Record of Decision and Green River Resource Management Plan

United States Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.usu.edu/wyoming_recdecisions

Part of the Environmental Sciences Commons

Recommended Citation
https://digitalcommons.usu.edu/wyoming_recdecisions/20

This Report is brought to you for free and open access by the Wyoming at DigitalCommons@USU. It has been accepted for inclusion in Record of Decisions (WY) by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@USU. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@usu.edu.
Record of Decision
and
Green River Resource Management Plan
The Bureau of Land Management is responsible for the balanced management of the public lands and resources and their various values so that they are considered in a combination that will best serve the needs of the American people. Management is based upon the principles of multiple use and sustained yield, a combination of uses that take into account the long-term needs of future generations for renewable and nonrenewable resources. These resources include recreation, range, timber, minerals, watershed, fish and wildlife, wilderness and natural, scenic, scientific, and cultural values.
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RECORD OF DECISION

for the

GREEN RIVER RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PLAN
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

DECISION

The decision is to select and approve the attached Green River Resource Management Plan (RMP) to guide the future management of the public lands and resources administered by the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) in the Green River Resource Area. The Green River RMP supersedes all previous land use planning decision documents for the Green River Resource Area. The Green River RMP was prepared under the regulations 43 CFR 1600 for implementing the land use planning requirements of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act (FLPMA). An environmental impact statement (EIS) was prepared for the Green River RMP in compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA). A copy of the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the Green River RMP is on file in the Green River Resource Area Office.

The decisions in the Green River RMP provide general management direction and allocation of uses for the BLM administered public lands and resources in the planning area. The selection and approval of the Green River RMP is based upon the analysis of environmental impacts of four alternative management plans, public comments, and consultation with Federal, state and local government agencies, and upon the consideration of 5 planning issues: 1) minerals resource management and rights of way, 2) land tenure adjustment and resource accessibility, 3) resources affecting vegetation, soils, air, and water quality, 4) recreation and cultural resource management, and 5) special management areas.

The attached Green River RMP is the proposed RMP presented in the Green River RMP Final EIS, published in April, 1996, with minor correction of errors and wording clarification. The Green River RMP provides a balance between protection and commodity uses with promotion of the environment. It represent the BLM's preferred management plan alternative for the Green River Resource Area and one of the environmentally preferred alternatives, in terms of minimizing environmental impacts and guiding the uses of the public lands in the resource area. This alternative best meets the Bureau's statutory mission under the Federal Land Policy and Management Act, and identifies actions to protect resources and to avoid or minimize environmental harm while allowing commodity uses. Alternative C of the EIS which would place more restrictions on land uses than the approved RMP, also qualifies as an environmentally preferred alternative.

WILDERNESS STUDY AREAS

The Bureau’s recommendations to the Secretary of the Interior on Wilderness Study Areas (WSA’s) in the Green River Resource Area have been made under separate documentation. These areas are addressed in separate Wilderness EIS and Wilderness report documents which are also on file in the Green River Resource Area Office. The decisions regarding wilderness area designations are made by Congress. When Congress makes the Wilderness decisions for the WSAs in the Green River Resource Area, they will be incorporated into the Green River RMP.

SPECIAL MANAGEMENT AREA DESIGNATIONS

There are unique and important areas, values, or resources on BLM administered lands within the Green River Resource Area that meet the criteria for protection and management under special management designations.

Areas of Critical Environmental Concern

The following designations for Areas of Critical Environmental Concern (ACEC) are retained (or modified) or established. The ACEC designations apply only to BLM administered public land surface.
implementing changes in grazing levels; (2) that it failed to designate lands unsuitable for coal surface mining because of their importance to wildlife; and (3) that it was lacking in providing protection for wildlife.

The Wyoming Outdoor Council, the Wyoming Chapter of the Sierra Club, Biodiversity Associates, Friends of Wild Wyoming Deserts, and the Greater Yellowstone Coalition submitted a joint protest on the proposed RMP objecting to (1) changes made between the draft and final EFIs; (2) portions relating to protection of air resources; (this was the only issue of protest for the Greater Yellowstone Coalition; (3) exclusion of rivers or waterway segments crossing private lands from the BLM Wild and Scenic Rivers review; and (4) not establishing intervals and standards for monitoring and evaluating the RMP.

The issues raised in the protests brought to our attention that some wording and information presented in the proposed RMP and Final EIS caused confusion and misunderstanding. To help rectify this, clarification has been provided in the attached Green River RMP. In resolving the protests on the proposed RMP and addressing the concerns raised, the BLM made the following clarifications, reflected in the Green River RMP. It was not necessary to make any changes in the proposed plan in the Final EIS.

1. The appendix describing acquisitions to be pursued has been clarified to avoid further confusion about acquisition of State lands. Specific State land parcel exchange proposals are not included in the appendix material attached to the approved RMP. The approval individual site specific parcel exchanges still exist, and should an exchange occur, the information in this appendix would be appropriately updated (Appendix 8.3).

Clarification has been added to the Lands and Realty Management section of the RMP to include wording that the preferred method of acquisition is through exchange, involving a discretionary and voluntary transfer of lands between the parties involved.

2. Information in the appendix describing standard operating procedures for range improvements and vegetation manipulations (Appendix 9.2) has been clarified.

Table A-2-1 has not been included as part of the appendix to remove the confusion of this table being considered as a land use plan decision. This table was intended to represent one example of several available methods that may be considered toward attaining the management objectives for riparian areas, as described in the Proposed RMP, where livestock grazing has been determined to be a concern.

Clarification has also been added to the Vegetation Management section, now providing additional information on some of the methods that can be used to achieve proper functioning condition for riparian areas. This section indicates that for utilization levels discussed in many tools or methods that can be used, if not in appropriate, town and meeting management objectives for riparian areas. The utilization of given information provided in Table A-2-1 (if previous paragraph may be considered and applied on an individual site basis during site specific activity and project planning for achieving riparian objectives.

3. The Wild Horse Management section and the Wild Horse Herd Management Area map in the RMP have been modified to clarify that the Little Colorado Desert Wild Horse Management Area (WHMA) is not a new proposed WHIMA. This area was originally established as a WHIMA in 1971 in accordance with the Wild Horse and Burro Act (Map 27).

4. The Special Management Area section of the RMP and the Visual Resource Management map in the RMP have been corrected to clarify the inconsistencies between the narrative in Special Management Areas and Summary Table, 2-1 of the Final EIS (Table 14 and Map 24).

Cedar Canyon - VRM classifications are II, III, and IV. Specifically, the area that can be seen for 1/2 mile from the petroglyphs, is a Class II VRM area.

Natural Corrals - VRM classification is II

Pine Springs - VRM classification is II

White Mountain Petroglyphs and the area that can be seen for 1/2 mile from the petroglyphs (visits 12) is a Class II VRM area.
and soil stability, recreational activities, livestock grazing and range improvement activities, mineral development and other important resource concerns. The CAP will provide more specific management direction for the activity planning area to prevent or address potential conflicts among or resulting from these uses.

The area to be addressed and analyzed for the CAP (about 600,000 acres) represents the cumulative impact analysis area for the activity plan because the lands outside the "core" area could be affected by the management of the core area and vice versa. Therefore, criteria have been established to avoid premature commitments allowing development or disturbance within highly sensitive areas for wildlife and/or areas that are sensitive for soils, vegetation, visual intrusion, etc., within the activity plan area, until the CAP is completed. Land and resource use activities proposed for the public lands outside the core area may be restricted or prohibited, if they fall in areas where the following criteria apply:

a) Slopes greater than 20%.
b) Forest-type areas such as juniper, limber pine, and aspen.
c) Tall sagebrush habitat (sagebrush 4 feet high or taller).
d) Badland areas with highly erodible soils.
e) All mountain shrub communities such as mountain mahogany, bitterbrush, and serviceberry (usually associated with 20% slopes).
f) All big game severe winter relief/crucial winter range areas and big game birthing areas.
g) Other sensitive areas or situations that may be identified.

ALTERNATIVES
Alternatives Considered in Detail

Each of the four alternative plans examined in detail provided a different emphasis for managing the resource area, and each resolved the planning issues differently.

Alternative A. Continuation of Present Management (No Action), continued the existing management and uses of the public lands and resources at present projected levels.

Alternative B emphasized developing and using natural resources. Environmental protection was provided for but the major emphasis was resource development.

Alternative C emphasized protection of the environment to a greater extent than Alternatives A or B. Resource development was provided for but the major emphasis was resource protection.

The Preferred Alternative (and Proposed Plan) allowed for resource use, with greater emphasis on the protection of the natural environment than Alternatives A or B. The Preferred Alternative consisted of watershed and wildlife prescriptions from Alternative C, wild horse management prescriptions from Alternative B, and the remaining resource management prescriptions (e.g., leasing, forest management, and livestock grazing) from Alternatives A, B, and C.

Alternatives and Management Options Eliminated from Detailed Study

Alternatives and management options considered but eliminated from detailed study included: no mineral (oil and gas) leasing, and lease stipulations (or development restrictions) that are less stringent than a no surface occupancy requirement in certain sensitive areas; no grazing on public lands; no timber harvesting on public lands; and maximum unconstrained alternatives that exclude other resource uses.

The Selected Plan

The Green River RMP consists of the proposed RMP described in the Final EIS, with some reorganization and changes as a result of public comment. As a result of protests on parts of the proposed RMP, some clarification has been included in the Green River RMP; however, no changes were made to the proposed decisions identified in the proposed RMP. The land use plans of local and state governments and other federal
PUBLIC PARTICIPATION AND CONSISTENCY

Public participation occurred throughout the planning process. Both formal and informal involvement methods were encouraged and used. The public participation that occurred is described in Chapter 5 of the Final EIS. The Environmental Protection Agency Notice of Filing for the Final EIS was published in the Federal Register on April 5, 1996. News articles were published in newspapers and presented on the radio concerning both the draft and final EISs. Open houses and meetings were held throughout the planning process. Twelve letters were submitted to the Director during the 60-day protest period for the Proposed Green River RMP and Final EIS.

Government agencies, organizations, and individuals received copies of both the draft and final EIS documents. Comment letters were received from individuals and organizations at the Draft EIS stage. Responses to these comments were prepared and printed in the Final EIS.

The Bureau of Reclamation is a cooperating agency in the preparation and review of the EIS. The Bureau of Reclamation manages Fontenelle Reservoir and surrounding lands, and lands in the Parson area and around the Big Sandy River. Comments received from the Bureau of Reclamation have been incorporated into the EIS.

The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service concurred with the BLM's "no effect" conclusion on the Proposed Green River RMP for threatened and endangered species. Since the proposed decisions in the proposed RMP were not changed, the "no effect" conclusion is still applicable.

The Governor's letter of June 4, 1996, indicated no consistency problems between the Proposed Green River RMP and State of Wyoming plans and programs. However, concern was raised over potential conflict that exchanges for state lands in special management areas identified by the BLM might be considered by the state. Clarification has been provided in the Green River RMP that it is not the intent of BLM to acquire all state lands in special management areas, and that no such agreement has been reached. Exchanges can be considered at any time with no restriction from either party. Concern was also raised with potential confusion over information in a table identifying utilization guidelines for proper functioning conditions located in Appendix 2 of the Final EIS. This livestock grazing issue is similar to those expressed by several parties who filed protests. To remove the confusion of the table being considered and applied as a land use planning decision, the table has not been included as part of the appendix materials. This utilization guideline information, as well as any appropriate method, may be considered and applied on an individual site basis, during site-specific activity and project planning for achieving riparian objectives.

Grazing permittees/lessees were contacted throughout the process and were consulted about the allotment categorization process. Discussions included: range condition and existing grazing management, changes in range management, range trend and sustainability, forage production, riparian area management, wildlife habitat values, user conflicts, public controversy, land ownership patterns and acreage, and range improvement needs.

The public is invited to continue to participate in the implementation of the Green River RMP through involvement in the activity or implementation planning phase of the planning process. This phase deals with site-specific and detailed decision making and project implementation or approval in support of the general land use planning determinations presented in the RMP.

The Green River RMP is consistent with officially adopted plans, programs, and policies of other Federal agencies and State and local governments, as well as those of the Department of the Interior and BLM.

MONITORING AND EVALUATION

Management actions and decisions of the Green River RMP will be tracked and evaluated to determine effectiveness and to determine if the objectives of the RMP are being met. If evaluation indicates that the RMP is not working as expected or needed, or if situations in the resource area change, it may become necessary to modify, amend, or revise the RMP. Intervals and standards for monitoring and evaluation will be established as necessary.
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INTRODUCTION

This Green River Resource Management Plan (RMP) provides management direction for approximately 3.6 million acres of public land surface and 3.5 million acres of Federal mineral estate land owned and/or managed by the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) in the Green River Resource Area (Table 1). The Green River RMP supersedes all previous planning decision documents for the Green River Resource Area.

The resource area administrative boundary includes parts of Sweetwater, Lincoln, Sublette, Fremont, and Uinta counties, in southwestern Wyoming (Map 1).

As provided by the Federal Land Policy and Management Act (FLPMA), the BLM has the responsibility to plan and manage the "public lands." As defined by the Act, the "public lands" are those Federally owned lands, and any interest in lands (e.g., Federally owned mineral estate), administered by the Secretary of the Interior, specifically through the Bureau of Land Management (Map A). Within the Green River RMP planning area, there are varied and intermingled land surface ownerships and overlapping mineral ownerships. Therefore, the administrative jurisdictions for land use planning and for managing the land surface and minerals are also varied, intermingled, and overlapping.

Because of this situation, the Green River RMP does not include planning and management decisions for lands or minerals within the planning area that are privately owned or owned by the State of Wyoming or local governments. Providing direction for the surface or minerals management of these lands is not within BLM's jurisdiction. In addition, the RMP does not include planning and management decisions for those Federally owned minerals within the planning area that are overlapped by Federally owned land surface that is administered by other Federal agencies. Table 1 summarizes the land surface and mineral ownerships and administrative relationships for the area (Map 2).

The planning and management decisions in the Green River RMP are represented by a selection of management objectives and management actions which resolve the planning issues and provide for sustained multiple use management of the public lands and resources. The RMP decisions are presented in bold type.

Appendix material referenced in this RMP provides resource information on wild and scenic river classifications, AECIE relevance and importance criteria, and general guidance and information that can be used in implementing the RMP decisions. The Wyoming "Standards for Healthy Rangelands and Guidelines for Livestock Grazing Management for Public Lands Administered by the Bureau of Land Management in the State of Wyoming" were approved by the Secretary of the Interior on August 12, 1997. They have been included in the appendix materials with the Green River Resource Management Plan and referenced in the RMP. The materials in the appendices are not RMP decisions. Maps related to the RMP are included. The small map scale was chosen to show a general sense of location. More detailed maps are on file in the Green River Resource Area Office. The information on these maps is dynamic and subject to change as new resource information and data are acquired.

All public land and resource uses in the planning area must conform with the decisions, terms, and conditions of use described in this RMP. Detailed decisions for the implementation of specific options will be made through the planning and environmental review that will be completed prior to the implementation of the project. Likewise, the authorization of specific uses will be based on conformance with RMP decisions and completion of environmental analyses. Figure 1 provides an illustration of the planning process.

AIR QUALITY MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT OBJECTIVE: The objectives for management of air quality are: to maintain and, where possible, enhance present air quality levels; 2) protect public health and safety and sensitive natural resources; and 3) within the scope of BLM's authority, minimize emissions which may add to acid rain, cause violations of air quality standards, or reduce visibility (Appendix 9.3).

MANAGEMENT ACTIONS: Special requirements (e.g., use authorization stipulations, mitigation measures, conditions of approval, etc.) to alleviate air quality impacts will be identified on a case-by-case basis and included in use authorizations (including mineral leases). Examples of such requirements would include: limiting emissions, spacing of source densities, requiring the collection of meteorological and/or air quality data, covering conveyors at minesites (no lower dust emissions), and placing restrictions on flaring of natural gas to reduce sulfur emissions. See Appendix 5.1 for specific guidance for applying air quality protection measures.

Plant facilities could be authorized where they minimize air quality impacts over the planning area, particularly the Flaming Gorge National Recreation Area. They may not be authorized where they create or aggravate conditions that are hazardous to public health by causing black ice on major highways, or possibly creme and continual fog that could inhibit transportation or recreation activities.

Surface disturbing activities will be managed to prevent violation of air quality regulations. Construction and surface disturbing activities will be designed with dust control measures to reduce particulate matter and visibility impacts. Coordination with local and state agencies to control dust on unpaved dirt roads will occur where necessary (see the Wyoming AQ Regulations in Appendix 5.1).

BLM will continue to participate with other agencies in the collection of air quality data and air quality pollution analysis (Appendix 5.1).

The State of Wyoming has the authority and responsibility to regulate air quality impacts within the state, including Class I areas. The State will continue to cooperate and coordinate with the USDA Forest Service, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, and the State of Wyoming, in managing and
Historic Trails
Congressionally Designated Historic Trails and Associated Resources

The BLM will cooperate with the National Park Service in implementing the Oregon/Mormon Pioneer National Historic Trails Management Plan.

The area within 1/4 mile of the visual horizon (which ever is less of any contributing trail segment) will be an avoidance area for surface disturbing activities (Map 3 and Table 2). Developments such as roads, pipelines, and powerlines may be allowed to cross trails in areas where previous disturbance has occurred and the trail segment has not changed the characteristics that contribute to its National Historic Site significance.

Motorized vehicles, such as those used for geophysical exploration, or large heavy vehicles such as buses used in recreational tours, or similar activities, could cross and drive down the trails without violating the visual analysis that no adverse effects will occur.

Geophysical activities such as shotcrews, blasting, and vibroseis locations could, generally, be allowed, provided they are at least 300 feet from the trail, do not occur directly on the trail, and a site-specific analysis determines that visual intrusions and adverse effects will not occur.

No blading will be allowed on any historic trail unless necessary to protect life or property. Historic trails are not available for use as an arterial access road e.g. oil and gas drilling access roads or as haul roads for heavy truck traffic.

The Parting-of-the-Ways historical site will be protected by closing it to exploration and development of locatable and salable minerals and a withdrawal from mineral location. An existing 40-acre mineral location withdrawal in park land will be continued (Table 3). The site will be managed under the prescription for management in the Oregon/Mormon Pioneer National Historic Trails Management Plan. The integrity of the Dry Sandy Swales trail segment (about 1 mile) will be protected. The site will be an avoidance area and will be closed to mineral exploration and development of activities that could adversely affect it (see discussions in Lands and Realty Management and Minerals Management and Table 3).

The area within 1/4 mile of either side of the Dry Sandy Swales trail segment will be managed in accordance with the Oregon/Mormon Pioneer National Historic Trails Management Plan.

Other Historic Trails and Historic Sites

Management of historic roads and trails that are eligible for the NRHP but are not Congressionally designated will generally be the same as for designated trails including a 1/4 mile protective setback on either side of the trails. These trails may be recommended for listing to the National Register of Historic Places. These trails include the Overland Trail, the Cherokee Trail, and the Point of Rocks to Boot Hill Trail.

LaCede Stage Station and Dog Springs Stage Station on the Overland Trail will be protected as exclusion areas and will be closed to surface disturbing activities that could adversely affect the sites. These sites will be closed to exploration and development of locatable minerals and entry under the land laws, and withdrawals will be pur chased. Cultural resource management plans may be written for these sites, and interpretive and visitor management efforts will be allowed as necessary (see discussions in Lands and Realty Management and Minerals Management; see Table 2 and Table 4).

The Dry Sandy Stage Station and Fort LaCede may be considered for acquisition under a willing seller/willing buyer type of acquisition. The BLM management of the site will consider acquisition of significant historic resources. The BLM will not use powers of condemnation to acquire these parcels (Appendix E-3).

Various sites in the area, including the 1870-1940 trails, will be managed according to their historical context. Expansion Eraf roads are those routes developed after completion of the Transcontinental Railroad in Wyoming in 1869. Management prescriptions similar to those in the Oregon/Mormon Pioneer National Historic Trails Management Plan will be applied, although the 1/4 mile protective setback might not always be applied. Management actions will include development of interpretive signs, removal of evidence of past surface disturbing activities, and, in severe cases, the removal of those Expansion Era trails that qualify.

The Big Sandy Station, Big Timber Station, Freighter Springs Station, Camp Carmichael, Lander's Camp, and the John Johnson Cabin/Chuck wagon trail segment are proposed for the preservation of cultural and historical values. Site specific resource management actions may be developed in cultural resource management plans for these sites.

Rock Art Sites

Five significant rock art sites and their surrounding views (within 1/2 mile) will be managed to protect their cultural and biological values. The BLM will remove and/or remove or modify activities that could adversely affect these values. Management of visitor use at rock art sites may include interpretive signage. Fencing, barriers, and other site measures will be prepared for these sites if necessary (see discussions in Lands and Realty Management and Minerals Management; see Table 2 and Table 4).

Archeological data will be synthesized in the Little Colorado Desert, Greater Nitchle Gulch, and Wamsutter Arch areas. Oil and gas development activities are prohibited in these areas.

Other Sites

The Tri-Territorial Marker is an exclusion area and is closed to: 1) the public; 2) grazing; and 3) oil and gas development activities that could adversely affect it; and exploration and development of locatable minerals. A withdrawal will be pursued. The site will be managed as a historic place with fencing, interpretive signs, or barriers to protect the site. Interpretive signs will be prepared for the site if necessary (see discussions in Lands and Realty Management and Minerals Management; see Table 2 and Table 4).

Archaeological data will be synthesized in the Little Colorado Desert, Greater Nitchle Gulch, and Wamsutter Arch areas. Oil and gas development activities are prohibited in these areas.

Other significant rock art sites are identified in the future, they will be managed in the same manner as the above five significant sites.

All other rock art sites will be managed on a case-by-case basis according to resource values.

Consideration will be given to specific site protection measures to avoid disturbance of traditional Native American practices at rock art sites or other cultural resource sites.

Other Sites

The Tri-Territorial Marker is an exclusion area and is closed to: 1) the public; 2) grazing; and 3) oil and gas development activities that could adversely affect it; and exploration and development of locatable minerals. A withdrawal will be pursued. The site will be managed as a historic place with fencing, interpretive signs, or barriers to protect the site. Interpretive signs will be prepared for the site if necessary (see discussions in Lands and Realty Management and Minerals Management; see Table 2 and Table 4).

Archaeological data will be synthesized in the Little Colorado Desert, Greater Nitchle Gulch, and Wamsutter Arch areas. Oil and gas development activities are prohibited in these areas.

Other significant rock art sites are identified in the future, they will be managed in the same manner as the above five significant sites.

All other rock art sites will be managed on a case-by-case basis according to resource values.

Consideration will be given to specific site protection measures to avoid disturbance of traditional Native American practices at rock art sites or other cultural resource sites.
Plaza a Lake areas with high cultural site densities would be managed as historic districts. Management prescriptions for surface disturbing activities in plaza lake areas will be developed on a case-by-case basis. A programmatic memorandum of agreement for data recovery with the NHPO and ACIP will also be pursued. Each plaza may be managed as an NRHP eligible historic district: Blue Forest, Blue Point, and Adobe Town Rims.

The Pine Springs ACEC (16,580 acres) is closed to surface disturbing activities. About 2,800 acres in the area will be closed to exploration and development of locatable mineral and entry under the laws. Withdrawal from these activities will be pursued. The existing 90-acre withdrawal will be retained. Cultural resource management plans may be written for the sites. Intensive and intrusive management efforts may be allowed as necessary. (See also Pine Springs ACEC, Lands and Realty Management and Minerals Management discussions. Table 3 and Table 4) Surface disturbing activities may include activities associated with mineral exploitation and development, construction of roads, pipelines, powerlines, mineral material sales, etc.

The Eden-Farson, Finley, Kempton, and Morgan archaeological sites, and similar sites identified in the future, will be managed to protect their important scientific values. No public interpretive efforts will be initiated at these sites. These sites will be managed according to Sections 106 and 110 of the NHPO and their locations will be kept confidential pursuant to NHPO regulations. Periodic law enforcement patrol and other efforts will be institutioned to ensure that the ARPA is enforced and that these sites are protected.

All known human burial sites will be protected regardless of their ethnic affiliation. Management of Native American burial sites will take into account recommendations from appropriate tribes. Data recovery will not be the preferred method for mitigation of adverse effects to any burial location.

Known burial areas will be closed to surface disturbing activities that could adversely affect them. See discussions in Lands and Realty Management and Minerals Management and Table 2.

Management emphasis for the prehistoric quarry site will vary for each quarry. A prehistoric quarry site will be protected by closing it to mineral location and pursuing a withdrawal. The site is an exclusion area and is closed where surface disturbances that could adversely affect it. Only those surface disturbing activities authorized for the site will be performed. See discussions in Lands and Realty Management and Minerals Management and Table 2 and Table 4.

South and North Table Mountains (the Borzio Site) contain cultural resources within standard Section 106 and 110 NHPO compliance. The area will be closed to surface disturbing activities that could adversely affect the cultural sites, but will be open for consideration of activities such as fencing, interpretive signs, or barriers to ensure protection of the area. Appropriate scientific study of sites in this area will be a priority within the resource area cultural program (see discussions in Lands and Realty Management and Minerals Management and Table 2).

Other Cultural and Paleontological Management Actions

Consultation with appropriate Native American tribes concerning areas of concern to them for traditional cultural purposes will be in accord with the American Indian Religious Freedom Act and BLM Manual 1906.1 Handbook. Native American consultation would occur within the context of specific development proposals, but will also be an ongoing process between BLMs and affected Indian tribes and traditional cultural leaders.

Interpretive materials will be prepared describing the cultural resources of the area. Those in charge of responsibility to manage them. Historical aspects of BLM programs will be interpreted for appropriate appreciation.

Exchanges for acquisition and cooperative agreements will be pursued to enhance management of cultural resources (Appendix 8).

Management needs for other cultural sites will be determined on a case-by-case basis according to their resource values.

Significant paleontological resources will be managed for their scientific and educational values and in accordance with 43 CFR 3600, 43 CFR 3622, and 43 CFR 3635.

Collecting of vertebrate fossils may be allowed with written authorization which may be issued only to an academic, scientific, governmental, or other qualified institution or individual. Collecting of invertebrate fossils and petrified wood for hobby purposes is allowed on public lands and is regulated under 43 CFR 3600, 43 CFR 3622, and 43 CFR 3635. A site protection plan may be written and implemented for the Fossil Fossil Fish Beds.

Surface disturbing activities that affect known vertebrate fossil localities will be considered in site specific analyses and potential adverse impacts will be streamlined. The Area Manager's discretion, mitigating measures may be required for surface disturbing activities occurring in areas having a reasonable chance for the occurrence of scientifically significant fossils. Mitigation measures may include surface inventory, construction monitoring, excavation/avoid, or other measures considered to be reasonable and appropriate by the Area Manager. Operators are required to report any paleontological resources discovered during the course of operations.

The Steamband Mountain and Boars Tusk-Killipacker Sand Dunes areas will be managed to protect the unique geological and ecological features and to provide for public interpretation of these features. The road around Boars Tusk is closed.

See other resource management prescriptions in this document for other prescriptions and guidance that may apply to cultural, natural history, and paleontological management actions within the Pine Springs, Historic Landscape ACEC. Pine Springs ACEC, Crookston Ranch (within the Greater Sand Dunes ACEC), White Mountain Petroglyphs ACEC, and Cedar Canyon ACEC.

Fire Management

Fire Management Objective: The objectives for fire management are to 1) use prescribed fire as a management tool to help meet multiple use resource management goals; and 2) provide cost-effective protection from wildfire to life, property, and resource values.

Management actions: Wildfire suppression will emphasize appropriate management response. Immediately after a wildfire has occurred, action will be taken to ensure protection from wildfires as determined for other cultural sites and ecosystems. Fire suppression actions will be based on achieving the most efficient control and allowing historical burns to increase. Activity plans will be developed for designated fire management areas defining specific parameters for all fire occurrences (Figure 2 and Map 4).

Ambient air quality standards will be maintained during prescribed fire operations.

Heavy equipment and actions that will cause surface disturbance will be used only after a site specific analysis has been performed and approved. Activities that cause surface disturbance will be considered on a case-by-case basis.

Priority areas for wildfire suppression will be identified in fire management plans or plans for the planning area.

A site specific analysis will be prepared for sensitive areas such as special status plant species, cultural sites, historic trails, and ACEC to determine the appropriate suppression activity that will be acceptable.

Use of chemical fire suppression agents is prohibited in road sites. Generally, use of chemical fire suppression agents is prohibited in special management areas, unless or until a wildfire situation analysis is completed or activity plan for the special management areas identifies chemical suppression agents as an allowable use.

Wildfires occurring in forested areas will be appropriatel y suppressed in accord with resource values threatened, as determined on a case-by-case basis.

Wildfires occurring in or directly threatening a developed or active timber sale will receive priority suppression attention. Fuels may be managed to provide for wildfire-resilient and for wildlife needs. Fuels management may include fuel treatments such as scarification, soil water treatments, and prescribed burning. Timber stand conditions and management considerations will dictate harvest methods and size and shape of units.
Cutting methods include, but are not limited to, decautting, indeterminate cutting, whether with or without thinning, and green selection. Individually cut stands will not exceed 25 acres in size unless a site-specific analyses on public BMP response objectives will be met with a larger cutoff unit size. All clearcut design and planning will consider other resource values such as escape cover for wildlife. Clearcut unit size and shape will be designed to minimize natural regeneration and edge effect for wildlife.

Clearcutting is not allowed within 100 feet of drainages or standing and flowing waters. Other logging activity, such as thinning or cable logging, could occur within the 100-foot zone if other resource values will not be adversely affected.

Timber harvesting activities will be restricted seasonally to limit the amount of wildlife and other vegetation damage in relation to snow and ice conditions. About 14.4% of commercial acreage in timber stands within big game winter ranges are closed to logging activity, usually from November 1 through April 30. The logging unit encompasses big game winter range habitats; the area is closed to timber harvest activity usually from May 1 through June 30. There will be no logging activity within grove nesting sites and riparian nesting sites usually from February 1 to July 31 (see Minerals Management). Exceptions may be approved if conditions described in Appendix 7 apply.

Timber harvest activities will be designed to protect water quality.

A 500-foot buffer from standing or flowing water, including, and or riparian buffer areas will be applied to surface disturbance activities (e.g. roads, unless impacts to soils, watershed, and water quality are mitigated. No surface disturbance is allowed within 100 feet of the edge of the inner fringe of intermittent and large ephemeral drainages. Surface disturbance is allowed up to 100 feet for water quality analyses. Linear earthen blinds will be considered on a case-by-case basis. Watershed activity.

Logging operations on slopes steeper than 45 percent will be limited to hydrologically, environmentally, and economically feasible methods such as cable yarding and/or skidding.

Slash disposal will be tailored to the being ideal harvest unit limit to promote reforestation, minimize erosion, and allow big game movement. Methods could include broadcast burning, pit burning, and logging. Lopping and screening, chipping, and piling are strongly discouraged.

Stand replacement of harvested areas or areas damaged by natural causes will be treed to increase tree seedlings within 5 to 15 years following harvest.

Commercial forest stands will be managed under the guidelines for suppression of wildfires. Aspen and juniper stands will be open to prescribed fire activities to enhance watershed and wildlife values.

Habitat fragmentation will be prevented if it has a negative ecological effect.

Special management areas (old growth, scientific research areas) will be identified and appropriate management incorporated into activity.

Woodland Forests -Juniper, Aspen, and Limber Pine

Woodland forest areas will be managed using silvicultural practices that promote stand viability. Treatme are: could include thinning, harvesting, burning, and thinning.

Vegetative material resulting from these treatments will normally be sold through public demand sales.

Woodland forest acreage will be maintained. Treatme may be implemented that influence successional stages, but such treatments will not permanently convert the area to another vegetation type. The area could be replaced by stands of sprouting aspen by various treatment and thinning methods (e.g. burning). Old deciduous trees may be left standing or downed to provide cover or visual interest for wildlife (e.g. Animal limbs, and juniper stands may be replaced where they are encroaching into other vegetation types.

Silvicultural treatments in mature timber stands will be designed to improve wildlife habitat and watershed conditions, that is, create small openings to provide forage for wildlife and accumulate snow drifts to increase moisture.

Cottonwood trees are not available for any harvesting.

Firewood cutting for camping purposes will be limited to designated areas (this mainly applies to the area around developed recreation sites).

See other resource management prescriptions in this document for other prescriptions and practices that may apply to forest resource management activities.

HAZARDOUS MATERIALS AND OTHER HAZARDS

MANAGEMENT OBJECTIVES: The objectives for management of hazardous materials and waste are to: 1) protect public and environmental health and safety on BLM-administered public lands; 2) comply with applicable federal and state laws; 3) prevent waste contamination due to any BLM-authorized activities; 4) minimize federal exposure to the liabilities associated with waste management on public lands; and 5) integrate hazardous materials and waste management policies and controls into all BLM programs.

MANAGEMENT ACTIONS: For BLM-authorized activities that involve hazardous materials or their use, prescribed management measures will be used to guard against releases or spills into the environment. If such materials are identified as a result of hazardous waste spills on BLM administered public lands, the BLM will provide appropriate warnings.

Sale or transfer of public lands on which storage or disposal of hazardous wastes is known to have occurred, unless in accordance with public notification of the type and quantity of these substances.

BLM-administered public lands contaminated with hazardous wastes will be reported, secured, and cleaned up according to applicable federal and state regulations and contingency plans. Parties responsible for contamination will be liable for cleanup and resource damage costs, as prescribed in federal and state regulations.

Certain wastes generated by the oil and gas industry are exempt from regulation as hazardous wastes. These exemptions are too complex in detail to be listed here but are on file in BLM offices. For producing petroleum, drilling fluids at well sites or other locations may be tested for TCLP contamination. Other hazardous wastes are indicated. Costs for testing and proper disposal will be borne by the operator if analysis confirms the presence of a nonhazardous waste.

See other resource management prescriptions in this document for other prescriptions and guidelines that may apply to hazardous materials management activities.

LANDS AND REALTY MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT OBJECTIVES: The objectives for the management of the land and realty program are to: 1) manage the public lands to support the goals and objectives of other resource programs; 2) respond to public demand for land use authorizations; and 3) acquire administrative and public access where necessary.

MANAGEMENT ACTIONS: Lands and realty management activities include BLM real properties, land ownership adjustment, utility transportation systems, withdrawn, classified, timber, desert land entries, and access.

Land Ownership Adjustment

Public lands will be retained in federal ownership with the exception of those lands which have potential for disposal. Lands currently identified as meeting the FLPMA disposal criteria are described in Appendix 6. The federal method of disposal will be by land exchanges. Other lands will be considered for disposal on a case-by-case basis (see Map 6). All disposal must meet the disposal criteria listed in Appendix 6-2. The disposal of these lands and any lands identified in the future must allow for the acquisition of important public facilities or meet other important public objectives such as community expansion and economic development. Public lands may have further potential for disposal because they are isolated and would be difficult to manage.

Lands will be provided to government entities for solid waste disposal through sale, exchange, or Recreation and Public Purposes (RAPP) patent. Government entities will be encouraged to purchase unused portions of sanitary landfills granted authorization under Recreation and Public Purposes leases. The BLM will aid in finding suitable landfill development locations (see the Hazardous Materials Management section).

Sweetwater County School District No. 1 will be given the opportunity to acquire Lots 3, 4, 5, Section 28, T. 19N., R. 106 W., 124 acres for school purposes prior to any other type of disposal.

Acquisition of lands will be considered to facilitate various resource management objectives. The preferred method for acquisition will be through exchange. Land exchanges are considered discretionary and voluntary real estate transactions between parties involved. Lands will be considered to include private/state lands along upper stream reaches of the Big Sandy River. State holdings in WY, other lands with important resource values. Consideration will be given to exchanges with lands specifically identified as ACEs. In those instances where a purchase or exchange is not feasible, attempts will be made to enter into cooperative agreements with the private landowners or federal agencies, threatened and endangered species habitat; and riparian habitats. Appendix 8 describes proposed acquisitions (about 20,000 acres) that could be made by purchase, exchange or through cooperative agreement to support resource needs.

Unauthorized uses within the planning area will be resolved. It circumstances warrant, the issuance of a permit, lease, or right of way, authorizing the use could occur as a means of resolving trespass. Disposal of the parcel through sale or exchange may be considered to resolve long-standing trespass.

Utility/Transportation Systems

Public lands will be made available throughout the planning area for transportation systems and land leases.

The planning area, with the exception of defined exclusion and avoidance areas, will be open to the consideration of granting rights-of-way (see Special Management Area section and Table 2).

Right-of-way corridors will not be designated due to the predominance of checkboard private land pattern in the planning area.

Areas are designated for avoidance or exclusion to rights-of-way where these uses are incompatible with management of sensitive natural resources and/or would have unacceptable impacts. Rights-of-way and avoidance areas are described in Table 2 and shown on Map 7 and Map 8.

An avoidance area for major utility lines will be located along I-80 between Point of Rocks and Green River. Due to topography, congestion, the transportation corridor, and surface mining this area will be restricted to local utility distribution lines. All other utilities will be located, if possible, in the northern or southern east-west corridors.

G R E E N RIVER R M P
Areas designated as utility windows, rights-of-way, concentration areas, and existing communication sites will be preferred locations for future grants. Five windows have been identified: 2 east-west and 3 north-south. Other areas will be considered for rights-of-way on a case-by-case basis (Map 9).

Windows 12 mile in width have been identified for the placement of utilities. The northern east-west window will be for underground facilities only, and the southern east-west window will be for both above and below ground facilities. A 1/2 mile wide north-south window on the west side of Flamingo Gorge, a window south along Highway 430, and a north-south window along the east side of Flamingo Gorge have been identified for above and below ground utilities.

The ROD and Federal Register notice for the BMP will meet the criteria for public notification for linear or site-specific rights-of-way within floodplains as required by BLM Manual 7121.01, except for those associated with perennial streams. The BLM will solicit public comment on site facilities or major linear rights-of-way along perennial streams unless another agency (federal, state, or local) already had solicited such comments.

The Aspen Mountain Communications Site Plan will govern development of sites at this location. Sites at other locations will be approved on a case-by-case basis. Shaping of sites will be advocated, where possible.

Withdrawals/Classifications

Withdrawals and classifications will be processed to protect important resource values (Table 4).

Withdrawals which no longer serve the purpose for which they were established will be revoked (Map 10 and Map 11).

Prior to revocation, withdrawn lands will be reviewed to determine if any other resource values require withdrawal protection (Table 3).

The Multiple Use Management Classification as it affects public lands in the planning area (2300 acres) will be revised.

An additional 63 acres inundated by water under Flamingo Gorge Reservoir may be withdrawn for the Bureau of Reclamation.

Public Water Reserves will be terminated where no longer needed, and acquired where the need exists (Map 11).

The BLM Rock Springs Administrative Site withdrawal will be retained (Table 3).

Desert Land Entries

No BLM-administered public lands within the planning area are available for agricultural entry under Desert Land Entry - 43 CFR 2520.1 due to one or more of the following factors: unsuitable soils, salinity contributions to the Colorado River System, lack of water supplies.

livelstock grazing, wild horses, wildlife, watershed, etc. (see Appendix 9-4).

The Palmer Draw area (970 acres) and special management use area proposed to livestock grazing. AEMs currently in effect in these areas will be suspended.

All developed and some semi-developed recreation areas are closed to livestock grazing and will be fenced to reduce conflicts between uses.

Authorized grazing preference may be reduced in areas with excessive soil erosion and poor range condition, if allotment evaluation warrants such a change, or to provide forage for wildlife, wild horse, and recreational uses.

Management will be implemented in "I" category allotments to maintain or improve wild horse, wildlife, watershed, recreation, and soils resource conditions. Management in "II" category allotments will be directed toward maintaining resource conditions. Management in "iii" category allotments will be directed towards monitoring resource conditions.

All BMPs will incorporate desired plant community objectives and riparian objectives where such resources exist. Grazing systems will be designed to maintain or improve plant diversity and will be implemented on all category allotments. BMPs will be written or modified for I category allotments. BMPs for M category allotments may not be modified unless monitoring and evaluation indicate a change in management is needed or riparian objectives need to be included. Riparian objectives will also be developed for III category allotments where riparian values exist (Appendix 9-3).

Management actions identified in the Rangeland Program Summary I, dated (1990) will continue to be implemented, as appropriate, through site specific activity planning.

Cooperative allotment management plans prepared in cooperation with state agencies, such as the Forest Service and the Natural Resource Conservation Service, will be consistent with this land use plan.

Site specific analyses will be conducted where necessary to help determine how to alleviate conflicts between wildlife, livestock grazing, and development. A site specific plan that considers wildlife needs will be developed for the Pine Canyon, Long Canyon, Cedar Canyon, and Table Mountain areas to alleviate conflicts between grazing, gas production and exploration, wildlife needs, and livestock grazing.

Unlimited forage on public lands will be appropriately allocated to wildlife, wild horses, livestock grazing, and for watershed improvement on a case-by-case basis.

Salt or mineral supplements for livestock are prohibited within 500 feet of water, wetlands, or riparian areas. Use of salt in these areas may continue unless an analysis shows that watershed, riparian, and wildlife objectives may not be met or increased by fencing. Salt or mineral supplements are prohibited on areas inhabited by special status plant species or other sensitive areas.

Range improvements will be directed at resolving or reducing resource concerns, improvement of wetland/riparian areas, and assistance in the implementation of vegetation/ground cover (see Vegetation sections). New range improvement measures may be implemented in "I" and "M" category allotments. Maintenance of range improvements will be directed in accordance with the BLM Rangeland Improvement Policy.

Water sources may be developed in crucial wildlife winter ranges only when consistent with wildlife habitat needs. Such sources will be designated to benefit livestock, wild horses, and wildlife. Alternative water supplies or facilities for livestock may be provided to relieve livestock grazing pressure along streambottoms and improve livestock distribution.

Construction of fences may be considered to meet management objectives. Fence construction in big game use areas and known migration routes will require site specific analysis and approval. Fences may be added, modified, or reconstructed if documented wildlife or wild horse conflicts can be resolved. Public input control will be encouraged as an alternative to fencing. All constructed fences will follow construction standards and design (BLM Manual 7125.40) and will be located and designed to not impede wild horse movement.

Combining and splitting allotments will be considered where such action will help meet BMP objectives (e.g., the Hurry Fork allotment could be split into 3 allotments and managed under the guidelines of revised BMPs). The Cottonwood Creek and Antelope Wash allotments could be consolidated into one two-parcel allotment and managed under the guidelines of a new BMP.

Requests for conversions of kinds of livestock and changes in seasons of grazing will be considered on a case-by-case basis through an environment of analysis. Such changes will be consistent with wildlife, wild horse, watershed, and riparian objectives. Special status plant species and riparian plant communities may be converted to livestock grazing, allowing livestock conversions, and all conversions will be consistent with available forage.

Livestock inflations will be controlled through livestock management or by environmentally acceptable mechanical, chemical, or biological means. BLM will cooperate and coordinate with County weed and pest districts (Appendix 9-2).

Stock driveway withdrawals numbers 421, 23, and 23 will be revoked (Table 3).

See other resource management prescriptions in this document for other prescriptions and guidance that may apply to livestock grazing management activities.

MINERALS MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT OBJECTIVE: The objective for management of the BLM-administered Federal minerals is to maintain or enhance economic mineral potential through exploration, conservation, and development, while protecting other resource values.
The minerals program is designed by: leasable minerals, mineral materials, locatable minerals, and geothermal activity.

Leasable Minerals
Public lands within the checkerboard area are open to mineral leasing and development to promote mineral resource recovery with appropriate mitigation measures to be applied on a case-by-case basis.

Fluid Leasables (Oil and Gas)
MANAGEMENT OBJECTIVE: The objective for management of oil and gas resources is to provide for leasing, exploration, and development of oil and gas while protecting other values.

MANAGEMENT ACTIONS: BLM-administered public lands are open to consideration for oil and gas leasing. Public lands closed to leasing include lands within the Red Creek ACEC and portions of the Wind River Indian Reservation.

The remainder of the public lands in the planning area are open to consideration for oil and gas leasing with appropriate mitigation measures. Table 7 provides information on which restrictions apply to particular actions and land use to protect resource values in certain areas. This table provides guidelines for all surface disturbing activities, not just those related to oil and gas exploration and development activities.

Where maximum protection of resources is necessary, a No Surface Occupancy requirement will be imposed. Areas identified as needing maximum protection are shown on Table 7. Additional areas may be identified through site-specific environmental analysis and activity planning.

Timing limitations (seasonal restrictions) will be applied when activities occur during crucial periods or ones that adversely affect crucial or sensitive resources. Such restrictions include, but are not limited to, soils during wet and muddy periods, crucial wildlife seasonal use areas, and raptor nesting areas. Exceptions to seasonal restrictions may be granted if the criteria in Appendix 2 apply (see Table 8, Map 15, Map 16, and Map 17).

Where controlled use or restrictions on specific activities are needed but do not necessarily exclude activities, controlled surface use or surface disturbance restrictions will be designed in the planning area. These restrictions will be placed on areas where resources considered could be tied as adverse effects could be mitigated (Table 7 and Map 18).

Development actions will continue on a case-by-case basis to identify mitigation needs to meet RMP objectives, provide for resource protection, and provide for legal actions. Determined sequence, timing, or level of development may occur. This may result in transportation planning and in limitations in the number of roads and drill pads, or deferring development in some areas until other areas have been restored to previous uses (Appendix 5 and Appendix 6).

Prior to issuing Federal mineral leases in areas around or adjacent to local community centers or in areas where the community and county governments will be consulted to obtain input and direction to protect public health and safety. Leased lands in such areas may be offered for lease with an NSO stipulation or, if the areas are too large for directional drilling, they may remain unleased.

Leases may also be issued with other appropriate mitigation requirements necessary to protect public health and safety and to allow for public expansion. These NSO areas may only be accessed through directional drilling. The NSO stipulation will be used to designate drainage problems or other needs, under the assumption that industry is the best judge of whether technology will enable access to the oil and gas resources under the terms of the lease.

Leasing with an NSO stipulation could become necessary for several reasons. For example, if the area is characterized by occupied dwellings and the potential for a large-scale expansion; if the area is surrounded by the scenic deep slopes of the Wind River or White Mountain, Willis Peak, and other similar topographic features. Any disturbance in the expanding urban areas or on the steep slopes, can affect the potential for expansion, public health and safety, watershed values, and the scenic resources. Likelihood of success in producing gas varies from low to high, which means that some development will likely occur and production will increase, and disturbances will occur along with year-round access. Any requests for relief from these requirements will require an environmental analysis on the action being considered and the RMP may have to be amended.

To the extent that laws and regulations allow, the areas cleared to oil and gas leasing will be restored to their natural state where possible and gas drainage results in a loss of Federal minerals through production on public lands (drainage). At such time, the lease prescription will be re-evaluated. Actions such as drainage agreements will also be considered.

Fluid Leasables (Geothermal)
MANAGEMENT OBJECTIVE: The resource management objective to provide opportunities for geothermal exploration and development.

MANAGEMENT ACTIONS: Geothermal resources are open to leasing consideration in areas that are open to oil and gas leasing consideration. Areas closed to oil and gas leasing are also closed to geothermal leasing.

Examination and development of geothermal resources are subject to application of mitigation requirements for surface disturbance activities and other activities in the planning area, in the manner as they are applied to oil and gas exploration and development activities.

Solid Leasables (Coal)
MANAGEMENT OBJECTIVE: The objective for management of the federal coal resources in the planning area is to provide for both short- and long-term development of Federal coal in a manner harmonious and timely manner, consistent with the policies of the federal coal management program, national environmental integrity, national energy needs, and related demands.

MANAGEMENT ACTIONS: With appropriate limitations and mitigation requirements for the protection of other resource values, all BLM-administered public lands and Federal coal lands in the Green River planning area, except for those lands identified as closed, are open to coal resource inventory and exploration to help identify coal resources and their development potential (Table 9).

The North Fork Vermillion Creek drainage and the Green River drainage are the Federal coal basins of primary consideration for Federal coal leasing and development see Table 9.

Federal coal lands within the Coal Occurrence and Development Potential areas (about 422,000 acres) are open to leasing with appropriate mitigation measures (i.e., new competitive leasing, emergency leasing, lease modifications, and exchange proposals, under the Federal Coal Management Program) with appropriate regulatory conditions and requirements for protection of other land and resource values and uses (see Map 19 and Table 10).

The Coal Occurrence and Development Potential area is subject to continued field investigations, studies, and evaluations to determine if certain coal basins or groups of coal basins can occur without having a significant long-term impact on sensitive and/or critical resources. Sensitive and critical resources, in general, and on threatened and endangered plant and animal species and their essential habitats. Such investigations, studies, and evaluations may be conducted on a case-by-case basis in reviewing individual coal leasing or development proposals. (e.g., main plans or other proposals) on the basis of need.

Where appropriate buffer zones will be created to protect sites that are listed or designated as critical habitat recovery zones will be implemented in the context of the SRHP district, it is appropriate to maximize efficiency of data recovery efforts.

Active grouse lags sage and sharptail grouse and the area within a 1/4 mile radius of active lags are avoidance areas. For coal development and leasing with the following requirements:

Surface disturbance activities associated with such actions as: surface coal mining such as exploration drilling, construction and location of ancillary facilities, roads and other types of right-of-ways, will be avoided, if possible. In cases where it is not possible to avoid these areas, intensive mitigation of the surface disturbance activities primarily excavation and other surface disturbance will be imposed. The following activities are included as part of the mitigation or avoid actions for which no leasable lessee will be established, etc., that analyses of effects to wildlife and other affected species habitats and populations, and the cumulative effects of mining operations and other activities in the area. Consultation with other agencies (e.g., USFWS, WDFG, etc.) interested parties, and industry will occur as needed or required.

Big game winter ranges and birthing areas are types to further consideration for Federal coal leasing and development with a provision for maintaining a balance between coal leasing and development, and adequate crucial wildlife habitat. A protecting these areas to prevent significant adverse impacts to important big game species. This will be accomplished through coordination including the sequencing of Federal coal leasing and development in these areas for example: satisfactory abandonment and adequate reclamation of mined lands in big game critical winter ranges and birthing areas will be required before additional Federal coal leasing and development is initiated in the same critical winter ranges and birthing areas.

The greater Cooper Ridge and Elk Butte areas are open to further consideration for Federal coal leasing and development, pending further study (about 25,306 acres). This is for the purpose of defining the extent of any deer and antelope crucial winter ranges in the area, and for determining if certain methods of coal mining can occur in the area without having a significant long-term impact on the deer and antelope species.
During the gross mining season, surface uses and activities are prohibited between the hours of 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m., within a 1/2-mile radius of active lease-ids, or those lease-ids occupied by mining bids.

Gross site nesting areas (riparian and shrillip strip) are open to conventional nesting and development, with certain requirements. Exploration activities and ancillary facilities will be allowed with the following requirement:

If an occupied gross nest may be adversely affected by coal mining and related surface disturbing activities, surface uses and activities will be delayed in the area of influence for the nest until nesting is completed.

Wetland and riparian areas on Federal coal lands are avoidance areas for surface disturbing activities and are open to consideration for coal leasing and development with the following requirements:

Surface disturbing activities associated with such activities as surface coal mining methods, exploration drilling, construction of ancillary facilities, road-and other types of rights-of-way, etc., will be avoided in these areas, if possible. In those cases where it is not possible to avoid these areas, intense migration of the surface disturbing activities will be required.

Areas of BLM-Administered Public Land
Surface Overlying State-Owned Coal

BLM-administered public land surfaces covering state-owned coal areas shall be opened for coal leasing and development with appropriate and necessary conditions and requirements for protection of the public land surface and surface resource values and uses, including big game, crucial features, and rights-of-way about 2,000 acres.

These lands are subject to continued field investigations, studies, and evaluations to determine if certain methods of coal mining can occur without having a significant long-term impact on wildlife, in general, and on threatened and endangered plant and animal species and their essential habitats. Surface-use designations, studies, and evaluations may be conducted on an as-needed or case-by-case basis in response to individual coal leases and development proposals by the state, if opportunities or needs arise.

Areas wide studies may be conducted. These studies include surface keeping resources, databases, etc., where native trees become abandoned, or where new native trees become established. The analysis of effects to wildlife and threatened and endangered species, habitat and populations, and the cumulative effects of mining operations and other activities in the area. Consultations with other agencies, etc., will be involved with the individual activities.

As sale areas, community pits, and localized con uses areas became established to provide for sales of mineral materials, these use areas will be evaluated on a case-by-case basis. Establishment of mineral material sites will be evaluated on a case-by-case basis.

No膏sale sale areas will be established.

