help to sequester carbon, such as managing vegetation types within the planning area to maintain a desired mix of seral stages and to increase cover and species diversity, which may help build organic carbon in soils and function as carbon sinks.

3.2.2 CULTURAL RESOURCES

Cultural resources are locations of human activity, occupation, or use. Cultural resources is a broadly defined term meant to include archaeological sites buried beneath the ground surface and aboveground built structures and features. Cultural resources include archaeological sites, places where important events occurred, buildings, structures, objects, travel routes, and other physical manifestations created by human groups who occupied and used the landscape.

In addition, the broad definition of cultural resources under certain laws (e.g., the National Historic Preservation Act [NHPA] which refers to cultural resources as historic properties) includes places of traditional cultural and religious importance to Native American and other ethnic groups. Such traditional cultural properties and places can include natural features, plant or mineral gathering locations, hunting or fishing locations, or geographic areas that are considered to be important to a culture, subculture, or community associated with traditional lifeways or religious practices.

Cultural resources are commonly divided into one of two broad time periods. The Prehistoric or Precontact Period refers to the time before circa 1800, when Euro-American settlers came into

contact with native peoples in Idaho; the Historic Period in Idaho refers to the time after 1800. In general, identified cultural resources in the planning area reflect the long prehistoric-precontact use of the area by native peoples, historic era exploration and access to the west, settlement, farming, and grazing activities, and the continuity of Native American cultural traditions and practices until modern times.

Examples of prehistoric-precontact cultural resources in the region include rock art, campsites, rock shelters, quarries, and scatters of stone tool-making debris. Historic cultural resources include material remains and the landscape alterations that have occurred since the arrival of Euro-Americans in the region. Examples include homesteads, ranching and agricultural features, mining sites, emigrant trail segments, abandoned communities, structural ruins, post-contact Native American sites, and scatters of historic artifacts.

Traditional cultural properties and places are specific locations associated with the cultural practices or beliefs of a living community. These sites are rooted in the community's history and are important in maintaining cultural identity. Examples of traditional cultural properties for Native American communities include natural landscape features, places used for ceremonies and worship, places where plants are gathered to be used in traditional medicines and ceremonies, places where artisan materials are found, and places and features of traditional subsistence systems, such as hunting and fishing locations (BLM 1981b; Lohse 1998; and State Historic Preservation Office [SHPO] 2002).

Within the planning area, the conservation of plants, fungi, and wildlife is of great importance to the Shoshone-Bannock Tribe's socioeconomic and cultural well being. Numerous plants, fungi, and wildlife are found on the public lands, providing the Shoshone-Bannock Tribes with valuable resources for food, medicine, cordage, and manufacturing of artisan materials. **Appendix M** identifies those plants, fungi, and wildlife species that are of cultural significance to the Shoshone-Bannock Tribes (not an all inclusive list).

The principal federal law addressing cultural resources is the NHPA, as amended (16 US Code [USC] Section 470), and its implementing regulations (36 Code of Federal Regulations [CFR] 800). The NHPA describes the process for identifying and evaluating archaeological and historic properties, for assessing the effects of federal actions on historic properties, and for consulting to avoid, reduce, or minimize adverse effects. The term historic properties refers to cultural resources that meet specific criteria for eligibility for listing on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP).

This process does not require historic properties to be preserved but does ensure that the decisions of federal agencies concerning the treatment of these places result from meaningful consideration of cultural and historic values and the options available to protect the properties. Management actions could result in an adverse effect on NRHP-eligible cultural resources or areas of importance to Native American or other traditional communities through direct disturbance, increased access, unauthorized activities, natural processes, dispersed activities, and incremental or inadvertent human actions.

3.2.2.1 Data Collection and Consultation Methods

Cultural Resource data presented here uses summary data derived from the Pocatello and Deep Creek Resource Area Background Document (BLM 1997b) and annual Cultural Resources Management Reporting data (1998-2007) collected and prepared by the BLM. Information on the number of known cultural resources is derived from cultural resources data maintained by the Idaho SHPO. No formal record search, field work, or detailed analysis of cultural resources site and survey data was conducted.

The identification and significance of traditional cultural properties, traditional use areas, and sacred sites is determined primarily by consulting with the affected contemporary communities. Representatives of the Shoshone-Bannock Tribes participate in developing the RMP. The BLM will continue to consult with the Shoshone-Bannock Tribes on a government-to-government basis to identify any concerns about the potential effects of future BLM activities on a variety of issues, including cultural resources and traditional cultural properties.

Inventories

Information on known cultural resources is derived primarily through field surveys to identify, locate, and record cultural resources. The first surveys within the PFO were conducted in the late 1950s by Dr. Earl Swanson, Jr., and other Idaho State College archaeologists. (Note that Idaho State College is now Idaho State University). Swanson's surveys resulted in the first systematic inventories in eastern Idaho to document archaeological sites in the region. However, most cultural resources that have been identified and documented since that time were associated with surveys taken to comply with Section 106 of the NHPA.

Available data indicate that intensive Class III surveys have been conducted on approximately 55,600 acres in the planning area, but these latter surveys have an inherent bias. As these surveys were focused on specific projects these inventories do not provide a systematic or scientific sample of the expected cultural resources in the entire planning area.

3.2.2.2 Affected Environment

Recorded Resources

As of 2007, there were approximately 460 cultural resource sites recorded in planning area. The major themes represented by the recorded sites include prehistoric archaeology, transportation, mining, agriculture, exploration/fur trapping, and settlement. Most of the sites within the planning area are prehistoric and representative such site types as lithic scatters, quarry sites, rock shelters, rock structures, petroglyphs, and a few pictographs.

Information on the number of sites assigned to each era or distribution of site types was not available. The NRHP's eligibility has not been determined for many of these documented sites, which await further evaluation through such methods as limited archaeological testing to understand the presence and content of subsurface archaeological materials. Formally nominated historic properties officially listed in the NRHP include portions of two emigrant trails: the Lander Trail and Big Hill on the Oregon Trail. Sections of the Hudspeth's Cutoff of the

California Trail traverse the planning area and are also listed in the NRHP. Historic trails within the PFO area are shown on **Figure 3-2**.

3.2.2.3 Resource Distribution

While the PFO has not been systematically inventoried for cultural resources, and, while further study has not been undertaken to identify broad patterns of cultural resource distributions, previous inventories and consultation have identified several important cultural resource areas within the planning area.

Within the PFO, three Areas of Critical Environmental Concern (ACECs) have been previously designated for cultural resource values, as follows:

- **Indian Rocks ACEC**, designated to protect significant Native American rock art and lithic scatter sites;
- **Van Komen Homestead ACEC**, the site of an early pioneer residence, which was destroyed in an August 2006 wildland fire; and
- **Juniper Townsite ACEC**, which contains the ruins of an early historic settlement.

Thirteen cultural resource management areas were identified in the 1988 Pocatello RMP as having potential for contributing scientific, historic, or management information. Three of these areas were designated as NSO: Historic Railroad Grade, Blackrock Canyon, and Historic Trail Segments. Ten of these areas were designated as Sensitive Areas: Prehistoric Areas A-G, Indian Rocks, Upper Valley, and the Bear Lake Plateau. Prehistoric Areas A-G include Goodenough Creek, Garden-Clifton Creeks, Marsh Creek, Bell Marsh Creek, King Creek, Dempsey Creek, and the Blackfoot River.

Some of these areas were selected because of their historic value. The Historic Railroad Grade includes segments of the historic Union Pacific-Oregon Shortline Railroad (constructed 1881-1884). Historic Trail Segments within the PFO include segments of the Oregon Trail, Hudspeth's Cutoff, and Lander Road. Blackrock Canyon was selected to protect known historic sites in the area.

Upper Valley and Blackfoot River were selected to protect both historic and prehistoric sites. Both areas have segments of the Lander Road and associated historic sites. There are also many prehistoric sites in these areas.

The Bear Lake Plateau, Goodenough Creek, Garden-Clifton Creeks, Marsh Creek, Bell Marsh Creek, King Creek, and Dempsey Creek were selected to protect documented prehistoric sites (lithic scatters). These areas were also considered important to protect because of their potential to contain additional undocumented prehistoric sites.

In 1997, the PFO reviewed and assessed cultural resources information and identified several important cultural resource areas within the planning area. Many of the cultural resource areas identified in the 1988 Pocatello RMP and discussed above fall within the broader cultural resource areas identified in 1997. These areas are discussed in the Cultural Resources "Pocatello and Deep Creek Resource Areas Background Document" (1997) and include the following:

Snake River/Massacre Rocks—This area is along the northern boundary of the PFO, on the south side of the Snake River. The Massacre Rocks area contains important prehistoric and historic sites. The area is named for an incident between Indians and Euro-Americans that resulted in the death of at least nine people. The area also contains segments of the Oregon National Historic Trail segments and the Register Rock site. On the north side of the Snake River outside of the planning area, numerous important cultural resources are known to also be located at Cedar Field. This area is also of great religious significance to the Shoshone-Bannock Tribes (BLM 1997b).

Portneuf River Corridor/Chesterfield to Pocatello—The Portneuf River corridor is an important area containing significant prehistoric cultural resources along its entire length, including the petroglyphs and lithic scatters of the Indian Rocks ACEC. Other prehistoric resources are present along Marsh Creek, Bell Marsh Creek, and Goodenough Creek. An obsidian source near Chesterfield and the hot springs at present day Lava Hot Springs were also used by the native inhabitants.

During historic times, the Oregon Trail passed northward through the Portneuf Valley to Ross Fork and Fort Hall. Chesterfield (no longer a town) was founded here in the 1880s and is now a National Historic District of 40 structures maintained by a private foundation. Other historic resources are in Blackrock Canyon, northeast of Portneuf. Some historic mining activity took place in the hills around Pocatello, most notably at the Fort Hall and Moonlight Mountain mines. Although none of these mines were very productive, there are numerous mining sites, including adits, cabins, tailing piles, and refuse scatters (BLM 1997b).

Blackfoot River Watershed—Ongoing cultural resources work in the vicinity of the Blackfoot Reservoir beginning in the 1960s has identified important prehistoric cultural resources within the watershed area. Some of these sites have been determined to be over 7,000 years old. Analysis of obsidian artifacts has indicated that native peoples using the Blackfoot River area obtained their obsidian from the obsidian source areas of Malad, Chesterfield and Yellowstone (in Yellowstone National Park).

The Lander Road, an alternate route on the Oregon Trail, parallels the river for several miles before turning west toward Fort Hall. There are also historic sites associated with settlements along the river that were abandoned during the Depression.

Curlew Grassland/Badger Hole Spring Area—Many springs on the public lands in this region have associated cultural resources visible on the ground surface. A bison kill site at Rock Springs on the Curlew National Grassland has been excavated by Weber State University. Cultural resources at springs on public land adjacent to the Curlew National Grassland could contain cultural deposits similar to the site at Rock Springs. There are also many historic era sites associated with agriculture and ranching including the Van Komen Homestead ACEC and Juniper Town site ACEC. Homestead ruins and their associated outbuildings and refuse deposits are the most common site types in this area (BLM 1997b).

Bear River Corridor—The Bear River served as the wintering grounds for the Northwestern Band of Shoshone. In January 1863, a Shoshone camp on the river near present day Preston was the site of a large Indian massacre. Approximately 250 Indians were killed in revenge for several murders in the Cache Valley. This important site is on private land and the Shoshone-Bannock

Tribes are working to have it formally listed and protected from future development. It is likely that there are many campsites along the river corridor, and while relatively little land is administered by the BLM, Native American sites on public lands in this area can be expected to have significant value to the Shoshone-Bannock Tribes and Northwestern Band of Shoshone.

Big Hill/Thomas Fork Valley—Multiple Oregon Trail branches in this area are associated with the challenge of crossing the Thomas Fork of the Bear River and the ascent of Big Hill and the Sheep Creek Hills. The area also contains Native American villages, early Mormon settlements (Franklin, the first permanent settlement in Idaho was founded by Mormon pioneers in 1860), and a short line railroad. Much of the landscape retains the historic setting of the area (Hutchison and Jones 1993).

The historic Union Pacific-Oregon Shortline Railroad began at the Union Pacific main line in Granger, Wyoming, and then headed west across Idaho. It provided a route to the Pacific that avoided the high elevations of the Wasatch and Sierra-Nevada Mountain Ranges. It also provided an additional way to transport the coal reserves in Wyoming to the northwest. This railroad was constructed from 1881-1884 and was absorbed by the Union Pacific Railroad in 1898.

Elkhorn Mountain/Malad Obsidian Source—This important regional stone tool material source is in the Caribou National Forest, and there are many associated stone tool workshops on adjacent public lands (BLM 1997b). While little research has been done, such sites possess considerable potential for providing information on collecting, manufacturing, transporting, and using obsidian obtained from these stone tool source areas.

Basalt Cliffs—In addition to the above areas and through consultation, the Shoshone-Bannock Tribes have identified the following broadly defined areas as areas of important traditional cultural and religious values.

3.2.2.4 Tribal Treaty Rights and Interests

Native American Tribes are sovereign nations and “exercise inherent authority over their members and territories.”² As such, they have their own governing system. In 1936, The Shoshone-Bannock Tribes adopted a constitutional form of government that established the seven-member Fort Hall Business Council, elected by tribal members living on the reservation. The council regulates business and other activities on the reservation according to the Law & Order Code and other ordinances.

The Supreme Court has noted “the undisputed existence of a general trust relationship between the United States and the Indian people.”³ Under this unique relationship with federally recognized American Indian tribes, federal agencies must consult at the government-to-government level in accordance with federal laws, treaties, and executive orders. This includes an obligation to protect and preserve the natural resources associated with off-reservation tribal treaty rights. Therefore, BLM, as a federal agency, must consider the effects of federal actions on tribal treaty rights and interests.

²Oklahoma Tax Commission v. Citizen Band Potawatomi Indian Tribe, 498U.S. 505, 509 (1991), citing Cherokee Nation v. Georgia, 8 L.Ed.25 (1831).

From 1787 to 1871, the US negotiated treaties with American Indian tribes. The Fort Hall Reservation was established by the Fort Bridger Treaty of 1868³ as a 1.8-million-acre homeland for the Shoshone and Bannock Indian Tribes. Further land cessations took place in 1889 and 1900. Today the reservation consists of 544,000 acres, of which the tribes own 96%.

Article 4 of the 1868 Fort Bridger Treaty states “The Indians herein named...shall have the right to hunt on the unoccupied land of the United States so long as game may be found thereon...” While the treaty itself specifies only hunting rights, the lawsuit *State of Idaho v. Tinno* established that any rights not specifically given up in the treaty were, in fact, reserved by the tribes. Further, in the Shoshone language, the same verb is used for hunt, fish, and gather, so it is assumed that the tribes expect to retain rights for all of those practices (Shoshone-Bannock Tribes presentation, 1868 Fort Bridger Treaty Rights Seminar: April 12-13, 2004).

The Shoshone-Bannock Tribes can exercise tribal grazing rights outside of the Fort Hall Reservation in those areas previously ceded to the federal government. Article IV of the Agreement of February 5, 1898 (31 Stat. 674, 15 Stat. 673), between the US and the Shoshone-Bannock Tribes, ratified by the Act of June 6, 1900, states the following:

“So long as any of the lands ceded, granted and relinquished under this treaty remain part of the public domain, Indians belonging to the above-mentioned Shoshone-Bannock tribes, and living on the reduced Fort Hall reservation, shall have the right, without any charge therefore, to cut timber for their own use, but not for sale and to pasture their livestock on said public lands, and to hunt thereon and to fish in the streams thereof.”

Subsequently, the BLM and the Fort Hall Business Council have entered into memorandums of understanding regarding tribal grazing rights on public lands within the ceded land boundary established by the agreement of February 5, 1898.

The PFO planning area occupies traditional lands of the Shoshone-Bannock, which retain social and economic values for tribal members, as well as spiritual and cultural uses. The BLM, through formal government-to-government consultation, recognizes the tribe’s interest and desire to protect, maintain, and enhance resources critical to the exercise of treaty rights, traditional customs, subsistence, and cultural use purposes.

In addition, the tribes are interested in the BLM acquiring lands that contain traditional cultural resources and are part of their aboriginal territory, as well as ensuring that public lands leaving federal ownership through land tenure adjustments do not diminish their rights or traditional uses.

³US v Mitchell, 463 U.S. 206, 225 (1983).

3.2.3 SOILS

Geology and soils have a major influence on topography, vegetation, watersheds and land use. Many of the management activities in the PFO area are influenced by factors controlled by the geology and soils of an area.

3.2.3.1 *Geologic Setting*

The PFO area can be divided into three distinct geologic provinces: the Idaho-Wyoming Thrust Belt, the Basin and Range, and the Snake River Plain.

The Idaho-Wyoming Thrust Belt generally comprises the northern and eastern half of the PFO area. It is part of the larger, Middle Rocky Mountain Province. The thrust belt is characterized by early Cretaceous-through-early Tertiary-aged -compression. The compression has formed a series of over 20 thrust complexes with associated large amplitude folds. The fold amplitudes may be up to several miles. The faults may have as much as 50 to 100 miles of eastward displacement. The generally parallel mountain ranges, resulting from the compression, trend to the northwest and reach elevations of nearly 10,000 feet. The valleys lie above 6000 feet and commonly contain Tertiary sediments, Quaternary gravels, or Quaternary basalts. The folds and faults of the region have created long, linear exposures of the Phosphoria Formation, key in the extraction of phosphate. Fossiliferous, shallow marine sediments of Cambrian through Jurassic age compose the majority of the region's stratigraphy. Extensive exposures of the Phosphoria Formation (the source rock for significant phosphate deposits) occur in the eastern portion of the PFO area.

The Basin and Range physiographic province makes up the western half of the PFO area. East-west extension beginning about 17 million years ago has created a series of north trending mountain ranges. The ranges are bound by normal faults and generally create a "horst and graben" structural fabric. The valleys or grabens may contain thousands of feet of late Tertiary and Quaternary gravels that may contain Quaternary basalt flows. With the exception of the northern fringe, where surface water flows to the Snake River, surface water in the Basin and Range flows towards evaporative basins and does not reach either the Pacific or Atlantic Oceans. Thick sequences of Paleozoic marine sediments representing the western carbonate shelf compose the majority of the region's stratigraphy. The eastern region of the Basin and Range has significant exposures of late Proterozoic sediments and volcanics.

The Pocatello, Portneuf, and Wasatch [Bear River] Ranges make up a transitional zone where the Idaho-Wyoming Thrust Belt has been overprinted by Basin and Range faulting.

The Eastern Snake River Plain makes up the third geologic province and bounds the PFO area to the northwest. It runs from the Island Park-Yellowstone area southwest to Twin Falls. The area is characterized by volcanic terrain approximately 60-70 miles wide. Volcanic activity started about 17 million years ago in the western portion of Idaho and migrated, relatively, eastward. The rocks are composed of basal rhyolites followed by an extensive series of basalt flows. The volcanic package may be up to 10,000 feet thick and locally contains sedimentary interbeds between basalt flows. In the Pocatello area, the rhyolites generally range from 8 to 10 million years old and grade into basalts about 6 million years old. Locally, basalts may be as young as 5,000 years old. The area contains remnant caldera complexes, shield volcanoes, rhyolite domes,

and cinder cones. The aquifer contained within the Snake River Plain is a major regional water source.

3.2.3.2 Topography

The topography of the Idaho-Wyoming Thrust Belt portion of the PFO area consists of two primary settings. First, the high elevation mountain ranges have slopes ranging from 20 to 40 percent. Included in this setting are ridges, mountain slopes and canyons formed in sedimentary, intrusive and metamorphic rocks. The mountain elevations reach 10,000 feet above sea level. Second, the valleys are located at low-to-mid elevations with slopes ranging from 5 to 30 percent. Included in this setting are draws and open basins formed in sedimentary rocks.

The topography of the Basin and Range physiographic portion of the PFO area also consists of two settings. Mountain ranges with slopes that range from 30 to 70 percent and elevations up to 9,500 feet make up the first. Included are mountain slopes and ridges formed in sedimentary rocks. The second physiographic feature is typified by broad valleys separating the mountains, with slopes from 5 to 20 percent. Broad valleys with well-developed alluvial fans typify the western PFO Basin and Range province. Narrow canyons and valleys in the transitional zone between the Basin and Range and the Thrust Belt are common in the eastern PFO area. The valleys range from 4,500 to 6,000 feet above seal level.

The topography of the Eastern Snake River Plain is generally flat with steep canyons carved into volcanic lava flows by the Snake River and its tributaries. The lowest elevations (around 4,000 feet) in the PFO area are associated with the Snake River Plain.

3.2.3.3 Soil Types

Soils in the PFO area have developed from bedrock, rocks/minerals deposited by rivers and glacial activity, and windblown silt and sand. They were derived primarily from the sedimentary, metamorphic, and volcanic rocks of the mountain ranges and highlands of the PFO area. Soil surveys on the county level have been conducted by the US Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) (http://www.or.nrcs.usda.gov/pnw_soil/id_reports.html). The soils in the PFO area vary from shallow in the mountains to very deep in the valleys.

The soils of the Idaho-Wyoming Thrust Belt portion of the PFO area vary from shallow (zero to twenty inches to bedrock) to deep (forty to sixty inches to bedrock) and are well drained on steep slopes. Surface textures are silt loam or loam. The soils in the valleys are moderately deep (twenty to forty inches to bedrock) to very deep (greater than sixty inches to bedrock) and well drained. Surface textures are loam or silt loam.

The soils of the Basin and Range portion of the PFO area also vary from shallow (zero to twenty inches to bedrock) to deep (forty to sixty inches to bedrock) and well drained in the mountain ranges. Surface textures are loam and silt loam. The soils in the valleys are moderately deep (twenty to forty inches to bedrock) to very deep (greater than sixty inches to bedrock) and well to somewhat poorly drained. Surface textures are loam or sandy loam.

The soils of the Eastern Snake River Plain vary from shallow (zero to twenty inches to bedrock) to very deep (greater than sixty inches to bedrock). In general, the soils are loess deposits overlying basalt flows with surface textures of silt loam.

Soils described by the NRCS as prime farmland occur within the PFO planning area. The extent of these particular soils by county within the planning area is identified in **Table 3-1**. Of approximately 613,800 acres of public lands in the PFO planning area, approximately 2,900 acres (<.4 percent) of public lands are described as prime farmland.

Table 3-1. Extent of Public Lands Described as Prime Farmland within the Pocatello Field Office Planning Area by County

County	Acres Public Lands Described as Prime Farmland
Bannock	84
Bear Lake	n/a
Bingham	n/a
Bonneville	n/a
Caribou	n/a
Cassia	37
Franklin	124
Oneida	2,680
Power	n/a
Total =	2,900 ¹

¹ Acres rounded to nearest 100 acres.

Source: NRCS 2005

3.2.3.4 Erosion and Run-off

There is significant potential for severe soil erosion by water and wind at several locations within the PFO area. However, in general the soil erosion potential in the PFO area ranges from slight to moderate. Factors determining erosion potential include slope, soil type and vegetative cover. The hazard for soil erosion by water and wind is rated in the county level soil surveys conducted by the NRCS (http://www.or.nrcs.usda.gov/pnw_soil/id_reports.html). Erosion generally increases when the vegetative community is disturbed by intense grazing, fire, road construction, and other events that reduce the amount of vegetative cover. Disturbance of biological crusts on coarse-textured soils could increase the potential for wind erosion. **Figure 3-3** presents areas with an elevated potential for soil erosion.

Many of the soils within the PFO area have limiting features that make reclamation and revegetation very difficult. While not mapped as such for the planning area, limiting features may include salinity, sodium content, clayey and sandy textures, drought conditions, alkalinity, low organic matter content, shallow depth to bedrock, stones and cobbles, and their wind erosion potential.

3.2.3.5 Compaction

Compacted soils generally support reduced vegetation, have lower water infiltration rates and have increased erosion potential. Soil compaction can be exacerbated by moist soil conditions. There is limited information available regarding soil compaction in the planning area. Problem areas have not been identified; but typically would include roads, high use areas for OHV, and areas with development, such as mining sites.

3.2.4 PALEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Paleontological Resources are the physical remains or other physical evidence of plants and animals generally preserved in sedimentary rock formations. Paleontological resources are important for correlating and dating rock strata and for understanding past environments, environmental change, and the evolution of life.

There are many recorded fossil locations in southern and southeastern Idaho, including the Hagerman fauna site, which is a very rich and important Pliocene locality, and the extensive Pleistocene localities in the American Falls Reservoir area. Vertebrate, invertebrate, and botanical paleontological resources are known to occur within several of the named geologic formations and various outcrops in the planning area. A level I inventory of paleontological resources was conducted in 1985 for the portion of the PFO area that was the former Pocatello Resource Area (BLM 1985b). It consisted of literature and record searches to identify areas that may have fossils. Idaho State University paleontologists were also asked about possible fossil locations. The Malad portion of the PFO area has no formal inventory information on file.

Cambrian formations, such as the upper Brigham Quartzite, Spence Shale, and the upper Wilbert, have produced many identifiable fossils. The Malad, Bear River, and Lemhi Ranges yield such fossils as the monera genus *Girvanella*, worm tubes, such as *Arenicolites* and *Monocreterion*, trilobite trace fossils *Cruziana* and *Rusophycus*, and many trilobite species, including *Albertella*, *Elrathina*, *Glossopleura*, *Idahoia*, and *Pagetia*. Brachiopods may also be found, particularly in the St. Charles Limestone (Maley 1987). Other types of fossils, including soft-bodied forms, have also been found (Robison 2004). Several Ordovician and Silurian formations occur in the area, some of which have produced invertebrate fossils.

Idaho was still under water during the Devonian. The Water Canyon Formation in Bear Lake County has produced a few fish scales and plates, as well as *Lingula* brachiopods, pelecypods, gastropods, and ostracods. *Psephaspis williamsi*, *Uranolophus* sp., *Dipterus* sp., and other lung fish have been identified (Maley 1987).

Brachiopods, corals, gastropods, crinoids, bryozoans, and bivalves deposited during the Lower Mississippian are present in Lodgepole Limestone and other strata outcrops in the vicinity of Malad, Montpelier, and Soda Springs (Christensen 1999).

The Phosphoria Formation, named for Phosphoria Gulch near Georgetown, is one of the most fossiliferous of the Idaho Pennsylvanian and Permian Formations. Fossils include sponge spicules, horn corals, bryozoans, brachiopods, pelecypods, pectins, gastropods, belemnite and ammonoid cephalopods, ostracods, conodonts, and fish and shark remains, including *Helicoprion*. The large spiral teeth from *Helicoprion* are the most impressive shark remains

known from the Paleozoic of Idaho. Most of the fish and shark remains reported from earlier formations are isolated teeth, scales, dermal plates, and small bones (BLM 1985b; Maley 1987).

The Thaynes Formation has been very productive and includes a wide variety of Triassic Period fossils. Many ammonoids have been found in the Thaynes outcrops in southeast Idaho. In the Caribou Range, the Thaynes has produced ammonoids, forams, conodonts, sponge spicules, fish scales and bones, and shark teeth. The decapod crustacean *Litogaster turnbullensis* has been found near Lava Hot Springs. Cephalopods, including ammonoid and nautiloid types, pelecypods, gastropods, conodonts, crinoids, brachiopods, crustaceans, an ichthyosaur (marine reptile), and fish remains, such as scales and bones and shark teeth and dermal denticles, have been found in the Bear River Range. Pelecypods, worm borings, and fucoids have been reported in the Garns Mountain area. Crinoids and brachiopods are also known from Thaynes Formation outcrops in Idaho (BLM 1985b; Maley 1987).

Other fossiliferous Triassic formations in the area include the Woodside and Dinwoody Formations, which are known to contain many invertebrate fossils. Marine invertebrates are also abundant in Twin Creek Limestone and other Jurassic formations.

The Gannet Group is well exposed in southeastern Idaho and has had some plant, invertebrate, and vertebrate fossil material recovered from it. The vertebrates include fish, sharks, crocodiles, turtles, and dinosaurs. Recent study has yielded material deposited during the Early Cretaceous period.

Most of the known dinosaur fossils from Idaho occur in the Wayan Formation of eastern Idaho. The Cretaceous Period material collected represents at least two types of crocodile, an iguanodontid dinosaur *Tenontosaurus*, Ankylosaurian and Theropod dinosaur material, indeterminate ornithischian dinosaur material, possible gastroliths, egg shells, turtle shells, crocodiles, and fish. Plant remains also have been found, including pollen, coal, fern and angiosperm leaves, and petrified wood. Fossil plants in the PFO area include *Tempskya* sp. (giant tree ferns). The ferns were probably deposited during swampy environmental conditions. Almost all of the known *Tempskya* material from Idaho has come from the Wayan and Sage Junction Formations in the Ammon and Wayan areas. The remaining Cretaceous formations of Idaho have so far not yielded very many fossils. The lower Bear River Formation has produced ostracods, other invertebrates, and charophytes (BLM 1985b; Maley 1987).

The Salt Lake and Starlight Formations of Pliocene and Upper Miocene stream and lake deposits include documented occurrences of plants, invertebrates, horses, camels, mastodons, fish, reptiles, birds, amphibians, carnivores, and other small mammals. These fossils are from the Tertiary period (BLM 1985b).

Lake beds, alluvial fans and stream alluvium have yielded Quaternary period fossils, such as birds, rodents, fish, amphibians, mammoth, mastodon, bison, musk ox, horse, camel, bear, dire wolf, mountain goat, saber toothed cat, ground sloth, and many others. Bonneville flood gravel pits between McCammon and Highway 30 have yielded Pleistocene bison, camel, musk ox, and horse fossils (Fortsch and Link 1999). The Quaternary period includes the Pleistocene and Holocene Epochs. It represents the final 1.6 million years of geologic time, from the beginning of the Glacial Epoch to the present.

3.2.5 VEGETATION

The precipitation, topography, elevation, and temperature extremes, combined with the soil and geological variability, and land use have created a variety of vegetation types across the PFO area. Vegetation is the most important biotic component of the ecosystem because it provides cover, browse, nesting and rearing habitat for a diverse assemblage of game and non-game wildlife and fish species, as well as forage for livestock and forest products. A diverse cover of vegetation also aids in maintaining healthy watersheds, streams, and lakes by holding soil in place, regulating stream flows, and filtering sediments from water. Native vegetation is also utilized and of great importance to the Shoshone-Bannock Tribes for medicine, food, fuel, building material, wildlife habitat, ceremonial uses, and aesthetics (**Appendix M**).

The PFO area lies within the Intermountain Semi-Desert and the Southern Rocky Mountain Steppe-Open Woodland-Coniferous Ecoregions (Bailey 1995) and, as consequence, vegetation is diverse and in some areas unique. Both Ecoregions have a semi-arid climate resulting from the influence of the Cascade and Sierra mountains to the west and the Bitterroot and Rocky Mountains to the north, which effectively block Pacific moisture. Summer monsoonal moisture intrusions are infrequent and are significantly modified by the arid Great Basin of Utah and Nevada. Summers may be hot (average high/low summer temperature: 86/47 °F) and winters marked by extreme cold (average high/low winter temperature: 32/22 °F). The growing season is short and is about 125 days. As elevation rises, the mean temperature lowers and the growing season shortens. Annual precipitation is about 12-20 inches though some low elevation areas may receive less than 10 inches and higher elevations over 60 inches. Snowfall averages between 36 and 40 inches annually in the lowest elevations to over 100 inches in the highest elevations. Winter snow accumulation and runoff provide available moisture for spring plant growth. Snow distribution patterns caused by wind, topography, and existing vegetation develop pockets of highly productive sites within the drier, less productive surrounding areas.

In Southeastern Idaho, basins and hills below 6,500 ft are generally dominated by sagebrush/grass and Juniper. Above 6,500 ft mountain shrub, aspen, and conifer are more abundant. Riparian areas are vegetation with scrub-shrub, emergent, saline, and calcareous fen community types. The PFO area is known to support eleven sensitive plant (7) and animal (4) species that occupy unique and/or specialized habitats and soils, further discussed in *Special Status Species Section 3.2.7*.

Fire suppression, introduction of invasive species/noxious weeds and pathogens, and land use activities have altered the dynamics of ecological succession and vegetation conditions across the PFO area.

The 11 major vegetation types of the PFO area are illustrated in **Figure 3-4** and identified in **Table 3-2**. Ten of these vegetation types were aggregated from 51 vegetation cover types originally classified by the Gap Analysis Program (GAP) for southern Idaho (Scott et al. 2002). The GAP was created to assess the conservation status of native animal species and plant communities at a landscape level, in order to meet the needs of natural resources management agencies like the BLM. An eleventh type, Seedings, was added by the PFO specifically for the RMP to identify those areas that were seeded with crested wheatgrass. One part of the GAP uses

Table 3-2. Vegetation Types, Descriptions, and Acres of Public Land.

Vegetation Type	Characterized By:	Acres (%)
Low-Elevation Shrub	Sagebrush steppe: Wyoming big sagebrush, basin big sagebrush, etc., with native grass and forb understory. Biological crust in interspaces.	38,100 6%
Mid-Elevation Shrub	Sagebrush steppe: Mountain big sagebrush, low sagebrush, bitterbrush, etc., with native grass and forb understory. Biological crust may be present in interspaces.	142,000 23%
Mountain Shrub	Serviceberry, buckbrush, snowberry, mountain mahogany, maple, chokecherry, antelope bitterbrush, etc., with native grass and forb understory.	187,100 30%
Perennial Grass	Idaho fescue, bluebunch wheatgrass, western wheatgrass, thickspike wheatgrass, Thurber's needlegrass, Sandberg bluegrass, and Indian ricegrass. Areas of Low-Elevation Shrub lacking shrubs because of disturbance.	64,600 11%
Seedings	Areas previously farmed/homesteaded and subsequently seeded to Crested wheatgrass in Low-Elevation Shrub.	42,100 7%
Juniper	Naturally occurring Utah juniper on shallow soils, wind swept ridges (approximately 14,400 acres) and encroached juniper in Mid-Elevation Shrub (approximately 11,300 acres). Biological crust may be present in interspaces of natural and encroached juniper sites.	25,700 4%
Dry Conifer	Douglas-fir	49,800 8%
Aspen/Aspen Conifer Mix	Pure stands of aspen (approximately 34,100 acres) and mixed conifer/aspen (approximately 6,400 acres).	40,500 7%
Wet/Cold Conifer	Lodgepole, Subalpine fir, Engelmann spruce.	700 ≤1%
Riparian	Streamside and wetland areas of cottonwood, willow, sedge, rush, etc.	6,600 1%
Other/Vegetated Lava	Lava, sand dunes, Salt Desert Shrub, barren areas, etc.	16,600 3%
Total Acres		613,800 100%

Acreages rounded to nearest 100 acres.

Percents rounded to nearest whole number.

Landsat Thematic Mapper satellite images to generate the digital maps from which land cover patterns are delineated. The minimum mapping unit is 2 hectares (approximately 5 acres), a landscape level resolution sufficient for regional-level planning. However, this minimal, mapping unit might not represent actual acres on the ground because the overall estimated accuracy of the GAP data for southern Idaho was 69 percent (Scott et al. 2002). To improve accuracy, GAP data was first modified for use in the Upper Snake River District Fire, Fuels, and Related Vegetation Management Direction Plan Amendment (FMDA) before being modified again for use in the Pocatello RMP, although the accuracy following modifications was not tested.

Distinct vegetation communities within the PFO area are influenced by characteristics such as soil depth, texture, and chemistry; climate variables, particularly temperature, total and seasonal distribution of precipitation and wind; and topographic features, most importantly elevation, aspect, and slope. Plant communities respond to other environmental influences, such as wildlife and livestock foraging, rodent burrowing, and fire. Plants themselves also influence soil chemistry and soil resistance to wind and water erosion.

Microbiotic crusts are the living layer of algae, lichen, and moss that grows on or just beneath the soil surface. When present, microbiotic crusts help stabilize soils and prevent wide-scale wind and water erosion and the spread of invasive species/noxious weeds. With blue-green algae as a common component, these crusts also fix nitrogen, benefiting neighboring plants. Disturbance can directly and indirectly affect many aspects of the structure and function of biological crust communities, including cover, species composition, and carbon and nitrogen fixation. The impact of a given disturbance depends on its severity, frequency, timing, and type, as well as the climatic conditions during and after it (Belnap et al. 2001). Biological crusts are components of several of the vegetation types within the planning area, such as Low Elevation Shrub and Mid-Elevation Shrub. They are less abundant in vegetation types where plant densities naturally preclude their presence, such as Mountain Shrub, Aspen/Dry Conifer, and Wet Cold Conifer.

These vegetation types are based on coarse-scale approximations. Within a mapping unit, species composition, species distributions, habitats and community structures may vary widely due to various factors such as environmental gradients, ecotones, natural variations, and site-specific historical influences (e.g., wildland fire, grazing, landslide, etc.). Reference to a species in **Table 3-2** indicates that it is one of the principal species used to define the vegetation cover type, but it does not mean that it is found only in that community. A species may be found in a number of vegetation cover types, where its presence would be more or less dominant. For example, mountain big sagebrush is primarily associated with the more mesic sites of Mid-Elevation shrub, but it can also be found at higher elevations in the Mountain Shrub vegetation type.

Land Health Conditions (LHC) describe on a broad landscape scale the current and or desired future conditions for the various vegetation types across the planning area. LHC-A occurs when all key ecological components are present as identified in land health standards and defined by the Fire Regime Condition Class (FRCC) 1, LHC-B occurs when some or all key ecological components are present as identified in land health standards and defined by FRCC 2, and LHC-C occurs when key ecological components are absent as identified in land health standards and

defined by FRCC 3. **Appendix J**, Section II provides a detailed description of the relationship between LHC indicators and FRCC descriptors.

Table 3-3 summarizes the current percentage for each LHC class by vegetation type. The LHC is discussed in the following sections showing the diverse and complex nature of the vegetation and ecological dynamics.

Table 3-3. Percent Current Land Health Conditions By Vegetation Type

Vegetation Type	Acres	Percent Current Condition		
		LHC-A	LHC-B	LHC-C
Low-Elevation Shrub (Perennial Grass & Seedings)	144,800	20%	51%	29%
Mid-Elevation Shrub (encroached juniper)	153,300	52%	25%	23%
Mountain Shrub	187,100	100%	0.0%	0.0%
Juniper (Natural Occurring)	14,400	0.0%	100%	0.0%
Aspen/Aspen Conifer Mix/Dry Conifer	90,300	45%	0.0%	55%
Wet/Cold Conifer	700	0.0%	100%	0.0%
Riparian	6,600	n/a	n/a	n/a
Other/Vegetated Lava	16,600	100%	0.0%	0.0%

Acreages rounded to nearest 100 acres. Percents rounded to nearest whole number.

3.2.5.1 Low-Elevation Shrub

As mapped in **Figure 3-4**, the Low-Elevation Shrub vegetation type comprises about 38,100 acres (6 percent, **Table 3-2**) of public land in the PFO area. Precipitation within this vegetation type ranges from 8-12" annually and generally occurs below 5,000 feet. Basin big sagebrush and/or Wyoming sagebrush are the dominant shrub species within this vegetation type. Perennial native grasses found in the understory include: bluebunch wheatgrass, Indian ricegrass, Basin wildrye, Fendler threeawn, needle and thread, Sandberg bluegrass, sand dropseed, and streambank wheatgrass. Common forbs also found in the understory include: phlox, hawksbeard, bushy bird's beak, penstemon, desert parsley, milkvetch, hoary aster, globe mallow, paintbrush, groundsel, and cryptantha. Soil surfaces in this vegetation type are usually covered with biological soil crust, which is a complex assemblage of lichens, mosses, liverworts, cyanobacteria, and algae dominate the first few millimeters of the soil surface (Rosentreter and Eldridge 2004).

Low-Elevation Shrub LHC is based upon the combined acreages for the Low-Elevation Shrub, Perennial Grass and Seedings vegetation types (approximately 144,800). Both Perennial Grass and Seedings are important components of the overall make up of the Low-Elevation Shrub type. The LHC (**Table 3-3**) is a result of historic and current land use activities, as well as wildland fire. Land use activities and wildland fire have been responsible for shifts in species composition, cover, and carbon and nitrogen fixation. The degree of these impacts depends on the severity, frequency, timing, and type, as well as the climatic conditions. Some major changes to this vegetation type include the introduction of invasive species/noxious weeds and loss of

biological soil crust and native perennial forbs. Because this vegetation type receives the least amount of precipitation its resiliency is the lowest.

Invasive species/noxious weeds are expected to increase in this vegetation type with a reduction or loss of native plants. Fuel loading, primarily from bulbous bluegrass and cheatgrass, is also likely to increase. Conserving plant communities in good condition is a priority, especially when these communities occupy large blocks of public lands. Restoration projects must consider the presence and ecology of noxious weeds, fuel loads, low resiliency, and habitat improvement. Projects in this vegetation type would require longer timeframes and stringent management actions/practices.

3.2.5.2 *Mid-Elevation Shrub*

As mapped in **Figure 3-4**, the Mid-Elevation Shrub vegetation type occupies about 142,000 acres (23 percent, **Table 3-2**) and generally occurs at elevations between 5,000 to 6,000 feet. Precipitation in this type ranges from 12-18 inches annually. The most common shrubs in this vegetation type are Mountain big sagebrush and bitterbrush, with lesser amounts of threetip sagebrush. Perennial grasses that dominate the understory typically include: bluebunch wheatgrass, Sandberg bluegrass, Cusick's bluegrass, California needlegrass, and Idaho fescue. Common forbs present include: arrowleaf balsamroot, sticky purple geranium, linear-leaf collomia, bastard toadflax, blue-eyed Mary, slender phlox, paintbrush, hawksbeard, slender cinquefoil, desert parsley, and milkvetch.

Mid-Elevation Shrub type has undergone effects similar to those of the Low-Elevation Shrub type, although to a lesser degree, from historic and current land use activities, as well as wildland fires, thus influencing its current LHC.

Mid-Elevation Shrub LHC (**Table 3-3**) is based upon the combined acres (approximately 153,300 acres) of the Mid-Elevation Shrub and those acres of encroached juniper (approximately 11,300 acres) that is mapped as the Juniper vegetation type (natural occurring and encroached juniper). As a result of fire suppression and/or lack of wildland fire, Utah juniper has encroached into the Mid-Elevation Shrub vegetation type. Although present, biological soil crust in this vegetation type is naturally less when compared with Low-Elevation Shrub.

Risks to this vegetation type include the continued loss of the shrub component, loss of native understory species, and an increase in noxious weeds. Restoration projects have a better chance for success than the Low-Elevation Shrub vegetation type because of higher precipitation levels. Opportunities to increasing bitterbrush and sagebrush would improve wildlife habitat. Taking post and poles and fuel wood from encroaching Utah juniper stands is an opportunity.

3.2.5.3 *Mountain Shrub*

The Mountain Shrub vegetation type occupies about 187,100 acres (30 percent, **Table 3-2**) and occurs in a transition zone between the Mid-Elevation Shrub and Aspen/Aspen Conifer Mix/Dry Conifer vegetation types. This vegetation type can almost always be found in areas that naturally accumulate a snow pack, particularly from snow drifting. Elevational ranges for this cover type are generally between 6,000 - 8,500 ft, and the average annual precipitation rates vary from 16-20 inches.

Mountain Shrub LHC (**Table 3-3**) is a result of its diversity, production, and the resiliency of plants to respond to disturbance. This vegetation type provides high quality browse, forage, cover and berry producing habitat. Indicative shrubs of this vegetation type are: maple, western serviceberry, chokecherry, mountain mahogany, mountain snowberry, blue elderberry, and snowbrush ceanothus. Mountain sagebrush is often present. Common grasses present include: oniongrass, slender wheatgrass, spike fescue, Idaho fescue, and blue wildrye with Kentucky bluegrass being present and in most instances abundant. Common forb species found include: bigleaf balsamroot, tall cinquefoil, one flowered helianthella, arnica, leafy bluebells, lanceleaf springbeauty, and sticky purple geranium. Biological soil crust is a minor component of this vegetation type.

Risks to this vegetation type included potential weed invasion, tent caterpillars, and overgrazing by wildlife. Kentucky bluegrass will likely increase and crowd out more desirable native plants.

Restoration opportunities in this vegetation type following disturbances (natural or human caused) respond well due to the increased precipitation levels and would maintain forbs and shrubs for fruit harvesting and wildlife habitat.

3.2.5.4 *Perennial Grass*

The Perennial Grass vegetation type currently occupies approximately 64,600 acres (11 percent, **Table 3-2**) of the public lands in the planning area. It is generally found up to about 6,000 feet in elevation with precipitation varied, ranging from 8-16 inches annually.

Historically, this vegetation type formed part of the mosaic pattern of the Low- and Mid-Elevation Shrub and Mountain Shrub vegetation types, although it is unclear how widespread it may have been represented across the landscape. The Perennial Grass type is considered an intermediate stage in the Low-Elevation Shrub type. Perennial Grass would eventually develop as part of the Low-Elevation Shrub vegetation type if undisturbed by wildland fires and human activities.

Major species making up this vegetation type are: Idaho fescue, bluebunch wheatgrass, western wheatgrass, thickspike wheatgrass, Thurber's needlegrass, Sandberg bluegrass, and Indian ricegrass.

3.2.5.5 *Seedings*

Crested wheatgrass and intermediate wheatgrass seedings occupy approximately 42,100 acres (7 percent, **Table 3-2**) and are primarily found in the areas previously homesteaded and farmed in the Black Pine Valley, the south end of the Sublette Mountains, and the southwest portion of the North Hansel Mountains. Crested wheatgrass is a perennial, introduced grass from Asia, commonly seeded in the arid sections of the western US. Intermediate wheatgrass is an introduced perennial grass native to Europe and Asia (NRCS 2003). Both wheatgrass species are an uncharacteristic component of the Low-Elevation Shrub type. The annual precipitation for these areas ranges from 8 to 12 inches in the lower elevations to 12 to 16 inches in the upper elevations. Elevation ranges from 4,455 feet to 5,700 feet.

Areas previously homesteaded and farmed disturbed the soils and native seedbank. Such lands reverted back to the BLM in the mid to late 1930s and were seeded to provide livestock forage and stabilization of erosive soils. Under these conditions, it is unlikely that native understory components would return to historic, pre-disturbance proportions. A small portion of these seedings were Emergency Stabilization and Rehabilitation projects due to wildland fire. Seedings have been combined with the Perennial Grass and Low-Elevation Shrub types as part of the discussion of Low-Elevation Shrub LHC.

The primary purpose of these seedings is to provide spring forage for livestock grazing and winter grazing for wildlife (NRCS 2003). These seedings, planted basically as a monoculture change very slowly. Species diversity remains very low with minimal forbs present in the interspaces. The vigor of these seedings increases with precipitation.

The condition of seedings is determined by the production or pounds per acre of biomass. The seedings in the drier areas or lower elevations are showing a downward trend due to the below normal precipitation the last 10 years. This is evidenced by the decreased vigor of plants and encroachment of other less desirable species. The seedings in the upper elevations, although not as productive appear to be stable.

Seeding longevity can be compromised when shrubs or invasive species begin to establish, resulting in reduced forage production. Increasing the shrub component increases species diversity. Opportunities to increase crested wheatgrass vigor and production exist by periodically removing brush species through restoration treatments such as fire. Maintaining healthy productive seedings which provides spring grazing would avoid future reductions in livestock grazing and provides winter grazing for wildlife, especially elk and habitat for Columbian sharp-tailed grouse.

3.2.5.6 *Juniper*

The Juniper vegetation type occupies about 25,700 acres (4 percent, **Table 3-2**) characterized by naturally occurring Utah juniper (approximately 14,400 acres) and encroached juniper (approximately 11,300 acres), which is found in the Mid-Elevation Shrub vegetation type. Rocky Mountain juniper also occurs, but is a minor component found in the Aspen/Aspen Conifer Mix vegetation type. Utah juniper typically occurs between 4,500 feet to 6,000 feet on a wide variety of soils within the 10- to 15- inch precipitation zone.

Juniper LHC (**Table 3-3**) is based solely upon the old-growth (naturally occurring) juniper found in fire-safe habitats on dry, stony outcrops along open ridges, as defined by ecological range sites. Associated species often found on the naturally occurring juniper sites include black sagebrush, Indian ricegrass, bluebunch wheatgrass, needle-and-thread, prickly phlox, cryptantha, woollypod milkvetch, curl-leaf mountain mahogany, bitterbrush, and big sagebrush.

Juniper encroachment into the Mid-Elevation Shrub type has been largely caused by fire suppression at the expense of sagebrush-bunchgrass communities where wildland fire plays an important ecological role. Estimates suggest that juniper woodlands have increased 10-fold over the past 130 years throughout the Intermountain West (Miller and Tausch 2001). Juniper encroachment results in the loss of desirable understory species, reduced cover, increased interspaces between plants and increased potential of soil erosion.

Restoration of encroached Utah juniper through the use of prescribed fire, chemical or mechanical treatments would result in the improvement of understory vegetation, species diversity, and wildlife habitat. In addition, these areas provide opportunities for making available fuelwood, posts and poles, and biomass products.

3.2.5.7 *Dry Conifer*

The Dry Conifer vegetation type occupies about 49,800 acres (8 percent, **Table 3-2**) of the public lands. The principal species is Douglas-fir. Douglas-fir occurs between 6,000 feet and 8,500 feet on variety soils in 20-inch to 30-inch precipitation zones. Douglas-fir can be found at lower elevations in canyons with enough moisture. Associated understory vegetation consists of elk sedge, aspen, choke-cherry, maple, limber pine, Oregon grape, snowberry, and pine grass.

Dry Conifer LHC has been combined with the Aspen/Aspen Conifer Mix type. LHC (**Table 3-3**) can be attributed to the lack of disturbance (e.g., wildland fire, timber harvest) and extended drought conditions. The lack of disturbance has resulted from overstocking (number of trees per acre) making this vegetation type more susceptible to insects and diseases thus contributing to its decline in ecological health.

The productivity and the health of stands could be enhanced through timber harvest, introducing prescribed fire and controlling invasive species/noxious weeds.

3.2.5.8 *Aspen/Aspen Conifer Mix*

The Aspen/Aspen Conifer Mix vegetation type occupies about 40,500 acres (7 percent, **Table 3-2**) and is found between 5,500 feet and 8,000 feet on a variety of soils. It grows best in deep, moist, loamy soils in a range of precipitation zones (16 to 40-inches). Aspens occur in pure stands (approximately 34,100 acres) or in association with various conifers such as subalpine fir, lodgepole pine, Rocky Mountain juniper and Douglas-fir (approximately 6,400 acres). Associated understory vegetation consists of mallowleaf ninebark, sticky current, maple, elk sedge, pinegrass, blue wildrye, wheeler's bluegrass and snowberry.

In many aspen stands, conifer encroachment is a natural pattern, resulting in an increased dominance by conifer and reducing the extent of aspen-dominated stands. However, due to fire suppression, conifer encroachment into aspen stands is occurring at unnatural levels in the PFO area. There has been a loss of aspen stands with remaining stands being either reduced in size or having a loss of aspen stems per acre.

Aspen/Aspen Conifer Mix LHC has been combined with the Dry Conifer type. The LHC (**Table 3-3**) is similar to the Dry Conifer type where the lack of disturbance (e.g., wildland fire) and longer periods of extended drought have contributed to its decline in ecological health. Also, like Dry Conifer, this type is susceptible to insects, disease and noxious weeds which could contribute to the decline in ecological health.

Treating this vegetation type, through the use of prescribed fire, removal of the undesired conifer component, and control of invasive species/noxious weeds, could enhance the overall health, productivity and regeneration of Aspen stands.

3.2.5.9 Wet Cold Conifer

The Wet/Cold Conifer vegetation type occupies only about 700 acres (≤ 0.1 percent, **Table 3-2**) of the public lands in the PFO area. This vegetation type occurs in the colder, humid environment generally above the Dry Conifer vegetation type. This vegetation type is mainly dominated by lodgepole pine, but also can include subalpine fir and Englemann spruce.

Lodgepole pine generally occurs at 6,500 – 7,500 feet in 18- to 40-inch precipitation zones. Lodgepole is typically the first species to establish after disturbance in spruce-fir and Douglas-fir communities. Subalpine fir is found above 6,500 feet in the PFO area. Associated understory vegetation consists of quaking aspen, maple, mallowleaf ninebark, grouse whortleberry, elk sedge and pine grass.

Engelmann spruce occurs incidentally in the PFO area and can only be found in the eastern part of the planning area in Caribou County. Englemann spruce is shade-tolerant and the dominant early species for mixed species forests that include lodgepole pine, aspen, and Douglas-fir. Understory vegetation can vary from sparse to quite dense, and the associated understory vegetation may consist of quaking aspen, maple, arrowleaf groundsel, lady-fern, Canby's licorice-root, snowberry, mallowleaf ninebark, grouse whortleberry, elk sedge, and pine grass.

Wet/Cold Conifer LHC (**Table 3-3**) is a result of having an increased and thus unnatural stocking level (number of trees per acre). Under these conditions, trees become stressed and more susceptible to disease and insect infestations. Extended drought conditions in southeastern Idaho and the lack of natural disturbance (e.g., wildland fire) can also contribute to the declining health of this vegetation type. As a result, a desirable mix of LHCs that would contribute to the overall health of the vegetation type is lacking.

Depending on the type and size of timber harvest and implementation of restoration projects (e.g., prescribed fire), a desired mix of LHCs would be achieved to improve the health of the Wet/Cold type. Various forest products (commercial timber, post and poles, biomass) could be made available. Reduction in tree stocking level per acre would reduce the susceptibility to insect and disease and allow natural process to maintain the overall health of this vegetation type.

3.2.5.10 Riparian

Riparian areas can be defined as an area of land directly influenced by permanent water. The areas exhibit vegetation or physical characteristics that reflect permanent surface or subsurface water influence. Typical riparian areas include lands along, adjacent to, or contiguous with rivers, streams, springs, lakes and reservoirs. Dry washes and ephemeral streams that have not historically supported riparian vegetation are not usually included in the definition of riparian habitat (BLM 1990b).

Riparian vegetation is important for moderating stream temperatures, adding structure to the river/stream networks, dissipating energy, storing water for later release, providing infiltration for groundwater, and providing water, forage, cover, and rearing habitats for insects, fish and terrestrial animal species. Riparian areas in good health maintain water quality and aquifers, control erosion, diminish the impact of floods, and act as a stabilizing force. These areas have

the highest production of grasses and other palatable species, as well as the greatest biodiversity, providing habitat, drawing wildlife and livestock, and inviting human activity.

Of the 243 bird species breeding in Idaho, 113 (46%) use riparian habitat as nesting habitat. Many of the other 130 species also use riparian habitat as a source of water, as migratory corridors, or for other purposes. Of the 119 neotropical migratory landbirds, 68 (57%) use riparian habitat. Many of Idaho's mammals, amphibians, reptiles, fish, and mollusks also depend on riparian habitat for survival. Riparian forests are biologically diverse and productive systems compared to adjacent uplands (Knopf et al. 1988). Shrub riparian habitat, while lacking the tree layer of the forests, still tends to have higher avian diversity than the surrounding uplands, especially in arid and semi-arid areas.

Riparian areas are unique and one of the most productive vegetation types on public lands in the PFO area. The importance of riparian areas ecologically and hydrologically is disproportionate to their occurrence across the landscape.

There are about 165 stream miles that support riparian vegetation, occupying about 6,600 acres (1 percent, **Table 3-2**) of public lands. Riparian areas are managed, monitored, and evaluated using the concept of proper functioning condition (PFC) as defined in Technical Reference 1737-15 (BLM 1998). Current PFO riparian area conditions are: 26 percent - Proper Functioning, 40 percent -Functional at Risk and 33 percent - Non-functional. Riparian areas are found at different elevations and precipitation zones and are found throughout the PFO area.

Riparian areas are generally described as scrub-shrub vegetation, emergent (herbaceous) vegetation, saline wetlands, and calcareous fens. **Table 3-4** characterizes the native vegetation and associated invasive species/noxious weeds found within these four riparian types in the PFO area.

Riparian areas in the PFO have been altered or degraded resulting from human activities, OHV use, recreational activities, roads, livestock grazing and noxious/invasive weed introduction. These activities contribute to ground disturbance, increased sedimentation, creating conditions allowing for the increase of less desirable native species, elimination of desirable woody tree and shrub species, and compaction of associated soils. Dewatering (e.g., range improvements, irrigation diversions) has resulted in the reduction in coverage of riparian areas and an increase in undesirable species. Management of riparian areas is challenging in the PFO area due to intermingled and scattered land ownership patterns.

Riparian areas in the PFO are extremely resilient and respond quickly to changes in management. Management changes would support a wide variety of native plant species, maintaining/improving habitat for fish, birds and mammals, and beneficial uses for public use.

Wetlands provide habitat for a wide variety of fish and wildlife species, from small populations of narrow endemics to millions of migrating waterfowl and shorebirds. However, many historic wetlands have been lost or degraded. Introduced exotic fish have also altered the ecology of most wetlands, and invasive species/noxious weeds are a growing problem in many areas.

Table 3-4. Riparian Types, Characteristic Native Vegetation and Associated Invasive Species/Noxious Weeds

Riparian Types	Characteristic Native Vegetation	Associated Invasive Species/Noxious Weeds
Scrub-shrub	Geyer's willow, Booth's willow, plane-leaf willow, red-osier dogwood, water birch, mountain alder, coyote, yellow, whiplash willow, and Douglas hawthorn.	
Emergent (Herbaceous)	Beaked sedge, water sedge, Nebraska sedge, soft-leaved sedge, hardstem bulrush, common spikerush, common cattail, reedgrass, reed canary grass, tufted hairgrass and mat muhly.	Canada thistle, purple loosestrife, perennial pepperweed, leafy spurge, musk thistle, poison hemlock, reed canary grass, Kentucky bluegrass, orchardgrass
Saline Wetlands	Saltgrass, goosefoot species, alkali muhly, alkali bluegrass, alkali muhly, American bulrush, seacoast bulrush, basin wildrye, greasewood and red glasswort ¹ .	
Calcareous Fens	Slender sedge, beaked sedge, water sedge, common cattail, and hardstem bulrush, beaked spikerush and shrubby cinquefoil, brown moss, hoary willow ¹ and green muhly ¹ .	

¹ Idaho BLM sensitive or watch plant species which are rare due to habitat loss and habitat specificity.

3.2.5.11 Other/Vegetated Lava

Other/Vegetated Lava includes: rock and barren lands, sand dunes, annual grass, salt desert shrub, and vegetated lava. There are about 16,600 acres of this vegetation type in the PFO area (2.8 percent, **Table 3-2**).

This vegetation type is largely devoid of vascular plants, but frequently supports mosses and lichens. A very small component of this vegetation type includes salt desert shrub vegetation that occurs in the southwest portion of the PFO area where precipitation is the lowest. Halophytes and succulent shrubs, which are saline-tolerant, characterize the Salt Desert Shrub vegetation type. Typical shrub species include: four-wing saltbush, winterfat, and greasewood. Common grasses include: Saltgrass, alkali sacaton, Indian rice-grass, and squirreltail. Goosefoot is typically the dominate forb in this vegetation type. Productivity is relatively low, as understory vegetation is naturally sparse. Biological crusts are usually present and cover most of the interspaces between shrubs. Annual grass (cheatgrass) portions of this vegetation type are a result of wildland or human caused fires. Cheatgrass can quickly invade Salt Desert Shrub without any disturbance.

A very small amount of annual grass (cheatgrass) (< 50 acres) and salt desert shrub (approximately 346 acres) are grouped into this vegetation type.

3.2.5.12 Invasive Species/Noxious Weeds

The productivity of public lands in the PFO area is in danger of being reduced by invasive species/noxious weeds. Currently it is unknown how many acres are occupied by these species

which can be found in all eleven vegetation types. Currently twenty-four species have been identified in the area and are listed in **Table 3-5**. This table identifies the priority for the invasive species/noxious weeds, growth form and the available treatment options. New species may be added to the list and prioritized for treatment if they are discovered on public lands and warrant treatment.

Table 3-5. Growth Form and Treatment Method for Invasive Species and Noxious Weeds

Priority Number	Common Weed Name	Growth Form ¹	Treatment Method ²
Noxious Weeds:			
1	Rush skeletonweed	P	1,11,111
2	Yellow star-thistle	P, SP	1,11,111
3	Jointed goatgrass	A	1
4	Buffalobur	A	1,11
5	Perennial pepperweed	P	1
6	Puncturevine (goathead)	A	1,11
7	Yellow toadflax	P	1
8	Poison hemlock	B	1,11
9	Diffuse knapweed	B, SP	1,11,111
10	Dyer's woad	B, SP	1,11,111
11	Spotted knapweed	B, SP	1,11,111
12	Leafy spurge	P	1,111
13	Perennial sowthistle	P	1
14	Russian knapweed	P	1
15	Dalmatian toadflax	P	1,111
16	Whitetop (hoary cress)	P	1,111
17	Black henbane	B	1,11
18	Hound's tongue	A, B	1,11
19	Scotch thistle	B	1,11
20	Field bindweed	P	1
21	Canada thistle	P	1,111
22	Musk thistle	A, B	1,11,111
Invasive Species:			
1	Tamarisk	P	1,11,111
2	Dame's rocket	B, SP	1,11
3	Bulbous bluegrass	P	1
4	Japanese brome	A	1
5	Cheatgrass	A	1
6	Bull thistle	B	1,11
7	Halogeton	A	1,11,111
8	Russian olive	P	1,11
9	Siberian elm	P	1,11
10	Kentucky bluegrass	P	111

¹A-annual; B-biennial; P-perennial; SP-short-lived perennial

²1-chemical; 11-mechanical; 111-biological

3.2.6 FISH AND WILDLIFE

The mission of the BLM is to manage habitat. Fish and wildlife populations are administered by the Idaho Department of Fish and Game (IDFG) or in the case of migratory species, the US Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS).

The IDFG has developed management objectives for big game animals and worked with various federal agencies in setting and achieving these objectives. The current *IDFG White-Tailed Deer, Mule deer, and Elk Management Plan* (IDFG 1999) includes species status and management objectives and is designed to be reviewed and updated regularly. This plan divides the state into Analysis Areas.

The PFO area includes all or part of five Analysis Areas for mule deer, with most of the PFO area being covered by three Analysis Areas. Management objectives in these areas are based on threshold populations. When populations in trend areas (small portions of a unit surveyed annually) are less than threshold numbers the management objective is to restrict antlerless harvest, conversely, when trend area populations are above threshold values the management objective is to encourage antlerless harvest. Analysis Area 20 (Units 56, 70, 73, 73A) has a threshold value of 5,700 deer. Analysis Area 21 (Units 71 and 74) has a threshold value of 2,000 deer. Analysis Area 22 (Units 72, 75, 76, 77, 78) has a threshold value of 10,000 deer.

The PFO area includes all or part of five Analysis Areas for elk, with most of the PFO area in three Analysis Areas. The Bannock Zone (Units 56, 70, 71, 72, 73, 73A, 74) has a management objective of 510 – 745 cows and 125 – 165 elk. The Bear River Zone (Units 75, 77, 78) has a management objective of 400 – 600 cows and 80 – 120 bulls. The Diamond Creek Zone (Units 66A and 76) has a management objective of 1300 – 1960 cows and 400 – 600 bulls.

To facilitate the description and analysis of existing fisheries and wildlife resources within the planning area, species are discussed in terms of their association with the vegetation cover types described in *Vegetation Section 3.2.5*. In addition, because vegetation cover types often include an array of species, the discussion focuses on those wildlife species representative of the suite of species that use each vegetation type. However, many “generalists,” or species which use multiple habitat types, are found throughout the PFO area. **Table 3-6** presents the wildlife species selected as representative of the aforementioned vegetation types.

Wildlife habitat management on the PFO area’s public lands consists of maintaining and improving food, water, and cover for over 100 species of mammals, 214 species of birds, 32 species of fish, 13 species of reptiles, and 5 species of amphibians. Complete lists of these species are found in **Appendix N**. Data regarding the abundance and distribution of nongame species, fur-bearers, and predators are limited. Significant differences in habitat requirements exist between species, whereby good habitat conditions for one species may not meet adequate habitat conditions for another species. To maintain diverse, viable, and abundant populations of wildlife, a mosaic of biologically and structurally diverse habitat types is necessary.

Table 3-6. Vegetation Types by Acreage and Representative Wildlife Species

Vegetation Type	Public Land Acres	Representative Wildlife Species
Low-Elevation Shrub	144,800	antelope, blue grouse, cottontail rabbit, Colombian sharp-tailed grouse, chukar, gray partridge, mourning dove, montaine vole, mule deer, ringneck pheasant, Rocky Mountain elk, greater sage-grouse, short-eared owl, Western meadowlark
Mid-Elevation Shrub	142,000	antelope, blue grouse, cottontail rabbit, Colombian sharp-tailed grouse, chukar, gray partridge, mule deer, Rocky Mountain elk, greater sage-grouse (representative species are the same for Mid-Elevation and Mountain Shrub)
Mountain Shrub	187,100	antelope, blue grouse, cottontail rabbit, Colombian sharp-tailed grouse, chukar, gray partridge, mule deer, Rocky Mountain elk, greater sage-grouse (representative species are the same for Mid-Elevation and Mountain Shrub)
Natural Juniper	14,400	cottontail rabbit, mountain lion, mourning dove, mule deer, Rocky Mountain elk
Aspen/Aspen Conifer Mix/Dry Conifer	40,500	black bear, blue grouse, moose, mountain lion, mule deer, Rocky Mountain elk, ruffed grouse (representative species are the same for Aspen/Aspen Conifer Mix and Wet/Cold Conifer)
Wet/Cold Conifer	700	black bear, blue grouse, moose, mountain lion, mule deer, Rocky Mountain elk, ruffed grouse (representative species are the same for Aspen/Aspen Conifer Mix and Wet/Cold Conifer)
Riparian	6,600	beaver, black bear, blue grouse, cottontail rabbit, Colombian sharp-tailed grouse, chukar, ducks, geese, gray partridge, moose, mourning dove, mule deer, ringneck pheasant, pronghorn antelope, Rocky Mountain elk, greater sage-grouse, snipe

Riparian zones are regarded as the most important habitats for wildlife, providing water and highly variable structural diversity. Aspen stands provide nest sites for cavity-nesting birds, in addition to providing forage and thermal and hiding cover for many other species (Dealy et al. 1981). Snag trees in aspen and conifer stands are essential to cavity-nesting nongame birds. Large, old, mature live trees provide a habitat component necessary to support many species of birds, bats, and other vertebrate and invertebrate species. These habitat features are found in variable amounts throughout the PFO area.

Idaho conservation effort, habitat conservation assessment, and conservation strategies have been prepared and are being implemented for 13 BLM sensitive species. These species occupy a variety of the upland, riparian, and aquatic habitats previously described. The goals, objectives,

and proposed actions of these conservation agreements and strategies provide a foundation for developing management direction in the RMP and are discussed in Section 3.2.7, Special Status Species.

3.2.6.1 Big Game

PFO area's resident big game animals typically move between spring/summer ranges and winter ranges annually. These animals are elk, mule deer, white-tailed deer, moose, pronghorn antelope, black bear, and mountain lion. Important habitat, essential to some aspect of the animal's life history, are typically winter range, calving, or fawning grounds and are tabulated for elk, mule deer, and pronghorn antelope. The acreage of those habitats on public lands is presented in **Table 3-7. Figure 3-5** shows winter range for big game animals in the PFO area.

Table 3-7. Big Game Habitat

Species	On All Lands within Planning Area (acres)	On Public Lands within Planning Area (acres)
Elk	854,157	98,404
Mule Deer	944,412	188,082
Pronghorn Antelope	35,304	15

Source: BLM 2004a

Close proximity to water remains an important factor within spring, summer, and fall habitats and is provided by both natural sources (streams, lakes, springs, seeps) and artificial sources (stock watering ponds and tanks) throughout the PFO area. Year-long or spring-summer-fall elk ranges are present throughout the region at higher elevations wherever forested habitat and topography provide good security from roads, motorized trail, and other human activities. Major summer habitats preferred by elk include Aspen/Aspen Conifer Mix/Dry Conifer, Mountain Shrub, Mid-Elevation Shrub and Riparian vegetation types. The location of and scattered nature of public lands means that the amount of elk summer habitat managed by the BLM is minimal.

Elk winter ranges are found throughout the PFO area on mid- to low elevation mountain shrub, sagebrush, juniper, and mountain mahogany sites. Elk in southeast Idaho do not seem to have a fidelity to a particular winter range but may move among them from year to year (Ackerman et al. 1984).

Mule Deer

Mule deer populations are presently considered low, with current management direction focused on improving existing numbers. Current efforts by IDFG include improving habitat through cooperation with land management agencies and private landowners (IDFG 2004a). Preferred habitats are characterized by vegetation mosaics of aspen and dry conifer or tall brush hiding cover, mixed with more open sagebrush, grass and bitterbrush foraging sites. Winter ranges are Natural Juniper, and Mid- to Low-Elevation Shrub vegetation types. Proximity to water is an important factor during spring, summer, and fall, which enhances deer dependency on riparian zones. Aspen stands provide an important required habitat component for fawning and fawn-rearing cover. Year-long or spring-summer-fall mule deer ranges are present throughout the region at higher elevations wherever forested habitat and topography provide good security from

roads, motorized trails and other human activities. The lands shown in **Figure 3-5** are considered winter range for both mule deer and elk. The IDFG has four Wildlife Management Areas (WMAs): Blackfoot River, Georgetown Summit, Portneuf, and Montpelier. The Blackfoot River WMA provides summer habitat for deer and elk. The Portneuf WMA and Montpelier WMA provide winter range for mule deer. Georgetown Summit WMA is important as elk winter range. The Portneuf, Montpelier, and Georgetown WMAs have public lands associated with them.

White-Tailed Deer

White-tailed deer in the PFO area are predominantly associated with major riparian areas, such as the Snake River, Blackfoot River, and the Gray's Lake area.

As Black (2004) indicated, white-tailed deer populations are rapidly expanding across their range, while mule deer populations have declined across the western US. White-tailed deer are displacing mule deer on several different ranges, including the eastern plains of Montana, Snake River plains in Idaho, Blackfoot Indian Reservation in Montana, and in many places throughout Canada.

White-tailed deer and mule deer often occupy the same habitats; have almost identical food preferences, and similar habitat preferences. However, white-tailed deer will out-compete mule deer for available resources, such as food and shelter, in most habitat types. The major difference between the two is that white-tailed deer tend to occupy their habitats year-round, where the mule deer migrate between summer and winter ranges. This allows mule deer to use higher elevation habitats that could not be occupied year-round.

Pronghorn Antelope

The pronghorn population provides limited hunting opportunities with its distribution primarily limited to those lands west of I-84. This small population is considered to be stable, with current Idaho Fish and Game management direction focused on improving or maintaining existing numbers. Pronghorn antelope make extensive use of sagebrush/grassland habitat types (e.g., Low- and Mid-Elevation Shrub cover types and Riparian cover types). Seasonal variations in snow distribution and depth influence antelope distribution on winter ranges, and this population can end up on the north shore of the Great Salt Lake during hard winters. During the spring/summer/fall, proximity to water is the major factor that influences pronghorn distribution.

Moose

Beginning in the late 1970s, moose populations in the PFO area are believed to have increased. Moose populations in the PFO area are considered to be stable, with management direction focused on improving or maintaining existing numbers. Generally, moose territories tend to be yearlong with elevation changes from winter to summer within the territory. Winter habitats are characterized by species found in the Mid-Elevation and Mountain Shrub vegetation types, such as serviceberry and willow. These species, interspersed with coniferous and deciduous trees, provide adequate winter forage and thermal cover requirements. Throughout the spring, summer, and fall, moose use riparian habitat areas as well as the adjacent Aspen/Aspen Conifer Mix and Wet/Cold conifer vegetation types, which provide calving, foraging, and thermal cover.

Black Bear

Habitat loss and fragmentation and unrestricted harvest have significantly changed the distribution and abundance of black bears in North America since colonial settlement. Although bears have been more carefully managed in the last 50 years and harvest levels are limited, threats from habitat alteration and fragmentation still exist. Black bear populations are difficult to inventory and monitor because the animals occur in relatively low densities and are secretive by nature. Black bears are an important game species in Idaho, but, because bears have low reproductive rates, their populations recover more slowly from losses than do those of most other North American mammals (Vaughan and Pelton 1995).

Black bear distribution in Idaho corresponds closely to the distribution of coniferous forests. Vaughan and Pelton (1995) indicated that in Idaho the black bear population is somewhere between 20,000 and 25,000 animals, with a slightly decreasing population trend. In the PFO area, most bear habitat is found in the higher elevations of the national forests, including the Mountain Shrub, Wet Conifer, and Aspen/Dry Conifer cover types.

Mountain Lion

The mountain lion is usually associated with remote, rough topography and is generally a solitary animal. Its annual home range varies greatly in different areas. In Idaho, home ranges of males were from 54 to 230 square kilometers, while females had home ranges of 14 to 148 square kilometers. However, home ranges of up to 1,454 square kilometers have been reported. Seasonal movements occurred within home range in response to prey movements; mountain lions moved farther in summer than in winter while hunting their prey, and some altitudinal movement was associated with ungulate movements and snows in winter (Idaho State University 2004a). Besides humans, mountain lions may face threats from other large predators such as other lions, bears, and wolves.

The mountain lion relies heavily on mule deer, which may comprise up to 75 percent of their diet throughout the year. They also occasionally prey on livestock, primarily sheep and cattle. The mountain lion is managed as a game species in Idaho. Generally, mountain lions will be found where there are healthy deer populations in the PFO area.

3.2.6.2 Upland Game Birds and Small Game

The PFO area contains habitat for many small game and upland game birds that are of interest to hunters and outdoor enthusiasts alike. Much of the habitat for these species is found in the transition areas from public land to US Department of Agriculture, National Forest Service (Forest Service) land or public land to private land, particularly agricultural lands.

Upland Game Birds

The primary upland game species found on the public lands throughout the region are greater sage-grouse, Columbian sharp-tailed grouse, blue grouse, ruffed grouse, gray partridge, wild turkey, ring-necked pheasant, mourning dove, and chukar. Of those species, sage and Columbian sharp-tailed grouse are considered sensitive species and are further discussed in *Special Status Species Section 3.2.7*. Mourning doves nest throughout the PFO area in most habitat types. Ring-

necked pheasants exist in low numbers on public lands, primarily within the BLM/agriculture land interface.

Preferred blue grouse and ruffed grouse habitat is closely associated with Aspen/Aspen Conifer Mix/Dry Conifer, and Riparian vegetation types. Blue grouse winter in high-elevation timber, both on public lands and adjacent National Forests, where they feed on needles of Douglas fir and buds of both Douglas fir and aspen. Riparian areas are important for grouse for brood rearing due to the presence of insects, preferred forbs, and berry-producing shrub species. Additionally, herbaceous cover is an important component of brood-rearing habitat, directly affecting areas of use and brood survival (Harju 1974; Zwickel 1972).

The introduced chukar and gray partridge are present throughout the PFO area, occupying the Low and Mid-Elevation Shrub, and Riparian, vegetation types. While chukars are usually associated with rock outcrops, small cliffs, and talus rock adjacent to water sources, gray partridge are usually associated with flat terrain often within agricultural fields and adjacent native sagebrush habitats. Riparian habitats adjacent to rocky escape cover are important brood rearing areas, providing insects, water, and preferred forb species.

The IDFG has released both the Merriam's and Rio Grande wild turkeys in various locations of the PFO planning area. Preferred habitats include Riparian zones and adjacent upland (Low-Elevation Shrub and Mid-Elevation Shrub vegetation types) or agricultural habitats. The public lands along river corridors were the sites for the original introductions because they provided the most habitat requirements, especially roosting and escape cover. The original introduced populations have since expanded into several different and apparently suitable habitats, ranging in elevation up to the aspen and conifer habitats.

Small Game

Cottontail rabbits are present in variable numbers throughout the region, inhabiting many of the Low-Elevation Shrub and Riparian vegetation types. There are some historical records in the PFO area for pygmy rabbits, a BLM sensitive species. Documentation of two active burrows for this species existed in Bear Lake County as recently as 2002 (Roberts 2003; Idaho Conservation Data Center 2004). During the winter of 2006-2007, IDFG surveyed portions of the Bear Lake Plateau for pygmy rabbits and documented approximately 265 active burrows on BLM-administered public lands. By testing the DNA of droppings, the IDFG estimated that approximately two-thirds of the burrows were inhabited by pygmy rabbits and the remainder by mountain cottontails. The IDFG has had hunting seasons on the pygmy rabbit, but the season was closed in 2002. Pygmy rabbits are further discussed in Section 3.2.7.2, Special Status Species. The snowshoe hare typically lives in forested areas and is not very common on public lands. In the summer it has a thin brown coat, which changes to a heavy white coat in winter. Hares feed on grasses, forbs, shrub shoots, tree bark, woody twigs, and tree buds from aspen, willow, and maple, which are found in aspen, conifer, and higher elevation riparian habitats. Many species prey on snowshoe hare, including coyotes, foxes, bobcats, great horned owls, and larger hawks. In addition to the small game species previously mentioned, IDFG maintains a season for the American crow.

3.2.6.3 Other Animals

The categories below are defined by regulations published by IDFG.

Fur-Bearers

Beaver, mink, muskrat, otter, and raccoon depend on aquatic or riparian habitats. Bobcats tend to be found in various habitats in hilly or rugged country, often associated with extensive cliffs or rock outcrops. Red fox occupy the more extensive and varied upland habitat types. Badgers are found throughout the Low-Elevation Shrub habitats, where ground squirrels and other rodents are prevalent.

Predatory Wildlife

Animals that the IDFG classifies as predators in Idaho include coyotes, jackrabbits, skunks, weasels, and starlings, all of which are found in a variety of habitats in the PFO area (State of Idaho 2005). Coyotes occupy most habitat types throughout the region and are considered extremely opportunistic in prey selection.

Unprotected Wildlife

Of the species found in the PFO area, IDFG considers marmots, fox squirrels, porcupines, Uinta ground squirrels, English sparrows, and feral pigeons as unprotected wildlife, meaning that these species can be harvested at any time and in any number with a valid hunting license.

Protected Nongame Wildlife

The following nongame wildlife species found in the PFO area are protected by Idaho law: bison, red squirrels, wolverines, chipmunks, golden-mantled ground squirrels, rock squirrels, pikas, northern flying squirrels, rattlesnakes, migratory song birds, hawks, owls, eagles, and vultures. All native bats, reptiles and amphibians are protected by Idaho Department of Fish & Game Commission Rule. Any bison most likely would have escaped from domestic herds, but all the rest could be seen in various habitats throughout the region.

Bats

All Idaho bats feed on insects and use a wide variety of habitat for foraging and roosting, ranging from caves and cliffs to conifer trees. Some bats hibernate in Idaho during winter, whereas others migrate to warmer regions (Idaho State University 2004b). Of the 14 species of bats found in Idaho, 10 have been found in the PFO area throughout most habitat types (**Appendix N**). Only the Townsend's big-eared bat is considered sensitive by the BLM.

Raptors

The raptors that spend all or part of the year in Idaho include 13 species of owls, one species of vulture, and 18 species of hawk-like birds, including falcons, eagles, buteos, accipiters, harriers, and osprey (BLM 2004b). All of the aforementioned species of raptors are found in various habitats in the PFO area and are included on the list in **Appendix N**.

Raptor nesting habitat in the PFO area includes cliff-nesting sites used by golden eagles, prairie falcons, peregrine falcons, and red-tailed hawks. Wet/Cold and Aspen/Aspen Conifer Mix vegetation types, and associated riparian areas (containing mature cottonwood trees) are used by forest hawks, including northern goshawks, Cooper's hawks, and sharp-shinned hawks, as well as many of the owl species and bald eagles. Low-Elevation Shrub communities are where the burrowing owls are found and cliffs or promontories near these habitats are used as nesting sites by ferruginous hawks. Artificial nest platforms and power poles near riparian areas provide nesting sites for osprey, although none are currently located on public land. Those species that the BLM considers sensitive (goshawks, ferruginous hawks, and peregrine falcons) are further discussed in the special status species section of this document.

3.2.6.4 *Migratory Birds and Other Birds of Conservation Concern*

Migratory birds include a number of species that spend the winter in the southern latitudes and fly north to nest and fledge their young in the summer. Some migrate as far as from the Arctic Circle to the southern tip of South America. Others may only move from Idaho to Arizona. Migrants vary in size from hawks to hummingbirds.

Appendix N contains a list of species known to occur within the PFO area, which are protected by the Migratory Bird Treaty Act. Most of these species are waterfowl and neotropical migrants, but the list also includes species such as gulls, owls, and hawks. Within the PFO area the Audubon Society and Bird Life International have recognized American Falls Reservoir, Bear Lake NWR, Mink Creek/Cherry Springs Nature Area, Curlew Valley, Oxford Slough, Bowen Canyon Bald Eagle Sanctuary ACEC, and the Blackfoot Reservoir as Important Bird Areas (IBAs).

Waterfowl

Throughout the PFO area, numerous species of waterfowl inhabit wetlands, riparian areas and reservoirs. These areas provide nesting, brood rearing and spring/fall migration habitat. Additionally, some important seasonal habitat for a variety of shorebird species is found in the mudflats around the major reservoirs. Some of the more important areas providing habitat for waterfowl and shorebirds include American Falls Reservoir, Hawkins Reservoir, Blackfoot River and reservoir, the Bear River and Oneida Narrows Reservoir, and the Chesterfield Reservoir, as well as wildlife refuges managed by the USFWS.

Neotropical Migrants

This group of birds includes those most familiar to people, such as warblers, hummingbirds, sparrows, and most hawks. Because this group is so large, the natural history and habitat of each of its members will not be discussed here.

All of these species depend on quality habitats containing adequate nesting substrate with sufficient cover to hide the female on the nest, diverse vegetation to supply insects during brood rearing, and seeds or fruits, for those that eat them, for the remainder of the year.

The Idaho Bird Conservation Plan describes the most important habitats, which were prioritized by looking at the number of birds that use a habitat as primary breeding habitat and by the

numbers of high priority birds that use the habitats (Idaho Partners in Flight [IPIF] 2000). The IPIF also considered the loss of habitat in quantity and quality, including the area of habitat within the state, management status and whether that habitat area provides moderate to good protection from degradation. Based on these criteria, IPIF identified their priorities as riparian, nonriverine wetlands, sagebrush, and ponderosa pine. Of the public lands covered in this plan, none are ponderosa pine, and there is not a significant amount of nonriverine wetlands.

3.2.6.5 Reptiles

Fifteen species of reptiles, including seven lizards and eight snakes, are found in various habitats in the PFO area (**Appendix N**) (Idaho State University 2004c).

The sagebrush lizard is a common species associated with shrub communities and juniper woodland. It is a ground dweller that prefers open ground with low shrubs and rocks where it retreats when threatened. It feeds on insects (Stebbins 1985). This species is still common but faces the same risks that other animals associated with diminishing sagebrush habitat face.

Two species of garter snakes occur throughout Idaho in many habitats, including grassland and wooded areas. However, they prefer moist habitats near riparian areas, lakes, or damp meadows. They feed on toads, frogs, fish, salamanders, small mammals, earthworms, slugs, leeches, and insects. While still seen, they don't seem to be as abundant as they have been in the past (Stebbins 2003).

3.2.6.6 Amphibians

Most amphibians have complex life cycles (adults, eggs, and larvae that metamorphose into juveniles) that require habitats with standing/still water for at least part of the year (Idaho State University 2004d). One salamander, two toads, and two frogs are found in the PFO area (**Appendix N**). The boreal subspecies of the Western toad and the northern leopard frog are sensitive species and are discussed in *Special Status Species Section 3.2.7*.

3.2.6.7 Fish

All of the fisheries resources are found in the riparian or other category (rivers, lakes, reservoirs) as previously identified. Of the numerous streams within the PFO area, many are ephemeral or very small and are either fishless or support only a limited sport fishery. Approximately 124 stream miles within the PFO area contain a sport fishery. However, the PFO area provides habitat for a very diverse fishery community, consisting of 18 native species and 14 nonnative (introduced) species. **Table 3-8** identifies the distribution and their regulatory status, if applicable, of these fish species.

Warm Water Fish Species

Most of the irrigation reservoirs have been stocked with warm water sport fish, sometimes illegally. Most of these introduced populations have remained in or near the reservoirs where conditions are conducive to their reproduction. With the small amount of public land on these reservoirs, the BLM has little influence on the condition of these fisheries.