Locatable Minerals

MANAGEMENT OBJECTIVE: The objective for management of Federal coal land is to provide for development of the resource.

MANAGEMENT ACTIONS: Withdrawal of suitable land parcels is to be pursued and to provide for development of the resource.

The mineral classification withdrawals in the RMP planning area (phosphate, coal, oil shale) will be revoked. In some areas, these classification withdrawals will remain in effect until replaced with an appropriate withdrawal for other, appropriate purposes. See Management Area section of other withdrawals from mineral location will be pursued to provide protection to important resource values (see Table 3 and Table 4).

Surface disturbing activities on mining claims require a notice submitted to BLM for an allowable surface disturbance of 5 acres or less and a plan of operations for disturbances of more than 5 acres. In ACES, WSA potential additions to the Wild and Scenic Rivers System, and areas closed to ORV use, a plan of operations will be required for any surface disturbing activities, regardless of acreage involved.

Geophysical Exploration

MANAGEMENT OBJECTIVE: The objective for management of geophysical exploration activities is to provide opportunities for exploration of mineral resources and collection of geophysical data, while protecting other resource values.

MANAGEMENT ACTIONS: Most of the planning area is open to exploratory geophysical activities where off-road vehicle use or explosive charges would cause unacceptable impacts. Off-road vehicles are allowed in those areas that are closed to the use of geophysical vehicles and explosive charges to protect sensitive resources.

Geophysical activities will generally be required to comply with the stipulations and ORV management prescriptions for the planning area (see Off-Road Vehicle Management). However, geophysical exploration has been and will continue to be routinely granted site specific authority for off-road vehicle use to subject appropriate limitations to protect various resources identified during analysis of proposed actions. Geophysical Notices of Intents will continue to be evaluated on a case-by-case basis, and all authorizations will be issued with appropriate analysis and mitigation requirements.

Geophysical activities will be restricted or prohibited within 1/4 mile or visual horizon of historic trails (which is closer to protect trail integrity. Vehicles used for geophysical exploration or similar activities could be allowed to cross and drive down historic trails, provided a site specific analysis determines that no adverse effects would occur.

Generally, subsides and vibratory activities will be restricted or prohibited within 1/4 mile or visual horizon of historic trails; however, exceptions may be allowed if supported by site specific analysis.

Geophysical travel through developed and semi-developed recreation sites is restricted to existing roads and trails.

Geophysical exploration on sections of the Sweetwater River, identified as having potential for wild classification under the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act requirements, is limited to foot access and placement of surface equipment. Non-motorized vehicle use is allowed in these areas. Surface disturbing activities may be allowed if a site specific analysis determines no adverse impacts would occur to river values (see Wild and Scenic River section).

See other resource management prescriptions in this document for other prescriptions and guidelines that may apply to minerals management activities.

OFF-ROAD VEHICLE MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT OBJECTIVE: The objective for off-road vehicle (ORV) management is to provide opportunity for off-road vehicle vehicle performance with other resource management objectives.

MANAGEMENT ACTIONS: Off-road vehicle use will be managed according to the ORV designations listed on Table 13 and Table 14.

Areas for ORV trails, cross-country races, and outings may be provided on a permissive basis.

Approximately 170,000 acres are closed to off-road vehicle use to protect naturalistic and outstanding opportunities for solitude, or primitive and unconfined recreation.

In areas designated as either "limited" to designated roads and trails or "limited" to existing roads and trails for off-road vehicle use, motorized vehicles must stay on designated roads and trails. This exception is allowed by the authorized officer. This limitation applies to all activities involving motorized vehicles. Exceptions to these areas will be evaluated against the use of other trails and roads.
for areas that are closed to off-road vehicle travel, some types of
off-road motor vehicle use may be allowed by the author-
ized management agency and be subject to specific rules and
regulations that are in place.
Vehicular travel in crucial and important wildlife habi-
tats and during crucial and important periods will be
restricted seasonally, as necessary, on certain grounds, such as
in game ranges, classified burned areas, etc. (Table 13).
Vehicular travel is restricted to designated roads in
sensitive watersheds and in cultural site management
areas.
Generally, over-the-snow vehicle use is subject to the
prescriptions described in Table 13 unless a specific site
analysis determines that exceptions can be allowed.
ORV implementation plans will be prepared, as necessary,
and will reflect the ORV designations made in this RMP.
ORV implementation planning will also be a part of compre-
hesive activity planning efforts.
See other resource management prescriptions in this docu-
ment for advice and guidance that may apply to off-
road vehicle management activities.

RECREATION RESOURCE
MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT OBJECTIVES: The objectives for rec-
recreation management are to:
1. Ensure the continued availability of outdoor recreational opportunities
   sought by the public while protecting other resources; 2. meet
   legal requirements for the health and safety of visitors; and
   3. anticipate, plan, and manage recreation and other
   types of resource uses.
   Information provided by the Recreation
   Opportunity Survey will aid in identifying the types of uses occurring on
   public lands.
MANAGEMENT ACTIONS Most public lands in the
planning area are open to consideration of all individual,
commercial, and competitive outdoor recreation uses.
Developed recreation sites will be managed to
ensure public health and safety.
Undeveloped recreation sites and other recreation use
areas will be managed with priority consideration for air
quality, cultural resources, watershed protection, wildlife
values, and public health and safety.
A 14-day camping limit is established on all BLM-
administered public lands. Camping is limited to 14 days
within a 28-day consecutive period. After the 14th day
of occupation, campers must move outside a 5-mile radius of
the previous location.
Dispersed camping is permitted near water sources
in designated areas to protect water quality and livestock
wastewater areas. Camp-

Special recreation permits will be considered on a case-
by-case basis. Appropriate mitigation will be included in
special recreation permits for commercial recreation events and
major competitive recreation events to provide resource pro-
tection and public safety.
Suitable wild horse herd viewing areas may be devel-
oped to enhance public viewing of wild horses. Wild horses
plus a 1/2 mile distance surrounding them are closed to
temporary or permanent interruptions and surface disturb-
ing activities that could interfere with opportunities to
view horses (e.g., structures, mineral activities, powerlines, roads, etc.).
Short-term interruptions within the 1/2 mile
distance and actions that will blend with the landscape or
will benefit the intent of the wild horse herd viewing areas
will be considered on a case-by-case basis.
The Oregon Buttes, Honeycomb Buttes, Steamboat
Mountain, Lewis Hills, Red Creek Mountain, Little
Mountain, and Cedar Canyon will be closed to ensure their
remaining value for recreational opportuni-
ties (Map 24). Recreation area management plans will be
prepared for these areas if necessary.
The Continental Divide National Scenic Trail, Conti-
nental Divide Snowmobile Trail, and Wind River Front are designated special recreation man-
gement areas (SRMAs) to place management emphasis
on enhancing recreation opportunities and to focus mana-
gement on areas with high recreation values or areas
where there are conflicts between recreation and other
uses. The former SRMA designations (Killpecker Sand
Dunes and Oregon and Mormon Pioneer National His-
toric Trails) are retained (Map 22). The management plan
for the Oregon and Mormon Pioneer Trails will be imple-
mented. Management plans for the Continental Divide
Front, the Sand Dunes, and the Continental Divide National
Scenic Trail and Snowmobile Trail will be developed.

The remainder of the planning area will be managed as
an extensive recreation management area.
Recreation project plans and an interpretive perspective
will be developed for the 14-Mile recreation site, Sweethar
Campgrounds, Boars Tusk, Lewie's Hill, and the Contin-
ental Divide Snowmobile Trail.

The 14-Mile Recreation Area is closed to surface dis-
turbing and development activities for recreation use in an
area officially associated with construction and development of
recreation facilities for the site. The public water reserve
and the recreational withdrawal areas are set by
mineral location and disposal will be retained (see Table 2
and Table 3).

The integrity of the Continental Divide Snowmobile
Trail will be maintained to allow for continued
snowmachine use. The trail system may be expanded by
adding loop trails. Maintaining that integrity will be accom-
plished by limiting surface disturbing activities, structures, or
facilities that block or hinder trail use on or within
1/4 mile of the trail. The only exceptions will be facilities that support
trail visitor use and experiences along the trail to protect
the health and safety of trail users.

Mountain bike trail opportunities will be explored.
Specific areas include but are not limited to the Little
Mountains-Finger Lakes area and the Wyoming Continental Divide Snowmobile Trail. Other
mountain bike trails may be developed on a case-by-case
basis. Pertaining to local citizens and Chambers of
Commerce, Forest Service, and the State of Wyoming will be
provided with a public input and a decision-making, and
brochure; will be developed. Implementation plans will consider mountain bike and
other mechanized vehicle needs.

The Green River, Sweetwater River, Big Sandy River,
and the Bitter Creek segment between towns of Rock
Springs and Green River will be managed for recreation
values. Recreation area management plans will be
developed, where necessary.
The establishment of a "greenbelt" along the Green River
from Fontenelle Dam to Flaming Gorge Reservoir will be
supported.

Five backcountry byways are designated and will in-
clude consideration for mountain bike use. They are Tri-
Terminals, Saddle Road, LaSede Loop, and the Firehole-Little Mountain
Brochures and an interpretive sign will be prepared to inform
visitors (see Map 21).

Additional travel routes that meet the criteria will be
considered for designation as backcountry byways on a
case-by-case basis.
Cutting of trees and firewood for camping purposes in
developed recreation sites is limited to designated areas.

Recreation site development projects and access routes
along existing and used streams and reservoirs will not
be managed to improve wildlife habitat condi-
tions.
Development of permanent recreation sites and facili-
ties in undeveloped recreation use areas will be consid-
eroed, provided proper mitigation and expec-
tive Order 11008 apply. The area within 500 feet
of riparian areas and floodplains is an avoidance area for
recreation site facilities. Exceptions may be considered
following a site specific analysis. Adverse impacts to
 riparian areas and water quality is prohibited. Water
sources at undeveloped recreation sites will be monitored. If the water is
not potable, sign will be posted.

Vegetation buffer strips will be maintained between
developed recreation facilities and surface water.

The natural values of Boars Tusk, Pilot Butte, and
Emmons Cone will be protected. Surface occupancy and
surface use disturbance in these areas are prohibited in
these areas unless such activity would enhance management of
these geologic features (Table 2 and Table 7). Interpretive facili-
ties will be developed.

Surface disturbing activities are prohibited within 1/4
mile of recreation sites unless such activities are deter-
mined to be compatible with or are done for meeting
recreation objectives for the area. Generally, such activities
(e.g., those associated with mineral development, roads, pipe-
lines, powerlines, etc.) will be designed to avoid these areas.
These areas will be open to development of recreation site
facilities. An approved plan will be required prior to the site
disturbance.

Posting information and directional signs will be
provided in some areas. This RMP establishes various types of resource
designations, and sign posting will be provided to promote
visitor use of the various areas consistent with management
objectives.

See other resource management prescriptions in this docu-
ment for other prescriptions and guidance that may apply to
recreation resource management activities.

Wind River Front Special Recreation
Management Area (261,140 acres of
BLM-administered public lands)

MANAGEMENT OBJECTIVES: The objectives for man-
ragement of the Wind River Front Special Recreation
Management Area (SRMA) are focused on the conser-
vation and enhancement of the recreation opportunities, activi-
ties, and setting of the area: 2 maintain the high visual
values of the area; 3 protect air quality in the adjacent
Classes I aired; 4 maintain or enhance biological diver-
sity; 5 prevent fragmentation of grasslands, shrublands,
streams, wetlands, and forest habitats; and 6 maintain
critical big game habitats and migration corridors so that
Wyoming Game and Fish Department population objec-
tives can be met.

MANAGEMENT ACTIONS: The Wind River Front is
Designated a Special Recreation Management Area (SRMA).

The Wind River SRMA is all of the BLM-
administered public lands in the Townships of Evaluation
East of Highway 191, northwest of Highway 28, and
south of the Bridger-Teton and Shoshone National
Forests. To facilitate management, the area is divided
into two units. The boundary between the two units is the Continental
Divide, and the eastern unit includes the Prospect Mountains
(see Map 22).

Eastern Unit (approximately 88,510
acres)

The management objective emphasizes for this unit of the
SRMA is for scenic, watershed, and wildlife values; recre-
aton use; riparian and vegetation resources; and to pro-
vide protection to the Class I aired in the Bridger
Wilderness.

Major facilities (including linear facilities) at gener-
ally within 1 mile of the evaluation area are not allowed if analysis indicates that the management objec-
tives for the unit could be met. For example, small and short-
distance feeder lines e.g., power, telephone, water may be
considered.
This unit of the SRMA is closed to mineral leasing.

Surface disturbing activities must conform to unit management objectives.

The 500 acres associated with the Aradus pupilla portion of the Special Status Plants ACEC is closed to ORV use. In the remainder of the unit, off-road vehicle (ORV) use is limited to designated roads and trails.

Seven BLM-administered public land parcels along the Sweetwater River (involving about 9.7 miles of the river) will be managed under the Wild and Scenic Act, interim management guidelines. The purpose of this interim management is to maintain or enhance the outstandingly remarkable resource values on the public lands along the river and to maintain their suitability for consideration by Congress for inclusion in the National Wild and Scenic River Preservation System. The suitable public land parcels along the river are closed to mineral location and withdrawal from the public land laws, including the mining laws, will be pursued. More detailed information on the alternative uses of these lands is in the U.S. River Resources Management Plan.

Surface disturbing activities in this unit will be limited through controlled surface use requirements or closing areas where maximum resource protection is necessary. Facility placement will be designed for minimum surface disturbance, unless a site-specific analysis determines that additional activity can occur and unit management objectives can be met. An exception may be granted if the operation/individual and surface management agency could arrive at an acceptable mitigation plan for anticipated impacts. Options in the mitigation plans may include consideration of development in one portion of the area coupled with no development in other areas. Other considerations may include placement of multiple facilities in a specific area if e.g., multiple wells and production facilities on one drill pad and/or using remote control operations (e.g., remote well head and production facility control to limit trips to locations or areas.

All activities in the unit will conform with the requirements of the Class III and Class IV visual resource management classifications and all management actions will be designed and located to blend into the natural landscape and to not be visually apparent to the casual visitor. Location of long linear facilities will be avoided in the unit. If avoidance is not possible, such facilities will be required to meet the visual resource management classification standards. A transportation plan will be completed prior to a determination of the unit.

The public lands along about 1.5 miles of the Big Sandy River, adjacent to the Bridger-Teton Forest boundary, will be managed to retain their inherent pristine character. Actions that would alter these characteristics in this area are prohibited. Along this segment of the Big Sandy River, and within a 1/2 mile of either bank of the river, the public lands are closed to surface disturbing activities. A surface occupancy requirement will be imposed on the area including the river and within 1/2 mile of either bank of the river (Table 2 and Table 7).

Western Unit (approximately 172,630 acres)

The management objective emphasis for this unit of the SRMA is for dispersed recreation uses such as camping, hiking, and fishing, with full consideration given to wildlife, cultural, vegetation, watershed values, and mineral development activity. This unit of the SRMA is open to mineral leasing. Daily vehicle and access may not be feasible for this entire area. Access, particularly proposed roads, may be limited and a road density analysis may be required. To prevent conflicts with recreation users, alternative land uses are contained in the U.S. River Resources Management Plan.

Surface disturbing activities in this unit will be limited through controlled surface use requirements or closing areas where maximum resource protection is necessary.

Facility placement will be designed for minimum surface disturbance, unless a site-specific analysis determines that additional activity can occur and unit management objectives can be met. An exception may be granted if the operation/individual and surface management agency could arrive at an acceptable mitigation plan for anticipated impacts. Options in the mitigation plans may include consideration of development in one portion of the area coupled with no development in other areas. Other considerations may include placement of multiple facilities in a specific area if e.g., multiple wells and production facilities on one drill pad and/or using remote control operations (e.g., remote well head and production facility control to limit trips to locations or areas.

Activities in the unit will conform with the requirements of the Class III and Class IV visual resource management classifications and all management actions will be designed and located to blend into the natural landscape and to not be visually apparent to the casual visitor. Location of long linear facilities will be avoided in the unit. If avoidance is not possible, such facilities will be required to meet the visual resource management classification standards. A transportation plan will be completed prior to a determination of the unit.

Surface disturbing activities are prohibited in the Dry Sandy Swales and the area within 1 mile of Dry Sandy Swales. Any surface occupancy requirement will be imposed in the area including the Dry Sandy Swales and within 1 mile of Dry Sandy Swales (Table 2 and Map 14).

See other resource management prescriptions in this document for other restrictions that may apply to recreation resource management activities.

**SPECIAL STATUS SPECIES MANAGEMENT**

Special Status species are those plant and animal species which are proposed for listing, officially listed (threatened and endangered), or candidates for listing as threatened or endangered by the Secretary of the Interior under the provisions of the Endangered Species Act, those listed or proposed for listing by a state in a category implying potential endangerment or extinction, and those designated by each BLM State Director as sensitive.

The management actions for special status species apply only to BLM-administered public lands. Emphasizing management of existing plant and animal populations and restricting those species from being listed as threatened or endangered would benefit the wild and scenic aspects of the Sweetwater River.

When species are listed as threatened or endangered, by law they become more universally protected on private and state-owned lands, in addition to Federal lands.

**MANAGEMENT OBJECTIVES:** The objectives for management of special status plant and animal species are to:

1. maintain or enhance essential and important habitats and prevent destruction or loss of the species' communities and important habitat;
2. provide opportunities for enhancing or expanding the habitats; and
3. prevent the need for listing these species as threatened or endangered. Applicable public land plans (10, 14, and Appendix 3) will be updated to include special status species.

Management actions for special status species are described above for the known species. This may result in a new discussion about vegetation types and communities as is required.

**Candidate, Sensitive, and Threatened and Endangered Plant Species Management**

MANAGEMENT ACTIONS: Any management actions on potential habitat if special status plant species communities are on federal lands, or on split estate lands (i.e., non-federal land surface ownership with BLM-administered federal minerals ownership) will be required to conform with the transportation plan and follow existing routes and previous use of the unit.

Surface disturbing activities are prohibited in the Dry Sandy Swales and the area within 1 mile of Dry Sandy Swales. Any surface occupancy requirement will be imposed in the area including the Dry Sandy Swales and within 1 mile of Dry Sandy Swales (Table 2 and Table 7).
livestock grazing resource management objectives: and 2) provide for plant diversity (desired plant communities) (Appendix 9).

MANAGEMENT ACTIONS. Riparian habitat will be maintained, improved, or restored to provide wildlfie and fish habitat, improve water quality, and enhance forage conditions. Where possible, acquisition of additional riparian area acreage will be pursued to enhance riparian habitat management (see Appendix 8.3).

The minimum management goal is 15% riparian area is to achieve proper functioning condition. This is considered the first priority for vegetation management. Desired plant communities must meet the criteria for proper functioning condition. Guidelines are to aid in achieving this goal.

Desired plant communities for upland and riparian areas will be established for the planning area through individual site-specific and implementation planning and as updated ecological site inventories data become available. All activities and implementation plans will incorporate desired plant community objectives. Native plant communities are the preferred species specified when establishing desired plant communities objectives (EOO 11098. BM Manual 124) (see Riparian Vegetation Guidelines for additional guidance).

Prescribed fire will be the preferred method of vegetation manipulation to convert stands of brush to grasslands and to promote regeneration of aspen stands and shrub species. Less intense burns during periods of high soil moisture will be the preferred method(s) in moist shrub communities (Appendix 9.2).

Prescribed burns may be conducted in the crucial big game winter ranges if habitat values will be improved for these species. Prescribed fire is the preferred method of vegetation manipulation in situations and upon areas where time permitted to regenerate shrubs. Chemical treatment will be used only where natural guidelines can be expected to prevent unintended effects on desirable fauna or flora and to prevent transportation of chemicals to other areas by water or air movement.

Approximately 2,000 acres of vegetative treatment will be designed to increase forage. While about 44,000 acres will primarily be designed to improve wildlife habitat. Treatment methods available include mechanical, biological, and prescribed fire (Appendix 9.2).

Prescribed burns generally will be conducted in areas having 75 percent sagebrush composition; 25 percent degradable grass composition, and greater than 10 inches of pre-rotation. Other vegetation manipulation methods will be considered for treated areas, based on objectives and cost benefits. All treated areas will be restocked at a minimum of 1,000 pounds of shrub seed per acre. Burn scar areas will be fenced from livestock and big game animals if necessary. Prescribed fire will be restricted in areas with serious problems of cold forage outbreaks.

Vegetation manipulation projects will be conducted to reach multiple use objectives and will involve site specific environmental analysis and coordination. Funds for vegetation manipulation in all categories will be provided by the BLM, other federal agencies, and private sources.

All vegetation manipulation projects will involve site specific, environmental analysis, coordination with affected livestock operators, and the WDF&G, and will include multiple use objectives for resource uses including livestock grazing, wildlife, recreation, and waterhers.

Vegetation treatments will be designed to be compatible with special status plant species. For example, sprays, burning, mechanical disturbances, etc., will not be allowed to adversely affect these plant species.

All vegetation treatments will be designed on a case-by-case basis and will be irregular in shape, for edge, cover, and visual aesthetics.

Vegetation treatment projects will be designed to protect water quality and dissipate erosion. This generally means accomplishing vegetation manipulation on the pattern and leaving sufficient untreated vegetation to buffer riparian areas and intermittent and ephemeral drainages from erosion. Specific treatment designs and erosion control will be determined on a case-by-case basis. See other resource management prescriptions in this document for other restrictions that may apply to vegetation management activities.

Riparian Vegetation Management

Riparian habitat in proper functioning condition is the minimum acceptable states or level within the Green River Resource Area see Glossary p. 21. RMP 75 percent of the riparian areas should, within 10 years, have riparian and riparian adjacent species states of implementation that will allow riparian areas to achieve or maintain proper functioning condition.

The Green River Resource Area uses BLM Technical Reports on Proper Functioning Condition (TR 173) and TR 173.1 to guide the effort in classifying or rating all lotic water (water and lentic (still) water) riparian area.

Site specific activity and implementation plans will be used to identify methods to achieve or maintain proper functioning condition in riparian areas.

Methods applied where grazing occurs include that are not limited to fencing; establishment of pastures and exclusions, off-site water development, off-site salt or mineral supplement placement, timing and season use of wildlife habitat, and allow use levels for key riparian species, herding, grazing systems, etc. Appendix 9.2 contains a list of 15 ecosystem level, methods that would be considered. Methods applied where surface disturbing activities occur include (but are not limited to) identified, as needed, by their impacts on specific species. A list of specific species is available from the Proper Functioning Condition (PFC) Program.

Management actions on public lands with a Class II visual resource management classification must be designed to blend into and retain the existing character of the natural landscape (Appendix 9.3).

Management actions on public lands with a Class III visual resource management classification must be designed to blend into and retain the existing character of the landscape (Appendix 9.3).

Management actions on public lands with a Class IV visual resource management classification could result in major modification of the character of the landscape.

The next step beyond basic proper functioning condition of riparian areas is the achievement of desired plant communities. Desired plant community objectives will be developed for riparian areas using principles derived from the Management Guidelines, including Ecological Site Inventory, comparison areas (comparing Ecological Site Inventory, aspect vegetation and precipitation), and estimating the structural component that can be achieved in the shorter term. Desired plant community objectives can be short and long term. Desired plant community objectives take into consideration all uses of the riparian area which can include livestock grazing, wildlife recreation, fisheries, flood control, etc.

While the desired plant community establishes objectives for the riparian area or upland plant community, the Desired Future Condition establishes goals for entire watersheds or larger blocks of lands involving all activities and resources. A combination of vegetation management and desired plant community are integral steps in the process of establishing and achieving the Desired Future Condition of an area.

Mean and improved upland and riparian areas will be managed under their respective visual resource management classifications (Map 24, Table 13, and 14).

Suitable wild horse herding viewing areas may be developed to enhance public viewing of horses. Viewing areas plans plus 150 mile distance surrounding them will be developed to long-term or permanent intrusions and surface disturbing activities that could interfere with opportunities to view horses (e.g., structures, mineral activities, powerlines, roads, etc. (Table 7 and Table 2). Short-term intrusions that will blend with the landscape or will not interfere with the wild horse herd viewing areas will be considered on a case-by-case basis.

All activities that could be viewed from the Fontenelle Ranger Station will be designed to be subordinate to the landscape.

See other resource management prescriptions in this document for other restrictions and guidance that may apply to visual resource management activities.

WATERSHED/SOILS MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT OBJECTIVES. The objectives for management of visual resources are to: 1) maintain or improve scenic beauty, 2) maintain or improve wildlife habitat, 3) maintain or improve surface and groundwater quality; and 4) protect, maintain, or improve wetlands, floodplains, and riparian areas (Appendix 9.3).

MANAGEMENT ACTIONS. Land uses and surface disturbing activities will be designed to reduce erosion and to maintain or improve water quality. Managed altered wetland and riparian areas will be directed toward restoration to pre-disturbance conditions. Practices to be followed include the practice of removing areas over which water travels, the practice of controlling the depth of stream crossings occurs during normal stream flows, not during high or peak flows when additional sediment from

GREEN RIVER RMP

All surface disturbing activities, regardless of the visual resource management class, are required to be mitigated to reduce visual impact. These will be achieved by designing and locating the disturbances in a manner that most closely meets the minimum degree of contrast acceptable for the visual resource management class.

Management actions in areas classified as rehabilitation areas will be designed to reclaim and improve visual resource values to achieve a higher classification (see Map 24 and Table 14).

The scenic values along Highway 28 within Fremont County will be protected. All proposed lands uses and activities within view of the highway will be evaluated for impacts and will require mitigation to protect the scenic value. The RMP visual resource management classifications on public lands will be retained.

The public lands along all other major highways in the planning area will be managed under their respective visual resource classifications (Map 24, Table 13, and 14).

MANAGEMENT OBJECTIVES. The objectives for management of visual resources are to: 1) maintain or improve scenic beauty, 2) maintain or improve wildlife habitat, 3) maintain or improve surface and groundwater quality; and 4) protect, maintain, or improve wetlands, floodplains, and riparian areas (Appendix 9.3).

MANAGEMENT ACTIONS. Land uses and surface disturbing activities will be designed to reduce erosion and to maintain or improve water quality. Managed altered wetland and riparian areas will be directed toward restoration to pre-disturbance conditions. Practices to be followed include the practice of removing areas over which water travels, the practice of controlling the depth of stream crossings occurs during normal stream flows, not during high or peak flows when additional sediment from
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Weirland and floodplain areas within the planning area will be managed in accordance with Executive Orders 11988 and 11990. The 100-year floodplains, weirlands, and riparian areas are closed to any new permanent facilities (e.g., storage tanks, structure pits, etc.). Proposals for linear crossings in these areas will be considered on a case-by-case basis (Table 7). Surface disturbing and construction activities (e.g., mineral exploration and development activities, pipelines, powerlines, roads, recreation sites, fences, wells, etc.) that could adversely affect water quality, and weirland and riparian habitat, will avoid the area within 500 feet of or on 100-year floodplains, weirlands, or perennial streams and within 100 feet of the edge of the inner gorge of intermittent and large ephemeral drainages. Proposals for linear crossings in these areas will be considered on a case-by-case basis. The site specific analysis determines that no adverse impacts will occur to floodplains, weirlands, perennial streams and water quality, and a plan to mitigate impacts to water quality is approved (Map 25 and Table 7).

Practically, determined on a case-by-case basis, will be implemented as needed to protect groundwater and prevent soil contamination. Such practices could include lining of reservoir, production, and other types of pits and will include alternate locations for plants, mill sites, ponds, and sewage lagoons where 100 soils are highly permeable (Appendix 5-1).

Aquifer recharge areas will be managed to protect groundwater quality and to ensure groundwater quality is adequate for recharge aquifers. Protection will be provided by limiting road density and surface occupancy to maintain a healthy recharge area. Vegetative cover and control of pond water quality that are conducive to groundwater recharge will be maintained. Activities within the water recharge area for the Town of Superior water supply will be designed to protect groundwater quality and will be allowed only if groundwater quality will be protected (Map 26).

BLM will cooperate with the State of Wyoming on the Wyoming State 208 water quality plan, and will coordinate the development of water quality plans consistent with BLM programs and RMP recommendations and decisions.

Water quality will be monitored as needed to determine pollution and land health conditions. An appropriate monitoring plan to monitor sources of water pollution will continue. Legal protection of those water uses, both consumptive and nonconsumptive (including instream uses), that are necessary for the accomplishment of BLM programs will be obtained, so that the beneficial uses may be continued or made possible in the future.

Activity and implementation plans for other land and resource uses and areas will include general watershed management directives and will incorporate sediment reduction and water quality improvement objectives. Priority areas (particularly for development of AMPs) include Upper Bitter Creek, Fourth J Basin, Vermillion Creek, and Upper Salt Wells Watersheds.

**Wild Horse Management**

**MANAGEMENT OBJECTIVES.** The objectives for management of wild horses are to: 1) protect, maintain, and control viable, healthy herds of wild horses while retaining their free-roaming nature; 2) provide adequate habitat for free-roaming wild horses through management consistent with principles of multiple use and environmental protection; and 3) provide opportunity for the public to view wild horses.

**MANAGEMENT ACTIONS:** Wild horses will be managed to meet five Wild Horse Herd Management Areas (Map 27).

An appropriate management level of 1,105 to 1,600 wild horses will be maintained among the five herd management areas (Table 15).

An appropriate management level: AML of 69 to 100 horses in the Little Colorado Desert is established. The AML was originally established in 1971, encompasses about 519,541 acres of BLM-administered public lands. The specific boundary and specific management prescriptions for this area will be identified in an activity plan (see Table 15).

The site specific activity plans for the five wild horse herd management areas in the planning area will be consistent with the BLM objectives for multiple use and environmental protection; and management implementation and monitoring. A monitoring program will be developed to provide information to support wild horse management decisions.

Specific habitat objectives for herd management areas will be developed. Consideration will be given to desired plant communities, wildlife, watershed, livestock grazing, and natural resource needs.

Water developments will be provided if necessary, to improve herd distribution and manage forage utilization. The plans for the checkerboard land portion of the herd areas, to better distribute wild horses will be determined. Any water developments proposed in the Rock Springs Allotment should primarily enhance the management of wild horses (Appendix 9-4 of the Draft EIS).

Water developments on crucial winter ranges could be allowed if they are consistent with wildlife objectives and do not result in adverse impacts to the crucial winter range.

Wild horse herd management will be directed to ensure that adequate forage (about 17,800 AUMs) will be available to support appropriate management levels in the herd units and that herds maintain appropriate age, sex, and color ratios.

**WILDERNESS RESOURCE MANAGEMENT**

**MANAGEMENT OBJECTIVE.** The objective for management of the wilderness resource is to retain the wilderness quality and manage the Wilderness Study Areas in the RMP planning area in accordance with the "Interim Management Policy and Guidelines for Lands Under Wilderness Review," until Congress acts on designation (see Map 29).

**MANAGEMENT ACTIONS:** Wilderness management plans will be prepared for those WSAs designated by Congress as wilderness.

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

Should Congress designate the WSAs in the Planning area as wilderness, the management of the designated areas will be for wilderness values, either as described in the appropriate Wilderness EIS or as directed by Congress.
WILDLIFE MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT OBJECTIVES: The objectives for management of wildlife and fish habitats are to: 1) maintain, improve, or enhance the biological diversity of plant and wildlife species while ensuring healthy ecosystems; and 2) restore disturbed or altered habitat with the objective to attain desired native plant communities, while providing for public enjoyment.

The objectives for management of wetlands/riparian areas are to: 1) achieve a healthy and productive condition for local and regional benefits and concerns with range, watershed, and wildlife needs; and 2) enhance or maintain riparian habitats by managing for deep-rooted native herbaceous or woody vegetation.

The objective for management of threatened, endangered, special status, and sensitive plant and animal species is to provide for their survival, or improve habitat through vegetative manipulation, mitigation measures, or other management actions including habitat acquisition and easements (see Special Status Species Management, Appendix D.1, and Appendix D.2).

MANAGEMENT ACTIONS: To the extent possible, suitable wildlife habitats will be provided to support the Wyoming Game and Fish Department 1989 Special Wildlife Areas Guidelines. Changes in the Wyoming Game and Fish Department planning objective levels will be considered based on habitat capability and availability and specific analyses.

BLM will cooperate with the Wyoming Game and Fish Department (WGFD) in preparation of studies for the introduction and reintroduction of native and non-native wildlife and fish species.

High value wildlife habitats will be maintained or improved by reducing habitat loss or alteration and by applying appropriate distance and seasonal restrictions and rehabilitation standards to all appropriate activities. These habitats include crucial wildlife habitat, participation areas, sensitive fisheries habitat, etc.

Big game crucial winter ranges and parturition areas will be protected by restricting activity by limiting activities during critical seasons of use and by limiting the amount of habitat disturbed. (See Glossary for surface disturbance factor for wildlife and surface disturbance activity.)

WILDLIFE MANAGEMENT

Objectives: To manage for wildlife in a manner consistent with the Bureau of Land Management's, the Wyoming Game and Fish Department's, and other federal and state agencies' objectives for wildlife habitat enhancement. This enhancement will focus on improving quality and quantity of wildlife resources and the habitat necessary for wildlife in the area.

Activities: The BLM will work with other agencies and interested parties to identify and implement actions to improve wildlife habitat.
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Proposed surface disturbing activities on BLM-administered public lands, within 1/2 mile from the Cedar Canyon Petrughyl rock art site (about 360 acres), will be analyzed for the visual impact they cause. Some disturbed areas were not seen from the rock art site within the 1/2 mile area surrounding the site (Table 2 and Table 2a). Surface disturbing activities visible within this vista are prohibited. Some disturbance activities, such as interpretive facilities, within the vista area will be allowed, if they do not affect the integrity of the rock art site. Other kinds of activities, such as audible disturbances, may be allowed if they would adversely affect the sacred Native American values (Table 4).

The vista area is also closed to: (1) the location of mining claims or entry under the 5 ed laws withdrawal from land entry and mineral location with permission; (2) mineral material sales; (3) the use of explosives and blasting, and vibrations operations; and (4) the use of fire retardant chemicals containing iodine.

The vista area will be managed consistent with a Class II visual resource management classification.

About 2,190 acres that are located entirely from the rock art site (i.e., outside of the 360-acre vista area), are open to: (1) the location of mining claims; (2) mineral material sales; and (3) interpretive activities, including the use of explosives and blasting, provided the wildlife, cultural, and scenic values are protected. This area is also an avoidance area for surface disturbing activities. Constraints will be applied as appropriate to protect the wildlife, cultural, and scenic values.

BLM will attempt to acquire needed access to this ACEC. Surveying and closing of all nonessential roads and trails will be accomplished along with providing legal and physical access.

The ACEC will be managed consistent with the Class II, Class III, and Class IV visual resource management classifications. Interpretive facilities will be designed and maintained to enhance the visual resource values. All future facilities will be designed to blend with the landscape, including painting where necessary, and disturbed areas will be revegetated to keep visual resources impacts to a minimum.

A reclamation plan for disturbed areas will be prepared to restore lost habitat. Reclamation of some areas may be required prior to disturbing additional areas.

Wildlife waters will be developed and maintained as necessary.

The ACEC is open to consideration of coal leasing by subsurface mining methods only. Surface coal mining methods are not allowed.

Any activities or ancillary facilities related to either surface or subsurface mining are prohibited on or within a 1/2 mile of rock art sites. In areas that are more than 1/2 mile from rock art sites, seasonal uses and (p) placement of surface facilities, activities, etc., related to subsurface mining, will be allowed on a very limited basis.

Proposed surface disturbing activities on BLM-administered public lands, within 1/2 mile from the Cedar Canyon Petrughyl rock art site (about 360 acres), will be analyzed for the visual impact they cause. Some disturbed areas were not seen from the rock art site within the 1/2 mile area surrounding the site (vista area). Surface disturbing activities visible within this vista are prohibited. Some disturbance activities, such as interpretive facilities, within the vista area will be allowed, if they do not affect the integrity of the rock art site. Other kinds of activities, such as audible disturbances, may be allowed if they would adversely affect the sacred Native American values (Table 4).

The vista area is also closed to: (1) the location of mining claims or entry under the 5 ed laws withdrawal from land entry and mineral location with permission; (2) mineral material sales; (3) the use of explosives and blasting, and vibrations operations; and (4) the use of fire retardant chemicals containing iodine.

The vista area will be managed consistent with a Class II visual resource management classification.

About 2,190 acres that are located entirely from the rock art site (i.e., outside of the 360-acre vista area), are open to: (1) the location of mining claims; (2) mineral material sales; and (3) interpretive activities, including the use of explosives and blasting, provided the wildlife, cultural, and scenic values are protected. This area is also an avoidance area for surface disturbing activities. Constraints will be applied as appropriate to protect the wildlife, cultural, and scenic values.

BLM will attempt to acquire needed access to this ACEC. Surveying and closing of all nonessential roads and trails will be accomplished along with providing legal and physical access.

The ACEC will be managed consistent with the Class II, Class III, and Class IV visual resource management classifications. Interpretive facilities will be designed and maintained to enhance the visual resource values. All future facilities will be designed to blend with the landscape, including painting where necessary, and disturbed areas will be revegetated to keep visual resources impacts to a minimum.

A reclamation plan for disturbed areas will be prepared to restore lost habitat. Reclamation of some areas may be required prior to disturbing additional areas.

Wildlife waters will be developed and maintained as necessary.

The ACEC is open to consideration of coal leasing by subsurface mining methods only. Surface coal mining methods are not allowed.

Any activities or ancillary facilities related to either surface or subsurface mining are prohibited on or within a 1/2 mile of rock art sites. In areas that are more than 1/2 mile from rock art sites, seasonal uses and (p) placement of surface facilities, activities, etc., related to subsurface mining, will be allowed on a very limited basis.
The area will be managed consistent with the Class II visual resource management classification. Management actions on the BLM-administered public lands classified as Class II visual resource management lands will be designed to retain the existing character of the landscape.

Fire suppression activities in this watershed will be limited to containment at ridgelines.

**Actions Unique to the Red Creek Watershed**

**MANAGEMENT ACTIONS:** The BLM-administered public lands within this watershed (about 55,000 acres) are closed to: 1) surface disturbing activities; 2) mineral sales; and 3) mineral location. A withdrawal from entry under land laws and mineral location will be pursued. This area is also an exclusion area for rights-of-way (see Table 2, Table 4, and Table 7).

Exceptions to these requirements are:

- A north-south right-of-way window, parallel to the east side of the Flaming Gorge National Recreation Area will be established on County Road 43-33 or to the west of this road.

Aboveground power lines that span the drainage from right to left across portions of east County Road 43-33 in the northern portion of the Currant Creek watershed, if environmental analysis demonstrates this is in the best interest of the watershed, and fisheries objectives could be met.

The rim areas within the Currant Creek watershed (the watershed's ridges) with slopes of less than 25 percent could be considered for surface disturbing activities if environmental analysis demonstrates that watershed, fisheries, wildlife, and scenic objectives could be met. Within the Currant Creek watershed, slopes greater than 25 percent and areas in or within 500 feet of riparian areas and floodplains are classified to retain surface disturbance unless specifically designed for enhancement of watershed values and Colorado River cutthroat trout within this area (see Table 9).

The BLM-administered public lands in the watershed are closed to coal and sodium exploration, prospecting, leasing, and disturbing the vegetation of disturbed areas (Appendix III).

BLM will pursue possibilities of land exchanges to acquire lands along Currant Creek and Trout Creek to improve management opportunities for Colorado River cutthroat trout and its habitat (Appendix 3).
GREEN RIVER RMP

Management of the portion of the Greater Sand Dunes area that overlaps the buffalo hump and Sand Dunes WSAs (25,250 acres in the western portion of the Sand Dunes area) is covered by the Interim Management Guidelines for Lands Under Wilderness Review. The prescribed management in this overlap area is more stringent than either the interim management policy or wilderness policy for designated wilderness areas, therefore, it is addressed here. Wilderness management recommendations and alternatives for this area are addressed in the Rocky Springs District Final Wilderness EIS.

The portion of the area that overlaps the WSAs is closed to off-road vehicles, including the snowmobiles, and some mechanized vehicles to maintain the unique natural, solitude, and primitive and unconfined recreational opportunities.

This overlap portion will also be closed to mineral location, entry, and exploration, and geophysical activities. The oil-shale withdrawal will remain in effect until a cumulative management plan for the area and, if necessary, lands could be identified to be withdrawn for protection of their resource values (Table 4).

The approximate 4,300 acres of Federal coal lands in the area are closed to further consideration for coal leasing and further development. Exchanges for acquisition will be pursued to enhance the management of resources in the area (10,020 acres).

Additional or Different Items Specific to the Eastern Portion of the Greater Sand Dunes Area

The eastern portion of the Greater Sand Dunes area is bounded on the west by the Sand Dunes WSA and on the east by the ACEC boundary.

Activities in the area will be required to conform with visual resource management classifications and prescriptions.

Geophysical activity, including off-road vehicle travel, is in allowed, provided resource damage is minimized and the activities conform with ORV designations and transportation plans for the area.

The relatively pristine portion of the eastern area that has no developments (approximately 8,800 acres), including the base of Steamboat Rim, will be managed to protect its scenic, habitat, and recreation communities, and visual and recreation resources.

Road construction and new access may not be feasible for many of the eastern portion. To prevent conflicts with big game, recreation users, and other land and resource use activities, alternative access methods may be needed use of existing or designated roads or pads, seasonal travel requirements or restrictions, use of helicopters, etc.

Activities will not be permitted to disrupt access to or use of developed and semi-developed recreation sites. Activities that are incompatible with recreation sites will be managed to avoid these sites.

Approximately 9,840 acres of Federal coal lands in the area are closed to coal leasing and development by subsurface mining methods and related surface facilities and activities. This area is open to consideration for coal leasing by subsurface mining methods with placement of surface facilities extremely limited.

Surface drilling, mining activities, geophysical activities, and oil and gas exploration and development activities are restricted seasonally on crucial big game winter ranges and big game birthing areas. Exceptions to this restriction may be approved for activities such as oil and gas development, rights-of-way, construction, and range improvement development, if conditions described in Appendix 7 apply. Once an operation starts such as oil and gas drilling/completion, it would be allowed to be completed into or through the winter. Decision points for shoreline related habitat impacts and winter conditions occur between exploration or development stages, such as pad construction and drilling startup, and between drilling/completion and production facility installation.

Surface water, soils, and shallow aquifers will be protected from contamination by practices such as closed drilling systems or installation of pit liners. Pit liners will be removed prior to reserve pit reclamation.

Dune ponds will not be used as water sources for development activities.

This portion of the ACEC is an avoidance area for rights-of-way. Some facilities could be allowed if it can be demonstrated that the management objectives of the area will be met. New linear facilities such as pipelines and powerlines in areas of ongoing development may be laid in buried adjacent to access roads or within existing concentration areas containing such lines. Pipelines in the stabilized dune areas will be installed as surface lines to avoid unnecessary disturbance of vegetation. Surface gas pipelines will be monitored by the operators to identify potential hazards to ORV users. Identified hazards will be marked to improve visibility. A recreation user map will be developed in cooperation with oil and gas operators to show the location of aboveground facilities (e.g., pipelines, well production facilities, snow fences, etc.).

Any proposed activity or use that involves surface disturbance will require appropriate engineering design, technical analysis, mitigation planning, etc.

Abandoned pipelines and other unnecessary facilities (e.g., snow fences) in stabilized dune areas will be removed.

About 10,500 acres are designated open to off-road vehicle travel on the active sand dunes area. Off-road vehicle travel on about 5,100 acres of stabilized dune areas is limited to existing roads and trails.

Crookston Ranch and Boars Tusk

The Crookston Ranch site will be managed to preserve its historic features and for the interpretation of ranching history in the area. About 500 acres of BLM-administered public lands surrounding the site (the area within a 1/2 mile radius) will be managed to preserve the setting of the historic ranch.

The Crookston Ranch and surrounding 500-acre area is closed to surface mining activities such as coal mining, and to the placement of related surface facilities.

The Crookston Ranch site (about 80 acres) is closed to:
1) surface disturbing activities; 2) mineral material sales; and 3) use of explosives and blasting (see Table 2 and Table 7).

The Crookston Ranch area is open to consideration of activities such as fencing, interpretive signs, or transportation barriers and protection of the site. These activities are prohibited from being developed on site. Either a protective right-of-way or withdrawal for the Crookston Ranch area will be needed to accomplish this goal.

Fires in the Crookston Ranch area will be immediately suppressed if there is any perception of the structures being burned.

Off-road vehicle use is limited to designated roads and trails in this area.

The Boars Tusk will be managed to preserve its value as a geologic feature.

The Boars Tusk area (about 90 acres) is closed to:
1) surface disturbing activities; 2) mineral material sales; and 3) use of explosives and blasting.

The area within a 1/2 mile radius of Boars Tusk (including Boars Tusk) is closed to blasting and explosive charges (about 500 acres).

The Boars Tusk area is open to consideration of activities such as fencing, interpretive signs, or transportation barriers to ensure protection of the site. Facilities are prohibited from being developed on the actual geologic feature.

Off-road vehicle use is limited to designated roads and trails in this area. The road around the Boars Tusk is closed.

The Boars Tusk and about 1,400 acres of BLM-administered public lands in the surrounding area will be managed for the production of natural and geologic values. The area is closed to any surface mining activity such as coal mining and any related surface facilities. The area is open to consideration of activities such as fencing, interpretive signs, or transportation barriers and methods only. Any activities or ancillary facilities related to subsurface mining are prohibited.

Deferred Decisions in the Eastern Portion of the Greater Sand Dunes Area

The issuance of federal minerals leases on BLM-administered public lands in the eastern portion of the Sand Dunes area (about 16,390 acres) is contingent upon completing a coordinated activity plan (CAP) encompassing the combined Steamboat Mountain and Greater Sand Dunes areas. This detailed implementation plan will identify areas of feasible access, allowable road densities, and amount and acceptable types of development in the area (e.g., field utilization may be required for oil and gas development activities in the area). Drilling of additional oil and gas wells or production from temporarily shut-in wells could be allowed upon completion of the activity or implementation plan.

Deferred actions and mitigation requirements will apply to all surface disturbance activities, not just those related to oil and gas exploration and development. Surface disturbing and disruptive activities such as road or utility development, mining, and clearcutting may be deferred until the CAP is completed. The CAP will cover such things as transportation, drill pad density, drilling, and operations after well completion, development and location of range improvements, recreational activities, etc.

Natural Corrals ACEC (1,276 acres of BLM-administered public lands)

The ACEC designation for the 1,276 acres of BLM-administered public lands in the area is retained.

MANAGEMENT OBJECTIVE. The management objectives for the 1,276 acres of BLM-administered public lands in the Crookston Corral ACEC is to protect and enhance the cultural, historical, geological, and genetic values in the area.

MANAGEMENT ACTIONS. The entire ACEC is open to consideration of oil and gas leasing with a No Surface Occupancy stipulation.

Any surface disturbing activities that could adversely affect the relevant and important resources in the ACEC are prohibited (Table 7 and Table 21).

The ACEC is closed to surface coal mining activity and related facilities and to mineral material sales. The ACEC is open to consideration of further leasing and development by subsurface mining methods only. Any related ancillary facilities and surface disturbing activities are prohibited.

Any acre of mineral location withdrawal in the area will be retained. The public water reserve withdrawal in section 12 will be revoked, since these lands are not included in the study area and the BLM water right on these lands will be put for sale if necessary.

The ACEC is open to consideration of such activities as fencing, interpretive signs, or construction of transportation barriers or barriers to other types of uses, to meet...
in BLM-administered public lands will be protected. Methods include stabilizing archeo-
logicaI components in place and by limiting surface disturbing
uses and activities that could adversely affect the cultural
resources. The components may be excavated to recover
archaeological information of stabilization is not effective.

Crucial big game winter range seasonal restorations and
raptor nesting restorations will be applied to activities
that would be disruptive and excessively stressful to big
game animals and raptors during these critical periods
(see Wildlife section and Table 8).

The ACEC will be managed consistent with the Class
II vision resources management classifica-
tion. The road/trunk from the spring located in the SE/
NW/4, SE/4 SW/4 of Section 18 and the National
Register of Historic Places. The ACEC is closed to off-
road vehicle use. This 20-acre NRHP site is also closed to
curable use for geohical studies and by off-road vehicles
and to the use of explosives and blasting. The
remainder of the ACEC is open to on-the-snow
vehicles; off-road vehicle travel is limited to designated
roads and trails.

Livestock grazing objectives and management prac-
tices will be evaluated and, as needed, modified to
be consistent with the management objectives for this area.
Grazing systems will be designed to achieve desired plant
communities and proper functioning condition of water-
sheds (upland and riparian) (Appendix 9.5).

The Oregon Buttes ACEC will be managed consistent
with the Class II visual resource management classifica-
tion. Management actions will be designed to blend into
e the natural landscape and retain the existing character of
the landscape.

Pine Springs ACEC (6,030 acres of
BLM-administered public lands)
The 6,300 acres of BLM-administered public lands in the Pine Springs area are designated the Pine Springs
ACEC.

MANAGEMENT OBJECTIVE: The management objec-
tive for the Pine Springs ACEC is to enhance and protect
cultural, historic, and prehistoric values.

MANAGEMENT ACTIONS: The Pine Springs ACEC is
protected from 90 acres to 6,030 acres.

Approximately 5,200 acres of the Pine Springs ACEC
overlooks the Pine Springs Devil's Playground Study Area
which is managed under the "Interim Management
Policy for Land Under Wildlife Review." Recommenda-
tions and alternatives for this area are addressed in the
Rock Springs District Final Wilderness EIS. The prescribed
management in this overlap area is managed by the
Interim management policy or management design for
derelated wilderness area; therefore, it is addressed here.

The ACEC is closed to: 1) surface disturbing activities
that could adversely affect resource values or preclude
meeting ACEC management objectives; 2) mineral loca-
tion and entry under the land laws (an additional with-
drawal of about 2,000 acres will be pursued); 3) mineral
mining except on public lands, or other types of distur-
bation or building materials; and 4) off-road vehicle travel,
with the exception of about 820 acres (see Table 2, Table 4,
and Table 14).

Motorized vehicle travel and some non-motorized ve-
cicle travel along the east edge of the ACEC (about 730
acres) and the Pine Springs 90-acre site is limited to
existing roads and trails (Table 14).

The Pine Springs site (90 acres) is closed to all geophysi-
cal operations and to the use of explosives and blasting.

The ACEC is open to consideration of such actions as
fencing, interpretive signs, or construction of barriers
to enhance and protect visual resource management classifica-
tion; and to additional spring developments if these
actions will not impact cultural values.

The ACEC is managed consistent with the Class II
visual resource management classification. Management
actions on the BLM-administered public lands, classified
as Class II visual resource, must be designed to
retain the existing character of the landscape.

South Pass Historic Landscape
ACEC (53,780 acres of BLM-
administered public lands)
The 53,780 acres of BLM-administered public lands in the South Pass Historic Landscape area are designated
the South Pass Historic Landscape ACEC. The ACEC will be
evaluated to determine if it meets the criteria for nomination
for the National Register of Historic Places.

MANAGEMENT OBJECTIVES: The management objec-
tive for the ACEC is to protect the visual and historical integrity
of the historic trails and surrounding viewpoints.

MANAGEMENT ACTIONS: The South Pass Historic
Landscape encompasses the viewed and lost wilderness
area along the Oregon, Mormon Pioneer, California, and Pony Express trails and the Landor Goldfield. The trail is
2.5-mile wide corridor along the Oregon, Mormon Pioneer,
and California trails, and a 2-mile wide corridor along the
Landor Goldfield (Map 29).

The landscape is open to consideration of mineral
leasing and mineral material sales, provided that effects
to the visual and cultural integrity of resource values will be
mitigated.

Most of the ACEC is also open to exploitation and
development of locatable minerals. A plan of operations
is required to address measures to mitigate affects to
the viewed before any mining claim activity is allowed.

A withdrawal of about 6,260 acres from mineral leases
under public land laws will be pursued, if necessary.

A right-of-way grant has been authorized, but not yet
issued, to permit motorized vehicle travel on public lands
through the South Pass Historic Land-
scape Area.

Should the Altamont Pipeline grant be issued, it will be
a one-time right-of-way authorization through the South
Pass Historic Landscape Area. Future rights-of-way across
public lands through this area (for linear utilities, trans-
mis\sion lines, communication sites, roads and highways) will
be subject to the visual and historic integrity of the
landscape are prohibited. In addition, should the Altamont
Pipeline not be built, the South Pass Historic Landscape
Area will be closed to any subsequent right-of-way
application to either replace or substitute for the Altamont
Pipeline. No motorized vehicle use or construction action
cross public lands in the area (Map 29).