Table 3-8. Fish Species within the Planning Area¹

Common Name	Scientific Name	Native or Nonnative	Probable Distribution	Regulatory Status ²
Bonneville cutthroat trout	<i>Oncorhynchus clarki utah</i>	Native	Bear River drainage	Type 2
Bear Lake cutthroat trout	<i>O. clarki</i> spp.	Native	Bear Lake	Type 2
Rainbow trout	<i>O. mykiss</i>	Nonnative	All drainages	
Yellowstone cutthroat trout	<i>O. clarki bouvieri</i>	Native	Snake, Blackfoot, Portneuf drainages	Type 2
Brown trout	<i>Salmo trutta</i>	Nonnative	Portneuf and upper Snake Rivers	
Brook trout	<i>Salvelinus fontinalis</i>	Nonnative	All drainages	
Lake trout	<i>S. namaycush</i>	Nonnative	Bear Lake	
Mountain whitefish	<i>Prosopium williamsoni</i>	Native	All drainages	
Bear Lake whitefish	<i>Prosopium abyssicola</i>	Native	Bear Lake	Type 2
Bonneville whitefish	<i>P. spilonotus</i>	Native	Bear Lake	Type 2
Bonneville cisco	<i>P. gemmiferum</i>	Native	Bear Lake	Type 2
Channel catfish	<i>Ictalurus punctatus</i>	Nonnative	Bear River, Malad River, Snake River	
Brown bullhead	<i>I. nebulosus</i>	Nonnative	American Falls Reservoir	
Bluegill	<i>Lepomis macrochirus</i>	Nonnative	Irrigation reservoirs	
Green sunfish	<i>L. cyanellus</i>	Nonnative	Irrigation reservoirs	
Black crappie	<i>Pomoxis nigromaculatus</i>	Nonnative	Irrigation reservoirs	
Largemouth bass	<i>Micropterus salmoides</i>	Nonnative	Irrigation reservoirs	
Smallmouth bass	<i>M. dolomieu</i>	Nonnative	Bear River, Snake River	
Yellow perch	<i>Perca flavescens</i>	Nonnative	Irrigation reservoirs	
Walleye	<i>Stizostedion vitreum</i>	Nonnative	Bear River drainage south of Oneida	
Carp	<i>Cyprinus carpio</i>	Nonnative	All drainages	
Leatherside chub	<i>Gila copei</i>	Native	Tygee Creek	Type 3
Utah chub	<i>G. atraria</i>	Native	All drainages	
Longnose dace	<i>Rhinichthys cataractae</i>	Native	All drainages	
Speckled dace	<i>R. osculus</i>	Native	All drainages	
Redside shiner	<i>Richardsonius balteatus</i>	Native	Willow Creek, Portneuf River, Bear River	
Utah sucker	<i>Catostomus ardens</i>	Native	All drainages	
Mountain sucker	<i>C. platyhynchus</i>	Native	All drainages	
Bluehead sucker	<i>C. discobolus</i>	Native	Portneuf River, Bear River	
Mottled sculpin	<i>Cottus bairdi</i>	Native	Snake River, Portneuf River, Bear River	
Bear Lake sculpin	<i>C. extensus</i>	Native	Bear Lake	Type 2
Piute sculpin	<i>C. beldingi</i>	Native	All drainages	

¹PFO area includes the Bear, Portneuf, Blackfoot, and parts of the Snake and Salt River drainages, as well as part or all of the Willow, Rock, and Bannock Creek drainages.

²BLM Type Classification (**Appendix O** for detailed definition)

Type 1 Federally listed, proposed, and candidate species

Type 2 Rangewide/globally imperiled species

Type 3 Regional/state imperiled species

Type 4 Peripheral Species

Type 5 Watch list species

Cold Water Fish Species

All of the native species occurring in the PFO area are considered cold water fish. Many are nongame species, such as the small and inconspicuous dace and sculpins, or fairly large, like the suckers.

Seven species of trout are found in the PFO area (**Table 3-8**). The most common of these are introduced rainbow trout, which are fairly ubiquitous and have been stocked in most streams, rivers, lakes, and reservoirs, where habitat conditions are favorable. Brook trout and brown trout are locally common in many of these cold water habitats. Lake trout are stocked only in Bear Lake.

The BLM considers three trout species as sensitive: Bonneville, Bear Lake, and Yellowstone cutthroat trout. Bonneville cutthroat trout are native to and found in the Bear River watershed (Simpson and Wallace 1982; Kershner 1995). Bear Lake cutthroat trout are limited to Bear Lake. Yellowstone cutthroat trout are native to the Snake River watershed, which includes Willow Creek, Blackfoot River, Portneuf River, and Bannock Creek (Forest Service 1996). Additional discussion, including probable distribution and brief life histories, is found in *Special Status Species Section 3.2.7*.

Generally, in the PFO area, stronger native salmonid populations (cutthroat trout) are associated with higher-elevation forested lands; here, densities generally decline as road densities increase. Analysis of extensive Forest Service and other agency stream inventory data reveals that major decreases in pool habitat (depth and frequency) have occurred basin-wide over the last forty to sixty years. These decreases are attributed to losses in riparian vegetation, road and highway construction, timber harvest, grazing, farming, and other disturbances. The losses appear to be greatest in low-gradient, biologically productive areas, which are primarily found in lower watersheds on privately owned lands. This results in populations that are often isolated from the main rivers; they are isolated from the rest of the population by irrigation diversions or degraded habitats caused by agricultural or other uses (Forest Service 1996). The long-term health and continued survival of native cutthroat trout depend on maintaining or improving riparian conditions and connecting isolated populations to ensure continued gene flow throughout the population as a whole.

Bear Lake Fisheries

A unique fishery in the PFO area is Bear Lake. It contains the endemic fish species Bonneville cutthroat trout, Bear Lake whitefish, Bonneville whitefish, Bonneville cisco, and Bear Lake sculpin. Though there are no public lands on the lakeshore itself, most of the streams and drainages feeding the lake pass through at least some public lands. BLM only indirectly influences this fishery by ensuring that the water quality of the streams leaving public lands meets State of Idaho criteria for cold water biota.

3.2.7 SPECIAL STATUS SPECIES

BLM special status species includes those species officially listed, proposed for listing, or candidates for listing as threatened or endangered under the Endangered Species Act of 1973

(ESA); species listed by the IDFG as endangered or threatened or species of special concern; and species designated by the BLM State Director as sensitive.

BLM policy includes a commitment to conserve federally listed and proposed threatened or endangered species and the habitats on which they depend and a commitment to manage other special status species so that BLM actions do not contribute to a need to list these species. The BLM is required to consult with the USFWS on potential impacts on federally listed plant and animal species. The USFWS also suggests the BLM consult with them informally when assessing projects that may affect candidate species. BLM actions will also be consistent with the *Idaho Standards for Rangeland Health and Guidelines for Livestock Grazing* (BLM 1997a) and the Interior Columbian Basin Ecosystem Management Project.

BLM sensitive species are designated by the State Director under 16 USC 1536 (a)(2). BLM Manual 6840 (Special Status Species Management) requires that sensitive species be managed so they would not need to be listed as proposed threatened or endangered, with the same level of protection as candidate species. Sensitive species is a BLM classification equivalent to IDFG’s species of special concern. An agreement between the BLM and IDFG makes these two lists identical.

In 2003, the BLM established special status species protocols to provide a framework for identifying species that are at risk of extinction over all or a significant portion of their range and occur on public lands in Idaho. These protocols were modeled after a similar protocol developed by Region 1 of the Forest Service and rely on an international system for ranking species imperilment originally set up by the Nature Conservancy for the Natural Heritage Programs and Conservation Data Centers in North and South America. Two slightly different protocols were developed for plants and animals. Both protocols include five ranking types. These ranking types are summarized in **Table 3-9** below and are described in detail in **Appendix O**.

Table 3-9. Table BLM Special Status Species Ranking

Type	Vegetation Category	Wildlife Category
1	Threatened, Endangered, Proposed, and Candidate Species	Threatened, Endangered, Proposed, and Candidate Species
2	Rangewide/Globally Imperiled Species – High Endangerment	Rangewide/Globally Imperiled Species
3	Rangewide/Globally Imperiled Species – Moderate Endangerment	Regional/State Imperiled Species
4	Species of Concern	Peripheral Species
5	Watch List	Watch List

In addition to the BLM special status species rankings, Idaho BLM uses other sources of information and criteria to help better define trends and threats for rare plant species, including the Idaho Native Plant Society’s ranking system and the USFWS “Listing Priority Ranking Table.” Status of all rare plant species are reviewed and updated at the annual Idaho Rare Plant Conference, and the BLM sensitive plant list is updated annually consistent with the results of the conference.

3.2.7.1 Federally Threatened, Endangered, and Candidate Species

Vegetation

There are no federally threatened, endangered, or candidate plants known to occur in the PFO area.

Fish and Wildlife

Before June 2007, three federally listed species were identified as being present in the PFO area (Table 3-10). Since June 2007, the bald eagle has been removed from the Endangered Species List, but it is addressed in this document under Special Status Species.

Table 3-10. Federally Listed Species in the Pocatello Field Office Area

Species	Habitat	ESA Status ¹	Idaho ²
Mammals			
Gray wolf (<i>Canus lupus</i>)	Low-, Mid-Elevation, and Mountain Shrub, Dry Conifer, Wet/Cold Conifer, and Riparian.	EXP	E
Birds			
Bald eagle ³ (<i>Haliaeetus leucocephalus</i>)	Dry Conifer, Aspen-Conifer, Mountain Shrub, and Riparian	T	E
Invertebrates			
Utah valvata snail (<i>Valvata utahensis</i>)	Riparian. Found only in the Snake River.	E	

¹Federal ESA Status: E = Endangered; T = Threatened; C = Candidate for listing as T or E; EXP = Experimental Nonessential Population.

²See Appendix O for description of status/category rankings.

³Removed from the Endangered Species List June 28, 2007.

Source: IDFG 2005

Gray Wolf

This species is considered an experimental nonessential population within the PFO area (USFWS 2008). Although suitable habitat may be present within the PFO area, the number of roads and BLM-activities (such as livestock grazing) may prevent wolves from using those habitats. Little opportunity exists for changing this circumstance because of the scattered pattern of public land. There is no officially documented occurrence of wolves occupying habitat in the PFO area, but at least two wolves that were apparently transients have been killed. They are believed to be from the experimental wolf packs that have been released in Yellowstone National Park. Since the Yellowstone release efforts of 1995 and 1996, wolf sightings on public lands within field offices surrounding Yellowstone Park have increased.

Bald Eagle

The bald eagle was removed from the Endangered Species List on June 28, 2007. Bald eagle seasonal habitat occurs throughout the PFO area, with most nesting, brood rearing, and winter

habitat occupations occurring along the Bear River. Four active nest sites occur on or near public lands. The Bowen Canyon Bald Eagle Sanctuary ACEC was designated to protect a winter roost on public land 10 miles south of American Falls. In the past ten years the number of nesting eagles has increased in the PFO area. With the management guidelines in place, the continued expansion of this population is highly likely.

Utah Valvata Snail

The Utah valvata snail is generally associated with cold, clean, well-oxygenated flowing waters in the mainstream Snake River and perennial flowing waters in large spring complexes (USFWS 1995). This species, like the other listed Snake River mollusks, is generally intolerant of turbid waters and pollution, although it can tolerate slower-flowing environments with silty vegetated substrate better than the other mollusks (USFWS 1992). The US Department of the Interior, Bureau of Reclamation (BOR) (2004) reported the Utah valvata snail appears to be a generalist and not a specialist.

The USFWS (2005) reported that the Utah valvata snail is generally found in shallow shoreline areas and in pools adjacent to rapids. This species appears to avoid areas with heavy currents or rapids, as well as areas subject to large daily or seasonal fluctuations (USFWS 1992; USFWS 2005). The species prefers well-oxygenated areas of clean, non-reducing limestone mud or mud-sand substrate among beds of submergent aquatic vegetation, notably *Chara* sp. (BOR 2004; USFWS 2005).

Utah valvata snails graze on diatoms, periphyton, aquatic plants or other sessile organisms, and dead and decaying plant and animal debris. This species is believed to have a maximum longevity of two years, although most are believed to survive only a single year. Eggs are likely laid in masses during the period March to June and are generally attached to macrophytes near the substrate (USFWS 1992; BOR 2004).

In December 2003, the Idaho State Office, the BLM, and the Snake River Office of the USFWS entered into a consultation agreement to provide for effective and efficient ESA Section 7 consultation on Idaho BLM land use plans. As a result of the consultation, the BLM and the USFWS entered into a conservation agreement, intended to promote the conservation of listed, proposed, and candidate species (December 2005) that previously had not undergone consultation for current land use plans. Conservation measures for the bald eagle, gray wolf and Utah valvata snail describe desired recovery and conservation objectives with corresponding implementation actions that add to or replace guidance within the Pocatello RMP (1988) and Malad MFP (1981). However, on June 28, 2007, the bald eagle was delisted from the Endangered Species List. In this document, those conservation measures and other management direction for the bald eagle are addressed under Special Status Species (fauna).

3.2.7.2 BLM Sensitive Species

Vegetation

Currently there are seven sensitive plant species known to occur in a variety of vegetation communities across the planning area. Two sensitive species are suspected to occur in the PFO area. These plants, their status, and a general description of their habitat types are listed in

Table 3-11. Considering the limited acreage of special status flora habitat in the planning area acreage has been rounded to the nearest acre.

Table 3-11. Sensitive Plant Species Known or Suspected to Occur in the Pocatello Field Office Area

Sensitive Species	Vegetation Type	BLM Status ¹	GRANK/SRANK/INPS Category ¹
Species Known to Occur			
Alderleaf mountain mahogany (<i>Cercocarpus montanus</i>)	Shrub Steppe Complex (Mountain Shrub), Juniper, Aspen/Aspen Conifer Mix	Type 3 sensitive	G5/S2/SP1
Cooper's hymenoxys (<i>Hymenoxys cooperi</i> var. <i>canescens</i>)	Shrub Steppe Complex (Mid-Elevation Shrub/Mountain Shrub)	Type 4 sensitive	G4G5/S1/S
Hoary willow (<i>Salix candida</i>)	Riparian	Type 4 sensitive	G5/S2/S
Iodinebush (<i>Allenrolfea occidentalis</i>)	Riparian	Type 3 sensitive	G4/S1/SP2
Red glasswort (<i>Salicornia rubra</i>)	Riparian	Type 4 sensitive	G5/S2/S
Silky cryptantha (<i>Cryptantha sericea</i>)	Shrub Steppe Complex (Mid-Elevation Shrub)	Type 3 sensitive	G4/SNA/SP1
Starveling milkvetch (<i>Astragalus jejunus</i> var. <i>jejunus</i>)	Shrub Steppe Complex (Mid-Elevation Shrub)	Type 2 sensitive	G3T3/S2/GP3
Species Suspected to Occur			
Idaho sedge (<i>Carex idahoa</i>)	Riparian	Type 2 sensitive	G4T2/S2/GP2
Meadow milkvetch (<i>Astragalus diversifolius</i>)	Riparian	Type 3 sensitive	G3/S2/GP2

¹See **Appendix O** for definitions.

Sources: BLM Survey Data (n.d.) and Idaho Conservation Data Center (2004)

Alderleaf mountain mahogany

Alderleaf mountain mahogany is a shrub that prefers well drained soils and can occur in a wide variety of shrub and juniper vegetation types. In the PFO area alderleaf mountain mahogany is known from a single occurrence on approximately 1 acre of public land in the Yago Creek drainage of the Portneuf Range. Alderleaf mountain mahogany can be killed by fire and wildfire is the primary threat to the Yago Creek occurrence. There is potential habitat throughout the planning area and more inventories are needed to determine the range of this species in Idaho.

Cooper's Hymenoxys

Cooper's hymenoxys can often be found on windswept ridges, hills, and benches (above 6,000 ft) and occupies approximately 29 of public land. This species is generally associated with black sagebrush, bluebunch wheatgrass, and Simpson's hedgehog cactus. Currently, there are four known occurrences of Cooper's hymenoxys in the planning area. Three occurrences are in the

Pleasantview Hills and one is in the Deep Creek Range (BLM no date). Establishment of roads, trails, firebreaks, and range improvements (e.g., pipelines, troughs, fences) and other surface disturbances are threats to Cooper's hymenoxys. There is potential habitat of this species in the Deep Creek and Sublette Ranges, Samaria Mountain, and Pleasantview Hills. Avoiding or restricting motorized vehicle use, the establishment of firebreaks, range improvement, and other surface disturbances in habitat would contribute towards conserving Cooper's hymenoxys in Idaho.

Hoary Willow

Hoary willow has a close affinity with calcareous fens, but can also grow in wet, hummocky, swamps and meadows. Hoary willow is known from two occurrences and occupies approximately 42 acres. Approximately 32 acres of hoary willow habitat can be found along the Blackfoot Reservoir near Henry Idaho, and approximately 10 acres of habitat can also be found in the large wetland complex just west of the Aspen Range. Habitat along the Blackfoot Reservoir occupies the public land withdraw for the Fort Hall Irrigation Project and the BLM and Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) share land management authority. Excessive livestock grazing, agricultural conversions, establishment of roads and trails, and alterations to natural floodplain dynamics are threats to hoary willow. Potential habitat of this species can be found in Caribou and Bingham Counties. Management actions designed to improve the condition of riparian areas, limit motorized vehicle use, and maintain natural floodplain dynamics are needed to conserve hoary willow in Idaho.

Iodinebush & Red glasswort

Iodinebush and red glasswort are succulent forbs that prefer to grow in moist saline and/or alkali flats. They are often associated with saltgrass, goosefoot, and other halophytes. Iodinebush and red glasswort are known from two occurrences near the Malad River in the Malad Valley on approximately 76 acres of public land. Red glasswort is also known from a small occurrence on approximately 2 acres of public land in the Stump Creek drainage of Caribou County. Primary threats of iodinebush and red glasswort are alterations to natural floodplain dynamics, establishment of roads and trails, and invasive species/noxious weeds. Closing occupied habitat of these species to cross-country travel by motorized vehicles and the maintenance of natural floodplain dynamics would contribute to the conservation of these Sensitive Plants on public lands. Control of invasive species/noxious weeds in and near habitat would also provide long-term maintenance of habitat.

Silky cryptantha & Starveling milkvetch

Silky cryptantha and starveling milkvetch grow on barren hills of loose soil and are often associated with low growing sagebrush, cushion forb, and bunchgrass species. They are also almost always growing in association with each other. Eight occurrences of silky cryptantha and starveling milkvetch are known on the Bear Lake Plateau and Sheep Creek Hills of Bear Lake County. These two plant species are known to occupy approximately 168 acres of public land. Habitat is primarily threatened by mineral (e.g., Oil & Gas, stone, and gravel) development activities, establishment of roads and trails, excessive livestock use, surface disturbing actions, rights-of-way (ROW) and fire suppression (firebreaks) activities. Avoiding or restricting surface

disturbing activities and adjustments to livestock grazing management are needed to conserve these species in Idaho.

Idaho Sedge (Suspected)

Idaho sedge is herbaceous perennial that has the potential to occur on public lands in Caribou, Bannock and Bingham Counties. Idaho sedge prefers moist calcareous meadows and is often associated with a diversity of grasses and forbs. Areas with potential habitat should be inventoried to determine if this species occurs on public lands.

Meadow milkvetch (Suspected)

Meadow milkvetch prefers to grow in alkaline sedge dominated meadows. Potential of habitat of Meadow milkvetch exists in Caribou and Bingham Counties. Areas with potential habitat should be inventoried to determine if this species occurs on public lands.

Watch List Plant Species

There are eight plant species listed on the Watch List (**Table 3-12**) that are either known or suspected to occur in the planning area. Plants listed on the Watch List are species that may be of conservation concern in Idaho, but lack sufficient information to base a recommendation regarding their appropriate classification. Watch List species are not considered Sensitive Species and associated Sensitive Species guidance does not apply. However, the Watch List includes species that may be added to the Sensitive Species List depending upon inventory and monitoring updates and/or changes of conservation status.

Table 3-12. Watch List Plant Species and Associated Vegetation Types

Scientific Name	Common Name	Vegetation Type
<i>Aspicilia fruticulosa</i>	Rimmed lichen	Shrub Steppe Complex (Low- and Mid-Elevation Shrub)
<i>Carex occidentalis</i>	Western sedge	Shrub Steppe Complex (Mountain Shrub); Aspen/Aspen Conifer Mix; Riparian; and Dry Conifer
<i>Carex tumulicola</i>	Foothill sedge	Shrub Steppe Complex (Mid-Elevation Shrub/Mountain Shrub), Aspen/Aspen Conifer Mix, and Riparian
<i>Cymopterus ibapensis</i>	Ibapah springparsley	Shrub Steppe Complex
<i>Juncus hallii</i>	Hall's rush	Riparian
<i>Muhlenbergia glomerata</i>	Spiked muhly	Riparian
<i>Muhlenbergia racemosa</i>	Marsh muhly	Riparian
<i>Pediocactus simpsonii</i>	Simpson's hedgehog cactus	Shrub Steppe Complex (Low- and Mid-Elevation Shrub, Mountain Shrub), Juniper

Sources: BLM Survey Data (n.d.), Idaho Conservation Data Center (2004), and Idaho Native Plant Society (n.d.).

Inventory and monitoring of species listed on the Watch List is needed to determine an appropriate classification of conservation status in Idaho.

Fish and Wildlife

Habitat Conservation Efforts

Idaho conservation efforts, final habitat conservation assessments, and conservation strategies have been prepared and are currently being implemented for the following BLM special status species with the potential to occur on the PFO area: Townsend’s big-eared bat (*Corynorhinus townsendii*), greater sage-grouse (*Centrocercus urophasianus*), Bonneville cutthroat trout (*Oncorhynchus clarki utah*), and Yellowstone cutthroat trout (*O. clarki bouveri*). Draft habitat conservation assessments and conservation strategies have been prepared for the following BLM special status species: trumpeter swan (*Cygnus buccinator*), northern goshawk (*Accipiter gentilis*), Columbian sharp-tailed grouse (*Tympanuchus phasianellus columbianus*), and leatherside chub (*Gila copei*). Identified species occupy a variety of the upland, riparian, and aquatic habitats in the PFO area.

The goals, objectives, and proposed actions of these conservation agreements and strategies will be incorporated into the RMP by reference, and the PFO area will remain actively involved in implementing them. All parties to these agreements recognize that they each have specific statutory responsibilities that cannot be delegated, particularly with respect to the management and conservation of fish and wildlife, their habitats, and the management, development, and allocation of water resources. Nothing in these agreements or strategies is intended to abrogate any of the BLM’s land management responsibilities. There may not be statutory authority to implement all actions, but signatories have authority to coordinate with agencies with those specific statutory responsibilities. **Table 3-13** lists BLM sensitive fish and wildlife species and their status. High profile sensitive species are discussed in the following brief narratives.

Table 3-13. BLM Listed Sensitive Fish and Wildlife Species in the Pocatello Field Office Area

Species	Habitat	BLM Status ¹	Idaho ¹
Mammals			
Pygmy rabbit (<i>Brachylagus idahoensis</i>)	Low- and Mid-Elevation Shrub	Type 2 sensitive	SC
Townsend’s big-eared bat (<i>Corynorhinus townsendii</i>)	All habitats in PFO area near water. Bats forage over riparian areas but need appropriate roosting habitat, such as nearby cliffs, rocks, snags, and cave features	Type 3 sensitive	SC
Cliff chipmunk (<i>Tamias dorsalis</i>)	Low- and Mid-Elevation Shrub, especially in rocky areas	Type 4 sensitive	SC
Kit fox (<i>Vulpes velox</i>)	Low- and Mid-Elevation Shrub	Type 4 sensitive	SC
Uinta chipmunk (<i>Tamias umbrinus</i>)	Mid-Elevation and Mountain Shrub and Dry Conifer	Type 4 sensitive	SC

Table 3-13. BLM Listed Sensitive Fish and Wildlife Species in the Pocatello Field Office Area (continued)

Species	Habitat	BLM Status ¹	Idaho ¹
Birds			
Greater sage-grouse (<i>Centrocercus urophasianus</i>)	Low- and Mid-Elevation Shrub, Mountain Shrub, and Riparian	Type 2 sensitive	
American white pelican (<i>Pelecanus erythrorhynchos</i>)	Other: open water	Type 2 sensitive	SC
Black tern (<i>Chlidonias niger</i>)	Other: marsh/wetlands	Type 3 sensitive	SC
Brewer's sparrow (<i>Spizella breweri</i>)	Low- and Mid-Elevation Shrub	Type 3 sensitive	P
Calliope hummingbird (<i>Stellula calliope</i>)	Aspen-Conifer Mix and Riparian.	Type 3 sensitive	
Columbian sharp-tailed grouse (<i>Tympanuchus phasianellus columbianus</i>)	Seedings (perennial grasses), Mountain Shrub, and Riparian	Type 3 sensitive	GSC
Ferruginous hawk (<i>Buteo regalis</i>)	Low- and Mid-Elevation Shrub, especially on cliffs.	Type 3 sensitive	P
Flammulated owl (<i>Otus flammeolus</i>)	Dry Conifer and Aspen-Conifer Mix	Type 3 sensitive	SC
Hammond's flycatcher (<i>Empidonax hammondii</i>)	Dry Conifer, Aspen-Conifer Mix, and Wet/Cold Conifer.	Type 3 sensitive	
Lewis' woodpecker (<i>Melanerpes lewis</i>)	Dry Conifer	Type 3 sensitive	
Loggerhead shrike (<i>Lanius ludovicianus</i>)	Low-, Mid-Elevation and Mountain Shrub.	Type 3 sensitive	SC
Northern goshawk (<i>Accipiter gentilis</i>)	Dry Conifer, Aspen-Conifer Mix, and Wet/Cold Conifer.	Type 3 sensitive	SC
Olive-sided flycatcher (<i>Contopus borealis</i>)	Dry Conifer and Wet/Cold Conifer.	Type 3 sensitive	
Peregrine falcon (<i>Falco peregrinus anatum</i>)	Riparian, Other (cliff features).	Type 3 sensitive	E
Prairie falcon (<i>F. mexicanus</i>)	Low-, Mid-Elevation and Mountain Shrub) and Other (cliff features)	Type 3 sensitive	
Sage sparrow (<i>Amphispiza belli</i>)	Low- and Mid-Elevation Shrub	Type 3 sensitive	P
Trumpeter swan (<i>Cygnus buccinator</i>)	Other: open water.	Type 3 sensitive	SC
Williamson's sapsucker (<i>Sphyrapicus throideus</i>)	Dry Conifer, Aspen/Aspen Conifer Mix and Wet/Cold Conifer.	Type 3 sensitive	
Willow flycatcher (<i>Empidonax trailii</i>)	Riparian.	Type 3 sensitive	P
Virginia's warbler (<i>Vermivora virginiae</i>)	Riparian and Aspen/Aspen Conifer Mix.	Type 4 sensitive	P

Table 3-13. BLM Listed Sensitive Fish and Wildlife Species in the Pocatello Field Office Area (continued)

Species	Habitat	BLM Status ¹	Idaho ¹
White-faced ibis (<i>Plegadis chihi</i>)	Other: marsh/wetlands.	Type 4 sensitive	P
Reptiles and Amphibians			
Northern leopard frog (<i>Rana pipiens</i>)	Riparian.	Type 2 sensitive	SC
Boreal toad (<i>Bufo boreas boreas</i>)	Dry Conifer, Aspen/Aspen Conifer Mix, and Riparian.	Type 2 sensitive	
Common garter snake (<i>Thamnophis sirtalis</i>)	Dry Conifer, Aspen/Aspen Conifer Mix, Mountain Shrub, and Riparian.	Type 3 sensitive	
Fish			
Yellowstone cutthroat trout (<i>Oncorhynchus clarki bouveri</i>)	Riparian.	Type 2 sensitive	
Bonneville cutthroat trout (<i>O. clarki utah</i>)	Riparian. Exists only in Bear River and its drainage.	Type 2 sensitive	
Bear Lake cutthroat (<i>O. clarki ssp.</i>)	Riparian. Exists only in Bear Lake.	Type 2 sensitive	
Bear Lake sculpin (<i>Cottus extensus</i>)	Riparian. Exists only in Bear Lake.	Type 2 sensitive	
Bear Lake whitefish (<i>Prosopium abyssiicola</i>)	Riparian. Exists only in Bear Lake.	Type 2 sensitive	
Bonneville cisco (<i>Prosopium gemmiferum</i>)	Riparian. Exists only in Bear Lake.	Type 2 sensitive	
Bonneville whitefish (<i>P. spilonotus</i>)	Riparian. Exists only in Bear River drainage.	Type 2 sensitive	
Leatherside chub (<i>Gila copei</i>)	Riparian.	Type 3 sensitive	

¹See **Appendix O** for description of status/category rankings.

Pygmy Rabbit

The pygmy rabbit, a BLM type 2 sensitive species, is the smallest of all North American rabbits. It occurs in Low- and Mid-Elevation Shrub types in dense stands of tall sagebrush and is the only rabbit in North America known to dig its own burrow. It spends most of its life within 30 feet of its burrow. Topography and soil are very important in choosing a burrow site. The looser sandy soils with tall sagebrush overstory favored by this rabbit are not common on the public lands in the PFO area. During the winter of 2006-2007, IDFG surveyed portions of the Bear Lake Plateau for pygmy rabbits and documented approximately 265 active burrows on BLM-administered public lands. By testing the DNA of droppings, the IDFG estimated that approximately two-thirds of the burrows were inhabited by pygmy rabbits and the remainder by mountain cottontails. This species has been in decline in the West due to the increasingly unhealthy sagebrush habitat resulting from increased wildfire frequency and cheatgrass invasion to the sagebrush understory.

American White Pelican

The American white pelican is a BLM type 2 sensitive species that is commonly found in association with the larger open reservoirs in the PFO area. There is no pelican nesting habitat found on public land in the PFO area, but Gull Island managed by the BIA in the Blackfoot Reservoir does have a nesting colony. In the PFO area, the BLM does not currently manage any area with suitable habitat, but if such habitat were acquired, the BLM would manage it for the protection of this species.

Ferruginous Hawk

The ferruginous hawk, a BLM type 3 sensitive species, is the largest of the North American buteos. It is a neotropical migrant that breeds from southwestern Canada to central Arizona, New Mexico, and northern Texas and winters in California to northern Mexico. In the PFO area, the ferruginous hawk nests in the Low- to Mid-Elevation Shrub vegetation types, often at edge of juniper habitats. It is highly sensitive to human disturbance and is threatened by habitat loss from oil and gas development, agricultural practices, and urban encroachment. It has experienced a decline across much of its range and has been extirpated from some of its former breeding grounds in Idaho. The nesting population in the Raft River-Curlew Valley is considered to be of global importance (Chipley 1998) because it provides habitat for more than one percent of the world's breeding ferruginous hawk population (**Figure 3-6**).

Northern Goshawk

The northern goshawk is a BLM type 3 sensitive species. It generally occurs in undisturbed forested areas. Areas of potentially suitable nesting habitat for northern goshawk within the PFO include Dry Conifer, Wet/Cold Conifer, and Aspen Conifer Mix forest vegetation types dominated by spruce, fir, pine, and aspen. The decreasing population of this species is most likely due to loss of habitat.

Columbian Sharp-Tailed Grouse

The Columbian sharp-tailed grouse is one of six subspecies of sharp-tailed grouse and is a BLM type 3 sensitive species (**Figure 3-6**). A 1980 paper indicated that Columbian sharp-tailed grouse occupied less than 10 percent of its former range in Idaho, Montana, Utah, and Wyoming and 10 to 50 percent in Colorado and Washington (Miller and Graul 1980). Intensive grazing was shown to be the most important factor, followed by the conversion of rangelands to cropland and ecological succession (Miller and Graul 1980). Recent studies have identified the loss of the Shrub Steppe habitats from agricultural expansion, fire, invasion of nonnative annual vegetation, and overgrazing by livestock (Ulliman et al. 1998).

The Columbian sharp-tailed grouse occupies various habitats within the PFO area, including Low- and Mid-Elevation Shrub, Mountain Shrub, and Perennial Grass. Idaho remains a stronghold for the Columbian sharp-tailed grouse populations, with 75 percent of the remaining birds (Page and Ritter 1999). Occupied habitats vary from sagebrush/grass native habitats to Conservation Reserve Program (CRP) lands and recently expanding into old crested wheatgrass fields. The implementation of the CRP in 1987 substantially benefited Columbian sharp-tailed grouse populations within the PFO area, an estimated six-fold increase, and all populations are

considered to be stable to increasing in numbers. The draft Conservation Strategy for Columbian sharp-tailed Grouse and its Habitat in Idaho (1998) has identified additional areas for reintroduction. The PFO has cooperated in the transplant program to Oregon, Montana, Washington, and Nevada for the past five years.

In southeastern Idaho, the largest concentrations of Columbian sharp-tailed grouse are in Fremont, Bonneville, and Oneida Counties (Ulliman 1995). Most of the habitat use by Columbian sharp-tails on public land in the PFO area is for winter range in the mountain brush type. For the most part, the lekking (courtship display), nesting, and brood rearing occurs on private CRP land. The greatest risk to the population is the loss of CRP land, which would likely result in a large reduction in Columbian sharp-tail production. That would make the small amount of year-round habitat on public land of crucial importance. Careful management of these areas would ensure the continued existence of the Columbian sharp-tailed grouse.

Greater Sage-Grouse

This BLM type 2 sensitive species was formerly one of the most wide-ranging and abundant native upland game birds in the western US (Dalke et al. 1963; BLM et al. 2000). Greater sage-grouse is considered a sagebrush obligate species, and its dependence on sagebrush is striking and well documented (Wallstead 1975). Greater sage-grouse is physiologically adapted to eating soft sagebrush leaves. Suitable greater sage-grouse habitats consist of sage-dominated landscapes that exhibit a diverse understory component of native grass and forbs. A complex of seasonal ranges forms a mosaic or spatial arrangement that determines the landscape's potential for grouse (Wyoming Game and Fish Department [WGFD] 2003).

A 1997 broad-scale assessment of the Columbia River Basin identified sagebrush steppe as the highest priority habitat for conservation, based on trends in bird populations and habitat degradation (Quigley and Arbelbide 1997; Saab and Rich 1997). The loss of sagebrush steppe habitat, along with a reduction in habitat quality, is thought to be the reason for the decline of, and the greatest risk to, the continued presence of greater sage-grouse in Idaho (Page and Ritter 1999).

In May 1999, the Washington state greater sage-grouse population was petitioned for listing under the ESA. In 2001, the USFWS found the listing was warranted but precluded by higher priority listings (USFWS 2001a). This was the first of seven petitions the USFWS received calling for listing greater sage-grouse under the ESA through December 2003. The justifications for the petitions revolve around population decline and habitat loss.

A new concern presented itself in the western hemisphere when West Nile virus arrived in Queens, New York, in 1999. By 2003, it had moved west and has been confirmed in the deaths of 27 greater sage-grouse. West Nile virus expanded rapidly into 11 states in the summer of 2003, including Colorado and Wyoming. In 2006, Idaho reported 11 cases of the West Nile virus in sage-grouse. Seven of the cases in 2006 and one case in 2007 were reported from the Duck Valley Indian Reservation (Idaho Sage-grouse Advisory Committee 2008). IDFG closed the sage-grouse season in portions of southwest Idaho because of West Nile concerns in 2006. West Nile virus is now a part of the Idaho ecological landscape, with unknown consequences for greater sage-grouse. West Nile virus appears to move from mosquitoes to birds and other animals, including humans (US Geological Survey [USGS] 2004).

Idaho BLM policy states that the *Conservation Plan for the Greater Sage-grouse in Idaho* (Idaho Sage-grouse Advisory Committee 2006) will be used as a reference resource to support and guide NEPA analysis and decisions affecting sage-grouse or sage-grouse habitat on Idaho BLM-administered public lands. The plan details the threats to the greater sage-grouse in Idaho and recommends conservation actions. Relevant management activities in RMPs shall be designed and implemented consistent with the guidance included in the *Conservation Plan for the Greater Sage-grouse* per Idaho BLM Instruction Memorandum No. ID-2009-006.

Greater sage-grouse populations are known to have distinct seasonal ranges, and some populations exhibit migratory patterns between distinct seasonal ranges that can exceed 47 miles (Dalke et al. 1963; Connelly, et al.1988). Research has yet to determine if any migratory greater sage-grouse populations exist within the PFO area (Connelly 2005). Although greater sage-grouse populations may move within ranges, they have been documented to show a high degree of fidelity to their seasonal ranges (Connelly et al. 2000). Traditional greater sage-grouse winter and summer habitat (key habitats) ranges in the PFO area are shown in **Figure 3-7**.

As fall progresses, but before heavy snowfall, greater sage-grouse move to wintering habitats. They tend to select areas with higher/taller overall sagebrush canopy coverage. It is critical that in high snow accumulation years, the tops of sagebrush plants extend 10 to 12 inches above the snow to provide food and cover for wintering grouse. In Idaho, greater sage-grouse select wintering areas of Wyoming big sagebrush that provides greater canopy cover in stands containing taller shrubs, compared to random sites (Connelly et al. 2000). Most of the winter range in the PFO area is on wind-swept ridges above the leks and brood-rearing areas.

In the PFO area, about half of the hens nest within three miles of the lek where they were bred (Connelly et al. 2000). Hens select shrubs having more ground and lateral cover, shrubs with larger canopies, and stands of sagebrush that exhibit more shrub canopy cover than random sites. Shrub communities attractive to grouse for nesting usually range between 8 and 18 inches height, but individual plants may reach 32 inches in height, with sagebrush canopy cover of 6% to 40%. These same sites generally should have a good stand of residual grasses with higher amounts of forbs (Wyoming Game and Fish Department 2003). Nesting hens also tend to select the tallest sagebrush plant within a stand to nest under and the mean height commonly used for nesting ranges from 11 to 31 inches (Keister and Willis 1986; Wakkinen 1990; Connelly et al. 2000). The understory grass component is an important element in nest success. Grass greater than 7 inches tall within stands of sagebrush 16 to 31 inches tall resulted in reduced nest predation, as compared to shorter stands (Gregg et al. 1994). Meeting these guidelines is the greatest opportunity for maintaining or increasing the number of greater sage-grouse in the PFO area. This includes restoring marginal habitat in the R1 and R2 categories and reconnecting isolated populations.

Immediately upon hatching, broods will move some distance from the nest site. Some have been reported to move as far as five miles in the first ten days. Early brood habitats may be used for up to a month and are selected for their elevated forb composition and increased insect activity. Insects make up most a chick's diet, and some studies have indicated as much as seventy five percent. Early brood rearing habitat includes more open sagebrush canopy (WGFD 2003). Riparian areas provide an important source for brood-rearing habitats and migration corridors (Call and Maser 1985).

From mid-July through mid-September, greater sage-grouse hens move their broods out of vegetation communities that become desiccated to more mesic sites that provide the possibility of succulent vegetation, usually in the form of forbs. They select areas that exhibit abundant forbs that often include riparian areas. These areas are usually limited in size within a landscape and are very important (Connelly et al. 2000).

Habitat Condition

Overall greater sage-grouse populations remain well below historic levels (Connelly et al. 2000). The most recent trends of greater sage-grouse populations in Idaho have shown a slight increase following the decline of about 40 percent from their long-term average. Greater sage-grouse populations have declined despite management and research efforts that date to the 1930s (Connelly et al. 2000). The most recent documentation of population trends for greater sage-grouse in the PFO is contained in the Conservation Plan for the Greater Sage-Grouse in Idaho (Idaho Sage-grouse Advisory Committee 2006). The average number of males per lek was used to document population trends. Most of the sage-grouse habitat in the PFO is contained in two sage-grouse planning areas (SGPA), the Curlew SGPA and the East Idaho Uplands SGPA. Lek data collected in the Curlew SGPA was insufficient to reliably document a population trend. In the East Idaho Uplands SGPA, one lek route indicated male attendance at leks averaged 31 males in 1983. The same lek route averaged only three to six males per lek from 1996 to 2003.

Factors considered to be contributing to the decline from historic population levels of greater sage-grouse throughout their range include drought, habitat loss from fire, conversion of native habitats to agriculture/farming, invasive species, pesticides, recreation, vegetation management, livestock grazing, introduced nonnative plants, weeds, fragmentation, mining, urban expansion, power lines, predation, rangeland conversion and hunting (Connelly et al. 2000; Blus et al. 1989, Braun 1998; WGFD 2003). The 2006 Conservation Plan for the Greater Sage-grouse in Idaho lists the top five threats to greater sage-grouse in Idaho as wildfire, infrastructure, annual grassland, livestock impacts, and human disturbance. Other threats listed in the Conservation Plan include west Nile virus, prescribed burning, seeded perennial, climate change, conifer encroachment, isolated populations, predation, and agricultural expansion.

Wildfire is a threat to greater sage-grouse populations and habitat as wildfires can quickly reach sizes of thousands of acres depending on fuel loads, weather conditions, and other factors. In the Curlew SGPA, fires between 1990 and 2003 burned approximately 81,886 acres, or approximately 21 percent of the area. In the same time period, about 46,429 acres or 9 percent of the East Idaho Uplands burned. Many of these ignitions (57 percent) were determined to be human-caused and therefore, preventable. Therefore, the use of prescribed fire as a tool to minimize the severity or spread of wildfire should be used with caution in sage grouse habitat to minimize any negative effects on grouse (Idaho Sage-grouse Advisory Committee 2006).

Two types of infrastructure development, linear and non-linear, occur within greater sage-grouse habitat in the PFO area. Linear infrastructure includes powerlines, roads, and rail lines, while non-linear infrastructure includes communications towers and wind energy development. Non-linear infrastructure features provide perching spots for raptors, and may disrupt grouse behavior. As of March 2005, there were no wind energy developments in the Curlew or East

Idaho Uplands SGPAs but numerous communication towers exist (Idaho Sage-grouse Advisory Committee 2006).

Annual grasslands occur within sage-grouse habitat in the PFO. Areas dominated with annual grasslands do not provide suitable habitat to meet the seasonal habitat needs of sage-grouse. The fire regime is also altered in areas dominated with annual grasslands due to increased risk of fire ignition and rate of spread. Annual grasslands are invasive species that spread rapidly and contribute to the degradation of sage-grouse habitat. Restoration of these affected lands will require a long-term commitment to restore their suitability to sage-grouse (Idaho Sage-grouse Advisory Committee 2006).

Livestock grazing has occurred within most of the sagebrush vegetation type in Idaho, which has contributed to the degradation of sage grouse habitat (Idaho Sage-grouse Advisory Committee 2006). Livestock grazing has changed the proportion of the shrub, grass, and forb functional groups, thereby increasing opportunities for the introduction and spread of noxious weeds. In some cases, it has also caused an overall decline in site potential through the loss of topsoil. However, implementation of improved grazing management practices including the control of the timing, intensity, duration, and frequency of grazing, as well as the sequence of treatments over time, have improved the vegetative conditions on many Idaho rangelands. Livestock grazing infrastructure, such as fences, water developments, and salt and mineral supplements, frequently occur in greater sage-grouse habitat (Idaho Sage-grouse Advisory Committee 2006).

According to the 2006 Conservation Plan for the Greater Sage-Grouse in Idaho, human disturbance threatens sage-grouse habitat in a variety of ways. Recreation, particularly OHV use, has been increasing nation-wide as well as in the PFO area. Other human activities including rangeland improvement practices, vegetation manipulation projects, roads construction and maintenance, mineral or energy developments, and other similar activities occur in sage-grouse habitat.