Approximately 33,780 acres surrounding the trails and visible from the trails are closed to surface disturbing activities
that could adversely affect the viewed. This provides
an exclusion area for all right-of-ways (Table 2 and Table 7).

Off-road vehicle travel is limited to designated roads
and trails in the areas that are visible from the historic
trails.

About 20,000 acres that are shielded by topography
and not visible from the trail are open to development
activities if these are subordinate to the landform and
donot visible from the historic trails, and provided that environ-
mental integrity of the area can be maintained. Rights-of-way
will be managed to avoid this area, and this area will not be considered
the preferred route for linear facilities (Table 2). Small feeder
lines would be allowed if analysis indicates that the visual
integrity of the area not be compromised. Rights-of-way
along roads in the area could also be allowed if they did
not compromise the visual integrity of the area. The prescribed
actions for the management of trails, will also apply to this
area.

Off-road vehicle travel is limited to existing roads and
trails in these areas that are shielded by topography.

All activities for the ACEC will be managed consistent
with the Class II visual resource management classifica-
tion. Development actions will be designed and located
to blend into the natural landscape and to not be visually
apparent to the casual visitor. The scenic values of the Highway 28 corridor (12 linear miles) will be protected.

Generally, vibration activity and shot hole activity
is prohibited on and within 300 feet of the historic trails.
Other geophysical and mineral exploration activities (for
historic trails corridors (about 16.42 miles) if specific
analysis determines that such activities would not adversely affect the visual and historical integrity of the trails will occur.
Steamboat Mountain ACEC (43,270 acres of BLM-administered public lands)

The Steamboat Mountain area (about 43,270 acres of BLM-administered public lands) is designated an ACEC.

MANAGEMENT OBJECTIVES: The management objectives for this ACEC are to: 1) enhance and maintain the water quality, vegetation, soil, and wildlife resources to ensure biological diversity and a healthy ecosystem; 2) maintain the unique diverse habitats (big sagebrush, aspen, limber pine, and mountain shrub communities) in the Steamboat Mountain area, especially on stabilized sand dunes along Steamboat Rim, Indian Gap, and in the Johnson, Lafonte, and Box Canyon areas; and 3) provide suitable habitat to maintain desired continuity. Remaining existence of the Steamboat elk herd and other big game populations (Map A).

MANAGEMENT ACTIONS: All activities will be designed to place priority consideration on elk habitat over conflicting land uses to ensure continued elk use of the area. In the case if the rim will be managed to protect big game habitat, vegetation communities, and visual and recreational resources. The ACEC is closed to mineral material sales.

Leasing and development of federal coal in the area will be considered for subsurface mining only. Development and development of coal lands will be designed to ensure adequate measures are taken to protect and maintain the elk herd and habitat. The location of surface facilities relating to subsurface mining will be designed on a project-by-project basis. Approximately 8,810 acres of coal land with development potential will be within the Steamboat Mountain ACEC.

The ACEC is open to actions that will enhance the management objectives for the area. Actions may be considered including: fencing, interpretive signs, or construction of vehicle barriers.

Seasonal restrictions will be applied to land and recreation use areas, to protect elk and deer during severe winter conditions and during birthing periods.

The ACEC is an avoidance area for rights-of-way. Communications sites are prohibited in the ACEC. Linear rights-of-way and geophysical activities are allowed if impact to the elk is limited and the unique habitats can be mitigated (See Table 2).

Motorized vehicle travel is limited to designated roads and trails. Seasonal road and trail closures may be imposed in areas where it is needed to protect elk and deer during critical winter and birthing periods. Transportation planning will be completed to identify the designated roads and trails. The May 10, July 1, and November 1 closures for vehicular travel in the area remains in effect to protect big game calving and fawning activity.

Deferred Decisions in the Steamboat Mountain ACEC

The following are unfinalized decisions and some locatable mineral decisions in the ACEC are deferred. Presently, leasing of unleased parcels and future parcels that may
become available for lease is contingent upon completing a coordinated activity plan (CAP) encompassing the Streambank Management Zones areas. The activity plan will identify feasible access, allowable road densities, guidelines for development of other minerals, and a time period of development will be acceptable.

Any determination to close parts of the ACEC to mineral location and to pursue withdrawals will be deferred to completion of the CAP. In the interim, those parts of the area not covered by withdrawals will remain open to mineral location and a plan of operations will be required for any locatable mineral activity. Any plan of operations submitted by a mining claimant must address the impacts of mining on the Streambank elk and deer herds to ensure no unnecessary or undue degradation occurs. A site specific environmental analysis will be required on each action.

Deferred actions and mitigation requirements will apply to all surface disturbing activities, not just those related to oil and gas exploration and development. Surface disturbing and disruptive activities, such as road or utility development, general construction range improvements, wet or dry drilling, exploratory drilling, etc., will be deferred until the CAP is completed. The CAP will cover such things as transportation, drilling pad density, drilling, and operations after well completion; development and location of range improvements, recreational activities, etc.

Considerations to be Addressed in Developing the ACEC

Since the area has a high development potential for oil and gas resources, some specific considerations for oil and gas development to be addressed in the CAP are identified here. These considerations include fragmentation of habitats by limiting roads, access, and use. Remote control oil and gas operations may be considered to address this. Contributing locations for condensate may also be needed to limit trips into well locations, especially during frost and snow winter periods. To minimize conflicts to habitat, it may be necessary to place interior facilities above ground.

Vehicle use and access may not be feasible for much of the area. Access may be limited by topography, accessibility, necessary to achieve area management objectives. To prevent conflicts with big game, recreation users, and other resources, alternative access methods may be needed to avoid existing roads, roads, etc.

Unleased areas may be offered for lease with an NSO stipulation if, in the interior of such tracts are too large, they may not be leased. These NSO stipulation areas may only be accessed through directional drilling. The NSO stipulation will be used to facilitate locating drainage problems, under the assumption that industry is the best judge of whether technology enables access to the oil and gas resources under the terms of the lease.

Leasing with an NSO stipulation could become necessary for several reasons. First, the area is characterized by steep slopes with streams and riparian zones filling the valley bottoms. Any disturbance on the steep slopes or in the riparian zones threatens to disrupt the habitat directly. Likelihood of success in producing gas is high which means production facilities will be necessary and year round access could be required which appears to make seasonal wildfire, insect, and disease mitigation and other mitigation is therefore necessary.

White Mountain Petroglyphs ACEC (20 acres of BLM-administered public lands)

The ACEC designation for the 20 acres of BLM-administered public lands in the White Mountain Petroglyphs area is retained.

MANAGEMENT OBJECTIVES. The management objectives of the White Mountain Petroglyphs ACEC are to: 1) protect cultural resources values from degradation; and 2) provide for wildlife and scenic values, and Native American concerns.

MANAGEMENT ACTIONS. The ACEC is open to consideration of such activities as: 1) visual resource management; 2) interpretation signs, or construction or placement of barriers to ensure protection of the site. Public awareness and use of the area as an educational site is encouraged.

The ACEC is an exclusion area for: 1) surface disturbing activities that could adversely affect the resource values in the area; 2) the knowledge of management units and entry under the land laws (the existing withdrawal will be retained); 3) mineral material sales for sand, gravel, or other types of construction or building materials; 4) the use of explosives and blasting; and 5) rights-of-way (see Table 2, Table 3, and Table 7).

The ACEC will be managed consistent with the Class II visual resource management classification. Management actions on the lands classified as Class II lands will be designed to retain the existing character of the landscape.

Threats are prohibited within 300 feet of the rock art site. Other lands of activity, such as audible disturbances, may not be allowed if the sacred Native American values at the rock art sites would be adversely affected.

LANDS PROTECTED. Lands within 1/2 mile radius of the rock art site (vistas) is an avoidance area and are open for consideration of such activities as: 1) fencing, interpretive signs, or construction and placement of trail and off-road vehicles barriers to ensure protection to the rock art. Most surface disturbing activities visible within the vista are prohibited. Some activities within 1/2 mile exclusion are visible from the panels will be allowed, if they do not affect the rock art site (vistas) (Table 2). The ACEC is closed to off-road vehicle travel including vehicles used for geophysical exploration activities and to the use of fire retardant chemicals containing dye (Table 1).

Off-road vehicle travel, including vehicles used for geophysical exploration and fire suppression activities, within that part of the vista that lies outside of the ACEC is prohibited. (See Table 2 and Table 3).

Human activity, recreation use, etc., is restricted seasonally (usually from February 1 through July 31) to protect the petroglyphs. Exception from this restriction may be approved if conditions described in Appendix 7 apply.

Livestock grazing objectives will be evaluated and, as needed, modified to be consistent with the management objectives for this area. Grazing systems will be designed to achieve desired plant communities and proper functioning condition of watersheds upland and riparian (Appendix 9-3).

See other resource management prescriptions in this document for other prescriptions and guidance that may apply to management activities in special designation management areas.

Other Management Areas

Monument Valley Management Area (69,340 acres of BLM-administered public lands)

Designation of the area as an ACEC will be deferred until a determination can be made that specific resources meet the ACEC criteria and importance criteria. Although the Monument Valley area has unique scenic features and has the apparent high potential for significant cultural and paleontological resources, there has been little systematic inventory of these features and resources. This lack of information precludes identification of specific resources that meet the ACEC criteria and importance criteria for designation. Management decisions on ACEC designation will be made without a more complete appreciation of the values in the area and appropriate management prescriptions, the area will be targeted for additional cultural and paleontological inventories. If specific resources are identified that meet the relevance and importance criteria, the area will then be considered for designation as an ACEC. Further public input will be solicited at that time.

MANAGEMENT OBJECTIVE. The management objective for the Monument Valley area is to provide protection of wildlife, geologic, cultural, watershed, scenic, and scientific values (geologic, cultural, and cultural).

MANAGEMENT ACTIONS. A portion of the Monument Valley area overlaps parts of the Adobe Town Wilderness Study Area. Management recommendations for alternatives to this area are addressed in the Final Adobe Town-Ferris Mountain Wilderness EIS.

The area is open to: 1) consideration for mineral leasing, exploration, and development when provided mitigation can be applied to retain the resource values; 2) consideration for mineral material sales with the appropriate constraints applied to all surface disturbing activities; and 3) development and public use with necessary consideration for wildlife, raptors, cultural, watershed, and scientific values (see Table 7 and Table 8).

The area is located in the eastern part of the Greater Red Cliffs ACEC. Because Pine Mountain does not contain the same sensitivity of resources
GREEN RIVER RMP

Management Actions Unique to the Four J Battle Portion of the Pine Mountain Management Area

To meet management objectives, surface occupancy and surface disturbance on BLM-administered public lands, including roads and other structures, may be permitted or prevented. No surface occupancy is allowed on the escarpment or toe slopes. Due to the highly erosive nature of these soils, surface disturbing activities should be designed for zero runoff into the established drainages.

Mineral leasing is allowed provided management objectives can be met and unacceptable impacts would not occur.

Livestock grazing will be allowed to optimize management goals in the long term and for uplands and riparian areas to reach proper functioning condition in a minimum. Grazing forage will be reserved for riparian and upland areas to provide forage that is needed for BLM-administered livestock. Full consideration will be given to maintaining and protecting important wildlife habitat.

Any determinations to allow partial occupancy of the area will be deferred to completion of a comprehensive activity or implementation plan for the area. In the interim, those parts of the area not covered by existing withdrawals will remain open to mineral location (Table 4).

Human activity, recreation use, etc., will be restricted seasonally (usually from February 1 to July 31), where needed to protect nesting raptors. Exceptions to this restriction may be approved if conditions described in Appendix 7 apply.

Project components, such as permanent and high profile structures, buildings, tanks, powerlines, roads, well pads, etc. are prohibited within an appropriate distance of active raptor nests. The appropriate distance will be determined through the collaborative planning and consultation processes. The determination may vary depending on the species involved, natural topographic barriers, and line-of-sight distances. Placement of facilities, "on" (very low profile) or below ground, and temporary disruptive activities, such as occur with pipeline construction, seismic activity, etc., could be granted exceptions within 1/2 mile of existing roads. Restrictions may be approved if conditions and criteria described in Appendix 7 apply.

Red Desert Watershed Management Area (341,060 acres of BLM-administered public lands)

The Red Desert Watershed Area was not found to contain values that meet the relevance and importance criteria. Therefore, it is not recommended for AEC designation.

MANAGEMENT OBJECTIVE

The management objective for the Red Desert Watershed Area is to manage for all resource values in the Red Desert area with emphasis on protection of visual resources, watershed values, and wildlife resources and to provide large areas of unmanaged views for enjoyment of scenic qualities. This will be achieved by Greatest Vernal Pool Habitat using topography to shield activities, using neutral colors so facilities blend with the landscape, identifying and protecting backcountry byways, and providing viewing points for the public (Map A).

A portion of the Red Desert Watershed Area encompasses portions of six wilderness study areas (Alkali Draw, Alkali Basin-East Sand Dunes, Honeycomb Buttes, Oregon Buttes, Red Butte, and South Pine Valley). Wilderness management recommendations and alternatives are addressed in the Red Springs District Wilderness Final EIS.

Sections of the Oregon Buttes ACF and some special status plant species are located within the Red Desert Watershed Area. Specific management prescriptions for these areas may be found in their respective development plans.

MANAGEMENT ACTIONS: The Red Desert Watershed Area will be managed to ensure developments and activities conform with the concepts of open space. The area will be managed consistent with the Class II and Class III visual resource management classifications. Site-specific visual resource reviews (SRVRS) will be conducted prior to allowing activities that may affect these values.

Surface disturbing activities, mineral exploration and development, and seismic activities will continue with acceptability to the subject management guidelines provided in the Minerals section. Approximately 2,500 acres are considered to be subject to the following restrictions: No new status plant species and to protect relevant and important resource values (GVL). All activities will be conducted in compliance with the Red Springs District Wilderness Final EIS.

Restrictions for protection of raptors, big game crucial winter range, and big game calving/fawning areas will apply (see Wildlife section and Table 8). Exceptions to these restrictions may be approved if conditions and criteria described in Appendix 7 apply.

Approximately 2,800 acres of Federal coal lands with development potential in the area are subject to consideration of coal leasing and development (see Coal Decisions). Most of the area is open to consideration of suitable mineral activities and mineral location.

The coal and stock driveways withdrawals will be revoked (Table 3).

The preferred route for rights-of-way in the management area is the east-west window described in the Lands and Realty Management section. Other areas will be evaluated in conflicts with other federal, state, local, agricultural, and scenic resource management objectives. Overhead powerlines are prohibited in the area (Table 2).

Approximately 95,580 acres are closed to off-road vehicle travel, and the remainder of the area is limited to
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found in Greater Red Creek, even though the watershed resources in the area are integrated with those of Greater Red Creek. The area does not contain populations of the Colorado River Riparian Fish, and thus will not need to receive the same management emphasis.

MANAGEMENT OBJECTIVES. The management objectives for the area are as follows: (1) improve watershed conditions and enhance watershed values; (2) improve riparian areas to proper functioning condition, as a minimum; (3) provide opportunities for dispersed recreation uses in the area consistent with the primary: water, riparian, and wildlife objectives; (4) maintain and protect important wildlife habitat, especially raptor habitat; and (5) reduce erosion.

The Pine Mountain area will be managed as an avoidance area for rights-of-way and surface disturbing activities.

The area is open to minimal leasing and related exploration and development activities with appropriate mitigation requirements (controlled surface use) applied to protect all other resource values.

Livestock grazing objectives and management practices will be re-evaluated and, as needed, modified to be consistent with the watershed, water quality, fisheries, recreation, and riparian management objectives. Grazing systems will be designed to achieve planned plant communities and proper functioning condition of watersheds (upland and riparian) (Appendix 9-3).

Reintroduction of Colorado River blue trout and other native species will be considered, if consistent with watershed and riparian objectives.

Activities that preclude the achievement or maintain water quality, fisheries, recreation, and riparian areas, and achievement of other management objectives will be prohibited.

Forested areas will be managed primarily toward meeting the watershed, riparian, wildlife, and recreation objectives for the area. Timber harvest levels and logging practices will be established to meet those objectives.

Any increase in vegetative production will be reserved for watershed stabilization and improvement purposes.

Management of habitat for special status species, if identified, will be developed on a case-by-case basis.

Restrictions for protection of raptors, big game crucial winter range, and big game calving/fawning areas will apply (see Wildlife section and Table 8). Exceptions to these restrictions may be approved if conditions and criteria described in Appendix 7 apply.

The area is open to consideration of activities that conform with objectives for the area. Such activities may include fencing, interpretive signs, transportation or other use barriers, and sediment or erosion control structures to meet resource management objectives. Any actions to be conducted in the Pine Mountain Area will be considered and analyzed on a case-by-case basis. Controls may be placed on the amount, sequence, timing, or level of activity or development that may occur to assure that they are consistent with or help to meet the management objectives for the area. This may result in such things as limiting the number of roads and other construction or other surface disturbing activities (such as well pads or debris or activities or development in some areas until other areas have been reclaimed and restored to previous uses (Appendix 5-2).

stands are maintained in healthy condition and the "snow fence" effect is preserved. For instance, a snow fence will be determined on a case-by-case basis to ensure that area objectives are met.

Aquifer recharge zones in the area will be managed to protect groundwater quality and aquifer function (Map 20). Protection includes limiting road density, surface disturbing activities, and surface configuration in the recharge zones to maintain them in a healthy and functioning condition.

Vegetation treatments will be designed to help meet and be consistent with management objectives for the area. Treatments in the inter gorge of intermittents and ephemeral drainages will be designed to leave mosaic patterns of treated and untreated areas of vegetation.

Herbicide headings sites must be located at least 500 feet from surface water or 500 feet in an area which ever is greater. Herbicide treatment of noxious weeds on BLM-administered public lands will be considered with specific analysis to help determine whether or not such actions will be authorized.

The entire area will be managed consistent with the Class III visual resource management classification.

Campings is allowed within 200 feet of surface water if damage to watershed, water quality, and wildlife values can be avoided. Otherwise, camping will be located at further distances from water.

Recreation developments will be kept to a minimum and designed primarily for the single use, with resource values the prevention of resource damage, and public health and safety.

Off-road vehicle travel is limited to designated roads and trails. A transportation plan will be completed. Some existing roads and trails in the area may be closed and reclassified as a result of transportation planning and reclassification, including consideration of public road location, construction, reconstruction, and development.

New road construction will be reviewed on a case-by-case basis for conformance with area and transportation plan objectives. In some cases, consideration of "no net gain in roads" factor may be an effective way to help meet objectives in the area.

The area is open to consideration of activities that conform with objectives for the area. Such activities may include fencing, interpretive signs, transportation or other use barriers, and sediment or erosion control structures to meet resource management objectives. Any actions to be conducted in the Pine Mountain Area will be considered and analyzed on a case-by-case basis. Controls may be placed on the amount, sequence, timing, or level of activity or development that may occur to assure that they are consistent with or help to meet the management objectives for the area. This may result in such things as limiting the number of roads and other construction or other surface disturbing activities (such as well pads or debris or activities or development in some areas until other areas have been reclaimed and restored to previous uses (Appendix 5-2).
designated roads and trails. Access for motorized vehicle travel will be managed to provide access opportunities in conformance with other resource objectives (see Map 20).

Recreational activities, opportunities, and uses will be maintained. The Great Divide Basin Wild Horse Herd Management Plan and the management objectives for the area.

Livestock grazing objectives will be evaluated and, as needed, modified to be consistent with the management objectives for this area. Grazing systems will be designed to achieve desired plant communities and proper functioning condition of watersheds (upland and riparian) (Appendix 9-3).

Activities that preclude the achievement or maintenance of proper functioning condition of upland and riparian areas and achievement of other management objectives in the area are prohibited.

Wild horse management in the area will be consistent with the Great Divide Basin Wild Horse Herd Management Plan and the management objectives for the area.

Vegetation resources in the area will be managed for continued livestock grazing, wild horse and wildlife uses in accordance with the management objectives for those resource values.

Sugarcane Basin Management Area (85,880 acres of BLM-administered public lands)

The Sugarcane Basin area is not designated an AWC, but will be maintained as a geographic management unit. The area is adjacent to the Green River and Little Muddy River, and contains a large area of the same sensitivity of resources found in Great Basin. Even though the watershed resources in the area are interconnected with those of the Great Divide Basin area, this does not mean the same management emphasis. The watershed, scenic, and wildlife resources are determined to be neither more, nor less significant for the basin, when compared to those values found in the Garnet, Sage, and Green Creek areas.

Management Objectives: The management objectives for the area are as follows: 1) to improve the watershed condition and enhance watershed values; 2) to retard riparian area to proper functioning condition, as a minimum; 3) provide for recreation and related land and water uses in the area consistent with the primary watershed, riparian, and wildlife objectives; and 4) maintain and protect intact mountain habitat.

Management Actions: The Sugarcane Basin area is managed to provide for designated roads and trails. Use of roads and trails is prohibited. Recreational and related land and water uses are consistent with the primary watershed, riparian, and wildlife objectives and 4) maintain and protect intact mountain habitat.

Management Treatments: Vegetation treatments will be designed to help maintain and be consistent with all management objectives for the area. Treatments in the inner gorge of intermittent and ephemeral drainages will be designed to leave mosaic patterns of treated and untreated areas of vegetation.

Herbicide loading sites must be located at least 500 feet from surface water or 500 feet from riparian areas (which are defined as a 1/4 mile wide riparian area). Herbicide treatment of noxious weeds in BLM-administered public lands will require a site specific analysis to help determine whether or not such actions will be authorized.

The area will be managed consistent with the Class II and Class III visual resource management classifications. Grazing is allowed within 200 feet of water if damage to watershed, water quality, and wildlife values can be avoided. Otherwise, grazing will be located at further distances from surface water.

Recreational developments will be kept to a minimum and designed primarily for the protection of resource values. In lieu of road construction, existing roads will be maintained. The BLM will manage these small and scattered parcels of public land as a logical wild and scenic river segment. However, it is recommended that a cooperative study among non-Federal land owners, BLM, BOR, and USFS be conducted to determine wild and scenic river eligibility and suitability along a sufficiently continuous segment of the Green River that could be logically managed as a wild and scenic river. BLM will also cooperate in the formation and management of a greenbelt area along the Green River.

Seven BLM-administered public land parcels along the Sevier River involving about 9.7 miles of the river were found to meet the wild and scenic river suitability factors to be granted a wild and scenic designation. These parcels are part of the Wild and Scenic River and the BLM lands along 9.7 miles of the river are classified as a wild and scenic river. The BLM lands along 9.5 miles are classified as a scenic river and the BLM lands along 1.4 miles are classified as a Recreational (Appendix 4 and Appendix 1). The BLM lands along 9.5 miles are classified as a scenic river and the BLM lands along 1.4 miles are classified as a Recreational (Appendix 4 and Appendix 1).

Management of BLM-Administered Public Lands That Meet the Wild and Scenic Rivers Suitability Factors

In conducting the wild and scenic river review process, application of the wild and scenic rivers eligibility criteria, determination of wild and scenic river suitability factors, and the application of the wild and scenic rivers suitability factors, focused on the BLM lands within a 1/2 mile wide corridor along the river segment of the river (i.e. approximatlely 1/4 mile wide along each bank of the river along the length of the river's width). The river corridor adjacent to this corridor identified on Map 30 will be considered in future site specific activity or management implementation planning to fulfill the stated management objective (Appendix 9-3).

Management Objectives: The management objectives for BLM lands that meet the wild and scenic rivers suitability factors is to maintain or enhance their outstandingly remarkable values and wild and scenic rivers classifications, until Congress considers them for possible designation.

The BLM-administered public lands along the Green River do not meet the wild and scenic river suitability factors. Therefore, the BLM is committed to managing these small and scattered parcels of public land as a logical wild and scenic river segment. However, it is recommended that a cooperative study among non-Federal land owners, BLM, BOR, and USFS be conducted to determine wild and scenic river eligibility and suitability along a sufficiently continuous segment of the Green River that could be logically managed as a wild and scenic river. BLM will also cooperate in the formation and management of a greenbelt area along the Green River.

It is likely that efforts will be directed in the area surrounding the Sevier River involving about 9.7 miles of the river to determine that the wild and scenic river suitability factors are met for the Sevier River. However, it is likely that the BLM lands along 9.5 miles are classified as a scenic river and the BLM lands along 1.4 miles are classified as a Recreational (Appendix 4 and Appendix 1).
The public lands are closed to recreational dredging for minerals, such as gold, and to mineral material sales.

Geophysical exploration is limited to foot access and use of surface cables on the public lands use of motorized or nonmotorized vehicles is prohibited. Surface charges may be allowed if site specific analyses determine no permanent adverse impacts would occur.

The public lands are closed to land disposal actions. Exchanges of public lands "outside the corridor" could be considered for acquiring private or state lands within the corridor or between the public land parcels along the river; however, public lands within the corridor will not be exchanged (Appendix 3).

The public lands are an exclusion area for rights-of-way (Table 2).

Water impoundments or diversions are prohibited on the public lands.

The public lands are closed to motorized and nonmotorized vehicles. Hikers will be required to "pack it out", there will be no exceptions, and they are permitted in keeping with current fire management regulations.

Any fire suppression activities on public lands will use "light-on-the-land" techniques. No motorized or nonmotorized vehicle ground equipment will be used to suppress fires. Helicopter bucket drops and the use of chainsaws may be allowed if no permanent impacts would occur.

The public lands are closed to commercial timber sales and harvesting. Cutting of trees will only be allowed with written permission or in association with safety and, environmental impact assessment requirements such as clearing trails, visitor safety, and fire controls.

Increases in active grazing preference and construction of new range improvements on the public lands are prohibited.

The public lands are closed to vegetation treatment or manipulation by other than hand or aerial seeding methods using species that will restore natural vegetation. Undesirable and exotic species could be removed by hand.

The public lands will be managed under a Class II VRM classification.

Interim Management on BLM-Administered Public Land Parcels Identified as Potentially Mining the Scenic Classification will focus on maintaining or enhancing the outstandingly remarkable historic, scenic, and resource values of unaltered character of the area in a near-natural setting. Any activities that conflict with this objective are prohibited.

Motorized and nonmotorized vehicles are restricted to using designated roads and trails. Trails may be closed if there is a demand for them and they conform with the objective for the scenic classification. Hikers will be required to "pack it out", there will be no exceptions, and they are permitted in keeping with current fire management regulations.

Any fire suppression activities on public lands will use "light-on-the-land" techniques. No motorized or nonmotorized vehicle ground equipment will be used to suppress fires. Helicopter bucket drops and the use of chainsaws may be allowed if no permanent impacts would occur.

The public lands are closed to commercial timber sales and harvesting. Cutting of trees will only be allowed with written permission or in association with safety and environmental impact assessment requirements such as clearing trails, visitor safety, and fire controls.

Increases in active grazing preference and construction of new range improvements on the public lands are prohibited. Range improvements will only be allowed if they are compatible with the objectives for the scenic classification.

The public lands are closed to vegetation treatment or manipulation by other than hand or aerial seeding methods using species that will restore natural vegetation. Undesirable and exotic species could be removed by hand.

The public lands will be managed under a Class II VRM classification.

See other resource management prescriptions in this document that may apply. Some of these include vegetation management activities of Wild and Scenic Rivers on BLM-administered public lands.
ACTIVE DUNE. A hill or accumulation of sand shaped by wind. A dune is typically changing from wind to water. Generally, an active dune is bare of vegetation.

ACTIVE POLLUTION. An activity that is deleterious to human health or the environment. This term is often used in the context of environmental regulations, as "the total number of animal units months of livestock grazing on public lands appropriated and attached to base property owned or controlled by a permittee or lessee." Grazing preference is displayed on a permit in three columns: Total, Suspended, and Active. The active level is the total level of AUMs that can be used by a permittee on the permit in an allotment. Suspended AUMs are those AUMs that are held in suspension merely because of production surpluses that stated that these AUMs were not present. They cannot be used by the permittee. Total preference is active plus suspended.

ACTIVITY FUNNELS. Fuels resulting from, or altered by, forest practices, such as logging, when burned or otherwise burned, without further harvest or thinning, as opposed to naturally created fuels.

AIR POLLUTION. The general term alluding to the undesirable addition of substances (gases, liquid, or solid) to the atmosphere that are foreign to the natural atmosphere or are injurious to health or vegetation when in combustion.

AIR QUALITY CONTROL REGION. A primary air quality administrative area designated in accordance with the provisions of the Clean Air Act and the basis of geographical and meteorological considerations.

ALKALINE-SALINE SOIL. Soil with a pH greater than 7.9 throughout most or all of it occupied by plant roots, and enough soluble salts to impair plant productivity.

ALKALINE SOILS. Any soil that has a pH greater than 7.9, but not necessarily so severe as soils naturally alkaline, exchangeable calcium carbonate content of 15 percent or higher.

ALLOWABLE BURNED AREA. Maximum area burned over a specified time period on land that is considered an acceptable loss for a specified area under organized fire suppression.

ALLOWABLE CUT. The amount of timber considered available for harvesting within a specified time period, without incurring adverse ecological or economic impacts.

ALLUVIUM. Unconsolidated debris from rocks or minerals, moved from their place of origin and deposited by running water, such as sand, gravel, cobbles, and boulders, and their mixtures with these materials.

ANIMAL UNIT MONTH (AUM). The amount of forage to sustain one mature cow or the equivalent, based on an average daily forage consumption of 26 pounds of dry matter per day. The equivalent animal unit for other ungulate species, based on a unit conversion factor of .75 pounds per animal per day: 10.5 for cattle; 7.6 for deer; 4.4 for moose; 2.0 for horses; and 5.2 for sheep.

ANTICLINAL. Inclined toward each other: an anticline is a folded strata in which the folds are convex upward. In simple articles the beds are in a crosswise position. These anticlines are the types of strata that dip in the same direction.

APPROPRIATE MANAGEMENT LEVEL (AML). The optimum level of wild horses that is having a thriving natural ecological balance on the public range.

AVAILABLE FUEL. That portion of the total fuel that would actually be consumed under specified burning conditions. Unless otherwise stated, this term is assumed to be the fuel consumed in the fire front and is not incorporated in NFRS and BEHAVE. Although generally ignored, the fuel consumed behind the fire line by incipient burning and glowing combustion is also a part of available fuel and can in some instances comprise a significant portion of the total.

AVERAGE WORST YEAR. Third worst fire season in the last 10 years, as determined by the sum of daily or burning indices during the regular fire-fighting season, using the same number of days each year to determine these totals.

AVOIDANCE AREA. Areas on public lands where future rights-of-way may be granted only when the legal alternative route or designated rights-of-way corridor is available.

BACKFIRE. (a) As used in fire suppression activities, see SUPPRESSION TACTICS. (b) As used in prescribed burning activities (to designate the fire movement in relation to wind or slope), see WINDER.

BADLAND. Surface features characterized by sharp erosional scar sculpture of weak rocks, forming steep, formless, and tasselled, shapely ridge-like drainag patterns, and normally dry watercourses.

BASE AREA (NFRS). An area representative of the major fire protection units. Base fuel types and slope classes are chosen from the base area.

BASE FUEL MODEL (NFRS). A representation of the vegetation type and fuel in a base area, in the calculation of fuel danger rating.

BIODIVERSITY. Soothing VICIOUS.

BIODIVERSITY. Diversity refers to the variety of life and processes and includes the variety of living organisms, the genetic diversity of a species, and the communities and ecosystems of which the organism is a part.

BIODIVERSITY/BIOREGION. A region defined by its interrelated ecosystems within a given area (e.g., a grassland, forest, or desert biome).

BOARD FOOT. A measurement of the volume of a tree which is based on a block of wood one foot square and one foot thick.

BOARD REGISTRY BOARD. A board of commissioner selected to review the results of fire suppression action on a specific unit or the specific action taken on several units. Generally only if deemed necessary or both good and poor action and to recommend or prescribe ways and means of doing a more effective and efficient job.

BOARDCASTING. Review a board of commissioner selected to review the results of fire suppression action on a specific unit or the specific action taken on several units. Generally only if deemed necessary or both good and poor action and to recommend or prescribe ways and means of doing a more effective and efficient job.

BIOGRAPHICAL DIRECTORY. A list of individuals, including their accomplishments, that may be included in the directory of the University of Southern California.

BRUSH BURN. A fire burning vegetation characterized by shrub or small trees (e.g., forest, range, rangeland, wildland).

BRUSH MANAGEMENT. Manipulation of stands of brush by manual, mechanical, and chemical means or by prescribed burning for the purpose of achieving land management objectives.

BURNING INDEX (BINDEX). A relative number related to the combustion that fire behavior makes to the amount of effort needed to contain it. Buching the BINDEX indicates that twice the effort will be required to contain a fire in that fuel type than is required for all other obstacles is held constant.

BURNING PERIOD. That part of each 24-hour period when fires are burning or likely to burn on the range.

CAMPING. Overnight occupancy on public land.

CANDIDATE PLANT SPECIES CATEGORIES (definition 6):

Category 1. Plants for which the USFS currently has on file substantial information on biological vulnerability and threats to support the applications of proposing to list them as endangered or threatened species. Presently, all data are being gathered and not all are considered precise in need of revision and, for some of the plants, concerning the precise boundaries for critical habitat described in the USFS俨宣' 1 2006 proposal. Public and prototypical of these plants are anticipated but because of the large number of such plants, the final review may be in draft stage.

Category 2. Plants for which information known in possession of the USFS indicates that proposing to list them as endangered or threatened species is appropriate, but for which substantial data on biological vulnerabilities and threats are not necessarily known or available. For these plants the critical habitat of the plants of Category 2, and some of the plants of these categories, may be reclassified in future years. It is likely that some of these will not be maintained, while others will be found to be in greater danger of extinction than once thought, and the number of such plants will therefore increase.

Category 3. Plants that have proven to be more abundant or widespread that is previously believed and that are not subject to any identifiable threat. Should further research or changes in land use indicate significant decline in any of these plants they may be reclassified for possible inclusion in one of the more critical categories.

CANDIDATE SPECIES. A plant or animal species whose numbers are declining so rapidly that official listing as threatened or endangered is a more urgent priority. See Section 10 of the Endangered Species Act which may become necessary as a conservation measure. Declines may be due to one or more factors, including: destruction/alteration of habitat, overutilization/overharvesting, introduction of new species, predation, and changes in the quality, extent, or ecological requirements of critical habitat.

CASCADING. A system that involves the activities of a complex with a simple system with another complex system with another simple system, etc.

CASE USE. Activities that involve the practices which do not necessarily lead to any appreciable damage or disturbance to lands, vegetation, or improvements. For example, activities which do not involve use of heavy equipment or explosives and which do not involve entry onto streets which are established roads and trails, are casual use.

CAUSE OF FIRE. For statistical purposes, fires grouped into broad categories. The 14 categories are: lightning, natural, smoking, deliberate, burning, incendiary, equipment use, railroad, children, miscellaneous.

CHARTS AND GRAPHS. A series of charts to show trends in information. Each chart is a bar graph, line graph, or pie chart.

CHECKBOARD LAND PATTERN. Alternating sections of federally owned lands with private or State lands on either side of the Union Pacific railroad right-of-way. The 36-mile-wide pattern of land on either side looks like a checkerboard on maps, with the checkerboard squares 1 by 1 mile. Each half of the checkerboard is used for surface mining and mineral development.

CHERRY-BOMBER. A Class A boundary which is drawn around a dead-end road or other linear feature to exclude it from the WSC.

CLINOPTILOLITE. A zeolite mineral occurring in the Bedrock Formation: a hydrated alumina-silicate formed by the alteration of volcanic tuffs and glasses. Zeolites are useful in drying air, in separation, in wastewater treatment, in the paper industry, as a dietary supplement for livestock, and as a soil conditioner.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL. Conditions or provisions required under which a specific natural disturbance or enhancement project is approved.

CONSERVATION USE. Recreation activities which are not consummate the critical habitat described in the USFS俨宣' 1 2006 proposal. Public and prototypical of these plants are anticipated but because of the large number of such plants, the final review may be in draft stage.

CONTAIN A FIRE. Take fire suppression action as needed which can reasonably be expected to keep the fire within established boundaries of control.

CONTAINMENT. Completion of a control line around a fire and any associated spot fires which can reasonably be expected to stop the fire's spread.

CONTROL LINE. A complete control line around a fire, any spot fire thereon, and any interior island to be saved, burned out, burned along any interior borders adjacent to areas already burned out, any cool-down all hot spots that are immediate threats to the control line, so that the line will not have to be held under fireline conditions. Implies more thorough suppression than containing a fire.

CONTROL TIME. Elapsed time from the first work on a fire until being the control line is assumed to be measured only from the time of containing a fire.

CONTROLLED SURFACE USE (CSU). Surface occupancy or use of gravel, sand, stone, timber, soil, and other materials, movement, or use of heavy equipment by any person, as directed by the management agency, to attain an acceptable plan for utilization of anticipated improvements. The use requires specific operational controls that may modify the lease rights. Controlled Surface Use is used for operating guidance, not as a substitute for the NSW or timing limitation stipulations.

CRUCIAL RANGE. Crucial range can describe any particular seasonal or habitat component of a given season or wintering range in many but not all cases. The crucial range is the portion of the range that is utilized by at least 50 percent of the population on the regular range. The term includes seasonal range for an area that has a specific component that is owned that is utilized relatively intact and, although some occupation may occur, is maintained to maintain average reproductive rates from 80 to 10 years.
CULTURAL RESOURCE INVENTORY LEVELS. A three-tiered process for discovering, recording, and evaluating cultural resources.

Class I - a review of existing literature and oral intermin data together with an analysis of a specific geographic region, any area of potential impact, drainage basin, resource area, etc. This class includes all projects except Class II.

Class II - a sampling survey usually aimed at developing and testing a predictive model of cultural resource distribution.

Class III - an on-site survey to discover, record, and evaluate cultural resources within a specific geographic area usually an area of potential effect for a proposed undertaking.

CULTURAL RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PLAN. A specific, site-specific plan designed to manage cultural resources, or a plan for managing a particular class of cultural resource.

DAILY ACTIVITY LEVELS. In fire danger rating, a subjective estimate of the degree of activity of a potential human caused fire hazard, based upon a normally experienced fireman.

Free fire levels are defined: low, low, normal, high, and extreme.

DEAD FUELS. Fuels with no living tissue in which moisture content is governed almost entirely by atmospheric moisture and temperature, requiring no water from precipitation, dry bulk temperature, and solar radiation.

DESIRED FUTURE CONDITION. A future land or resource condition that achieves a set of compatible multi-use goals and objectives.

DEVELOPMENTAL PLANT. The plant community which provides the vegetation attributes required for restoring or extending RMP vegetation objectives. The desired plant community must be within an ecologically-suitable cap to provide these attributes, through potential vegetation, management action, or both (BLM Wyoming Instruction Memorandum 91-291. 5227 9/1/87)

DOMINO effect. Activities disrupt purposely to human presence and related activities that may cause displacement of or excessive stress to wildlife during critical life-cycle periods.

DISTURBANCE FACTOR FOR WILDLIFE. Defined as an abiotic or biotic factor or disturbance activity often associated with surface disturbance activities that affect wildlife species, particularly in riparian areas.

DROUGHT. Period of relatively long durations with substantially below normal precipitation, usually occurring over a large area.

ECOLOGICAL FUNCTIONALITY. This term is involved in the RMP. See: ECOLOGICAL STATUS.

ECOLOGICAL STATUS. Defined in the Bureau's monitoring manual as: "the present state of vegetation of a range site in relation to the potential natural community for the site. Ecological status is a unique independent. It is an expression of the relative degree to which the range site's attributes, and amounts of plants in plants, in a plant community resemble that of the potential natural community. The degree of similarity is measured within 25, 50, 75, or 100 percent similarity to the potential natural community. It is a measure of current, mid, late seral, and potential natural community, respectively. This replaces range condition."

ENERGY RELEASE COMPONENT (ERC). The compared total heat released per unit area (BTU) per square foot with the amount of plant material that could be burned.

EOLIAN ICE-CELLS. Particulate form issued from snowfall and isomalt from surface heat by amounts of windblown fines. This euns less small poe dune.

ERODIBILITY. The tendency of a soil to erode as influenced by texture under specified soils, structure, or slope.

EXCEPTION. A case by case exemption from a lease stipulation. The stipulation applies to all other sites within the field-to-field which the restricted criteria apply.

EXCLUSION AREA. Areas where future rights-of-way may be granted only when mandated by law.

EXISTING ROADS AND VEHICLE ROUTES. Defined as roads existing prior to a land use plan and not specifically excluded from use by the land use plan, and not excluded from use by the land use plan, and not excluded from use by the land use plan.

FIRE MODEL. A computerized model which simulates the fire behavior of fuel models. The model includes the following characteristics:

- Fuel models: four National Fire Danger Rating System fuel models (e.g., Size, burning rate, and moisture content)
- Burned vegetation: adequately describe the make up and potential fire danger of the fuels involved in the planning area.
- Winds: average for the range.
- Rain: none. and do not allow enough to burn grass and other herbaceous plants. The shrubs occur at a third third of the base of the transect and Model M might be used for scrub oak, shrub oak and desert shrub associations on the west, and mixing sagebrush and grass to the southeast. The fuel model is found in 1800-1774 TAC units in the planning area.

Fuel Model M is meant to represent western grasslands vegetated by perennial grasses, which are either 1-2 or 2-3 meters in height and the loadier having less than those in Model A fuels. Otherwise, the situations are very similar shrubs and trees except less than one third of the area. The fuel components in the area are more than 50 percent from a fuel model may be substituted for Fuel Model K in the early and early burn due to the availability of time fuels.

Fuel Model K is presented in the short needle coniferous forest study. It is used to model the fire models. In the Forest Resource data, fire model D & C represents a fire model with a short needle coniferous forest. The fuel model is found in 18000-2000 TAC units in the planning area. Juniper may be substitute with tall shrubs and trees.

Fuel Model G is used for dune centers stands where there is a heavy buildup of litter and cut-down woody material. Such stands are subject to wind erosion at the rate and to being affected by disease wind, or ice damage, natural events that create a very heavy buildup of dead material on the forest floor. The duff and litter and deep and much of the woody material is more than one inch in diameter, and other growth is under a variable, but shrubs are usually restricted to openings. Topography is represented by fuel model K. Fuel Model K is presented in the rock and soil type areas.

Fuel Model D is used for salt marsh and tidal areas in which the fuel model is located in small isolated areas generally associated with wetland area, low fuel rating areas. Only during a drought condition do these areas pose a threat.

Fuel Load: Neshens of fire fuels that historically experienced on a specified period over a given period annually one day at a specified rate of fire danger.

Fire Management Objective. Planned, measurable to be achieved and used as a basis for land management goals and objectives.

Fire management plan. Statement for a specific area of fire management activities and used as a basis for land management goals and objectives.

WATER QUALITY. The state of water vapor,驾驶员, and any associated action or activity associated with it. Water quality is a measure of the health or condition of water, including the presence of harmful wastes or contaminants, or pollution.

Regional water bodies are managed to ensure the continued use of water in the area for habitat and recreation activities.

Fire resource management categories. Categorizes the types of forest resources for which forest management is the primary use and where other resources may or may not be emphasized.

Forests are inventoried for management purposes and are categorized based on their forest type, growth form, and other characteristics.

Forests are inventoried for management purposes and are categorized based on their forest type, growth form, and other characteristics.

Fire resource management categories. Categorizes the types of forest resources for which forest management is the primary use and where other resources may or may not be emphasized.

Forests are inventoried for management purposes and are categorized based on their forest type, growth form, and other characteristics.

Forest resource management categories. Categorizes the types of forest resources for which forest management is the primary use and where other resources may or may not be emphasized.

Forest resource management categories. Categorizes the types of forest resources for which forest management is the primary use and where other resources may or may not be emphasized.
OVERMAN. A description of a timber area (or stand) that is past the age of maturity as defined by the culmination of mean annual growth, site characteristics, and age at degradation which may include that are not limited to low growth rates, dead and dying trees, stumps, and an accumulation of down woody materials.

PERENNIAL STREAM. A stream or reach of a stream which flows continuously throughout the year, and whose upper surface generally stands lower than the water table in the region adjoining the stream. A perennial or live stream.

PLAYA. The usually dry, nearly level, lake plain that occupies the lowest part of closed depressions, such as adobe or intermediate basin floors. Temporary flooding occurs in response to precipitation, episodic or otherwise, which causes runoff, shallow sheets of water which quickly gather and almost quickly evaporate.

POLETIMBER. As a route of trees that measure 50 to 80 inches in height at chest height.

POTENTIAL HABITAT. An area which displays similar environmental characteristics such as elevation, soil type, precipitation, associated species, slope, and aspect as the known habitat of the subject species.

PRECIPITATION. Any of all forms of water particles, liquid or solid, that fall from the atmosphere and reach the ground.

PRESCRIBED FIRE. Any application of fire to wild land fuels on either their natural or modified state, under specified environmental conditions which allow the fire to be controlled or determined beforehand to produce the fire’s intensity and rate of spread to attain desired resource management objectives.

PRESCRIBED FIRE.- A fire burning with a prescription resulting from planned or unplanned ignition.

PRESCRIPTION. Written statement defining objectives to be attained, as well as temperature, humidity, wind direction, and wind speed, fuel moisture content, and soil moisture under which the fire will be allowed to burn, generally expressed as acceptable ranges of the various indices, and the limits of the geographic area to be covered.

PROPER FUNCTIONING CONDITION. Riparian wetland areas are functioning properly when adequate vegetation, landform, and water regime exist and they present a distinct stream ecosystem associated with high water table, thereby reducing erosion and improving water quality, filter sediment, capture biodegradable and toxic materials, improve water quality development, improve flood water storage development, and groundwater recharge; develop root mass that stabilizes streambanks against erosion, provide biologic diversity and channel characteristics, to provide the habitat and the water depth, duration, and temperature necessary for fish production, waterfowl breeding, and other uses; and support greater biodiversity. The functioning condition of riparian wetland areas is a result of integration of the biology, soil, water, and vegetation (Prechtl, 1993; and BM Manual 1973-79). See FUNCTIONAL AT-RISK, NON FUNCTIONAL.

PUBLIC LAND. Land administered by the Bureau of Land Management.

RAPTOR. A bird of prey, such as an eagle, hawk, or owl.

RARE SPECIES. Wildlife species whose populations are consistently small and widely dispersed, or whose ranges are restricted to a few localities that are generally remote and isolated from other habitats, habitat availability, or habitat condition might lead toward extinction.

RECLAMATION. The reconstruction of disturbed areas by reestablishing the land to a condition appropriate or equal to that which existed prior to disturbance, or to a stable and productive condition consistent with the land and the immediate goal of reclamation is to stabilize disturbed areas and protect both disturbed and adjacent undisturbed areas from excessive degradation.

RECLAMATION USER DAY. Any recreational activity taking place within a 24-hour period, or portion thereof, for each individual recreating on public lands.

RESERVE DAMAGE. Defined as leaving long-term signs of scorching, timber mortality, or causing erosion or water pollution, creating undue degradation of other vegetation or wildlife resources, or where destruction of natural features, such as a stream bed, would make it destructive or capable of supporting major portions of the potential of the disturbed areas, but used by and allowed to a significant portion of the population to survive the occasional extremely severe winter.

SMOKE MANAGEMENT. Application of fire behavior and meteorological principles to minimize degradation of air quality during prescribed fires.

SOIL REGRADATION. Any soil which regains the physical and structural integrity of the soil. This may include but is not limited to the reduction of loss of structural integrity or the characteristics of the soil which result in undesirable characteristics in terms of soil quality.

SOLID WASTE. A solid waste is any solid, or punctured gaseous material that is no longer used and is otherwise disposed of; including solid refuse, solid waste, solid waste material, recycling, or municipal solid waste. The solid waste treatment includes the destruction of waste and may be disposed of in landfills, sanitary landfills, mining waste, or industrial waste.

RESTRICTED AREAS. Areas where mitigation such as seasonal restrictions is required to protect resource values.

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

RIPARIAN HABITAT. A highly valued wetland vegetation community found along or adjacent to streams, lakes, ponds, and other open water bodies (both permanent and intermittent). This unique habitat is crucial to the continued existence of many fish and wildlife species known to occur in the area. Riparian vegetation helps maintain high water levels in streams and streambanks, create quality fish and wildlife habitat, prevent or reduce flood, and maintain or improve water quality.

SALINITY. The concentration of dissolved salts or substances in water. It is used to describe the existence of saline soils. The electrical conductivity (EC) of a saturated extract is the standard measure of salinity and is expressed in microsiemens per centimeter. It has been adopted to define specific salinity groups and use in irrigation development, and to determine if specific salinity groups and use in irrigation development is feasible within the area and to determine if specific salinity groups and use in irrigation development is feasible within the area and to determine irrigation practices and recommendations.

SAPLING. A tree that is greater than three feet in height and less than four inches in diameter.

SAW TIMBER. A class of live trees that measure 9 inches in diameter breast height sibh and larger.

SECTION 108 CONSULTATION. Also known as the 108 CFR directive, Section 108 requires the Minister of Indian Affairs to the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, State Historic Preservation Officer and the Secretary of the Interior to consider historic properties that could be affected by a specific undertaking. Section 108 is the portion of the National Historic Preservation Act that outlines the procedure. The procedure is codified in 36 CFR 800.

SEED/SAVS. Stand of trees composed of seedlings and/or saplings.

SEEDLINGS. A tree grown from seed that does not reach a height of three feet or a diameter of two inches.

SEVERE WINTER RELIEF. A concerted survival range which may be an area considered a CRU or RANG. It is used to a great extent, only in occasionally extremely severe winters (i.e., the mean January temperature is at or below 0°F), it would make it destructive or capable of supporting major portions of the potential of the disturbed areas, but used by and allowed to a significant portion of the population to survive the occasional extremely severe winter.

SMOKE MANAGEMENT APPLICATION OF FIRE BEHAVIOR AND METEOROLOGICAL PRINCIPLES TO MINIMIZE DEGRADATION OF AIR QUALITY DURING PRESCRIBED FIRES.

SOIL REGRADATION. Any soil which regains the physical and structural integrity of the soil. This may include but is not limited to the reduction of loss of structural integrity or the characteristics of the soil which result in undesirable characteristics in terms of soil quality.

SOLID WASTE. A solid waste is any solid, or punctured gaseous material that is no longer used and is otherwise disposed of; including solid refuse, solid waste, solid waste material, recycling, or municipal solid waste. The solid waste treatment includes the destruction of waste and may be disposed of in landfills, sanitary landfills, mining waste, or industrial waste.

RESTRICTED AREAS. Areas where mitigation such as seasonal restrictions is required to protect resource values.

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

RIPARIAN HABITAT. A highly valued wetland vegetation community found along or adjacent to streams, lakes, ponds, and other open water bodies (both permanent and intermittent). This unique habitat is crucial to the continued existence of many fish and wildlife species known to occur in the area. Riparian vegetation helps maintain high water levels in streams and streambanks, create quality fish and wildlife habitat, prevent or reduce flood, and maintain or improve water quality.

SALINITY. The concentration of dissolved salts or substances in water. It is used to describe the existence of saline soils. The electrical conductivity (EC) of a saturated extract is the standard measure of salinity and is expressed in microsiemens per centimeter. It has been adopted to define specific salinity groups and use in irrigation development, and to determine if specific salinity groups and use in irrigation development is feasible within the area and to determine irrigation practices and recommendations.

SAPLING. A tree that is greater than three feet in height and less than four inches in diameter.

SAW TIMBER. A class of live trees that measure 9 inches in diameter breast height sibh and larger.

SECTION 108 CONSULTATION. Also known as the 108 CFR directive, Section 108 requires the Minister of Indian Affairs to the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, State Historic Preservation Officer and the Secretary of the Interior to consider historic properties that could be affected by a specific undertaking. Section 108 is the portion of the National Historic Preservation Act that outlines the procedure. The procedure is codified in 36 CFR 800.

SEED/SAVS. Stand of trees composed of seedlings and/or saplings.

SEEDLINGS. A tree grown from seed that does not reach a height of three feet or a diameter of two inches.

SEVERE WINTER RELIEF. A concerted survival range which may be an area considered a CRU or RANG. It is used to a great extent, only in occasionally extremely severe winters (i.e., the mean January temperature is at or below 0°F), it would make it destructive or capable of supporting major portions of the potential of the disturbed areas, but used by and allowed to a significant portion of the population to survive the occasional extremely severe winter.

SMOKE MANAGEMENT APPLICATION OF FIRE BEHAVIOR AND METEOROLOGICAL PRINCIPLES TO MINIMIZE DEGRADATION OF AIR QUALITY DURING PRESCRIBED FIRES.