Habitat conditions for greater sage-grouse vary throughout the PFO area. Herbaceous cover remains an important habitat component in meeting adequate nesting and brood rearing requirements. An important factor affecting herbaceous cover includes the amount of cover remaining (residual cover) following livestock grazing within greater sage-grouse habitat. The diversity and availability of forbs, grasses, sagebrush canopy cover, and sagebrush height are primary indicators of quality habitat (Call and Maser 1985). Wildfire has affected areas of greater sage-grouse habitat by removing sagebrush, causing the habitat to degrade through the invasion of nonnative plants, further isolating populations. Increasingly separated and isolated populations have become common throughout the grouse's range (Beck et. al. 2003).

Common predators of the greater sage-grouse include a number of raptor species such as golden eagles, red-tailed hawks and Swainson's hawk, as well as common ravens. Raptors will hunt adult and juvenile grouse while ravens will hunt juveniles as well as predate nests. Other predators include mammalian species such as coyotes, badgers, and red foxes. Predation can be an important cause of greater sage-grouse mortality for both adults and chicks. Predation during nesting and early brood rearing activities can have significant influences on greater sage-grouse populations (WGFD 2003). Predation of adults may be an influence on females during incubation and brood-rearing and for males during the breeding season. Two studies in Idaho

reported annual adult survival rates from 42 to 75 percent (Connelly et. al. 1994; Wik 2002). The annual survival of breeding age birds tends to be greater than 50 percent in most situations and as high as 75 percent for females in Idaho (Idaho Sage-grouse Advisory Committee 2006). In general, these survival rates are higher than for other gamebirds (Connelly et al. 1994).

The BLM and its partners have split greater sage-grouse habitat into six categories: Key Habitat, Restoration 1, Restoration 2, Restoration 3, Stronghold Habitat, and Isolated Habitat. **Table 3-14** lists the acres of each of these categories within the PFO area. Key habitats are areas of generally intact sagebrush that provide sage-grouse habitat during some portion of the year. Restoration 1 areas are sagebrush limited areas characterized by perennial grass species composition and/or structure that should provide suitable nesting habitat in the future, once sufficient sagebrush cover is reestablished. Restoration 2 areas are areas dominated or strongly influenced by invasive annuals such as cheatgrass or medusahead rye or similar species. Areas with sagebrush may be present, but, in general, understories are not suitable for sage-grouse. Restoration 3 areas are areas where junipers or other conifer species are encroaching into sage-grouse habitat. Small inclusions of perennial grasslands, either native or introduced, or other habitats, such as mountain mahogany, may be present. Because of the critical nature of these areas, they should not only be protected from catastrophic fires but should be maintained and improved as needed.

Table 3-14. Pocatello Field Office Greater Sage-grouse Habitat (Acres)

	Field Office Total (Federal, State, and Private)	Field Office (Public Lands)
Key Habitat	710,357	221,222
Restoration 1	115,072	58,170
Restoration 2	0.0	0.0
Restoration 3	12,038	11,570
Stronghold Habitat	417,115	227,566
Isolated Habitat	125,961	22,562

Source: Idaho Sage-grouse Advisory Committee 2006

Amphibians

Boreal Toad

This is a BLM type 2 sensitive species. In Idaho, the boreal toad subspecies is the population of western toads south of the Snake River that appears to be more closely related to the Colorado population than the populations in the rest of its distribution. This species inhabits areas near springs, streams, meadows, and woodlands between 7,000 and 12,000 feet elevation in the western portions of North America. Boreal toads breed in wetland areas during May and June. Once the breeding season has ended, the adults tend to move away from wetland areas and toward moist coniferous forest. Boreal toad populations have been declining throughout their range because of habitat loss and degradation, environmental contaminants, and disease and possibly because of changing environmental conditions, such as ozone depletion. Management of riparian areas and wetlands to maintain the vegetation in a properly functioning condition is key to the ensured presence of toads on public lands. This is a candidate species for listing under the ESA in Colorado, New Mexico, and Wyoming.

Northern Leopard Frog

This is a BLM type 2 sensitive species and can be found throughout the northern portions of North America, extending down through the PFO area into the Bonneville Basin and as far south as Arizona and New Mexico. Northern leopard frogs are found in riparian/wetland areas, in a variety of habitats, including grasslands, brushlands, woodlands, and forest habitats between sea level and about 11,000 feet elevation. The best northern leopard frog habitats on public lands in the PFO area are the least disturbed riparian areas. Maintaining them and improving those in less than proper functioning condition is the best opportunity for maintaining or increasing the population on public lands.

Fish

Yellowstone Cutthroat Trout

Yellowstone cutthroat trout became isolated in the headwaters of the Snake River following the creation of Shoshone Falls somewhere between 30,000 and 60,000 years ago. Historic habitat essentially covered the entire Snake River drainage above Shoshone Falls, which includes the Blackfoot, Salt, and Portneuf River drainages. Historic Yellowstone cutthroat trout river and stream habitat within Idaho is estimated to be nearly 4,000 miles. In addition, Henry's Lake and two Palisades lakes were thought to be occupied. Recent assessments indicate less than 2,000 miles are currently occupied, or about forty-three percent, including streams flowing through private, state, and Federal lands. At present, an estimated eighty to ninety percent of occupied Yellowstone cutthroat trout habitat occurs within the National Forest System.

Another cutthroat trout having fine pepper-like spotting is currently found in the Snake River and its tributaries, from Jackson Lake to the Palisades Reservoir. When first inventoried, this fish was thought to be a separate subspecies, but continued genetic comparison of the two cutthroat forms has not provided definitive proof that would lead to a total acceptance that the "fine-spotted" cutthroat trout is indeed a separate subspecies. Therefore, current taxonomy simply lists the fish as a generic subspecies (*Oncorhynchus clarki* subsp.) (Forest Service 1996; Behnke 1992). In this document, both subspecies are considered as one.

The Yellowstone cutthroat trout is found in the Blackfoot River, Portneuf River, Salt River, Willow Creek, and Bannock Creek watersheds. In the Blackfoot River watershed, Yellowstone cutthroat trout in the PFO area have strong populations in Wolverine Creek, Rawlins Creek, Brush Creek and Browns Canyon Creek. Depressed populations are found in Blackfoot River proper, Blackfoot Reservoir, Lanes Creek and Lander Creek. Fishery habitat condition trend in the Blackfoot River watershed is static to slowly improving.

In the Portneuf River watershed, Yellowstone cutthroat trout in the PFO area have strong populations in Rapid Creek, Goodenough Creek, and Bell Marsh Creek. Depressed populations are found in Gibson Jack Creek, mainstem Mink Creek, Walker Creek, Harkness Creek, Robbers Roost Creek, Garden Creek, Stockton Creek, and King Creek. Fishery habitat condition trend in the Portneuf River watershed is static to slowly improving.

The Salt River watershed in the PFO area has strong populations of Yellowstone cutthroat trout in Stump and Horse Creeks, with depressed populations in Tygee and Crow Creeks. Habitat

condition trends on Stump and Horse Creeks are in a steady upward trend, while Tygee and Crow Creek populations are static.

The entire Willow Creek watershed is historic Yellowstone cutthroat trout range, but there is very little stream habitat in the watershed managed by the PFO. Most of the Bannock Creek watershed is in the Fort Hall Indian Reservation. The watershed is historic Yellowstone cutthroat trout habitat but very little is known about the current status. The BLM manages two small but strong populations of Yellowstone cutthroat populations in Midnight and Crystal Creeks. Habitat conditions are showing an upward trend.

Habitat and Species Trends

The Yellowstone cutthroat trout fishery in the Blackfoot Reservoir and the mainstem above the reservoir has been greatly affected by the last three years of drought. The operation of the Blackfoot River Dam by the BIA during the nonirrigation season limits flows on the river to approximately 30 cubic feet/second, which severely limits salmonid habitat, in particular, overwinter habitat. Dam releases for irrigation result in extremely high summer flows, likely affecting available habitat for salmonids. In some places, the high flows can restrict fisherman access to the river.

Regulatory Status

The American Fisheries Society designated this species a “Species of Special Concern – Class A” and petitioned for its listing under the ESA. The ninety-day finding for the petition to list the Yellowstone cutthroat trout as threatened stated that “the petition failed to present substantial information indicating that listing this subspecies of fish may be warranted at this time” (USFWS 2001b). The Forest Service and the BLM have designated the species as sensitive, and Idaho Fish and Game identified it as a species of special concern.

In March 2000, five states, Yellowstone National Park, and the Forest Service entered into a memorandum of agreement (MOA) intended to provide a range-wide focus on shared goals and objectives for the conserving and restoring Yellowstone cutthroat trout. The stated goal of the MOA is to “ensure the persistence of the Yellowstone cutthroat subspecies within its historic range and to manage Yellowstone cutthroat trout to preserve genetic integrity and provide adequate numbers and populations to provide for the protection and maintenance of both the intrinsic and recreational values associated with this fish” (Montana Department of Fish, Wildlife, and Parks et al. 2000). In 2003, the State of Idaho developed a management plan for Yellowstone cutthroat trout (IDFG 2003a). In 2004, the Interstate, Interagency Yellowstone Cutthroat Trout MOA Group developed a range-wide assessment of the historic and current distribution of the cutthroat, with emphasis on genetic purity, habitat conditions, migration barriers, and the overall health of the greater five state populations (May et al. 2004). The emphasis is on defining and managing core populations (genetically pure), conservation populations (slightly introgressed populations), and recreational populations (highly introgressed but still possessing a significant amount of cutthroat genetic material).

Bonneville Cutthroat Trout

The Bonneville cutthroat trout is the only trout native to the Great Basin. The species thrived in ancient Lake Bonneville and its tributaries. About 8,000 years ago, the lake desiccated and populations fragmented, forcing the trout into streams throughout the basin, forming isolated disjunct populations. As a result, two populations with genetic differences are evident today between the Bear River Basin Bonneville cutthroat trout and those found in the main Bonneville Basin in southern Utah. The Bonneville cutthroat trout evolved in a lake environment. After Lake Bonneville was drained, only Bear Lake (adjacent to a small portion of the PFO area), Utah Lake (near Provo, Utah) and Panguitch Lake (Utah) retained lake populations. Of these populations, only Bear Lake populations still survive. During the past 150 years, metapopulations have been significantly reduced by human activities, including nonnative trout introductions and habitat fragmentation (Forest Service 1996; Kershner 1995).

Spawning occurs in the spring, normally in April and May, depending on local water temperature. Like other trout, the female digs a small depression in the gravel substrate where she deposits her eggs. She is usually attended by a single male, and both the male and female protect the redd during spawning. The eggs usually hatch in two to four months. After spawning there is usually a significant mortality of adults. Because cutthroat and rainbow trout spawn in the same places at the same times, there is considerable hybridization between the two species. Feeding habits of Bonneville cutthroat trout are similar to other trout, and the diet consists primarily of aquatic and terrestrial insects. Fish make up a sizable portion of the diet of larger fish (Simpson and Wallace 1982).

The historic habitat for the Bonneville cutthroat trout, found within the upper Bear River Subbasin (4th Hydrologic Unit Code [HUC]) in Idaho, is estimated to include about 2,000 stream miles. About twenty-nine percent of this historical mileage occurs within the boundaries of the Bridger-Teton, Caribou, and Wasatch-Cache National Forests. Populations are estimated to exist only in about seven percent of the historical mileage (Forest Service 1996).

The Bonneville cutthroat trout is currently found in a small number of streams in the Bear River watershed. On lands managed by the PFO, there are strong populations of Bonneville cutthroat trout in Co-op Creek and Maple Creek, with depressed populations in the mainstem Bear River, North Creek, Montpelier Creek, Georgetown Creek, Steve's Creek, Paris Creek, Cottonwood Creek and Dry Creek. There are also small depressed populations in the Dairy Creek drainage of the Malad River watershed, but there are no populations on public land.

Regulatory Status

The Forest Service and the BLM have identified the Bonneville cutthroat trout as a sensitive species. The Idaho Fish and Game has categorized it as species of special concern. The trout was petitioned for listing under the ESA on December 8, 1998, and the USFWS issued a determination on the Bonneville cutthroat trout petition of "not warranted" for listing under the ESA on October 9, 2001.

In 1994, the Forest Service signed a conservation agreement to aggressively manage lands within the Montpelier-Elk Valley Cattle and Horse Allotment, which includes lands within both the Thomas Fork drainage (Pruess, Dry, and Giraffe Creeks) and the Salt River drainage (Crow

Creek and tributaries). Participating parties are IDFG, Idaho Soil Conservation Commission, Caribou Cattlemen's Association, Bear Lake Soil and Water Conservation District, IDEQ, NRCS, and the Forest Service. The agreement, last reviewed and amended in March 2000, revised livestock grazing practices throughout the allotment and specified actions needed to improve stream and riparian habitat conditions. A comprehensive monitoring protocol was also established. Monitoring has revealed an improvement in overall habitat conditions, and increases in fish populations have been documented.

In addition, a range-wide Conservation Agreement and Strategy for Bonneville Cutthroat Trout was signed in December 2000 by IDFG, Nevada Division of Wildlife, Utah Department of Natural Resources, WGFD, Confederated Tribes of the Goshute Reservation, BLM, National Park Service, Forest Service, and Utah Reclamation Mitigation and Conservation Commission. The agreement outlines specific conservation actions and activities to be completed within ten years, with the most significant actions to benefit Bonneville cutthroat trout to be implemented within five years.

On August 28, 2002, a settlement agreement was reached with PacifiCorp resolving the relicensing of the Bear River Hydroelectric Project. The BLM was signatory to this agreement, which called for developing a Bonneville Cutthroat Trout Restoration Plan for the Bear River watershed and for forming an environmental coordination committee to implement the restoration plan. The BLM will be a member of the committee to help direct the restoration and recovery of Bonneville cutthroat trout in the Bear River watershed and specifically on public lands within the PFO area. The PacifiCorp will fund restoration activities over the 30-year life of the new license.

Inland Native Fish Strategy

The Inland Native Fish Strategy (INFISH) is an interim strategy designed to provide additional protection for existing populations of native trout, outside the range of anadromous fish, on 22 national forests in the Pacific Northwest Northern and Intermountain Regions (west of the continental divide in the Columbia River Drainage). Implementing this strategy was deemed necessary because these species were at risk due to habitat degradation, introduction of invasive species/noxious weeds, loss of migratory forms, and overfishing. As part of this strategy, the regional foresters designated a network of priority watersheds. Priority watersheds are drainages that still contain excellent habitat or assemblages of native fish, that provide for metapopulation objectives, or that are watersheds, which have excellent potential for restoration.

INFISH also established interim Riparian Management Objectives (RMOs) and Riparian Habitat Conservation Areas (RHCAs). RMOs are habitat parameters that describe good fish habitat and include pool frequency, water temperature, large woody debris, bank stability, lower bank angle, and width/depth ratio. Where site-specific data is available, these RMOs can be adjusted to better describe local stream conditions through the development of a watershed analysis. These RMOs for stream channel conditions provide the criteria against which attainment or progress toward attainment of riparian goals is measured. RHCAs are portions of watersheds where riparian-dependent resources receive primary emphasis. The RHCAs are defined for four categories of stream or water bodies that depend on flow conditions and presence of fish. The RHCAs are

areas where specific management activities are subject to standards and guidelines in INFISH, in addition to existing standards and guidelines in the RMPs.

INFISH became a BLM planning and management policy following the signing of the biological assessment (June 15, 1998) and the subsequent biological opinion (August 14, 1998) on the *Effects to Bull Trout from Continued Implementation of Land and Resource Management Plans and Resource Management Plans, as Amended by the Interim Strategy for Managing Fish-Producing Watershed in Eastern Oregon and Washington, Idaho, Western Montana and Portions of Nevada* (Forest Service 1995). INFISH as BLM management policy was reaffirmed under the Interior Columbia Basin Ecosystem Management Project (ICBEMP) Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (Forest Service and BLM 2000b).

Because RMOs and RHCAs of INFISH are interim, and because the ICBEMP was not implemented, the state directors and regional foresters elected not to prepare a record of decision and instead have chosen to complete the project through use of The Interior Columbia Basin Strategy. An aquatic conservation component was developed under the Interior Columbia Basin Strategy, and that component or direction updates and replaces INFISH for application to RMPs in Idaho. Details regarding direction from this aquatic conservation strategy are found at <http://www.fs.fed.us/r6/fish/9506-infish.pdf>.

To meet this direction, the BLM developed the Matrix of Cutthroat (Yellowstone and Bonneville) Trout Objectives to guide the planning and conservation activities for these two salmonid species (**Appendix E**). The matrix includes cutthroat trout habitat indicators and a definition describing and quantifying their functional ecological condition, categories of which are as follows:

- Functioning properly;
- Functioning at risk; and
- Functioning at an unacceptable risk.

The aquatic habitat elements are as follows:

- Pool frequency and quality;
- Habitat complexity/channel structure;
- Spawning gravel quantity and quality;
- Salmonid rearing habitat;
- Water quality;
- Life history diversity and isolation;
- Flow/hydrology; and,
- Watershed condition (functional condition and riparian conservation area).

Bear Lake Fisheries

A unique fishery in the PFO area is Bear Lake. It contains several endemic fish species, including the Bear Lake cutthroat trout, Bear Lake whitefish, Bonneville whitefish, Bonneville cisco, and Bear Lake sculpin. There are no public lands on the lakeshore itself. Only two

streams, Indian Creek and Fish Haven Creek cross public land and their entire flow is diverted for irrigation shortly after spring runoff. BLM only indirectly influences this fishery by ensuring that the water quality of the streams leaving public lands meets State of Idaho criteria for cold water biota.

Bear Lake Cutthroat Trout

Bear Lake cutthroat trout are closely related to the Bonneville cutthroat trout strain but have evolved in Bear Lake and are well adapted to its environment. The Bear Lake cutthroat trout ascend streams to spawn from May to June, with eggs hatching a few months later. Spawning habits are closely related to other trout species. The diet of this strain of cutthroat trout is similar to other trout and consists of aquatic and terrestrial insects. As the fish becomes larger it may take smaller fish that are endemic to Bear Lake, such as the Bonneville cisco, Bonneville whitefish, Bear Lake whitefish, and the Bear Lake sculpin (Utah Division of Wildlife Resources 2004).

Bear Lake Whitefish

The natural range of the Bear Lake whitefish is limited to Bear Lake Idaho/Utah. The vertical distribution of this whitefish is generally confined to the 60-foot level and below where the water temperature is uniformly 39°F.

Spawning occurs in late January and early February, but it may stretch into March. Spawning takes place in 60 to 100 feet of water when the temperatures are between 35 and 39°F. Growth is fairly rapid in the first two years but slows after that. The Bear Lake whitefish is a dwarf variety of whitefish and seldom exceeds eight inches in length.

The diet of the Bear Lake whitefish consists of freshwater crustaceans, primarily ostracods and to a lesser extent copepods, insects, and aquatic earthworms (Simpson and Wallace 1982).

Bonneville Whitefish

The native range of the Bonneville whitefish is confined to Bear Lake Idaho/Utah. Most whitefish inhabit the cold deeper portion of Bear Lake. The normal spawning time of the Bonneville whitefish is late November and early December, when the fish move into the shallower waters and deposit eggs in rocky or sandy bars.

The food of this whitefish is more varied than other whitefish in Bear Lake. The primary food item is midge larvae, followed by copepods, ostracods, and aquatic worms. The Bonneville whitefish will also eat, on occasion, miscellaneous aquatic and terrestrial insects, including midges (Simpson and Wallace 1982).

Bonneville Cisco

Although its natural range is restricted to Bear Lake, successful transplants have been established in Lake Tahoe in California and Nevada. The Bonneville cisco spawns in late January or early February, usually in water that is two to three feet deep. However, spawning may extend to a depth of 65 feet, often after the lake has become ice covered. Eggs are broadcast

and gradually settle to the bottom and become attached to the substrate. The food of this fish consists almost exclusively of zooplankton (Simpson and Wallace 1982).

Bear Lake Sculpin

The range of the Bear Lake sculpin is restricted to Bear Lake Idaho and Utah. Spawning takes place in the spring around the rocks near shore. Like other sculpin, the eggs are deposited on the underside of rocks or other substrate. After spawning, the fish move to the deeper waters of the lake. Bear Lake sculpin are an important food source for cutthroat and lake trout (Simpson and Wallace 1982).

3.2.8 VISUAL RESOURCES

3.2.8.1 Region of Influence

Visual resources are the visible physical features on a landscape, such as land, water, vegetation, animals, and structures (BLM 2004c). The region of influence for visual resources is the 613,800 acres of public land in the planning area of southeastern Idaho.

3.2.8.2 Visual Resource Management System

It is the intent and policy of both the Department of Interior and the BLM that the visual resource values of public lands must be considered in all land use planning efforts and surface disturbing activities. This does not mean that visual resource management (VRM) should be used as a method to preclude all other resource development. It means that the visual values must be considered and those considerations documented in the decision making process, and that if resource development/extraction is approved, a reasonable attempt must be made to meet the VRM objectives for the area in question and to minimize the visual impacts of the proposal per Washington Office Information Bulletin 98-135.

The objective of the VRM system is to manage public lands in a manner that will protect the quality of the scenic values of these lands. In order to meet its responsibility to maintain the scenic values of the public lands, the BLM has developed a VRM system that addresses the following (BLM 2004d):

Different levels of scenic values require different levels of management. For example, management of an area with high scenic value might be focused on preserving the existing character of the landscape, and management of an area with little scenic value might allow for major modifications to the landscape.

Determining how an area should be managed first requires an assessment of the area's scenic values.

Assessing scenic values and determining visual impacts can be a subjective process. To describe proposed projects, objectivity and consistency can be greatly increased by using the basic design elements of form, line, color, and texture, which are often used to describe and evaluate landscapes. Projects that repeat these design elements are usually in harmony with their surroundings; those that do not repeat these elements create contrast. By adjusting project designs so the elements are repeated, visual impacts can be minimized.

The BLM's VRM system provides a way to identify and evaluate scenic values to determine the appropriate levels of management (BLM 2004d). It also provides a way to analyze potential visual impacts and apply visual design techniques to ensure that surface-disturbing activities are in harmony with their surroundings. The BLM's VRM system consists of two stages: inventory (visual resource inventory) and analysis (visual resource contrast rating).

3.2.8.3 Inventory

The inventory stage involves identifying the visual resources of an area and assigning them to inventory classes using the BLM's visual resource inventory process (BLM 2004d). This involves rating the visual appeal of a tract of land, measuring public concern for scenic quality, and determining whether the tract of land is visible from travel routes or observation points. The process is described in detail in BLM Handbook H-8410-1, *Visual Resource Inventory* (BLM 2004e).

The results of the visual resource inventory become an important component of the BLM's RMP for the area. The RMP establishes how the public lands will be used and allocated for different purposes and is developed through public participation and collaboration. Visual values are considered throughout the RMP process, and the area's visual resources are then assigned to management classes with the following established objectives:

- Class I: To preserve the existing character of the landscape. The level of change to the characteristic landscape should be very low and must not attract attention.
- Class II: To retain the existing character of the landscape. The level of change to the characteristic landscape should be low.
- Class III: To partially retain the existing character of the landscape. The level of change to the characteristic landscape should be moderate.
- Class IV: 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.

Within the region of influence, public land is categorized as follows (**Figure 3-8**):

- Class I: 11,200 acres;
- Class II: 78,600 acres;
- Class III: 221,000 acres; and
- Class IV: 303,000 acres.

3.2.8.4 Analysis

The analysis stage involves determining whether the potential visual impacts from proposed surface-disturbing activities or developments will meet the management objectives established for the area, or whether design adjustments will be required (BLM 2004d). A visual contrast rating process is used for this analysis and involves comparing the project features with the major features in the existing landscape using the basic design elements of form, line, color, and texture. This process is described in BLM Handbook H-8431-1, *Visual Resource Contrast*

Rating (BLM 2004e). The analysis can then be used as a guide for resolving visual impacts. Once every attempt is made to reduce visual impacts, BLM managers can decide whether to accept or deny project proposals. Managers also have the option of attaching additional mitigation stipulations to bring the proposal into compliance.

General Visual Setting

Class I

Figure 3-8 shows Class I public land is in the center of the planning area and northeast of Lava Hot Springs.

The Petticoat Peak Wilderness Study Area (WSA) is within the Fish Creek Mountain Range, one mile northeast of Lava Hot Springs. Topography is steep and mountainous, with Petticoat Peak being the highest point at over 8,000 feet. Many canyons and ridges radiate from the mountain peak. Dominant vegetation on the western slopes consists of junipers, mountain shrubs, and sagebrush. Thick stands of Douglas fir, intermingled with lodgepole pine, cover the WSA's eastern side. A variety of shrubs, forbs, and grasses are found throughout. Aspen groves can be found through moist sites in the area.

The Worm Creek WSA is a 40-acre tract, with two sides of the tract adjacent to the Forest Service's 16,000-acre Worm Creek Roadless Area, which is recommended for wilderness designation. The other two sides of the 40-acre tract are adjacent to private land. The topography varies from benchland to steep hillsides, and elevation ranges from 6,500 feet to 7,200 feet. The surrounding terrain contains high elevation basins and steep, rocky mountain peaks. Several peaks on the main ridge near the WSA exceed 9,000 feet. The lower, moister northern portion of the area supports a dense stand of aspen and a Douglas fir/lodgepole pine mix. Understory species include mountain maple, Oregon grape, pinegrass, snowberry, willow, and serviceberry. The area provides a suitable habitat for deer, elk, and a variety of birds and small mammals. Minimal human activity has taken place in the WSA, but there have been isolated cases of unauthorized firewood cutting and OHV use.

Class II

Figure 3-8 shows Class II public land is scattered throughout the planning area. The primary concentrations of Class II public land are between Rockland, Roy, and Arbon, south of Samaria, between Treasureton and Mink Creek, and between Goshen and Blackfoot Reservoir.

The area between Rockland, Roy, and Arbon is part of the Deep Creek Mountains, which form a rolling unbroken escarpment that begins near American Falls and runs southward toward Holbrook. Rockland Valley and Arbon Valley flank the range on the west and east, respectively. Bannock Peak (elevation 8,263 feet) and Deep Creek Peak (elevation 8,748 feet) are noticeable peaks in the mountains. Deep Creek Peak is the highest point in the range. There are several long, well-developed canyons, including Knox Canyon, and various springs in the range.

The Samaria Mountains are south of Malad. Pocatello Valley is west of the mountains, and the Malad River is east of the mountains. Samaria Creek drains the northern portion of the

mountains. Various springs and Grover Canyon, Buckboard Canyon, and North Canyon are found in the mountains.

Oneida Narrows is between Treasureton and Mink Creek. The Bear River drains Oneida Reservoir. Oneida Narrows contains a narrow band of box elder along the Bear River, with adjacent northwesterly and southeasterly facing slopes of mountain mahogany, bigtooth maple, Rocky Mountain juniper, and bluebunch wheatgrass communities (BLM 1987b). Small stands of aspen dot the slopes. Nearly vertical limestone cliffs, containing grottos and caves, provide a haven for a variety of birds and uniquely adapted plants. The area is undisturbed and diverse.

Much of the Class II public land between Goshen and Blackfoot Reservoir is along the Blackfoot River. The BLM conducted a visual resources assessment as part of the field investigations for the *Final Resource Assessment Blackfoot River Wild and Scenic River Eligibility Study and Tentative Classification* (BLM 2002a). The BLM found that the study corridor (between the Blackfoot Reservoir and the northernmost portion of the Fort Hall Indian Reservation) consisted of areas with shallow to deep canyons, rolling hills, open meadows, salt lake geologic formations, highly eroded formations, high basalt cliffs, and areas with numerous rapids and cascading whitewater. In some areas the adjacent scenery would enhance the overall visual quality of a segment of the river. The water just below the dam appeared to be cloudy and became clearer farther downstream. The water flows are regulated by the releases from the dam. Cultural modifications along the study corridor include home sites, ranches, roads (two-track, gravel, and dirt), recreation sites, fences, power lines, dams, signs, bridges, and evidence of OHV use. In general, the vegetation within the corridor had very little variety.

Class III

Figure 3-8 shows Class III public land is scattered throughout the planning area.

The primary concentrations of Class III public land are between Rockland, Roy, and Arbon, northeast of Stone and Holbrook, southeast of Pocatello, north and southeast of Lava Hot Springs, and around Pegram. The area between Rockland, Roy, and Arbon is part of the Deep Creek Mountains and is described above under Class II.

The area northeast of Stone is in the Curlew Valley, between the North Hansel Mountains to the east and Sublett Range to the west. It borders the Curlew National Grassland, which is representative of shrub steppe vegetation and topography and is predominantly covered with sagebrush and nonnative seeded grasses (Forest Service 2003b). The Curlew Valley has been identified as an IBA in the state of Idaho, and, with its mix of sagebrush grassland, CRP plantings, and agricultural lands, provides habitat for Columbian sharp-tailed grouse, greater sage-grouse, and other sagebrush associated species. Deep Creek is west of Stone and drains Stone Reservoir, which is north of Stone.

The area northeast of Holbrook is in the Pleasantview Hills, between Curlew Valley to the west and Malad Valley to the east. Numerous canyons, springs, and creeks are found in this area.

The area southeast of Pocatello is in the Pocatello Range. Noticeable peaks include Chinese Peak, Camelback Mountain, and Moonlight Mountain. Communication towers and small buildings are visible on top of Chinese Peak. Given the area's proximity to Pocatello, it is

common to find urban-rural interface disturbances, such as OHV trails that are not designated and illegal dumping.

The area north and southeast of Lava Hot Springs is in the Portneuf Range of the Caribou National Forest. The Portneuf River bisects this area, and smaller creeks drain various canyons.

The area around Pegram is in southeastern Idaho on Bear Lake Plateau and the lowlands around the Caribou National Forest. Thomas Fork drains Thomas Fork Valley in the eastern part of this area.

Class IV

Figure 3-8 shows Class IV public land is scattered throughout the planning area. The primary concentrations of Class IV public land are around Juniper, between Crystal and Woodruff, and between Chesterfield and Soda Springs.

The area between Crystal and Woodruff includes Bannock Range, the lowlands of the Pleasantview Hills, and the lowlands of the Samaria Mountains. This area is between Arbon Valley and Pocatello Valley to the west and the Caribou National Forest to the east.

The area around Juniper includes the lowlands of the Sublett Range, with Curlew Valley to the southeast and Sawtooth National Forest to the north and west. Table Mountain is visible in the southern half of this area, and numerous canyons and creeks wind through the entire area.

The area between Chesterfield and Soda Springs is in the Chesterfield Range and Blackfoot Lava Field, around Blackfoot Reservoir, and in the lowlands of the Aspen Range. The Blackfoot River drains north from the lava field, which is covered by basalt lava.

Scenic Byways

There are 1,869 miles of scenic byways in Idaho (Idaho Transportation Department 2004). The Bear Lake-Caribou Scenic Byway passes public land. The Bear Lake-Caribou Scenic Byway crosses public lands that have been designated VRM Class III and has VRM Class IV in the background.

Bear Lake straddles the Idaho-Utah border and boasts sandy beaches, water sports, fishing, boating, and Bear Lake State Park. This byway follows Bear Lake north on US 89 to Montpelier, then north on US 30, where you leave the Cache National Forest and enter the Caribou National Forest. The intersection of US 89 and US 30 at Montpelier is the site of a new trail center dedicated to the history and scenic wonders of the 2,000-mile Oregon/California Trail, part of the largest voluntary migration ever. Traveling northwest on US 30 to Soda Springs, this byway meets the Pioneer Historic Byway. From there the two byways share State Highway 34 north and east to the Wyoming border, passing Blackfoot Reservoir along the way. Special resources include Bear Lake, Bear Lake State Park, Paris Museum, Minnetonka Cave, Caribou National Forest, the Oregon Trail, and Captive Geyser in Soda Springs.

3.2.9 WATER RESOURCES

3.2.9.1 Groundwater

The northern half of the public lands within the PFO area occurs atop the Eastern Snake River Plain Aquifer, which extends from the headwaters of Camas Creek in Clark County to King Hill in Elmore County. These public lands serve as an important groundwater recharge area because they contain recent lava flows with thin soil cover (less than 40 inches), allowing precipitation to easily infiltrate to the aquifer (Garabedian 1992).

Regionally, groundwater moves through the Eastern Snake River Plain Aquifer through interflow zones in Quaternary basalt of the Snake River Group. Groundwater flows are generally from the recharge areas on public lands to the discharge areas along the Main Snake River or Blackfoot River. Locally, public lands along or adjacent to the 165 miles of streams within the PFO area are equally important to the shallow, unconfined alluvial aquifers. In addition, nearly 300 springs on public lands within the PFO area form small groundwater discharge areas, locally important for wetland vegetation, wildlife, and livestock.

Groundwater flow systems in the PFO area are closely tied to the structurally complex thrust fault fold/horstgraben geology of the area. Minor flow systems are also associated with limestone caverns, intra-canyon lava flows, geothermal convection, lake beds, and flood gravels.

A study of the hydrology and springs associated with the Meade Peak Thrust System was conducted in 1983. The study indicated the presence of a deep, thrust block controlled system that allows water to move from the eastern high mountain ranges west into the Blackfoot Reservoir and Bear River area. Other studies completed in the Portneuf River and Bear River Range indicate that flow systems in these areas also cut across mountain ranges, producing inter-basin flows (BLM 1987b).

Shallow ground water flow systems are also found in the valleys throughout the PFO area. Recharge for these systems takes place in the adjacent mountain ranges. Springs that originate from these systems have low conductivity, low dissolved solids, good water quality, and variable flows.

3.2.9.2 Surface Water

Public lands managed by the BLM within the PFO area drain into two separate regional basins: the closed Great Salt Lake Basin via the Bear River and the Columbia River Basin via the Snake River. Within these basins, the PFO area includes all or portions of 15 subbasins or watersheds (4th order). These watersheds, along with their USGS - HUC number, are listed in **Table 3-15** and shown in **Figure 3-9**.

The PFO area has approximately 165 miles of streams and rivers on public lands and contains a large variety of stream types, from very small spring creeks to reaches of medium and large rivers. Within the PFO area, the BLM manages public lands along three major rivers: the Blackfoot, Portneuf, and Bear Rivers.

Table 3-15. Watersheds in the Pocatello Field Office Planning Area

Watershed Name	HUC Number	Watershed Size (square miles)	BLM land in HUC (acres)
American Falls	17040206	2,850	47,167
Bear Lake	16010201	1,238	28,886
Blackfoot	17040207	1,051	41,393
Central Bear	16010102	834	32,546
Curlew Valley	16020309	1,930	207,709
Idaho Falls	17040201	1,140	1,427
Lake Walcott	17040209	3,670	38,483
Little Bear-Logan	16010203	928	0
Lower Bear-Malad	16010204	1,171	68,793
Middle Bear	16010202	1,216	28,580
Palisades	17040104	930	0
Portneuf	17040208	1304	108,812
Raft	17040210	1,470	110
Salt	17040105	926	4,302
Willow	17040205	651	4,626

Source: BLM 2004a

Other surface waters on public lands include shoreline and open water habitat on lakes, reservoirs, and ponds (**Figure 3-9**).

The PFO also manages about 300 springs, most are developed for livestock water. Most of the rivers in the PFO area have been developed for irrigation, hydropower, or both. The streams and rivers on public lands occur in a wide variety of landscapes, primarily mid-elevation valleys to lower elevation, fast-flowing basalt canyons. Stream and river conditions vary, from completely undisturbed river and vegetative communities in inaccessible rocky canyons to deep, erodible soil banks at lower elevations where livestock and people involved in recreation and irrigation diversion activities have total access to stream banks.

The dominant legislation affecting the nation's water quality and the BLM's compliance with state water quality requirements is the Federal Water Pollution Control Act of 1972, including all subsequent revisions (commonly called the Clean Water Act). The primary goal of the Clean Water Act is to restore and maintain the chemical, physical and biological integrity of the nation's waters (33 USC §1251.101). Section 313 includes the Federal Facilities Pollution Control section, which states that all federal agencies shall comply with all federal, state, and local water quality and environmental requirements.

Currently, the most significant water quality requirements affecting the BLM's land management comes from section 303(d) of the Clean Water Act. In this section, states are required to identify and prioritize water bodies that are water quality limited (i.e., water bodies that do not meet water quality standards) and publish a priority list of impaired waters. This list is commonly called the 303(d) list, named for Section 303(d) of the Clean Water Act, which requires the states to develop total maximum daily loads (TMDLs) for these 303(d)-listed streams. The TMDL process is a coordinated process for state, private, and federal entities to work on subbasin assessments for each 4th order watershed, to analyze the pollutant load for each listed stream, and

to allocate a maximum load to that stream for each pollutant. This process affects federal agencies through the implementation plan, which defines how land management agencies will reduce pollutant input to listed streams. While the BLM can manage actions on public lands, they cannot control point and non-point pollution on other lands. Therefore, the fragmented land ownership pattern of the planning area requires a coordinated effort to address water quality. The BLM participates on watershed advisory groups to work through this process.

There are 32 rivers on the 303(d) list that traverse public lands in the planning area. These rivers occur in eight of the 15 watersheds and contain 892 miles of impaired segments, of which the PFO manages 153 miles of stream banks along them. Likewise, there are 1,499 acres of impaired reservoir waters, of which less than one-acre are on public lands (**Figure 3-10** and **Table 3-16**). The primary pollutants of concern in these water bodies are sedimentation, nutrients, temperature, flow alternation, and bacteria. The major influences on water supply and water quality on BLM-managed streams in these areas include selenium pollution from phosphate mining (primarily in the Blackfoot subbasin⁴), livestock grazing, forestry, agriculture, roads, hydropower, and recreation. Sedimentation is the most common pollutant on segments that traverse public lands. The designated beneficial use for these listed streams is cold water biota.

For all of these listed streams, TMDL plans will include implementation actions to reduce their pollutant loads. The EPA has approved TMDL implementation plans for the Blackfoot, Lake Walcott, Portneuf, and Palisades watersheds.

⁴As of 2002, the most recent EPA-approved 303(d) listing includes the following streams as impaired due to selenium: Sage Creek (source to mouth), Blackfoot River (confluence of Lanes and Diamond Creeks to confluence of Slug Creek), Chicken Creek, Dry Valley Creek (source to mouth), Maybe Creek (source to mouth), upper and lower Mill Canyon, and Spring Creek (IDEQ 2005).

Table 3-16. Listed 303(d) Water Bodies on Public Lands within the Planning Area

Watershed (subbasin)	Major Land Uses	Water Body in Planning Area	Total Miles/Acres	Miles/Acres on Public Lands	Pollutants of Concern
Bear Lake	Agriculture, range, forest, urban	Alexander Reservoir	1,010.61 acres	0.05 acres	Sedimentation
		Co-Op Creek	7.07	0.9	Nutrients, Sedimentation
		Georgetown Canyon	13.54	0.27	Sedimentation
		Montpelier Creek	19.40	0.09	Flow Alteration, Nutrients, Oil & Grease, Sedimentation
		Bear River	71.8	0.66	Nutrients, Sedimentation
		North Creek	11.83	1.01	Unknown Sources
Middle Bear	Agriculture, range, forest, urban	Bear River	76.66	6.58	Flow Alteration, Nutrients, Sedimentation
		Cottonwood Creek	23.54	2.39	Sedimentation
		Densmore Creek	9.02	0.38	Nutrients, Sedimentation
		Maple Creek	8.14	0.31	Bacteria, Unknown Sources
		Mink Creek	11.7	0.10	Nutrients, Sedimentation
		Oneida Narrows Res.	420.68 acres	0.78 acres	Sedimentation
		Trout Creek	11.37	0.92	Nutrients, Sedimentation
		Williams Creek	7.25	0.94	Nutrients, Sedimentation
Lower Bear-Malad	Agriculture, range, forest, urban	Dairy Creek	12.02	1.01	Unknown Sources
		Samaria Creek	9.22	1.24	Nutrients, Sedimentation
Willow	Cropland, rangeland	Willow Creek	20.84	0.07	Sedimentation, Temperature
American Falls	Agriculture, grazing, urban	Bannock Creek	51.48	0.14	Bacteria, Nutrients, Sedimentation
		Knox Creek	11.32	2.21	Unknown Sources
		Rattlesnake Creek	16.21	0.96	Sedimentation
		W. Fk. Bannock Cr.	3.65	2.92	Sedimentation
Blackfoot	Dryland and irrigated agriculture, livestock grazing, phosphate mining	Blackfoot River	105.49	26.15	Flow Alteration, Nutrients, Sedimentation
		Brush Creek	15.30	0.37	Temperature, Unknown Sources
		Deadman Creek	4.05	0.24	Temperature
		Dry Valley Creek	11.15	0.21	Sedimentation
		Lanes Creek	16.64	0.26	Sedimentation
		Meadow Creek	34.04	6.09	Sedimentation
		Rawlins Creek	7.90	0.58	Sedimentation
		Wolverine Creek	10.78	2.71	Nutrients, Sedimentation

1

Table 3-16. Listed 303(d) Water Bodies on Public Lands within the Planning Area *(continued)*

Watershed (subbasin)	Major Land Uses	Water Body in Planning Area	Total Miles/Acres	Miles/Acres on Public Lands	Pollutants of Concern
Portneuf	Agriculture, rangeland, urban	Arkansas Creek	5.40	0.38	Sedimentation, Unknown Sources
		Bell Marsh Creek	6.37	1.04	Sedimentation
		Garden Creek	17.50	1.79	Nutrients, Sedimentation
		Gibson Jack Creek	4.31	0.10	Sedimentation
		Goodenough Creek	6.76	1.03	Sedimentation
		Hawkins Reservoir	67.48 acres	0.08 acres	Dissolved Oxygen, Nutrients, Sedimentation
		Hawkins Creek	15.06	0.15	Nutrients, Sedimentation
		Marsh Creek	52.25	0.68	Nutrients, Sedimentation
		Portneuf River	105.07	0.19	Bacteria, Flow Alteration, Nutrients, Sedimentation
		Rapid Creek	6.24	0.01	Sedimentation
		Walker Creek	6.08	0.48	Sedimentation
Lake Walcott	Range, agriculture	E. Fork Rock Creek	11.30	1.2	Sedimentation
		S. Fork Rock Creek	29.37	2.3	Temperature, Unknown Sources
Central Bear	Range, agriculture	Bear River	30.1	1.21	Flow Alteration, Nutrients, Sedimentation
		TOTAL Stream Miles	890.97	69.82	
		TOTAL Acres	1498.77	0.91	

Sources: IDEQ 2001, 2005; BLM 2008.

3.2.9.3 *Drinking Water*

The BLM within the PFO area manages one municipal watershed providing drinking water for the community of Downey, Idaho, in Bannock County. This 1,855-acre watershed was withdrawn from settlement, sale, location, or entry under public land laws, including nonmetalliferous mining under the US Mining laws. The Downey Municipal Watershed is a spring complex about two miles east of Downey that provides 90 percent of the water supply to Downey residents. The two developed springs have the water supply contained in a diversion box and pipeline. Any land management action within this watershed must adequately protect this drinking water source.

3.2.9.4 *Water Rights*

The PFO has more than 350 water right claims in the Idaho Snake River Basin Adjudication for livestock and wildlife. By Executive Order (Public Water Reserve [PWR] 107, dated April 17, 1926), all public lands of the US containing a spring or water hole needed or used for public purposes were included in a blanket withdrawal without identification of the lands affected. Spring claims make up 74 percent of the total, with the remaining water right claims on streams, wells, ponds, lakes, or manmade reservoirs. The BLM also has numerous water right claims on waters in the Bear River watershed, outside of the Idaho Snake River Basin Adjudication. Further discussion on withdrawals and water rights are discussed in the *Lands and Realty Section 3.3.2.2*.

3.2.9.5 *Riparian and Wetland Resources*

The PFO uses the riparian-wetland PFC health assessment database to store and retrieve riparian data (Hansen et al. 1993-2000). The PFC method from the University of Montana's Montana Riparian-Wetland Riparian Association is used to report the riparian condition class: the riparian-wetland polygon (or reach) is either in PFC, functioning-at-risk or nonfunctional (BLM 1993). Within the PFO area, 26 percent (36 miles) of the streams are in PFC, 40 percent (56 miles) are functioning-at-risk, 33 percent (46 miles) are nonfunctional, and one-percent are unknown.

3.2.9.6 *Hydroelectric Diversions and Facilities*

Several hydroelectric power generating facilities exist along the Bear River on public lands. These facilities are the Soda, Grace/Cove, and Oneida projects operated by PacifiCorp. These public lands are withdrawn and regulated by the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC). Any expansion of these facilities could change or eliminate certain uses on public lands.

3.2.10 WILDLAND FIRE MANAGEMENT

Direction for fire suppression and fuels management will be established through the desired future condition, goals, and objectives for the vegetation cover types found in the PFO area.

The primary focus and number one priority for fire suppression and fuels management activities in the PFO area is within the wildland urban interface (WUI). Although the protection of life and property within WUI areas are of highest priority, changes in vegetation conditions, such as juniper encroachment into the Mid-Elevation Shrub vegetation type and conifer encroachment

into pure stands of the Aspen vegetation type are also important. Mountain shrubs, aspen regeneration and conifer forest health issues predominate outside the WUI.

3.2.10.1 Wildland-Urban Interface

The WUI can be described as a line, area, or zone that occurs where human developments, such as communities, farms, ranches, summer homes, and recreational facilities meet or intermix with undeveloped wildland or vegetative fuels on forestland or rangeland (Lavery and Williams 2000). During the 2000 fire season, approximately 6.8 million acres of public and private lands burned in the US, resulting in the loss of property, damage to natural resources, and the disruption of community services. Many of these fires burned in WUI areas and exceeded the fire suppression capabilities of firefighters.

Seasonal wildland fires represent a potential threat to both new and established older communities along the WUI. For areas in and around the WUI where wildland fire occurrence is on the increase and there have been no fuels reductions or green-strip treatments, the risk of catastrophic wildland fire is elevated due to the increased fuel loads and associated increase in fire severity. Reducing fuel loads within the WUI may require the use of prescribed fire which poses an inherent risk to WUI areas due to the possibility of escape.

Several healthy vegetative communities evolved with fire and require fire to establish, promote, and/or maintain certain vegetation types found within the ecosystem. These vegetation communities may inherently promote catastrophic wildland fires in order to regenerate or recruit new seedlings. Where these vegetative communities overlap with the WUI, the goal is to reduce the threat of catastrophic wildland fires and assure public safety.

During the wildland fire season, the availability of fire fighting personnel is often diminished depending on the occurrence of other fires in the region, the size of those fires, the size of the communities-at-risk (CAR), and the number of structures needing protection. Even for the individual fire, there are not always enough fire fighters to quickly suppress fires before structures are threatened or damaged by fire. While fire fighters are defending one structure, the perimeter of the fire may rage on elsewhere, threatening many more structures and consuming many acres of vegetation. For these reasons, residents of communities along the WUI cannot solely depend on fire fighters to save their property. Residents in the WUI can help protect their property and community by taking defensive steps towards reducing fuel loads both before and during the fire season.

The BLM can reduce wildland fire in and around WUI areas by planning and implementing fuels reduction and restoration treatments on surrounding public lands. Existing project proposals in those identified WUI communities that have approved plans and completed environmental compliance will have the highest priority for fuels treatment, and work is already underway in many of these communities, including:

- Portneuf West Bench—Fuels reduction with Caribou National Forest - Pocatello and Inkom;
- Buckskin Fuels—Pocatello and Inkom;
- Lava Ranches Fuels Reduction—In interface around lava hot springs;

- Soda Hills Fuels Reduction—Landscape level fuels – Soda Springs; and
- Samaria Mountains Fuels Reduction—Samaria and Pleasantview.

Additional projects identified as priority in community wildfire protection plans (CWPPs) will be readied for implementation and will receive the next priority. Finally, for those newly identified projects or projects not ready for implementation, the planning process will be initiated toward future treatments and implementation schedules will be developed as CWPPs are updated.

Communities-at-Risk

A list of all WUI communities that are at high risk from wildland fire was published in the Federal Register (Forest Service et al. 2001). Approximately 44 “communities-at-risk”, of varying size and development, are located within the PFO area. CWPPs define CARs at highest risk from wildfire. CWPP requirements under the Healthy Forests Restoration Act include identifying risk, mapping WUI, and identifying priority projects on both federal and non-federal lands.

WUI areas have been identified based on their proximity to BLM-administered public lands, fuels and vegetation types, continuity of land patterns such that the potential for large wildland fires exist, and professional judgment. The potential risk for public health and safety for the following identified WUI areas is low: Bear Lake Valley, Soda Springs, Oneida, Preston/Malad, and Curlew; for the following areas is moderate: Blackfoot River, Bear Lake Plateau, and Lava Hot Springs; and for the following areas high: Pocatello, Pleasantviews, and Sublette.

All nine counties encompassed by the PFO planning area have completed, in cooperation with the BLM, CWPPs. The BLM has agreements with municipal, county, and fire districts to provide mutual fire-fighting aid between local and county fire departments and the BLM. Operating plans are updated and maintained annually by the local and county fire departments. These annual plans help fire managers utilize time, manpower, and resources to effectively protect communities-at-risk and fight wildland fires.

3.2.10.2 Current Fire Regime Condition Class Trends

FRCC is described as the degree of departure from historical fire regime and vegetative conditions. FRCC classes indicate the degree of departure in ecological components such as species composition, structural stages, stand age, dominate cover type, and canopy closure caused by disturbance frequency, climate, and management actions. The departure has changed ecosystem components such as species composition, structural stage, stand age, and canopy closure. Departures from the historic fire regimes are caused by fire exclusion, timber harvesting, grazing, introduction and establishment of invasive species/noxious weeds, insects and disease, and other management activities. Cheatgrass is known to alter fire regimes and behavior in semiarid climates.

Historic Fire Regimes

Historic Fire Regimes (**Table 3-17**) are used as part of the FRCC to describe fire frequency (average number of years between fires) and fire severity (effect of the fire on the dominant overstory vegetation – low, mixed, or stand replacement). There are five historical fire regimes.

Table 3-17. Historical Fire Regimes

Fire Regime	Description
I	0 to 35-year frequency, low severity
II	0 to 35-year frequency, stand-replacement severity
III	35 to 200 year frequency, mixed severity
IV	35 to 100+-year frequency, stand-replacement severity
V	200+ year frequency, stand-replacement severity 100 years

Source: Hardy et al. 2001.

Historic Fire Regime Condition Classes

Three FRCC classes are used as described by Hardy et al. (2001). Components of FRCC are the historic fire regime and vegetation condition. **Appendix J**, Section II and III, describes the relationship between FRCC descriptors and land health indicators (vegetation condition including seral classes and disturbance regimes) for LHC-A, -B, and -C. FRCC classes, like LHC, are based upon the presence or absence of ecological components necessary for a healthy ecosystem. The FRCC classes are described as follows:

Fire Regime Condition Class 1 (LHC-A)

- Fire regimes are within or near an historical range.
- The risk of losing key ecosystem components is low.
- Fire frequencies have departed from historical frequencies by no more than one return interval.
- Vegetative attributes are similar to historic conditions (e.g., species composition, age, and structure) and are intact and functioning.

Fire Regime Condition Class 2 (LHC-B)

- Fire regimes have been moderately altered from their historical range.
- The risk of losing key ecosystem components has increased to moderate.
- Fire frequencies have increased or decreased from historical frequencies by more than one return interval, resulting in moderate changes in fire size, frequency, intensity, severity, or landscape patterns.
- Vegetative attributes have moderately departed from historic but are still functioning.

Fire Regime Condition Class 3 (LHC-C)

- Fire regimes have been significantly altered from their historical range.
- The risk of losing key ecosystem components is high.

- Fire frequencies have departed from historical frequencies by multiple return intervals, creating dramatic changes in fire size, frequency, intensity, severity, or landscape patterns.
- Vegetative attributes have significantly departed from historical and may not be functioning properly.

Table 3-18 describes the current FRCC by vegetation type. Descriptions of the various vegetation cover types are included in *Vegetation Section 3.2.5*.

Table 3-18. Historic and Current Fire Regime Condition Class By Vegetation Type

Vegetation Type	Acres	Fire Regime Condition Class	Historic Fire Regime
Low-Elevation Shrub (including perennial grass and seedlings acres)	144,800	2	IV
Mid-Elevation Shrub (inclusive of encroached juniper acres)	167,700	2	IV
Mountain Shrub	187,100	2	I
Juniper (Natural Occurring)	14,400	2	III
Aspen/Aspen Conifer Mix/Dry Conifer	90,300	3	II
Wet/Cold Conifer	700	2	V
Riparian	6,600	n/a	n/a
Other/Vegetated Lava	16,600	1	III

3.2.10.3 Vegetation Types Fire Regimes

The information below is a summary of more detailed information provided in **Appendix J**, which contains supporting references.

Low-Elevation Shrub (including perennial grass and seedings)

This type is in historic fire regime IV. The fire return interval for replacement fire varies from 30 to 120 years, with an average of 92 years. The fire return interval for mixed severity fire varies from 120 to 500 years, with an average of 714 years. The average return interval for surface fires is 81 years. Fire size ranges from 10 to 10,000 acres with an average of 250 acres.

Cheatgrass invasion has resulted in finer fuels and more frequent large fires. Large fires impact the existing sagebrush steppe habitat and facilitate expansion of cheatgrass. Once cheatgrass dominates a site, the fire regime is altered to more frequent stand replacing fires. Shortened natural/historical fire rotations impact perennial vegetation by killing the tops of the plants and allowing little time (few growing seasons) between recurrent fires.

Perennial and annual grass plant communities occur principally in what was once sagebrush steppe, primarily the Low-Elevation Shrub type. These perennial grasslands are composed of seeded ranges and recovering burned areas. Expansion of cheatgrass into native sites is a major, immediate concern, altering fire regimes through increased fire frequency and severity compared to the historical fire regimes typical of intact sagebrush steppe. In Perennial and annual

grasslands, current fire frequency has increased compared to the historic fire regime typical of intact sagebrush steppe.

In the PFO area from 1970 through 2001, approximately 4,000 acres (3 percent) of Low-Elevation Shrub burned.

Mid-Elevation Shrub and Juniper (Encroached)

This type is in historic fire regime IV. The fire return interval for stand replacement fire varies from 15 to 100 years, with an average of 49 years. Before settlement, mosaic burns generally exceeded 75 percent topkill (replacement fire). Fire size ranges from 10 to 30,000 acres, with an average of 500 acres.

In the PFO area from 1970 through 2001, approximately 17,500 acres (approximately 10 percent) of the Mid-Elevation Shrub and Juniper type had burned. With an average fire frequency of 49 years and only 10 percent of the Mid-Elevation Shrub and Juniper type having burned during the 32-year period, current fire return intervals are not within historical ranges.

Mountain Shrub

This type is in historic fire regime III. The fire return interval for replacement fire varies from 50 to 300 years, with an average of 80 years. The fire return interval for mixed severity fire varies from 20 to 60 years, with an average of 100 years. Fire size ranges from 5 to 100 acres with an average of 40 acres.

Aspen/Aspen-Conifer Mix and Dry Conifer

This is a strongly fire adapted community. This type is in historic fire regime II. The fire return interval for replacement fire varies from 50 to 300 years, with an average of 100 years. The fire return interval for mixed severity fire varies from 10 to 50 years, with an average of 40 years. Fire size ranges from 1 to 100 acres with an average of 50 acres.

Past management has reduced the fire occurrence and severity in this vegetation type and caused a moderate deviation from its historic fire regime.

Wet/Cold Conifer

This type is in historic fire regime V. The fire return interval for replacement fire varies from 150 to 200 years, with an average of 175 years. The fire return interval for mixed severity fire is 1000 years. Fire size ranges from 1 to 1000 acres with an average of 100 acres. Subalpine fir and Engelmann spruce are very sensitive to wildland fire. Fire severity in these stands varies from low severity, which consumes duff and small diameter fuels, to high severity, which may become stand-replacing fires. Lodgepole pine normally burns in medium to high severity fires, though fires in lodgepole also include slow moving fires in sparse duff.

Riparian

Natural fire is generally an infrequent occurrence in this vegetation type, though the dominant cover type adjacent to the riparian plant community usually dictates its natural/historical fire rotation. For those larger riparian areas (e.g., around Bear Lake) the natural/historical fire

rotation is estimated to range from 200 to 300+ years and thought to be stand replacing when they occur. Riparian communities are classified as fire regime V.

Other/Vegetated Lava/Natural Juniper

Historically, natural fire was infrequent and noncontiguous in open vegetated lava areas, where only one to a few shrub/trees burned; whereas, natural fire was infrequent but contiguous in the denser stands and could result in stand replacement. Due to the broken terrain of the vegetation type, secondary succession following wildland fire is highly unpredictable and depends on specific microsite characteristics like the amount of soil deposition and soil development, seed sources, and dispersal from surrounding areas. Consequently, the development of vegetation following fire is quite varied. This vegetation type is composed of varying amounts of herbaceous forbs, grasses, and shrubs (e.g., Wyoming and mountain sagebrush, bitterbrush, syringa, currant, and chokecherry) as well as juniper. Vegetated Lava is classified as fire regime V.

3.3 RESOURCE USES

This section contains a description of the existing human uses of resources in the planning area and follows the order of topics addressed in Chapter 2. These topics are:

- Forestry;
- Lands and Realty;
- Livestock Grazing;
- Minerals and Energy; and
- Recreation.

3.3.1 FORESTRY

Currently, over 90 percent of forested lands, or nearly 45,000 acres, within the planning area are in primarily mature age classes (90-110 years old). Young, thrifty stands of Douglas-fir (*Pseudotsuga menziesii*) and aspen (*Populus tremuloides*) are rare. Generally, tree densities are high and natural regeneration is poor.

From 1975-1985 the planning area produced seven timber sales totaling 974 thousand board feet (MBF). Fourteen timber sales occurred between 1986-1991 totaling 11,619 MBF, mostly for Douglas-fir bark beetle caused tree mortality. Since 1992 the planning area has had 9 timber sales totaling 7,210 MBF. There are currently five areas planned for future harvest. These five areas include approximately 7,000 MBF. The forestry program also averages more than 300 vegetative permits per year for firewood, Christmas trees, etc. Douglas-fir is the dominant commercial species in the planning area with minor amounts of lodgepole pine (*Pinus contorta*), subalpine fir (*Abies lasiocarpa*), and Engelmann spruce (*Picea engelmannii*).

The direction for the program is set by the fire, fuels, and wildlife programs along with the President's Healthy Forest Initiative and Healthy Forests Restoration Act with the intent of rejuvenating woodland and commercial forest lands. It is also the direction of the forestry program to accelerate harvesting to treat all WUI lands within the next 10 years lessening the threat of wildfire to human health and property. A 1990-93 forest inventory demonstrated an

overall trend of decline in tree growth (declining mean annual increment). This means the yearly diameter growth is less than the average diameter growth of the given tree or stand. This decline in growth will continue until the tree dies naturally or from fire, insect or disease.

Due to the single species dominance of shade tolerant Douglas-fir, an abundance of mature host trees of adequate size, high tree densities, prolonged drought and poor growth rates and tree vigor, many forested areas and associated resource values are at high risk of fire, insect and disease epidemics-primarily Douglas-fir bark beetle, tussock moth, spruce budworm, and dwarf mistletoe. Approximately a quarter of all Douglas-fir trees, greater than eight inches in diameter, have died in the past 15 years as a result of bark beetles. Existing and additional mortality will increase the risk of catastrophic wildfire that threatens forest resources and WUI communities.

Wood products would be provided by using timber harvesting as a method to protect and sustain live, mature forest structure through the management of tree densities, species composition, and natural fuel loading from the 45,708 acres of available commercial timberlands. Stewardship contracting is being explored as a possible option to implement long term harvesting and fuel reduction goals, as well as to stimulate local economies. Accelerated harvesting should be used to treat all WUI lands within the next ten years lessening the threat of wildfire to human health and property. Harvesting and treatment should be achieved while maintaining a no net increase in open road densities.

3.3.1.1 Lands Inventory and Classification

Timber Production Capability Classification is a site specific method of identifying lands based upon physical and biological characteristics; land-types are classified by soils, vegetative productivity and habitat types, lithology, geomorphic characteristics, and a number of other subdivided physiographic and biological features (**Table 3-19**). A detailed Timber Production Capability Classification was completed within the planning area in 1984.

Table 3-19. Planning Area Forest Lands Classifications

Forest Lands (Woodlands)	Acres
Not Suitable for Commercial Management Activities	59,411
Forest Lands Suitable for Commercial Management Activities:	
With Limiting Factors:	
Low site productivity	767
Moisture availability	3,852
Unstable Slopes	777
Understory Competition	1,171
Ancillary Commercial Species:	
Aspen	7,590
Juniper	1,405
Total	15,562
Deferred/Suitable:	
Petticoat Peak WSA	2,519
Worm Creek WSA	40
Bowen Canyon Bald Eagle Sanctuary ACEC	559
Total	3,118
Suitable for Commercial Management Activities - No Limiting Factors	27,028

Table 3-19. Planning Area Forest Lands Classifications

Forest Lands (Woodlands)	Acres
Total (includes deferred, suitable acreage)	45,708

Source: BLM 1984

3.3.1.2 Annual Probable Sale Quantity

The annual probable sale quantity for the planning area is 600 MBF based on the forest land base of 45,708 acres. With an annual harvest of 600 MBF the average of 193 acres could be thinned each year based on the average volume per acre historically removed from the planning area. Salvage logging of fire, insect, and disease killed trees is not included in the annual probable sale quantity.

3.3.1.3 Commercial Timber Harvesting

Since the RMP and Malad MFP, the area within the PFO has produced 28 commercial timber sales, on a total of 4,390 acres on public lands (16 percent of the total suitable commercial forest), shown on **Table 3-20**.

Table 3-20. Past Commercial Timber Harvesting on Public Lands

Commercial Timber Silvicultural Method	Acres
Commercial Thinning	927
Sanitation Salvage	1,401
Salvage	1,943
Clearcut	119
Total	4,390

3.3.1.4 Reforestation

Data on past acres of planting are incomplete, however, using the data available and knowledge of the area, the BLM estimates that approximately 700 acres have been planted in the RMP area. It is possible that more acres have been planted.

3.3.1.5 Forested Land Treated for Fuel Reduction Forest Health Treatments

There is no information available on the number of acres or volume removed specifically for fuel reduction or forest health improvement.

3.3.2 LANDS AND REALTY

3.3.2.1 Land Status

The land use information provided below establishes a baseline for analyzing potential impacts from the proposed project.

Land ownership in the planning area is mixed, with state and private lands interspersed among the public land (**Figure 1-1**). Lands administered by the PFO total 613,800 acres, or 12 percent of the 5,142,098 acres within the planning area boundary of southeastern Idaho. Due to the scattered land pattern and the isolated nature of many of the public land parcels, management can be extremely difficult. Land ownership patterns within the PFO planning area have been

dictated primarily by the topography. Originally, most of the privately owned lands were obtained through agricultural entries such as the Homestead Act. Public lands within the PFO planning area provide for livestock grazing, wildlife habitat, recreational uses (such as OHV, camping, hunting, fishing, hiking, biking, and skiing), mining operations, access roads, utility ROWs, and various other land use authorizations.

3.3.2.2 Withdrawals

A withdrawal is a formal action that results in one or more of the following actions:

- Transfers total or partial jurisdiction of federal land between federal agencies;
- Segregates (closes) federal land to some or all of the public land laws and/or mineral laws; or
- Dedicates land for a specific public purpose.

The three major categories of formal withdrawals are congressional withdrawals, administrative withdrawals, and Federal Power Act or FERC withdrawals. Congressional withdrawals are those made by Congress in the form of public laws (Acts of Congress). Administrative withdrawals are made by the President, Secretary of the Interior, or other authorized officers of the executive branch of the federal government. Federal Power Act or FERC withdrawals are power project withdrawals established under the authority of the Federal Power Act of 1920.

The PFO area includes approximately 45 withdrawals. **Figure 1-1** identifies the lands withdrawn within the Pocatello planning area. Examples of these withdrawals include power site reserves, power projects, PWRs, administrative sites (Forest Service and USFWS), a stock driveway and two wildlife reserves. Other types of withdrawals or de facto withdrawals include land use classifications for recreation and public purposes. These withdrawn lands receive varying degrees of management, depending on the land uses and type of withdrawal.

By Executive Order dated April 17, 1926 (PWR 107), all public lands of the US containing a spring or water hole needed or used for public purposes were included in a blanket withdrawal without identification of the lands affected. According to the Executive Order, the land is “withdrawn from settlement, location, sale, or entry.” Not all lands withdrawn under PWR 107 have been identified and recorded, making protection under this Executive Order difficult.

Some of the lands that are set aside under a withdrawal may have a resource that is not being protected, used, or developed because of the classification. There may be a more valuable use for these lands. There is also a concern that public land status records are not being updated and maintained to reflect current uses.

A review conducted under the authority of Section 204(1) of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act (FLPMA) identified lands within the PFO area that are no longer needed by the holding agency. Certain identified withdrawals could then be modified, extended, or revoked according to the processes outlined in Section 204(a) of FLPMA and further process guidance provided in the BLM Washington Office Instruction Memorandum No. 96-145. The revocation or termination of these withdrawn lands would accomplish the following:

- Provide an increased opportunity to use the lands for exchange, land disposals, mineral development, or other needs, as indicated in the land use plan;
- Protect and manage valuable resources; and
- Allow for management by one agency, thereby reducing overhead costs.

The 1988 RMP established direction to pursue a withdrawal on the 1,500 acres associated with the designated ACEC and Research Natural Areas (RNAs). This direction would be carried through each alternative to protect the resources for which the land was designated. The Soda Springs Hills area and the Bowen Canyon ACEC are managed for specific resource protections (e.g., deer winter range and bald eagle habitat) and are examples of areas warranting a discretionary withdrawal to help manage and protect these types of public lands.

3.3.2.3 Land Use Authorizations

Land Use Authorizations are issued for a variety of purposes, both short-term and long-term. Short-term uses include agricultural leases, military training areas, and other uses involving minimal land improvements or disturbances. Long-term uses include ROWs for power lines, highways, roads, pipelines, fiber optics, communication sites, electric power generation sites, and irrigation.

The Idaho BLM's water rights policy has been changing and continues to change with the ongoing process of the Snake River Basin Adjudication effort. All future actions involving water rights shall adhere to the State of Idaho and BLM statewide water rights policies. Older land use authorizations are silent on water rights issues; as new applications are received and old permits are renewed, determination would be made that Idaho water rights policies are being followed and language implementing current Idaho water rights policy would be included.

Land Use Permits and Leases

A lease is an authorization to possess and use public land for a fixed period of time. A lease is issued when there is going to be substantial construction, development, and improvement and there is an investment of large amounts of capital that will be amortized over time.

Permits are authorized when uses of public lands will be short-term and involve little or no land improvement, construction, or investment. Permits have been a method used to clear up unauthorized use, stipulating that the applicant remove or halt the unauthorized use and rehabilitate the land if necessary.

The Recreation and Public Purposes Act allows state and local governments, as well as qualified nonprofit organizations, the opportunity to lease (and potentially patent) public land where there is a strong public need for a particular use. The PFO has leased lands under this authority for a variety of purposes, including scout camps, a fire department, a shooting range, and public parks.

Currently there are five land use permits and seven leases in the Pocatello planning area authorized according to regulations found at 43 CFR 2900.

Rights-of-Way

There are approximately 391 authorized ROWs within the PFO area, with an average of ten new ROWs being issued each fiscal year. These authorizations include such uses as roads, water pipelines, natural gas pipelines, power lines, telephone lines, fiber optic cables, railroads, canals, ditches, and communications sites.

Transportation system authorizations include reservations made for state and federal highways and ROWs granted to counties and individuals for access roads. Several major ROW corridors, as identified by the Western Utility Group, now known as Western Regional Corridor Planning Partnership, exist within the PFO area, but most of the land within these corridors is private. **Figure 3-11** identifies the location of existing utility ROW corridors. The existing utility corridors already have significant development for a particular use, such as electrical power transmission lines, natural gas pipelines, and fiber optic and communication lines. In many instances, these corridors can be found in conjunction with federal interstate highways, state highways, and railroads. Future applicants are and will continue to be encouraged to use the existing corridors where applicable.

The *Approved Resource Management Plan Amendments/Record of Decision (ROD) for Designation of Energy Corridors on Bureau of Land Management Administered Lands in the 11 Western States (January 2009)* are consistent with the requirements of Section 368 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005. This document amended the Malad MFP (1981) by designating one Section 368 Energy Corridor (#49-202) on public lands in the southwest portion of the PFO area (**Figure 3-11**).

With the large number of varying ROW authorizations, it is important that all environmental resources and concerns be taken into consideration. There could be loss of resources or environmental damages that may be prevented if compatible uses are analyzed and, where possible, consolidated. Avoidance and exclusion areas are currently identified within the PFO area to protect resources and prevent unnecessary or undue environmental damages. Areas with important resource values are taken into consideration when processing ROW applications. Areas with seasonal restrictions are also identified and stipulations are attached to ROWs according to this guidance.

According to current BLM guidance and the President's National Energy Policy, the BLM objective is to continue to make public land available for needed ROWs where consistent with national, state, and local plans, and use ROWs in-common to minimize environmental impacts and proliferation of separate ROWs. This guidance and policy also pertains to ROWs for alternative, renewable energy resources, such as wind, solar, geothermal, and biomass.

Communication Sites

The PFO area has three major communication sites within its boundaries; Howard Mountain, Chinese Peak, and Fish Creek. These sites accommodate approximately 32 ROW holders/lessees. The PFO area is also home to several small communication and single-use sites, including Malad Mountain, Boundary Ridge, Garden Creek, and Curlew. These small and single-use communication sites accommodate an additional nine holders/lessees. These figures do not include the number of tenants or customers legally operating out of holder/lessee

buildings. Howard Mountain and Chinese Peak are both complex sites overlooking Pocatello. Howard Mountain is home to both high-power and low-power users, but interference issues have not been significant because the sites are scattered over a large area, providing both distance and vertical separation of antenna elements.

3.3.2.4 Land Tenure Adjustment

As stated above, the PFO area contains a mixed ownership land pattern. Although the potential for resource values may be high on some public land parcels, lack of access or isolation from other resources of these parcels make it very difficult to manage. Land tenure adjustments within the planning area help to resolve split mineral estate situations, to consolidate public land (through sale, exchange, or acquisition), to acquire access, and to resolve unauthorized use cases. Land tenure adjustments are also important to the local and state governments to consolidate ownership and to make lands available for public purposes.

FLPMA and other Federal laws, Executive Orders, and policies suggest criteria to use when categorizing public lands for retention or disposal, and for identifying acquisition priorities. The following list of criteria is not considered all-inclusive, but represents the major activities and issues affecting lands within the planning area. These criteria are meant to streamline consideration of land tenure adjustment proposals.

Lands with Highest Priority for Retention or Acquisition:

- Those lands specifically identified by the Shoshone-Bannock Tribes as having special importance related to treaty and/or traditional uses/values;
- Important, crucial, or critical habitat for special status species including proposed species, listed species, and candidate species under the ESA; State-listed species; and BLM State Director-designated sensitive species;
- Riparian areas and wetlands;
- Parcels that provide public and/or administrative access to larger blocks of public land; and
- Lands with special designation or management emphasis.

Special Designation/Management Areas Where it is a High Priority to Acquire Inholdings:

- ACECs, or lands adjacent to and important for expansion of such areas;
- National Historic Trails;
- Wild and Scenic Rivers (eligible, recommended suitable, or designated);
- Significant cultural resources and sites eligible for inclusion on the NRHP; and
- Wilderness and WSAs.

Areas Generally Retained, but May be Exchanged for Parcels with Higher Resource Values:

- Important habitat areas for fish or wildlife;
- Developed recreation sites and recreation access;
- Areas with recreation opportunities and benefits;

- Significant energy and mineral resources areas; and
- Significant paleontological resources areas.

Areas that are a High Priority for Disposal:

- Parcels which are difficult or costly to administer (manageability and/or isolation of the parcel);
- Parcels more suitable for management by another Federal or State agency; and
- Parcels of special importance to (and generally adjacent to) local communities for purposes including, but not limited to, community expansion, extended community services, or economic development.

Other Issues to be Considered Prior to Any Land Tenure Adjustment Action:

- To what extent the individual action will help achieve overall land ownership management objectives at the watershed level, in cooperation with State and private landowners;
- Existing legal accessibility of the land for public uses;
- Amount of public investments in facilities or improvements and the potential for recovering those investments; and
- Consistency with cooperative agreements and plans or policies of other agencies.

Split Mineral Estate

Public land within the PFO area involves split mineral estate situations, which involve private surface ownership and federal subsurface ownership. Through various acts, the federal government has retained mineral values, while encouraging settlement. As late as the 1980s, BLM policy concerning mineral estate was to reserve all oil and gas rights, as well as any other mineral values. Those lands which the US reserved minerals and where they contain valuable mineral resources are generally kept in federal ownership. Many of the private surface owners have requested that the subsurface minerals be sold or transferred to their ownership. Management of the existing split estates has been, and will continue to be a challenge. It is important not to split estates when completing a land tenure adjustment.

Consolidation

With the current scattered land pattern of the PFO area, the BLM continues to struggle with the management of isolated or small parcels. Many of these parcels have no resource value and would be a benefit to a private citizen and the local tax base.

Large areas of land should be categorized for land tenure adjustments allowing the BLM to use the proper authority to block up land. By blocking up lands, management would be more effective. The BLM could dispose of lands with lower resource values and could acquire lands with valuable habitat, recreational value, scenic value, or opportunity for resource development. More acreage would be available for lease or conveyance under the Recreation and Public

Purposes Act, allowing the state and nonprofit organizations to develop and use lands for important community recreation and public purposes.

Land Disposal

The public lands currently identified and available for disposal in the existing planning documents are shown on **Figure 2-5**. The lands were identified for disposal by parcels, either by exchange only, sale or exchange, or state exchange only. This identification process for land disposal is very limiting, especially with the type of mixed land ownership pattern within the PFO area. Public land is exchanged when parcels meet the criteria under Section 206 of FLPMA. Public land is sold when parcels meet the disposal criteria under Section 203 of FLPMA.

On July 25, 2000, Congress passed the Federal Land Transaction Facilitation Act, Public Law (PL) 106-248. Lands identified for disposal in land use plans as of that date may be sold or exchanged under Federal Land Transaction Facilitation Act, and the monies received from sales or exchanges could be retained in an account and used by the BLM and other federal agencies to purchase additional lands. The money is not deposited in the General Treasury. Lands identified in the 1988 Pocatello RMP and the 1981 Malad MFP (Amendments) would qualify under this act.

The BLM has been working with the Idaho Department of Lands for many years to consolidate lands that mutually meet both agencies' needs. There are currently two pending State Exchanges that the PFO would like to finalize.

The Shoshone-Bannock Tribes have rights to and cultural/historical affiliation with the lands in the planning area, so the Shoshone-Bannock Tribes are interested in ensuring that lands that go out of federal ownership do not diminish their rights or traditional uses. Some of the traditional uses include hunting, fishing, firewood gathering, and livestock grazing. Consultation with the Shoshone-Bannock Tribes would continue.

Many unauthorized uses are unintentional and many of the affected areas have little, if any, remaining public resource values after years of unauthorized use. Therefore, it would be beneficial to resolve these cases. One way would be through disposal of the parcel of land associated with the long-standing unauthorized use.

Land Acquisition

Private land acquisition is authorized under section 205 of the FLPMA, primarily through land exchanges with private landowners and the State of Idaho.

In 2002, funds were made available to the PFO area (specifically the Soda Springs Hills area) through the Land and Water Conservation Funds to acquire land for protecting deer winter range. Approximately 1,174 acres were acquired and will be managed for deer wintering range and other uses that will complement this resource. If future funds are made available, land consolidation would continue within the Soda Springs Hills for protecting deer winter range.

There are approximately 70,738 acres of Bankhead-Jones land within the PFO area. The US acquired these lands under Title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act of July 22, 1937 (50 Stat. 522; 7 USC 1001, et seq.). These are considered "acquired" lands and, therefore, are subject to certain management provisions. The lands are not available for lease or sale under the

Recreation and Public Purposes Act of 1926 (44 Stat. 741), as revised in 1954 (68 Stat. 173; 43 USC 869 et seq.). Bankhead-Jones lands can be exchanged or sold, under FLPMA authority, to either public or private entities. These lands require special mineral management, which is addressed in the Mineral Resources section of this plan.

3.3.2.5 Access

Access needs are subsequently prioritized and worked on when there are landowners willing to grant an easement to the BLM or sell land in order to provide access to public lands. Public complaints and inquiries regarding access to public lands within the PFO area have increased significantly within the last five years. Not only does the public have limited access to public lands for recreation, in many cases the BLM does not have legal or administrative access to manage or monitor areas that have resource values or authorized uses occurring on them. Public demand for access is expected to continue, as there are more users of public land and access continues to be limited.

As more private landowners choose to deny access across their land to public land, less land is available for the public's use and enjoyment. This has the potential to cause hostility among private citizens, local and state agencies, and the federal government. There is likely to be a continued loss of access, putting valuable resources at risk due to lack of management. It is important that traditional access to public lands be reserved when public land is exchanged or sold. Priority access needs are identified in **Figure 2-13**. All opportunities for access acquisition will be pursued as they arise.

3.3.2.6 Unauthorized Land Use

There are many documented and unresolved unauthorized use and/or occupancy (trespass) cases in the PFO area. The BLM expects that there are still large numbers of trespass cases that have not been discovered or documented. Some of the trespasses include agricultural use, irrigation ditches, spring development, buildings and structures, power lines, telephone lines, roads, fences, and dumps. Workload priorities and limited staffing usually require that unauthorized use/occupancy cases go unresolved. There could be a public safety issue associated with unauthorized use/occupancy, as well as a potential loss of valuable resources. If the unauthorized use damages the lands or resources, taxpayer money may need to be expended to repair the damages. Resolving the unauthorized use of public lands could protect valuable resources, prevent damage to resources, protect public safety, and allow the BLM to collect money for damages, processing, monitoring, and rental.

3.3.3 LIVESTOCK GRAZING

Livestock grazing relies heavily on the vegetation resources within the PFO area. Grazing occurs on 91 percent (556,300 acres) of the land administered by the BLM. Nine counties and many small farming and ranching communities throughout southeastern Idaho rely on revenues associated with livestock grazing on public land (**Figure 3-12**). For grazing administrative purposes, the PFO area is divided into 449 allotments.

Appendix P shows the breakdown of allotments with an active permit/lease, acreages of each allotment, animal unit months (AUMs), and season of use. Grazing use by livestock is measured in terms of AUMs. One AUM is equal to the amount of forage used to support one cow and one calf

for one month (approximately 800 pounds of forage). The PFO normally licenses up to 74,358 AUMs; however, the BLM may also authorize additional forage to be available to qualified applicants on a temporary nonrenewable basis (43 CFR sec. 4110.3-1(a)).

The Department of the Interior Stock driveway Withdrawal No. 157 (Idaho No. 9) created by an Act of Congress on December 29, 1916 (39 Stat., 862) and issued via secretarial order withdrew approximately 8,535 acres of public land along the Blackfoot River from disposal and reserved for use by the general public for stock driveway purposes. The stock driveway also makes up part or all of nine grazing allotments.

The BIA has withdrawn approximately 12,400 acres of BLM-administered public lands next to the Blackfoot Reservoir and Grays Lake National Wildlife Refuge in connection with the Fort Hall Irrigation Project. With this withdrawal, the BIA manages concessions, business, agricultural and grazing leases or permits, in accordance with 25 CFR, Part 173, on these public lands. With these lands administered by the BIA for the purposes stated above, livestock grazing may be authorized; however, because the BLM does not administer grazing, these lands are identified as unavailable to livestock grazing.

Grazing allotments are unique geographically, and range from large contiguous blocks of public land totaling some 131,000 acres to small isolated parcels of public land of less than 40 acres (**Figure 3-12**). This affects how the allotments are managed. Large contiguous blocks usually have public access and are minimally impacted by surrounding private land. The isolated tracts are often a small component of a larger private land holding. Administrative access to these small tracts of public land exists only because of the grazing permit or lease. Allotments may include private, State, Forest Service, or a combination thereof in addition to public lands. Allotments may be permitted or leased to one (individual allotment) or more (common allotment) operators. There are approximately 389 operators authorized by permit/lease to use 366 allotments. In addition, allotments may be grazed by a grazing association under one permit/lease, which may have up to 50 to 60 members. There are 20 grazing associations in the PFO area. Grazing permits or leases that are awarded to permittees convey no right, title, or interest in the public land and resources.

The Taylor Grazing Act of 1934 created grazing districts through out the west. However, not all public land lies within a grazing district. These lands are primarily scattered isolated tracts that people settling the west did not want to homestead. The PFO area lies within the Burley Grazing District and Idaho Falls Grazing District. The maximum season of use for allotments within a district is from April 16 through November 15, while the season of use for allotments outside these grazing districts could occur throughout the year. However, each individual allotment within these grazing districts has a specific season of use that falls with the established dates and is described in the operator's grazing permit/lease. The season of use is based on plant phenology and individual operation needs. Season long use entails grazing one pasture beginning generally in the spring or early summer and ending in late summer or sometime in the fall. Some shifting of livestock use may occur within the pasture (e.g., from canyon to canyon). Deferred rotation uses the entire allotment rotating pastures so that livestock start in a different pasture each year. Rest-rotation of pastures involves grazing during certain periods and resting certain periods with some pastures rested the entire grazing season. These periods of use are referred to as treatments and are rotated so that no pasture receives the same use every year. Periodic allotment assessments may indicate changes in the season of use are necessary to meet Idaho

Standards for Rangeland Health. Seasons of use are allotment-specific, and may be managed as season-long or using a grazing system (e.g., rest rotation, deferred).

Allotment vegetative conditions and rangeland health are periodically assessed using indicators as described in the *Idaho Standards for Rangeland Health and Guidelines for Livestock Grazing (Appendix A)* (BLM 1997a). The assessment leads to an evaluation of whether an allotment is meeting, not meeting, or not meeting but making significant progress toward meeting the Idaho Standards for Rangeland Health and Guidelines for Livestock Grazing Management. Following the evaluation, a determination is made on the cause if the allotment is not meeting Idaho Standards for Rangeland Health. To date, 367 allotments have been assessed in which these allotments are expected to be meeting or making significant progress towards meeting the Idaho Standards for Rangeland Health through changing current management strategies such as season of use and or livestock numbers. Such strategies are developed through meetings with the stakeholders, interested public, state and federal agencies, and the tribes.

An Environmental Assessment (EA) analyzes the various grazing strategies as alternatives and followed by a decision. The alternatives may include adjustments in the stocking rate, season of use, and kind and class of livestock necessary to meet or make significant progress towards meeting the established standards and guides. Recently, adjustments in grazing management were made to 24 allotments totaling 123,692 acres (**Table 3-21**). Adjustments include changes in season of use, reductions in active grazing preference, and implementation of various grazing systems including herding livestock. These changes were necessary to meet or move towards meeting the standards for rangeland health.

Table 3-21. Allotments Requiring Grazing Management Adjustments

Allotment Name	Date Assessment Completed	Acres
Samaria	2000	24,436
South Stone	2000	11,962
Hansel Mountain ¹	2000	5,360
Pleasantview	2000	59,026
Inkom	2001	5,511
Martha's Canyon Wyoming	2001	138
Martha's Canyon Idaho	2001	256
Cedar Creek	2006	1,026
Chesterfield Range	2006	3,779
Cottonwood Creek-2	2006	1,217
Crow Creek-2	2006	121
Dairy Hollow	2006	402
Dairy Ridge	2006	4,028
Fish Haven-2	2006	960
Meadow Creek	2006	160
Harer Point	2006	1,319
Henry Creek-3	2006	536
High Country	2006	1,280
Horse Creek-1	2006	360
Indian Creek	2006	430
North Creek	2006	377
Thatcher Hill-2	2006	520
Willow Creek County Line	2006	41
1 st and 2 nd Hollows	2008	447

¹Pocatello Valley, Alder, and Hansel Mountain allotments combined to form Hansel Mountain Allotment.

3.3.4 MINERALS AND ENERGY

The PFO area's varied geology is favorable for the occurrence of several mineral resources. Major mineral resources of interest include the non-energy leasable mineral phosphate; locatable minerals, such as gold (**Figure 3-13**), limestone, and zeolites; salable minerals, including sand, stone, gravel, and pumice (**Figure 3-14**); and fluid leasable minerals such as oil and gas (**Figure 3-15**) and geothermal resources. The development of the phosphate mineral resource is of significant importance to the local economy and the national phosphorus fertilizer and chemical demand.

The BLM manages the federal mineral estate for the US. The land surface overlying this estate is often managed by a federal agency other than BLM or is owned by a non-federal entity such as the State of Idaho or private interests. The PFO administers approximately 613,800 acres of public land surface and 2,116,800 acres of federally owned subsurface minerals estate. Of these 2,116,800 acres of federal mineral ownership, approximately 419,500 acres occur on lands where the surface is either owned by the State of Idaho or private entities (referred to as "split estate" lands). In addition, approximately 1,083,500 acres of the federal mineral estate managed by BLM lie under other federal lands managed by agencies such as the Forest Service and USFWS. These "split-estate" lands and lands where the surface is managed by another federal agency present minerals management challenges that require close coordination and cooperation. Interagency, tribal, state and private cooperation is integral in developing mineral resources and in protecting other resource values and uses on these lands.