SOIL REGRADATION. Any soil which regains the physical and structural integrity of the soil. This may include but is not limited to the reduction of loss of structural integrity or the characteristics of the soil which result in undesirable characteristics in terms of soil quality.

SOLID WASTE. A solid waste is any solid, or punctured gaseous material that is no longer used and is otherwise disposed of; including solid refuse, solid waste, solid waste material, recycling, or municipal solid waste. The solid waste treatment includes the destruction of waste and may be disposed of in landfills, sanitary landfills, mining waste, or industrial waste.

RESTRICTED AREAS. Areas where mitigation such as seasonal restrictions is required to protect resource values.

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

RIPARIAN HABITAT. A highly valued wetland vegetation community found along or adjacent to streams, lakes, ponds, and other open water bodies (both permanent and intermittent). This unique habitat is crucial to the continued existence of many fish and wildlife species known to occur in the area. Riparian vegetation helps maintain high water levels in streams and streambanks, create quality fish and wildlife habitat, prevent or reduce flood, and maintain or improve water quality.

SALINITY. The concentration of dissolved salts or substances in water. It is used to describe the existence of saline soils. The electrical conductivity (EC) of a saturated extract is the standard measure of salinity and is expressed in microsiemens per centimeter. It has been adopted to define specific salinity groups and use in irrigation development, and to determine if specific salinity groups and use in irrigation development is feasible within the area and to determine irrigation practices and recommendations.

SAPLING. A tree that is greater than three feet in height and less than four inches in diameter.

SAW TIMBER. A class of live trees that measure 9 inches in diameter breast height sibh and larger.
UNNECESSARY OR UNDE DегАDIГAtION. Impacts or disturbances greater than those which would normally result when the same or similar activity is being accomplished by a prudent person using the best reasonably available technology in a usual, customary, and proficient manner that takes into consideration the effects of the activity on other resources and land uses, including those resources and uses outside the area of activity. Unnecessary and undue degradation may involve failure to initiate and complete reasonable mitigation measures, including reclamation of disturbed areas, creation of a nuisance, or failure to comply with applicable environmental protection statutes and regulations.

UNOCCUPIED HISTORICAL HABITAT. Habitat which is known to have been previously occupied by a species but has no animals at the present time.

UNOCCUPIED SUITABLE HABITAT. Habitat where a species is not found at the present time, has not been recorded as historical habitat, but which apparently contains suitable physical and biological characteristics necessary for that particular species.

VALUES AT RISK. Any of all natural resources, improvements, or other values which may be jeopardized if a fire occurs.

VEGETATION MANIPULATION. Land treatment projects designed to improve the growth of more desirable plant species. Biological, chemical, or mechanical methods of vegetation removal, including prescribed burns, are used.

VISUAL RESOURCE MANAGEMENT CLASSES (definition of). Class I. The objective of this class is to maintain a landscape setting that appears unaltered by humans. It is applied to wilderness areas, some natural areas, wild portions of the wild scenic rivers, and other similar situations where management activities are to be restricted.

Class II. The objective of this class is to design proposed alterations so as to retain the existing character of the landscape. The level of change to the characteristic landscape should be low. Management activities may be seen, but should not attract attention of the casual observer. Any changes must repeat the basic elements of form, line, color, and texture found in the predominant natural features of the characteristic landscape.

Class III. The objective of this class is to design proposed alterations so as to partially retain the existing character of the landscape. Contrasts to the basic elements (form, line, color, and texture) caused by a management activity may be evident and begin to attract attention in the characteristic landscape. However, the changes should remain subordinate to the existing characteristic landscape. Structures located in the foreland distance zone (0-1/2 mile) often create a contrast that exceeds the VRM class, even when designed to harmonize and blend with the characteristic landscape. This may be especially true when a distinctive architectural motif or style is designed. Approval by the District Manager is required on a case-by-case basis to determine whether the structure(s) meet the acceptable VRM class standards, and if not, whether they add acceptable visual variety to the landscape.

Class IV. The objective of this class is to provide for management activities which require major modification of the existing character of the landscape. Contrasts may be seen and be a dominant feature of the landscape in terms of scale; however, the change should repeat the basic elements (form, line, color, and texture) inherent in the characteristic landscape. Structures located in the foreground distance zone (0-1/2 mile) often create a contrast that exceeds the VRM class, even when designed to harmonize and blend with the characteristic landscape. This may be especially true when a distinctive architectural motif or style is designed. Approval by the District Manager is required on a case-by-case basis to determine whether the structure(s) meet the acceptable VRM class standards, and if not, whether they add acceptable visual variety to the landscape.

Rehabilitation Area. Change is needed or change may add acceptable visual variety to an area. This class applies to areas where the naturalistic character has been disturbed to a point where rehabilitation is needed to bring it back into character with the surrounding landscape. This class would apply to areas identified in the scenic evaluation where the quality class has been reduced because of unacceptable cultural modification. The contrast is inharmonious with the characteristic landscape. It may also be applied to areas that have the potential for enhancement; i.e., add acceptable visual variety to an area or site. It should be considered an interim or short-term classification until one of the other VRM class objectives can be reached through rehabilitation or enhancement. The desired visual resource management class should be identified.

WAIVER. A permanent exemption from a lease stipulation for the entire leasehold.

WETLAND. Lands where at least periodic inundation or saturation with water (either from the surface or subsurface) is the dominant factor determining the nature of soil development and the types of plant and animal communities living there. These include the entire zones associated with streams, lakes, ponds, springs, canals, swales, wet meadows, and some aspen stands. Wetlands support all fish. They also support more species of wildlife (in higher densities) than any other habitat type in the planning area. They comprise less than one percent of the public land acreage.

Wetlands are lands transitional between terrestrial and aquatic systems where the water table is usually at or near the surface of the land is covered by shallow water. For purposes of this document, wetlands must have one or more of the following three attributes: (1) at least periodically, the land supports predominantly hydrophytes, (2) the substrate is predominantly undrained hydric soil, and (3) the substrate is non-soil and is saturated with water or covered by shallow water at some time during the growing season of each year.

WILDFIRE. Any fire occurring on wildland that neither meets management objectives nor occurs within a prescribed fire area, thus requiring a suppression response.

WINDOWS. Short segments of right-of-way corridor utilized when designating a full length right-of-way corridor is not feasible.

WITHDRAWAL. Removal or withholding of public lands, by statute or Secretarial order, from operation of some or all of the public land laws. A mineral withdrawal includes public lands potentially valuable for leasable minerals, precluding the disposal of the lands except with a mineral reservation clause unless the lands are found not to contain a valuable deposit of minerals. A mineral withdrawal is the closing of an area to mineral exploration and development activities.
TABLE 1

| Land and Mineral Ownership and Administrative Jurisdictions Within The Green River RMP Planning Area |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas the Green River RMP Will Cover</th>
<th>Approximate Acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Where the land surface and mineral estate are both Federally owned and are both administered by the BLM</td>
<td>3,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Areas where the land surface is Federally owned and administered by the BLM and the mineral estate is owned and administered by private individuals.</td>
<td>135,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Areas where the land surface is owned and administered by private individuals, the state of Wyoming, or local governments and the mineral estate is Federally owned and administered by the BLM.</td>
<td>110,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total BLIm administered federal mineral estate to be covered by RMP decisions</td>
<td>3,615,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total BLIm administered federal mineral estate to be recovered by RMP decisions</td>
<td>3,581,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total BLIm administered &quot;federal mineral estate that will not be covered by RMP decisions</td>
<td>267,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas the Green River RMP Decisions Will Not Cover</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D. Areas where the federal land surface is administered by the Forest Service and the Federal mineral estate administered by the BLM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Areas where the federal land surface is administered by the Bureau of Reclamation and the Federal mineral estate is administered by the BLM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Areas where the federal land surface is administered by the U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service and the Federal mineral estate is administered by the BLM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total BLIM administered &quot;federal mineral estate that will not be covered by RMP decisions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total land surface acres in the Green River RMP planning area (all ownerships) | 5,350,000         |

---

1. Because of land surface and mineral ownership overlap and administrative responsibility overlap, acreage figures are not additive.
2. For the purposes of the Green River RMP Planning effort, areas where one or more of the mineral resource categories are Federally owned are defined and addressed as "all mineral estate as far as it is Federally owned." Where mineral ownership overlaps but the mineral estate is almost entirely non-Federally owned, the Green River RMP Planning effort will not participate in theB.
3. Areas where the land surface is Federally owned, and the mineral estate is administered by the BLM, the RMP will include planning and management decisions for both the land surface and the BLM.
4. Areas where the Federal land surface is owned and the mineral estate is Federally owned, the RMP will include land planning and management decisions for the BLM-administered land surface and surface and mineral management decisions for the Federal mineral estate that the BLM manages. The RMP will also include land and resource management decisions for the Federal mineral estate that are not BLM-administered.
5. Areas where the land surface is privately owned or owned by the State of Wyoming or local governments, the RMP will include land planning and management decisions for only the BLIm administered Federal land surface. While these surface management decisions may have some affect on the use of the mineral estate on non-Federally owned mineral, the RMP will not plan for the non-Federally owned mineral.
6. Areas where the land surface is owned and the mineral estate is administered by private individuals, the state of Wyoming, or local governments and the mineral estate is owned and administered by the BLM. Areas in these three categories that are owned by the State of Wyoming or local governments will have land planning and management decisions made by the State of Wyoming. Areas where the land surface is owned and the mineral estate is owned and administered by private individuals that are owned by the State of Wyoming or local governments will have land planning and management decisions made by the State of Wyoming. Areas in these three categories where the land surface is owned and the mineral estate is owned and administered by the BLM will have land planning and management decisions made by the BLM.
7. Areas where the BLIm administered land surface is in the Federal mineral estate that is owned and administered by the BLM, the RMP will include surface and mineral management decisions for the BLM-administered parts of the Federal mineral estate. Areas where the land surface is owned and the mineral estate is owned by the State of Wyoming or local governments will have land planning and management decisions made by the State of Wyoming. Areas where the land surface is owned and the mineral estate is owned by private individuals will have land planning and management decisions made by the land owner. The RMP will include land planning and management decisions for areas in the remaining ownership categories where overlapping areas exist.
8. The Green River RMP will not include any land use planning or management decisions for areas where the land surface is owned by those entities that are not included in the RMP. See the Maps showing areas over which the agencies have jurisdiction.

---

*The Green River RMP will not include any land use planning or management decisions for areas where the land surface is owned by those entities that are not included in the RMP. See the Maps showing areas over which the agencies have jurisdiction.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ROW Avoidance Areas</th>
<th>Approximate Acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boars Tusk</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cedar Canyon Petroglyphs (Vista)</td>
<td>360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crookston Ranch</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dry Sandy Swales (1/4 mile buffer)</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emmons Corral</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14-Mile Recreation Area</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater Red Creek ACEC - Sage Creek Drainage</td>
<td>52.276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater Sand Dunes ACEC (1k lands within 1 mile or visual horizon)</td>
<td>70.850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic Trails (1/4 mile buffer)</td>
<td>64.910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horse Head Viewing Area (1/2 mile buffer)</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LlB-Lake Bluffs Petroglyphs (Vista)</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monument Valley (erosive soil areas and slopes &gt;25%)</td>
<td>1,280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North and South Table Mountains</td>
<td>3,450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon Buttes ACEC</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pilot Butte</td>
<td>64.200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pine Mountains</td>
<td>6.030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sage Grouse Leks (1/4 mile buffer)</td>
<td>8.170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Pass Historic Landscape ACEC (within landscape not in vista)</td>
<td>20.080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Status Plants (actual sites)</td>
<td>3.610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Status Plants (potential sites)</td>
<td>39.870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steamboat Mountain ACEC</td>
<td>43.270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sugarloaf Basin</td>
<td>85.808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sugarloaf Petroglyphs (Vista)</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolar Petroglyphs (Vista)</td>
<td>310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Mountain Petroglyphs (Vista)</td>
<td>480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wind River Front (Eastern Portion)</td>
<td>88.510</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ROW Exclusion Areas</th>
<th>Approximate Acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Big Sandy River (1/2 mile wide corridor, 1.5 miles long)</td>
<td>480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cedar Canyon Petroglyphs</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dry Sandy Swales</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dug Springs Stage Station</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater Red Creek ACEC - Curran Creek Drainage (from headwaters 30 miles downstream)</td>
<td>23.540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater Red Creek ACEC - original Red Creek ACEC</td>
<td>55.880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LlB-Lake Bluffs Petroglyphs</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LaGrande Stage Station</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American Burial Sites</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Corrals ACEC</td>
<td>1.276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pine Butte</td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prehistoric Quarry Site</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Pass Historic Landscape ACEC (within landscape)</td>
<td>33.720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Status Plants ACECs</td>
<td>900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steamboat Mountain ACEC (Communication sites)</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sugarloaf Petroglyphs</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 2 (continued) RIGHTS-OF-WAY AVOIDANCE AND EXCLUSION AREAS</th>
<th>Approximate Acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sweetwater River Wild, Scenic, and Recreational Segments (1/2 mile corridor, 9.7 miles long)</td>
<td>3.110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolar Petroglyphs</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tri-Territory Marker</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Mountain Petroglyphs</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wind River Front (Eastern Portion)</td>
<td>88.510</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Where applicable
2 Petroglyphs and Vista total 1,000 acres
3 Major facilities in the Wind River Front (Eastern Portion) will be excluded. Long linear facilities will be avoided.
4 Greater Red Creek/Red Rock ACEC portions. The crossing right-of-way concentration area would be an avoidance area for rights-of-way within new development authorized in the crossing right-of-way. Richards Gap would be removed after 10 years. This corridor at the area would be an exclusion area. Requirements would be given to the land user for access to private property.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 3 WITHDRAWALS REVOKED OR RETAINED</th>
<th>Approximate Acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Revoked</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classification Withdrawal</td>
<td>1,080.600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coal Withdrawal</td>
<td>375.828</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple Use Management Classification</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oil Shale Withdrawal</td>
<td>2,428.800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phosphate Withdrawal</td>
<td>14.717</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Water Reserves</td>
<td>21.368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stock Driveways</td>
<td>37.111</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Retained                                |                   |
| Classification Withdrawal               |                   |
| Coal Withdrawal                         | 14.000            |
| Natural Corrals Archaeological Site     | 357                |
| Oregon Trail/Tracing of the Ways       | 520                |
| Pine Springs Archaeological Site        | 90                 |
| Public Water Reserves                   | 4.240              |
| Sugarloaf Petroglyphs                   |                   |
| White Mountain Petroglyphs              |                   |

Note: Approximately 500,000 acres of withdrawals overlap.
### TABLE 4
WITHDRAWALS TO BE PURSUED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Approximate Acres</th>
<th>Existing Withdrawal Overlap</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4-J Basin 1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cedar Canyon Petroglyph Site &amp; ACEC</td>
<td>515</td>
<td>Oil Shale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crookston Ranch</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Oil Shale/Coal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dug Springs Stage Station</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Oil Shale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flaming Gorge Reservoir (BOR)</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>Oil Shale/Coal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater Red Creek ACEC (Red Creek/Currant Creek Drainage)</td>
<td>79,620</td>
<td>Oil Shale/Coal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater Sand Dunes ACEC</td>
<td>25,250</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LaBarge Bluffs Petroglyph Site</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Oil Shale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LaClede Stage Station</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Oil Shale/Coal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monument Valley Area 1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Oil Shale/Coal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pine Springs Expansion Area</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>Oil Shale/Coal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prehistoric Quarry Site</td>
<td>160</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Water Reserve</td>
<td>9,386</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Pass Historic Landscape 1</td>
<td>5,260</td>
<td>Coal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Status Plant Species</td>
<td>3,610</td>
<td>Oil Shale/Coal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steamboat Mountain Area 2 (tentative)</td>
<td>43,270</td>
<td>Coal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweetwater Recreation Site</td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweetwater River Segment</td>
<td>3,970</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolar Petroglyph Site</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tri-Territory Marker</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Coal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wind River Front (east) 2</td>
<td>88,510</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>261,804</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Actual withdrawal acreage to be determined.

2 Actual withdrawal acreage for these areas to be determined upon completion of site specific management plans.

### TABLE 5
ESTIMATED ANNUAL ALLOWABLE CUT
(board feet)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timber Unit</th>
<th>Allowable Cut 500,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wind River</td>
<td>250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pine Mountain</td>
<td>130,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little Mountain</td>
<td>115,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry's Fork</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The allowable cut is based on commercial timber acreage in each unit.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Road/Area Identification</th>
<th>Road Names</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Land Ownership</th>
<th>Benefitting Resource</th>
<th>Minerals</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Wildlife</th>
<th>Forestry</th>
<th>Recreation</th>
<th>Lands</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Pine Creek</td>
<td>secs. 19-20, 22, 27, 30. T. 29 N., R. 101 W.</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Prospect Mountain</td>
<td>sec. 23, T. 27 N., R. 104 W.</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Little Colorado</td>
<td>sec. 36, T. 27 N., R. 109 W.</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Bush Rim</td>
<td>sec. 36, T. 24 N., R. 102 W.</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Natural Corrals</td>
<td>sec. 19, T. 21 N., R. 101 W.</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Cedar Canyon Petroglyphs</td>
<td>secs. 1, 13, 15, 19, 21, 23. T. 22 N., R. 104 W.</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>White Mountain Petroglyphs</td>
<td>sec. 19, T. 22 N., R. 104 W.</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Fort LaClede/ Dug Springs</td>
<td>secs. 19, 21, 25, 27. T. 17 N., R. 98 W.</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Canyon Creek</td>
<td>secs. 19, T. 17 N., R. 95 W.</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Currant Creek</td>
<td>secs. 35. T. 15 N., R. 107 W.</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Hickey Mountain</td>
<td>secs. 21-23. T. 12 N., R. 114 W.</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Surface Ownership</td>
<td>Hydrocarbon Potential</td>
<td>(Federal/Surface and Subsurface Acres)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Federal Acres</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Leasing</td>
<td>55,880</td>
<td>20,810</td>
<td>12,230</td>
<td>26,430</td>
<td>59,470</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater Red Creek ACEC</td>
<td>88,510</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>92,990</td>
<td>92,990</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wind River Front (Eastern Portion)</td>
<td>144,390</td>
<td>20,810</td>
<td>12,230</td>
<td>119,420</td>
<td>152,460</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Surface Occupancy (NSO)</td>
<td>144,390</td>
<td>20,810</td>
<td>12,230</td>
<td>119,420</td>
<td>152,460</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14-Mile Recreation Area</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big Sandy River and 1/4 mile buffer (1.5 miles)</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>240</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bozor Trail</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cedar Canyon, LaBarge, Sugarloaf, Tolar, and White Mountain Petroglyphs + 1/2 mile vista</td>
<td>1,600</td>
<td>770</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>1,600</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crookedon Ranch</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cottonwood Canyon</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>160</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Creek Drainage</td>
<td>23,740</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,820</td>
<td>21,200</td>
<td>24,020</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dry Sandy Swales</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emmons Creek</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater Soda Dunes ACEC (developed recreation sites and ORV parking lot)</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LaCedle and Dew Springs Stage Stations</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American Burials</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Corral ACEC</td>
<td>1,115</td>
<td>1,250</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,250</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North and South Table Mountains</td>
<td>1,280</td>
<td>1,280</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,280</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon Buttes ACEC</td>
<td>3,450</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,450</td>
<td>3,450</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pilot Butte</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>120</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pine Butte</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>320</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pine Springs ACEC</td>
<td>6,090</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6,090</td>
<td>6,090</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prehistoric Quarry</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>190</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raptor nesting occupied nests, cliffs, bluffs, roosts, outcrops and pinacles with 1-mile buffer of Lander County and area visible within 3-mile buffer of Oregon Trail</td>
<td>835</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>845</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Pass Historic Landscape (area visible within 1-mile buffer of Lander County and area visible within 3-mile buffer of Oregon Trail)</td>
<td>33,700</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>34,400</td>
<td>35,390</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special status plant species habitat</td>
<td>3,010</td>
<td>2,600</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>3,210</td>
<td>3,620</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweetwater River and 1/4 mile buffer (Wild &amp; Scenic part 5.8 miles)</td>
<td>1,060</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,060</td>
<td>1,060</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tri-Territory Marker</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wild horse herd viewing area + 1/2 mile buffer</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total No Surface Occupancy</td>
<td>79,120</td>
<td>7,130</td>
<td>4,830</td>
<td>69,193</td>
<td>81,261</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seasonal Restrictions</td>
<td>817,640</td>
<td>268,740</td>
<td>335,370</td>
<td>241,780</td>
<td>845,890</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** All acres are measured up to surface boundary only.

**Table 7 (continued):**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Surface Ownership</th>
<th>Hydrocarbon Potential</th>
<th>(Federal/Surface and Subsurface Acres)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Federal Acres</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mule Deer Patrimum Areas</td>
<td>40,900</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raptor Habitat</td>
<td>365,300</td>
<td>263,780</td>
<td>47,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sage Grouse Nesting Areas (1 3/4 mile from lek)</td>
<td>447,170</td>
<td>110,740</td>
<td>218,770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Seasonal Restrictions</td>
<td>1,954,560</td>
<td>934,800</td>
<td>483,870</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Controlled Surface Use Restrictions:**

| Continental Divide Snowmobile Trail (1 1/4 mile buffer) | 0 | 0 | 2,330 | 2,330 |
| Floodplains, wetlands, and riparian areas within 1/10 mile of floodplains and waters | 153,320 | 33,370 | 65,700 | 58,250 | 157,320 |
| Highly erodable soils | 158,110 | 62,590 | 34,390 | 63,200 | 159,890 |
| Historic Trails (1/4 mile or visual horizon) | 64,910 | 44,430 | 25,400 | 23,740 | 83,570 |
| Monument Valley | 69,940 | 69,940 | 0 | 69,940 |
| Pine Mountain and Sugarloaf Basin | 150,080 | 44,800 | 60 | 88,040 | 152,500 |
| Recreation sites + 1/4 mile buffer | 930 | 530 | 150 | 470 | 930 |
| Riparian Areas | 8,730 | 2,780 | 1,714 | 1,940 | 9,438 |
| Sage Creek Watershed | 52,270 | 6,660 | 31,450 | 13,850 | 52,060 |
| Sage Grouse Leks and 1/4 mile buffer | 9,670 | 1,420 | 4,410 | 2,960 | 8,490 |
| Slopes greater than 25% | 188,090 | 84,440 | 29,730 | 83,700 | 197,870 |
| South Pass Historic Landscape (area not visible within 1-mile buffer of Lander County and area not visible within 3-mile buffer of Oregon Trail) | 20,080 | 0 | 460 | 20,640 | 21,100 |
| Special-status plant species potential habitat | 39,870 | 7,090 | 16,890 | 19,690 | 43,670 |
| Steamboat Mountain-Crushed Overlap | 25,600 | 27,000 | 0 | 27,000 |
| Superior Recharge (modified) | 7,120 | 8,180 | 0 | 8,180 |
| View from Fontenelle Reservoir | 120 | 220 | 0 | 220 |
| VRM Class II Lands | 681,560 | 278,500 | 66,200 | 387,140 | 731,640 |
| Within 100 feet inner gorge of intermittent/ephemeral streams | 7,170 | 4,130 | 920 | 2,500 | 7,550 |
| Within 1 1/4 mile on South Fork of Sweetwater River (Recreational part 3.4 miles) | 1,189,340 | 541,320 | 100,250 | 533,850 | 1,255,240 |

**Total Controlled Surface Use Restrictions:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Surface Ownership</th>
<th>Hydrocarbon Potential</th>
<th>(Federal/Surface and Subsurface Acres)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Special Management</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steamboat Mountain ACEC</td>
<td>43,270</td>
<td>44,190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater Sand Dunes ACEC</td>
<td>70,990</td>
<td>56,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rock Springs-Green River Expansion area</td>
<td>26,600</td>
<td>13,860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wind River Front (Eastern Portion)</td>
<td>172,630</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Special Management</td>
<td>313,370</td>
<td>116,650</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1. Acres are measured up to surface boundary only.
2. Refer to Appendix 2 for more details on specific activities.
3. These are the locations of the plants designated as Special Status Plant ACEC. As new populations are identified, their locations will be added in a timely manner.
TABLE 7 (continued)
AREAS OF OIL AND GAS LEASE RESTRICTIONS BY HYDROCARBON POTENTIAL
(approximate acres)\(^1\)

\(^1\)Surface disturbing activities that could adversely affect water quality, and wetland and riparian habitat will avoid the area within 500 feet of or on 100-year floodplains, wetlands, or perennial streams. The 100-year floodplains, wetlands, and riparian areas will be closed to any new permanent facilities. Activities could be allowed if a site specific analysis determines that no adverse impacts would occur (see the Watershed Management section).

\(^1\)All activity will conform with requirements of Class II visual values.

\(^1\)This includes the actual plant sites and potential habitat. Acres will change as floristic inventories identify actual areas with potential. Searches will be required prior to surface disturbance activities.

\(^1\)To be determined with completion of a comprehensive and detailed site specific activity or implementation plan encompassing the combined Steamboat Mountain and Greater Sand Dunes areas.

\(^1\)The Ericson Formation recharge area, for the town of Superior sole source aquifer and overlying formations, will be protected through the use of mitigation.

\(^1\)Leasing will allow for consultation with local communities, and provide direction to protect public health and safety.

\(^1\)Surface disturbing activities will be limited through controlled surface use requirements or closing areas where maximum resource protection is necessary.

TABLE 8
SEASONAL RESTRICTIONS FOR ALL SURFACE DISTURBANCE ACTIVITIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affected Areas</th>
<th>Restriction</th>
<th>Restricted Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Big Game Crucial Winter Ranges</td>
<td>Nov. 15 - April 30</td>
<td>Antelope, elk, moose, and mule deer crucial winter ranges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parturition Areas</td>
<td>May 1 - June 30</td>
<td>Designated parturition areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sage Grouse Leks and Nesting Areas</td>
<td>Feb. 1 - July 31</td>
<td>Up to 2-mile radius of lek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golden Eagle Nest</td>
<td>Feb. 1 - July 31</td>
<td>Within one-half mile radius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osprey Nest</td>
<td>Feb. 1 - July 31</td>
<td>Within one-half mile radius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swainson’s Hawk Nest</td>
<td>Feb. 1 - July 31</td>
<td>Within one-half mile radius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferruginous Hawk Nest</td>
<td>Feb. 1 - July 31</td>
<td>Within one mile radius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coopers Hawk Nest</td>
<td>Feb. 1 - July 31</td>
<td>Within one-half mile radius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burrowing Owl Nest</td>
<td>Feb. 1 - July 31</td>
<td>Within one-half mile radius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merlin Nest</td>
<td>Feb. 1 - July 31</td>
<td>Within one-half mile radius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Raptors</td>
<td>Feb. 1 - July 31</td>
<td>Within one-half mile radius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Game Fish Spawning Areas</td>
<td>Spring spawning.</td>
<td>Determined on case-by-case basis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fall spawning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 9
AREAS CLOSED TO COAL EXPLORATION AND SODIUM PROSPECTING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Approximate Acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14 Mile Recreation Area</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boars Tusk</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crookston Ranch</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Creek Drainage</td>
<td>23,740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dry Sandy Swales</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emmons Cone (including Salt Wells Creek/Bitter Creek)</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floodplains (excluding Salt Wells Creek/Bitter Creek)</td>
<td>95,550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interstate 80 (IB WS)</td>
<td>558</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorporated Cities and Towns</td>
<td>3,770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LaSalde and Dry Springs Stage Stations</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American Burials</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Corridors ABTC</td>
<td>1,115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North and South Table Mountains</td>
<td>1,280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Fork Vermillion Creek</td>
<td>440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon Buttes ABTC</td>
<td>3,450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petroglyphs: Cedar Canyon, LaBarge, Sugarloaf, Tolar, and White Mountain (1/2 mile vista)</td>
<td>1,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pilot Butte</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pine Butte</td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pine Springs ABTC</td>
<td>6,120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pinyon, Quary</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raptor Nesting</td>
<td>8,985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red Creek ABTC</td>
<td>55,880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rock Springs-Green River Expansion Area</td>
<td>26,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sage Grouse Lakes (1/4 mile buffer)</td>
<td>8,170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Pass Historic Landscape</td>
<td>33,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Status Plant Species Sites</td>
<td>3,610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steamboat Mountain Area (outside area w/coal recommendation)</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superior Recharge</td>
<td>1,064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweetwater River (1/4 mile buffer)</td>
<td>1,460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tri-Territory Marker</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union Pacific Railroad</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wild Horse Herd Viewing Area (1/2 mile buffer)</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilderness Study Areas</td>
<td>172,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Defined and completed in the area-specific implementation plan*

---

TABLE 10
SUMMARY DESCRIPTION OF COAL SCREENING PROCESS RESULTS AND COAL MANAGEMENT ACTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coal Screening Process Results</th>
<th>Federal Coal Lands (acres)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Federal Coal Development Potential Area</td>
<td>475,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leased Federal Coal Lands (not evaluated)</td>
<td>(30,200)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Coal Lands Unsuitable for (closed to) Leasing Consideration</td>
<td>(12,600)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Coal Lands Unacceptable for (closed to) Leasing Consideration</td>
<td>(10,410)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Coal Management Actions

- Remaining Federal Coal Lands Acceptable for Leasing Consideration: 422,490
- Portion Subject to No Surface Occupancy Restriction: 13,340
- Portion Potentially Subject to a No Surface Occupancy on Raptor Habitat: 112,920
- Portion Subject to No Surface Mining Restriction and Limited Surface Facilities Restriction: 13,042
### Table 11
AREAS CLOSED TO MINERAL MATERIAL SALES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Approximate Acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14 Mile</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big Sandy and 1/4 mile Butler</td>
<td>480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boars Tank</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cedar Canyon ACEC</td>
<td>360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cottonwood Canyon</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crookston Ranch</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curant Creek Drainage</td>
<td>23.740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dry Sandy Swales</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dug Springs Stage Station</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emmons Cone</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LaClede Stage Station</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American Burial Sites</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Corrals ACEC</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North and South Table Mountains</td>
<td>1,280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied Raptor Nests</td>
<td>835</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon Buttes ACEC</td>
<td>3,450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parting of the Ways</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pilot Butte</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pine Butte</td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pine Springs ACEC</td>
<td>6,030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prehistoric Quarry Site</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red Crk ACEC</td>
<td>55,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rock Art Sites</td>
<td>1,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sand Dunes ACEC</td>
<td>41,640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Pass Historic Landscape ACEC</td>
<td>5,260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Pass Historic Landscape (on the Vista and outside the 5,260 of the ACEC)</td>
<td>53,780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Status Plant Species Sites</td>
<td>3,610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steamboat Mountain ACEC</td>
<td>5,150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweetwater River and 1/4 Mile Buffer</td>
<td>1,460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wild Horse Viewing</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL ACRES: 245,342

**NOTE:** Surface, historic, prehistoric materials of the pre-modern period would be considered in these areas due to U.S. law.

**Footnote:** Completion of site-specific, implementation plan.

### Table 12
AREAS CLOSED TO GEOPHYSICAL VEHICLES & EXPLOSIVE CHARGES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Approximate Acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14-Mile Recreation Area</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boars Tank</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Status Plant Species Locations</td>
<td>3,610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cedar Canyon Petroglyphs</td>
<td>515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crookston Ranch</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dry Sandy Swales (1 mile)</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dug Springs Stage Station</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lathage Bluffs Petroglyphs</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LaClede Stage Station</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American Burial Sites</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Corrals</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon Trail/Farthing of the Ways</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pine Springs ACEC</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prehistoric Quarry Site</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sugarloaf Petroglyphs</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolar Petroglyphs</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Mountain Petroglyphs</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilderness Study Areas (excluding Adobe Town)</td>
<td>72,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL: 177,117

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AREA</th>
<th>DESIGNATION</th>
<th>APPROXIMATE ACRES</th>
<th>SEASON/DATES OF RESTRICTION AND REASON FOR RESTRICTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adobe Town-Haystacks</td>
<td>Limited to designated roads &amp; trails</td>
<td>54,000</td>
<td>To protect fragile and highly erodible soils.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big Game Winter Ranges</td>
<td>Limited through seasonal closures (11/15 - 4/30 as needed)</td>
<td>1,500,000</td>
<td>To reduce stress to wintering animals. Closure to over-the-snow vehicles would be evaluated on a case-by-case basis in conjunction with the Wyoming Game &amp; Fish Department.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cedar Canyon ACEC</td>
<td>Limited to designated roads and trails</td>
<td>2,550</td>
<td>Limited to protect wildlife and cultural values (including over-the-snow vehicles).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crookston Ranch</td>
<td>Closed</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>To protect historic site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deer Parturition Areas</td>
<td>Limited through seasonal closures (May 1 to June 30 as needed)</td>
<td>40,880</td>
<td>To reduce stress to deer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dry Sandy Swales</td>
<td>Closed</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Area closed to protect integrity of setting and soils.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dug Springs Stage Station</td>
<td>Limited to designated roads and trails</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Limited to protect historic values.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elk Calving Areas</td>
<td>Limited through seasonal closures (to be decided by biologist - May 1 to June 30 as needed)</td>
<td>85,830</td>
<td>To reduce stress to elk.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General GRRA</td>
<td>Limited to existing roads and trails</td>
<td>2,436,595</td>
<td>To reduce resource damage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater Red Creek ACEC</td>
<td>Closed</td>
<td>8,020</td>
<td>Area closed to protect watershed values.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater Sand Dunes ACEC (Eastern Portion)</td>
<td>Limited to designated roads and trails (includes Currant Creek, Sage Creek, and remainder of Red Creek)</td>
<td>123,870</td>
<td>To protect watershed values. Transportation planning would be done to protect resource values.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Open</td>
<td>10,500</td>
<td>Area designated open on active sand dunes to allow the recreating public a place to play in the sand dunes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Limited to existing roads and trails</td>
<td>5,810</td>
<td>Limited to protect resource values.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Closed</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>Closed around Boars Tusk to protect geologic values.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AREA</td>
<td>DESIGNATION</td>
<td>APPROXIMATE ACRES</td>
<td>SEASON/DATES OF RESTRICTION AND REASON FOR RESTRICTION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green River City Limits</td>
<td>Limited to designated roads and trails within a 2-mile radius around the city limits</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td>To reduce impacts from ORV freplay.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LaBarge Bluffs Petroglyphs</td>
<td>Closed</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Area closed to protect cultural values.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LaClede Stage Station</td>
<td>Limited to designated roads and trails</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Limited to protect cultural values.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monument Valley</td>
<td>Limited to designated roads and trails</td>
<td>69,940</td>
<td>To protect paleontological and watershed values. A transportation road plan would be prepared.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moose Calving Areas</td>
<td>Limited through seasonal closures (to be decided by biologist - May 1 to June 30 as needed)</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>To reduce stress to moose.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Corrals ACEC</td>
<td>Closed</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>NRHP site and the trail 1/2 mile to the spring are closed to protect wildlife and cultural values.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Limited to designated road and trails</td>
<td>1,300</td>
<td>Limited to protect resource values.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North &amp; South Table Mountains</td>
<td>Limited to designated roads and trails</td>
<td>1,280</td>
<td>Limited to protect cultural and wildlife values.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon Buttes ACEC</td>
<td>Closed</td>
<td>3,450</td>
<td>All of the ACEC is closed to vehicle traffic to protect adjacent WSA values.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patting of the Ways</td>
<td>Limited to designated roads and trails</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Limited to protect historical values.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pine Mountain</td>
<td>Limited to designated roads and trails</td>
<td>64,200</td>
<td>To protect watershed values. Transportation planning would be done to protect resource values.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pine Springs ACEC</td>
<td>Closed</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>Closed yearlong within fences including over the snow vehicles to protect cultural values.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Closed</td>
<td>5,940</td>
<td>Closed yearlong - including over the snow vehicles to protect cultural and prehistoric values.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Limited to existing roads and trails</td>
<td>740</td>
<td>Limited to protect resource values.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AREA</td>
<td>DESIGNATION</td>
<td>APPROXIMATE ACRES</td>
<td>SEASON/DATES OF RESTRICTION AND REASON FOR RESTRICTION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prehistoric Quarry Site</td>
<td>Closed</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>Area closed to protect cultural values.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raptor Nesting Areas</td>
<td>Limited through seasonal closures (2/1 through 7/31)</td>
<td>835</td>
<td>To protect nesting raptors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red Desert</td>
<td>Limited to designated roads and trails</td>
<td>245,480</td>
<td>Limited to protect scenic resource values.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riparian Areas</td>
<td>Limited to existing roads and trails</td>
<td>8,730</td>
<td>To protect riparian and watershed values. During muddy conditions vehicle travel will be limited to existing roads and trails to protect soil and watershed values.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sage Creek Mountain</td>
<td>Limited to existing roads and trails</td>
<td>1,300</td>
<td>Limited to protect cultural values and T&amp;E plants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Pass</td>
<td>Limited to designated roads and trails</td>
<td>33,700</td>
<td>Limited to protect cultural resource values.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Status Plant Species</td>
<td>Closed</td>
<td>3,610</td>
<td>Closed yearlong to protect plant populations. (Does not apply to over-the-snow vehicles.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steamboat Mountain ACEC</td>
<td>Limited to designated roads and trails</td>
<td>43,270</td>
<td>To protect wildlife values.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steep Slopes of White Mountain</td>
<td>Limited to designated roads and trails</td>
<td>68,640</td>
<td>To protect watershed and visual values.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sugarloft Basin</td>
<td>Limited to designated roads and trails</td>
<td>85,880</td>
<td>To protect watershed values. Transportation planning would be done to protect resource values.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sugarloft Petroglyphs</td>
<td>Closed</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Area closed to protect cultural values.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited to designated roads and trails</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>Limited to protect cultural values.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolar Petroglyphs</td>
<td>Closed</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Area closed to protect cultural values.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited to designated roads and trails</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>Limited within 1/2 mile radius to protect cultural values.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Mountain Petroglyphs ACEC</td>
<td>Closed</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Closed to maintain integrity of setting and protect cultural values. Vehicle travel limited to parking area. All other acreage is closed to vehicle travel.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited to designated roads and trails</td>
<td>980</td>
<td>Limited within 1/2 mile radius.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 13 (continued)
**ORV DESIGNATIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AREA</th>
<th>DESIGNATION</th>
<th>APPROXIMATE ACRES</th>
<th>SEASON/DATES OF RESTRICTION AND REASON FOR RESTRICTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wilderness Study Areas</td>
<td>Closed</td>
<td>172.160</td>
<td>To protect naturalness, solitude, and opportunities for unconfined recreation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wind River Front Special Recreation Management Area</td>
<td>Limited to designated roads and trails</td>
<td>260.580</td>
<td>To protect the Class I airshed, scenic, watershed, and wildlife values, recreation use, and riparian and vegetation resources.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE:** WSAs in the resource area (excluding Adobe Town) are closed to non-motorized mechanical transport, as well as motorized transport.

### TABLE 15
**WILD HORSE APPROPRIATE MANAGEMENT LEVELS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>AML (ft)</th>
<th>VRM Class</th>
<th>VRM Class</th>
<th>Approximate Acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adobe Town</td>
<td>165-215</td>
<td>Class I</td>
<td>681,560</td>
<td>2.251,810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little Colorado Area</td>
<td>60-100</td>
<td>Class II</td>
<td>623,700</td>
<td>24,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saline Creek WHIMA</td>
<td>211-265</td>
<td>Class III</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Mountain WHIMA</td>
<td>205-300</td>
<td>Class IV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Divide Basin WHIMA</td>
<td>415-640</td>
<td>Class V</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*By definition, rehabilitation is necessary to bring these areas up to one of the four other classes.

### TABLE 14
**VRM CLASSES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rehabilitation Areas</th>
<th>Class I</th>
<th>Class II</th>
<th>Class III</th>
<th>Class IV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>681,560</td>
<td>623,700</td>
<td>623,700</td>
<td>24,100</td>
<td>24,100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

24,100
The Resource Management Plan shall be revised as necessary, based on monitoring and evaluation findings, new data, new or revised policy and changes in circumstances affecting the entire plan or major portions of the plan.
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Figure 2 (continued)

1 Appropriate management actions are derived through the Wildland Fire Situation Analysis and are generally based on the following criteria.

- **Scale value = 1**
  - Suppression tactic is generally full control
  - High protection values
  - High rehabilitation costs
  - High suppression costs
  - High Risk Management
  - Fire Suppression constraints: Extremely Limited to None

- **Scale value = 2**
  - Modified Suppression tactics
  - Moderate Suppression costs
  - Large rehabilitation needs
  - High resource values
  - Moderate Risk
  - Prescribed fire limited to areas easily protected
  - Fire Suppression constraints: Moderately Limited to None

- **Scale value = 3**
  - Limited Suppression tactics
  - Low Suppression costs
  - Low rehabilitation needs
  - Prescribed fire use is important
  - Fire Dependent Ecosystems involved
  - High or moderate resource values
  - Low risk
  - Fire Suppression constraints: Use of heavy equipment limited
  - Retardant limited
  - Complete rehab of fire lines

- **Scale value = 4**
  - Limited use of suppression tactics
  - Prescribed fire used on a landscape basis
  - Moderate Suppression costs
  - Fire rehabilitation is inappropriate
  - Resource values complimented by fire
  - Fire Suppression constraints: Same as 3 plus:
  - No dug fire lines
  - Natural boundaries used extensively
  - Fire costs may not exceed value

- **Scale value = 5**
  - Suppression tactics viewed as ecosystem threatening or opposing.
  - Prescribed fire use on landscape basis both management and natural ignited.
  - Resource values highly dependent on fire.
  - Fire Suppression constraints: Same as 4 plus:
  - Extensive use of resource monitoring

---
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APPENDIX 1

ACEC CRITERIA

As part of the process for developing the Green River Resource Management Plan, BLM planning team members reviewed all BLM administered public lands in the planning area to determine if any areas should be considered for designation as Areas of Critical Environmental Concern (ACECs) or if any existing ACEC designations should be modified or terminated. Only BLM administered public lands (i.e., public lands surface) can be considered for ACEC designation.

To be eligible for designation as an ACEC, an area must meet the relevance and importance criteria described in 43 CFR 1603.72 and BLM Manual 1613.

Relevance and Importance are defined as follows:

1. Relevance. There shall be present a significant historic, cultural, or scenic value; a fish or wildlife resource; or other natural system or process; or natural hazard.

2. Importance. The above described value, resource, system process; or hazard shall have substantial significance and values. This generally requires qualities of more than local significance and special worth, consequence, meaning, distinctiveness, or cause for concern. A natural hazard can be important if it is a significant threat to life or property.

An area meets the "relevance" criteria if it contains one or more of the following:

1. A significant historic cultural, or scenic value (including but not limited to rare or sensitive archaeological resources and religious or cultural resources important to Native Americans).

2. A fish or wildlife resource (including but not limited to habitat for endangered sensitive, or threatened species, or habitat essential for maintaining species diversity).

3. A natural process or system (including but not limited to ecologically sensitive, or threatened plant species, rare, endemic, or relic plants or plant communities which are terrestrial, aquatic, or riparian or rare geological features).

4. Natural hazards (including but not limited to areas of avalanche, dangerous flooding, landslides, unstable soils, seismic activity, or dangerous winds). A hazard caused by human action may meet the relevance criteria if it is determined through the resource management planning process that it has become part of a natural process.

An area meets the "importance" criteria if it further meets one of the following:

1. Has more than locally significant qualities which give it special worth, consequence, meaning, distinctiveness, or cause for concern, especially compared to any similar resource.

2. Has qualities or circumstances that make it fragile, sensitive, rare, impermanent, exemplary, unique, endangered, threatened, or vulnerable to adverse change.

3. Has been recommended or has significant national priority concern to carry out the mandates of the EPWSM.

4. Has qualities which warrant highlighting in order to satisfy public or management concerns about safety and public welfare.

5. Poses a significant threat to human life and safety or to property.

Table A1 shows the areas that were identified in the review and the BLM relevance and importance determinations for them were made. The Green River RMP interdisciplinary team identified seven existing ACECs potential expansions to three of the existing ACECs, and eleven potential new ACECs, to be addressed during the Green River RMP planning effort.

Of the 21 areas and expansions reviewed, the BLM administered lands on four lands were found to not meet the criteria and were dropped from further consideration. Identification was determined on one area, until a more complete review could be conducted. The BLM administered lands on the seven existing ACECs were found to meet the criteria and were retained. Based on the criteria, expansions were recommended for two of those. Three of the 11 potential new ACECs were also found to meet the criteria and were recommended in the Proposed Plans for the Final FIS. One of the three proposed ACECs includes the four candidate plant areas recommended in the Draft FIS.
### TABLE A1-1
**EVALUATION OF ACEC RELEVANCE AND IMPORTANCE CRITERIA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXISTING OR PROPOSED ACECs</th>
<th>RELEVANCE CRITERIA (resources)</th>
<th>IMPORTANCE CRITERIA</th>
<th>RECOMMENDED</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BIG SANDY RIVER (Proposed 1 mile)</td>
<td>Criterion 1</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>Meets relevance criteria for historic values. The area did not meet the importance criteria.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEDAR CANYON (Existing)</td>
<td>Criteria 1,2,3</td>
<td>Criteria 1,2,3</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>Meets the relevance and importance criteria for cultural, raptor, and wildlife values, as identified when originally designated an ACEC. The ACEC designation should be retained.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GREATER RED CREEK (Existing and proposed expansion, formerly Tri-State Monument)</td>
<td>Criteria 1,2,3,4</td>
<td>Criteria 1,2,3</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>Meets the relevance and importance criteria for unstable fragile soils, unique ecological features, watershed and cultural values, and sensitive species of regional, national, and international importance. The values of the existing Red Creek ACEC remain the same as identified when Red Creek was originally designated an ACEC. The ACEC designation should be retained and should be expanded to include the Sage Creek and Currant Creek drainages.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GREATER SAND DUNES (Existing)</td>
<td>Criteria 1,2,3</td>
<td>Criteria 1,2,3,4</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>Meets the relevance and importance criteria for outstanding geologic features, prehistoric and historic values of national significance, and recreation values of regional/national importance, as identified when originally designated an ACEC. The ACEC designation should be retained.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KNOWN SODIUM LEASING AREA (Proposed)</td>
<td>deferred</td>
<td>deferred</td>
<td>deferred</td>
<td>Public comment on the RMP Draft EIS recommended consideration of the KSLA for ACEC designation due to an outstanding mineral of regional/national importance. However, the potential for ACEC designation should consider the entire KSLA as a whole and most of the area is within the Kemmerer Resource Area. This area would be deferred for special study and analyzed separately from this document.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MONUMENT VALLEY (Proposed)</td>
<td>deferred</td>
<td>deferred</td>
<td>deferred</td>
<td>Potentially outstanding geologic features, prehistoric and historic values of national significance, recreation values. Further information would be obtained on the actual values present and their relevance and importance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXISTING OR PROPOSED ACECs</td>
<td>RELEVANCE CRITERIA (resources)</td>
<td>IMPORTANCE CRITERIA</td>
<td>RECOMMENDED</td>
<td>COMMENTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NATURAL CORRALS (Existing)</td>
<td>Criteria 1, 3</td>
<td>Criteria 1, 2</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>Meets the relevance and importance criteria for unique volcanic monoliths, prehistoric values of national significance, and outstanding recreation opportunities as identified when originally designated an ACEC. The ACEC designation should be retained.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NATURAL CORRALS EXPANSION (Proposed)</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>Public comment requested expansion of the ACEC. However, the highest value resources were determined to be found within the existing ACEC boundary, and the expansion area did not meet relevance and importance criteria. Also, much of the area identified for expansion is on private land and not under administrative jurisdiction or the BLM.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NORTH AND SOUTH TABLE MOUNTAINS (Proposed)</td>
<td>Criteria 1, 3</td>
<td>Criteria 1, 2</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>The values in this area do not need special emphasis to be effectively managed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OREGON BUTTES (Existing)</td>
<td>Criteria 1, 3</td>
<td>Criteria 1, 2</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>Meets the relevance and importance criteria for historic values and geologic landmark of national significance as identified when originally designated an ACEC. The ACEC designation should be retained.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PINE SPRINGS (Existing)</td>
<td>Criterion 1</td>
<td>Criteria 1, 2</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>Meets the relevance and importance criteria for cultural values of national significance as identified when originally designated an ACEC. The ACEC designation should be retained.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PINE SPRINGS EXPANSION (Proposed)</td>
<td>Criterion 1</td>
<td>Criteria 1, 2</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>Meets the relevance and importance criteria for cultural values of national significance. The ACEC designation for Pine Springs should be expanded to include this area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLAYA LAKES AREAS (Proposed)</td>
<td>Criterion 1</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>The area did not have more than local significance and did not meet the importance criteria. The values in this area do not need special emphasis to be effectively managed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXISTING OR PROPOSED ACECs</td>
<td>RELEVANCE CRITERIA (resources)</td>
<td>IMPORTANCE CRITERIA</td>
<td>RECOMMENDED</td>
<td>COMMENTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RED DESERT WATERSHED (Proposed)</td>
<td>Criteria 1.3</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>The area did not meet the importance criteria. Where values need special management emphasis, this has been provided. However, as a unit, the area does not need special emphasis to be effectively managed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIPARIAN AREAS (Proposed)</td>
<td>Criteria 2.3</td>
<td>Criteria 2.3</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>The values in these areas already receive special management emphasis through various BLM programs, and the ACEC designation is unnecessary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUTH PASS HISTORIC LANDSCAPE (Proposed)</td>
<td>Criterion 1</td>
<td>Criteria 1.2.3</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>Meets the relevance and importance criteria for historic and scenic values of national significance, and for outstanding geographic features. The values in this area need special emphasis to be effectively managed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPECIAL STATUS (CANDIDATE) PLAN SPECIES (Proposed)</td>
<td>Criterion 3</td>
<td>Criteria 1.2.3</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>Meets the relevance criteria for natural processes or systems and importance criteria of more than local significance qualities, fragile, sensitive, rare and vulnerable to adverse change, and warrants protection to satisfy national priority concerns and carry out the mandates of FLPMA. The values in this area need special emphasis to be effectively managed. <em>Arabidopsis pusilla</em> is proposed for listing as a Threatened and Endangered species.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STEAMBOAT MOUNTAIN (Proposed)</td>
<td>Criteria 1.2.3</td>
<td>Criteria 1.2</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>Meets the relevance and importance criteria for wildlife and cultural values of national significance. Unique habitat features found nowhere else in the Resource Area. The values in this area need special emphasis to be effectively managed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHITE MOUNTAIN PETROGLYPHS (Existing)</td>
<td>Criterion 1</td>
<td>Criteria 1.2</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>Meets the relevance and importance criterion for cultural values of national significance as identified when the area was originally designated an ACEC. The ACEC designation should be retained.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 2

WYOMING BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT (BLM) MITIGATION GUIDELINES FOR SURFACE DISTURBING AND DISRUPTIVE ACTIVITIES

INTRODUCTION

These guidelines are primarily for the use of any agency or person currently the holder of any surface use permits. These guidelines state that for the 100,000-year-old parkway which is designated as a National Recreation Area, the BLM will not grant any area that is designated by the federal government for public use.

Because of the mitigation guidelines, the BLM has the right to modify the operations of any agency or person currently the holder of any surface use permits. These guidelines state that for the 100,000-year-old parkway which is designated as a National Recreation Area, the BLM will not grant any area that is designated by the federal government for public use.

MIGRATION GUIDELINES

1. Surface Disturbance Mitigation Guidelines

Surface disturbance will be prohibited in all of the following areas or conditions:

- Within important scenic areas.
- Within important wildlife areas.
- Within coastal areas.
- Within important historical areas.
- Within important riparian areas.
- Within areas of special geological, agricultural, or visual interest.

Guidance

The intent of the SURFACE DISTURBTANT MITIGATION GUIDELINES is to inform permitted entities of the limitations and requirements. The BLM has the right to modify the operations of any agency or person currently the holder of any surface use permits. These guidelines state that for the 100,000-year-old parkway which is designated as a National Recreation Area, the BLM will not grant any area that is designated by the federal government for public use.

2. Wildlife Mitigation Guidelines

a. To protect riparian wildlife habitats, areas of critical importance to the riparian wildlife habitats, and areas designated as critical habitat for species designated as endangered species,

b. To protect designated critical habitat areas, and areas designated as critical habitat which are not yet protected under the Endangered Species Act.