Minerals managed by the BLM are categorized according to the laws under which they are managed as leasable, salable, or locatable. Although similar in many ways, each classification is administered somewhat differently and may also have different requirements for acquisition, exploration, and development.

Leasable Minerals

Leasable minerals are those minerals that can be explored for and developed under the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920, as amended, other leasing acts, and regulations at 43 CFR 3100, 3200, 3400, and 3500. They include energy mineral resources, such as oil, gas, coal, and geothermal fluids, and some non-energy minerals, such as phosphate, sodium, potassium, and in some circumstances sulphur. The BLM uses discretionary authority to decide whether or not to lease mineral resources for exploration and development. Where the federal government owns the mineral estate and an agency other than the BLM manages the surface, the BLM will consult with that agency prior to leasing or approving an operations plan. In some situations, such as oil and gas or coal leasing, the BLM may need to obtain concurrence from the surface management agency as required by law.

The holder of a mineral lease or permit has a contractual agreement with the government that grants exclusive rights to reasonable exploration and development of the leased commodity. The lessee pays the US annual rentals and also royalties on all mineral production from the leases.

Salable Minerals

Salable minerals, or mineral materials, are common varieties of minerals and building materials such as sand, stone, gravel, pumice, pumicite, cinders, and clay. BLM management of salable minerals is under the Materials Act of July 31, 1947 (61 Stat. 681), amended by the Acts of July 23, 1955 (PL 167; 69 Stat. 367), and September 28, 1962 (PL 87 713) and regulations at 43 CFR 3600. The BLM is authorized to dispose of mineral materials either through a contract of sale or a free use permit.

Generally, salable minerals are widespread, of low unit value, and are often used for construction or landscaping materials. Their value depends largely on market factors, quality of the material, availability of transportation, and transportation costs. As with leasable minerals, the BLM has discretionary authority to issue permits for the disposal of salable minerals. The Forest Service has authority to manage salable minerals within the national forests in a similar manner.

Locatable Minerals

Locatable minerals are those that are not leasable or salable which are managed under the General Mining Law of 1872 (17 Stat. 91, as amended) and regulations at 43 CFR 3700 and 3800. They typically include gold, silver, copper, gemstones, lead, zinc, barite, gypsum, and certain varieties of high calcium limestone. The 1872 Mining Law provides US citizens the right to prospect, explore, and develop these minerals on public domain lands that have not been “withdrawn” from mineral entry by Congress or the Secretary of the Interior. The law also provides for necessary access across public land to conduct these activities. Depending on the stage of exploration or development, reasonable access can range from unimproved temporary roads for prospecting or drilling to more permanent improved roads for full mine development and transportation of ore.

Exploration for and development of locatable mineral resources under the 1872 Mining Law are nondiscretionary activities, meaning that the BLM cannot prohibit reasonably necessary activities required for the prospecting, exploration, and development of valuable locatable mineral deposits. However, the BLM has authority to regulate these activities and require mitigation or changes in operational practices to ensure that activities do not result in “unnecessary or undue” degradation of the environment. The BLM has the authority and the obligation to regulate locatable mineral operations in order to prevent or minimize damage to surface resources on public land. This is the purpose of the 43 CFR 3809 regulations, which ensure that a proposed mineral exploration or development activity conforms to reasonable industry standards for that type of activity, based on the appropriate stage of operation development. If the BLM concludes that the proposed activity would result in undue or unnecessary degradation of the lands, it would not be approved under 43 CFR 3809.

Acquired lands, as distinguished from public lands, are those lands in federal ownership which have been obtained by the government by purchase, donation or exchange. Minerals that qualify as locatable minerals in public domain lands may in some cases be obtained through a mineral lease on acquired lands pursuant to the Mineral Leasing Act for Acquired Lands (61 Stat. 913; 30 USC 351 359). Leasable Minerals on acquired lands may include gold, silver, copper, gems, and uranium. For example, lands acquired by the federal government, such as under the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act (PL 75-210), that include deposits of otherwise locatable

minerals, could be leased at the discretion of the BLM. Also, all minerals designated by the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920 as leasable in public domain lands are leasable in acquired lands. Lease administration is conducted according to regulations at 43 CFR 3500.

Mineral Disposals may be made from acquired lands under the same procedures and authorities as disposals from public lands. The BLM regards mineral materials as salable on acquired lands because FLPMA designates lands managed by the BLM as "public lands" without regard to how they were acquired, with the exception of lands managed for Native American Indians.

Minerals Management Planning

The BLM can use its discretion in the RMP to close areas to mineral leasing and disposal of mineral materials. The BLM can specify protection of sensitive areas with a "no surface occupancy" stipulation in fluid mineral leases where necessary. The BLM can also use its discretionary authority outside of planning to deny requests for mineral material disposal or leasing on a case-by-case basis. The plan identifies some areas where the BLM will pursue a "withdrawal" from mineral entry for locatable minerals with the Secretary of the Interior. Most other areas would be open to consideration of mineral development proposals.

Selenium and other hazardous elements associated with mining have been detected at elevated concentrations in soil, groundwater, and vegetation at phosphate mine sites in the PFO area since the last land use plan was prepared. Issues relating to contamination and reclamation of mine sites as well as renewed interest in oil and gas resources within the PFO area, warrant a revision of the management direction for minerals and energy resources.

3.3.4.1 Non-Energy Leasable Minerals: Phosphate

Background

The PFO area is situated in the heart of the Western Phosphate Field, one of the world's major phosphate producing regions. Phosphate mining has been an important industry in southeastern Idaho since 1907. Since 1946, phosphate mining has disturbed almost 15,000 acres of land in southeast Idaho (USGS 2001). Phosphorus is an important industrial commodity as well as a nutrient essential to all life including crop production. Phosphate is present in economically minable quantities in the organic-rich black shales of the Meade Peak member of the Permian Phosphoria formation. The ore produced from federal leases administered by the PFO is a major source of both phosphate fertilizer and elemental phosphorus produced at industrial plants located in Pocatello and Soda Springs, Idaho.

Economic Impact

Phosphate mining within the PFO boundaries constitutes the largest mineral industry of Idaho, producing more than \$600 million in processed mineral value in 1997 (USGS 2004). Phosphate mining and processing are key components of the southeast Idaho and Star Valley, Wyoming, economies. Four phosphate mines currently operate on federal leases in Caribou County, Idaho, within the PFO area. Direct employment at the phosphate mines and processing facilities in southeast Idaho was over 2,100 in 1998, with an estimated total payroll of over \$110 million that year, although direct employment and payroll were less in 2002. The Minerals Management

Service (2002) reported that federal revenues from phosphate-related activity in Caribou County, Idaho, on federal leases for fiscal year 2001 were almost \$9.34 million. Federal law requires royalties and other revenues collected from federal phosphate leases be split equally between the state where the activity occurs and the federal treasury.

As with all economic enterprises, the future of southeast Idaho phosphate mining and processing depend on the profitability of the operations. The question of profitability encompasses the total range of costs associated with mining and processing the ore (including addressing all environmental concerns) and delivering the end product to the various customers. It also includes consideration of international production and market conditions. The BLM plays an important role in balancing the prudent administration of leases with protecting the environmental resources in the area to ensure a well managed viable industry.

Geologic Occurrence

The phosphate deposits within the PFO area are of sedimentary origin and are on a Permian age shallow-basin floor that reached from southwest Montana to northern Utah. Precipitates from upwelling cold nutrient-rich waters and from organic sediments, rich in phosphate, were eventually buried by other sediments and changed into stone. The resulting phosphate shale beds were exposed at the earth's surface by thrust faulting, folding, and erosion. The folding and thrusting exposed the phosphate shale beds in long linear outcrops paralleling the geologic fabric of the area.

The thickest and highest grade surface and near-surface deposits in the western field are located and mined in southeast Idaho within the PFO area. A large portion of the phosphate reserves in this area also lie within the boundaries of the Caribou National Forest. The USGS estimated the reserves in the southeast Idaho portion of the field to be more than one billion tons (Gulbrandsen and Krier 1980). About half of this amount is currently under federal lease to private companies.

Phosphate mines use surface mining methods to follow the long, linear surface outcrop pattern of the phosphate deposits. Because of this outcrop pattern, a typical phosphate mine pit is several hundred feet wide and 200 to 400 feet deep and may continue for several miles along the strike of the deposit.

In southeast Idaho, phosphate is mined from two high-grade beds in the Meade Peak Shale Member of the Phosphoria Formation. The upper ore zone is typically 15 feet thick while the lower ore averages 45 feet in thickness. The ore beds enclose a middle waste zone about 75 to 90 feet thick, composed of low-grade phosphatic shale. The low-grade rocks are placed in waste piles along with unmineralized rock that is removed to expose ore-grade phosphatic shale. Typical ore cutoff grade is 24 percent phosphorus pentoxide.

Phosphate Leasing

The BLM is the designated federal agency authorized to issue or modify federal phosphate leases and/or approve exploration and development activities on those leases, including approving mining and reclamation plans.

When the BLM issues a federal phosphate lease, it conveys to the lessee the exclusive rights to explore for and extract the phosphate resources contained in the lease, subject to existing laws and regulations. The term of a phosphate lease is indeterminate and is in effect as long as rents, royalties, and other lease requirements are met. Lease terms and conditions can be reasonably readjusted every 20 years. Although BLM phosphate leases in Idaho have similar terms and conditions, the BLM may apply individual lease-specific conditions of approval and/or mitigation measures to the phosphate leases or subsequent exploration and mining operations through an environmental analysis process under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA).

The PFO administers lease operations on the vast majority of federal phosphate leases and permits in the State of Idaho. Current and pending cases are shown in **Table 3-22**.

Table 3-22. PFO-Administered Leasable Phosphate Cases

Type	Number	Acreage
Known Leasing Areas	7	70,302
Phosphate Prospecting Permits		
Pending	6	2,000
Authorized	0	
Exploration Licenses		
Pending	3	2,040
Authorized	1	200
Leases		
Competitive, authorized	47	30,224
Competitive, pending	1	480
Preference Right, authorized	28	9,517
Preference Right, pending	1	720
Fringe Acreage, authorized	8	2,320
Fringe Acreage, pending	2	679
Phosphate Use Permit		
Authorized	4	230
Pending	0	

Currently, there are 83 phosphate leases within the PFO jurisdiction, covering about 42,000 acres. About 28,200 additional acres consist of unleased Known Phosphate Leasing Areas (KPLAs), which is land known to contain phosphate deposits and that the Department of the Interior has formally classified as subject to competitive leasing for any federally owned phosphate resources. The seven KPLAs in southeast Idaho include a mixture of federal, state, and private surface ownerships, totaling about 70,300 acres.

All or portions of forty-six federal phosphate leases administered by the PFO are within the boundaries of the Caribou-Targhee National Forest. These leased areas cover about 25,000 acres. The BLM considers leasing phosphate and approving mining and exploration plans on public lands where the surface is managed by another federal agency, such as the Forest Service, only

after consulting with the surface management agency. When reviewing phosphate development proposals within the Caribou-Targhee National Forest, the PFO and the Forest Service typically coordinate analyses together and prepare a joint NEPA document. The Forest Service uses this NEPA document to formulate recommendations to give to the BLM. The BLM then makes a decision after considering recommendations from the Forest, direction contained in the Caribou Forest Plan, and input from the public, including the applicant.

Pending lease modifications, exploration licenses, and prospecting permit applications that affect approximately 5,900 acres lie within the PFO area. Some of these applications could result in new leased acreage.

The PFO also provides minerals expertise and support to the BIA at the Fort Hall Indian Reservation. The PFO administers and supervises phosphate exploration and development operations, including approximately 4,700 acre Gay Mine located on the reservation (USGS 2001).

Phosphate Production and Utilization

Phosphate rock is a nonrenewable, nonrecyclable natural resource that is used primarily in the production of ammonium phosphate and super phosphate fertilizers. Elemental phosphorous, also extracted from phosphate rock and produced in southeast Idaho, is used to produce numerous industrial products and chemicals, including herbicides, detergent and food additives where purity is crucial.

In 2002, in the US, phosphate rock ore was mined by nine firms in four states. Florida and North Carolina accounted for 83 percent of nation's output, and Idaho and Utah accounted for the remaining 17 percent (USGS 2003). Krauss, et al. (1984) estimated resources of economically exploitable phosphate ore at 1 billion metric tons in southeast Idaho, at an average grade of about 24 percent phosphorus pentoxide (Kraus, et al. 1984).

Currently, phosphate produced from federal leases administered by the PFO totals between four and six million tons per year and accounts for between 3.0 and 4.5 percent of total world production and 13 to 15 percent of the US production (BLM 2003f). Production from federal leases in 2001 in the Caribou-Targhee National Forest was about 4,800,000 tons (Forest Service 2003a).

Table 3-23 lists active mines within the PFO area that have federal phosphate leases administered by the BLM as part of its authorized mine and reclamation plans. **Figure 3-16** presents the locations of KPLAs and existing phosphate mines.

In the 1990's, three elemental phosphorus plants operated in the region, supplied with phosphate rock mined from federal leases administered by the PFO. In 2004, only one elemental phosphorus plant, in Soda Springs, Idaho remained. This is the last elemental phosphorus plant in the US. Two large phosphate fertilizer production facilities in southeast Idaho depend entirely on mines that produce from federal phosphate leases. These plants are located in Soda Springs and Pocatello.

Table 3-23. BLM-Administered Phosphate Mines in the Pocatello Field Office Area

Mine	Lessee/Operator	Status	Surface Owner or Mgmt. Agency
Dry Valley	Agrium	A	B, F, S, P
Rasmussen Ridge	Agrium	T	F, S
Enoch Valley	Monsanto	R	F, S, P
South Rasmussen	Monsanto	A	F, S
Smoky Canyon	J.R. Simplot Co.	A	F
Gay	Simplot/FMC	R	I

STATUS:

A - Active, T - Active, but temporarily idle, R - Mining complete, reclamation in progress

SURFACE OWNER/MANAGEMENT AGENCY:

B = BLM, F - Forest Service, S - State of Idaho, I - Fort Hall Indian Reservation, P - Private

Currently, the PFO is working on new permits for two new mine proposals. These are the J.R. Simplot Company - Smoky Canyon, Panels F & G (Manning and Deer Creek) Mine, and the Monsanto Blackfoot Bridge Mine. The BLM anticipates that these or similar proposals will replace existing mines as they are depleted of their phosphate resources. Over the life of this RMP, the PFO anticipates two additional applications to mine may be submitted for existing leases in the Slug Creek drainage (Caldwell Canyon), and the Dairy Syncline area. Site-specific environmental analyses will be conducted when those applications are received.

Selenium and Other Contamination Issues at Phosphate Mines

In 1996, federal and state agencies became aware of elevated levels of selenium leaching from a historic phosphate mine. Six horses pastured downstream from the South Maybe Canyon Mine were diagnosed with selenium poisoning. At that time, tribal governments and federal and state agencies cooperated with the phosphate mining companies to determine the nature and extent of the release. Interim sampling and study programs showed selenium and copper, cadmium, nickel, chromium, vanadium, and zinc were elevated at the pasture site. Subsequent investigations have found selenium and other contaminants in water, soil, and reclamation vegetation at the southeast Idaho phosphate mines. These contaminants are associated with both the historic and active phosphate mines.

Selenium and other contaminants are released from phosphate mines through the oxidation process. Material located between the two main ore beds, often called interburden or the center waste shale, is naturally enriched in clay, carbon, selenium, and many other metals. When the interburden is removed during the mining process and placed in stockpiles, it is exposed to air and oxygenated rain. As the rock oxidizes, selenium and other metals can become soluble to water. Once dissolved, these contaminants can be transported to surface and ground water.

Selenium in water can be taken up and bioaccumulated by plants and can enter the food chain. Selenium in small doses is a necessary nutrient often added to salt blocks for grazing animals. In larger doses selenium may be toxic. Sheep and horses tend to be the most sensitive livestock and the most likely to suffer detrimental effects of chronic or acute selenium poisoning. Currently, the risks to wildlife in the phosphate mining area are being assessed. An investigation and remediation of selenium and other contamination of phosphate mine areas is currently underway

under the authority of a joint federal and state Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA) project. Remediation will be completed on a site-by-site basis. Changes in BLM grazing management have been made to reduce risks to livestock. Public lands affected by selenium accumulation in vegetation have been closed to sheep and horse grazing.

In 1999, the BLM sent a letter to all grazing permittees warning of the potential risks to livestock associated with water and vegetation from reclaimed phosphate mining disturbance. In 2000, a formal response under CERCLA was taken by the involved federal (BLM, Forest Service, USFWS, BIA, and EPA), state (IDEQ), and tribal (Shoshone-Bannock Tribes) agencies. The IDEQ was chosen as the lead agency.

Signed consent orders among the agencies and phosphate mining companies outlined a two-tiered approach to assessing the risk associated with the selenium release. There would be one large area-wide investigation and 15 separate, site-specific investigations.

A Web site has been developed where data and reports are centralized in downloadable formats, along with a map server, at http://giscenter-ims.isu.edu/SISP/SISP_Home_Page.html.

Area-Wide CERCLA Investigation

The first tier of the coordinated CERCLA investigation is assessing the nature of the selenium release on an area-wide scale. This involves a study area of approximately 2,500 square miles for which an area-wide human health and ecological risk assessment and an area-wide risk management plan has been developed. Among other things, the plan includes analysis of groundwater, surface water, soil, waste rock, and ecological receptors such as vegetation, invertebrates, small mammals, birds, and large ungulates. It has been found on a regional, area-wide basis that, toxicologically, selenium and cadmium pose the greatest toxicological risk to the environment.

The conclusions of the area wide human health and ecological risk assessment are as follows:

- Based on current conditions, there is a low probability of human health risks in the region. Potentially significant health risks to humans are indicated only in the case of subsistence lifestyle users and only if subsistence is localized in a highly affected area. Based on regional observations, subsistence level human use is highly unlikely.
- Based on current conditions, there is a low probability of population level impacts on regional wildlife.
- There is a high probability of subpopulation or individual level effects occurring for ecological flora and fauna receptors growing and residing in the vicinity of highly affected areas.

The IDEQ has listed six stream segments within the project area as impaired with high selenium concentrations under section 303(d) of the Clean Water Act. Based on high selenium concentrations in some fish, in 2002, the Idaho Department of Health and Welfare has issued a fish consumption advisory for cutthroat and brook trout from East Mill Creek.

Site-Specific Investigations

After the regulatory agencies' formal CERCLA action, a schedule was developed for investigating the selenium releases from four active and 11 inactive phosphate mines. Investigations at eight sites were expected to begin in 2002, at four sites in 2003, and at three sites in 2004. Investigations were expected to take one to two years each, followed by one to two years of mitigation, if necessary. This schedule has proven to be optimistic. Although many investigations are underway, several will not start until at least 2008. Most investigations are expected to take three to four years, and mitigation could take at least that long. Under CERCLA, the cost of the investigation and remediation is the burden of the potentially responsible parties, such as the phosphate mining companies.

Work is being carried out under consent orders between agencies and the phosphate mining companies: FMC Corporation, J. R. Simplot Company, P4 Production, LLC, Rhodia, LLC, and Nu-West Industries, Incorporated. There are 15 phosphate mining sites involved, and remediation is expected to be completed at all of the sites between 2015 and 2020. More is now known about the contaminant release mechanism and potential environmental pathways. Operating mines and future phosphate mines are now incorporating improved selenium control practices, and the hope is that future releases of metals into the environment will not be above regulatory standards.

Phosphate Mine Reclamation and Selenium Control

Reclamation

Prior to the 1970s, there were few federal mine reclamation requirements. Since then, additional reclamation requirements affecting phosphate mines have been developed in the form of laws, regulations and lease terms. Some of the current requirements include: FLPMA, the Idaho Surface Mining Act, regulations at 43 CFR 3500, standard industry practices, Region IV Forest Service requirements and guidelines, and site-specific requirements incorporated into each Mine and Reclamation Plan from NEPA analysis.

The BLM requires each mining operation to post a performance bond that includes a reclamation component. The bonds provide the agencies with sufficient funding to complete outstanding reclamation in the case of company insolvency.

Current reclamation practices at the phosphate mines include backfilling mined-out pits, use of external waste rock dumps, shaping, planting, and other state-of-the-art practices. Several phosphate mines have received state and national reclamation awards. Although backfilling mined-out pits is a standard practice that is employed at all new phosphate mines, in most instances, current phosphate mining economics preclude re-excavating and hauling overburden from external dumps to fill the final pit excavation left over from previous mining operations. Reclaimed waste dump slope ratios are generally designed to not exceed 3:1 slope (horizontal to vertical).

General reclamation requirements include the following:

- Implementing an overall reclamation program designed to remove facilities and recontour, topsoil, and reseed project features (for example, pits, waste dumps, tailings disposal areas, haul roads, mill sites, conveyor systems, railroads, slurry pipeline, and transmission line corridors) in accordance with the standards and requirements mentioned above.
- Working toward restoring diverse plant communities that incorporate native species beneficial to wildlife, including grasses, forbs, brush, aspen, and conifer. A revegetation plan is used to direct long-term standards.
- Phosphate mines typically have at least one external overburden rock waste dump composed of overburden material from the initial mine excavation. Then, as mining proceeds and when possible, the BLM requires mine operators to use overburden to backfill previously mined areas. An additional external dump may be necessary in some cases where the volume of mined material, which packs less efficiently, is greater than remaining pit volume.
- Topsoil is salvaged prior to mine disturbance and used for seeding reclaimed areas.
- Livestock grazing is prohibited until the area is released to multiple use management.

Best Management Practices

Operators of active mines have implemented newly designed mitigation measures and operational practices engineered to minimize, reduce, or eliminate impacts from selenium and other contamination at their sites (**Appendix C** and Selenium BMPs Catalog for Phosphate Mining, Idaho Mining Association and IDEQ 2004). Measures and practices have also been developed in EISs prepared for recent phosphate mining proposals. The BLM has applied selenium control measures to all mine and reclamation approvals since 2000 and will continue to refine these management practices in each upcoming mine and reclamation plan assessment, environmental review, and selenium assessment (BLM and Forest Service 2000; BLM, et. al. 2003; BLM and Forest Service 2002; BLM and Forest Service 2005). The BLM has instituted intensive monitoring of mine sites to determine the effectiveness of these measures and to assist in modifying these practices if they are determined to be less effective than needed. In addition to measures formulated in recent phosphate mine EISs, a draft catalog of BMPs for addressing selenium control has been developed for use by regulatory agencies and the phosphate mining industry.

Where possible, placing seleniferous materials in external waste dumps is minimized, usually through backfilling mined-out pits. This action reduces the oxidizing process and the potential for selenium release.

If it is necessary to place seleniferous shales in waste rock dumps, the shales are encapsulated in “clean,” non-seleniferous material, usually chert or limestone from the upper parts of the Phosphoria Formation. This effectively breaks the connection between reclamation vegetation on the surface of waste dumps and pore water in the shales in the waste dump that may have acquired selenium.

Control of selenium in surface water is also a focus of BMPs. Clean, snow or rain runoff water is channeled around or within mine sites to avoid contact with seleniferous material or active mining areas. Water that may pick up selenium is controlled to prevent mixing with clean water. For example, it may be diverted back into the mined areas where it does not pose a threat as a pathway to animals or plants. Seleniferous shale is not typically used any longer in road construction or as growth media (soil substitute) in mine reclamation activities.

A variety of techniques are in place to prevent or reduce erosion and control sedimentation of streams. These include, but are not limited to, sloping of waste dumps to a 3:1 ratio (horizontal height to vertical height), sediment check dams, fast-growing seed mixes, and use of rock- or membrane-lined channels.

3.3.4.2 Other Leasable Minerals

Although other leasable minerals are present within the PFO area, they do not play a major role in mineral development activities at this time compared to phosphate.

Coal

There are no federal coal leases within the PFO area or in Idaho, but there is some Cretaceous-aged coal in the Fall Creek area of the Caribou Range. A four-foot interval of the Bear River Formation contains interbedded coal, clay, and limestone. This area is just north of the PFO boundary. Coal beds also form an outcrop to a minor extent at some other Idaho localities.

Oil Shale

High grade oil shale does not exist in within the PFO area. Low-grade oil shale has been reported near Meade Peak in the Paris-Bloomington area. It occurs in the vanadiferous zone in quantities ranging from 6 to 10 gallons per ton of rock (McKelvey 1946). Oil shale has been described in the Retort shale member, the top member of the Phosphoria Formation (Condit 1919). Oil shale has also been discovered on the bank of Bear River about four miles south of Soda Springs, where a flat-lying bed more than four feet thick disappears under basalt; a sample of the bed yielded 20 gallons of oil per ton of rock (USGS, et. al. 1977).

Sodium and Nitrate

There are no federal sodium or nitrate leases in the PFO area, and, based on current conditions, none are expected. However, there are small occurrences of both sodium and nitrate within the area.

Several springs along portions of Crow Creek and Stump Creek have sufficient dissolved sodium that the brines have been boiled and evaporated to create salt. Salt was produced from several springs from the mid 1800s to the early 1900s.

Fluid Leasable minerals: Oil and Gas/Geothermal

Oil and Gas Leasing

Oil and gas leasing on Federal lands is administered by the BLM through a competitive and noncompetitive leasing system. Oil and gas leases are issued for public domain lands under the

authority of the Mineral Leasing Act of February 25, 1920 (41 Stat. 437; 30 USC 181 *et. seq.*) as amended and supplemented, the Act of August 8, 1946 (60 Stat. 950), and the Act of September 2, 1960 (74 Stat. 781). Authority for leasing on acquired lands comes from the Leasing Act for Acquired Lands enacted on August 7, 1947 (61 Stat. 913). Upon passage of the Federal Onshore Oil and Gas Leasing Reform Act of 1987 (Pub. L. 100-203) the BLM made a major revision to the Federal Oil and Gas regulations in 43 CFR 3100. Made effective on June 17, 1988, the new regulations cover competitive and noncompetitive onshore oil and gas leasing.

Currently there are two oil and gas leases totaling approximately 2,500 acres. Issued between 2000 and 2003, these leases have a term of ten years. The leases are located in the vicinity of Bear Lake, on the western margin of the overthrust belt. No plans to drill have been submitted or approved on any of the leases.

The potential for oil and gas presence is high in the eastern portion of the field office. Occasional applications are received for oil and gas leases. **Appendices H and P** provide a thorough explanation of the current and proposed oil and gas leasing process, application of stipulations, and a reasonably foreseeable development scenario (RFDS).

Oil and Gas Occurrence

There are no producing oil or gas fields in Idaho. Oil and gas discoveries in Wyoming and Utah during the 1970s indicate the potential for oil and gas within the Idaho-Wyoming Thrust Belt, but there are no oil fields in Idaho. Hydrocarbons have been recovered from eight different carbonate and clastic units that range in age from Ordovician to Cretaceous (Powers 1978). The Phosphoria Formation is generally rich enough in organics to be considered a source rock.

Figure 3-15 shows the oil and gas potential for the PFO area. Based on a 1980s survey of oil companies and a 1978 USGS open file report, potential for oil and gas exists in the far eastern portions of the PFO area, primarily in the Bear Lake area and phosphate mining areas. These areas are considered to have a high potential for oil and gas discoveries in the PFO area. Oil and gas potential in the western portion of the PFO area comes with a deficiency of knowledge pertaining to the older, western thrust plate geometries which affect potential petroleum source reservoirs. Extreme heat associated with Snake Rive Plain volcanic activity has most likely burned or volatilized any hydrocarbons that may have existed on the north western portion of the PFO. This area is considered to have no oil and gas potential.

Oil and Gas Exploration

Historically, oil and gas activity in the PFO area has consisted of exploration only, and there has been no known production. Exploration dates back to 1926 and was directed toward the western Basin and Range portion of the PFO area and the Bear Lake area. By the mid 1980s, there were about 22 oil and gas bore holes in the Bear Lake area and 10 holes in the Basin and Range. Geophysical exploration was very widespread in southeast Idaho during the 1980s, but very little activity has taken place since. Drilling success has been limited, at best. The area has no producing wells, and the complex geology masks potential targets. This increases the costs and risks associated with exploration in rugged terrain and testing targets not expressed at the surface.

Coal Bed Methane

The potential for coal gas is very low in the PFO area. USGS indicates only a minor amount of potential in the overthrust belt located in the north and east portions of the FO area.

Geothermal Leasing

Leasing of geothermal resources on Federal lands is authorized by the Geothermal Steam Act of 1970 (84 Stat. 1566; 30 USC 1001 1025). In order to administer this law, regulations contained in 43 CFR 3200 were published December 21, 1973 and made effective January 1, 1974. These regulations are administered by the BLM. Another set of regulations which are also administered by the BLM and contained in 30 CFR 270, regulate exploration, development and production operations under federal leases. By law, the BLM is the designated federal agency for lease administration. On National Forest System lands, the Forest Service must agree to geothermal leasing. The BLM will not lease lands where it may cause “undue degradation to public lands and resources” within the National Park system, in a National Recreation Area, or where geothermal development may threaten thermal features in adjacent parks. The Energy Policy Act of 2005 directs that geothermal leases are to be issued by competitive bidding.

Currently there are two geothermal leases in the PFO area totaling approximately 730 acres. The leases are located in the Soda Springs and Grays Lake areas. The leases were issued in 2004 and have a term of 10 years which can be extended if a well exists that is producing or is capable of producing geothermal resources. There is a high potential for geothermal resource presence and development in some portions of the field office. **Appendices H and Q** provide a thorough explanation of the current and proposed geothermal leasing process, application of stipulations, and a RFDS.

Geothermal Occurrence

Geothermal resources occur most often in areas where there is anomalously high heat flow caused by volcanism or near-surface magma or some other exceptionally hot subsurface body. They often occur along fault or fracture zones where fracturing allows groundwater to circulate to depths such that it can be warmed significantly before it circulates back toward the surface.

The PFO area has abundant geothermal resources, including both thermal springs, where warm or hot water comes to the surface naturally, and thermal wells, which must be drilled, developed, and sometimes pumped. **Figure 3-17** shows the locations of geothermal features within the PFO area, where there are numerous undeveloped hot and warm springs and several developed geothermal resources. All of these developed uses are “direct” uses, where the hot water is used for space heating or for the hot water itself and not primarily to generate electricity. There are no geothermal power plants in the PFO area.

Much of the PFO area is near faults, Quaternary lava flows, and other predictors of geothermal potential. The entire area has a geothermal potential for direct uses. In local areas, the potential may be medium or high, depending on the proximity to certain geologic features or structures. A ranking of medium or high does not mean that the area will be developed or that a usable resource exists at any specific location. **Figure 3-18** shows the geothermal potential for zones in the PFO area. A low ranking does not mean an area does not contain an undiscovered geothermal

resource. Likewise, a ranking of high does not guarantee the presence of any geothermal resource.

Geothermal Use

Geothermal energy is broken down into two main uses, electrical generation and direct use. There are several subtypes of each. In any given area, direct uses of geothermal resources are much more likely than electrical uses because the resource does not need to be as hot, there are fewer technical challenges to overcome, and the required infrastructure and capital outlays are significantly less.

Geothermal resources in the PFO area are typically directly used. The town of Lava Hot Springs is renowned for its large thermal pools, and there are also several thermal wells in the area used for heating structures or providing hot water for recreation. Water temperature is approximately 104°F. As the town's name suggests, Lava Hot Springs is an important geothermal resource in the PFO area. Other commercial hot springs include those in Downata, Bear Lake, Indian Springs, and Maple Grove.

Figure 3-19 shows the locations of the utilized geothermal resources in the PFO area. There are several commercial heating and recreational wells and springs in the Lava Hot Springs area. Several thermal wells are either not in use or are used for non-geothermal purposes, such as stock watering or irrigation. Many thermal wells used for private residential heating may not be shown.

3.3.4.3 Locatable Minerals

A variety of locatable minerals are found within the PFO area due to its geologic diversity. However, the area generally lacks any known large, economically viable metal deposits. There are 456 active mining claims on public lands, most of which are in the Caribou Mountain Mining District or are associated with the production of lime and cement. There are no active metal mines and one gold mine is in the process of being closed. There are occurrences of gold, silver, copper, lead, mercury, manganese, rare earth elements, vanadium, uranium, sulphur, zeolites, perlite, magnesium, barite, silica, and high calcium grade limestone, dolomite and other minerals.

Locatable minerals are managed under the authority of the 1872 Mining Law, as amended, and 43 CFR, Parts 3700 and 3800. These laws and regulations give the public the right to explore for, develop, and extract locatable mineral deposits on open federal lands and mineral estates.

Precious Metal Occurrences and Current Operations

Precious metals in the PFO area consist principally of gold, gold placer, and silver. **Figure 3-13** shows occurrences of precious metals within the PFO area. Currently, there are no active large-scale precious metal mining operations. With the exception of the Black Pine Mine in Cassia County and the Caribou Mining District in Bonneville County, most precious metal deposits are small and uneconomic.

Mining for gold started and was active in the Caribou Mining District between 1870 and 1890. The mining district is in the Caribou Range east of Grey's Lake NWR and on the Caribou-

Targhee National Forest and patented mining claims. There are several shafts and adits in the area but no open pits. Today, there are approximately 52 active mining claims in the area, but no large-scale mining activity. Gold mineralization and lesser copper, silver, and iron are associated with sediments intruded by 50 million-year-old diorite magma. It is generally considered the metal source and driver of the hydrothermal system in the Caribou Mountain area.

The Black Pine Mine, located in the extreme western portion of the PFO area about 25 miles northwest of Snowville, Utah, was operated by Pegasus Gold Corporation between 1992 and 1999. The open pit mine produced around 50,000 ounces of gold annually using cyanide heap leaching methods from a Carlin-type disseminated gold deposit. The Black Pine Mine filed for bankruptcy and is no longer operating. The Forest Service is rehabilitating the mine site and associated facilities.

Panning and placer mining for gold are still popular recreational activities in the PFO area. There are gold placer deposits in the streams draining the Caribou Mining District and in the Snake River. The State of Idaho administers permits for mechanized gold collection or dredging in rivers. Both McCoy Creek and Tincup Creek, in the Caribou area, are closed to mechanized dredging. The Snake River contains placer deposits, from the town of Blackfoot downstream to American Falls Reservoir and from American Falls Reservoir downstream all the way to the Idaho/Oregon border. Snake River gold is typically quite fine in size. There are 90 active placer claims in the PFO area.

The Fort Hall Mining District encompasses all of the small prospects and mines from the historic Fort Hall Mine just south of Pocatello in Fort Hall Canyon, north to the prospects on Moonlight Mountain. The district also includes the prospects in the Portneuf Gap/Blackrock Canyon area, the Chinese Peak area, Bell Marsh Creek, and Garden Gap area. The district is dominated by base metals, but minor amounts of gold and silver do occur. Mineralization generally occurs in quartz veins in Precambrian siliceous and volcanic rocks.

Base Metal Occurrences and Current Operations

Base metal deposits, which consist of copper, lead, zinc, manganese, and minor molybdenite, are relatively abundant in the PFO area. The Fort Hall Mining District, areas around the Black Pine Mine, the Bear Lake Mining District, the Montpelier District, and the Nounan area have all produced small amounts of copper, lead, or zinc. Manganese has been produced in areas associated with geothermal activity. Currently, there are no active base metal mines in operation. Base metal deposits within the PFO area are typically small.

The Montpelier Mining District in the Pegram Hills, east of Montpelier, contains several copper prospects but has had no production. Copper, as malachite staining, occurs on fractures in shales of the Ankara Formation and is presumed to be related to and associated with “red beds” of the Triassic aged formation (Mansfield 1927). There are no active claims in the area.

A small amount of copper carbonates (azurite and malachite) occur in Ordovician-aged carbonate units west of the town of Nounan, on the northern end of the Wasatch (Bear River) range. The mineralization is hosted in northwest-trending quartz veins. There are no active claims in the area.

There are manganese deposits, associated with geothermal occurrences, in the PFO area. Small amounts of production have occurred around Lava Hot Springs and the north end of the Oneida Narrows.

Rare Earth Occurrences and Current Operations

Vanadium, uranium, and other rare earth elements (for example, concentrations of gallium, scandium, and Yttrium) are elevated, along with phosphate, in the black shales of the Phosphoria Formation. The Permian-aged Phosphoria Formation outcrops are over a large area east, northeast, and southeast of Soda Springs, Idaho. The Paleozoic sedimentary sequence in this area has been intensely folded and faulted by the Idaho-Wyoming Fold and Thrust Belt; thus, the Phosphoria Formation has a surface expression of long linear bands.

In the late 1930s, the USGS discovered high values of vanadium oxide in the Phosphoria Formation. By the end of the 1940s, the USGS, Wyodak Coal Co., and the US Bureau of Mines had indicated subeconomic vanadium resources in the Paris-Bloomington area and on Sublette Ridge, Wyoming (McKelvey, et. al. 1986).

Vanadium has been recovered in the past as a by-product of elemental phosphorus processing. Vanadium has been recovered in the past from ferro-phosphorus, a by-product of elemental phosphorus production. This plant, in Soda Springs, Idaho, began operation in March 1964 and closed in 1999. The plant had a capacity of about 4 million pounds per year. In this case, the vanadium was not considered to be a locatable mineral since its recovery was in conjunction with processing a leasable mineral.

Currently there are no rare earth mining operations in the PFO area. Although uranium and other rare earth elements are elevated over 10 times background concentrations in shales of the Phosphoria Formation, in current economic conditions they are of only scientific interest.

Industrial Mineral Occurrences and Current Operations

Industrial minerals are those that are utilized in industrial processes. Some examples of industrial minerals are limestone, zeolites, silica, sulphur, perlite, pumice, and peat. The types and uses of industrial minerals are varied. They may be categorized as leasable or salable instead of locatable. They are managed according to the rules and regulations applicable to their categorization.

Precambrian through Mesozoic limestone is common throughout the PFO area. Depending on the mineral and its characteristics, industrial minerals may be leasable, salable, or locatable. The two limestone processing operations in the PFO area are the Ash Grove Cement plant in Inkom and Chemstar's Tenmile Pass operation in the Chesterfield Range. Ash Grove Cement produced 240,000 tons of product in 2001. The mine and plant are on private land. Chemstar's Tenmile Pass operation, permitted to mine 7,000 to 10,000 tons of chemical- and metallurgical-grade limestone per day and to produce 600 tons of lime per day, is active but not currently producing. There are approximately 320 active limestone claims in the PFO area.

Zeolites (hydrous aluminosilicates) are found in the PFO area, most commonly in the reworked ash deposits of the Salt Lake Formation. They are sought for their high capacity for ion exchange

and are used in filtration systems, environmental cleanup, and specialty concretes. Currently, there are 24 active claims for zeolites in the PFO area.

In 2000, the Bear River Zeolite Company constructed its zeolite mining operation northeast of Preston. They began mining and processing zeolite in mid-2001. The ore, potassium clinoptilolite, is mined from extensive ash deposits of the Salt Lake Formation. The company currently mines and mills about 5,000 tons of ore annually. There is very little to no waste associated with the ore. The mine is located on private land, but portions of the future reserves extend onto public land.

Silica, often used as a flux in the processing of other minerals, is also located throughout the resource area. Most silica is mined in the form of silica-rich quartzite, sandstone, and conglomerates, the most common of which would be the Ordovician Swan Peak quartzite and the Precambrian Caddy Canyon Quartzite. Silica is currently being mined from patented claims for use at the Monsanto Phosphate Plant.

Sulphur occurs east of Soda Springs, Idaho, in the lower part of Sulphur Canyon of the Aspen Range. It occurs as small crystals associated with springs along the Aspen Range range-front fault system. There are also several prospects along the range front to the southeast. Sulphur deposits are sometimes surface mined for use in soil additives, as in Nevada. There are currently no active sulphur mining operations in southeast Idaho.

Perlite, hydrated rhyolitic glass, is sought for its low density and high insulating capacity. It is also used to increase soil's water retention as a soil amendment. It is associated with six- to nine-million-year-old rhyolitic pyroclastic and lava flows and is found northwest of Wakely Peak in the Bannock Range. Idaho is the seventh largest perlite producing state in the nation, and Hess Pumice Products operates the only perlite facility in the PFO area. The company has a pit on private land in Wright Canyon, about 20 miles northwest of Malad and processes the raw material by "heating and popping" at a perlite expanding facility in Malad. Hess sells both raw material and finished product by contract. In 2002, it mined approximately 20,000 tons, but in 2001 mined no raw material and used existing stockpiles. The project has reported reserves to last 50 to 100 more years at current mining rates.

Peat occurs in several places in the south end of Marsh Valley, west of the town of Downey. The peat is used in horticulture as mulch and soil additive but not as a fuel. Occurrences of peat also exist north of Bear Lake near the town of Dingle. There are two active peat operations in the PFO area, on private land in the south end of Marsh Valley, in the vicinity of Interstate 15. Production is inconsistent, and the deposits are mined only to fill contracts.

3.3.4.4 Salable Minerals

Interest has increased in the use of the PFO area's salable minerals during the past few years. As of August, 2006, the PFO (including the Malad Field Station) has 16 free use permits, one negotiated sale, and five community pits/common use areas. The community pits and common use areas offer sand, gravel, and stone for public purchase and use. These gravel pits and stone quarries are located near Pocatello, McCammon, Stone, and Bear Lake. Free use permits are occasionally issued to local government highway departments, non profit, and other eligible entities. Annually, approximately ten permits are sold to the public for sand and gravel out of

two pits. The material is used primarily for road building, fill, and other maintenance. Building stone use has also increased in popularity. Scoriaceous basalt, quartzite, and sandstone are available. **Figure 3-14** shows the occurrences of sand and gravel within the PFO area.

The Materials Act of July 31, 1947 (61 Stat. 681), amended by the Acts of July 23, 1955 (PL-167; 69 Stat. 367), and September 28, 1962 (PL87-713), authorized that certain mineral materials be disposed either through a contract of sale or a free use permit. This group of mineral materials, commonly known as "salable minerals" includes, but is not limited to petrified wood and common varieties of sand, stone, gravel, pumicite, cinders and clay on public lands of the US - 30 USC 601 (1976). Regulations that guide the BLM's salable minerals program are found in Title 43 CFR, Group 3600.

Sand and Gravel Occurrences and Current Operations

Sand and gravel occurs throughout the PFO area and are used as fill material, aggregate in concretes, for road base, and sometimes in hot-mix asphalt.

There are three main types of deposits. The first two types of sand and gravel deposits are associated with Pleistocene-aged Lake Bonneville, a large lake that covered two-thirds of Utah and portions of Nevada and Idaho. Approximately 17 thousand years ago, a natural dam failed, catastrophically draining the lake. The resulting flood created large gravel deposits in Marsh Valley and in the flats northwest of Pocatello to the American Falls Reservoir. Sand and gravel is also found in Gilbert-type deltas where rivers emptied into Lake Bonneville and dropped their sediment loads. Today these deposits form "benches" along the sides of Cache Valley and Pocatello Valley. Deposits are coarsest near the mouths of canyons and are fine distally. Gravels from both of the Bonneville-type deposits tend to be unconsolidated to loosely consolidated. Clast-types reflect the bedrock of the surrounding mountain ranges, generally limestone and quartzite, though basalt clasts are not uncommon. The Bonneville-type deposits are generally well sorted, though screening may be necessary depending on the application. Bear Lake Valley contains similar gravel deposits, but they are related to Pleistocene Bear Lake high levels/benches and not to Lake Bonneville.

The third type of gravel deposit is associated with alluvial fans, active stream channels, and abandoned stream channels. These sands and gravels vary locally in size, sorting and parent material. Quality and quantity also vary from deposit to deposit. The main use of these types of deposit is for rural road maintenance and fill.

Sand and gravel occur throughout the PFO area. Approximately 10 permits per year are sold to the public, for a total of about 760 cubic yards. Approximately 5,700 tons of sand and gravel were removed from public land last year under 12 free-use permits. Sand and gravel are used as aggregate in some concretes, for road base, and sometimes in hot-mix asphalt. The PFO area has two pits available for use.

Cinders and Pumice Occurrences and Current Operations

Both volcanic cinders and pumice occur within the PFO area. Cinders are small (less than two centimeters [cm]) highly vesiculated basalt, which form when there is highly volatile material or high water content in basaltic eruptions. They have a moderate specific gravity of around 2 and

are used for winter road traction and for decorative landscaping groundcover. Scoria is a slightly larger and less vesiculated form of basalt and occurs in similar deposits (2-10 cm) and has similar applications. Deposits of both of these forms of basalt may be somewhat cohesive but crush easily. Quaternary- and late Tertiary-aged basaltic volcanism is ubiquitous in the valleys of southeast Idaho and on the eastern Snake River Plain. The largest and highest quality cinder deposits are found in the Gem Valley volcanic center, but smaller deposits are also found in Marsh Valley and Arbon Valley. Nearly all of the valleys in southeast Idaho with mapped basalt deposits are highly likely to contain cinders and scoria.

Pumice is a highly vesiculated rhyolitic glass with a very low specific gravity of less than 1 to 1.5. It occurs as massive blocks deposited in lava flows and as lapilli deposited in pyroclastic flows. It is a multi-use abrasive, and in larger blocks it is cut and used as a lightweight, high-temperature, nonconductive, rigid insulator. It is found associated with the perlite northwest of Malad, in Rockland Valley, Gem Valley, and in the China Cap area north of Soda Springs.

Building Stone Occurrences and Current Operations

Limestone is common throughout the Neoproterozoic- and Paleozoic-aged rock-containing mountain ranges in the PFO area. It is relatively durable and may be easy or difficult to work, depending on which formation it comes from. Aesthetically it is not very popular, however some rocks rich in common variety invertebrate fossils have a higher aesthetic value. Limestone boulders are also valuable for decorative landscaping, particularly when covered with lichen. Some limestone, generically referred to as tuffa or travertine, may be highly valuable when cut into slabs and polished for use in countertops and tile. These deposits generally occur erratically in valleys and are associated with sodic and thermal springs. Unique mineralization localized in some areas of the Salt Lake Formation limestone may make some deposits of this rock popular if a market is developed.

Basalt is ubiquitous throughout southeast Idaho and is a common rock type in basins and on the Snake River Plain. It is extremely durable and thus makes an excellent structural stone. When moderately vesiculated, it is also a good natural insulator, compared to other building stones. However, when basalt becomes overly vesiculated it loses its durability and is then usually used as a facing stone only. There are many buildings in southeast Idaho in which basalt was used as a building stone, though recently it has not been aesthetically popular. There is a large demand for decorative basalt boulders. Lichen-encrusted and naturally sculpted boulders can be very valuable. Caliche-encrusted boulders are also used for landscaping but are less desirable. Basalt boulders litter the ground and shallow subsurface throughout Marsh Valley, the Lower Portneuf Valley and Blackfoot River Canyon.

Quartzite occurs through out the Neoproterozoic- and Paleozoic-aged rock-containing mountain ranges of southeast Idaho. Boulders are found in hillslope or talus deposits, the lower Salt Lake Formation, alluvial fans, and less commonly in Bonneville flood deposits. The most common quartzite formations are the Neoproterozoic Caddy Canyon Quartzite, Neoproterozoic Mutual Formation, which is often purple to pinkish white and may be conglomeritic, the Cambrian Camelback Quartzite, which is often whitish with rusty iron oxide coatings, and the Ordovician Swan Peak Formation, which is white to pale green. Mutual and Swan Peak Formations are

generally the most aesthetically pleasing. Most quartzite is in the form of boulders and is not quarried in this area. Quartzite, like dense basalt, is extremely durable but very difficult to work.

Sandstone, particularly Jurassic Nugget sandstone, is easily worked and cleaves into flat pieces or flagstone. It is relatively durable and aesthetically pleasing. Because of this, it can be shipped a long way to market and still be profitable. It occurs on the Bear Lake plateau on the east side of Bear Lake. It is a lateral equivalent to the Navajo sandstone, which forms the dramatic canyon land scenery of southern Utah.

There are currently three community pits, designed for public collection of building or decorative stone, in the PFO area. Sandstone is available at the Bear Lake Community Pit, basalt is available at the Hell's Half Acre Community Pit, and quartzite is available at the Caddy Canyon Community Pit.

The Bear Lake Community Sandstone Pit is a quarry that was opened in 1988 and continues to operate. The pit is accessed via Indian Creek Road, near the northeast corner of the lake. Four permits were issued for four tons of rock in 2001, seven permits for 64 tons were written in 2002, and 13 permits were written for 446 tons of sandstone by the third quarter of 2003. The quarry is relatively remote from the PFO area, and in 2003, there have been two instances of alleged mineral trespass at the pit.

The Caddy Canyon Community Quartzite Pit also was established in 1988. Currently, public access is very limited and development of this resource has almost halted. Quartzite is available from a talus-type deposit on the side of the canyon. Over the last several years about one permit for two tons of rock has been issued each year.

The Hells Half Acre Community Basalt Pit is northwest of Blackfoot, Idaho. It was established in 1980 and is still in operation. Historically, 7 to 10 permits per year are issued here.

3.3.4.5 Abandoned Mine Lands Program

The Abandoned Mine Lands (AML) Program is a state and national BLM priority. The emphasis has been placed on ensuring public safety and protecting watersheds from hazardous materials and mine drainage. At the field office level, the purpose of the program is to identify and characterize inactive mine sites. Hazards or potential hazards to human health, safety, and the environment will be inventoried, and data collected will be stored in a state or national database.

Specific sites may be closed or remediated in order to protect human health or the environment. In the Pocatello Resource Area, there are two main groups of inactive mines: the underground mines, associated with phosphate mining between 1907 and about 1950, and the small underground mines and exploration adits, associated with the pursuit of base metals in the early 1900s.

Currently, the AML Program has not been active in assessing the small underground phosphate mines. This assessment is being conducted as part of the area-wide selenium investigation. To date, the assessment is not yet complete. If remediation is necessary and no responsible party is available or capable to conduct remedial work, then it is likely that the BLM's AML expertise and resources would be used where applicable.

The PFO staff have implemented closures of shafts and abandoned mine openings to ensure public safety. Abandoned portals and shafts have recently been closed in the Chinese Peak and Lava Hot Springs areas. The abandoned mines program continues to remediate hazards as they are identified and as resources allow.

3.3.5 RECREATION

Public lands in the planning area provide a variety of recreation opportunities. The major uses include, but are not limited to, fishing, hunting, camping, OHV use, mountain biking, hiking, horseback riding, cross-country skiing, wildlife viewing, pleasure driving, snowmobiling, and motorized and nonmotorized boating. The PFO manages developed recreation sites, Special Recreation Management Areas (SRMAs), several dispersed (undeveloped) recreation sites/areas, motorized and nonmotorized trails, and three rivers used for recreation.

3.3.5.1 Recreation Opportunity Spectrum

Planning area public lands contain a variety of Recreation Opportunity Spectrum (ROS) settings, but no formal ROS classifications have been recorded in previous planning documents. The ROS inventory, adopted by the BLM and the Forest Service, characterizes lands in terms of the types of recreation experiences, activities, and settings that are provided. These opportunities are within a spectrum of six land classes: primitive, semiprimitive nonmotorized, semiprimitive motorized, roaded natural, rural, and modern-urban. Within areas inventoried using ROS, opportunities for recreation are varied and are classified according to the types of experience that can be achieved from participation, a variety of activities, and different environmental settings. The primary determinant of these recreation opportunity classes is the setting, which describes the overall environment in which the recreation occurs, influences specific types of activities that can occur, and ultimately determines the resulting types of experiences that users can achieve. The setting is formulated using a number of factors, such as remoteness, size, amount of landscape alteration or development, number of recreation users and their noticeability, and management constraints. Six broad types or classes of recreation opportunities have been recognized on a spectrum ranging from largely natural and low-use areas (resource dependent) to highly developed and intensively used areas (facility dependent). These classes are named and described in **Table 3-24**. Although no formal ROS classifications have been recorded in previous planning documents, all public lands were classified according to the ROS system as part of the ICBEMP in the late 1990s (Forest Service and BLM 2003).

Table 3-24. Recreation Opportunity Spectrum

ROS Unit	Description of Unit
Primitive (Unit I)	Areas lying more than three miles from the nearest point of motor vehicle access, having unmodified landscapes, where there is little evidence of other people, and that are almost completely free of management controls.
Semiprimitive Nonmotorized (Unit II)	Areas at least one-half mile from the nearest point of motor vehicle access but not as distant as three miles, having mostly natural landscapes, where there is some evidence of other people, and where there are very few management controls.

Table 3-24. Recreation Opportunity Spectrum

ROS Unit	Description of Unit
Semiprimitive Motorized (Unit III)	Areas alongside or near four-wheel-drive roads and trails, having mostly natural landscapes, where there is often evidence of other people but where numbers seem to remain low, and where management controls are evident but not dominant.
Roaded Natural (Unit IV)	Areas alongside or near improved roads where pickups and cars can be driven, having naturally appearing but modified landscapes, where there are moderate evidence and numbers of other people, and where management controls provide a sense of security.
Rural	Areas alongside or near paved highways, or having heavily modified landscapes, where there may be considerable evidence or numbers of other people, and where management controls are easily seen.
Modern-Urban	Areas alongside or near paved highways, or where the natural landscape is dominated or replaced by manmade developments, where there is much evidence of other people, and where management controls are numerous and dominant.

Source: BLM 1988d

3.3.5.2 Visitor Use

Most recreation activity is concentrated in the Pocatello Off-road Vehicle SRMA, the Blackfoot River SRMA, and the Oneida Narrows, which does not have a special management designation. The remaining recreation areas and sites are within the Pocatello Extensive Recreation Management Area (ERMA), which comprises the remainder of planning area public lands outside the two SRMAs.

A total of 266,081 visits comprising 398,277 visitor days were made to public lands in the planning area between October 1, 2002 and September 30, 2003 (BLM 2004f). A visit is one person's trip, or visit, to planning area public lands. A visitor day represents one person doing an activity for any part of one day. For example, if one person spent one night camping on public lands, it is counted as two visitor days. Most visits comprised of more than one day; each visit to planning area public lands averaged about 1.5 days. **Table 3-25** displays the diverse activities enjoyed by recreationists for public lands in the PFO area.

The majority of visitor days are spent camping, viewing wildlife, and for social gatherings. Each of these activities comprises about 20 percent of visitor days. Freshwater fishing and picnicking each total about seven percent, and the remaining recreation activities, including OHV use, horseback riding, hunting, boating, and other uses, each comprise less than five percent of total visitor days (BLM 2004g).

In addition, Forest Service lands, such as Caribou-Targhee National Forest, are within the planning area and constitute a major recreation and tourism destination, drawing local visitors and tourists from throughout the region and the nation. **Table 3-26** displays the estimated number of travel parties to the planning area by season.

Table 3-25. Recreation Management Area Use in the Pocatello Field Office Area (October 1, 2002 – September 30, 2003)

Management Area/Site	Approximate Visits	Approximate Visitor Days	Approximate Percentage of Total Visitor Days
Blackfoot River SRMA Total	68,101	97,336	24%
Blackfoot Reservoir Campground	7,000	11,734	3%
Graves Creek Campground	4,000	4,338	1%
Cutthroat Trout Campground	2,601	3,095	1%
Sagehen Flat Campground	2,900	4,160	1%
Wolverine Canyon Campground (2 sites)	7,000	6,198	2%
Upper Blackfoot River (dispersed use)	35,100	52,562	13%
Trail Creek Bridge Campground	6,000	9,685	2%
Morgan's Bridge	3,500	5,564	1%
Pocatello SRMA Total	35,300	43,589	11%
Blackrock Canyon/Chinese Peak OHV Area	8,300	10,334	3%
Dispersed use	27,000	33,255	8%
Pocatello ERMA Total	166,680	261,352	65%
Goodenough Creek Campground	6,600	7,893	2%
Heart Mountain Spring Campground	1,900	2,448	1%
Pipeline	4,000	4,000	1%
Hawkins Reservoir Campground	7,400	10,483	3%
Maple Grove Campground	6,000	14,343	4%
Red Point Campground	14,200	34,766	9%
Dispersed use	126,580	187,419	47%
Total for All Recreation Management Areas	270,081	402,277	100%

Source: BLM 2004h

Table 3-26. Number of Travel Parties to the Planning Area Region by Season

Season	Dates (Duration)	Total Travel Parties
Spring	March 16-June 14 (91 days)	2,060,602
Summer	June 15-September 6 (84 days)	2,481,095
Fall	September 7-November 30 (85 days)	1,951,288
Winter	December 1-March 15 (105 days)	2,112,980
Year-Round (Total)	(365 days)	8,605,965

Source: University of Idaho 2000

Since 1980, there has been an average four percent increase in recreation visits to the planning area, and recreation visits are estimated to continue to increase at an annual rate of one to four percent. While Idaho's population grew 28 percent between 1990 and 2000, the planning area's populations increased between 5 and 23 percent. Population growth, as well as an increase in the number of visitors per year to Idaho, has created a rising demand for recreation opportunities. In 2002, the Outdoor Industry Association's State of Affairs ranked Idaho as the number one state

in the nation for recreation, with about 87 percent of residents participating in outdoor activities (Outdoor Industry Association 2003).

Because southeast Idaho contains large portions of public land, recreation activities are abundant and readily accessible to many residents. Pocatello's proximity to ski areas makes it popular for snowboarding, skiing, and mountain biking. In addition to campers, picnickers, and all-terrain vehicle (ATV) users, trails through public lands receive heavy traffic from hikers and motorcyclists during snow-free seasons. ATV users, mountain bikers, and cross-country skiers have increased the popularity of trails.

According to a University of Idaho travel study that surveyed user trends within the planning area, just less than 50 percent of visitors to planning area counties identified themselves as day users, and about 52 percent stayed overnight. Almost 30 percent of overnight stays were on open lands, and the remainder stayed in public campsites (21 percent), local motels (17 percent), and private homes (22 percent) (University of Idaho 2000).

Visitors attached the highest importance rating to the experience of obtaining environmental awareness and managing for environmental benefits. In addition, remote and more primitive recreation opportunities were favored by the greatest percentage of visitors (University of Idaho 2000). The most common and most desired activities on public lands were fishing, hiking, camping, photography, wildlife/bird observation, picnicking, hunting, and OHV use. The area was most highly valued for viewing scenery, experiencing nature, escaping crowds and stress, being physically active, experiencing quiet and solitude, providing a sense of discovery, and being with friends (Idaho Department of Commerce 2003).

3.3.5.3 Visitor Publications and Facilities

The BLM has developed and published informational material in response to customer demand for maps of wilderness trails, rapids, campsites, and other interest points. Its primary tools for distributing these materials are wilderness area brochures and a joint BLM/Forest Service newspaper that provides information and maps for the PFO area and the Caribou-Targhee National Forest. Brochures are provided at the local BLM office, trailheads on BLM- and Forest Service-administered lands, counties' chambers of commerce, some local businesses, commercial outfitters, the BLM state office, and nearby BLM offices. Various BLM Web sites provide additional information.

The PFO actively manages 11 developed recreation sites (including one fee site, the Maple Grove Campground) and several dispersed recreation sites/areas (**Table 3-27**). Dike Lake Campground, which will be renamed Blackfoot Reservoir Campground, is scheduled to be converted to a fee site before this RMP is completed. The PFO area has nine developed and five undeveloped camping areas (**Table 3-27**). Developed camping area facilities may include toilets, tables, and fire grills. **Figure 2-3** depicts developed sites.

Table 3-27. Recreation Management Areas and BLM Developed and Dispersed Use Sites

Management Area/Site	Developed or Undeveloped/Dispersed	Primary Recreation Activities
Blackfoot River SRMA		
Dike Lake Campground (to be renamed as Blackfoot Reservoir Campground)	Developed	Camping, fishing, boating
Grave's Creek	Developed	Camping, fishing, nonmotorized boating
Cutthroat Trout	Developed	Camping, fishing, nonmotorized boating
Sage Hen Flats	Developed	Camping, fishing, nonmotorized boating
Wolverine Canyon (2 sites)	Undeveloped	Camping, picnicking
Upper Blackfoot River	Undeveloped	Camping, fishing, nonmotorized boating
Trail Creek Bridge	Developed	Camping, fishing, nonmotorized boating
Morgans Bridge	Developed	Camping, fishing, nonmotorized boating
Negro Creek	Undeveloped	Camping, fishing, nonmotorized boating
Pocatello Off-road Vehicle SRMA		
Blackrock Canyon/Chinese Peak OHV Area	Developed	OHV use, picnicking
Trail Creek Bridge	Undeveloped	OHV use, mountain biking, hiking/running
Sandy Lane/City Creek	Undeveloped	OHV use, mountain biking, hiking/running
Moonlight Mountain	Undeveloped	Picnicking, OHV use
Chinese Peak Hang Gliding Access	Undeveloped	Hang gliding, OHV use
Pocatello ERMA		
Goodenough Creek	Developed	Multiple use trailhead, camping, picnicking
Harkness Canyon	Undeveloped	Multiple use trailhead, camping
Black Canyon (Bear River)	Undeveloped	Nonmotorized boating
Fish Haven Creek	Undeveloped	Camping, picnicking, hunting
Heart Mountain Spring	Developed	Camping, picnicking
Pipeline	Developed	Camping, fishing, motorized boating
Hawkins Reservoir	Developed	Camping, fishing, picnicking
Maple Grove	Developed	Camping, fishing, motorized boating, picnicking
Red Point	Developed	Camping, fishing, nonmotorized boating, picnicking, caving
Formation Springs	Undeveloped	Hiking, sightseeing

Source: BLM 1988a

3.3.5.4 Recreation Management Areas

The current RMP recognizes recreation as the principal use of lands in two designated SRMAs: the Blackfoot River SRMA (14,720 acres) and the Pocatello Off-Road Vehicle SRMA (33,382 acres), which together comprise eight percent of the planning area (**Figure 2-3**). The remaining 92 percent of the planning area is the Pocatello ERMA, where significant recreation opportunities are limited to individual sites rather than larger areas of public lands. Visits to the

SRMAs are detailed below; visits to the Pocatello ERMA totaled 162,680 (comprising over 257,300 visitor days) between October 2002 and September 2003 (BLM 2004h). **Table 3-26** shows these management areas and the major developed and undeveloped BLM recreation sites.

Blackfoot River SRMA

The 14,720-acre Blackfoot River SRMA includes public lands along the Blackfoot River and Wolverine Creek (**Figure 2-3**). Several campgrounds have been constructed along the river corridor. Developed campgrounds and recreation sites within the SRMA are listed in **Table 3-27**. Recreational opportunities that exist in the Blackfoot River corridor include fishing, hunting, rock climbing, hiking, camping, picnicking, floating, kayaking, and boating. Fishing, camping, and nonmotorized boating are the primary activities. An intensively used recreation area, visits to the recreation sites and semi-developed campgrounds located along the river corridor totaled 68,101 between October 2002 and September 2003 (**Table 3-25**). These over 68,000 visits comprised over 97,300 visitor days (BLM 2004h).

The 34-mile segment of the Blackfoot River has become popular for nonmotorized boating. With adequate flows, most rapids between the Government Dam and Trail Creek are described as being runnable in open canoes, kayaks, rafts, and drift boats. The reach below Trail Creek Bridge with Class IV and V rapids was described as relatively unexplored but as having been run. These guidebooks refer to the area as an “extraordinary place to watch for birds” and as “having good fishing” (Daly and Watters 1999).

In the study area, vehicle access is generally limited to existing roads and trails. Several trails exist within the river corridor. Hunting, hiking, and camping are common activities in the river corridor and draw regional recreationists and out-of-state visitors. Visitors hunt and fish along the river throughout the year.

Pocatello Off-road Vehicle SRMA

The Pocatello Off-Road Vehicle SRMA encompasses 33,382 acres and includes public lands surrounding Pocatello (**Figure 2-12**). Lands are primarily located in the West Bench, Chinese Peak, Blackrock Canyon, Camelback, North Pocatello, South Pocatello, and Moonlight Mountain areas. The major recreation activity requiring intensive management is OHV use, primarily due to the rapid growth in the activity and the existing and potential resource damage resulting from the activity. Other recreation activities include mountain biking, hiking, running, cross-country skiing, horseback riding, hunting, and picnicking. Visits to the SRMA totaled 35,300 (comprising over 43,500 visitor days) between October 2002 and September 2003 (**Table 26**) (BLM 2004h).

The BLM is currently inventorying planning area public lands for existing routes and to date has inventoried approximately 40 percent of planning area public lands. These inventories show approximately 150 miles of existing routes on public lands in the Pocatello Off-Road Vehicle SRMA. However, it is challenging to assess all existing OHV routes, as new trails begin to be formed after a single OHV travels across an area. User-created trails are continually being developed throughout the PFO area. Inventories are continuing through the travel management planning process. These include four-wheel drive roads and trails, pack trails, old railroad grades, and other routes (BLM 2004a). Some are suitable for OHV use, while others are not

because of erosion, visual resources, road and trail density, or other factors. OHV designations within the SRMA are a mix of limited and open designations with seasonal closures. The “limited to existing roads and trails” designation has proven to be a failure in the PFO area. New trails have been pioneered throughout the Pocatello urban interface. Areas receiving the heaviest amount of use include the Blackrock Canyon/Chinese Peak OHV Area (which has 40 miles of designated trails), Trail Creek, Sandy Lane/City Creek, and Moonlight Mountain (**Table 3-27**).

3.3.5.5 *Off-Highway Vehicle Use*

“Off-highway vehicle” is a general term that refers to any motorized vehicle capable of operating on roads, trails, or designed areas that are not maintained. OHVs used in the planning area include trail motorcycles, ATVs (i.e., vehicles used on and off existing roads and trails, such as four-wheelers and three-wheelers), four-wheel drive vehicles (e.g., jeeps), and snowmobiles. OHV use occurs on public land throughout the PFO area. Motor vehicles generally provide a means of transportation for hunting, fishing, sightseeing, and other recreation activities. The PFO manages motorized and nonmotorized trails. The BLM’s OHV designations are as follows:

- **Open:** The BLM designates areas as open for intensive OHV use where there are no compelling resource protection needs, user conflicts, or public safety issues to warrant limiting cross-country travel.
- **Limited:** The agency designates areas as limited where it must restrict OHV use in order to meet specific resource management objectives. These limitations may include restricting the number or types of vehicles, limiting the time or season of use, allowing permitted or licensed use only, limiting use to existing roads and trails, and limiting use to designated roads and trails. The BLM may place other limitations, as necessary, to protect resources, particularly in areas that motorized OHV enthusiasts use intensely or where they participate in competitive events.
- **Closed:** The BLM designates areas as closed if closure to all vehicular use is necessary to protect resources, to ensure visitor safety, or to reduce use conflicts.

There are currently no designations for nonmotorized/mechanical (e.g., mountain bikes) or nonmotorized/nonmechanical recreational uses of public lands. Current OHV designations are listed in **Table 3-28** and are shown on **Figure 2-12**. The current designation system is highly complex and has proven to be confusing to the general public. In particular, the “limited to existing roads and trails” designation has proven to be a failure in the PFO area. New user-created routes have been pioneered throughout the Pocatello urban interface.

OHV use on public lands has increased substantially over the past few decades. According to the Idaho Department of Parks and Recreation, Southeast Idaho Recreation Registration Analysis, motorbike/ATV registrations in the nine planning area counties have increased over 97 percent between 1999 and 2003 (Idaho State Parks and Recreation 2005).

Table 3-28. Current Off-Highway Vehicle Designations and Existing Routes on Planning Area Public Lands

OHV Designation Area (Figure 2-12)	OHV Designation	Size (acres)	Percent of Planning Area
1	Closed to all vehicles ¹	1,300	0.2
2	Wheeled vehicles limited to existing roads and trails, closed to over-snow vehicles	11,500	1.9
3	Wheeled vehicles limited to existing roads and trails, open to over-snow vehicles	68,000	11.1
4	All vehicles limited to designated routes	71,900	11.7
5	Open to wheeled vehicles, over-snow vehicles restricted to designated routes	5,800	0.9
6	Wheeled vehicles limited to designated routes, closed to over-snow vehicles	4,800	0.8
7	Open to wheeled vehicles, closed to over-snow vehicles	3,700	0.6
8	Wheeled vehicles limited to existing roads and trails, over-snow vehicles restricted to designated routes	28,000	4.5
9	Vehicles over 40 inches wide limited to designated routes, wheeled vehicles less than 40 inches wide limited to existing roads and trails, open to over-snow vehicles	5,300	0.9
N/A	Open to all vehicles ²	61,300	10.0
N/A	Not designated ³	352,200	57.4
Total		613,800	

¹Closed areas consist of Worm Creek WSA, Travertine Park ACEC, and all RNAs, except Robbers Roost RNA, which limits wheeled vehicles to designated routes and is closed to over-snow vehicles.

²Consists of the Pocatello Resource Area boundary that was not numbered as another designation type in the Pocatello RMP and EIS (BLM 1988a).

³Consists of the Malad area of the Malad MFP (BLM 1981a), none of which was designated for any particular types of OHV use.

Source: BLM 2004a

3.3.5.6 Recreation Permit Administration

Special Recreation Permits

Special Recreation Permits are authorizations that allow for recreational uses of public lands and related waters. They are issued as a means to control visitor use, to protect recreational and natural resources, and to provide for the health and safety of visitors. Commercial Special Recreation Permits also are issued as a mechanism to provide a fair return for the commercial use of public lands. The PFO generally issues a few Special Recreation Permits for commercial hunting and fishing, yurt rentals, and an occasional organized event. All commercial, competitive, vending, special area uses, and organized group activities and event-use Special Recreation Permits are considered on a case-by-case basis.

Recreation Use Permits

Recreation use permits are authorizations for use of developed facilities that meet the fee criteria established by the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1964, as amended or subsequent authority (such as the pilot fee demonstration program). Recreation use permits are issued to ensure that US residents receive a fair and equitable return for the use of those facilities to help recover the cost of construction, operation, maintenance, and management of the permits. The PFO currently requires recreation use permits at Maple Grove Campground, which is the only fee site in the PFO area. The charge for overnight camping in each site is \$5 for the first vehicle and \$2 for additional vehicles. Fees are used to provide services for picnicking, camping, hiking, hunting, fishing, boating, and other watersports.

Concession Leases

Concession leases authorize the operation of recreation-oriented services and facilities by the private sector, on public lands, in support of BLM recreation programs. The concessionaire is authorized through a concession lease that requires the concessionaire to pay fees to the BLM in exchange for the opportunity to do business on public lands. BLM Handbook H-2930-1, Recreation Permit Administration, provides consistent and explicit direction to supplement the Recreation Permit Administration Manual 2930 and regulations set forth in 43 CFR 2930. There are no concession leases in the PFO area.

3.4 SPECIAL DESIGNATIONS

This section discusses existing WSA, ACEC, RNA, designated watchable wildlife areas, and wild and scenic river study segments in the planning area.

3.4.1 AREAS OF CRITICAL ENVIRONMENTAL CONCERN AND RESEARCH NATURAL AREAS

An ACEC is an area of public land where special management attention is required to protect and prevent irreparable damage to important historic, cultural, or scenic values, fish and wildlife resources, or other natural systems or processes or to protect life and safety from natural hazards. The restrictions associated with an ACEC designation are determined at the time the designation is made and are designed to protect the values or serve the purposes for which the designation was made.

An RNA is a special management area designated either by Congress or by an agency for research and education because the area has one or more of the following characteristics:

- A typical representation of a common plant or animal association;
- An unusual plant or animal association;
- A threatened or endangered plant or animal species;
- A typical representation of common geologic, soil, or water feature; or
- Outstanding or unusual geologic, soil, or water feature.

RNAs may be designated separately or as a part of other administrative designations such, as ACEC.

All ACECs and RNAs should be managed according to the BLM's publication *Fish and Wildlife 2000; Rare Plants & Natural Plant Communities, A Strategy for the Future National Strategy Plan Series* (BLM 2002c), the dictates of which are as follows:

- Natural, undisturbed plant communities are important as RNAs, serving as controls against which management of similar disturbed communities can be evaluated. For this reason, it is important to preserve good examples of every major plant community in an undisturbed state, even those that are common.
- This strategy focuses on natural plant communities, defined as those that have not been substantially altered by human activity or that are managed to minimize the adverse effects of human disturbance. Note that this definition does not state that a natural plant community must show no signs of human activity or that the effects of human disturbance must be eliminated. Probably nowhere in the West is it possible to find a plant community that could meet the latter definition. A natural plant community chosen for special management designations should be among the best representative stands of that community type. If the best remaining stands all show considerable evidence of human activities, then the best of these should be chosen and managed to reduce these effects.
- Once designated for special management, natural plant communities are managed in concert with the natural processes under which those particular communities evolved. For some natural plant communities it may be necessary to exclude particular uses. Others may require more intense management, such as prescribed burning to simulate wildfire. The management of all such natural plant communities requires careful planning, with consideration given to the principles of reserve design.

As further discussed in BLM 2000, the BLM's long-term strategy on management of Natural Plant Communities has the following goals:

- Goal 1, Policy. Develop policy and guidance for defining and managing natural plant communities;
- Goal 2, Inventory and Monitoring. Identify natural plant communities on public lands and ensure adequate data are available to guide management and conservation activities and evaluate the effects of management actions;
- Goal 3, Planning. Develop and implement plans, in accordance with schedules resulting from management decisions, to maintain the characteristics of natural plant communities; and
- Goal 4, Coordination. Collaborate on a continuing basis with the National Park Service, Forest Service, USFWS, the states, and private groups to protect the best natural plant communities and to ensure consistent management across jurisdictional boundaries.

Other ACECs should be managed for the purpose for which they were established; that is, a watershed should be managed to preserve vegetation to capture and release water; a historical ACEC should be managed to preserve the historical values and, where applicable and necessary, to restore those previously lost; and a wildlife ACEC should be managed to preserve those habitat components necessary for the long-term benefit of the wildlife.

The management of ACECs and RNAs could necessitate, for example, removing livestock where incompatible (e.g., RNAs), installing protective fencing around historical sites, restoring watershed values, and implementing travel, or seasonal access restrictions.

There are seven ACECs and seven RNAs in the PFO area, as listed in **Table 3-29** and shown on **Figure 2-3**.

The 1988 Pocatello RMP designates some public lands as closed to OHV use. This includes Travertine Park ACEC and all RNAs, except Robbers Roost RNA, which limits wheeled vehicles to designated routes and is closed to over-snow vehicles. Indian Rocks ACEC's designation limits all vehicles to designated routes. The Stump Creek ACEC designation limits wheeled vehicles to designated routes and is closed to over-snow vehicles. Bowen Canyon Bald Eagle Sanctuary ACEC is open to wheeled vehicles and closed to over-snow vehicles. Downey Watershed ACEC's designation limits wheeled vehicles to designated routes and is closed to over-snow vehicles. Old Juniper Townsite ACEC and Van Komen Homestead ACEC do not have OHV designations. In August 2006, the structures of the Van Komen Homestead ACEC were completely destroyed by a wildland fire. Thus, with the total loss of these structures, there is no longer a need to maintain this ACEC designation.

Table 3-29. Areas of Critical Environmental Concern and Research Natural Areas in the Planning Area

Name	Size (Acres)	Attributes for which the Area Was Designated	Management Plan		Plan That Designated Area (Date)
			Name	Status	
Bowen Canyon Bald Eagle Sanctuary ACEC	2,300	Area provides habitat for a unique and sensitive bird species, the bald eagle. Area is about 10 miles south of American Falls, Idaho. American Falls Reservoir and the Snake River provide fish and waterfowl, the primary food base for bald eagles wintering in Bowen Canyon, which provides roosting habitat for this eagle population.	Bowen Canyon Bald Eagle Sanctuary ACEC Management Plan	Signed 1/30/81	Bowen Canyon Bald Eagle Sanctuary 1/30/81
Downey Watershed ACEC	1,854	Area was withdrawn from all forms of mineral entry in 1919 to preserve all the area's water (from natural springs) for the city of Downey, Idaho. Below some of the contained springs, native vegetation was in poor condition because of heavy livestock grazing. A withdrawal recommendation was made to protect the watershed and water sources.	Nine Mile Coordinated Activity Plan	Signed 8/10/93	Pocatello RMP 1/8/88
Indian Rocks ACEC	3,105	The Shoshone-Bannock Tribes historically used this area as a wintering ground. There are abundant cultural resources here, such as lithic scatters, petroglyphs, and pictographs.	Indian Rocks ACEC Land Use Plan Amendment	Approved 1/31/92	Pocatello RMP Amendment 9/4/99
Old Juniper Townsite ACEC	3	This site is important for preserving and presenting the history and settlement of the Black Pine Valley. The Daughters of Utah Pioneers find this site to be an important cultural resource for the inspiration and benefit of the people. All that remains is the original school house.	None		ACEC and RNA Environmental Concern Amendment January 21, 1988
Stump Creek Ridge ACEC	2,472	This area is one of the most important elk winter ranges in the PFO area. Up to 300 elk winter along this ridge, from Hyde Canyon (Forest Service) south to Stump Creek. About 100 deer also use the area. Elevations on the ridge system range from 6,100 to 7,400 feet.	Stump Creek Habitat Management Plan	Signed 11/25/80	Pocatello RMP 1/8/88
Van Komen Homestead ACEC*	3	This site is the most significant historical feature in the Black Pine Valley and is the last remaining major structure on public land. The residence, buildings and machinery remain intact as when the site was abandoned in the 1930s. The site merits preservation for the inspiration and benefit of the people as it was significant in American history and culture.	None		ACEC and RNA Environmental Concern Amendment January 21, 1988

Table 3-29. Areas of Critical Environmental Concern and Research Natural Areas in the Planning Area (continued)

Name	Size (Acres)	Attributes for which the Area Was Designated	Management Plan		Plan That Designated Area (Date)
Travertine Park ACEC	184	This area has relatively undisturbed mixed-shrub vegetation types, protected by a river on the north, by cliffs and rough talus on the south, and by rock talus slopes from river to cliffs at either end. This mixed-shrub community is isolated and exhibits features not found elsewhere in Idaho.	None		Pocatello RMP 1/8/88
Travertine Park RNA	23	RNA is a small portion of land in a larger Travertine Park ACEC.	None		Pocatello RMP 1/8/88
Cheatbeck Canyon RNA	100	Contains an excellent mixed stand of boxelder and bigtooth maple, surrounded on the south and east by Douglas fir forests and on the north by sagebrush/grass. Boxelder and bigtooth maple occur naturally only in southeastern Idaho. Aside from a narrow band along the Bear River in Oneida Narrows, this proposed RNA would provide the only stand of boxelder in any proposed or established RNA and probably the best example of bigtooth maple.	Cheatbeck Canyon RNA	Draft	Pocatello RMP 1/8/88
Dairy Hollow RNA	44	Most of the rangeland in the extreme southeastern corner of Idaho has been affected by grazing. The RNA has a good stand of Wyoming sagebrush and needle-and-thread grass habitat type. Only one other proposed RNA, in another geomorphic province, has this habitat type, and on that one, the stand is small. In addition, the area contains interesting columns and bluffs of conglomerate capped with red sandstone, several of which hawks have used as nest sites. One ferruginous hawk nest with three young was located in the area.	Dairy Hollow RNA	Draft	Pocatello RMP 1/8/88

Table 3-29. Areas of Critical Environmental Concern and Research Natural Areas in the Planning Area (continued)

Name	Size (Acres)	Attributes for which the Area Was Designated	Management Plan		Plan That Designated Area (Date)
Formation Cave RNA	70	The area has travertine terraces that were once ponds and broad, gently sloping outwash plains. A stream once crossed the area and probably filled some of the ponds, but the water has been diverted for irrigation, and only a small area along the east boundary has any standing water. The terraces have pristine stands of bitterbrush, Nevada bluegrass, and shrubby cinquefoil due to their inaccessibility to livestock and motorbikes. Along the old stream channel and where the water table is close to the surface, water birch is predominating. This area is managed cooperatively with The Nature Conservancy.	Formation Springs	Draft	Pocatello RMP 1/8/88
Oneida Narrows RNA	614	This area contains a narrow band of boxelder along the Bear River, with adjacent northwesterly and southeasterly facing slopes of mountain mahogany, bigtooth maple, Rocky Mountain juniper, and bluebunch wheatgrass communities. Small stands of aspen dot the slopes. Near-vertical limestone cliffs, containing grottos and caves, provide a haven for a variety of birds and uniquely adapted plants. The area is quite undisturbed and diverse.	Oneida Narrows RNA	Signed 5/18/94	Pocatello RMP 1/8/88
Pine Gap RNA	237	This very uniform area of calcareous soil near Pine Gap is covered with a community of black sagebrush and bluebunch wheatgrass. It shows signs of past grazing, yet is in very good condition. Its uniformity is an outstanding feature. It also contains a rare plant, <i>Cryptantha caespitosa</i> (tufted cryptantha). Although there are other stands of the black sagebrush/blue bunch wheatgrass habitat type in the PFO area, the Pine Gap site is by far the best.	Pine Gap RNA	Draft	Pocatello RMP 1/8/88
Robbers Roost RNA	403	Vegetation is in good condition and provides an unrepresented sample of shrub communities so common in this part of Idaho. It provides a very good undisturbed reference and study area for those shrub communities.	None		Pocatello RMP 1/8/88

Sources: BLM 1981c; 1988a; 1999; 2003e; 2004a

*The structures of the Van Komen Homestead ACEC were completely destroyed by a wildland fire in August 2006.

3.4.2 DESIGNATED WATCHABLE WILDLIFE AREAS

There are five designated watchable wildlife areas in the planning area (Pope 2003), as follows:

- Juniper Rest Area (site #73). Located on Interstate 84 five miles north of the Utah border, this site is about 40 acres, where people can park their vehicles, walk through a juniper-wooded area, and watch birds, such as vesper sparrow, mountain bluebird, hawks, and northern harrier. It is about 75 percent public land.
- Oxford Slough/Twin Lakes/Swan Lake (site #74). Located in Franklin County from Swan Lake to Oxford to Clifton, this is a series of locations around Oxford Slough near Preston. There are 40-acre public land parcels at Swan Lake and Oxford Reservoir. The 40-acre Twin Lakes parcel is under the BLM's Recreation and Public Purposes Act lease to Idaho Fish and Game, and during the summer a day-use fee is charged. USFWS manages a waterfowl production area at Oxford Slough. People would have to park their vehicles along the highway and use binoculars for waterfowl and shorebird viewing.
- Formation Springs RNA (site #70). Located near Soda Springs, this is a 70-acre parcel between two pieces of land owned by The Nature Conservancy. It is a lush riparian complex that people can wander through after parking their vehicles on public land.
- Lower Blackfoot River from Blackfoot to Government Dam (site #63). This is composed of a 28-mile scenic drive along the Blackfoot River, from its confluence with Wolverine Creek to the Government Dam. The habitats include sagebrush flats, Douglas fir forest, and deep river canyons with lush riparian areas. Much of the riverbank is public land. There are several turnouts from which to watch birds and other areas that are appropriate to hike. Travertine Park RNA near Government Dam is part of this loop.
- American Falls Dam and vicinity (site #67). Located near the town of American Falls, this area consists of some small loops that connect the highways and county roads to riverside observation points or hiking areas. Most of the area is private land, with the exception of the BLM's Pipeline Recreation Site on the south side of the Snake River.

3.4.3 WILD AND SCENIC RIVERS

No rivers in the planning area are currently managed under the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act of 1968 (PL 90-542, as amended; 16 USC 1271-2287 [WSR Act]). Congress enacted the WSR Act to provide a national policy for preserving and protecting selected rivers and river segments in their free-flowing condition for the benefit and enjoyment of present and future generations. Section 5(d)(1) of the act directs federal agencies to consider potential wild and scenic rivers in their land and water planning processes. To fulfill this requirement, the BLM inventories and evaluates rivers when it develops an RMP for public lands in a specified area.

A river under consideration for inclusion in the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System (NWSRS) is evaluated for eligibility and tentative classification and suitability. The river segment is first assessed to identify whether it is free-flowing and contains any outstandingly remarkable values, to determine eligibility for inclusion into the NWSRS. If a segment of a river is found eligible it is assessed for its suitability for inclusion in the NWSRS.

Initial screening and identification efforts of planning area rivers resulted in the Bear River (**Figure 3-20**) and Blackfoot River (**Figure 3-21**) being found eligible for further consideration in the inventory process. Additional review focused on whether eligible segments met free-flowing criteria and contained any outstandingly remarkable values, as defined in the WSR Act. Members of the BLM resource team conducted this review for each of their areas of expertise, using their knowledge of the area and consulting available inventory information. This information was considered against the outstandingly remarkable values criteria in the WSR Act.

3.4.4 ELIGIBILITY DETERMINATIONS

The BLM resource team prepared and reviewed documentation of the values considered outstandingly remarkable for both of the river segments. As a result of this evaluation, some segments of both rivers were found eligible for further study. A description of outstandingly remarkable values for both candidates, as well as the tentative classification, is below.