Guidance

The WILDLIFE MITIGATION GUIDELINE is intended to protect the activities of wildlife, including those of the species designated as endangered species. The intent of the WILDLIFE MITIGATION GUIDELINE is to protect the activities of wildlife, including those of the species designated as endangered species.
Mitigation of paleontological and natural history sites will be treated on a case-by-case basis. Factors such as site significance, economics, safety, and project urgency must be taken into account when making a decision to mitigate. Authority to protect (through mitigation) such values is provided for in FLPMA, Section 102(a)(8). When avoidance is not possible, appropriate mitigation may include excavation (data recovery), stabilization, monitoring, protection barriers and signs, or other physical and administrative protection measures.

4. Special Resource Mitigation Guideline

To protect (resource value), activities or surface use will not be allowed (i.e., within a specific distance of the resource value or between date to date) in (legal description).

Application of this limitation to operation and maintenance of a developed project must be based on environmental analysis of the operational or production aspects.

Exception, waiver, or modification of this limitation in any year may be approved in writing, including documented supporting analysis, by the Authorized Officer.

Example Resource Categories (Select or identify category and specific resource value):

a. Recreation areas.
b. Special natural history or paleontological features.
c. Special management areas.
d. Sections of major rivers.
e. Prior existing rights-of-way.
f. Occupied dwellings.
g. Other (specify).

Guidance

The SPECIAL RESOURCE MITIGATION GUIDELINE is intended for use only in site-specific situations where one of the first three general mitigation guidelines will not adequately address the concern. The resource value, location, and specific restrictions must be clearly identified. A detailed plan addressing specific mitigation and special restrictions will be required prior to disturbance or development and will become a condition for approval of the permit, plan of development, or other use authorization.

Exception, waiver, or modification of requirements developed from this guideline must be based upon environmental analysis of proposals (e.g., activity plans, plans of development, plans of operation, applications for permit to drill) and, if necessary, must allow for other mitigation to be applied on a site-specific basis.

5. No Surface Occupancy Guideline

No Surface Occupancy will be allowed on the following described lands (legal description) because of (resource value).

Example Resource Categories (Select or identify category and specific resource value):

a. Recreation Areas (e.g., campgrounds, historic trails, national monuments).
b. Major reservoirs/dams.
c. Special management area (e.g., known threatened or endangered species habitat, areas suitable for consideration for wild and scenic rivers designation).
d. Other (specify).

Guidance

The NO SURFACE OCCUPANCY (NSO) MITIGATION GUIDELINE is intended for use only when other mitigation is determined insufficient to adequately protect the public interest and is the only alternative to "no development" or "no leasing." The legal description and resource value of concern must be identified and be tied to an NSO land use planning decision.

Waiver of, or exception(s) to, the NSO requirement will be subject to the same test used to initially justify its imposition. If it is found that less restrictive mitigation would adequately protect the public interest or value of concern, then a waiver or exception to the NSO requirement is possible. The record must show that because conditions or uses have changed, less restrictive requirements will protect the public interest. An environmental analysis must be conducted and documented (e.g., environmental assessment, environmental impact statement, etc.) as necessary in order to provide the basis for a waiver or exception to an NSO planning decision. Modification of the NSO requirement will pertain only to refinement or correction of the locations to which it applied. If the waiver, exception, or modification is found to be consistent with the intent of the planning decision, it may be granted. If found inconsistent with the intent of the planning decision, a plan amendment would be required before the waiver, exception, or modification could be granted.

When considering the "no development" or "no leasing" option, a rigorous test must be met and fully documented in the record. This test must be based upon stringent standards described in the land use planning document. Since rejection of all development rights is more severe than the most restrictive mitigation requirement, the record must show that consideration was given to development subject to reasonable mitigation, including "no surface occupancy." The record must also show that other mitigation was determined to be insufficient to adequately protect the public interest. A "no development" or "no leasing" decision should not be made solely because it appears that conventional methods of development would be feasible, especially where an NSO restriction may be acceptable to a potential permittee. In such cases, the potential permittee should have the opportunity to decide whether or not to go ahead with the proposal (or accept the use authorization), recognizing that an NSO restriction is involved.
INTRODUCTION
Since the Federal coal lands within the Green River Resource Area were reviewed and evaluated in 1981, there have been some changes in the Federal coal area in this time--in the coal screening/planning procedures. In addition, a considerable amount of new coal resource data has been compiled that has resulted in identifying a significantly larger area and amount of Federal coal having development potential. The status of other land and resource values and uses in the coal development potential area have also changed. Thus, the 1981 coal planning results have become outdated and are unsuitable as a viable planning base for managing the Federal coal program in the planning area.

The purpose for conducting another review and evaluation of the coal resources within the Green River Resource Area in this time--to update the coal resource data, the coal screening results and the coal planning decisions for the Federal coal area with the new data and information gathered since 1981. This information and the results of the new review will be used to provide the opportunities for the Federal coal development of Federal coal in an orderly and timely manner, consistent with the Federal coal policies, environmental integrity, national energy needs, and related demands. Development of this RMP EIS will serve as a model for public input to the coal screening process.

CONSULTATION AND COORDINATION
Two Federal Register Notices were published requesting and/or providing information on the coal screening process. On September 30, 1988 vol. 53, no. 190, p. 30621; a call for coal and other resource input was made. The specific information was provided as a result of this notice.

A letter dated February 12, 1988, 57, no. 23, p. 56023; the Notice of Availability of the Draft EIS for the RMP was published. Fifteen comments regarding coal were received and printed in Appendix 1 of the Final EIS.

A letter with a map of the proposed coal potential area was mailed on March 7, 1988 reiterating information on coal potential. Four responses were received that supported the potential area, or coal activities in general.

UNSUITABILITY Criteria
Comments received from the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and the Wyoming Game and Fish Department as required under the consultation process of the coal unsuitability criteria (43 CFR 1836) are summarized as follows:

Comments concerning Criteria 9 and 10 for Federal land unsuitability criteria. State described general criteria for determining unsuitability of Federal land based on the identification of areas with Federal coal development potential. The Wyoming Game and Fish Department stressed the importance of considering areas that are acceptable for Federal mining and development within the critical habitat for the Greater Sage Grouse.

COAL SCREENING/PLANNING PROCEDURES
The Federal coal Management Program established four major steps to be used in the identification of Federal coal areas that are acceptable for coal development.

1. Coal screening
2. Coal development
3. Coal production
4. Coal development

Coal screening procedures are to be used to determine if a Federal coal area is acceptable for coal development. The Wyoming Game and Fish Department assisted in the coal screening/planning procedures.

HOW THE PROCEDURES ARE APPLIED
To help clarify the coal screening process conducted in the planning area, two categories of coal and land/onshore relationships are identified: 1) competitive Federal coal lease areas and 2) areas where Federal-owned land surface or water or primarily owned coal. The Federal coal opportunities were applied to the Federal coal and development potential areas where identified.

Application of coal unsuitability criteria to all known and assumed potential areas.

Step 1 - Identification of Coal Development Potential
All areas of known and assumed Federal coal development potential for both surface and subsurface mining were identified using geological and economic data submitted by coal companies and interpretation of available geological data from various other sources. The process adopted for the Federal coal development potential areas where identified.

Step 2 - Application of Coal Unsuitability Criteria
24 coal unsuitability criteria were applied to all known and assumed development potential areas.

Step 3 - Multiple Use Conflict Evaluation
This step is a review of the Federal coal lands that remain acceptable after applying the coal unsuitability criteria. It involves considering the impacts of Federal coal mining and development on multiple uses. This step is concerned with the unsuitability criteria and identifying areas that would be "unsuitable" for coal surface mining or for surface mining or development.

Step 4 - Surface Owner Consultation
This section addresses the surface mining control and reclamation act (SMCRA) regulations. It is consistent with certain qualified areas of private coal leases and private coal development of Federal coal owned when mining or as the Federal coal is being conducted. It is consistent with the public review and comment periods for the Draft EIS.

This step does not apply to areas where only subsurface mining is being conducted. It is used only for those private coal leases and private coal development that are owned by the Federal coal when mining or as the Federal coal is being conducted. It is consistent in providing for public review and comment periods for the Draft EIS.

This section describes or identifies qualified areas or surface owners that are interested in applying the coal development and surface mining methods on Federal lands.

This section describes or identifies qualified areas or surface owners that are interested in applying the coal development and surface mining methods on Federal lands.
Step 1 - Identification of Coal Development Potential

The areas of known and assumed coal development potential are shown on Map 3.

Step 2 - Application of Coal Unsuitability Criteria

This following discussion briefly explains the suitability criteria in application of each unsuitability criteria.


The Federal coal lands and the Federal surface and water system in the region of the town of Rock Springs and Superior, were determined to be unsuitable for coal mining and related surface operations and impacts.

Rationale: There are no exceptions available that would allow continuation of coal mining and development within incorporated cities, towns, and villages.

Criterion Number 2. Rights-of-Way and Exemptions

Only those Federal coal lands and Federal surface and water systems along the Interstate 80 and Union Pacific Railroad rights of way, were determined to be unsuitable for coal mining and related surface operations and impacts.

Rationale: After applying the exceptions to this criterion in the coal lands along the Interstate 80 and Union Pacific Railroad rights of way, pivotal unsuitable became coal development would create unacceptable surface conditions, and costs associated with relocation of these rights-of-way. Most of the other rights-of-way crossing the coal development potential area are located to accommodate existing surface and related activities. Thus, a general determination was made that most rights-of-way across the coal development potential area are located to accommodate existing surface and related activities. Thus, a general determination was made that most rights-of-way across the coal development potential area are located to accommodate existing surface and related activities. Thus, a general determination was made that most rights-of-way across the coal development potential area are located to accommodate existing surface and related activities. Thus, a general determination was made that most rights-of-way across the coal development potential area are located to accommodate existing surface and related activities. Thus, a general determination was made that most rights-of-way across the coal development potential area are located to accommodate existing surface and related activities. Thus, a general determination was made that most rights-of-way across the coal development potential area are located to accommodate existing surface and related activities.
Citation Number 15. Habitat for State High-Interest Wildlife and Plants.

No areas were determined to be unsuitable under this criterion. The greater Cooper Ridge and Elk Butte areas were determined to be acceptable for cropland development for Federal cropland leasing and development, pending further analysis.

Rationale: The primary habitat considerations involved with the cropland development area were the big game crucial winter ranges, elk calving areas, grouse leks and nesting areas, and burrowing nesting areas. It was determined that these habitat areas would be acceptable for cropland development with a provision that any Federal cropland lease issued in these areas would include a requirement for developing appropriate mitigation measures that would protect the long-term interest of the species and habitats involved.

The requirement of a specific activity that would have the effect that the lease would be required to develop mitigation measures or habitat improvements at the extrapolation points (in connection with mining and reclamation plans to meet the requirements of BLM and the appropriate State agencies. Mitigation measures may include but would not be limited to such things as seasonal operations in some areas, oil or on site habitat improvement or development, such as a specific peatland mitigation plan, or other appropriate measures for long-term habitat protection.

Concerning the Greater Cooper Ridge and Elk Butte Areas.

The greater Cooper Ridge and Elk Butte areas about 25.796 acres and 43.88 million tons of coal were determined to be acceptable for further consideration for Federal cropland development and leasing, pending further analysis. This analysis is for the purpose of defining the extent of any deer and antelope crucial winter range in the area and for determining the effects of certain cropland operations on the area. In the summary of the unsuitable criteria, the cropland development activities are considered.

Concerning Group 3 Areas. 1. Active grouse leks (sexually and shortpaired) and the area within 1/4 mile radius of active leks about 66.7 acres and 1 million tons of coal were determined to be acceptable for cropland development. Exploration activities and ancillary facilities would be allowed provided that such activities and ancillary facilities are related to exploration or ancillary facility development avoid the lek and 1/4 mile radius areas, if possible, and where not possible, intensive mitigation was applied to the basic features and other elements of the leks. Microhabitat structure such as buildings, overhead powerlines, other types of ancillary facilities, etc., were prohibited in these areas; and 13) during the grouse mating season, surface uses and services were prohibited between the hours of 6:00 p.m. and 6:00 a.m. with the exception of ski trails.

Grouse nesting areas (sex or shortpaired) were determined to be acceptable for further consideration for Federal cropland development and leasing with certain restrictions. Exploration activities and ancillary facilities will be allowed with the following requirement: If an area is adversely affected by cropland mining and related surface operations, surface uses and activities will be delayed in the area of influence for the next nesting season.

Citation Number 16. Riverine, Coastal, and Special Floodplains.

The floodplains of Butcher Creek and Salt Wells Creek were determined to be unsuitable for cropland mining and related surface operations and impacts.

Citation Number 17. Municipal Watersheds.

The Federal cropland lands within the municipal watershed for the town of Superior were determined to be unsuitable for cropland mining and related surface operations and impacts.

Rationale: These lands are a part of the surface stayage of the Escrion Formation and the associated archeic area, in the area outlined above. The Town of Superior is drinking water from wells drifted on the Escrion Formation. In consultation with the Town of Superior, it was determined that the escape of water from this area could not be permitted.

Citation Number 18. National Resource Waters.

No areas were determined to be unsuitable under this criterion.

Rationale: No National Resource Waters, within the cropland development area, were identified by the State of Wyoming in its water quality management plan.

Citation Number 19. Alluvial Valley Floors.

No areas were determined to be unsuitable under this criterion.

Rationale: No alluvial valley floors have been identified by the State of Wyoming or BLM within the cropland development area.

Citation Number 20. Unsuitability Criteria Proposed by a State or an Indian Tribe.

No areas were determined to be unsuitable under this criterion.

Rationale: Neither the State of Wyoming nor an Indian Tribe proposed any unsuitability criteria to the Secretary of the Interior.

Summary of Results of Application of the Unsuitability Criteria

Approximately 12,000 acres of public lands within the coastal development area consisting approximately 225 million tons of coal were determined to be unsuitable for cropland mining and related surface operations and impacts. Map 2. Areas found to be unsuitable include incorporated towns, the north side of the Union Pacific Railroad W.A. line, and the town of Superior of municipal watershed sacrificial area.

Federal State Coal lands affected by the unsuitable determinations are based in Table A-1.

Step 3 - Multiple Use Conflicts

In this step of the screening process, those lands which were determined to be unacceptable for further leasing consideration and in certain multiple areas, were further evaluated. In the evaluation of potential conflicts, all potential uses of public lands were considered along with those uses that are directly connected with the unsuitable criteria and included cropland activities that are considered unsuitable for cropland related surface operations and impacts.

This evaluation of multiple use conflicts involves a situation in which multiple uses conflict and developing the unsuitable management scenario presented in the alternate RMA.

1. Alternative A.

The impact analysis of the cropland development activities for Alternative A as a simulation of existing management direction for the Non-Class area: Alternative A is described in Chapter 2 of the EIS. The results of the multiple use conflicts evaluation for Alternative A as summarized in Appendix 3.1. The EIS as the RMA. With respect to the cropland development activities for Alternative A, the same as those developed in 1981, and were provided for purposes of comparative analysis only. The 1981 cropland development activities were based on an area that was not outlined and unsuitable and will be superseded by the 1982 cropland development and the approved Great River RMA.

2. Alternative B.

Based on the results of the 1992 application of the cropland unsuitable criteria, the cropland development potential area described in Appendix 3.2. The basic assumption of the multiple use conflicts evaluation for Alternative B was that, with very few conflicts, any conflicts or impacts to surface uses, surface activities, and values which may be caused by cropland mining and related surface operations and impacts, could be mitigated and could be allowed. Thus, as presented in the above results of applying the cropland unsuitable criteria, except for the 12,000 acres determined to be unsuitable, the impacts to the bulk of surface uses and values which are applicable in addition requirements for environmental protection or protection of other multiple use values would meet minimum requirements.

The results of the multiple use conflicts evaluation of Alternative B are documented in the following pages. They were derived in the impact analysis of Alternative B in Chapter 4 of the EIS.

3. Alternative C.

Based on the results of both the unsuitable criteria and the impact analysis of Alternative B, the cropland management scenario for Alternative C was developed in Chapter 2 of the EIS. To provide a guide for comparative impact analysis, a basic assumption on the Alternative C scenario was developed and applied to those areas which were determined as unsuitable, that is, may be caused by cropland and related surface operations and impacts. It could not be mitigated or would be unmitigated. In direct contrast to the above scenario for Alternative B, none of the exceptions to the unsuitable criteria, would be applicable, i.e., all factors related to the criteria would be assigned unsuitable, and requirements for environmental protection and protection of other multiple use values would be heavy to extreme.

The results of the multiple use conflicts evaluation for Alternative C were derived from the impact analysis of Alternative C in Chapter 4 of the EIS and are documented below.

Proposed Plan. In addition to the multiple use conflicts and the cropland unsuitable criteria, the cropland management scenario for the Proposed Plan (Chapter 2 of the EIS) was also based on the comparison analysis and scenarios in the EIS of both Alternatives B and C. That is, the cropland management activities for the Proposed Plan (Chapter 2 of the EIS) are a blend of criteria between any excessive or unnecessary impacts to other resource values and activities result from Alternative B and any excessive or unnecessary impacts to cropland development that may result from Alternative C.

The results of the multiple use conflicts evaluation of the Proposed Plan were derived from the impact analysis of the Proposed Plan Chapter 4 of the EIS and are documented below.

Table A-3 shows the acreage and coal tonnage affected in the multiple use conflicts evaluation by land and coal ownership categories.

Alternative B. Under Alternative B, about 433,000 acres of Federal coal lands and about 7.3 billion tons of coal, within the Coastal Development Potential Area (see Map 3), would be open for further consideration for Federal cropland leasing and development. This would include multiple uses conflicts and other resource values and activities such as emergency leasing, lease modifications, and exchange proposals, the Federal cropland leasing and other resource uses and activities that are necessary conditions and requirements for protection of other land and resource values and uses (Map 3).

Conflicts. Cropland development related and surface operations and activities would cause conflicts with the Rocky Mountain Ecosystem.

Analysis. Primary concerns are public health and safety and conflicts with expanding subdivisions and development around Rock Springs.

Determination. Cropland mining activities in the Rocky Springs Expansion Area would be unacceptable. Therefore, about 10,000 acres of surface area of Federal lands would be unacceptable for further leasing consideration.

Conflicts. Cropland development related and surface operations activities would cause conflicts within the Cedar Cave, Greater South Dunes, Natural Corrals, and Steamboat Mountain Area.

Analysis. Cropland development by surface mining methods and other surface operations and activities would adversely affect the
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wildlife, cultural, geologic and scenic values. Development would conflict with wildlife management objectives in the Shoshone
Mountain ACEC.

Determination: The ACEC would be acceptable for coal
development of this area only, if protective area
values. About 207,755 acres and 176.5 million tons of coal could
be affected.

Only very limited surface facilities would be allowed on the
Cedar Canyon and Shoshone Mountain areas.

The Natural Corridors and Great Sand Dunes areas would be
unacceptable for any surface operations and activities related to
coal mining.

Conflict: Coal development activities and related surface
operations and activities would conflict with known and
unknown historic and cultural values and sites that are eligible for
listing on the National Register of Historic Places.

Analysis: Current policy requires that known and unknown
historic and cultural values and sites be identified and appropriate
measures taken prior to determination of sites. Some areas would
not be acceptable for coal development by surface mining methods
or for other coal-related economic activities.

The Eastern Shoshone Tribe has expressed concern that areas of
interest to them for religious or spiritual reasons may be within the
current coal development potential area. They have not asked the
area to address specific concerns and would like to reserve the
right to comment concerning specific areas proposed for coal leasing.
The Comanche Ute, Bannock, Northern Shoshone and North
East Apache tribes have also been consulted but have not
provided comments.

Determination: In cases where underground mining methods
would be used, such values and cultural and
historical values of any eligible National Register sites within the
Federal coal development potential area could be affected or mitigated.
Where surface mining methods and surface operations are con-
cerned, the value of any known or unknown historic sites within
the Federal coal development potential area that may be within the
Federal coal development potential area that could be mitigated by
avoidance, documentation, excavation or other means.

An unknown amount of acreage and tons of coal
would be.

Surveys for cultural resources would be done during coal
 operations, planning, processing of individual coal lease applications,
during mining, approval processing, and during the term of the
lease and mine life.

Prior to coal leasing, the tribes that are known to have inhabited
regions within the proposed areas where cultural resources
are located in the area would be
solicited for comments.

Conflict: Coal development activities and related surface operations
and activities, combined with other activities such as other energy
development, community and population expansion, simultaneous
the Uinta Basin. Mines operating within this area may ad-
versely affect habitat and cause stress and displacement of
big game in the proposed wildland-wetland areas.

Mines operating, particularly in
affected, would reduce availability and accessibility of wildland
valleys and adjoining watersheds, as the area could be replaced by
traditional ranges and in some cases mortality due to a lack of
important habitats to support these animals.

Determination: A provision for maintaining a balance between
crude oil development and adequate wildlife range
areas would be. Important big game species would be required of
be accommodated through mitigation, and the minimum total
amount of coal would be acceptable for coal development by
surface mining methods only. These same lands would be unacceptable for
surface coal mining methods and any surface operations and activities related to
crude oil development.

Conflict: Coal development activities and related surface operations
and activities would conflict with the historic values of the
Tent Creek and Cedar Canyon Rock art sites and surrounding
areas and the Pine Canyon rock art sites.

Analysis: These rock art sites and surrounding areas would be
affected by surface coal mining methods and any surface
operations and activities related to coal mining.

Determination: The structure and pattern of the rock art panels
would be preserved. The Tent Creek rock art site (about 20 acres of
Federal coal lands and 13.0 million tons of coal) would be acceptable
for coal development by subsurface mining methods only. These
same lands would be unacceptable for surface coal mining
methods and any surface operations and activities related to coal
mining.

The Cedar Canyon Petroglyph site (about 20 acres of
Federal coal lands and 13.0 million tons of coal) would be acceptable
for coal development by subsurface mining methods only. These
same lands would be unacceptable for surface coal mining
methods and any surface operations and activities related to coal
mining.

Conflict: Coal development activities and related surface operations
and activities would conflict with the values of the
Tent Creek and Cedar Canyon Rock art sites and surrounding
areas.

Analysis: All the rock art panels would be preserved. The Tent Creek and Cedar
Canyon Rock art sites and surrounding areas would be affected by subsurface
mining methods only. These same lands would be unacceptable for
surface coal mining methods and any surface operations and activities related to
crude oil development.

Conflict: Coal development activities and related surface operations
and activities would conflict with the historic values of the
Tent Creek and Cedar Canyon Rock art sites.

Analysis: The Tent Creek and Cedar Canyon Rock art sites would be
affected by crude oil development. The Tent Creek and Cedar
Canyon Rock art sites and surrounding areas would be affected by
subsurface mining methods only. These same lands would be unacceptable for
surface coal mining methods and any surface operations and activities related to
coal mining.

Conflict: Coal development activities and related surface operations
and activities would conflict with the historic values of the
Tent Creek and Cedar Canyon Rock art sites.

Analysis: The Tent Creek and Cedar Canyon Rock art sites would be
affected by crude oil development. The Tent Creek and Cedar
Canyon Rock art sites and surrounding areas would be affected by
subsurface mining methods only. These same lands would be unacceptable for
surface coal mining methods and any surface operations and activities related to
crude oil development.
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be an unnecessary and unacceptable impact and therefore this coal development option should be dropped from further consideration.

Proposed Plan

Under the proposed plan, about 422,500 acres of federal coal lands and about 7.2 billion tons of coal within the Coal Development Potential Area (see Map 31) would be open to further consideration for coal leasing and development (i.e., new competitive leasing, emergency leasing, lease modifications, and exchange proposals, under the Federal Coal Management Program) with appropriate and necessary conditions and requirements for protection of other land and resource values and uses (Map 35, Map 36, and Map 37).

The coal development scenario for the Proposed Plan was derived primarily through considering and comparing the impact analyses of the coal development scenarios for Alternatives B and C as summarized above. The coal development scenario in the Proposed plan is a modification of the Alternative B scenario. That is, the areas identified as unacceptable for coal development in the impact analysis of Alternative B were not included in the coal development scenario for the Proposed Plan. Only the areas that were determined to be acceptable for coal development (including specified mining methods and mitigation requirements) became a part of the coal development scenario for the Proposed Plan. As a result, there were no unacceptable adverse affects that would be caused by coal development identified in the analysis of the Proposed Plan.

Step 4 - Surface Owner Consultation

Surface owner consultation was initiated during the public comment and review period for the Green River Draft EIS. There were no surface owners of split estate lands (i.e., privately-owned surface over Federally-owned coal) who expressed a preference against surface mining the Federal coal on their lands. Therefore, there were no Federal coal lands in the Planning Area determined to be unavailable for further consideration for leasing and development due to surface owner consultation. It should be understood that surface owners of split estate lands still have the opportunity to consent or refuse to consent to the leasing of federal coal under their lands, before such federal coal leases would be issued.

Surface owner consultation does not apply to Federal surface/State coal areas, PRLAs, or to competitive Federal coal areas where subsurface mining is concerned.

**TABLE A3-1**

**1995 APPLICATION OF COAL UNSUITABILITY CRITERIA:**

**COMPETITIVE FEDERAL COAL AREAS (acres)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unsuitability Criterion</th>
<th>Federal Surface Federal Coal</th>
<th>State Surface Federal Coal</th>
<th>Private Surface Federal Coal</th>
<th>Total Unsuitable</th>
<th>Tonnages¹ (millions)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coal Development Potential Area (Total)</td>
<td>422,000</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>11,860</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Cities/Towns</td>
<td>678</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,594</td>
<td>2,272</td>
<td>38.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I-80 &amp; UPRR</td>
<td>856</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>1,016</td>
<td>17.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Dwelling Buffer²</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. WSAs</td>
<td>4,294</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4,294</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Scenic Federal Lands</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Scientific Studies</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Sites on the National Register of Historic Places</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Natural Areas or National Natural Landmarks</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Threatened or Endangered Plant and Animal Species</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. State Listed Animal Species and Plant Species</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Bald or Golden Eagle Nest and Buffer Zones</td>
<td>21,995</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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#### TABLE A3-1 (continued)

1995 APPLICATION OF COAL UNSUITABILITY CRITERIA: COMPETITIVE FEDERAL COAL AREAS (acres)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unsuitability Criterion</th>
<th>Federal Surface/Federal Coal</th>
<th>State Surface/Federal Coal</th>
<th>Private Surface/Federal Coal</th>
<th>Total Unsuitable</th>
<th>Tonnages (millions)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12. Bald and Golden Eagle Roost and Concentration Areas</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Falcon Cliff Nesting Site and Buffer Zones</td>
<td>10,576</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>516</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. High Priority Habitat for Migratory Bird Species</td>
<td>112,920</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,393</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Species of State High Interest:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- antelope crucial winter range</td>
<td>140,861</td>
<td>3,306</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- elk crucial winter range</td>
<td>30,367</td>
<td>611</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- elk calving</td>
<td>12,720</td>
<td>658</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- deer crucial winter range</td>
<td>124,860</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>3,205</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- deer parturition</td>
<td>6,933</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- sage grouse (1/4 mile buffer)</td>
<td>41,260</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- sage grouse (2 mile buffer)</td>
<td>12,660</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- wetlands and floodplains</td>
<td>1,769</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Floodplains (estimated)</td>
<td>1,958</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>2,135</td>
<td>36.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Watersheds</td>
<td>1,862</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,864</td>
<td>31.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. National Resource Waters</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Alluvial Valley Floors</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Lands Identified by an Indian Tribe</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Coal/tonnage figures are based upon an average 17,000 tons per acre, where both surface and subsurface mining are affected.

Note: No Federal Surface/Private Minerals lands exist in the Coal Development Potential Area.

#### TABLE A3-2

1995 APPLICATION OF COAL UNSUITABILITY CRITERIA: FEDERAL SURFACE/STATE COAL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unsuitability Criterion</th>
<th>Federal Surface/State Coal</th>
<th>Tonnages (millions)</th>
<th>Unsuitable Acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coal Development Potential Area (Total)</td>
<td>30,362</td>
<td>506</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Cities/Towns</td>
<td>506</td>
<td>56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I-80 &amp; UP RR</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Dugout Buffer</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. WSAs</td>
<td>575</td>
<td>575</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Scenic Federal Lands</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Scientific Studies</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Sites on the National Register of Historic Places</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Natural Areas or Natural Natural Landmarks</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Threatened or Endangered Plant and Animal Species</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. State Listed Animal Species and Plant Species</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Bald or Golden Eagle Nest and Buffer Zones</td>
<td>2,245</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Bald and Golden Eagle Roost and Concentration Areas</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Falcon Cliff Nesting Site and buffer zones</td>
<td>890</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. High Priority Habitat for Migratory Bird Species: saguaro nests &amp; buffer zones</td>
<td>9,874</td>
<td>167.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Species of State High Interest:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- antelope crucial winter range</td>
<td>7,340</td>
<td>124.8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- elk crucial winter range</td>
<td>702</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- elk calving</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- deer crucial winter range</td>
<td>4,867</td>
<td>85.1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- deer parturition</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- sage grouse (1/4 mile buffer)</td>
<td>3,639</td>
<td>61.8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- sage grouse (2 mile buffer)</td>
<td>495</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- wetlands and floodplains</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Floodplains (estimated)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Watersheds</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. National Resource Waters</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Alluvial Valley Floors</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Lands Identified by an Indian Tribe</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Coal/tonnage figures are based upon an average 17,000 tons per acre, where both surface and subsurface mining are affected.

Note: No Federal Surface/Private Minerals lands exist in the Coal Development Potential Area.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Competitive Federal Coal</th>
<th>Federal Surface/ State Coal</th>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North Fork Vermillion Creek (estimated)</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>0 0 unacceptable for surface or subsurface mining methods only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boars Tusk</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>90 0.7 unacceptable for subsurface mining methods only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater Sand</td>
<td>7,140</td>
<td>60.7</td>
<td>0 0 acceptable for subsurface mining methods only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cedar Canyon ACEC</td>
<td>1,907</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>643 5.4 acceptable for subsurface mining methods only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Central ACEC</td>
<td>1,275</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>0 0 acceptable for subsurface mining methods only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steens Mountain</td>
<td>9,810</td>
<td>83.4</td>
<td>0 0 acceptable for subsurface mining methods only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emmons-Cone</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0 0 acceptable for subsurface mining methods only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horsa, Trails</td>
<td>8,095</td>
<td>68.7</td>
<td>350 2.9 acceptable for subsurface mining methods only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North and South</td>
<td>640</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>640 5.4 acceptable for subsurface mining methods only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table Mountains</td>
<td>1,280</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>0 0 acceptable for subsurface mining methods only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pine Canyon</td>
<td>10,005</td>
<td>170.1</td>
<td>191 3.2 unacceptable for surface and subsurface mining methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rock Springs - Modified</td>
<td>8,995</td>
<td>76.4</td>
<td>655 5.5 acceptable for surface &amp; subsurface mining methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expansion Area</td>
<td>4,580</td>
<td>77.9</td>
<td>130 2.2 acceptable for surface and subsurface mining methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sage Creek Watershed</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>0 0 acceptable for subsurface mining methods only</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: All tonnages are based upon an average 17,000 tons per acre, where both surface and subsurface mining are affected.

APPENDIX 3

TABLE A.3.3 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Competitive Federal Coal</th>
<th>Federal Surface/ State Coal</th>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cedar Canyon Petroglyphs &amp; 500 acre buffer</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>acceptable for subsurface mining methods only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coos Canyon Ranch and 500 acre buffer</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>acceptable for subsurface mining methods only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolar Petroglyphs Site and 500 acre buffer</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>acceptable for subsurface mining methods only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big Game Crucial Winter</td>
<td>14,590</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>0 0 acceptable for surface and subsurface mining methods only</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: No Federal Surface/State Minerals Land exists in the Coal Development Potential Area.
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APPENDIX 4-1
IDENTIFICATION AND CLASSIFICATION
OF BLM-ADMINISTERED PUBLIC LANDS WITHIN THE
GREEN RIVER RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PLAN
PLANNING AREA DETERMINED TO MEET
THE WILD AND SCENIC RIVERS ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA
**APPENDIX 4-1**

**IDENTIFICATION AND CLASSIFICATION OF BLM-ADMINISTERED PUBLIC LANDS WITHIN THE GREEN RIVER RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PLAN PLANNING AREA DETERMINED TO MEET THE WILD AND SCENIC RIVERS ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA**

(September 1992)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BLM-Administered Public Land Parcel Number</th>
<th>Length of Waterway Across BLM Land Parcel, in Miles</th>
<th>Name of Waterway, or Waterway Review Segment, and Location of BLM-Administered Public Land Parcel</th>
<th>Distance to Next BLM Land Parcel, in Miles</th>
<th>Notes: Description/Outstandingly Remarkable Values of BLM-Administered Public Land Parcel</th>
<th>Tentative Classification of Waterway Across BLM-Administered Public Land Parcel</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>LITTLE RED CREEK (Part of Red Creek Unit)</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>Low riparian; two 2-tracks in waterway corridor; one 2-track crosses creek.</td>
<td>Scenic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>R. 104 W., T. 12 N., Section 12, from border of private land north to border of private land in Section 1.</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>Low riparian; road parallels entire east bank of creek through BLM-administered parcel and crosses creek; seismic line parallels west bank and crosses creek. 1.4 mile is part of public water reserve.</td>
<td>Recreational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>R. 104 W., T. 13 N., Section 35, from border of private land north to border of private land, R. 104 W., T. 13 N., Section 35.</td>
<td>End of waterway segment reviewed</td>
<td>Low riparian; adjacent private lands within waterway corridor; road and two 2-tracks in corridor parallel both banks.</td>
<td>Recreational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Miles Across BLM Lands</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>TOTAL LENGTH OF WATERWAY SEGMENT REVIEWED (miles)</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% BLM Jurisdiction of Waterway Segment Reviewed</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLM-Administered Public Land Parcel Number</td>
<td>Length of Waterway Across BLM Land Parcel in Miles</td>
<td>Name of Waterway or Waterway Review Segment and Location of BLM-Administered Public Land Parcel</td>
<td>Distance to Next BLM Land Parcel in Miles</td>
<td>Notes Description Outstandingly Remarkable Values of BLM-Administered Public Land Parcel</td>
<td>Tentative Classification of Waterway Across BLM-Administered Public Land Parcel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>JUNE CREEK</strong> (Part of Red Creek Unit)</td>
<td><strong>2.6</strong></td>
<td>Outstandingly remarkable values of BLM-administered lands in the waterway review segment include scenic, the red eroded geologic features are remarkable scenic badland, which is unusual in this area. The watershed is relatively untouched and pristine.</td>
<td><strong>Recreational</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>R. 104 W., T. 12 N., Section 9, from border of state land north to junction with Red Creek, R. 104 W., T. 13 N., Section 14</td>
<td><strong>End of Waterway Segment Reviewed</strong></td>
<td><strong>Low-moderate riparian, 2-track parallels entire west bank of creek, four 2-track crossings of creek</strong></td>
<td><strong>Recreational</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Miles Across BLM Lands</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.6</strong></td>
<td><strong>TOTAL LENGTH OF WATERWAY SEGMENT REVIEWED (miles)</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.6</strong></td>
<td><strong>Recreational</strong></td>
<td><strong>Recreational</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>% BLM JURISDICTION OF WATERWAY SEGMENT REVIEWED</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Recreational</strong></td>
<td><strong>Recreational</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BLM-Administered Public Land Parcel Number</th>
<th>Length of Waterway Across BLM Land Parcel in Miles</th>
<th>Name of Waterway or Waterway Review Segment and Location of BLM-Administered Public Land Parcel</th>
<th>Distance to Next BLM Land Parcel in Miles</th>
<th>Notes Description Outstandingly Remarkable Values of BLM-Administered Public Land Parcel</th>
<th>Tentative Classification of Waterway Across BLM-Administered Public Land Parcel</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>BEEF STEER CREEK</strong> (part of Red Creek Unit)</td>
<td><strong>4.0</strong></td>
<td>Outstandingly remarkable values of BLM-administered lands in the waterway review segment include scenic, the red eroded geologic features are remarkable scenic badlands which is unusual in this area. The watershed is relatively untouched and pristine.</td>
<td><strong>Scenic</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>R. 105 W., T. 13 N., Section 12, from headwaters southeast to junction with Red Creek, R. 104 W., T. 13 N., Section 13</td>
<td><strong>End of Waterway Segment Reviewed</strong></td>
<td><strong>Low-moderate riparian, 3 seismic crossings, four 2-track access points on west side of creek</strong></td>
<td><strong>Scenic</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Miles Across BLM Lands</strong></td>
<td><strong>4.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>TOTAL LENGTH OF WATERWAY SEGMENT REVIEWED (miles)</strong></td>
<td><strong>4.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>Scenic</strong></td>
<td><strong>Scenic</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>% BLM JURISDICTION OF WATERWAY SEGMENT REVIEWED</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Scenic</strong></td>
<td><strong>Scenic</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLM Administered Public Land Parcel Number</td>
<td>Length of Waterway Across BLM Land Parcel in Miles</td>
<td>Name of Waterway, or Waterway Review Segment and Location of BLM-Administered Public Land Parcel</td>
<td>Distance to Next BLM Land Parcel in Miles</td>
<td>Notes/Description Outstandingly Remarkable Values of BLM-Administered Public Land Parcel</td>
<td>Tentative Classification of Waterway Across BLM-Administered Public Land Parcel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RED CREEK (Part of Red Creek Unit)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Outstandingly remarkable values of BLM-administered lands in the waterway review segment include scenic; the red eroded geologic features are remarkable scenic badlands which is unusual in this area. The watershed is relatively untouched and pristine.</td>
<td>Recreational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>R. 103 W., T. 12 N., Section 4, from headwaters spring, north to border of state land, R. 103 W., T. 13 N., Section 34</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>Adjacent state lands within waterway corridor. Low riparian. Heavily timbered in corridor with stock trails cut to creek. Beaver pond stocked with Colorado River cutthroat trout. Two-track in corridor on ridgetop above creek.</td>
<td>Recreational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>R. 103 W., T. 13 N., Section 34, from border of state land northwest to border of state land, Section 33.</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>Low-moderate riparian. Heavily timbered in corridor. Series of dry historic beaver ponds. Two-track in corridor on ridgetop above creek.</td>
<td>Recreational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>R. 104 W., T. 13 N., Section 36, from border of state land west to border of state land.</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>Low-moderate riparian; 2-track parallels south bank of creek</td>
<td>Recreational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>R. 104 W., T. 13 N., Section 35, from border of private land northwest to border of private land, Section 34</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>Adjacent low riparian private lands within waterway corridor; 2-track parallels creek on north 0.2 mile</td>
<td>Scenic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>R. 104 W., T. 13 N., Section 34, from border of private land west to border of state land, Section 31</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>Low riparian; two 2-track crossings, two 2-tracks parallel south bank of creek along 20% of distance through BLM-administered parcel, 1 seismic crossing.</td>
<td>Recreational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>R. 105 W., T. 12 N., Section 1, from border of state land southwest to border of private land Section 15.</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>Low riparian; no crossings; eight 2-track access points on both sides of creek through BLM-administered parcel</td>
<td>Scenic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>R. 105 W., T. 12 N., Section 22, from border of private land south to Wyoming-Utah state line and private land border</td>
<td>End of Waterway Segment Reviewed</td>
<td>Low riparian; road crosses creek and parallels 50% of creek through BLM-administered parcel, ranch 3.4 mile SE of lower end of BLM-administered parcel.</td>
<td>Recreational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Miles Across BLM Land</strong></td>
<td><strong>8.25</strong></td>
<td><strong>TOTAL LENGTH OF WATERWAY SEGMENT REVIEWED (miles)</strong></td>
<td><strong>14.25</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% BLM Jurisdiction of Waterway Segment Reviewed</td>
<td><strong>68%</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLM-Administered Public Land Parcel Number</td>
<td>Length of Waterway Across BLM Land Parcel, in Miles</td>
<td>Name of Waterway, or Waterway Review Segment, and Location of BLM-Administered Public Land Parcel</td>
<td>Distance to Next BLM Land Parcel, in Miles</td>
<td>Notes/Description Outstandingly Remarkable Values of BLM-Administered Public Land Parcel</td>
<td>Tentative Classification of Waterway Across BLM-Administered Public Land Parcel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>R. 106 W., T. 13 N., Section 1, from border of state land north to border of state land, R. 106 W., T. 14 N., Section 36</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>Moderate riparian; no roads in waterway corridor through BLM-administered land; nearest access is 2-track parallel to creek 1.2 mile west on bench.</td>
<td>Wild</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>R. 106 W., T. 14 N., Section 36, from border of state land north to border of state land, Section 25</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>Moderate riparian; no roads in waterway corridor through BLM-administered land; nearest access is 2-track parallel to creek 1.2 mile west on bench.</td>
<td>Wild</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>R. 106 W., T. 14 N., Section 25, from border of state land northwest to border of state land, Section 24.</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>Moderate riparian; one 2-track parallels east bank of creek in lower end of BLM-administered parcel; public water reserve covers 80% of creek through BLM-administered land; adjacent state lands within waterway corridor</td>
<td>Scenic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>R. 106 W., T. 14 N., Section 11, from border of state land northwest to border of private land, Section 10</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>Moderate to heavy riparian, 2-track parallels 1.5 miles of creek on north side, 1.4 mile of creek through BLM-administered land covered by public water reserve.</td>
<td>Scenic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>R. 106 W., T. 14 N., Section 5, from border of state land west to border of private land, Section 31.</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>Moderate to heavy riparian, entire creek through BLM-administered land is covered by public water reserve; one 2-track parallels entire distance of creek through BLM-administered land and crosses once; another 2-track follows opposite side of creek along 50% of distance through BLM-administered land.</td>
<td>Scenic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>R. 107 W., T. 14 N., Section 1, from border of private land northwest to border of private land.</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>Heavy riparian; 2-track parallels both sides creek; adjacent private lands within waterway corridor at each end (up and downstream) of BLM-administered parcel; ranch approximately 1.2 mile downstream from BLM-administered parcel.</td>
<td>Scenic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>R. 107 W., T. 15 N., Section 30, from border of private land west to border of private land.</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>Low-moderate riparian; road parallels north bank of creek entire distance through BLM-administered parcel; one 2-track access to creek.</td>
<td>Recreational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLM-Administered Public Land Parcel Number</td>
<td>Length of Waterway Across BLM Land Parcel, in Miles</td>
<td>Name of Waterway, or Waterway Review Segment, and Location of BLM-Administered Public Land Parcel</td>
<td>Distance to Next BLM Land Parcel, in Miles</td>
<td>Notes/Description Outstandingly Remarkable Values of BLM-Administered Public Land Parcel</td>
<td>Tentative Classification of Waterway Across BLM-Administered Public Land Parcel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 8                                        | 0.2                                             | R. 107 W., T. 15 N., Section 30, from border of private land west to border of Flaming Gorge NRA.  
|                                          |                                                 | End of Waterway Segment Reviewed                                                                | Low-moderate riparian, road and 2-track parallel entire distance of creek through BLM-administered parcel on north side. | Recreational                                                                        |
| **Total Miles Across BLM Lands**         | **6.3**                                         | **TOTAL LENGTH OF WATERWAY SEGMENT REVIEWED (miles)**                                            | **17.15**                                 |                                                                                     |                                                                                     |
|                                          | **37%**                                         | **% BLM JURISDICTION OF WATERWAY SEGMENT REVIEWED**                                            |                                           |                                                                                     |                                                                                     |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BLM-Administered Public Land Parcel Number</th>
<th>Length of Waterway Across BLM Land Parcel, in Miles</th>
<th>Name of Waterway, or Waterway Review Segment, and Location of BLM-Administered Public Land Parcel</th>
<th>Distance to Next BLM Land Parcel, in Miles</th>
<th>Notes/Description Outstandingly Remarkable Values of BLM-Administered Public Land Parcel</th>
<th>Tentative Classification of Waterway Across BLM-Administered Public Land Parcel</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>DRIPPING SPRINGS FORK, CURRANT CREEK</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Outstandingly remarkable values of BLM-administered lands in the waterway review segment include fisheries; there are populations of the Colorado River cutthroat trout in the watershed. This candidate species is a pure strain.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 1                                        | 2.0                                             | R. 105 W., T. 13 N., Section 7, from headwaters north to border of state land; R. 106 W., T. 14 N., Section 36  
<p>|                                          |                                                 | End of Waterway Segment Reviewed                                                                | Heavy riparian; 1 powerline crossing, 2-track parallels upstream half (southern) of creek; 1 mile of creek across BLM-administered land is covered by public water reserve; adjacent state lands within waterway corridor. | Scenic                                                                              |
| <strong>Total Miles Across BLM Lands</strong>         | <strong>2.0</strong>                                         | <strong>TOTAL LENGTH OF WATERWAY SEGMENT REVIEWED (miles)</strong>                                          | <strong>2.0</strong>                                   |                                                                                     |                                                                                     |
|                                          | <strong>100%</strong>                                         | <strong>% BLM JURISDICTION OF WATERWAY SEGMENT REVIEWED</strong>                                           |                                           |                                                                                     |                                                                                     |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BLM-Administered Public Land Parcel Number</th>
<th>Length of Waterway Across BLM Land Parcel in Miles</th>
<th>Name of Waterway or Waterway Review Segment and Location of BLM-Administered Public Land Parcel</th>
<th>Distance to Next BLM Land Parcel in Miles</th>
<th>Notes/Description</th>
<th>Tentative Classification of Waterway Across BLM-Administered Public Land Parcel</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>EAST FORK Currant Creek (part of currant Creek Unit)</td>
<td>End of Waterway Segment Reviewed</td>
<td>Outstandingly remarkable values of BLM-administered lands in the waterway review segment include fisheries; there are populations of the Colorado River cutthroat trout in the watershed. This candidate species is a pure strain.</td>
<td>Scenic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Miles Across BLM Lands</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>TOTAL LENGTH OF WATERWAY SEGMENT REVIEWED (miles)</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100%</td>
<td>% BLM JURISDICTION OF WATERWAY SEGMENT REVIEWED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| 1 | 2.0 | R. 105 W., T. 13 N., Section 19, northwest to border of state land, R. 106 W., T. 13 N., Section 12. | End of Waterway Segment Reviewed | Moderate-heavy riparian; 1 powerline crossing; one 2-track parallels lower 50% in the downstream portion of the west bank. | Scenic |
| Total Miles Across BLM Lands              | 2.0                                           | TOTAL LENGTH OF WATERWAY SEGMENT REVIEWED (miles)                                               | 2.0                                      |                  |                                                                                  |
| 100%                                      | % BLM JURISDICTION OF WATERWAY SEGMENT REVIEWED |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BLM-Administered Public Land Parcel Number</th>
<th>Length of Waterway Across BLM Land Parcel, in Miles</th>
<th>Name of Waterway, or Waterway Review Segment, and Location of BLM-Administered Public Land Parcel</th>
<th>Distance to Next BLM Land Parcel, in Miles</th>
<th>Notes/Description/Outstandingly Remarkable Values of BLM-Administered Public Land Parcel</th>
<th>Tentative Classification of Waterway Across BLM-Administered Public Land Parcel</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>WEST FORK Currant CREEK (part of Currant Creek Unit)</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>Outstandingly remarkable values of BLM-administered lands in the waterway review segment include fisheries; there are populations of the Colorado River cutthroat trout in the watershed. This candidate species is a pure strain.</td>
<td>Recreational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>R. 106 W., T. 13 N., Section 11, from border of state land north to border of state land.</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>Low riparian; no roads within corridor through BLM-administered parcel; nearest access road 1/2 mile west parallels creek on ridge.</td>
<td>Wild</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>R. 106 W., T. 13 N., Section 12, from border of state land, north to border of state land.</td>
<td>End of Waterway Segment Reviewed</td>
<td>Low riparian; one 2-track access at lower end of BLM-administered parcel.</td>
<td>Recreational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Miles Across BLM Lands</strong></td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td><strong>TOTAL LENGTH OF WATERWAY SEGMENT REVIEWED (miles)</strong></td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>% BLM Jurisdiction of Waterway Segment Reviewed</strong></td>
<td>58%</td>
<td><strong>% BLM Jurisdiction of Waterway Segment Reviewed</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLM-Administered Public Land Parcel Number</td>
<td>Length of Waterway Across BLM Land Parcel, in Miles</td>
<td>Name of Waterway, or Waterway Review Segment, and Location of BLM-Administered Public Land Parcel</td>
<td>Distance to Next BLM Land Parcel, in Miles</td>
<td>Notes/Description Outstandingly Remarkable Values of BLM-Administered Public Land Parcel</td>
<td>Tentative Classification of Waterway Across BLM-Administered Public Land Parcel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>R. 101 W., T. 27 N., Section 5, from headwaters west to border of private lands, R. 102 W., T. 27 N., Section 1.</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>Low riparian; road/2-track along entire length and right next to creek; historic trail within waterway corridor.</td>
<td>Recreational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>R. 102 W., T. 27 N., Section 11, from border of private land southwest to border of private land, Section 21.</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>Low-moderate riparian; three 2-track crossings; dam/structure in channel; 2-tracks on both sides of creek upstream half (northeast portion) and 1 on downstream half; other 2-tracks within waterway corridor; historic trail within waterway corridor.</td>
<td>Recreational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>R. 102 W., T. 27 N., Section 29, from border of private land southwest to border of private land.</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>Moderate-heavy riparian; two 2-tracks within waterway corridor parallel north bank of creek.</td>
<td>Scenic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>R. 102 W., T. 27 N., Section 31, from border of private land southwest to border of private land.</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>Low riparian; road parallels north bank of creek within waterway corridor.</td>
<td>Scenic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>R. 103 W., T. 26 N., Section 1, from border of state land west to border of state land.</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>Low riparian; 2 seismic crossings of creek; adjacent state lands within waterway corridor.</td>
<td>Scenic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>R. 103 W., T. 26 N., Section 2, from border of state land southwest to border of state land.</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>Low riparian; old railroad grade access 1/2 mile north of creek, no roads within corridor; adjacent state lands within waterway corridor.</td>
<td>Wild</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>R. 103 W., T. 26 N., Section 2, from border of state land southwest to border of state land.</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>Low riparian; railroad grade within waterway corridor; adjacent state lands within waterway corridor.</td>
<td>Scenic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>R. 103 W., T. 26 N., Section 2, from border of state land southwest to border of state land.</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>Low riparian; 1 seismic crossing; railroad grade within waterway corridor; adjacent state lands within waterway corridor.</td>
<td>Recreational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>R. 103 W., T. 26 N., Section 10, from border of state land south to border of state land.</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>Low riparian; railroad grade crosses creek; adjacent state lands within waterway corridor.</td>
<td>Recreational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLM-Administered Public Land Parcel Number</td>
<td>Length of Waterway Across BLM Land Parcel, in Miles</td>
<td>Name of Waterway or Waterway Review Segment and Location of BLM-Administered Public Land Parcel</td>
<td>Distance to Next BLM Land Parcel, in Miles</td>
<td>Notes: Description Outstandingly Remarkable Values of BLM-Administered Public Land Parcel</td>
<td>Tentative Classification of Waterway Across BLM-Administered Public Land Parcel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>R 103 W., T. 26 N., Section 10, from border of state land southwest to border of state land.</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>Low riparian, railroad grade within waterway corridor, 2-track crosses creek, one other 2-track to creek, adjacent state lands within waterway corridor.</td>
<td>Recreational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>R 103 W., T. 26 N., Section 17, from border of state land southwest to border of state land.</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>Low riparian, railroad grade within waterway corridor, two 2-tracks within waterway corridor and one 2-track along creek through BLM-administered parcel, adjacent state lands within waterway corridor.</td>
<td>Recreational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>R 103 W., T. 26 N., Section 19, from border of state land southwest to border of state land.</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>Low riparian, one 2-track within waterway corridor.</td>
<td>Recreational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>R 103 W., T. 26 N., Section 19, from border of state land southwest to border of state land.</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>Low riparian, one 2-track within waterway corridor.</td>
<td>Recreational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>R 104 W., T. 26 N., Section 24, from border of state land southwest to border of state land.</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>Low riparian, one 2-track parallels north bank of creek.</td>
<td>Recreational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>R 104 W. 9, T. 26 N., Section 26, from border of state land west to border of state land.</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>Low riparian, railroad grade within waterway corridor, 3 two-tracks in corridor (1 crosses creek).</td>
<td>Recreational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>R 104 W., T. 26 N., Section 26, from border of state land southwest to border of Bureau of Reclamation lands, R 105 W., T. 25 N., Section 23</td>
<td>End of Waterway Segment Reviewed</td>
<td>Low riparian, railroad grade within waterway corridor entire length of creek through BLM-administered parcel, railroad crosses one time, 2-tracks parallel entire creek distance through BLM-administered parcel. 2 road and three 2-track crossings of the creek.</td>
<td>Recreational</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Miles Across BLM Lands**: 22.0

**Total Length of Waterway Segment Reviewed (miles)**: 34.05

**% BLM Jurisdiction of Waterway Segment Reviewed**: 65%
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BLM-Administered Public Land Parcel Number</th>
<th>Length of Waterway Across BLM Land Parcel, in Miles</th>
<th>Name of Waterway, or Waterway Review Segment, and Location of BLM-Administered Public Land Parcel</th>
<th>Distance to Next BLM Land Parcel, in Miles</th>
<th>Notes/Description/Outstandingly Remarkable Values of BLM-Administered Public Land Parcel</th>
<th>Tentative Classification of Waterway Across BLM-Administered Public Land Parcel</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>NORTH FORK OF BEAR CREEK</td>
<td>End of Waterway Segment Reviewed</td>
<td>Outstandingly remarkable values of BLM-administered lands in the waterway review segment include geologic, scenic, recreation, and scientific. The creek flows through the Honeycomb Buttes Wilderness Study Area. The geology of the area is rare and the contrasting colors are scenic. Popular for recreationists and good opportunities for studying high plains desert ecology. The waterway review segment is intermittent.</td>
<td>Wild</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total MILES Across BLM Lands</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>TOTAL LENGTH OF WATERWAY SEGMENT REVIEWED (miles)</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% BLM JURISDICTION OF WATERWAY SEGMENT REVIEWED</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLM-Administered Public Land Parcel Number</td>
<td>Length of Waterway Across BLM Land Parcel, in Miles</td>
<td>Name of Waterway, or Waterway Review Segment, and Location of BLM-Administered Public Land Parcel</td>
<td>Distance to Next BLM Land Parcel, in Miles</td>
<td>Notes/Description</td>
<td>Tentative Classification of Waterway Across BLM-Administered Public Land Parcel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>R. 103 W., T. 12 N., Section 22, from headwaters northeast to border of private land, Section 24.</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>Low-moderate riparian; road and 2-track parallel 50% of creek distance through BLM-administered parcel; 3 seismic crossings; adjacent state lands within corridor at upstream end of BLM-administered parcel; adjacent private lands within corridor at downstream end of BLM-administered parcel.</td>
<td>Recreational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>R. 102 W., T. 12 N., Section 18, from border of private land northeast to border of private land.</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>Low riparian; two 2-tracks to creek; road parallels south side of creek (within 1.4 mile) through BLM-administered parcel.</td>
<td>Recreational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>R. 102 W., T. 12 N., Section 18, from border of private land northeast to border of state land.</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>Low riparian, 2-track parallels creek on south side</td>
<td>Recreational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>R. 102 W., T. 12 N., Section 17, from border of state land southeast to border of private land, Section 16 (NE corner).</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>Low-riparian, road parallels north side of creek through BLM-administered parcel; 1 old irrigation diversion; 2 roads and 3 seismic crossings.</td>
<td>Recreational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>R. 102 W., T. 12 N., Section 23, from border of private land east to border of private land.</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>Low-moderate riparian; road parallels north side of creek through BLM-administered parcel; 1 new irrigation diversion.</td>
<td>Recreational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>R. 102 W., T. 12 N., Section 13, from border of private land east to border of private land, R. 101 W., T. 12 N., Section 18.</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>Moderate riparian; road crosses creek and parallels north side of creek through BLM-administered parcel.</td>
<td>Recreational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>R. 101 W., T. 12 N., Section 20, from border of state land southeast to border of private land.</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>Moderate riparian; bench road parallels north side of creek (1.8 mile from creek) through BLM-administered parcel.</td>
<td>Recreational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLM-Administered Public Land Parcel Number</td>
<td>Length of Waterway Across BLM Land Parcel, in Miles</td>
<td>Name of Waterway, or Waterway Review Segment, and Location of BLM-Administered Public Land Parcel</td>
<td>Distance to Next BLM Land Parcel, in Miles</td>
<td>Notes/Description/Outstandingly Remarkable Values of BLM-Administered Public Land Parcel</td>
<td>Tentative Classification of Waterway Across BLM-Administered Public Land Parcel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>R. 101 W., T. 12 N., Section 21 from border of private land southeast to Wyoming-Colorado state line.</td>
<td>End of Waterway Segment Reviewed</td>
<td>Moderate-heavy riparian; no roads in waterway corridor; nearest access 2-track to creek at upstream end of BLM-administered parcel.</td>
<td>Wild</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Miles Across BLM Lands</strong></td>
<td><strong>5.05</strong></td>
<td><strong>TOTAL LENGTH OF WATERWAY SEGMENT REVIEWED (miles)</strong></td>
<td><strong>11.15</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45%</td>
<td>% BLM JURISDICTION OF WATERWAY SEGMENT REVIEWED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLM-Administered Public Land Parcel Number</td>
<td>Length of Waterway Across BLM Land Parcel, in Miles</td>
<td>Name of Waterway, or Waterway Review Segment, and Location of BLM-Administered Public Land Parcel</td>
<td>Distance to Next BLM Land Parcel, in Miles</td>
<td>Notes: Description Outstandingly Remarkable Values of BLM-Administered Public Land Parcel</td>
<td>Tentative Classification of Waterway Across BLM-Administered Public Land Parcel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>R. 102 W., T. 30 N., Section 19, from Bridger Forest border south to beginning of Sweetwater Canyon, Section 19.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Heavy riparian, one road leading to Guard Station Campground and network of roads in the campground.</td>
<td>Recreational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>R. 102 W., T. 30 N., Section 19 from beginning of Sweetwater Canyon to the Sweetwater Campground</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No access to Canyon other than foot, three 2-tracks to rim of Canyon from west, road access to Sweetwater Campground at southern end of BLM-administered parcel.</td>
<td>Wild</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>R. 102 W., T. 29 N., Section 5, from Sweetwater Campground southeast to border of state lands, Section 16.</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>Heavy riparian, road access into BLM-administered parcel and road parallels 0.1 mile of the river within this parcel.</td>
<td>Recreational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>R. 102 W., T. 29 N., Section 27, from border of private land SE., to border of state lands.</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>Heavy riparian, nearest access 2-track 1.2 mile south of BLM-administered parcel; no roads in corridor.</td>
<td>Wild</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>R. 102 W., T. 29 N., Section 34, from border of state land south to border of private land.</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>Heavy riparian, 2-track parallels west bank, one 2-track access from east, two 2-tracks access from west.</td>
<td>Scenic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>R. 102 W., T. 28 N., Section 4, from border of private land south to border of private land.</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>Heavy riparian, no roads in corridor, nearest access is 2-track 1.4 mile above north end of BLM-administered parcel.</td>
<td>Wild</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>R. 102 W., T. 28 N., Section 10, from border of private land southeast to border of private land Section 11.</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>Heavy riparian, no roads in corridor, nearest access is parallel road 3.4 mile east of river.</td>
<td>Wild</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>R. 101 W., T. 28 N., Section 19, from border of private land southeast to border of private land.</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>Heavy riparian, two 2-tracks in corridor, adjacent private lands within corridor.</td>
<td>Scenic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>R. 100 W., T. 28 N., Section 29, from border of state land northeast to border of private land Section 27.</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>Moderate-heavy riparian, two 2-tracks in corridor each side of river.</td>
<td>Scenic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLM-Administered Public Land Parcel Number</td>
<td>Length of Waterway Across BLM Land Parcel, in Miles</td>
<td>Name of Waterway, or Waterway Review Segment, and Location of BLM-Administered Public Land Parcel</td>
<td>Distance to Next BLM Land Parcel, in Miles</td>
<td>Notes/Description/Outstandingly Remarkable Values of BLM-Administered Public Land Parcel</td>
<td>Tentative Classification of Waterway Across BLM-Administered Public Land Parcel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>R. 100 W., T. 28 N., Section 29, from border of state land northeast to border of private land, Section 26.</td>
<td>End of Waterway Segment Reviewed</td>
<td>Heavy riparian; diversion and irrigation ditch along north bank of river, two 2-tracks in corridor; adjacent private lands within corridor.</td>
<td>Recreational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Miles Across BLM Lands</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>TOTAL LENGTH OF WATERWAY SEGMENT REVIEWED (miles)</td>
<td>29.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>% BLM JURISDICTION OF WATERWAY SEGMENT REVIEWED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**BIG SANDY RIVER**

Outstandingly remarkable values of BLM-administered public lands in the waterway review segment include historic. The river played a major role in the Oregon, Mormon Pioneer, California, and Pony Express National Historic Trails as a major campsite. Jedediah Smith's party, which discovered South Pass traveling east to west, crossed the upper reaches of the river.

<p>| 1                                          | 1.5                                               | R. 104 W., T. 30 N., Section 5, from Bridger Forest border south to border of state land, Section 8 | 2.0                                        | Heavy riparian, one front 2-track to river at north end of BLM-administered parcel | Wild                                            |
|                                           |                                                   | There are a total of 36 BLM-administered land parcels along the 74.6-mile review segment of the Big Sandy River. The 36 BLM-administered parcels represent a total of 16.15 miles of the review segment. Only the one parcel, involving 1.5 miles of the waterway, was determined to meet the WSR eligibility criteria. |                                           |                                                                                       |                                               |
|                                           |                                                   | TOTAL LENGTH OF WATERWAY SEGMENT REVIEWED (miles)                                               | 74.6                                      |                                                                                       |                                               |
| Total Miles Across BLM Lands              | 16.15                                             |                                                                                                  |                                           |                                                                                       |                                               |
|                                           | 25%                                               | % BLM JURISDICTION OF WATERWAY SEGMENT REVIEWED                                               |                                           |                                                                                       |                                               |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BLM-Administered Public Land Parcel Number</th>
<th>Length of Waterway Across BLM Land Parcel, in Miles</th>
<th>Name of Waterway, or Waterway Review Segment, and Location of BLM-Administered Public Land Parcel</th>
<th>Distance to Next BLM Land Parcel, in Miles</th>
<th>Notes/Description Outstandingly Remarkable Values of BLM-Administered Public Land Parcel</th>
<th>Tentative Classification of Waterway Across BLM-Administered Public Land Parcel</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>R. 112 W., T. 28 N., Section 24, from border of private land southeast and west (loop) to border of private land</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>Outstandingly remarkable values of BLM-administered lands in the waterway review segment include wildlife, historic, and recreational. The river played a major role in the Oregon, Mormon Pioneer, California, and Pony Express National Historic Trails as it was one of the most dangerous crossings along the trails. Wildlife populations along the Green River are extensive and varied. The river is popular for floating, fishing, camping, and retracing historic expeditions.</td>
<td>Scenic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>R. 112 W., T. 28 N., Section 26, from border of private land southwest to border of private land</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>Heavy riparian, cottonwood bottom, 2-track access on west bank of river.</td>
<td>Recreational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>R. 112 W., T. 27 N., Section 20, from border of private land southwest to border of private land, Section 29</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>Moderate riparian, U.S. 179 within corridor west of BLM-administered parcel, one parallel 2-track between highway and river.</td>
<td>Recreational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>R. 112 W., T. 27 N., Section 31, from border of private land south to border of private land</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>Moderate riparian, two 2-tracks, one on each side of river through BLM-administered parcel.</td>
<td>Recreational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>R. 112 W., T. 27 N., Section 31, from border of private land south to border of private land</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>Moderate riparian, U.S. 189 within corridor, adjacent private lands within corridor, bridge crosses river; BLM-administered parcel approximately 1.2 mile north of Farm Ranch.</td>
<td>Recreational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>R. 112 W., T. 26 N., Section 33, from border of private land southwest to border of private and Bureau of Reclamation land forks</td>
<td>56.0</td>
<td>Moderate-heavy riparian, river splits around island, adjacent private lands within corridor, roads and 2-tracks parallel both banks</td>
<td>Recreational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>R. 107 W., T. 18 N., Section 8, from border of private land southeast to border of private land</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>Moderate riparian, adjacent private lands within corridor, 1-80 crosses river approximately 100 yards below BLM-administered parcel; 2-track access to river south side.</td>
<td>Recreational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>R. 107 W., T. 18 N., Section 8, from border of private land east to border of private land</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>Low-moderate riparian, adjacent private lands, Union Pacific railroad, and Rio Vista subdivision within corridor.</td>
<td>Recreational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLM Administered Public Land Parcel Number</td>
<td>Length of Waterway Across BLM Land Parcel in Miles</td>
<td>Name of Waterway or Waterway Review Segment and Location of BLM Administered Public Land Parcel</td>
<td>Distance to Next BLM Land Parcel in Miles</td>
<td>Notes/Description Outstandingly Remarkable Values of BLM Administered Public Land Parcel</td>
<td>Tentative Classification of Waterway Across BLM Administered Public Land Parcel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>R. 107 W., T. 12 N., Section 16, from border of private land southeast to border of private land</td>
<td>1 nd of Waterway Segment Reviewed</td>
<td>Low riparian, 180' within corridor, pipeline or powerline crosses river, 2-track to river both sides</td>
<td>Recreational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Miles Across BLM Lands</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>TOTAL LENGTH OF WATERWAY SEGMENT REVIEWED (miles)</td>
<td>710</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% BLM Jurisdiction of Waterway Segment Reviewed</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPELLEND 4-2

WILD AND SCENIC RIVERS SUITABILITY REVIEW OF BLM-ADMINISTERED PUBLIC LANDS ALONG THE RED CREEK UNIT, CURTAIN CREEK UNIT, PACIFIC CREEK, NORTH FORK OF BEAR CREEK, CANYON CREEK, THE SWEETWATER RIVER, THE BIG SANDY RIVER, AND THE GREEN RIVER IN THE GREEN RIVER RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PLAN PLANNING AREA

(Sepember 1992)

PUBLIC LANDS ALONG RF.VIEW OF BLM·ADMINISTF.RD

After publication of the Draft EIS for the Green River RMP, in letters were received commenting on the Wild and Scenic Rivers review in the draft EIS. The comment management of prohibiting or urging mineral development on BLM administered public lands that are the wild and scenic rivers suitability factors, but, in principle, did not oppose either the eligibility or suitability determinations on the BLM administered lands along the waterways reviewed. Thirty-four letters supported the suitability determination for the BLM administered lands along the Sweetwater River and encouraged the BLM to classify all eligible BLM administered lands as suitable. One letter from Wyoming Governor Mike Sullivan praised the process for conducting the eligibility and suitability reviews concurrently.

At public meetings, open houses, and feedback sessions since publication of the Draft EIS for the Green River RMP, there has been neither significant support nor opposition to the eligibility and suitability determinations made during the Wild and Scenic Rivers review.

Table A-2-1 summarizes the results of the wild and scenic rivers suitability review conducted for the BLM administered public lands that are the wild and scenic rivers in Green River Resource Management Plan Planning Area.

RESULTS OF THE WILD AND SCENIC RIVERS SUITABILITY REVIEW OF BLM-ADMINISTERED PUBLIC LANDS ALONG WATERWAYS IN THE GREEN RIVER RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PLAN PLANNING AREA

Red Creek (includes Little Red Creek, June Creek, and Beet Steer Creek)

The BLM determined that the 16 BLM administered public land parcels along the Red Creek Unit review segments including Little Red Creek, June Creek, and Beet Steer Creek do not meet the wild and scenic river suitability factors and will be given no further consideration in the wild and scenic rivers review. The non-suitability determination is based on (1) the potential conflicts with management and activities conducted on the adjacent and downstream state and private lands that BLM has no jurisdiction or control over; and (2) The suitability of the BLM to manage the BLM administered public lands involved in the context of a Wild and Scenic River because of the interpreted parcels of public and state land. The land and resource values on the BLM administered lands involved in and will continue to be appropriately managed under all other applicable BLM mandates and regulations for multiple use, sustained yield, and environmental integrity, and should suffer no adverse effects for lack of a wild and scenic river designation.

Canyon Creek (includes Dripping Springs, East, Middle, and West Forks)

It was determined that the 14 BLM administered public land parcels along the Curtain Creek Unit review segments including Dripping Springs, East, Middle, and West Forks do not meet the wild and scenic river suitability factors and will be given no further consideration in the wild and scenic river review. The non-suitability determination is based on (1) the potential conflicts with management and activities conducted on the adjacent and downstream state and private lands that BLM has no jurisdiction or control over; and (2) The suitability of the BLM to manage the BLM administered public lands involved in the context of a Wild and Scenic River because of the interpreted parcels of public and state land. The land and resource values on the BLM administered lands involved in and will continue to be appropriately managed under all other applicable BLM mandates and regulations for multiple use, sustained yield, and environmental integrity, and should suffer no adverse effects for lack of a wild and scenic river designation.

Sweetwater River

It was determined that the 0 BLM administered public land parcels along the Sweetwater River Unit review segments meet the wild and scenic river suitability factors and will be given no further consideration in the wild and scenic river review. The non-suitability determination is based on (1) the potential conflicts with management and activities conducted on the adjacent and downstream state and private lands that BLM has no jurisdiction or control over; and (2) The suitability of the BLM to manage the BLM administered public lands involved in the context of a Wild and Scenic River because of the interpreted parcels of public and private state land. The land and resource values on the BLM administered lands involved in and will continue to be appropriately managed under all other applicable BLM mandates and regulations for multiple use, sustained yield, and environmental integrity, and should suffer no adverse effects for lack of a wild and scenic river designation.

North Fork of Bear Creek

It proved that the 0 BLM administered public land parcels along the North Fork of Bear Creek Unit review segments do not meet the wild and scenic river suitability factors and will be given no further consideration for inclusion in the wild and scenic river review. The non-suitability determination is based on (1) The BLM administered land parcels do not constitute a wild in the context of the National Wild and Scenic River System; and (2) The lack of public, state local, federal, tribal, or interest recreation or protection of part of all of the creek. The land and resource values on the BLM administered lands involved in and will continue to be appropriately managed under all other applicable BLM mandates and regulations for multiple use, sustained yield, and environmental integrity, and should suffer no adverse effects for lack of a wild and scenic river designation.

Big Sandy River

It was determined that the one BLM administered public land parcel along the Big Sandy River Unit review segment do not meet the wild and scenic river suitability factors and will be given no further consideration for inclusion in the wild and scenic river system. The non-suitability determination is based on the suitability of the BLM to manage the small amount of BLM administered public lands involved in the context of a Wild and Scenic River. The land and resource values on the BLM administered lands involved in and will continue to be appropriately managed under all other applicable BLM mandates and regulations for multiple use, sustained yield, and environmental integrity, and should suffer no adverse effects for lack of a wild and scenic river designation.

Green River

It was determined that the 0 BLM administered public land parcels along the Green River Unit review segments do not meet the wild and scenic river suitability factors and will be given no further consideration for inclusion in the wild and scenic river system. The non-suitability determination is based on the suitability of the BLM to manage the small amount of BLM administered public lands involved in the context of a Wild and Scenic River. The land and resource values on the BLM administered lands involved in and will continue to be appropriately managed under all other applicable BLM mandates and regulations for multiple use, sustained yield, and environmental integrity, and should suffer no adverse effects for lack of a wild and scenic river designation.
# APPENDIX 4-2

## TABLE A4-2-1

**SUMMARY OF WILD AND SCENIC RIVERS SUITABILITY REVIEW OF BLM-ADMINISTERED PUBLIC LANDS THAT MEET THE WSR ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA ALONG WATERWAYS IN THE GREEN RIVER RESOURCE AREA**

(September 1992)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Waterway Reviewed</th>
<th>Determination</th>
<th>Justification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Red Creek Unit</td>
<td>BLM Lands Not Suitable</td>
<td>Not a worthy addition to WSR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(all BLM land parcels along Red Creek and all other tributaries in the unit)</td>
<td></td>
<td>System: Land ownership conflicts. Manageability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currant Creek Unit</td>
<td>BLM Lands Not Suitable</td>
<td>Land ownership conflicts. Manageability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(all BLM land parcels along Currant Creek and all other tributaries in the unit)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Creek</td>
<td>BLM Lands Not Suitable</td>
<td>Land ownership conflicts. Manageability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Fork of Bear Creek</td>
<td>BLM Lands Not Suitable</td>
<td>Not a worthy addition to WSR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(all BLM land parcels along North Fork of Bear Creek)</td>
<td></td>
<td>System: Lack of interest for designation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canyon Creek</td>
<td>BLM Lands Not Suitable</td>
<td>Potential use conflicts. Manageability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green River¹</td>
<td>BLM Lands Not Suitable</td>
<td>Manageability. Land ownership conflicts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweetwater River</td>
<td>7 BLM Land Parcels Suitable</td>
<td>Scenic, historic, and recreational values.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(upstream portion of review segment)</td>
<td></td>
<td>unique land and resource diversity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweetwater River</td>
<td>3 BLM Land Parcels Not Suitable</td>
<td>Land ownership conflicts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(downstream portion of review segment)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big Sandy River</td>
<td>BLM Lands Not Suitable</td>
<td>Manageability</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Green River: The portion of the Green River administered by the BLM did not meet the suitability factors based upon the ability of the BLM to manage the BLM-administered lands in the context of a wild and scenic river because of the large and numerous separations of the few BLM-administered parcels by interspersed private and state lands and by other federal lands administered by the BOR and USFWS. However, the BLM would participate in any future joint WSR reviews or studies that may be conducted on the Green River.
APPENDIX 5-I

STANDARD PRACTICES, BEST MANAGEMENT PRACTICES, AND GUIDELINES FOR SURFACE DISTURBING ACTIVITIES

This appendix describes the practices utilized to mitigate adverse effects caused by surface disturbing activities.

Standard practices applied to surface disturbing activities are statements of guidelines and techniques for establishing standards (or national) consistency in avoiding and mitigating environmental impacts and resource conflicts. These practices have been developed through field experience, through planning analyses, and from legal or regulatory directives. They emphasize the Bureau's responsibility to ensure that good construction practices are used on public lands, and they apply to all types of surface disturbing activities.

Best management practices (BMPs) are developed by State agencies in cooperation with Federal agencies to control nonpoint source pollution, primarily the runoff of the Clean Water Act and the CTR 1865 require states to maintain a "Water Quality Management Planning Continuing Planning Process." The primary purpose of this process is to address water quality among other issues, address BMPs; BMPs are advised rather than required. BMPs are a key element in the Water Quality Plan Plan with which the Federal Government must comply under Executive Orders 12088 and 12372, and Clean Water Act Sections 319(a) and 319(a). The standard practices in this document are designed to meet the intent of the State's BMPs, and may therefore be subject to revision when the State BMPs are updated.

The State of Wyoming has released draft basin plans (in BMPs) which address authoritative statements or policy statements in lieu of BMPs for minerals and oil and gas. The State has not yet released a draft basin plan. The State has adopted the policy that the rules and regulations promulgated for oil and gas exploration and development activities, and other related water quality measures shall be considered as the BMPs for these activities.

The Wyoming BMP policy on reclamation assumes that an area can be reclaimed, or that it is no longer subject to disturbance, and that every surface disturbance on public lands receives attention for short-term stabilization and long-term reclamation. Mitigation measures reduce the extent of the area which is reclaimed to an area which is subject to disturbance (as defined by the Bureau of Land Management). It is designed to protect the environment and to reduce the effects of mining activities. The BLM reclamation regulations require that all mining activities be consistent with the guidelines set forth in the reclamation regulations. These regulations are intended to ensure that mining activities are conducted in a manner that minimizes the environmental impact of mining activities.

In addition to the BMPs developed by the Water Quality Plan Plan with which the Federal Government must comply under Executive Orders 12088 and 12372, and Clean Water Act Sections 319(a) and 319(a), the Bureau has adopted the policy that the rules and regulations promulgated for oil and gas exploration and development activities, and other related water quality measures shall be considered as the BMPs for these activities.

The Wyoming BMP policy on reclamation assumes that an area can be reclaimed, or that it is no longer subject to disturbance, and that every surface disturbance on public lands receives attention for short-term stabilization and long-term reclamation. Mitigation measures reduce the extent of the area which is reclaimed to an area which is subject to disturbance (as defined by the Bureau of Land Management). It is designed to protect the environment and to reduce the effects of mining activities. The BLM reclamation regulations require that all mining activities be consistent with the guidelines set forth in the reclamation regulations. These regulations are intended to ensure that mining activities are conducted in a manner that minimizes the environmental impact of mining activities.

The following are standard practices applied to surface disturbing activities. These practices are applied, when necessary, to reduce environmental impacts. Large projects require construction plans and/or erosion control, reclamation, and vegetation plans. (Appendix 5-1) which would incorporate these practices. The standard practices or this document are designed to meet the intent of the State's BMPs, and may therefore be subject to revision when the State BMPs are updated.

Although the headings below address specific types of mining activities, the practices may address a variety of surface disturbing problems. These notations do not represent all practices, but represent those which are assumed to be acceptable in all acceptable proposed surface disturbing activities. Operators are encouraged to develop better methods for achieving the same goals.

Air Quality

Bureau actions must comply with all applicable air quality laws, regulations, and standards, and must have the minimum amount of emissions that include only those air pollution sources that are of public interest, and require that every surface disturbance on public lands receive attention for short-term stabilization and long-term reclamation. Mitigation measures reduce the extent of the area which is reclaimed to an area which is subject to disturbance (as defined by the Bureau of Land Management). It is designed to protect the environment and to reduce the effects of mining activities. The BLM reclamation regulations require that all mining activities be consistent with the guidelines set forth in the reclamation regulations. These regulations are intended to ensure that mining activities are conducted in a manner that minimizes the environmental impact of mining activities.

The following are standard practices applied to surface disturbing activities. These practices are applied, when necessary, to reduce environmental impacts. Large projects require construction plans and/or erosion control, reclamation, and vegetation plans. (Appendix 5-1) which would incorporate these practices. The standard practices or this document are designed to meet the intent of the State's BMPs, and may therefore be subject to revision when the State BMPs are updated.

Although the headings below address specific types of mining activities, the practices may address a variety of surface disturbing problems. These notations do not represent all practices, but represent those which are assumed to be acceptable in all acceptable proposed surface disturbing activities. Operators are encouraged to develop better methods for achieving the same goals.

Air Quality

Bureau actions must comply with all applicable air quality laws, regulations, and standards, and must have the minimum amount of emissions that include only those air pollution sources that are of public interest, and require that every surface disturbance on public lands receive attention for short-term stabilization and long-term reclamation. Mitigation measures reduce the extent of the area which is reclaimed to an area which is subject to disturbance (as defined by the Bureau of Land Management). It is designed to protect the environment and to reduce the effects of mining activities. The BLM reclamation regulations require that all mining activities be consistent with the guidelines set forth in the reclamation regulations. These regulations are intended to ensure that mining activities are conducted in a manner that minimizes the environmental impact of mining activities.

The following are standard practices applied to surface disturbing activities. These practices are applied, when necessary, to reduce environmental impacts. Large projects require construction plans and/or erosion control, reclamation, and vegetation plans. (Appendix 5-1) which would incorporate these practices. The standard practices or this document are designed to meet the intent of the State's BMPs, and may therefore be subject to revision when the State BMPs are updated.

Although the headings below address specific types of mining activities, the practices may address a variety of surface disturbing problems. These notations do not represent all practices, but represent those which are assumed to be acceptable in all acceptable proposed surface disturbing activities. Operators are encouraged to develop better methods for achieving the same goals.

Air Quality

Bureau actions must comply with all applicable air quality laws, regulations, and standards, and must have the minimum amount of emissions that include only those air pollution sources that are of public interest, and require that every surface disturbance on public lands receive attention for short-term stabilization and long-term reclamation. Mitigation measures reduce the extent of the area which is reclaimed to an area which is subject to disturbance (as defined by the Bureau of Land Management). It is designed to protect the environment and to reduce the effects of mining activities. The BLM reclamation regulations require that all mining activities be consistent with the guidelines set forth in the reclamation regulations. These regulations are intended to ensure that mining activities are conducted in a manner that minimizes the environmental impact of mining activities.

The following are standard practices applied to surface disturbing activities. These practices are applied, when necessary, to reduce environmental impacts. Large projects require construction plans and/or erosion control, reclamation, and vegetation plans. (Appendix 5-1) which would incorporate these practices. The standard practices or this document are designed to meet the intent of the State's BMPs, and may therefore be subject to revision when the State BMPs are updated.

Although the headings below address specific types of mining activities, the practices may address a variety of surface disturbing problems. These notations do not represent all practices, but represent those which are assumed to be acceptable in all acceptable proposed surface disturbing activities. Operators are encouraged to develop better methods for achieving the same goals.

Air Quality

Bureau actions must comply with all applicable air quality laws, regulations, and standards, and must have the minimum amount of emissions that include only those air pollution sources that are of public interest, and require that every surface disturbance on public lands receive attention for short-term stabilization and long-term reclamation. Mitigation measures reduce the extent of the area which is reclaimed to an area which is subject to disturbance (as defined by the Bureau of Land Management). It is designed to protect the environment and to reduce the effects of mining activities. The BLM reclamation regulations require that all mining activities be consistent with the guidelines set forth in the reclamation regulations. These regulations are intended to ensure that mining activities are conducted in a manner that minimizes the environmental impact of mining activities.

The following are standard practices applied to surface disturbing activities. These practices are applied, when necessary, to reduce environmental impacts. Large projects require construction plans and/or erosion control, reclamation, and vegetation plans. (Appendix 5-1) which would incorporate these practices. The standard practices or this document are designed to meet the intent of the State's BMPs, and may therefore be subject to revision when the State BMPs are updated.

Although the headings below address specific types of mining activities, the practices may address a variety of surface disturbing problems. These notations do not represent all practices, but represent those which are assumed to be acceptable in all acceptable proposed surface disturbing activities. Operators are encouraged to develop better methods for achieving the same goals.

Air Quality

Bureau actions must comply with all applicable air quality laws, regulations, and standards, and must have the minimum amount of emissions that include only those air pollution sources that are of public interest, and require that every surface disturbance on public lands receive attention for short-term stabilization and long-term reclamation. Mitigation measures reduce the extent of the area which is reclaimed to an area which is subject to disturbance (as defined by the Bureau of Land Management). It is designed to protect the environment and to reduce the effects of mining activities. The BLM reclamation regulations require that all mining activities be consistent with the guidelines set forth in the reclamation regulations. These regulations are intended to ensure that mining activities are conducted in a manner that minimizes the environmental impact of mining activities.
On all areas to be reclaimed, soil mixes would be required to be site-specific, composed of native species, and would be required to allow for native plant establishment. Appropriately designed seed mix composition lists must be developed for each site if the project occurs in an area where there are several different plant communities present. Limbergrass palatability and wildlife habitat needs will be considered in seed mix selection. The following is a list of general guidance for native seed use in BLM Manzanar 175 demonstration, Transpl., Augmentation, and Restoration of Fish, Wildlife, and Plants, and Executive Order No. 11988 (Fish and Wildlife).

Intersecting, secondary, or staggered seeding may be required to achieve regeneration objectives. During rehabilitation of areas in important wildlife habitat, provision would be made for the establishment of suitable plants and wildlife species, if determined to be beneficial for the habitat affected. Follow-up seeding or corrective erosion control measures may be required on areas of surface defacement to reduce future failure.

Trees, shrubs, and ground cover must be cleared from rights-of-way or other areas requiring vegetation control. No further vegetation control would be required, except in cases of surface or channel degradation.

Rocks or gravel would be responsible for the control of all non-vegetated areas through surface defacement. Aerial application of chemicals would be prohibited within 10±10 feet of special status plant locations, and hand application would be prohibited within 5 feet of special status plant locations. Inactive deferred areas would be allowed in the Rock Springs District Nova Scotia Woodlands (CA 1982b) or the Rock Springs District Nova Scotia Woodlands (CA 1987). Herbicide application would be monitored by the BLM authorized officer.

Rocks

Rocks would be constructed as described in BLM Manual 9113. New construction would be placed in three layers: a base layer, a middle layer, and a surface layer. Base and surface layer would be in a mix of gravel, sand, and phosphates prior to the Grizzly River. Where necessary, running surfaces of the roads would be gravelled if the base does not already contain sufficient aggregate. New roads would be upgradient where necessary.

To control or reduce sediments, guidance involving proper road placement and barrier strips to stream channels, graveling, proper drainage, seasonal closure, and in some cases, redesign or construction of old roads to eliminate erosion would be necessary. Construction may also be prohibited during periods when soil is saturated, from May 1st to October 31st.

On newly constructed roads and permanent roads, the placement of topsoil, seeding, and stabilization would be required on all cut and fill slopes, and on cut and fill slopes other than those that do not have a source of on-site native seed materials. On-cut and fill slopes would be seeded with native species that would generally be restored using on-site native seed materials. Seed mix composition lists must be developed for each site if the project occurs in an area where there are several different plant communities present. Limbergrass palatability and wildlife habitat needs will be considered in seed mix selection.

The following genera and species are recommended for seed mix composition lists:

- *Buchloe dactyloides* (bluebunch)
- *Calamovilfa longifolia* (tule)
- *Ceratocephalus leucanthemos* (blue grama)
- *Eriochloa hymenoides* (tall love grass)
- *Koeleria macrantha* (bluebunch)
- *Puccinellia fendleri* (sand bluestem)
- *Poa secunda* (brome grass)
- *Stipa viridula* (bitterbrush)

The following is a list of general guidance for native seed use in BLM Manzanar 175 demonstration, Transpl., Augmentation, and Restoration of Fish, Wildlife, and Plants, and Executive Order No. 11988 (Fish and Wildlife).

Intersecting, secondary, or staggered seeding may be required to achieve regeneration objectives. During rehabilitation of areas in important wildlife habitat, provision would be made for the establishment of suitable plants and wildlife species, if determined to be beneficial for the habitat affected. Follow-up seeding or corrective erosion control measures may be required on areas of surface defacement to reduce future failure.

Trees, shrubs, and ground cover must be cleared from rights-of-way or other areas requiring vegetation control. No further vegetation control would be required, except in cases of surface or channel degradation.

Rocks, shrubs, and ground cover must be cleared from rights-of-way or other areas requiring vegetation control. No further vegetation control would be required, except in cases of surface or channel degradation.

Rocks would be constructed as described in BLM Manual 9113. New construction would be placed in three layers: a base layer, a middle layer, and a surface layer. Base and surface layer would be in a mix of gravel, sand, and phosphates prior to the Grizzly River. Where necessary, running surfaces of the roads would be gravelled if the base does not already contain sufficient aggregate. New roads would be upgradient where necessary.

To control or reduce sediments, guidance involving proper road placement and barrier strips to stream channels, graveling, proper drainage, seasonal closure, and in some cases, redesign or construction of old roads to eliminate erosion would be necessary. Construction may also be prohibited during periods when soil is saturated, from May 1st to October 31st.

On newly constructed roads and permanent roads, the placement of topsoil, seeding, and stabilization would be required on all cut and fill slopes, and on cut and fill slopes other than those that do not have a source of on-site native seed materials. On-cut and fill slopes would be seeded with native species that would generally be restored using on-site native seed materials. Seed mix composition lists must be developed for each site if the project occurs in an area where there are several different plant communities present. Limbergrass palatability and wildlife habitat needs will be considered in seed mix selection.

The following genera and species are recommended for seed mix composition lists:

- *Buchloe dactyloides* (bluebunch)
- *Calamovilfa longifolia* (tule)
- *Ceratocephalus leucanthemos* (blue grama)
- *Eriochloa hymenoides* (tall love grass)
- *Koeleria macrantha* (bluebunch)
- *Puccinellia fendleri* (sand bluestem)
- *Poa secunda* (brome grass)
- *Stipa viridula* (bitterbrush)

On-cut and fill slopes would be seeded with native species that would generally be restored using on-site native seed materials. Seed mix composition lists must be developed for each site if the project occurs in an area where there are several different plant communities present. Limbergrass palatability and wildlife habitat needs will be considered in seed mix selection.

The following genera and species are recommended for seed mix composition lists:

- *Buchloe dactyloides* (bluebunch)
- *Calamovilfa longifolia* (tule)
- *Ceratocephalus leucanthemos* (blue grama)
- *Eriochloa hymenoides* (tall love grass)
- *Koeleria macrantha* (bluebunch)
- *Puccinellia fendleri* (sand bluestem)
- *Poa secunda* (brome grass)
- *Stipa viridula* (bitterbrush)
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All surface disturbance, permanent facilities, etc., shall remain a minimum of 500 feet away from the edge of surface waters, riparian areas, wetlands, and 100-year floodplains unless it is determined through site specific analysis and the Area Manager approves in writing, that there is no practicable alternative to the proposed action. If such a circumstance exists, then all practicable measures to mitigate possible harm to these areas must be employed. These mitigating measures would be determined case by case and may include, but are not limited to, diking, lining, screening, mulching, terracing, and diversions.

Well Pads and Facilities

Dumping of produced water on roads would not be allowed unless TDS is less than 400 mg/l (State standard for the Colorado River drainage) and the water does not contain hazardous material. No produced water would be allowed on roads in Sublette County.

Both produced water and reserve pits should be constructed to ensure protection of surface and ground water. The review to determine the need for installation of lining material should be done on a case-by-case basis and consider soil permeability, water quality, and depth to ground water. Oil-based muds used for drilling operations should be environmentally acceptable.

Pits would be fenced as specified in individual authorizations. Any pits with harmful fluids in them shall be maintained in a manner that would prevent migratory bird mortality.

Abandoned sites must be satisfactorily rehabilitated in accordance with a plan approved by the BLM. Soil samples may be analyzed to determine reclamation potential, appropriate reseeding species, and nutrient deficits. Tests may include: pH, mechanical analysis, electrical conductivity, and sodium content. Terraces or elongated water breaks would be constructed after slope reduction. Disturbances should be reclaimed or managed for zero runoff from the location until the area is stabilized. All excavations and pits should be closed by backfilling and contouring to conform to surrounding terrain. On well pads and larger locations, the surface use plan would include objectives for successful reclamation including: soil stabilization, plant community composition, and desired vegetation density and diversity.

On producing locations, operators would be required to reduce slopes to original contours (not to exceed 3:1 slopes). Areas not used for production purposes should be backfilled and blended into the surrounding terrain, reseeded, and erosion control measures installed. Erosion control measures would be required after slope reduction. Facilities would be required to approach zero runoff from the location to avoid contamination and water quality degradation downstream. Mulching, erosion control measures, and fertilization may be required to achieve acceptable stabilization.

Reserve pits would not be located in areas where groundwater is less than 50 feet from the surface and soil permeability is greater than 10 cm/hr.

Produced water from oil and gas operations would be disposed of in accordance with the requirements of Onshore Oil and Gas Order #7.

Any produced water pit or drilling fluids pit that shows indications of containing hazardous wastes would be tested for the Toxicity Characteristic Leaching Procedure constituents. If analysis proves positive, the fluids would be disposed of in an approved manner. The cost of the testing and disposal would be borne by the potentially responsible party.

No surface disturbance is recommended on slopes in excess of 25 percent unless erosion controls can be ensured and adequate re-vegetation is expected. Engineering proposals and revegetation and restoration plans would be required in these areas.

No sour gas lines would be located closer than one mile to a populated area or sensitive receptor. The applicants must use the best available engineering design (e.g., alignment, block valve type and spacing, pipe grade), and best construction techniques (e.g., surveillance, warning signs) as approved by the Authorized Officer to minimize both the probability of rupture and radius of exposure in the event of an accidental pipeline release of sour gas. A variance from the one-mile distance may be granted by the Authorized Officer based on detailed site-specific analysis that would consider meteorology, topography, and special pipeline design and/or construction measures. This analysis would ensure that populated areas and sensitive receptors would not be exposed to an increased level of risk.

Wilderness

A controlled surface use stipulation would be applied for activities within 1/4 mile of the visual horizon of the WSA boundary. Actions within or adjacent to the WSAs would be evaluated on a case-by-case basis to determine if appropriate mitigation would be necessary.
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ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS AND MITIGATION OF OIL AND GAS DEVELOPMENT AND OTHER SURFACE DISTURBING ACTIVITIES

THE TIERED APPROACH

The BL 111 has developed, and the BL 111-121 11111 Director has utilized, a tiered approach to the analysis of oil and gas development. This approach is applicable to all surface disturbing activities, and is as follows:

Tier One: The BMP develops the necessary policy, land use decisions, and environmental analyses to deal with the public lands. It is during this phase of analysis that lease stipulations are determined.

Tier Two: A more detailed evaluation of planned activity for a specific area is performed and analyzed (e.g., by field evaluation of proposed or a coordinated activity plan). An environmental analysis looks at a reasonable range of alternatives and assesses the cumulative impacts of the development. Conditions and stipulations for drills and COAs may be determined in this tier.

Tier Three: A site-specific environmental analysis would be made for each application for a permit to drill, right-of-way (ROW), siting notice, etc., which would assess the impacts of the proposed development. COAs may be determined at this tier.

At each tiered phase of evaluation, the appropriate level of necessary and due diligence activities was determined with the proposed development then assessed. Where necessary, mitigation to other resources is identified, season restrictions or other protective measures are then developed for use by the decisionmaker. These would be tied to leases as stipulations, or to ROWs, sitings, notices, etc., and COAs.

The tiered approach to evaluating effects of proposed actions that BMP authorities allow for subsequent refining of planning and management decisions to avoid unnecessary and under-degradation of other resources. This is primarily done through conducting and documenting the effectiveness of environmental analyses of proposed development, which includes identifying mitigation requirements for the impacted resources.

The BMP not only has the authority, but also the responsibility to manage the public lands and resources in a manner that maintains balance between commodity development and protection of environmental and other land and resource values for future generations. This authority and responsibility are paramount to the BMPs' mandate to manage the public lands and resources under the concepts of multiple-use, sustained yield, and environmental integrity. Furthermore, the Federal Land Management Act (FLMA) requires the BMP to consider and coordinate with other public entities and plans, such as State and local planning documents, when making resource decisions.

If we did not have the authority to further refine our planning and management decisions, or increment marginal uses of prop-
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LEASE NOTICES

Lease notices are a parallel tool to lease stipulations. Lease notices are attached leases with time, location, resource, and emergency information to assist in submitting acceptable plans of operation, or to assist in the administration of leases. If a violation of a condition is known to exist that could affect lease operations, full disclosure should be made at the time of lease issuance through the use of lease notice.

PERMIT/ORDER CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL (COAs)

COAs are conditions or requirements under which a site-specific surface disturbing or human presence activity will be acceptable (in an AP). After issuing ROWs, the approved need for surface use(s) must be clearly notified and documented in the applicable site-specific environmental document. Any COA must also have specific, excepted, or modified criteria identified in the site-specific, environmental document to allow for changes in environmental conditions which were determined, by the BMPs, are large-negative environmental impacts.

COAs, when applied to oil and gas activities as with APs, must provide effective mitigation to prevent adverse and unnecessary changes in environmental conditions. Reference is made to the terms "unnecessary" and "undue degradation" in the following section to apply COAs.

Further analysis of Tier Two and Three providing clear and continuing need for such mitigation are necessary to prevent undue and unnecessary changes of the environment.

WAIVERS, MODIFICATIONS, OR EXCEPTIONS TO STIPULATIONS OR COAs

Lease use plans and/or NFEs determine/establish guidelines for future changes, modifications, or exceptions to stipulations or COAs that may be granted. Substantial modifications or waivers subsequent to lease issuance are subject to public review for at least a 30-day period in accordance with Section 502(e) of the Federal Oiler and Gas Leasing Reform Act of 1987. This standard would also be applied to COAs.

It is important to recognize that the authorized officer has the authority to modify the site location and design of facilities, control the rate of development and timing of operations as well as require other mitigation, i.e., COAs under Sections 2 and 6 of the standard (leases [BMP Form 310011 and under 43CFR 3101.2]. The authorized officer may also万公里 a proposed oil and gas operation up to 200 acres, or to initially disturb surface up to 80 days (the 60-200 meter buffer rule by using this authority, and attaching a COA to the AP).

The BMP 11111 11111 Director, or his representative, utilizing appropriate COAs, can exceed the 60-200 meter rule for site-specific actions, such as an APD, where there is site-specific, environmental analysis and clear and convincing evidence in the determination showing undue and unnecessary degradation would result if protective restrictions were not applied. This environmental documentation must address two factors: (1) a combination of benefits and environmental impacts which were clearly consistent with those resources which do not include adverse impacts that are acceptable level, and (2) the identified impacts constitute undue and unnecessary degradation of public lands or resources. This takes into consideration that due and necessary degradation is acceptable.

Any application of mitigation or COAs in a post-lease operation is subject to State Director review or requested by the operator. Such a review would consider whether the identified impact is unnecessary and undue degradation. If so determined, the COA would be upheld as being consistent with the granted lease rights, and within the Government's reserved authority to mitigate operations. If determined to be unnecessary and undue degradation, the mitigation would not be allowed. If the impaired mitigation was developed by the BMP, then a plan maintenance action or amendment would be necessary to correct any defects which may infringe on valid existing rights.
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EROSION CONTROL, REVEGETATION, AND RESTORATION PLAN (ERRP)

The purpose of developing an ERRP is to allow for cooperative innovation in site development and reclamation of a disturbed area to a predetermined land use for wellfield and treatment plant activities. The following is an outline of topics to be covered in an ERRP. All ERRPs must address these points but are not limited to them. Although the ERRP is a formal document, amendments can be approved by the Authorizing Officer.

I. INTRODUCTION
Clear identification of Reclamation Goal
This is to be identified by the Federal Land Management (FLM) agency concerned and should include specific goals for percent permanent cover and species diversity expected for successful reclamation. Permanent cover would be used as a guideline for establishing goals.

Short description of activity causing disturbance and project time frames:
- Proposed Start Date
- Duration of Project
- Completion Date
- End of Project Life (Estimated)
- Seasonal measures for ERRP
- Seasonal reviews to minimize change
- When plan would be considered implemented

III. SITE MAP FOR PROJECT SHOULD INCLUDE
This information should not just cover the proposed disturbed area, but should extend beyond site boundaries by approximately 150 yards.

- Soil Description and Boundaries Symbols
- Soil Outline
- Photo Record Point
- Riparian Areas
- Sable Areas

Location and Volume of Proposed Material Stockpiles
- Time Material Would Be Stored
- Type of Material in Pile
- Identity Existing Drainage Patterns
- Identity Existing Vegetative Cover
- Identity Existing ORV or Two-Track Roads

IV. ZERO RUNOFF
Zero runoff for purposes of the ERRP means no portion of natural or man-made rainfall would leave the disturbed area by either surface or subsurface flow.

All disturbed sites, except linear rights-of-way, would maintain zero runoff until the area is stabilized. Stabilization would be a value that must be clearly defined in the plan. Stabilization for purposes of the ERRP is to mean that point in time when neither erosion nor deposition occurs which is greater than pre-disturbance. This point must be measurable.

- Erosion or deposition occurring which is greater than pre-disturbance will be the point of measurement.

The 30-day runoff event can be estimated based on detailed site-specific analysis that would consider geology, topography, water quality, and special site design and/or construction measures.

V. EROSION CONTROL MEASURES
Description of Proposed Measures:
- Identity levels of runoff planned for, i.e., 50-year storm, etc.
- Include a description of the proposed construction design.
- Map locating erosion control measures placement
- Include Zero Runoff Measures

VI. FUGITIVE DUST CONTROL
Wetting or other approved dust abatement procedures would be implemented when necessary to prevent severe wind erosion and loss of soil materials during construction.

VI. REVEGETATION

Type
- Seed
- Established Stock
- Site Preparation
- Planting
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X. POTENTIAL PROBLEMS
- Address Possible Weak Points
  - Erosion
  - Slumping

VIII. MONITORING SITE RECLAMATION PROGRESS

Methods
- Time Frames
- Photo Record Station with location of Site Pre-disturbance

IX. SITE ABANDONMENT
- Include Time Frames
APPENDIX 6

GENERAL CULTURAL PRESCRIPTIONS

General Management Prescriptions

Initiate formal law enforcement patrol of the Sugarloaf petroglyphs, Tolar petroglyphs, White Mountain Petroglyphs ACEC, Cedar Canyon petroglyphs, Eden-Farson site, Pine Springs ACEC, and LaBarge Bluffs petroglyphs.

Administration of the Archeological Resources Protection Act (ARPA)

Administration of the ARPA will focus on three areas:

Public Education/Outreach Programs - designed to increase public appreciation and understanding of cultural resources through formal presentations to school groups, civic organizations, businesses, and other government offices; hosting of an annual Archeology Week fair at a shopping mall or other large facility; publication of brochures and other materials; leading tours to important sites; participation in academic forums and presentation of professional papers; sponsorship; or cooperative agreement for formal archeological and historical field schools.

Administrative Controls - including fencing, road closures, withdrawals, sign posting, and similar physical and administrative protection including, when possible, formal inventory of specific areas identified as likely to be impacted by looters and vandals.

Law Enforcement Patrol - District Ranger, sometimes with the assistance of Cultural Program personnel, would patrol specific sites and general areas identified as high potential for ARPA violation. Areas designated at this time include the Adobe Town-Monument Valley region and the Devils Playground-Twin Buttes area. Specific sites identified are the Dug Springs stage station, LaClede stage station, White Mountain petroglyphs, Cedar Canyon petroglyphs, Tolar petroglyphs, LaBarge Bluffs petroglyphs, Pine Spring, Sage Creek Mountain burial sites, North Table Mountain stratified site and associated site complex, Eden-Farson site, Finley site, and Farson Fossil Fish Beds, Eighteenmile Canyon Fish Beds, and Canyon Creek Fossil Rookery paleontological sites.

Fire Management Direction

Known Native American grave sites would be provided to the Fire Management Officer so that they would not be impacted by fire suppression activities.

Cultural inventories would not normally be required prior to fire fighting activities in most cases. On a case-by-case basis, the area archeologist may request the opportunity to inventory specific areas prior to their impact by firefighting activities.

The cultural program may conduct post-fire inventory of areas where fire lines were bladed or other substantial surface disturbance took place, and mitigation efforts may be undertaken at the discretion of the Area Manager.
PROCEDURES FOR PROCESSING APPLICATIONS IN AREAS OF SEASONAL RESTRICTION

Upon receipt of an application, the project location is reviewed against the resource management plan. The project is determined consistent with the plan and to identify existing resource concerns in the project area. An AIP is posted for 30 days for public review.

Review the proposal against existing environmental documents and the RMP to determine whether existing documentation is adequate.

If existing documentation is adequate, prepare an Administrative Determination (ADI) including appropriate mitigation measures for the proposed development or amendment when necessary.

If existing documentation is insufficient or nonexistent, prepare NEPA documents as needed and prepare adequate formal RMP documents.

Issue a decision on the application consistent with the AD or NEPA document as appropriate.

NOTES: In seasonally managed wildlife habitat, an approved APD will generally include a seasonal Closure of Approval (COA) because the APD is valid for one-year date of issuance and BLM does not control the start-up date for project activity. (2) Critical field conditions during the closure period cannot be predicted at the time of APD approval.

If seasonally restricted COA is needed because lease contains no such stipulation, the decision whether to impose the restriction must also be considered the reasonableness of the restrictions to relate to the operator's ability to exercise the benefits of the lease (43 CFR 3100.12.3). The need for a COA must be documented in a site-specific EA or EIS, if necessary. This analysis must provide clear and compelling evidence of the need and necessary justification would result if the COA were not applied.

PROCEDURES FOR HANDLING REQUESTS FOR EXCEPTION FROM SEASONAL STIPULATIONS AND/OR CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

A request for exception must be initiated by writing the operator. This may be done concurrently with submission of an application for situations involving lease stipulations, or subsequent to permit approval in the case of COA attached to permit applications.

When requested concurrently with an application, the exception from a stipulation or from a COA is considered in part of the project proposal in the RMP NEPA compliance review.

For separate requests, the request is considered as a separate action and is analyzed and documented individually for RMP and NEPA compliance.

CRITERIA FOR CONSIDERING EXCEPTIONS TO SEASONAL RESTRICTED ACTIVITY

Presently, land use activities within the Green River Resource Area may be authorized with seasonal restrictions, no "surface occupancy" (i.e., restriction to two-wheeled and small,专项整治 activities. Stipulations were developed to provide protection of natural resources. Protective wildlife seasonal stipulations are developed consistent with statewide dates. For example, big game winter ranges are protected from November 15 through April 30. This restriction is not intended to be a direct area to development but is in place to protect big game if weather or other habitat need dictate that it is necessary.

Over the past few years the public has received the impression that crucial winter ranges are open to all hunting. This is true only when conditions dictate. The BLM can and does grant exceptions to seasonal restrictions if the wildlife benefit. In consultation with the Wildlife Game and Fish Department, the BLM is aware of the need to establish appropriate areas for non-lethal hunting. This protects the population being protected. Wildlife biologists use a set of criteria when considering a request for an exception. Professional judgment plays a key part in the Bureau’s recommendation to the Area Manager to grant or not grant exceptions.