3.4.4.1 *Bear River*

During the 1994 field season, a BLM interdisciplinary team (IDT) inventoried public land tracts along the Bear River (**Figure 3-20**) and its tributary streams in Idaho. The Bear River was first divided into the upper study segment (Wyoming border to Alexander Dam) and the lower study segment (Alexander Dam to the Utah border). The IDT viewed a total of 37 tracts, 20 in the upper segment and 17 in the lower segment.

The IDT determined 10 eligible tracts, which comprised a total of 11 river miles of public lands. The segments were found to be eligible for their outstandingly remarkable wildlife, geologic, recreational, and hydrologic values. There were 10 eligible tracts on the Bear River. All of these tracts were given a tentative classification of “recreational” because of the degree of development and accessibility by road or railroad.

3.4.4.2 *Blackfoot River*

During the spring and summer of 2002, a BLM IDT conducted an eligibility study on public lands along the Blackfoot River (**Figure 3-21**) between Government Dam and immediately below the Wolverine Creek and Blackfoot River confluence. The study area was divided into 11 segments delineated by land ownership. The IDT analyzed only those segments containing public lands. The team determined that nonpublic lands would be included in the study only if the landowner or managing entity willingly volunteered to include their lands in the study.

The IDT concluded that only one segment within the study area on the Blackfoot River was eligible. The eligible segment is between Miner Creek and Cedar Creek and is made up of 5.6 river miles of both tribal and public lands. Only the side of the river containing public land was analyzed for eligibility and was found to be eligible for its outstandingly remarkable scenic, recreational, and botanical values. Its tentative classification was “scenic” (BLM 2002a).

3.4.5 SUITABILITY DETERMINATIONS

A BLM IDT conducted a suitability study on the one eligible segment on the Blackfoot River and ten eligible segments on the Bear River (**Figure 3-21** and **Figure 3-20**). The purpose of the

suitability phase was to determine if the eligible segments meet the suitability criteria for inclusion in the NWSRS.

The suitability study assessed the eligible segments using the seven suitability factors outlined in BLM Manual 8351, *Wild and Scenic Rivers – Policy and Program Direction for Identification, Evaluation, and Management*. These factors are as follows:

1. Characteristics that do or do not make the area a worthy addition to the NWSRS.
2. Status of landownership, minerals (surface and subsurface), use in the area, including the amount of private land involved, and associated or incompatible uses. Jurisdictional consideration (administrative role and/or presence) must be taken into account to the extent that management would be affected. In situations where there is identified river study area, it may be difficult to ensure those identified outstandingly remarkable values could be properly maintained and afforded adequate management protection over time. Accordingly, for those situations where the BLM is unable to protect or maintain any identified outstandingly remarkable values or through other mechanisms (existing or potential), river segments may be determined suitable only if the entity with land use planning responsibility supports the finding and commits to assisting the BLM in protecting the identified river values. An alternative method to consider these segments is for state and local governments or private citizens to initiate efforts for designation under Section 2(a)(ii), or a joint study under Section 5(c) of the WSR Act. In certain cases, there might be existing or future opportunities for the BLM to acquire river shoreline or where landowners are willing to donate, exchange, transfer, assign, sell, or sign an easement. Wherever appropriate, the BLM shall encourage the state, responsible federal agency, or other entities to evaluate segments where the BLM lacks sufficient jurisdictional control, and the BLM shall provide technical assistance concerning the wild and scenic rivers studies, as well as information concerning public lands within the study corridor. The BLM shall continue to protect and, wherever possible, enhance any outstandingly remarkable values identified in the RMP process, which are associated with lands under the BLM's jurisdiction.
3. The reasonably foreseeable potential uses of the land and related water, which would be enhanced, foreclosed or curtailed if the area were included in the NWSRS, and the values, which could be foreclosed or diminished if the area is not protected as part of the NWSRS.
4. Federal, public, state, tribal, local, or other interests in the designation or nondesignation of the river, including the extent to which the administration of the river, including the costs thereof, may be shared by state, local, or other agencies and individuals.
5. The estimated cost, if necessary, of acquiring lands or interests in lands and administering the area should it be added to the NWSRS.
6. Ability of the agency to manage and protect the river area or segment as a wild and scenic river, or other mechanisms (existing and potential) to protect identified values, other than the wild and scenic river designation.
7. Historical or existing rights that could be adversely affected. In determining suitability, consideration of any valid existing rights must be afforded under applicable laws, regulations, and policies.

These factors were considered for each river to answer the following three questions:

- Should the river's free-flowing character, water quality, and outstandingly remarkable values be protected, or are one or more other uses important enough to warrant doing otherwise?
- Will the river's free-flowing character, water quality, and outstandingly remarkable values be protected through designation? Is designation as a WSR the best method for protecting the river corridor? In answering these questions, the benefits and impacts of WSR designation must be evaluated and alternative protection methods considered.
- Is there a demonstrated commitment to protect the river by any nonfederal entities who may be partially responsible for implementing protective management?

The IDT concluded that no eligible segments are suitable for inclusion in the NWSRS. This conclusion on the Bear River was based on the small size and disjunctive location of the eligible segments, as they are isolated 40-acre tracts or very short, isolated segments of public land. On the Blackfoot River, land ownership considerations that make only one side of the river manageable led to this segment's unsuitability. The WSR Act does not specify a minimum size requirement for river segments to be suitable for inclusion in the NWSRS. During the suitability determination, a river segment is of sufficient length if a specific outstandingly remarkable value or values can be protected should the segment be designated. However, the WSR Act states that management strategies necessary to administer the entire river area should be taken into account and, as such, excessive segmentation should be avoided. Manageability of the Bear and Blackfoot River segments as wild and scenic rivers is not feasible or practical because the BLM has no authority over private or state lands. The BLM could pursue other designations for these eligible segments as an alternative mechanism to protect the segments' existing identified outstandingly remarkable values. Also, if the State of Idaho were to undertake a study under section 2a(ii) of the WSR Act, the BLM would participate as an active partner in that study. Additionally, most of the comments received from the general public, agencies, and Shoshone-Bannock Tribes showed opposition to the designation of the rivers in the NWSRS.

3.4.6 WILDERNESS STUDY AREAS

There are no designated wilderness areas in the planning area. There are two WSAs in the planning area: Petticoat Peak WSA (11,200 acres) and Worm Creek WSA (40 acres).

3.4.6.1 *Petticoat Peak Wilderness Study Area*

The Petticoat Peak WSA (Idaho [ID]-28-1) is within the Fish Creek Mountain Range, one mile northeast of Lava Hot Springs (**Figure 2-3**). Topography is steep and mountainous, with Petticoat Peak being the highest point at over 8,000 feet. Many canyons and ridges radiate from the mountain peak. Dominant vegetation on the western slopes consists of junipers, mountain shrubs, and sagebrush. Thick stands of Douglas fir, intermingled with lodgepole pine and limber pine, cover the WSA's east side. A variety of shrubs, forbs, and grasses are found throughout. Aspen groves can be found through moist sites in the area. The OHV designation for the WSA is "Limited", restricting motorized and mechanized travel to designated routes.

All of the 11,200-acre Petticoat Peak WSA was recommended as unsuitable for Wilderness designation (BLM 1986). If Congress were to carry forward this recommendation, the WSA designation would be removed and the area would be managed for multiple use, similar to adjacent public lands or as directed by the release language.

3.4.6.2 Worm Creek Wilderness Study Area

The Worm Creek WSA (ID-37-77) is a 40-acre tract, two sides of which are adjacent to the Forest Service's 16,000-acre Worm Creek Roadless Area. The other two sides of the tract are adjacent to private land (**Figure 2-3**). The topography varies from benchland to steep hillsides, and elevation ranges from 6,500 feet to 7,200 feet. The surrounding terrain contains high elevation basins and steep, rocky mountain peaks. Several peaks on the main ridge near the WSA exceed 9,000 feet. The area supports a dense stand of aspen and a Douglas fir/lodgepole pine mix. Understory species include mountain maple, Oregon grape, pinegrass, snowberry, willow, and serviceberry. The area provides a suitable habitat for deer and elk and a variety of birds and small mammals. The WSA is closed to OHV use. There is minimal human activity in the WSA, but there have been isolated cases of unauthorized firewood cutting and OHV use.

All of Worm Creek WSA is recommended as suitable for wilderness designation (BLM 1986), but alone this parcel does not qualify as wilderness because of its size. Designation of the 40-acre parcel therefore depends on designation of the adjacent Forest Service 16,000-acre Worm Creek Roadless Area.

3.5 SOCIOECONOMIC RESOURCES AND ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE

The planning area encompasses about 613,800 acres of land managed by the BLM in southern Idaho. These lands are within portions of nine southeastern Idaho counties: Bannock, Bear Lake, Bingham, Bonneville, Caribou, Cassia, Franklin, Oneida, and Power. The economies of all of these counties are affected by public land uses within the planning area. Similarly, the demographics, social structure, and values within the counties influence the demand for recreation and other opportunities provided by the public lands. This section is a discussion of the socioeconomic resources of the region of influence. Data for Idaho is presented for comparison purposes. Socioeconomic conditions addressed include population, housing, employment, schools, and protection of children.

3.5.1 SOCIOECONOMIC RESOURCES

3.5.1.1 Definition of Resource

Socioeconomic resources include population, employment, income, housing, earnings, and schools. Population is the number of residents in the area and the recent change in population growth. Employment data takes into account labor sectors, labor force, and statistics on unemployment. Income information is provided as an annual total by county and as per capita income. Housing includes numbers of units, ownership, and vacancy rate. Earnings-by-industry provides a measure of the health of local business activity. School enrollment and capacity are important considerations in assessing the effects of potential growth. Each of these socioeconomic characteristics is discussed below. In addition the social setting, including changes over time in the social structure, cohesiveness, and culture, is described in Section

3.5.1.9, Social Characteristics. This section also addresses some of the important nonmarket commodities of public lands, which generally cannot be quantified but have a value to our society, including the sense of open space, optional use values, and bequest value.

3.5.1.2 Population

While Idaho's population has risen 28.5 percent in the last decade, the population of the planning area has grown an average of 12.8 percent (Idaho Department of Labor 2003). Although all of these counties are sparsely populated, the populations of Bonneville, Bannock, and Bingham Counties ranked in the top ten (third, fifth, and seventh) for growth out of a total of 44 counties in the state (US Census Bureau 2002). The populations of the other six counties in the planning area ranked from thirteenth to thirty-eighth, with Oneida County having the smallest population of the nine counties studied.

Table 3-30 displays population trends from 1990 to 2000 and percent change over the ten-year period of the nine counties analyzed. With the exception of Bear Lake, Caribou, Cassia, and Power, the counties within this region have grown at a rate above the area average of 11.9 percent. Many of these counties are experiencing development and growth in suburbs bordering urban areas around the Wasatch front in Utah, where many people are moving to and commuting from for jobs in Salt Lake City and Ogden, Utah, and other large surrounding urban areas (Forest Service 2003a).

Table 3-30. County Population Estimates

County	1990	2000	1990-2000 Change	1990-2000 Percent Change	Median Age (2000)
Bannock	66,026	75,565	9,539	14.4%	29.8
Bear Lake	6,084	6,411	327	5.4%	35.8
Bingham	37,583	41,735	4,152	11.0%	29.7
Bonneville	72,207	82,522	10,315	14.3%	31.8
Caribou	6,963	7,304	341	4.9%	35.0
Cassia	19,532	21,416	1,884	9.6%	31.1
Franklin	9,232	11,329	2,097	22.7%	27.7
Oneida	3,492	4,125	633	18.1%	31.4
Power	7,086	7,538	452	6.4%	31.6
Idaho	1,273,855	1,273,593	368,417	28.5%	33.2

Sources: US Census Bureau 2002

In 2000, the three largest county populations were in Bonneville, Bannock, and Bingham at 82,522, 75,565, and 41,735 and represent increases of 14.3 percent, 14.4 percent, and 11.0 percent from their 1990 populations. The growth in each of these counties over the 10-year period did not exceed the state average of 28.5 percent. Over this decade, the largest population percent change occurred in Franklin County, with a 22.7 percent increase, and the lowest population percent change occurred in Caribou County, with a 4.9 percent increase. As of 2001, the population of all nine counties had grown approximately nine percent over the past 10 years and totaled 253,268 people (US Census Bureau 2002). Growth is projected to continue, as shown in **Table 3-31**.

Table 3-31. County Population Projections

County	2000	2005	2010	2015	2020	2000-2020 Change	2000-2020 Percent Change
Bannock	75,565	80,584	86,339	92,044	97,816	22,251	29.4%
Bear Lake	6,411	6,723	7,190	7,652	8,119	1,708	26.6%
Bingham	41,735	47,137	50,535	53,905	57,317	15,582	37.3%
Bonneville	82,522	90,728	97,268	103,755	110,332	27,810	33.7%
Caribou	7,304	7,545	7,843	8,105	8,344	1,040	14.2%
Cassia	21,416	23,715	24,827	25,856	26,836	5,420	25.3%
Franklin	11,329	12,078	12,750	13,373	13,965	2,636	23.3%
Oneida	4,125	4,221	4,398	4,558	4,705	580	14.1%
Power	7,538	8,760	9,170	9,612	9,886	2,348	35.1%
Idaho	1,273,855	1,386,4893	1,497,548	1,609,314	1,722,954	449,099	35.3%

Source: US Census Bureau 2002

The median age for all nine counties in 2002 was 31.5 years. This was slightly lower than the average of the state's median age of 33.2. With the exception of Bannock and Franklin Counties, whose figures were slightly lower, approximately one-third of the counties were made up of children (under 18 years of age). The percent of population over 65 ranged from approximately 10 to 16 percent, with Power County having the largest population, at 15.9 percent, and Bingham and Bonneville having the lowest populations, at 10.3 and 10.2 percent. The average household size in all counties ranged from 2.40 to 2.69 persons, with Bannock County having the smallest household size and Franklin County having the largest (US Census Bureau 2002).

Population growth is projected to continue in all planning area counties, as shown in **Table 3-31**. Bingham, Power, Bannock, and Bonneville Counties are expected to have the largest growth in population between 2000 and 2020, with growths of 37.3 percent, 35.1 percent, 33.7 percent, and 29.4 percent, respectively, while the lowest population growths during the same time period are expected to occur in Oneida (14.1 percent) and Caribou (14.2 percent) Counties (US Census Bureau 2002). Analysis of the current and future trends in population growth is further discussed below under *Social Characteristics*.

3.5.1.3 Housing

Table 3-32 shows housing occupancy type and vacancy for counties of the planning area in 1990 and 2000. Between 1990 and 2000, most counties experienced an increase of 11.0 to 17.3 percent in total number of housing units. Franklin County had the largest increase, at 19.2 percent in the number of housing units, and Power County had the lowest increase, at 5.3 percent. All counties experienced a lower percentage increase in the number of housing units than did the state, which experienced an increase of 27.7 percent. In 2000, the average number of persons per household was 2.92, which was higher than that of the state's persons per household average of 2.69. Bannock County had the same persons per household figure as the state, and Franklin County had the highest, at 3.24. In 2000 Power and Oneida Counties had the highest vacancy rate (3.4 percent and 3.0 percent), and Bonneville County had the lowest vacancy rate (1.6 percent). In general vacancy rates in the planning area declined between 1990 and 2000 for

Table 3-32. County Housing Estimates 1990-2000

County	1990			2000			Housing Units
	Housing Units	Vacancy Rate	Persons per Household	Housing Units	Vacancy Rate	Persons per Household	Percent Change
Bannock	25,694	2.4%	3.00	29,102	2.1%	2.69	13.3%
Bear Lake	2,934	5.0%	3.07	3,268	2.8%	2.81	11.4%
Bingham	12,664	2.0%	3.31	14,303	1.7%	3.10	13.0%
Bonneville	26,049	1.9%	2.94	30,484	1.6%	2.83	17.0%
Caribou	2,867	3.7%	3.10	3,188	2.2%	2.83	11.2%
Cassia	7,212	1.7%	3.05	7,862	2.7%	2.99	9.0%
Franklin	3,249	2.0%	3.31	3,872	2.3%	3.24	19.2%
Oneida	1,496	2.2%	3.02	1,755	3.0%	2.85	17.3%
Power	2,701	2.6%	2.95	2,844	3.4%	2.92	5.3%
Idaho	413,327	2.0%	2.73	527,824	2.2%	2.69	27.7%

Sources: Idaho Department of Finance 2002; US Census Bureau 2002

Bannock, Bear Lake, Bingham, Bonneville, and Caribou Counties and increased for Cassia, Franklin, Oneida, and Power Counties, as well as in the state as a whole.

3.5.1.4 Employment and Economy

Between 1990 and 2000, labor force and employment increased, and unemployment decreased in all counties. **Table 3-33** shows employment data for all counties in 2000. The three largest counties in the planning area had unemployment rates ranging from 5.0 to 7.2 percent, while, on average, most counties and the state had unemployment rates of approximately 5.0 percent. Though individual counties have varying data, employment trends in all counties were similar (US Census Bureau 2002).

Table 3-33. County Employment Statistics (2000)

County	Employed	Unemployed	Unemployment Rate
Bannock	35,641	2,646	6.9 %
Bear Lake	2,482	193	7.2 %
Bingham	17,841	1,094	5.8 %
Bonneville	38,309	2,012	5.0 %
Caribou	2,981	151	4.8 %
Cassia	8,942	488	5.2 %
Franklin	4,911	274	5.3 %
Oneida	1,751	78	4.3 %
Power	3,325	163	4.7 %
Idaho	599,453	36,784	5.8 %

Source: Idaho Department of Labor 2003

As shown in **Table 3-34**, between 1990 and 2000, the greatest percentage increase in employment in all counties occurred in the construction sector. The increase in construction needs and employment has stemmed from a growing population in the area. Construction needs for residences, second homes, commercial structures, and infrastructure have risen to accommodate population increases. In both Power and Oneida Counties, construction employment increased by over 200 percent.

Table 3-34. County Employment by Sector and Average Sector Growth

Sector	Bannock	Bear Lake	Bingham	Bonneville	Caribou	Cassia	Franklin	Oneida	Power
Farm (9.8%)									
1990	747	548	2,367	1,385	636	1,616	960	419	698
2000	832	595	2,368	1,442	705	1,808	1,022	523	996
Agriculture/ Forestry/ Fishing (44%)									
1990	217	29	694	485	65	495	667	42	124
2000	460	228	662	1,082	89	604	92	235	607
Mining (-11.4%)									
1990	24	0.0	105	38	526	49	5	34	11
2000	62	0.0	8	62	408	128	30	0.0	0.0
Construction (51.1%)									
1990	1,454	55	672	3,315	161	407	126	26	84
2000	2,574	154	1,221	3,931	320	639	264	81	335
Manufacturing (12.4%)									
1990	1,998	97	2,391	1,999	682	1,615	295	21	1,836
2000	3,055	105	2,452	2,568	795	1,287	279	30	1,718
Transportation/ Utility (27.3%)									
1990	2,419	79	423	1,126	136	297	103	53	216
2000	2,065	107	598	2,062	166	657	125	50	349
Trade (33.2%)									
1990	7,948	519	3,230	10,873	586	2,165	687	194	569
2000	10,134	638	4,546	14,948	722	2,742	1,049	285	586
Finance/ Insurance/ Real Estate (26.6%)									
1990	2,462	109	484	2,461	150	594	115	70	86
2000	2,885	182	596	3,213	168	734	285	87	118
Services (49.7%)									
1990	6,837	264	2,944	12,984	446	1,785	491	184	364
2000	11,741	828	2,962	19,036	609	2,589	815	240	539
Government (23.6%)									
1990	6,982	530	3,319	4,817	642	1,413	624	332	571
2000	9,085	614	4,037	5,645	666	1,709	846	436	731

Sources: BEA 2004; Sonoran Institute 2004; US Census Bureau 1990, 2000a

The average percentage of total employment growth for all counties between 1990 and 2000 was slightly lower than the percentage of total employment growth for the state. After construction, the highest average percentage of total employment growth in the nine-county area occurred in the services (49.9 percent), agriculture/fishing/forestry (44.0 percent), trade (33.2 percent), transportation and utilities (27.3 percent), and the finance/insurance/real estate (26.6) sectors, followed by the government sector (23.6 percent). Between 1990 and 2000, farm employment grew in each of the nine counties, as did employment in the government, construction, trade, finance/insurance/real estate, and services sectors. In 2000, the nine counties in the planning area followed a similar employment pattern within the different industry sectors, though Bear Lake and Caribou Counties displayed a greater deviation from the nine county averages (Bureau of Economic Analysis [BEA] 2004).

The only sector in the nine counties to show a significant decline in employment was mining, which declined 11.4 percent within the ten-year period. This decline in employment may be attributed to changes in phosphate mining operations, particularly in Caribou County. In addition, the decline in mining employment can be attributed to plant closures in Silverbow, Montana (Rhodia, Inc., in 1998), Pocatello (FMC Corporation in 2001), and Soda Springs (Astaris, LLP, in 2003), as well as one mine closure (Astaris, LLP, in 2002). Although employment changes within the mining industry sector are shown to be negative, mining still remains a relatively large employer in the planning area and the largest revenue generator for public land.

3.5.1.5 Income and Earnings by Industry

As shown in **Table 3-35**, in 2000, per capita personal incomes for Bannock, Bonneville, Caribou, Cassia, and Power Counties were all above \$20,000, an average increase of 34.6 percent over their 1990 incomes, but still slightly below the state average of \$23,987. Bear Lake experienced the most significant increase, as per capita personal income was \$16,631, reflecting an increase of 52.5 percent since 1990 but still remains below the state average of \$23,987 (BEA 2002).

Table 3-35. Per Capita Personal Incomes

County	1990	Percent Difference from State Average 1990	2000	Percent Difference from State Average 2000	Percent Change
Bannock	\$14,161	-10.7%	\$21,081	-12.1%	48.9%
Bear Lake	\$10,906	-31.2%	\$16,631	-30.7%	52.5%
Bingham	\$14,184	-10.6%	\$18,748	-21.8%	32.2%
Bonneville	\$17,235	8.7%	\$23,670	-1.3%	37.3%
Caribou	\$14,385	-9.3%	\$20,677	-13.8%	43.7%
Cassia	\$16,535	4.3%	\$21,144	-11.9%	27.9%
Franklin	\$11,086	-30.1%	\$15,870	-33.8%	43.2%
Oneida	\$11,730	-26.0%	\$15,340	-36.0%	30.8%
Power	\$18,083	14.0%	\$20,863	-13.0%	15.4%
Idaho	\$15,858	-	\$23,987	-	51.3%

Note: Figures calculated without taking into account the inflation rate.

Source: BEA 2002

Between 1990 and 2000, earnings by persons employed in Bannock and Bear Lake Counties increased by approximately fifty percent, while earnings of persons employed in Caribou and Franklin Counties increased by 43.7 percent and 43.2 percent. These counties experienced per capita personal income growth levels similar to those of the state (51.3 percent). Per capita personal income change was lowest in Power County, with a percent change of 15.4 percent. Differences in per capita personal income from the state average in 1990 and 2000 varied among the counties. Bear Lake, Franklin, and Onieda Counties displayed the greatest deviance, with Oneida County's deviance increasing over the ten year period. While Bonneville, Cassia, and

Power counties had higher per capita personal incomes than the state in 1990, all counties had lower figures than the state average in 2000 (BEA 2002).

In 2000, the industry category with the largest earnings in all counties was the nonfarm sector, as shown in **Table 3-36**. Farm earnings decreased in all counties except in Bear Lake, Caribou, and Franklin, where there were increases of 28.0 percent, 13.0 percent, and 32.4 percent. Bonneville County experienced the largest decrease in farm earnings of all the counties, with a decline of 53.5 percent. All counties experienced increases in nonfarm and private earnings from 1990 to 2000. With regard to nonfarm earnings, Bannock, Bear Lake, and Franklin Counties experienced the largest increases of 74.0 percent, 81.8 percent, and 88.1 percent. With regard to private earnings, these counties experienced increases of 70.3 percent, 85.6 percent, and 89.4 percent. In a similar pattern, earnings decreased at the state level in farm earnings between 1990 and 2000, while nonfarm and private earnings doubled (BEA 2002).

Table 3-36. Earnings by Industry Sector 2002 (in Thousands of Dollars)

Industry Sector	Bannock	Bear Lake	Bingham	Bonneville	Caribou	Cassia	Franklin	Oneida	Power	Idaho
Farm Earnings										
1990	6,679	2,241	94,448	41,272	8,404	81,127	13,614	1,864	44,055	973,884
2000	5,002	2,869	60,985	19,585	7,315	70,665	18,031	1,147	27,705	794,497
Percent Change	-25.1%	28.0%	-35.4%	-53.5%	13.0%	-12.9%	32.4%	-38.5%	-37.1%	-18.4%
Nonfarm Earnings										
1990	599,895	23,913	295,171	823,493	85,598	166,053	37,537	14,322	88,149	10,473,954
2000	1,043,861	43,478	402,189	1,402,036	132,029	246,570	70,592	24,067	137,929	21,396,054
Percent Change	74.0%	81.8%	36.2%	70.3%	54.2%	48.5%	88.1%	68.0%	56.5%	104.3%
Private Earnings										
1990	443,965	14,433	232,083	704,598	73,806	136,709	26,451	8,302	76,424	8,310,749
2000	755,677	26,790	296,049	1,197,037	112,700	197,913	50,090	14,030	118,945	17,536,340
Percent Change	70.3%	85.6%	27.6%	69.9%	52.7%	44.8%	89.4%	69.0%	55.6%	111.0%

Note: All state and local area dollar estimates are in current dollars (not adjusted for inflation).

Farm Earnings: The net income of sole proprietors, partners, and hired laborers arising directly from the current production of agricultural commodities, livestock or crops. It includes net farm proprietors' income and the wages and salaries, pay-in-kind, and other labor income of hired farm laborers, but specifically excludes the income of nonfamily farm corporations.

Nonfarm Earnings: The sum of wage and salary disbursements, other labor income, and proprietors' income for all industries, excluding farm.

Private Earnings: The sum of wage and salary disbursements, other labor income, and nonfarm proprietors' income, excluding farm and government.

Source: BEA 2002

3.5.1.6 Economic Influence of Public Lands

Local economies benefit from public land management. Local economies realize direct and indirect impacts from a variety of activities on public lands, including visitor expenditures, and the processing and harvesting of natural resources (i.e. timber, minerals, and forage). The BLM collects revenues from recreational and commercial activities that take place on the nearly 12 million acres of BLM-managed lands in Idaho, of which the federal government redirects revenues back to the states in which they were collected. These revenues are collected from facility fees (e.g., campgrounds), BLM recreation permits (special, competitive, organized group activity and event use permits), timber sales, mining leases and mineral revenues, and grazing

fees. The agricultural, hunting, forestry, and fishing sectors have shown increases in employment due to an increase in activity (Forest Service 2003a).

More than \$15 million dollars in annual revenues are returned to the American people (BLM 2003e) and are reinvested in the state's public lands. In 2002, the BLM invested close to \$50 million in Idaho public lands (BLM 2003e). Investments are made in the management of land and resources, land acquisition, range improvements, construction and access, central hazardous materials fund, and wildfire preparedness and operations. How recreational and commercial sectors of public lands influence local economies are discussed below.

3.5.1.7 Recreation and Activities on Public Lands

Since 1980, there has been an average four percent increase in recreation visits to the planning area, and recreation visits are estimated to continue to increase at an annual rate of one to four percent. Population growth, as well as an increase in the number of visitors per year to Idaho, has created a rising demand for recreation opportunities.

Several historic trail segments, such as those of the Oregon National Historic Trail, converge within areas of the planning area (National Park Service 2003). In addition, the planning area contains two SRMAs managed by the PFO: the Pocatello ORV SRMA and the Blackfoot River. The numerous recreational opportunities that exist in the Blackfoot River corridor include fishing, hunting, rock climbing, hiking, camping, picnicking, floating, kayaking, and boating. An intensively used recreation area, visits to the recreation sites and semi-developed campgrounds along the river corridor totaled over 17,961 in 2001 (BLM 2003f). Pocatello's proximity to ski areas makes it popular for snowboarding, skiing, and mountain biking. In addition to campers, picnickers, and ATV users, during snow-free seasons, trails through public lands receive heavy traffic from hikers and motorcyclists. OHV users, mountain bikers, and cross-country skiers have increased the popularity of trails.

The most common and most desired activities on public lands are fishing, hiking, camping, photography, wildlife/bird observation, picnicking, hunting, and OHV use. The recreation area is most highly valued for viewing scenery, experiencing nature, escaping crowds and stress, being physically active, experiencing quiet and solitude, providing a sense of discovery, and being with friends (Idaho Department of Commerce 2003).

3.5.1.8 Schools and the Protection of Children

Executive Order 13045, entitled "Protection of Children from Environmental Health Risks and Safety Risks" (Executive Order 13045, 62 FR 19885), states that each federal agency shall make it a high priority to identify and assess environmental health risks and safety risks that may disproportionately affect children and ensure that its policies, programs, activities, and standards address disproportionate risks to children that result from environmental health risks or safety risks. Environmental health risks and safety risks mean risks to health or to safety that are attributable to products or substances that the child is likely to come into contact with or to ingest.

Of the larger counties, approximately 32.2 percent of Bannock County and 35.1 percent of Bonneville County are made up of children (under 18 years of age). Similar percentages of children reside in counties within the study area: 37.4 percent in Bear Lake County, 35.8 percent in Bingham County, 34.5 percent in Caribou County, 37.1 percent in Cassia County, 40.4 percent in Franklin County, 35.0 percent in Oneida County, and 36.6 percent in Power County (US Census Bureau 2002).

Twenty-one school districts serve all counties of the planning area. The school districts are made up of 140 schools with a total enrollment in the 2001-2002 school year of 53,775 students. Pocatello School District in Bannock County has the greatest number of schools within its county. Pocatello School District is composed of two preschools, fifteen elementary schools, three junior high schools (grades 8 and 9), five high schools (grades 10 through twelve), six private schools, and nine alternative/other schools (charter schools [kindergarten through 6th grade], detention centers, and professional schools). Bannock County has an enrollment of approximately 14,325 students, 12,152 of them being within the Pocatello School District (Access Idaho 2003).

Table 3-37 presents educational attainment in 2000 of all counties population over 25 years of age. Franklin and Bear Lake Counties had the highest population of high school graduates, with 68.9 percent and 68.3 percent, respectively; however, of the planning area counties, both counties accounted for having two of the lowest populations of college graduates. Bonneville and Bannock Counties had the greatest number of college graduates, with 17.3 percent and 16.4 percent, respectively, both being higher than the state average (14.8 percent). These same counties also had the largest population of people who had attained a graduate or professional degree, with 8.9 percent and 8.5 percent, respectively.

Table 3-37. Educational Attainment 2000 (Population 25 years and Over)

County	No High School Degree	High School Graduate	Associate's Degree	Bachelor's Degree	Graduate or Professional Degree
Bannock	12.5%	55.3%	7.3%	16.4%	8.5%
Bear Lake	14.6%	68.3%	5.4%	8.7%	3.0%
Bingham	19.4%	58.8%	7.4%	10.7%	3.7%
Bonneville	12.1%	53.2%	8.5%	17.3%	8.9%
Caribou	13.4%	63.4%	7.3%	12.4%	3.5%
Cassia	23.1%	57.2%	5.8%	9.1%	4.8%
Franklin	11.8%	68.9%	5.8%	10.3%	3.2%
Oneida	13.5%	65.3%	6.2%	12.1%	2.9%
Power	25.4%	54.5%	5.8%	10.8%	3.5%
Idaho	15.4%	55.8%	7.2%	14.8%	6.8%

Source: US Census 2002

3.5.1.9 Social Characteristics

The ICBEMP Supplemental Draft EIS (March 2000) characterizes much of the planning area as rural, where agriculturally-based lifestyles dominate (Forest Service and BLM 2000b). The 1998 ICBEMP publication, Economic and Social Conditions of Communities: Economic and Social Characteristics of Interior Columbia Basin Communities and an Estimation of Effects on

Communities from the Alternatives of the Eastside and Upper Columbia River Basin Draft Environmental Impact Statements, evaluates the level of isolation of communities within the planning area as well as the level of economic dependency on industries that use resources on public lands (Forest Service and BLM 1998). This analysis provides a framework for evaluating the potential effects of changes in public land management policies on these communities. In general, smaller rural and tribal communities are more subject to potential effects from external forces, such as changes in historical land use policies. A community's ability to adjust to change while remaining a cohesive community and maintaining economic viability can be measured by its degree of isolation and its resource dependence (Forest Service and BLM 2000b).

Smaller communities geographically isolated from larger population centers have less diversified economies than more populated areas. Employment and income within these communities is likely to rely heavily on a few major industries. Communities isolated from larger towns also tend to have a stronger sense of autonomy, which can add to community cohesiveness (Forest Service and BLM 1998).

Within the planning area, eight communities were identified by the 1998 economic and social conditions study as being isolated from large population and trade centers, most of which are located in Bear Lake County. Isolated communities include Bloomington, Dingle, Fish Haven, Geneva, Georgetown, Ovid, and Montpelier (Forest Service and BLM 1998), all in Bear Lake County which contains approximately 8.2 percent BLM lands (BLM 2004a), and Holbrook (Forest Service and BLM 1998) in Oneida County, with 33.6 percent BLM lands (BLM 2004a).

Of the planning area communities evaluated for employment specialization (or a lack of economic diversity), eleven had high or very high specialization ratings. McCammon in Bannock County, Dayton and Weston in Franklin County, and Arbon Valley and Rockland in Power County had employment specialization in agriculture (Forest Service and BLM 1998), which could mean that changes in grazing management could affect these communities more than others. Approximately 3.7 percent of Franklin County and 9.6 percent of Power County is composed of BLM-administered lands (BLM 2004a). Basalt in Bannock County and Rockland experienced specialization in agricultural services. Franklin in Franklin County had a very high dependence on the mining industry (Forest Service and BLM 1998). This could result in a greater reaction to changes in minerals management on public lands in Franklin; however, only 3.7 percent of the land in Franklin County is made up of BLM lands. No planning area communities were identified as timber specialized communities (BLM 2004a).

Local groups have traditionally used the commodity resources on BLM-administered lands to generate local income. Typically, the local areas closest to federal lands have reaped substantial economic benefits from their adjacency to available resources. In recent years regional and national users and their values have gained importance over local use and have increased the number of users of federal lands. The economic and social value of these lands also has increased as use has increased and as the unique attributes of these lands has become scarcer. However, this increased value has not necessarily generate income to support local jobs or other economic activity or funds to support local government investments in infrastructure or social services that traditional commodity production generated (Forest Service and BLM 2000b).

Social values and attitudes within the planning area are affected by the surrounding demographic and economic trends. High levels of in-migration, and the resulting population growth in the planning area, have changed the predominant lifestyles, attitudes, beliefs, and other social conditions of the people who live there. As identified in Section 2.1, the population of Bear Lake County has expanded by more than that of the state average, as evidenced by it being one of the most preferred places to live within the state. Many people relocate to this county for its scenic beauty, recreational opportunities, unhurried atmosphere, and its abundance of open space (Idaho Department of Commerce 2003). With the population increasing in all of the counties within the planning area, some negative attitudes toward growth have also developed; however, many growing communities within these counties have adapted to growth and have experienced improvements in quality of life. Examples of this include the development and improvement of a number of recreational facilities and opportunities, as well as the development of vacation homes in the area.

Much of the incoming business is locating near the Idaho-Utah border and is a result of communities spreading outside and around the large metropolitan portions within the planning area. This has raised concerns about the health and development of the historic and environmental integrity of the area's towns and wilderness areas. The influx of business has improved the counties' tax bases, but county officials indicate that the pristine and historic nature of the area is what attracts visitors, provides the image visitors have of the community, and supports other business corridors.

3.5.2 ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE

This section addresses specific topics related to environmental justice, as required by NEPA. On February 11, 1994, President Clinton issued Executive Order 12898, Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority and Low-Income Populations. This order requires that "each federal agency make achieving environmental justice part of its mission by identifying and addressing, as appropriate, disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects of its programs, policies, and activities, on minority populations and low-income populations" (Executive Order 12898, 59 FR 7629 [Section 1-201]). The following information was gathered to comply with the order: economic, racial, and demographic information generated to identify areas of low-income and high minority populations in and around the project area.

BLM management has contributed to the fair treatment and meaningful involvement of all people, regardless of ethnicity or income in the environmental decision-making process. For example, BLM is working to prevent the flow of pollutants to streams and other water bodies in the PFO planning area. BLM is working in close coordination with the southeast Idaho Selenium working group, which involves several state/federal and tribal entities, to provide environmental protection to all of these groups.

3.5.2.1 *Demographics*

The planning area includes Bannock, Bear Lake, Bingham, Bonneville, Caribou, Cassia, Franklin, Oneida, and Power Counties. Racial and ethnic data from 2000 for these counties and for the state have been compiled and are presented in **Table 3-38**. In 2000, the Hispanic

Table 3-38. Total Percentage of Population by Race/Ethnicity (2000)

County	White	Black, African American	Native American, Alaskan, Aleut	Asian, Pacific Islander	Some Other Race	Latino, Hispanic, Any Race
Bannock	91.3	0.6	2.9	1.2	4.1	4.7
Bear Lake	97.7	0.1	0.5	0.1	1.6	2.4
Bingham	82.4	0.2	6.7	0.6	10.1	13.3
Bonneville	92.8	0.5	0.6	0.9	5.2	6.9
Caribou	96.1	0.1	0.2	0.2	3.3	4.0
Cassia	84.7	0.2	0.8	0.5	12.1	20.6
Franklin	95.1	0.1	0.3	0.1	4.3	5.2
Oneida	97.5	0.1	0.3	0.2	1.9	2.3
Power	83.8	0.1	3.3	0.3	12.5	21.7
Idaho	91.0	0.4	1.4	1.0	6.3	7.9
Average Total	91.2	0.2	1.7	0.5	6.1	8.9

Note: Percentages for a given year do not add to 100 because “Hispanic” is an ethnicity category, which includes all races and because people can select from more than one race.

Source: US Census Bureau 2002

population formed the dominant ethnic group within the planning area, and the African American population composed the least. Bingham (13.3 percent), Cassia (20.6 percent), and Power Counties (21.7 percent) had the largest Hispanic populations, and the percentages of their Hispanic populations roughly doubled or tripled compared to the state (7.9 percent).

According to the ICBEMP Supplemental Draft EIS (Forest Service and BLM 2000b), Hispanics, originally settling in the interior Columbia River Basin for jobs in irrigated agriculture, have begun to use public lands, especially national forests, both for income and recreation. As more first and second generation Hispanics work outside the agricultural sector, their use of public lands for recreation has increased and is predicted to continue to increase. However, the proportion of Hispanic recreational users is still well below their proportion of the population. Public lands are also used by members of the Hispanic community who earn income in forestry related activities. Members of minority populations are employed in forestry-related activities, including mill work, harvesting, and reforestation (Forest Service and BLM 2000b).

Over the last decade, most ethnic and racial populations have increased throughout counties within the planning area, with the exception of the Native American and African American populations, which have remained the same or slightly decreased.

3.5.2.2 *Income and Poverty Level*

Table 3-39 provides income statistics for counties of the planning area, Idaho, and the US. All counties have a lower per capita income than the Idaho and US average, and, except for Bonneville and Caribou Counties, all counties have lower median household incomes as well. However, Idaho’s statewide poverty rate (13.8 percent) exceeds the poverty rates of all of the planning area counties, except Bannock County (13.9 percent), and the percentage of Cassia County’s population living in poverty (13.6 percent) also is close to the state average. The percentage of population living in poverty in Idaho exceeded that of the US in both 1990 and 2000, though the difference was narrowed within the ten year period.

Table 3-39. County Income and Poverty Level (2000)

County	Median Household Income	Per Capita Income	Percentage of Population Living in Poverty (2000)	Percentage of Population Living in Poverty (1990)
Bannock	\$36,683	\$17,148	13.9 %	13.8%
Bear Lake	\$32,162	\$13,592	9.6 %	14.3%
Bingham	\$36,423	\$14,365	12.4 %	15.6%
Bonneville	\$41,805	\$18,326	10.1 %	9.9%
Caribou	\$37,609	\$15,179	9.6 %	7.1%
Cassia	\$33,322	\$14,087	13.6 %	14.5%
Franklin	\$36,061	\$13,702	7.4 %	10.6%
Oneida	\$34,309	\$13,829	10.8 %	14.7%
Power	\$32,226	\$14,007	16.1 %	13.2%
Idaho	\$37,572	\$22,871	13.8%	16.3%
US	\$41,994	\$21,587	12.4%	13.1%

Source: US Census Bureau 2002

The US Census Bureau uses a set of money income thresholds that vary by family size and composition to determine which families are poor. If a family's total income is less than its threshold, then that family, and every individual in it, is considered poor. The poverty thresholds do not vary geographically, but they are updated annually for inflation using the Consumer Price Index. For example, in 2000 the average estimated poverty threshold for an individual in the US was an annual income of \$8,787 and for a four-person household it was \$17,601. US Census Bureau estimates indicate that approximately 7.0 to 16.1 percent of county populations in the planning area were below the poverty line. The percentages in Bannock (13.9 percent), Cassia (13.2 percent), and Power (16.1 percent) exceeded the state average of 13.2 percent (US Census Bureau 2002). While most counties displayed lower or similar values from 1990, Caribou and Power Counties actually had a 2.5 percent and 2.9 percent increase in the number of individuals below the poverty line from 1990 levels (US Census Bureau 2002).

3.5.2.3 Fort Hall Indian Reservation and Tribal Treat Rights and Interests

The Fort Hall Indian Reservation covers about 519,800 acres in the northwest portion of the planning area. Demographic information for the reservation is included in the county statistics presented above. Following is a summary of the demographic and economic conditions directly related to the reservation and associated off-reservation unoccupied public lands.

Approximately 5,760 people live on the Fort Hall Indian Reservation, about 65 percent of whom are American Indian and 33 percent are white (US Census Bureau 2000b). About half of the enrolled members of the Shoshone-Bannock Tribes reside on the reservation. The population is fairly equally divided between males and females, and about 52 percent are married. Twenty-seven percent of the population does not have a high school diploma, 59 percent do have a high school diploma, and 11 percent have some type of advanced degree. About 50 percent of the work force (defined as being 16 years and over) is employed. The larger job sectors include construction, manufacturing, service industry, sales and office occupations, and educational, health, and social services. Many jobs, especially in the service and industry sectors, are seasonal, so employment rates can fluctuate greatly. The per capita income is \$11,309, with a

median household income of \$31,960 (US Census Bureau 2000b). For tribal members, subsistence hunting, fishing, gathering, and livestock pasturing on public lands in the planning area contribute to their economic condition. Tribal members have raised the importance of having continued access to these activities.

This page intentionally left blank