There is no clear cut formula.

Approximately 20 percent of the Federal lands (3,331,000 acres) in the resource area have wildlife restrictions. Following are some of the factors considered by the wildlife biologist to determine if a request for exception should be granted.

Big Game Winter Ranges

The criteria used for critical, conjugate game winter range is the areas covered, relationship to wildlife and wildlife in the area at its use, and whether or not the population at its use, and whether or not the population at its use, and whether or not the population at its use.

The most crucial time period for these animals in the Green River Resource Area is usually from January through March 15, and this time period is when the stipulation is generally enforced. However, the remaining time frames of the standard statewide stipulation allow the authorities the option to enforce a longer seasonal restriction if winter conditions warrant.

In both cases, processing includes coordination with the Wyoming Game and Fish Department (WGF) for seasonal wildlife-based lease stipulations or permit COAs.

The unpredictability of weather, animal movement and conditions, etc. preclude analysis of requests related to wildlife far in advance of the time periods in question. Analyses of t.g. include review of potential mitigation measures and alternative traffic restrictions, alternative scheduling, staging activity, etc.

A. General Considerations Regarding a Request for Exception

- Are the factors leading to the inclusion of the wildlife seasonal restriction still valid?
- Subsequent requests for an exception from a lease stipulation or a permit from a relief from a conditional on an application (e.g., ADP, SS, ROW) are:
- What are the dates for the proposed exception/permit?

B. Criteria to Consider for Granting Exceptions on Winter Ranges:

1. Animal presence or absence
2. Animal condition
3. Weather severity
   a. (winter conditions: depth, existing, previous)
   b. snow/temperature patterns
   c. animal size and condition of animals except use
   d. air temperature and duration
   e. actual dates of snowfall: forecast dates for duration of winter
4. Habitat Condition and Availability
   a. animal density, depth, or snow
   b. condition, good or poor
   c. competition (with other wildlife)
   d. fate availability
   e. amount of range
   f. snow depth
   g. has livestock use decreased available winter range
5. Site Location
   a. difficulty of access to habitat
   b. presence of winter range
   c. proportion of winter range is affected
   d. range is the site located within the winter range
6. Other activity in the area and this activity likely to increase the cumulative adverse impact
7. Timing
   a. early or winter season
   b. near end of winter season
   c. what kind of length and duration of disruptive activity is expected
   d. how much of the winter is remaining when activity is likely to occur

General Considerations for Granting Exceptions to Stipulations

- Short-term exceptions are more likely to be considered early (November 15 December 10 and late April) (April 20) in the winter season, depending on weather conditions and animal occupancy. Exceptions would not be granted if requested from December 15 March unless unusually mild winter conditions prevail. Exceptions in late calving areas (May 1 June 30) dates
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Moose
- Exception will generally be granted except where physical barriers (i.e., highways, fences, rivers, canyons, etc.) limit animals ability to move into other suitable habitats. In the case of developing oil and gas fields would be proposed of disruptive disturbance. BLM and WGF coordination will be required to assure that cumulative disturbance and/or range competition with other big game and livestock will not affect herd objectives. Exceptions to restrictions will be closely watched during severe winters when moose movement is restricted.

Antelope
- Exceptions will generally be granted except where physical barriers (i.e., highways, fences, rivers, canyons, etc.) limit animals ability to move into other suitable habitats. In the case of developing oil and gas fields would be proposed of disruptive disturbance. BLM and WGF coordination will be required to assure that cumulative disturbance and/or range competition with other big game and livestock will not affect herd objectives. Exceptions to restrictions will be closely watched during severe winters when moose movement is restricted.

Deer
- Short-term exceptions may be granted early (November 15 December 10 and late April) (April 20) depending on weather conditions and animal occupancy, using the previously discussed criteria. Exceptions can be granted for north slopes, deep snow areas or other habitats within crucial ranges which preclude use by wintering deer, and in which access roads are determined to have little adverse impact.

Raptors
- The "no-surface occupancy" stipulation of February 1 to July 31, wintering or breeding of raptors must be shortened depending on nesting choreology of individual species, nest site location and topography. Should be possible, may be allowed. Exceptions may be available.

Sage Grouse
A "controlled surface use" stipulation will be applied a 14-mile radius of active sage grouse nesting grounds to include as aboveground facilities (power lines, storage tanks, fences, etc). Local disturbances such as pipelines, seismic activity, etc., could be granted exceptions. A "controlled surface use" stipulation will be applied from February 1 through May 15, and this time period is when the stipulation is generally enforced. However, the remaining time frames of the scheduled statewide stipulation allows the authorities the option to enforce a longer seasonal restriction if winter conditions warrant.

General Considerations for Granting Exceptions to Stipulations

- Short-term exceptions are more likely to be considered early (November 15 December 10 and late April) (April 20) in the winter season, depending on weather conditions and animal occupancy. Exceptions would not be granted if requested from December 15 March unless unusually mild winter conditions prevail. Exceptions in late calving areas (May 1 June 30) dates

will not be granted due to elk sensitivity to disturbance. Displacement in open habitats is much greater than wooded or forests, hence restricted areas will encompass larger areas in open habitats.
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**LANDS IDENTIFIED AS POSSIBLY SUITABLE FOR DISPOSAL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>Township and Range</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Lot or Legal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Section 8</td>
<td>Lot 5, S1/2NE1/4SE1/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55.23</td>
<td>T. 24 N., R. 99 W.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.33</td>
<td>T. 24 N., R. 99 W.</td>
<td>Section 9</td>
<td>Lot 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128.00</td>
<td>T. 13 N., R. 101 W.</td>
<td>Section 18</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107.61</td>
<td>T. 13 N., R. 102 W.</td>
<td>Section 13</td>
<td>Lots 1, 2, and 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>T. 27 N., R. 103 W.</td>
<td>Section 4</td>
<td>S1/2SW1/4NE1/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80.00</td>
<td>T. 30 N., R. 105 W.</td>
<td>Section 20</td>
<td>NW1/4SE1/4, NE1/4NW1/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.00</td>
<td>T. 19 N., R. 106 W.</td>
<td>Section 34</td>
<td>SW1/4SE1/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80.00</td>
<td>T. 19 N., R. 107 W.</td>
<td>Section 34</td>
<td>N1/2NE1/4NE1/4, S1/2NE1/4NW1/4, W1/2NW1/4SW1/4, E1/2NE1/4ES1/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.53</td>
<td>T. 12 N., R. 111 W.</td>
<td>Section 6</td>
<td>Lots 11, 12, and 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.56</td>
<td>T. 12 N., R. 112 W.</td>
<td>Section 1</td>
<td>Lot 5, 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.39</td>
<td>T. 12 N., R. 112 W.</td>
<td>Section 13</td>
<td>Lot 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sale/Exchange - Lands Available for Community or Industrial Expansion**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>Township and Range</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Lot or Legal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>80.00</td>
<td>T. 21 N., R. 101 W.</td>
<td>Section 24</td>
<td>N1/2SW1/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64.00</td>
<td>T. 21 N., R. 101 W.</td>
<td>Section 36</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.00</td>
<td>T. 19 N., R. 105 W.</td>
<td>Section 10</td>
<td>NE1/4NW1/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64.00</td>
<td>T. 19 N., R. 104 W.</td>
<td>Section 2</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64.00</td>
<td>T. 19 N., R. 104 W.</td>
<td>Section 14</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64.00</td>
<td>T. 18 N., R. 104 W.</td>
<td>Section 20</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160.00</td>
<td>T. 18 N., R. 104 W.</td>
<td>Section 22</td>
<td>NW1/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82.87</td>
<td>T. 18 N., R. 105 W.</td>
<td>Section 8</td>
<td>Lots 5, 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>320.00</td>
<td>T. 18 N., R. 105 W.</td>
<td>Section 18</td>
<td>S1/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120.00</td>
<td>T. 19 N., R. 105 W.</td>
<td>Section 4</td>
<td>N1/2SE1/4, SE1/4SE1/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>240.00</td>
<td>T. 18 N., R. 106 W.</td>
<td>Section 14</td>
<td>E1/2SW1/4, SE1/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64.00</td>
<td>T. 18 N., R. 106 W.</td>
<td>Section 24</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>480.10</td>
<td>T. 17 N., R. 107 W.</td>
<td>Section 4</td>
<td>Lots 7, 8, S1/2NW1/2, S1/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>315.62</td>
<td>T. 17 N., R. 107 W.</td>
<td>Section 6</td>
<td>Lots 10-14, SW1/4NW1/4, E1/2SW1/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>640.00</td>
<td>T. 17 N., R. 107 W.</td>
<td>Section 8</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>230.00</td>
<td>T. 17 N., R. 107 W.</td>
<td>Section 10</td>
<td>Lots S1/2E1/2, E1/2SW1/4, E1/2SW1/2, SE1/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>640.00</td>
<td>T. 17 N., R. 107 W.</td>
<td>Section 20</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>640.00</td>
<td>T. 17 N., R. 107 W.</td>
<td>Section 14</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>637.70</td>
<td>T. 17 N., R. 107 W.</td>
<td>Section 18</td>
<td>Lots 5-8, E1/2, E1/2W1/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>640.32</td>
<td>T. 18 N., R. 107 W.</td>
<td>Section 4</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>233.00</td>
<td>T. 18 N., R. 107 W.</td>
<td>Section 14</td>
<td>Lots 9-12, 15, 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500.28</td>
<td>T. 18 N., R. 107 W.</td>
<td>Section 16</td>
<td>Lots 3-7, 10-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>632.56</td>
<td>T. 18 N., R. 107 W.</td>
<td>Section 18</td>
<td>Lots 6-8, E1/2, E1/2W1/2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Recreation and Public Purposes Lands**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>Township and Range</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Lot or Legal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>159.54</td>
<td>T. 19 N., R. 105 W.</td>
<td>Section 4</td>
<td>Lots 5, 6, S1/2NE1/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125.54</td>
<td>T. 19 N., R. 105 W.</td>
<td>Section 14</td>
<td>Lots 9, 10, 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134.83</td>
<td>T. 19 N., R. 105 W.</td>
<td>Section 26</td>
<td>Lots 3, 4, 5, 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>T. 20 N., R. 105 W.</td>
<td>Section 20</td>
<td>NW1/4SW1/4SE1/4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Landfill Sites**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>Township and Range</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Lot or Legal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>T. 20 N., R. 101 W.</td>
<td>Section 28</td>
<td>SE1/4SE1/4SE1/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>640.00</td>
<td>T. 18 N., R. 105 W.</td>
<td>Section 20</td>
<td>(except acreage sold previously to Solid Waste District #1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>320.00</td>
<td>T. 18 N., R. 105 W.</td>
<td>Section 30</td>
<td>E1/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.04</td>
<td>T. 17 N., R. 107 W.</td>
<td>Section 4</td>
<td>Lot 9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**24,527.69 TOTAL ACREAGE**

---

**NOTE:** Also see Appendix 8-2.
APPENDIX 8-2

DISPOSAL CRITERIA

The Federal Land Policy Act of 1976 provides for retention of the public lands in federal ownership and management by BLM for multiple use and sustained yield of the lands and resources, with environmental integrity. Public lands may be transferred from BLM to other federal agencies for management. Disposal by sale, exchange or Recreation and Public Purpose patent remains an option if such an action will serve an important objective and have a public benefit.

Prior to any disposal, a site specific analysis must determine that the lands considered contain no significant wildlife, recreation, or other resource values the loss of which cannot be mitigated; have no overriding public values; and represent no substantial public investments. Disposal must serve the public interest. Exchange will be the priority method for disposals.

Lands will not be considered for disposal if they are allocated for a specific use, even though they meet the general disposal criteria.

EXCHANGES

The policy is to promote land exchanges which serve the national interest and are beneficial to BLM programs or which support the programs of other agencies (referencer Sections 102, 205, and 206 of FLPMA).

Transfer of leasable minerals out of Federal ownership should be avoided except where non-Federal leasable minerals are to be received in return. It is preferable to trade both surface and subsurface (mineral) estates.

Exchanges should involve lands similar in character and/or value. Proposals will not be considered where it is the intent to transfer acquired lands out of Federal ownership or control.

Exchanges should not be made solely for the purpose of blocking up Federal land ownership.

SALES

Public land sale proposals are the result of either a BLM initiative or in response to expressed public interest or need. Lands to be considered for disposal, at a minimum, must meet the following criteria as outlined in Section 203 of the Federal Land Management and Policy Act.

1. They are difficult and uneconomical to manage, and are not suitable for management by another Federal department or agency.
2. Disposal would serve important public objectives, including but not limited to, community expansion or economic development which could not be achieved prudently or feasibly on land other than public lands and which outweigh other public objectives or values.
3. Such tract was acquired for a specific purpose, and the tract is no longer required for that purpose or any other Federal purpose.

SALES/EXCHANGES INVOLVING WETLANDS

Bureau policy is to retain wetlands in Federal ownership unless Federal, State, public and private institutions, and parties have demonstrated the ability to maintain, restore, and protect wetlands and riparian habitats on a continuous basis (BLM Manual 6740). Sales/exchanges may be authorized when:

1. The tract of public wetlands is either so small or remote that it is uneconomical to manage.
2. The tract of public wetlands is not suitable for management by another Federal agency.
3. The tract contains restrictions of uses as prohibited by identified Federal, State, or local wetlands regulations.
4. The tract contains restrictions and conditions that ensure the patentee can maintain, restore, and protect the wetlands on a continuous basis.

RECREATION AND PUBLIC PURPOSES LEASE/PATENT

The objective of the R&PP Act is to meet the needs of State and local governmental agencies and other qualified organizations for public lands required for recreational and public purposes. Use of the R&PP Act protects public values in the land through its reversionary provisions and helps qualified entities obtain the more liberal pricing authorized under the act.

Public lands shall be conveyed or leased only for an established or definitely proposed project for which there is a reasonable timetable of development and satisfactory development and management plans. No more land than is reasonably necessary for the proposed use shall be conveyed.

DESERT LAND ENTRIES

The purpose of the Desert Land Law is to permit the reclamation by irrigation of and public lands through individual effort and private capital.

Lands which will not produce any reasonably remunerative agricultural crop by the usual means or methods of cultivation without artificial irrigation may be considered for a desert land entry. The lands must be unoccupied, surveyed, unreserved, and unappropriated. Tracts need not be contiguous, but shall be sufficiently close to each other as to be managed satisfactorily as an economic unit.

The proposed crop may include any agricultural product to which the land under consideration is generally adapted and which would return a fair reward for the expense of producing it.

All Desert Land Entry applications will be coordinated with the Wyoming State Engineer and the U.S. Natural Resource Conservation Service (reference Soil's section).
## APPENDIX 8-3
### ACQUISITIONS TO BE PURSUED WITH WILLING PARTIES ONLY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Approximate Acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Easements to provide access to public lands for resource needs</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Riparian lands</td>
<td>840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Land within the 1/2 mile corridor or between river segments on the Big Sandy River</td>
<td>1,280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Land within the 1/2 mile corridor or between river segments on the Sweetwater River</td>
<td>4,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. State inholdings in the Devils Playground WSA</td>
<td>1,920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. State inholdings in the Sand Dunes WSA</td>
<td>1,920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Black Rock (West Red Desert HMP)</td>
<td>640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Prospect Mountains HMP</td>
<td>2,420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Sage Creek/Currant Creek HMP</td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. State lands in the Greater Sand Dunes ACEC</td>
<td>640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Fort LaClede</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Land on Pine Butte to manage the candidate plant species <em>Descurainia torulosa</em></td>
<td>1,920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. State lands on Steamboat Mountain</td>
<td>2,072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Lands along Currant Creek</td>
<td>4,020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. SW of Section 16, Rador Springs</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. SW of Section 7, Scott Meadows</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. NWSW of Section 9, Gunn Mining Townsite</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. SW of Section 29, Hallville Mine and Town</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. N2NE, SWNE, NWSE of Section 25, Washington Homestead - Finley</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. NENE of Section 1, Big Pond Stage Station</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Section 27, Aspen Mountain Site</td>
<td>640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. State inholdings in the Sand Dunes and Buffalo Hump WSAs</td>
<td>640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. NENE of Section 29 and SWSW of Section 21, T. 27 N., R. 103 W., Dry Sandy Stage &amp; Pony Express Station</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. NESW of section 30, T. 15 N., R. 107 W. for watershed</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. SESE of section 23, T. 13 N., R. 106 W. for watershed</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### APPENDIX 9-1
### ALLOTMENT MONITORING AND CATEGORIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NUMBER</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>ACTUAL USE</th>
<th>UTILIZATION</th>
<th>TREND</th>
<th>FIELD OBSERVATIONS</th>
<th>OTHER STUDIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0305</td>
<td>GOLD CREEK</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0310</td>
<td>JOSHUA FJORD</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0323</td>
<td>EMERY CREEK</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0328</td>
<td>EDEN PROJECT</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0329</td>
<td>JEFFERSON PLACE</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0335</td>
<td>SPICE GROVE</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0342</td>
<td>GRASS CREEK</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0346</td>
<td>PULLEY PLACE</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0357</td>
<td>PACIFIC SPRINGS</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0365</td>
<td>JOHNSON PLACE</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0367</td>
<td>COOKSTON RANCH</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0371</td>
<td>JENNI MEADOWS</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0383</td>
<td>BIG SANDY RANCH</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0384</td>
<td>HAY MEADOW</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0392</td>
<td>RICHIE FARM</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0406</td>
<td>HAY MEADOW LAC</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SRT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0407</td>
<td>CIRCLE SPRINGS</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0409</td>
<td>RIFLE</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0413</td>
<td>MILLION CREEK</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0418</td>
<td>ALASKA CREEK</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0425</td>
<td>CROOKED WASH</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0428</td>
<td>HORSESHOE WASH</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0433</td>
<td>PINE MOUNTAIN</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SRT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0442</td>
<td>RED CREEK</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0449</td>
<td>SALT WILLS</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SRT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0451</td>
<td>SUGARLOAF</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0452</td>
<td>SPRING CREEK</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0453</td>
<td>HENRY'S FORK</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0459</td>
<td>HICKORY MOUNTAIN</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0462</td>
<td>LAKE TERRI</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SRT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0464</td>
<td>STAG HOLLOW</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0474</td>
<td>DUNDREW</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0476</td>
<td>POISON CREEK</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0481</td>
<td>BALD HILLS</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0493</td>
<td>HANKS</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0499</td>
<td>HONEY HOLLOW</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0499</td>
<td>HONEY HOLLOW</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0508</td>
<td>ANTELOPE</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0509</td>
<td>CIRCLE BAR</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0523</td>
<td>SAGE</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0525</td>
<td>COTTONWOOD CREEK</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0526</td>
<td>PEOPLES CANAL</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0527</td>
<td>MELLOK MOUNTAIN</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SRT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1301</td>
<td>WHITE ACORN</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1302</td>
<td>LITTLE PROSPECT II</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1303</td>
<td>LITTLE SANDY</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1304</td>
<td>PROSPECT MOUNTAIN</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:** Precipitation data was collected for all allotments. X = Monitoring only place. SRT = Special report transect.
APPENDIX 9.2

STANDARD OPERATING PROCEDURES FOR RANGE IMPROVEMENTS AND VEGETATION MANIPULATIONS

These operating procedures provide standard guidance for all range improvements and vegetation manipulations.

Consulation with the affected interest groups and an approved environmental analysis would be required for all range improvements before any project is constructed.

Roads or trails to new construction or project sites would be constructed only if access does not exist.

Proposed range improvements that would result in surface disturbance would be incented and archaeological features. All archeological sites identified would be avoided or mitigated. If unavoidable, post-construction archeological inventory and excavation of the project would temporarily discontinue archeological surveys and studies until the discovery and determination of the appropriate action.

Proposed range improvements resulting in surface disturbance would be subject to these guidelines.

No action would be taken by BLM that could jeopardize the continued existence of any federally threatened or endangered species.

Wildlife escape devices would be installed and maintained in all water troughs.

Fences in pinyon-Juniper winter ranges, deer-crucial winter ranges, and known migration routes would be constructed to minimal standard. A standard fence would be done with top wire smooth and top wire barbed. Monitored annually, and modified if necessary to facilitate wildlife movement by wildlife.

All areas where vegetation manipulation occurs would be totally fenced with livestock grazing for a minimum of two growing seasons, or for a period of two years following the re-establishment of key forage species.

Chemical treatment would consist of applying approved chemicals to meet project objectives. Before chemicals are applied, the BLM would consult with Department of Intron regulations. All chemicals applied are approved by the approved product use proposal and an environmental assessment. All applications would be carried out in compliance with the pesticide laws or Wyoming.

All land treatment projects on crucial wildlife ranges will be limited in size, where necessary by the cover and to range requirements of wildlife. Proper mitigation measures would be incorporated.

All burning projects will have a burn plan, environmental assessment, and a burn permit from the State of Wyoming’s Department of Environmental Quality prior to initiation.

The impact on, an area, range boundaries and in white horse distribution would be considered in planning all water facilities.

On identified crucial deer winter ranges where vegetation manipulation and/or livestock grazing has occurred, include a variety of high quality shrub seedlings, such as winterfat, shadeclad, four-wing saltbush and in certain instances mountain mahogany and antelope bitterbrush, to complement the usual grass mixture.

Exclusion of wild horses and livestock and possible re-seeding operations may be required in severe unstable waterbars.

All vegetation treatments will be designed irregular in shape for edge effect cover, and visual aesthetics.

DESIGN OF RANGE IMPROVEMENTS

All range improvements will be designed and constructed in such a manner as to minimize environmental impacts while maximizing function and cost-effectiveness. Specific design criteria for range improvements, an environmental assessment (EA) will be prepared analyzing the alternatives for the project.

Brush Control

Brush control refers to the removal of a shrub or tree inventory to reduce the grass forb understorey from the effects of competition for soil nutrients and water. The techniques involved in brush control generally fall into one of three categories: burning, chemical, or mechanical.

Burning involves the use of fire under prescribed conditions to change the character of the vegetation. This technique takes advantage of the relative fire tolerance between plant species. Prescribed burning is most useful in removing a dense fire-sensitive species, such as big sagebrush, thereby opening up the community to the natural response of fire intolerant grasses, forbs, and shrubs. Prescribed fire can also be useful in preparing a seedbed for artificial seeding. The main disadvantage to prescribed burning is the need for enclosed ground, fuel moisture, and weather conditions for fire to spread. Artificial seeding of the site can be quite slow but usually results in increased productivity, palatability, and species diversity while erosion potential is decreased over a period. The level of prescribed burning is low compared to other techniques.

Chemical treatments involve the use of grass and actually applied herbicides to target species to reduce their competitive effect on more desirable species. Many of these herbicides are very toxic and all very specific in action, selectivity, and persistence. However, relatively few compounds are approved for use in brush removal on public lands. These compounds are usually selective for broadleaf vegetation and leave only grasses and tolerant forbs and shrubs after treatment.

Mechanical treatments involve the use of a range of equipment to reduce or control vegetation in a specific area. This approach will be used for species that are not responsive to fire or to any other treatment. A wide variety of mechanical treatments that will exist in Wyoming and adjacent states, and may be used for use by wildlife. All spring developments will be managed as a closed system.

Water Pipelines

Pipelines consist of plastic usually polyethylene, pipe buried by mechanical pipe laying equipment to sub-surface 10 to 20 feet horizontal to make access necessary to maintain the life and efficiency of the pipe material. Pipelines originate at spring sources and wells and are used to distribute water to unsurfaced areas. Drinking troughs are situated along the pipeline usually more than 10 feet apart to distribute use throughout the area.

Fences

Fences are constructed to provide management boundaries such as providing for livestock exclusion after 100 feet.

Nuisious Weed Guidelines

Chemical treatment by spray application within 100 feet of perennial streams would be prohibited. If re-appraisals or re-appraisals are conducted, the buffer would be expanded to make certain vegetation is not destroyed. Nuisious weeds may be treated in accordance with the Rock Springs District Nuisious Weed EA's by 1982 published in the Area Nuisious Weed Control Program EA.

Aerial application of chemicals would be allowed within 1/4 mile of special status plant locations.

The County Weed and Pest Supervisors will consult with the BLM to determine if a new treatment project is necessary. The County Weed and Pest Supervisor with the BLM Rock Springs District Weed Supervisor will consult with the County Weed and Pest Supervisor to determine if a new treatment project is necessary. All treatment area prior to chemical application: For management purposes, re-appraisals is the site location survey and immediately adjacent and subject to the influences of surface and subsurface water to streams, rivers, or standing bodies of water.

Monitoring

All chemical treatment sites will be re-appraisals by the County Weed and Pest Supervisors with the BLM Rock Springs District Weed Supervisor to determine if a new treatment project is necessary. All treatment area prior to chemical application: For management purposes, re-appraisals is the site location survey and immediately adjacent and subject to the influences of surface and subsurface water to streams, rivers, or standing bodies of water.

Aerial Application

All aerial application, particularly near live water ponds, would be required for direct consultation and approval of an Authorized Officer of the Rock Springs District prior to the action. An unplanted buffer zone of 100 feet would be maintained near live or still water. Spray areas will be irregular in shape.
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PROPER FUNCTIONING CONDITION GUIDELINES

In riparian areas where livestock grazing has been determined to be a contributing factor to stream conditions in less than proper functioning condition, or is determined to be adversely affecting the recovery of the area to proper functioning condition, appropriate grazing management practices would be used to help meet the riparian function for the area. Appropriate methods would be determined through site-specific analysis. Methods include that are not limited to grazing strategies of use, seasonal changes, grazing systems, riparian pasture fences and exclusions, changes in class of livestock, managing use levels, off-stay water, off-site salting, rest or for 1 or more years, and reduction in number of AIs. These are not the only means of methods that can be implemented to meet riparian objectives. Depending on the resources available, other methods could include roads and trails, area closures to ORVs, road and gas development restrictions, etc. Each section for specific stipulations that may be applied. These methods and practices will be coordinated with the Desired Plant Community (DPC) objectives that will be developed for all habitats.

The current condition objectives, trend of the riparian area, along with factors that may be affecting the riparian area would be considered in determining appropriate management methods to apply. Interactions such (IBI) output, along with input from users and interest parties, is essential in determining the causes of any unsatisfactory conditions and the methods to be used in management riparian areas. Implementation of various management practices is feasible and can be done when new information is acquired. For an example, utilization levels, the amount of plant material that can be consumed by grazing animals over an identified time period could be implemented as a management tool to assist in achieving riparian objectives (DPC, DPC etc.). Desired Plant Communities could range from canyons sets to Potential Natural Communities (PNC). Such levels would be developed specific to a geographic area or allotment. Resource data and other information related to these areas would be needed in determining appropriate levels. Examples of some grazing management practices can be found in the Management Situation Analysis (MSA) on file in the Green River Resource Area Office.

Technical Report 1377-4 page 10, also referenced in TR 1377-4, states that utilization targets and guidelines are also that can be used to help ensure long term objectives are met. When riparian conditions are unsatisfactory, a decrease in the use of riparian forage by grazing animals and corresponding decrease in time spent in the riparian areas, will enhance the effects of increasing plant material for the protection of stream banks, decreasing surface runoff and soil compaction; increasing infiltration, providing for increased soil reserves, etc. Other management actions may also be necessary to accomplish objectives for riparian condition on a site specific basis. The minimum acceptable level for riparian areas within the Green River Resource Area is proper functioning condition.
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STANDARDS FOR HEALTHY RANGELANDS AND GUIDELINES FOR LIVESTOCK GRAZING MANAGEMENT FOR PUBLIC LANDS ADMINISTERED BY THE BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT IN THE STATE OF WYOMING
August 12, 1997

INTRODUCTION

According to the Department at the Interior's final rule for grazing administration, effective August 21, 1997, the Wyoming Bureau of Land Management (BLM) State Director is responsible for the development of standards for healthy rangelands and guidelines for livestock grazing management on 18 million acres of Wyoming's public rangelands. The development and application of these standards and guidelines is to achieve four fundamentals of rangeland health outlined in the grazing regulations (43 CFR 1901). These four fundamentals are: (1) water-harvesting function, (2) water, nutrients, and energy cycling processes; (3) water quality meets State standards; and (4) habitat for special-status species is protected.

Standards address the health productivity, and sustenance of the lands administered public rangelands and represent the minimum acceptable conditions on the public rangelands. The standards apply to the livestock uses on public lands. Their application will be determined by use specific guidelines are developed. Standards are formulated with goals and are observed on a landscape scale. They describe the healthy rangelands rather than important rangeland by products. The achievement of standards is determined by observing grazing and meeting appropriate standards and indicators. Standards are a component of a system whose characteristics are presence, absence, quantity, and distribution can be observed measured, or monitored based on sound scientific principles.

Guidelines provide for and guide the development and implementation of reasonable, responsible, and cost-effective management practices at the grazing allotment and watershed level. The guidelines in this document apply specifically to livestock grazing management practices with BLM administered public lands. These management practices will either maintain existing desirable conditions or improve rangeland and watershed standards with reasonable limitations. Appropriate guidelines will ensure that the resulting management practices reflect the potential for the watershed consider other uses and natural influences, and balance resource goals social, cultural, historical, and economic opportunities to sustain viable local communities. Guidelines like standards apply statewide.

Implementation of the Wyoming standards and guidelines will be accomplished by setting goals and implementing specific practices. All elements of the grazing management plans and high priority allotments will be reviewed first. Lower priority allotments will be reviewed when time allows or when it becomes necessary for BLM to review the permeability for other reasons such as permits, changes in ownership, etc. The permeability and recommended practices will be notified that allotments are scheduled for review and encouraged to participate in the review. The review will first determine if an allotment is consistent with the six standards. If it does, no further action will be necessary. If any of the standards are not, then the grazing plan or contributing factors will be reviewed. The grazing plan will be reviewed to determine if it is being met, then a strategy will be developed to acquire the data in a timely manner.

On a continuing basis, the Standards for Healthy Rangelands will direct the management of the public lands. They will serve to focus the ongoing development and implementation of activity plans toward the maintenance or the attainment of healthy rangelands.

Quantifiable resource objectives and specific management practices to maintain or achieve the standards will be developed at the local BLM District and Resource Area levels and will consider all reasonable and practical options available to achieve desired results on a watershed or grazing allotment scale. The objectives shall be reflected in site-specific activity or implementation plans as well as in livestock grazing permit terms for the public lands. These objectives and practices may be developed formally or informally through mechanisms available to local needs such as Coordinated Resource Management (CRM) efforts.

The development and implementation of standards and guidelines will enable on the ground management of the public rangelands to maintain a clear and responsible focus on the health of the land and its dependent natural and human communities. This development and implementation will ensure that any mechanisms currently being employed or that may be developed in the future will maintain a consistent focus on these essential concerns. This development and implementation will also enable immediate attention to be brought to bear on existing resource concerns.

These standards and guidelines are compatible with BLM's three tiered land use planning process. The first tier includes the laws, regulations, and policies governing BLM's administration and management of the public lands and their uses. The previous mentioned fundamentals of rangeland health as specified in 43 CFR 1901, the requirements for BLM to develop State or regional standards and guidelines, and the standards and guidelines themselves, are part of this first tier. Also part of this first tier are the specific requirements of various Federal laws and the objectives of 43 CFR 1901 that require BLM to consider the social and economic well being of the local communities in its management process.

These standards and guidelines will provide for statewide consistency and guidance in the preparation, amendment, and maintenance of BLM land use plans, which represent the second tier of the planning process. The BLM land use plans provide general allocation decisions concerning the kinds of resource uses and that can occur on the BLM administered public lands, where they can occur, and the types of conditional requirements under which they can occur. In general, the standards and the guidelines for development of planning area-specific management objectives concerning rangeland health and productivity, and the guidelines will directly develop a livestock grazing management actions to help accomplish those objectives.

The third tier of the BLM planning process, activity or implementation planning, is directed by the applicable land use plan and, therefore, by the standards and guidelines. The standards and guidelines, as BLM-statewide policy, will also directly guide development of the site-specific objectives and methods and practices used to implement the land use plan decisions. Activity or implementation plans contain objectives which describe the site-specific conditions desired. Grazing permeability for the public lands contain terms and conditions which describe specific actions required to attain or maintain the desired conditions. Through monitoring and evaluation, the BLM, grazing permittees, and other interested parties determine if progress is being made to achieve activity plan objectives.

Wyoming rangelands support a variety of uses which are of significant economic importance to the State and its communities. These uses include oil and gas production, mining, recreation, and tourism, fishing, hunting, wildlife viewing, and livestock grazing. Rangelands also provide amenities which contribute to the quality of life in Wyoming such as open spaces, solitude, and opportunities for personal renewal. Wyoming's rangelands should be managed with consideration of the State's historical, cultural, and social development.
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INDICATORS MAY INCLUDE BUT ARE NOT LIMITED TO:

- Species diversity.
- Age distribution.
- All indicators associated with the upland and riparian standards.
- Population trends.
- Habitat fragmentation.

The above indicators are applied as appropriate to the potential of the ecological site.

STANDARD #5

Water quality meets State standards.

This MEANS THAT:

The State of Wyoming is authorized to administer the Clean Water Act. BLM management actions or use authorizations will comply with all Federal and State water quality laws, rules, and regulations to address water quality issues that originate on public lands. Provisions for the establishment of water quality standards are included in the Clean Water Act, as amended, and the Wyoming Environmental Quality Act as amended. Regulations are found in Part 40, of the Code of Federal Regulations and in Wyoming’s Water Quality Rules and Regulations. These standards contain certain standard Quality Standards for Wyoming Surface Waters.

Natural processes and human actions influence the chemical, physical, and biological characteristics of water. Water quality varies from place to place with the seasons, the climate, and the kind substrate through which water moves. Therefore, the assessment of water quality takes into several factors into account.

INDICATORS MAY INCLUDE BUT ARE NOT LIMITED TO:

- Chemical characteristics (e.g., pH, conductivity, dissolved solids).
- Physical characteristics (e.g., sediment, temperature, color, etc).
- Biological characteristics (e.g., macro- and micro-invertebrates, fish, aquatic plants, and animal species).

STANDARD #6

Air quality meets State standards.

This MEANS THAT:

The State of Wyoming is authorized to administer the Clean Air Act. BLM management actions or use authorizations will comply with all Federal and State air quality laws, rules, and regulations. Provisions for the establishment of air quality standards are included in the Clean Air Act, as amended, and the Wyoming Environmental Quality Act as amended. Regulations are found in Part 40 of the Code of Federal Regulations and in Wyoming’s Air Quality Standards and Regulations. These standards contain certain standards for Wyoming Surface Waters.

Natural processes and human actions influence the chemical, physical, and biological characteristics of air. Air quality varies from place to place with the seasons, the climate, and the kind substrate through which air moves. Therefore, the assessment of air quality takes into several factors into account.

INDICATORS MAY INCLUDE BUT ARE NOT LIMITED TO:

- Particulate matter.
- Sulfur dioxide.
- Carbon monoxide.
- Ozone.
- Nitrogen oxides.
- Hydrocarbons.

This MEANS THAT:

Wyoming has highly varied riparian and wetland systems on public lands. These systems vary from large rivers to small streams and from springs to large wet meadows. These systems are in various stages of natural cycles and may also reflect other disturbances that is either detected or widespread throughout the watershed. Riparian vegetation captures sediments and associated materials, thus enhancing the number of species by capturing and assisting materials that would otherwise move through a system.
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BLM WYOMING GUIDELINES FOR LIVESTOCK GUIDELINES MANAGEMENT

1. Timing, duration, and levels of authorized grazing will ensure that adequate amounts of vegetation cover, including standing plant material and litter, remain after authorized use to support infiltration, moisture, and seed-dwelling soils. This release of soil and water to maintain system function, and to maintain subwater conditions that support permeability rates and other processes appropriate to the site.

2. Grazing management practices will resume, maintain, or improve riparian and plant communities. Grazing management strategies consider hydrology, physical attributes, and potential for the watershed and the ecological site. Grazing management will maintain adequate residual plant cover, ensure mineral recovery, residual cover, sediment capture, erosion, and water quality.

3. Range improvement practices (instream structures, fences, water-sourcing structures) and adjacent riparian zones will establish that stream channel management practices are capable of maintaining channel, gradient, width/drop ratios, channel roughness and sinuosity and functions appropriate to climate and landform and environment. These standards for stream alteration, upper, middle, and lower, riparian zones, are designed to provide for the ecological and hydrological functions, wildlife habitat, and scenic landscape values associated with the water source. Range improvements will be located away from riparian areas if they conflict with achieving or maintaining riparian function.

4. Grazing practices that provide the basic community of more than just forage may be designed to determine that the appropriate kinds and amounts of soil organisms, plants, and animals are used to support the hydrologic and nutrient cycle, and energy flow are maintained or enhanced.

5. Continuous season-long or other grazing management practices that prevent ecological degradation of these species are capable of maintaining the productivity of riparian and/or natural wetland ecologies. Grazing management practices, riparian management, and riparian and/or multiple vegetation cycling practices will be modified to ensure adequate criteria vary at the appropriate times. The rip periods will provide for riparian establishment or the necessary processes at sites sufficient to move the ecological site condition to the appropriate resource, buffer, and riparian habitat, or potential and subsequent achievement of the standard.

6. Grazing management practices that range improvements will include the protection riparian and wetland systems and maintain, enhance, or enhance water quality to meet resource values. The effects of new range improvements and other grazing management practices that impair the health and function of range lands will be considered prior to resource implementation.

7. Grazing management practices will incorporate the kinds and amounts of use that will reduce, maintain, or enhance habitats to assist in the recovery, establishment of species of special concern and sensitive species will be maintained or enhanced.

8. Grazing management practices will improve or maintain the physical and biological conditions necessary to support native animal populations and
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ment and in a manner which contributes to a diverse, balanced, competitive, and resilient economy in order to provide opportunity for economic development. Healthy rangelands can best sustain these needs.

To varying degrees, BLM management of the public lands and resources plays a role in the social and economic, well-being of Wyoming communities. The National Environmental Policy Act (part of the above-mentioned first planning tier) and various other laws and regulations mandate the BLM to analyze the socioeconomic impacts of actions occurring on public rangelands. These analyses occur during the environmental analysis process of land use planning second planning tier, where resource allocations are made, and during the environmental analysis process of activity implementation planning third planning tier. In many situations, factors that affect the social and economic, well-being of local communities extend far beyond the scope of BLM management or individual public land users' responsibilities. In addition, since standards and guidelines are physically and biologically unique to the landscape, it is difficult to provide a measurable socioeconomic indicator of vegetation diversity and water quality. It is important that guidelines be realistic and within the control of the land manager and users to achieve.

STANDARDS FOR HEALTHY PUBLIC RANGELANDS

STANDARD #1

Within the potential of the ecological site (wall type, landform, climate, and geology), soils are stable and allow for water infiltration to provide for optimal plant growth and minimal surface runoff.

This MEANS THAT:

The hydrologic cycle will be supported by providing for water capture, storage, and sustained release. Adequate energy flow and nutrient cycling through the system will be achieved as optimal plant growth occurs. Plant communities are highly varied within Wyoming.

INDICATORS MAY INCLUDE BUT ARE NOT LIMITED TO:

- Water infiltration rates.
- Soil compaction.
- Erosion risk (rills, gulches, pediments, capping).
- Soil micro-organisms.
- Vegetative cover (soil type, grassland, and shrub).
- Bare ground and litter.

The above indicators are applied as appropriate to the potential of the ecological site.

STANDARD #2

Riparian and wetland vegetation has structural, age, and species diversity including the stage of channel succession and is resilient and capable of recovering from natural and human disturbances. Vegetation on flood plain and riparian zones, and species of special concern and sensitive species, endangered species, species of special concern, or sensitive species will be maintained or enhanced.

This MEANS THAT:

The management of Wyoming rangelands will achieve or maintain adequate habitat conditions that support diverse plant and animal species. These may include riparian vegetation species (U. S. Fish and Wildlife, designated species, special concern species, endanger species, species of special concern and sensitive species): (Wyoming designated spatial standards). The intent of this standard is to allow the listed species to recover and be defined, and to avoid or prevent additional species becoming listed.
plant communities. This will involve emphasizing native plant species in the support of ecological function and incorporating the use of non-native species only in those situations in which native plant species are not available in sufficient quantities or are incapable of maintaining or achieving properly functioning conditions and biological health.

DEFINITIONS

ACTIVITY PLANS
Allotment Management Plans (AMPs), Habitat Management Plans (HMPs), Watershed Management Plans (WMPs), and other plans developed at the local level to address specific concerns and accomplish specific objectives.

COORDINATED RESOURCE MANAGEMENT (CRM)
A group of people working together to develop common resource goals and resolve natural resource concerns. CRM represents a process that strives for win-win situations through consensus-based decision-making.

DESIRED PLANT COMMUNITY
A plant community which produces the kind, proportion, and amount of vegetation necessary for meeting or exceeding the land use plan/ activity plan objectives established for an ecological system. The desired plant community must be consistent with the site's capability to produce the desired vegetation through management, land treatment, or a combination of the two.

ECOLOGICAL SITE
An area of land with specific physical characteristics that differ from other areas both in its ability to produce distinctive kinds and amounts of vegetation and in its response to management.

EROSION
1. Detachment and movement of soil or rock fragments by water, wind, ice, or gravity, etc. 2. The land surface worn away by running water, wind, ice, or other geologic agents, including such processes as gravitational creep.

GRAZING MANAGEMENT PRACTICES
Grazing management practices include such things as grazing systems (rotation, deferred rotation, etc.), timing and duration of grazing, hedging, salting, etc. They do not include physical range improvements.

GUIDELINES (For Grazing Management)
Guidelines provide for, and guide the development and implementation of, reasonable, responsible, and cost-effective management actions at the allotment and watershed level which move rangelands toward statewide standards or maintain existing desirable conditions. Appropriate guidelines will ensure that the resultant management actions reflect the potential for the watershed, consider other uses and values for the resources, and neighboring social, cultural/historic, and economic opportunities to sustain viable local communities. Guidelines, and therefore, the management actions they engender, are based on sound science, past and present management experience, and public input.

9. Grazing management practices on uplands will maintain desired plant communities or facilitate change toward desired plant communities.

INDEX
An indicator is a component of a system whose characteristics (e.g., presence, absence, quantity, and distribution) can be observed, measured, or monitored based on sound scientific principles. An indicator can be evaluated at a site or species-specific level. Monitoring of an indicator must be able to show change within a timeframe acceptable to management and be capable of showing how the health of the ecosystem is changing in response to specific management actions. Selection of the appropriate indicators to be observed, measured, or monitored in a particular allotment is a critical aspect of early communication among interested groups involved in the process. The best usable indicators are those for which change or trend can be easily quantified and for which agreement as to the significance of the indicator is broad-based.

LITTER
The uppermost layer of organic debris on the soil surface, essentially the freshly fallen or slightly decomposed vegetal material.

MANAGEMENT ACTIONS
Management actions are the specific actions prescribed by the BLM to achieve resource objectives, land use allocations, or other program or multiple use goals. Management actions include both grazing management practices and range improvements.

OBJECTIVE
An objective is a site-specific statement of a desired rangeland condition. It may contain either or both qualitative elements and quantitative elements. Objectives frequently speak to change. They are the focus of monitoring and evaluation activities at the local level.

RANGE IMPROVEMENTS
Range improvements include such things as corrals, fences, water development (reservoirs, spring developments, pipelines, wells, etc.) and land treatments (prescribed fire, herbicide treatments, mechanical treatments, etc.)

RANGELAND HEALTH
The degree to which the integrity of the soil and ecological processes of rangeland ecosystems are sustained.

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

STANDARDS
Standards are synonymous with goals and are observed on a landscape scale. Standards apply to rangeland health and not to the important by-products of healthy rangelands. Standards relate to the current capability or realistic potential of a specific site to produce these by-products, not to the presence or absence of the products themselves. It is the sustainability of the processes, or rangeland health, that produces these by-products.
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TERMS AND CONDITIONS
Terms and conditions are very specific land use requirements that are made a part of the land use authorization in order to assure maintenance or attainment of the standard. Terms and conditions may incorporate or reference the appropriate portions of activity plans (e.g., Allotment Management Plans). In other words, where an activity plan exists that contains objectives focused on meeting the standards, compliance with the plan may be the only term and condition necessary in that allotment.

UPLAND
Those portions of the landscape which do not receive additional moisture for plant growth from run-off, streamflow, etc. Typically these are hills, ridges, valleys, slopes, and rolling plains.
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## APPENDIX 9-4
### RESOURCE MONITORING AND EVALUATION ALLOTMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Grazing Management</th>
<th>Trend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>03000</td>
<td>Gold Creek</td>
<td>changes needed</td>
<td>downward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03028</td>
<td>Eden Project</td>
<td>inconclusive</td>
<td>static</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03029</td>
<td>Juel Place</td>
<td>satisfactory</td>
<td>static</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03030</td>
<td>Spicer Group</td>
<td>satisfactory</td>
<td>static</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03031</td>
<td>Grass Creek</td>
<td>satisfactory</td>
<td>upward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03032</td>
<td>Pulley Place</td>
<td>satisfactory</td>
<td>static</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03033</td>
<td>Pacific Springs</td>
<td>changes needed</td>
<td>downward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03034</td>
<td>Johnson Place</td>
<td>satisfactory</td>
<td>static</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03035</td>
<td>Cookston Ranch</td>
<td>satisfactory</td>
<td>static</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03036</td>
<td>Jensen Meadows</td>
<td>satisfactory</td>
<td>upward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03037</td>
<td>Big Sandy Ranch</td>
<td>satisfactory</td>
<td>upward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04001</td>
<td>Hay Meadow</td>
<td>satisfactory</td>
<td>static</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04002</td>
<td>Circle Springs</td>
<td>inconclusive</td>
<td>inconclusive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04003</td>
<td>Rife</td>
<td>minor revisions</td>
<td>static</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04004</td>
<td>Alkali Creek</td>
<td>satisfactory</td>
<td>static</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04005</td>
<td>Vermilion Creek</td>
<td>minor revisions</td>
<td>static</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04006</td>
<td>Crooked Wash</td>
<td>satisfactory</td>
<td>static</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04007</td>
<td>Horseshoe Wash</td>
<td>changes needed</td>
<td>downward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04008</td>
<td>Pine Mountain</td>
<td>changes needed</td>
<td>downward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04009</td>
<td>Red Creek</td>
<td>changes needed</td>
<td>downward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04010</td>
<td>Salt Wells</td>
<td>changes needed</td>
<td>downward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04011</td>
<td>Sugarloaf</td>
<td>changes needed</td>
<td>downward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04012</td>
<td>Spring Creek</td>
<td>changes needed</td>
<td>downward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04013</td>
<td>Henry’s Fork</td>
<td>changes needed</td>
<td>downward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04014</td>
<td>Hickey Mountain</td>
<td>changes needed</td>
<td>downward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04015</td>
<td>Larson</td>
<td>satisfactory</td>
<td>upward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04016</td>
<td>Stag Hollow</td>
<td>satisfactory</td>
<td>upward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04017</td>
<td>Donohoo</td>
<td>satisfactory</td>
<td>upward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04018</td>
<td>Poison Creek</td>
<td>changes needed</td>
<td>downward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04019</td>
<td>Bald Hills</td>
<td>changes needed</td>
<td>downward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04020</td>
<td>Hanks</td>
<td>changes needed</td>
<td>static</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04021</td>
<td>Hisey Hollow</td>
<td>changes needed</td>
<td>downward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04022</td>
<td>Cedar Point</td>
<td>changes needed</td>
<td>downward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04023</td>
<td>Antelope Wash</td>
<td>changes needed</td>
<td>downward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04024</td>
<td>Circle Bar</td>
<td>changes needed</td>
<td>downward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04025</td>
<td>Sage</td>
<td>changes needed</td>
<td>downward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04026</td>
<td>Cottonwood Creek</td>
<td>changes needed</td>
<td>downward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04027</td>
<td>Peoples Canal</td>
<td>changes needed</td>
<td>downward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13001</td>
<td>Mellor Mountain</td>
<td>changes needed</td>
<td>downward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13002</td>
<td>White Acorn</td>
<td>changes needed</td>
<td>downward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13003</td>
<td>Little Sandy</td>
<td>changes needed</td>
<td>downward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13004</td>
<td>Prospect Mountain</td>
<td>changes needed</td>
<td>downward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13005</td>
<td>Poston</td>
<td>changes needed</td>
<td>downward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13006</td>
<td>Bar-X</td>
<td>changes needed</td>
<td>downward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13007</td>
<td>Fish Creek</td>
<td>changes needed</td>
<td>downward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13008</td>
<td>Pine Creek</td>
<td>changes needed</td>
<td>downward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13009</td>
<td>Continental Peak</td>
<td>changes needed</td>
<td>downward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13010</td>
<td>Red Desert</td>
<td>changes needed</td>
<td>downward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13011</td>
<td>Bush Rim</td>
<td>changes needed</td>
<td>downward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13012</td>
<td>Steamboat Mountain</td>
<td>changes needed</td>
<td>downward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13013</td>
<td>Sands</td>
<td>changes needed</td>
<td>downward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13014</td>
<td>Fourth of July</td>
<td>changes needed</td>
<td>downward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13015</td>
<td>Eighteenmile</td>
<td>changes needed</td>
<td>downward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13016</td>
<td>Rock Springs</td>
<td>changes needed</td>
<td>downward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13017</td>
<td>Sandy Pasture</td>
<td>changes needed</td>
<td>downward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13018</td>
<td>Buckskin Sandy</td>
<td>changes needed</td>
<td>downward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13019</td>
<td>Mack Flat</td>
<td>changes needed</td>
<td>downward</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### APPENDIX 9-4

**RESOURCE MONITORING AND EVALUATION ALLOTMENTS (continued)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Grazing Management</th>
<th>Trend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13022</td>
<td>Lombard</td>
<td>charges needed</td>
<td>downward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13023</td>
<td>Eight-Head</td>
<td>minor revision</td>
<td>static</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13024</td>
<td>Big Slick</td>
<td>satisfactory</td>
<td>upward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13025</td>
<td>Highway Gasson</td>
<td>charges needed</td>
<td>downward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13026</td>
<td>Boundry</td>
<td>satisfactory</td>
<td>static</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13027</td>
<td>Sabata</td>
<td>minor revision</td>
<td>static</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13000</td>
<td>Jack-Ranch</td>
<td>satisfactory</td>
<td>state</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13001</td>
<td>Upper White Acorn</td>
<td>satisfactory</td>
<td>static</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13002</td>
<td>McCart Ranch</td>
<td>satisfactory</td>
<td>static</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13005</td>
<td>Joe's Ranch</td>
<td>satisfactory</td>
<td>static</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13004</td>
<td>Long Draw</td>
<td>satisfactory</td>
<td>static</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13104</td>
<td>Errata-Napo Ranch</td>
<td>satisfactory</td>
<td>static</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13006</td>
<td>Dryer's Place</td>
<td>satisfactory</td>
<td>static</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13007</td>
<td>Middle Hot Place</td>
<td>satisfactory</td>
<td>static</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13008</td>
<td>Sycamores</td>
<td>minor revision</td>
<td>static</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13100</td>
<td>Dead On</td>
<td>satisfactory</td>
<td>static</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13114</td>
<td>Onitas Place</td>
<td>satisfactory</td>
<td>static</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13115</td>
<td>Houghton Place</td>
<td>satisfactory</td>
<td>static</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### WILD HORSE HERD MANAGEMENT AREAS

**Area** | **Condition and Trend**
---|---
Divide Basin | These grazing allotments appear to be in fair to good condition with much of the vegetation and resource objectives being met. The overall herd objectives of diverse age, color, and gender, and general health condition have been met and are being maintained.
White Mountain | The vegetation trend in the Highway Gasson and Lombard Allotments is upward in all key areas while the trend of vegetation on most checkerboard land of the Rock Springs Allotment appears to be static. The White Mountain wild horse herd is healthy and stable. Although stated in the management plan, this herd has not been managed to promote or increase horses with paint and appaloosa coloring.
Desert Common/Figure 4 | The vegetative trend of all key species is down in the western third of the allotment. Key areas in the eastern portion of the allotment are exhibiting a slight to upward or static trend. The trend of riparian communities along the Green River appears to be static or downward. Wild horses are not causing resource damage because they are rarely present in the allotment. There is currently very little opportunity to manage age, color, and gender composition of wild horses in the Figure 4 Allotment.
Adobe Town | Range condition in the Green River Resource Area portion of the Adobe Town WHMA appears to be stable and in good condition. Herbivory by wild horses within the planning area portion has been maintained at or near the desired levels.
Salt Wells Creek | Range conditions appear to be static in most areas that are affected by wild horse populations, but some areas that have seen consistent concentrations of wild horses during the growing season appear to have experienced diminishing plant vigor and composition. Herbivory by wild horses has remained at or near objective levels since institution of wild horse gathering.

### APPENDIX 10-1

**BIOLOGICAL ASSESSMENT**

for

Green River Resource Area
Resource Management Plan

Bureau of Land Management
Rock Springs District

July 1995
A. Listed Species

The following information is taken from the Green River Management Situation-Analysis NMSA. Numerous studies and surveys have been conducted and a variety of field data is reviewed in this document. The volume of project-related field data is covered in the following chapters. The volume of project-related field data is covered in the following chapters.

1. Black-Footed Ferret (Mustela nigripes)

Population Distribution

Populations of black-footed ferrets are severely endangered and their historical ranges in the western United States is restricted to a few isolated locations. The current range of the black-footed ferret is centered in the states of Montana, Wyoming, and South Dakota. The ferrets were once found in the states of Washington, Oregon, and Idaho, but their populations have declined significantly in those states. The black-footed ferret is listed as a federally endangered species and is protected under the Endangered Species Act.

Status of the black-footed ferret is uncertain to change, to the extent described in the previous section, of the preferred alternative and under Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act.

2. Bald Eagle (Haliaeetus leucocephalus)

Population Distribution

Bald eagles are found in the northern United States and Canada. They are generally found in areas with large bodies of water, such as lakes and rivers. They are also found in areas with large forests, such as the boreal forest. Bald eagles are considered to be a threatened species under the Endangered Species Act.

Habitat Requirements

Potential areas of the habitat can be delineated due to their association with prairie dogs and prairie dogs colonies, although their diet may also consist of other small mammals and birds. Bald eagles are found in a variety of habitats, including forests, grasslands, and wetlands. However, they are most commonly found in areas with large bodies of water, such as lakes and rivers. Bald eagles are also known to nest in areas with large trees, such as cottonwood groves.

B. Conflicts

Past animal damage control programs probably had the greatest impact on prairie dogs. Producers and businesses in prairie dog-infested areas have experienced economic losses due to the damage caused by prairie dogs. The damage can include the destruction of crops, vegetation, and infrastructure. The damage is most severe in areas where prairie dogs are found in high densities.

Some effective methods to control prairie dog populations include the use of poisons, pesticides, and mechanical methods. However, these methods can be expensive and have limited effectiveness. In some cases, the use of natural predators, such as coyotes and foxes, may be successful in controlling prairie dog populations.

The use of poisons and pesticides is limited due to the potential for non-target impacts, such as the poisoning of non-target species, including birds and mammals. Mechanical methods, such as trapping and gassing, can be effective in controlling prairie dog populations, but they can be expensive and time-consuming.

The use of natural predators, such as coyotes and foxes, may be successful in controlling prairie dog populations. However, these methods can be costly and may not be effective in all situations.

C. Solutions

The use of non-lethal methods, such as habitat manipulation and the use of natural predators, may be effective in controlling prairie dog populations. Habitat manipulation can include the creation of water bodies, the planting of vegetation, and the creation of wildlife corridors.

The use of non-lethal methods, such as habitat manipulation and the use of natural predators, may be effective in controlling prairie dog populations.

The use of non-lethal methods, such as habitat manipulation and the use of natural predators, may be effective in controlling prairie dog populations.

The use of non-lethal methods, such as habitat manipulation and the use of natural predators, may be effective in controlling prairie dog populations.
3. American Peregrine Falcon (Falco peregrinus)  

Populations Distribution  
The population of the nesting habitat varies in a variety of areas such as along the Sweetwater and Green rivers on cliffs, in canyons north of Richland, and on Oregon Butte, Black Rock, or Pine Butte. Peregrines also inhabit the subalpine and montane environments near Labyrinth and the cliffs of Canyon Creek. Sightings of peregrine falcons are rare and do not add to the list of known species currently known to exist here. In 1976, a peregrine was observed by a BLM contract survey crew on Oregon Butte. A 1977 sighting on the Green River above the delta was confirmed and that year a young peregrine was seen on Pine Butte by a raptor researcher. A 1978 sighting on the Sweetwater River is a positive finding at an altitude on a nunatak cliff edge there. That inventory has not yet been performed. Migrating peregrines are often sighted along the Green River during spring and fall.  

Habitat Requirements  
The presence of a nesting area is a preferred habitat component, with talons at times nesting on slopes, rock crevices, tall buildings, and occasionally on sand dunes. Principal food items of peregrines are passerine birds, raptors, birds, and small mammals. Fishes and other small birds are common in the vicinity of nesting sites. Management efforts to improve the number of peregrines and reduce mortality would include protecting the public land use and school grounds, the natural history of the species, and other raptors on the national areas.  

4. Whopping Crane (Grus americana L.)  

Population Distribution  
The bird was fairly abundant prior to 1900 and was found distributed in all the major river systems across North America. Population estimates range from about 10000 in the early 1900s and into the early 1930s to a rapid decline in whirping crane populations until the species became extinct in the wild in the 1950s. The remaining flock bred in Alberta, Canada at Wood Buffalo Park, migrated across the Great Plains, and wintered in the Matanuska-National Wildlife Refuge, Texas.  

Captive breeding programs, cross-breeding, and inoculation have been successful in increasing the crane population number to over 100. The Wyoming Game and Fish Department has been monitoring whirping crane population and habitat in Wyoming since 1982. Following the 1988 breeding season, monitoring efforts were greatly reduced in part to lack of success with the attempts to establish breeding pairs at Grizzly Lake National Wildlife Refuge, Idaho. The Grizzly Lake program has predominantly abandoned the whirping crane program with other species being attempted.  

As of March 21, 1996, only 13 whirping cranes were known to exist and the AI breeding program was terminated along with the AI program on the Audubon Society's in North Dakota.  

Habitat Requirements  
Whirping cranes select moist, marshy prairie, ponds, and marshes. Their nest is a mound in the sand or in burrows, deep water, or in brush on the edge of the water. They are usually found in areas where the water is not at its highest level.  

Conflicts  
The apparent reason for the precipitous decline of the species in the United States, as recorded in 1947, was the commercial demand for the skeleton, which was highly valuable for making ornamental pieces.  

5. Bontytail Chub (Gila robusta elegans)  

Distribution  
This native longjawed fish was once abundant throughout the Colorado River system. Apparently it is a species of the Great Basin (Cope 1872, Cope and Yarrow 1975, Koch 1989, Jordan and Everhart 1997, and Jordan and Everhart 1997). It is currently distributed among the Green River and tributaries all through western Arizona. As early as 1900, bontytail chubs were reported in decreasing numbers in the upper Green River tributaries. Refer to Section V, page 21 of this document and megacodon for Green River threatened and endangered fish species.  

Habitat Requirements  
Bontytail chubs are found in deep, swift, rocky, sand areas in main channels of the Green River. Water temperatures are variable. The species prefers cold water discharges from dams which displace their downstream until water temperatures sufficiently increase for migration or reproduction. The chub is known to breed in the summer. Most of the fish are known to exist in the upper Green River tributaries.  

Conflicts  
Impacts to the bontytail chub are about the same for the other native Colorado River fish species. Water diversions, reduced stream flows, and reduced water quality affect the detrimental changes to the habitat of the species. This fish is being brought back from the brink of extinction.  

6. Colorado Safflower (Physococcus lucasii)  

Population Distribution  
The Colorado safflower is found in the Colorado River drainage. Before construction of Flaming Gorge Dam, this fish lived in the lower Colorado River. The introduction of non-native fish species has reduced the safflower's range to the Green River and Black Fork. The safflower is not known to exist in the upper Colorado River drainage.  

Habitat Requirements  
The safflower is an obligate native fish species that is sensitive to the habitat conditions found in the Colorado River drainage.  

Conflicts  
The endangered species act of 1973, the Migratory Bird Treaty Act, and Wyoming Game and Fish Department laws.  

7. Humpback Chub (Cyprinidae)  

Population Distribution  
This fish is endemic to the Colorado River basin, but found only in relatively restricted areas. One of the populations occurred on the lower Green River and Classroom Creek, while the other occurred in the Green River.  

Habitat Requirements  
The humpback chub is found in deep, swift, rocky, sand areas in main channels of the Green River. Water temperatures are variable. The species prefers cold water discharges from dams which displace their downstream until water temperatures sufficiently increase for migration or reproduction. The chub is known to breed in the summer. Most of the fish are known to exist in the upper Green River tributaries.  

Conflicts  
The humpback chub is found in deep, swift, rocky, sand areas in main channels of the Green River. Water temperatures are variable. The species prefers cold water discharges from dams which displace their downstream until water temperatures sufficiently increase for migration or reproduction. The chub is known to breed in the summer. Most of the fish are known to exist in the upper Green River tributaries.  

8. Razorback Sucker (Xyrauchen texanus)  

Population Distribution  
This fish is found in the Colorado River system. This species is found in the upper Colorado River drainage and is not known to exist in the lower Colorado River drainage.  

Habitat Requirements  
The Razorback Sucker prefers the upper Colorado River drainage and is not known to exist in the lower Colorado River drainage. This species is not known to exist in the upper Colorado River drainage.  

Conflicts  
Elimination of all clear, swift, white water areas in Wyoming's portion of the Colorado River has removed the potential habitat suitable for this species. Competition with non-native fish species is also given as a reason for population declines within suitable habitat.  

APPENDIX 10-1  

Environmental problems as a result of public and private land development and construction activities leading to the probable extinction of Colorado River safflowers and their spawning in the Green River Resource Area include: dam construction, river impoundment, diversions, irrigation, water pollution, hazards and removals. Refer to Section IV, page 21 of this document and megacodon for information on Green River threatened and endangered fish species.
2. North American Wolverine (Gulo gulo luscus)

No sightings of this species in the region are known.

3. Pygmy Rabbit (Syrituges idahoensis)

The USFWS and the State of Washington are currently conducting a status review of the species, and no recoveries have been documented.

4. Black Tern (Chlidonias niger)

The species has been sighted in the region.

5. Ferruginous Hawk (Buteo regalis)

The species has been sighted in the region.

6. Loggerhead Shrike (Lanius ludovicianus)

The species has been recorded in the region.

7. Long-Billed Curlew (Numenius americanus)

The species has been recorded in the region.

8. Mountain Plover (Charadrius montanus)

The species has been recorded in the region.

9. Northern Goshawk (Accipiter gentilis)

The species has been recorded in the region.

10. Western Snowy Plover (Charadrius alexandrinus)

The species has been recorded in the region.

11. White-Faced Ibis (Plegadis chihi)

The species has been recorded in the region.

12. Colorado River Cutthroat Trout (Oncorhyncus clarki)

The species has been recorded in the region.
14. Leatherside Chub (Gila copei)
The leatherside chub is an "endangered" species on the Green River system and a native of Boisieville Branch Creek. They are found in pools and riffles of clear, cold streams and rivers in intermontane current. Present status of this fish is unclear and a threat of being declared an endangered species due to habitat loss for this fish species.

15. Roundtail Chub (Gila robusta)
This large warm-water species grows to 17 inches in length and is also a inhabitant of the Green River system. As with other chubs and suckers, habitat is usually clear, cold streams and intermontane current. Habitat consists of river bars with boulders and gravel substrates, stones, and cobble. It prefers water in intermontane current and cold water habitat enhancement measures are implemented in thePreferred Alternative of the DEIS. Sustained harvest of this species could result in habitat modification and elimination of the species.

D. Threatened, Endangered, Candidate, and Sensitive Plant Species

\[\text{TEXT NOT AVAILABLE}\]

2. William's Rockcress (Arabis williamsii)

William's rockcress is a Category C candidate under review for Federal listing as Threatened or Endangered. The Nature Conservancy ranks this species as G1/2, vulnerable to extinction globally, and extremely vulnerable to extinction regionally. William's rockcress is endemic to Wyoming and is known to occur in 19 different locations. Populations are small, scattered, and associated with the peaks and ridges along the north and south ends of the Wind River Range, and the east flank of the Wind River Range west of Big Pine.

William's rockcress occurs on public land north of Wyoming Highway 26 in the vicinity of Willow and West Willow Creek. The site just west of West Willow Creek is the type locality for the species. Habitat consists of open, rocky soil, often on relatively bare ground including loose rocks, stones, and gravel. Some unusual or disperse populations are associated with sagebrush grassland, scrubby sagebrush, and alpine meadows. William's rockcress is only known on the Wind River Range and is therefore the type locality for the Wind River Range and the Wind River Range.

3. Mystery Wormwood (Artemisia biennis var. diffuse)

Mystery wormwood is a Category 2 candidate under review for Federal listing as Threatened or Endangered. The Nature Conservancy ranks this plant species as G1/C1, globally threatened, and extremely vulnerable to extinction. Taxonomically, there is still a question regarding its validity as a species. Very little is known about this species.

The mystery wormwood was described growing in a seasonal alpine meadow adjacent to Rock Springs. It is likely to be found in cinder cones and basaltic rock outcrops. It is not currently known to be found in any other Wyoming area. A subsequent search in 1984 could not relocate these plants.

4. Precious Milkvetch (Astragalus prominatus)

Precious milkvetch is a Category 2 candidate under review for Federal listing as Threatened or Endangered. The Nature Conservancy ranks this plant as G1/E1, extremely vulnerable to extinction globally, and extremely vulnerable to extinction regionally. One population is known from an area in Bighorn County, where this species is known from Wyoming only. Precious milkvetch is found in upland prairie and meadow habitat. It is found in small, scattered populations in upland prairie and meadow habitat in Bighorn County, Wyoming.

A field survey conducted for the BLM in 1983 of the Wyoming Natural Diversity Database in 1986 established permanent roam sites in 1987. A population of precious milkvetch is known from the Bighorn Mountains and from the Bighorn Mountains in the Bighorn Mountains in the Bighorn Mountains.

A population of precious milkvetch is known from the Bighorn Mountains and from the Bighorn Mountains in the Bighorn Mountains. A population of precious milkvetch is known from the Bighorn Mountains and from the Bighorn Mountains in the Bighorn Mountains. A population of precious milkvetch is known from the Bighorn Mountains and from the Bighorn Mountains in the Bighorn Mountains.

The precious milkvetch is known from the Bighorn Mountains and from the Bighorn Mountains in the Bighorn Mountains. A population of precious milkvetch is known from the Bighorn Mountains and from the Bighorn Mountains in the Bighorn Mountains. A population of precious milkvetch is known from the Bighorn Mountains and from the Bighorn Mountains in the Bighorn Mountains.

A field survey conducted for the BLM in 1983 of the Wyoming Natural Diversity Database in 1986 established permanent roam sites in 1987. A population of precious milkvetch is known from the Bighorn Mountains and from the Bighorn Mountains in the Bighorn Mountains. A population of precious milkvetch is known from the Bighorn Mountains and from the Bighorn Mountains in the Bighorn Mountains.

The precious milkvetch is known from the Bighorn Mountains and from the Bighorn Mountains in the Bighorn Mountains. A population of precious milkvetch is known from the Bighorn Mountains and from the Bighorn Mountains in the Bighorn Mountains. A population of precious milkvetch is known from the Bighorn Mountains and from the Bighorn Mountains in the Bighorn Mountains.

The precious milkvetch is known from the Bighorn Mountains and from the Bighorn Mountains in the Bighorn Mountains. A population of precious milkvetch is known from the Bighorn Mountains and from the Bighorn Mountains in the Bighorn Mountains. A population of precious milkvetch is known from the Bighorn Mountains and from the Bighorn Mountains in the Bighorn Mountains.

A field survey conducted for the BLM in 1983 of the Wyoming Natural Diversity Database in 1986 established permanent roam sites in 1987. A population of precious milkvetch is known from the Bighorn Mountains and from the Bighorn Mountains in the Bighorn Mountains.

The precious milkvetch is known from the Bighorn Mountains and from the Bighorn Mountains in the Bighorn Mountains. A population of precious milkvetch is known from the Bighorn Mountains and from the Bighorn Mountains in the Bighorn Mountains. A population of precious milkvetch is known from the Bighorn Mountains and from the Bighorn Mountains in the Bighorn Mountains.

A field survey conducted for the BLM in 1983 of the Wyoming Natural Diversity Database in 1986 established permanent roam sites in 1987. A population of precious milkvetch is known from the Bighorn Mountains and from the Bighorn Mountains in the Bighorn Mountains. A population of precious milkvetch is known from the Bighorn Mountains and from the Bighorn Mountains in the Bighorn Mountains.

The precious milkvetch is known from the Bighorn Mountains and from the Bighorn Mountains in the Bighorn Mountains. A population of precious milkvetch is known from the Bighorn Mountains and from the Bighorn Mountains in the Bighorn Mountains. A population of precious milkvetch is known from the Bighorn Mountains and from the Bighorn Mountains in the Bighorn Mountains.

A field survey conducted for the BLM in 1983 of the Wyoming Natural Diversity Database in 1986 established permanent roam sites in 1987. A population of precious milkvetch is known from the Bighorn Mountains and from the Bighorn Mountains in the Bighorn Mountains. A population of precious milkvetch is known from the Bighorn Mountains and from the Bighorn Mountains in the Bighorn Mountains.

The precious milkvetch is known from the Bighorn Mountains and from the Bighorn Mountains in the Bighorn Mountains. A population of precious milkvetch is known from the Bighorn Mountains and from the Bighorn Mountains in the Bighorn Mountains. A population of precious milkvetch is known from the Bighorn Mountains and from the Bighorn Mountains in the Bighorn Mountains.

A field survey conducted for the BLM in 1983 of the Wyoming Natural Diversity Database in 1986 established permanent roam sites in 1987. A population of precious milkvetch is known from the Bighorn Mountains and from the Bighorn Mountains in the Bighorn Mountains. A population of precious milkvetch is known from the Bighorn Mountains and from the Bighorn Mountains in the Bighorn Mountains.

The precious milkvetch is known from the Bighorn Mountains and from the Bighorn Mountains in the Bighorn Mountains. A population of precious milkvetch is known from the Bighorn Mountains and from the Bighorn Mountains in the Bighorn Mountains. A population of precious milkvetch is known from the Bighorn Mountains and from the Bighorn Mountains in the Bighorn Mountains.

A field survey conducted for the BLM in 1983 of the Wyoming Natural Diversity Database in 1986 established permanent roam sites in 1987. A population of precious milkvetch is known from the Bighorn Mountains and from the Bighorn Mountains in the Bighorn Mountains. A population of precious milkvetch is known from the Bighorn Mountains and from the Bighorn Mountains in the Bighorn Mountains.
The contracted Indian ricegrass is generally found in broad areas on dry, shallow, or sandy soils. Within the Resource Area, the contracted Indian ricegrass has been noted in subdivisions of the National Parks and elsewhere in the state.

Prior to 1993, this species was known from only 12 locations in Wyoming and Colorado and was considered imperiled throughout its range. Field surveys through the Rocky Mountains in 1993 and 1994 resulted in discovering numerous new locations of the species. A study published in 1994 by the Wyoming Natural Diversity Database showed the species is widespread in central and western Wyoming. Contracted Indian ricegrass is palatable to livestock and could potentially be threatened on a local level by overgrazing or large-scale surface disturbances. However, due to its wide range, numerous occurrences, and low threats, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service is considering downgrading the contracted Indian ricegrass to Category C.

9. Swallow's Mountain Ricegrass (Oryzopsis swalleni)

This species is of Category 3C, endangered under review for Federal listing as Threatened or Endangered. The Nature Conservancy ranks this plant as G2SE, very similar to extinction globally and very vulnerable to extinction statewide. The tufted wildpea is endemic to southwest Wyoming, currently with 18 known occurrences. Its single known location in the planning area is Category 3C.

The tufted wildpea’s habitat consists of sparsely vegetated shale slopes and talus conglomerate, which has been found growing between 6,000 and 7,000 feet in elevation.

This species was originally studied for the BLM in 1981, but the study concentrated on taxonomic differences between this species and others in the area. Survey routes of collections were not documented, and the entire range of the species was not mapped. Complete information concerning distribution and population sizes and trends is lacking. Due to the lack of immediate threats to the species, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service downgraded the tufted wildpea to 3C status (Notice of Review 1993).

Most of its potential habitat has been lost to urbanization, and it is likely that more of the species will be found during the general flora inventories of the Rocky Mountains.

12. Green River Greenthread (Thelwelera caespitosa)

The Green River greenthread is a Category 2 Candidate under review for Federal listing as Threatened or Endangered. The Nature Conservancy ranks this plant G1SE, extremely similar to extinction globally and extremely vulnerable to extinction statewide. The species is known from two locations in Wyoming and one historical occurrence in northeastern Utah. Both Wyoming locations occur within the Resource Area on escarpments above the Green River.

The Green River greenthread was discovered in 1988 growing on a ridge of barren white shale derived from the Green River Formation. This area is part of the Uinta Escarpment in the vicinity of a heavily used recreational area where individual plants have been harvested by visitors for personal use. In 1995, the species was listed as a candidate species under review for Federal listing. The plant has been even more directly impacted, but still exists in an area of past drilling activity.

Due to its extreme rarity, impacts from seismic activity, mineral development, road construction, recreation, or other surface disturbing activities could have serious impacts on this species. A monitoring plan was developed in 1996 and may be used to provide data. A habitat management plan which would protect prescriptive actions is planned for this species.

13. Uinta Greenthread (Thelwelera pubescens)

Uinta greenthread is a Category 2 Candidate under review for Federal listing as Threatened or Endangered. The Nature Conservancy ranks this plant G1SE, extremely similar to extinction globally and extremely vulnerable to extinction statewide. Thelwelera pubescens is restricted to less than 100 square miles in southwestern Wyoming and southeastern Idaho within the Resource Area. In the Resource Area, it occurs in BLM-managed public land on the north flank of the Uinta Mountains in northeastern Utah and southeastern Idaho. These mountains are isolated plateaus capped with cobble, coarse soils formed from Bishop Tuff and Bishop basalt. The Uinta green thread grows along the rims of these mountains. All suitable potential habitat in the area of known populations has been surveyed for Uinta greenthread.

This species is generally abundant where it occurs, populations range in size from thousands to tens of thousands of individuals. Due to its overall range, disturbance could significantly impact the species. A status survey was conducted for this species in 1988 by the Wyoming Natural Diversity Database in order to detect and gas field development in the area. A species status survey was conducted for this species in 1988 by the Wyoming Natural Diversity Database in order to detect and gas field development in the area.

III. INFORMATION SOURCES

The previous discussions on habitat use, activities, and habitats with the natural environment and its physical and chemical conditions will be described in the Green River Management Situation Analysis. The Green River Management Situation Analysis may be found in the Background Information section of the Draft EIS document and will include a summary of the draft EIS. The Draft EIS is available for public review and comment.

Some of the information concerning Wyoming's wildlife, distribution, and history was furnished by Tramuel Julian, James Jane, Elaine Raper, and Don Ross (former WDFW biologists) and to some extent by Richard L. Rehn, Wyoming Game and Fish Department. Additional data was provided by Dick Randall, Humane Society of the United States; Merle Bennett; Dick Gibbons; Joe Rodriguez, H. Anderson, and Shirley D. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Tom Moore, Wyoming Geological Survey, and Tom Witter, University of Wyoming, provided data. A habitat management plan which would protect prescriptive actions is planned for this species. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service has initiated a habitat management plan which would protect prescriptive actions is planned for this species.

14. Cedar Rim Easter Daisy (Towensia microcephala)

The Cedar Rim Easter daisy is a Category 2 Candidate under review for Federal listing as Threatened or Endangered. The Nature Conservancy ranks this plant G1SE, extremely similar to extinction globally and extremely vulnerable to extinction statewide. The species was recently discovered and is found only in southwestern Cedar County in Utah. It grows in nearly identical habitat to that of Thelwelera pubescens.

The population of the Cedar Rim Easter daisy grows on a rocky slope at the summit of Cedar Mountains within one mile of the population of Thelwelera pubescens. Very little is known about this species. However, the Wyoming Natural Diversity Database has identified a species of this species in the summer of 1994. A monitoring program was established and is recommended that monitoring be done yearly.

Due to the extreme rarity and apparently very small population size, surface disturbance could significantly impact this species to the point of extinction.
IV. DIRECT AND INDIRECT IMPACTS

Colorado River Water Depletions

There are four species of fish in the upper Colorado River system that are considered to be the Colorado squawfish (Ptychocheilus lucius), the humpback chub (Gila cyphaena), the humpnose dace (Gila gila) and the razorback sucker (Xenosacra texana). Though they currently exist only downstream from this Resource Area, water from the upper Green River basin affects the downstream habitat for these fish. Under the Restores and Implementation Program for Endangered Fish Species (RIP), any water depletions from tributary waters within the Colorado River drainage are considered as jeopardizing the continued existence of these fish. Tributary water, defined as water that contributes to mainstream flow, depletion is defined as any water that would contribute to the river flow if not intercepted and removed from the system.

The RIRP was developed as a cooperative effort between the states of Colorado, Utah, and Wyoming (Department of the Interior, and the Administrator of the Western Area Power Administration, Department of Energy, is further implement the RIP).

Projects

For the purposes of this document the term "project" will mean any activity identified by BLM that normally requires an environmental analysis in order to be implemented and which depletions of or contributions to these fish in the Green River or tributaries. In figuring average annual depletions a project could be for a period of one year or it could be as large as 150 gas wells drilled in 10 years. For this document only small depletions under 125 acre feet/ year average annual depletions per project are considered. Larger depletions events caused by things such as new trona ponds or expanded trona mining operations, new coal operations, new power plant operations, irrigation projects or other large resource uses, will be covered by separate environmental analyses and projects. All large projects, if capable of producing deleterious impacts, should be handled as separate species level analyses. All coupled methane projects would be handled in separate analyses, and estimated number of wells of all projects are not included in the tables in this document. The Green River RIM, with an analysis period of 20 years, contains an estimate of small depletions. The average annual depletions is calculated for both BLM and other project proponents (Table 4). Also calculated is the area of land depleted by projects developed prior to 1988 (Table 1) and the amount of water contribution provided by past projects that are still contributing water to the system today (Table 4).

New Depletions

Throughout the Upper Green River basin, water depletions could occur from, but are not limited to, such activities as oil and gas exploration and development, power plant generation, irrigation, construction, and other withdrawals, water wells, etc. Past environmental analyses and biological assessments have documented impacts from such uses. Some of these actions are internal agency actions and others are BLM permitted actions by outside organizations or individuals. Whether or not any specific action would actually result in a depletion from tributary water to the Green River needs to be determined case by case site specifically. In examining the total water depletion from small depletions being taking less than 125 acre feet/year for the next 20 years in the Green River Resource Area, some assumptions are made:

1. Only half of the reservoirs, water pits, and catchments installed under the range or wildlife project would be assumed to affect the flow in the Green River.

2. Reservoir, water pits, and catchments installed under the range or wildlife projects that cause a depletion would be assumed to average 0.5 acre-feet/year.

3. Reservoirs, water pits, and catchments, installed under the range or wildlife projects would be assumed to be installed in all year of the project.

4. Water wells would cause a depletion if located within the floodplains or other recharge zones as delineated by the District geologist.

5. Oil and gas well drilling operations would be assumed to cause, on average, for an 8,000 foot well depth, a one-depletion of 1 acre foot per well. Actual number of wells drilled are based on 40 gallons of water per foot of depth.

6. Water used in hydrosalt testing of pipelines would be assumed to be returned to the water system.

7. Spring developments would be assumed to deplete 0.5 acre-feet per year each, all installed year of the plan, and only half of the project.

8. Larger depletions events over 125 acre feet/year caused by things such as new trona ponds or expanded trona mining operations, new coal operations, new power plant operations, irrigation projects or other large resource uses, will be covered by separate environmental analyses and projects. All large projects, if capable of producing deleterious impacts, should be handled as separate species level analyses. All coupled methane projects would be handled in separate analyses, and estimated number of wells of all projects are not included in the tables in this document.

Historic Depletions

Historic depletions are those depletions occurring prior to January 22, 1968 (the date the RIRP Cooperative Agreement was signed) and which continue to deplete today. Restores are an example of such depletions provided they stop water from entering a tributary that would add to the surface flow of the Green River or its tributaries. Any project, large reservoirs, etc., would be covered by separate environmental and biological analyses. All coupled methane projects would be handled in separate analyses, and estimated number of wells of all projects are not included in the tables in this document. The Green River RIM, with an analysis period of 20 years, contains an estimate of small depletions. The average annual depletions is calculated for both BLM and other project proponents (Table 4). Also calculated is the area of land depleted by projects developed prior to 1988 (Table 1) and the amount of water contribution provided by past projects that are still contributing water to the system today (Table 4).

Water Contributions to the Green River System

There are several abandoned or converted exploration wells (from Oil and Gas, Trona, Coal, DDE, etc.) on BLM-administered lands that are maintained as flowing wells and that provide some ground flowing water of good quality, supplementing the flow of perennial streams within the Green River System. The estimated total flow from these wells is 222.6 acre-feet per year into perennial resources. This water is from deep aquifers that do not normally contribute to the surface flow of the Green River. There is a potential number of such wells, but only twice this number of flowing wells which do not provide water on the surface to perennial streams but quite possibly make it underground to the Green River. It is not possible to accurately or total effect from these water sources and this flow is not figured into any calculated impacts. There are feders delivered with 252.5 acre feet per year will more than offset the expected average annual depletions (1739.5 acre feet/year) for projects which create new, such depletions during the RMP analysis period under the Proposed Alternative (Table 1). Should the average annual small depletion total be adjusted upward in future years because of unproven increased activity depletions they will offset to the amount of the contributions (222.6 acre feet/year) calculated above those contributions continue; if that figure should be exceeded, further analysis and consultation concerning impacts on wetlands in hanclope projects with within the breadth of the Green River basin logically would be defined as, possibly not significant. Small depletion factors can be figured into the calculations for water contribution.

Future Considerations

In order to make the analysis of the many possible changes that may occur during the life of the Resource Management Plan, the Green River Resource Area will provide the USWS documentation of water depletions or contributions for projects as they are implemented. This will be done to show that accurate average annual water contributions currently at 222.6 acre-feet/year.

Historic depletions from those projects initiated prior to 1988 and continuing today will change only as these projects cease to be. As this occurs the total unload the water from the system. All new projects, including repair of watered out reservoirs from exploration activities and new projects and additions. A new and revised accumulation among USWS and BLM should be held to review depletions issues for the Resource Area.

Animal Damage Control Activities


Leasable and Salable Minerals

Applications and issuance of minerals requires that an Endangered Species Act (ESA) Determination be made under the "No Effect" or "May Effect" decision be rendered. Consultation will be initiated on actions in which a "May Effect" determination has been rendered. No Effect alternatives are either unfeasible or unacceptable.

All Other Land Use Activities

All land use activities regardless of origin are required to comply with Section 7 of the Federal Endangered Species Act of 1973 and Section 10 of the Endangered Species Act. Information on site specific Threatened or Endangered Species clearances are and will be performed in advance or under contract to satisfy provisions of the Endangered Species Act.

V. CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

The Resource Management Plan emphasizes maintenance and enhancement of threatened and endangered and special status species and their habitats. The impacts to these species and their habitats will be addressed as each activity plan is prepared or revised. The following discussion relates only to those activities within the plan which could cumulatively impact Threatened, Endangered, or Special Status plants and wildlife.

Fire Management

Fire suppression activities and associated fire camps could ad

variably affect Special Status plants through application of retardant or emulsion of fire lines. The discussion in Volume 1, page 125 indicates that suppression activities would be designed to protect candidate plants.

Lands and Realty Management

Cumulative adverse impacts could occur through issuance of rights-of-way, leases and similar interests in the public domain and the development of pipelines, roads, pipelines, and wells at east fast injury would adversely affect occupation of woodland riparian habitats by hawks, and riparian clays by white falcon. Roadway dust or flaming fumes from gas wells may adversely affect special status plant communities. The cumulative effect of roadways, pipelines, and wells in the vicinity of occupied habitat for locally IRI'halts for Black-footed ferrets and fragment these special habitats. Many rocky plant communities occur in high elevation sites or on isolatedgeologic features. These are also protected for compensation purposes and special-status plants could occur with construction and maintenance of communication facilities in some locations.

Livestock Grazing Management

Volume 1, page 136 proposes as Management Actions, that grazing preferences and grazing management tasks in the grazing preference of 318,647 AUMS. With the past 5-year average of 180,000 AUMS of grazing use, we are seeing some wellwatered range habitats gradually improve while others are in condition, and yet others continue to deteriorate. Many of the listed and threatened species use seasonally occupied range habitats. Should the full grazing preference of livestock be activated, development of critical habitats for species insensitive for many listed plant and animal species. Grazing levels based upon monitoring plans and onage use may allow more active AUMS of grazing than presently occur but it requires livestock much fewer to prevent overgrazing.

Development of supplemental wildlife waters in lightly used portions of some pastures could cumulatively impact special status plant species and possibly some salt marshes in some of the near riparian areas and in potential special status plant communities would have adverse impacts to some species listed in Table 1.
Minerals Management

Leachable Minerals

As previously discussed, oil and gas field development could adversely impact threatened and endangered species. The cumulative effect of human disturbance, noise, dust, vehicles, human presence, habitat fragmentation, roads, wells, camps, etc., and potential for accidental wildlife discharge. The present 194 active mining is not adverse to development in a higher section, such as 80 acres, whereas considerable fragmentation and habitat intrusion would occur.

Leachable mineral development is often associated with open waste impoundments with water quality of a toxic nature. As more large impoundments are developed, the likelihood of threatened and endangered species losses increases. Several of the species in Table 1 live in the area. The completed project over a period of years may also displace plants or fish species. Deposited colliery over a wide area during appropriate season would have low impacts.

Recreation Resource Management

There may be some cumulative impacts to upturned habitat and associated threatened and endangered species from overutilization. 200 use on and along upturned habitats and on major waterways.

VI. COORDINATION WHICH WILL REDUCE ADVERSE, THREATENED AND ENDANGERED IMPACTS

Much of the data for the planning area has been entered into the Geographic Information System. This data has been used to overlay conflicting resource information in areas of development and protective, thereby coordinating management. The habitat database has about 3,000 acres closed during the time of invention and located in various habitats. This represents about one-third of the total area identified during various habitat surveys. The BLM could be used in the process of summarizing data for GIS input for habitats for other threatened and endangered species. These data will not be available to other futures.

Some additional measures of mitigation discussed in the RMP to offset potential impacts from various activities are discussed.

Adverse habitat nesting skills. Hauls, troughs, outcrops, and predators may be considered Non-Surface Occupancy areas subject to habitat activity that year and during a season which could occur between February 1 to July 15 depending on species and fledging hatching dates. Nesting raptors would be protected by restricting activities within a buffer zone of 0.5 to 8 miles radius of active raptor nesting sites or occupied habitat reference Table 7. Seasonal Restrictions for All Surface Disturbance Activities of the DEIS. Active or nesting raptor nesting sites would be protected and managed to allow for continued nesting activities.

Any coal leasing on federal coal lands would be subject to the following conditions:

1. Inventory followed by consultation with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.
2. No surface mining or surface operations in areas having active or viable nest or in the associated buffer zone, as determined by the USFWS.
3. It exceptions are granted, no surface disturbances activities will be permitted in such areas during breeding and nesting seasons.
4. Should an nest become established in an area within a mile of the lease area, during the course of mining of the BLM will, with the USFWS determine mitigative measures that may be necessary to protect nesting birds.
5. The Tri State Monument ACEI to be under the protection of the watered landscape and sensitive fish species. The area contains the Curtian Creek, Sage Creek, Shallow Creek. Watered features such as subterranean water, quality, and stability are currently threatening the existence of Colorado River cutthroat trout through habitat degradation and significantly affects the fisheries potential of the Green River.

Fish spawning areas would also be protected by preventing or restricting stream disturbance activities during spawning periods. Disturbances in active fish spawning areas or spawning areas during the construction of a case-by-case basis.

Over 600,000 acres of coal potential lands would be subject to continued field investigations, studies, and evaluations to determine if certain methods of coal mining can occur without having a significant long-term impact on wildlife, and especially on threatened and endangered plant and animal species and threatened species. Such investigations, studies, and evaluations may be conducted on an as needed or as soon as possible basis. The major individual coal leasing or development proposals, e.g., mine plans or options. It needs area wide studies and evaluated.

These studies would include keeping track of background data current, e.g., where existing raptor nests become abandoned or where new raptor nests become established. It analysis of effects to wildlife and threatened and endangered species habitat and populations, and the cumulative effect of mining operations and other activities within the area. Consultation with other agencies e.g., USFWS, WFGF, etc., threatened species groups, and with condition would occur as needed or required.

Inventories and clearances are required for authorized BLM activities as some essential habitat for animals and plants classified as threatened or endangered and special status species. These studies will be done in cooperation with BLM and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service guidelines to provide the presence or absence of these species. In the event of an area which is identified, the leaseholder will be required to modify opera- tional plans to include the protection requirements of the species, habitat use restrictions, occupancy limitations, facility design modifications.

Habitat for threatened, endangered, and sensitive plant and animal species would be provided, maintained, or improved through vegetation manipulation, mitigation measures, or other management actions including habitat protection, preservation, and recreation.

Site specific activities planning all-inclusive planning, habitat management plans, etc., and site specific analysis of individual activities require further site specific analysis of effects to all resources including threatened and endangered species. Inventories will be conducted and the data bases kept current.

Off-road vehicle travel on public land areas would be limited to existing roads and trails to reduce adverse environmental damage and reduce conflicts with sensitive and/or threatened and endangered species. Some roads and trails would be closed and reclaimed as a result of transportation planning. Transportation planning would include proper road location, construction, restoration, design and construction.

Known locations of candidate plant species communities (144 locations and 1,110 acre) are to be protected to 1 to 3 surface disturbance activities that could adversely affect the plants or their habitat. The location of new mining claims withdrawals would be preserved, 3 mineral material sales, 4 off-road vehicle trails, 3 geophysical exploration activities, and 6 the use of explosives and blasting.

In addition, the area 1,440 acres occupied by four of the plants described above (Arabis pellucida, Arabis praemontana, Desertorum torulosa, and Triloba ophiocoma) has been designated as an Area of Environmental Concern in the Potential Alternatives.

Searches would be conducted to identify new plant locations on or potential habitat areas prior to projects. As new populations are identified, they would be added to the ACEI. Up to an additional 20,000 acres of potential habitat could be added to the ACEI if it is determined that any of the four candidate plant species is protected. It is a plant not be deleted, management of that plant species under ACEE prescriptions would be determined. The ACEE criteria would increase or decrease depending upon the results of the searches or delays. If plants are found on identified potential habitat areas, the plant site and associated habitat would be protected and not used and not to be protected, occupancy will be allowed with proper mitigation.

It may be desirable to acquire approximately 1,900 acres of habitat near Pine Butte to enhance management of Desertorum torulosa.

Please refer to the Draft Environmental Impact Statement of the Green River RMP for additional mitigation and 1 protective measures.

VII. MAY EFFECT/NO EFFECT DETERMINATION

The Green River RMP in and of itself is an overall plan for management direction of various commodity and natural resource programs for the next 20 years. BLM policy of "no loss" of wetlands and direction to "achieve 20 percent of riparian areas in proper functioning condition" should improve the status of many of the species previously discussed. Numerous other proposed voids without adverse actions prescriptions demonstrate progressive attitudes toward diversity and improved responsible environmental management.

It has been noted that any water depletion to the Colorado River or its tributaries constitutes a "may effect" situation to the endangered fish species of this water. Water will be removed from the Colorado River or its tributaries during the implementation of the GRRP. However, the contribution of good quality water from Flowing well current in the amount of 224.2 acres-feet per year, the effect of the anticipated water depletion. This contributed water resource instead flows to the river system. If these wells were not maintained or were shut down, that water would not be available to the system.

In addition, the relationship between the operation of Flaming Gorge Dam and water depletion to the river is highly uncertain. The delta, which would have a flow of the Yampa's_web bordering back acres or water as a result of 3,794,500,000 cubic feet of water 3 to over the area of 42,000 acres. All of the critical habitat for the Colorado River endangered fish species is located downstream of this dam. The operation of the dam is entirely responsible for the water regime provided by the Green River through the Colorado River. It is very unlikely that the average annual depletion of water for small depletion during the new 20 years. The Cottonwood State Park is an area which is 42,000 acres of the river, with an inflow to the system, a critical habitat for the delta. A critical habitat for the fish effect on the river flows through the critical habitat areas.

Analysis of the proposed management prescriptions in the RMP indicate that the Green River RMP is unlikely to adversely affect the status of any previously discussed plant or wildlife species and constitutes a "No Effect" determination.
TABLE 1  
SPECIES LIST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>USFWS Category</th>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>Scientific Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Listed Species</td>
<td>Black-footed ferret</td>
<td>Mustela nigripes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bald eagle</td>
<td>Haliaeetus leucocephalus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Peregrine falcon</td>
<td>Falco peregrinus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Whooping crane</td>
<td>Grus americana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bonytail chub</td>
<td>Gila robusta elegans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Colorado squawfish</td>
<td>Psorichthys linnaei</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Humpback chub</td>
<td>Gila cypha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Razorback sucker</td>
<td>Xyrauchen texanus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Species</td>
<td>Small rockcrane</td>
<td>Anchisaurus paﬃlata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate Species</td>
<td>Lynx</td>
<td>Felis lynx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>North American woodchuck</td>
<td>Gulo gulo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pygmy rabbit</td>
<td>Sylvilagus auduboni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Black tern</td>
<td>Chlidonias niger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ferruginous hawk</td>
<td>Buteo regalis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Loggerhead shrike</td>
<td>Larus ludovicanus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Long-billed curlew</td>
<td>Numenius arquata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mountain plover</td>
<td>Charadrius montanus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Northern goshawk</td>
<td>Accipiter gentilis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Western snowy plover</td>
<td>Charadrius nivosus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>White-tailed ptarmigan</td>
<td>Lagopus leucocephalus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Colorado River cutthroat trout</td>
<td>Oncorhynchus clarki pleuropterus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hamelechamomou chub</td>
<td>Catostomus latipinnis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leatherﬁsh chub</td>
<td>Gila copei</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Roundtail chub</td>
<td>Gila robusta robusta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Large blue head bladderpod</td>
<td>Lasioscyllium macrostomatum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Meadow pupfish</td>
<td>Cypripedium laterale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Precious milkvetch</td>
<td>Astraptes ﬂoridus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sternace brandongue</td>
<td>Perseaum acuminata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Williams rockcrane</td>
<td>Anchisaurus williamsi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wyoming tansy mustard</td>
<td>Descurainia pectinata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pubescent greenthread</td>
<td>Teleosperma pubescens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Green River greenthread</td>
<td>Teleosperma greggii</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 2  
FERRET SIGHTINGS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>May 1968</td>
<td>2 miles south of Green River</td>
<td>1 adult</td>
<td>Probable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 miles off river</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
<td>T. 18 N. R. 93 W. Sec. 21</td>
<td>1 adult</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 1972</td>
<td>T. 14 N. R. 98 W. Secs. 35-36</td>
<td>1 adult</td>
<td>Probable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 1973</td>
<td>55 miles west of Rawlins,</td>
<td>1 adult</td>
<td>Possible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.2 miles south of Tipton Road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 1974</td>
<td>T. 18 N. R. 98 W. Sec. 30,</td>
<td>1 adult</td>
<td>Probable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 miles south of Bitter Creek</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 1975</td>
<td>5 miles west and 2 miles</td>
<td>1 adult</td>
<td>Possible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>south of Green River</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 1975</td>
<td>T. 21 N. R. 111 W. Sec. 23</td>
<td>1 adult</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>T. 22 N. R. 110 W. Sec. 22</td>
<td>1 adult</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer 1979</td>
<td>Swedeswater County, Superior Exit on 1-80</td>
<td>1 adult</td>
<td>Probable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 1983</td>
<td>T. 23 N. R. 98 W. Swedeswater County</td>
<td>1 adult</td>
<td>Confirmed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 1983</td>
<td>Swedeswater County, Bxc Road near 1-80</td>
<td>1 adult</td>
<td>Probable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 1984</td>
<td>T. 18 N. R. 107 W. Sec. 22,</td>
<td>1 adult</td>
<td>Probable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 mile west of Green River</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 1984</td>
<td>Swedeswater County, near Green River</td>
<td>1 adult</td>
<td>Probable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 1992</td>
<td>T. 15 N. R. 96 W. Sec. 16, south of trail toward Sand Creek in Adobe Town</td>
<td>1 adult</td>
<td>Probable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### APPENDIX 10-1

#### TABLE 3
**CANDIDATE PLANT SPECIES IN THE GREEN RIVER RESOURCE AREA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scientific Name</th>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Federal</th>
<th>Conservancy*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Antennaria dioica</td>
<td>meadow p延vovye</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>G2S2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arabis pahsila</td>
<td>small rockcress</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>G1SI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arabis williamei</td>
<td>William's rockcress</td>
<td>3C</td>
<td>G3S3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artemisia founda</td>
<td>diffused sedgebrush</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>G5T/SI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Astilbe canadensis</td>
<td>precocious milkvetch</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>G1SI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cerastium articulatum</td>
<td>Osveye's df sce</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>G3S1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Descurainia luxurians</td>
<td>Wyoming tawny mustard</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>G1SI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lentilullula lasiocarpa</td>
<td>large fringed bladderpod</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>G2S2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occisus convicta</td>
<td>Contracted miregrass</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>G5S3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ophiopogon jadeshii</td>
<td>Swallen's mountain miregrass</td>
<td>3C</td>
<td>G5S1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persicaria anserina</td>
<td>anseist's beardedrop</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>G2S1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physarum condensata</td>
<td>Tallied miregapp</td>
<td>3C</td>
<td>G2S2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philopogon pubescens</td>
<td>Uinta greenhead</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>G1SI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philopogon carpinum</td>
<td>Green River greenhead</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>G1SI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Townsendia microchelata</td>
<td>Cedar Mountain Easter daisy</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>G1SI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Classification:
- G1: Extensively vulnerable to extinction globally
- G2: Very vulnerable to extinction globally
- G3: Vulnerable to extinction globally
- G4: Apparently secure globally
- G5: Secure globally

*Conservancy*:
- S: State
- I: Interim

**Note:** The ranking system used by the Nature Conservancy, Natural Diversity Data Base for plant sensitivity, is a global and a state-wide basis. Sensitivity is determined by the vulnerability of the species to extinction globally or extinction statewide, based on threats to the population.


#### APPENDIX 10-1

#### TABLE 4
**SUMMARY TABLE FOR NEW SMALL WATER DEPLETIONS WITHIN THE GREEN RIVER DRAINAGE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>BLM-Initiated</th>
<th>Other Project Proponents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reservoirs (#)</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Wells (#)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring Developments (#)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oil &amp; Gas Well Drilling (#)</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>1,206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irrigation</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Activity**
- BLM Total Depletion (acre-feet)
- Other Water Proponent Total Depletion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>BLM-Initiated Activity</th>
<th>Other Project Proponents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reservoirs (#)</td>
<td>407</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Wells (#)</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring Developments (#)</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oil &amp; Gas Well Drilling (#)</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>3,071</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Activity**
- BLM Total Depletion (acre-feet)
- Other Water Proponent Total Depletion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>BLM-Initiated Activity</th>
<th>Other Project Proponents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reservoirs</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Wells</td>
<td>&quot;but for...&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;but for...&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oil &amp; Gas Wells</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVERAGE ANNUAL DEPLETION</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### TABLE 5
**HISTORIC DEPLETIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>BLM-Initiated Activity</th>
<th>Other Project Proponents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reservoirs (#)</td>
<td>407</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Wells (#)</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring Developments (#)</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oil &amp; Gas Well Drilling (#)</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>3,071</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Activity**
- BLM Total Depletion (acre-feet)
- Other Water Proponent Total Depletion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Other Water Proponent Total Depletion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reservoirs</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Wells</td>
<td>&quot;but for...&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oil &amp; Gas Wells</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVERAGE ANNUAL DEPLETION</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Footnotes:*
1. Wells drilled in 1900-1907. Water used for drilling these wells was a one-time use at the time of drilling and does not continue today. Water for drilling-wells since 1908 is handled as new depletion.
2. But for... - all but an estimated 1/2 of the perennial surface acre of 56.46 acres. Of this the pond-only average 1/2 full in any year. Calculations are as follows: 10% x 56.46 x 0.5 x 0.5 x 113 acre-feet/year
3. It should be noted that this refers to small depletions of less than 125 acre-feet/year. There are several major projects in the reservoir area using thousands of acre-feet of water per year which would fall under the "major depletion" category and which were begun prior to 1908 e.g. Irrigation, coal mines, Bridger Power, phosphate plant, etc.

---

*Note:* The table data includes species and their conservation status, as well as summary data for water depletions within the Green River drainage area.
### APPENDIX 10-I

**TABLE 6**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Flow (gpm)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Little Sandy River</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pencil Point/Flat Top</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roundtop Artesian</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big Sandy River</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flowing Well (Loudoun)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Creek (above Jack Morrison)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big Sandy Reservoir</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitchell Slough</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bitter Creek</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron Mile Marsh</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threemile Meadow</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above Hallville</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Bitter Creek</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **TOTAL**                  | **138**    

CALCULATION: 1 gpm = 1.83 acre-feet/year | 138 gpm = 245.95 acres \( \times 1.83 \times \frac{1}{22} \) acre/acre/year = 2.18

### APPENDIX 10-I

**TABLE 7**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affected Areas</th>
<th>Restrictions</th>
<th>Restricted Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Big Game Crucial Winter Ranges</td>
<td>November 15 - April 30</td>
<td>Antelope, elk, moose, and mule deer crucial winter ranges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purrington Areas</td>
<td>May 1 - June 30</td>
<td>Designated purrington areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sage Grouse Leaks and Nesting Areas</td>
<td>February 1 - July 31</td>
<td>Up to 2 mile radius of lek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golden Eagle Nest</td>
<td>February 1 - July 31</td>
<td>Within 1/2 mile radius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osprey Nest</td>
<td>February 1 - July 31</td>
<td>Within 1/2 mile radius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swans’ Hawk Nest</td>
<td>February 1 - July 31</td>
<td>Within 1/2 mile radius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferruginous Hawk Nest</td>
<td>February 1 - July 31</td>
<td>Within 1 mile radius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coopers Hawk Nest</td>
<td>February 1 - July 31</td>
<td>Within 1/2 mile radius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burrowing Owl Nest</td>
<td>February 1 - July 31</td>
<td>Within 1/2 mile radius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merlin Nest</td>
<td>February 1 - July 31</td>
<td>Within 1/2 mile radius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Raptors</td>
<td>February 1 - July 31</td>
<td>Within 1/2 mile radius</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Memorandum

To: District Manager, Rock Springs
From: Deputy State Director, Lands and Renewable Resources
Subject: Biological Assessment for the Green River Resource Management Plan

Attached is a memo recently received from the U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service containing their Biological Opinion on our Biological Assessment of the impacts of the Green River RMP on the endangered fish species of the lower Colorado River. The depletion fee for the projected depletion of 73.05 acre-feet is waived. This concludes the Service's consultation on the impacts of the proposed action.

If you have any questions, please call Mark Gorges at 307-775-6100.

Attachment
Program was judged to have made sufficient progress to be the reasonable and prudent alternative to avoid the likelihood of jeopardy to the endangered fishes and to avoid destruction or adverse modification of their critical habitat for depletions of 100 acre-feet or less. Therefore, the depletion fee for this project is waived.

Permits or other documents authorizing specific projects that result in depletions should state that the Bureau retains discretionary authority over each project for the purpose of endangered species consultation. If the Recovery Program is unable to implement the Plan in a timely manner, reinitiation of section 7 consultation may be required so that a new reasonable and prudent alternative can be developed by the Service.

This concludes the Service’s consultation on the impacts of the proposed action. If new information becomes available, new species are listed, sufficient progress is not achieved, or should there be any changes in the action in a manner or to an extent not considered herein, formal section 7 consultation should be reinitiated.

We appreciate the Bureau’s effort to address all depletions in the Green River Resource Area. We believe that this approach offers an opportunity to simultaneously evaluate cumulative impacts of many programs. Completion of this consultation will reduce the need for additional consultation on each individual project. We encourage the Bureau to initiate consultation for the other Resource Areas within the Colorado River Drainage in Wyoming, in one consultation, if possible. This will allow for a more complete review of depletions impacts, while minimizing paperwork for all involved. Such a consultation could be done on a programmatic basis (e.g., petroleum development), or, as was done in this case, on a geographic-area planning basis. My staff remains available to assist you as necessary.

Charles P. Davis

cc: Director, WGFQ, Cheyenne, Wyoming
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