

TABLE X: SUMMARY OF IMPACTS TO WILD HORSES

**Significance Criteria:**

- Available habitat components (i.e., forage, water, cover, space) become insufficient to achieve and maintain a viable, healthy wild horse herd managed in a thriving, natural ecological balance with the other range uses.
- Surface disturbances and artificial barriers compromise the wild and free-roaming nature of the Sand Wash wild horse herd that affects the viability of the wild horse herd.
- External factors resulting in herd genetic diversity being depleted to the point that the herd is no longer self-sustaining.

**Assumptions:**

- The wild horse population would continue to increase through recruitment of foals at between 20-22 percent annually.
- Wild horse removals (gathers) would occur every 3 to 5 years.
- The Sand Wash Basin wild horse herd would be managed within the AML range through removals and the selected application of additional population control practices.

**Methods of Analysis:**

Impact analyses and conclusions are based on interdisciplinary team knowledge of resources and the project area, which includes BLM specialists from the Little Snake Field Office and cooperating agencies, as well as a review of existing literature. Effects are quantified where possible using field investigations, and geographic information systems. In the absence of quantitative data, best professional judgment was used. Impacts are sometimes described using ranges of potential impacts or in qualitative terms if appropriate.

Impacts on wild horses are generally the result of activities that affect forage, water availability, available habitat, and the wild and free-roaming nature of a herd. Forage conditions are affected by surface disturbing activities. As the surface is disturbed within Herd Management Areas (HMA), vegetation availability and productivity is affected in the short-term by crushing or shearing the actual vegetation or by compacting or displacing the upper soil horizon, affecting both existing vegetation and the productivity of future vegetation growth. However, some surface disturbing activities could result in long-term improvements in forage condition (e.g. vegetation treatments). In these instances, appropriately applied disturbances could reduce built-up overstory or decadent vegetation, allowing forage vegetation to increase. Management actions that could result in surface disturbance or could preclude surface disturbance are noted as potentially impacting forage conditions in the HMAs. Likewise, management actions that could disturb or restrict access, or that could preclude disturbance to water resources and adjacent riparian habitat are noted as potentially impacting these habitat components.

The wild and free-roaming character of wild horses is also integral to the preservation noted in the Wild and Free-Roaming Horse and Burro Act. The condition of the environment in the HMAs impacts this wild and free-roaming character. Areas that are largely natural with limited human presence or intervention preserve this character. In these areas, wild horses can be managed and viewed with limited impediments on their movement across the landscape. Changes in the landscape that could result in increased human disturbances and presence could reduce the wild and free-roaming nature of wild horses.

TABLE X: SUMMARY OF IMPACTS TO WILD HORSES

ALTERNATIVE A (NO ACTION ALTERNATIVE)	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
<b>SOIL RESOURCES</b>			
<b>Fragile Soils</b>			
<p>A. Allow surface-disturbing activities on isolated sites that meet fragile soil criteria only where performance standards and objectives can be met. Fragile soil criteria areas:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Are rated as highly or severely erodible by wind or water, as described by the Natural Resources Conservation Service in the Area Soil Survey Report or as described by on-site inspection.</li> <li>2. Have slopes greater than or equal to 35%, if they also have one of the following soil characteristics:               <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Surface texture that is sand, loamy sand, very fine sandy loam, silty clay or clay.</li> <li>b) A depth to bedrock less than 20 inches.</li> <li>c) Erosion condition rated as 'poor'.</li> </ol> </li> </ol>	No similar action.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.

TABLE X: SUMMARY OF IMPACTS TO WILD HORSES

ALTERNATIVE A (NO ACTION ALTERNATIVE)	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
d) K factor greater than 0.32.			
Controlling surface disturbing activities on fragile soils would reduce vegetation removal and help to conserve forage for wild horses in these areas.  This would also limit construction of range improvements in these areas.	Not controlling surface disturbing activities on fragile soils would result in increased removal of forage for wild horses.  This would increase flexibility in constructing range improvements in these areas.	Same as Alternative A	Same as Alternative A
B. Permit surface occupancy on federal surface only where adherence to performance objectives for surface-disturbing activities within fragile-soil areas is assured. Performance objectives for fragile soils are the following: 1. Maintain the soil productivity by reducing soil loss from erosion and through proper handling of the soil material. 2. Reduce impact to off-site areas by controlling erosion and/or overland flow from these areas. 3. Protect water quality and quantity of	No similar action.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A

**Deleted:** ¶  
Are there any fragile soils within the SWBHMA? This is the only place any impact would occur.

TABLE X: SUMMARY OF IMPACTS TO WILD HORSES

ALTERNATIVE A (NO ACTION ALTERNATIVE)	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
adjacent surface and groundwater sources. 4. Reduce accelerated erosion caused by surface-disturbing activities. 5. Select best possible site for development to reduce the impacts to the soil and water resources.			
Controlling surface occupancy on fragile soils would reduce vegetation removal and help to conserve forage for wild horses in these areas.  This would also limit construction of range improvements in these areas.	Not controlling surface occupancy on fragile soils would result in increased removal of forage for wild horses.  This would also result in increased flexibility in constructing range improvements	Same as Alternative A	Same as Alternative A
WATER RESOURCES			
Establish no-surface occupancy stipulations from within 500 feet to ¼ mile of perennial water sources, depending on type and use of source, soil type and slope steepness.	No similar action.	Establish no-surface occupancy stipulations up to ¼ mile of perennial water sources, if necessary depending on type and use of source, soil type and slope steepness. Exceptions granted according to Appendix X.	Same as Alternative C.
Prohibiting surface occupancy in these areas would reduce vegetation removal and help to conserve forage and water resources for wild horses.	Not prohibiting surface occupancy along perennial water sources would result in removal of forage and water resources for wild horses in	Same as Alternative A, except are greater area may be protected.	Same as Alternative A, except are greater area may be protected.

**Deleted:** Are there any fragile soils within the SWBHMA? This is the only place any impact would occur. ¶

TABLE X: SUMMARY OF IMPACTS TO WILD HORSES

ALTERNATIVE A (NO ACTION ALTERNATIVE)	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
This would prohibit construction of range improvements in these areas, which may limit management opportunities for water developments for wild horses.	these areas.  This would result in increased flexibility in constructing range improvements in these areas.		
VEGETATION			
Desired Plant Communities			
A. No similar action	Upland and riparian vegetation would be managed to achieve desired plant community (DPC) objectives established for a localized area to meet the Standards for Rangeland Health and objectives for the planning area. DPC objectives will be determined through use various reference information, including NRCS Range Site Guides and updated ecological site inventory data, in conjunction with the specific objectives for the area.	Same as Alternative B	Same as Alternative B
	Would improve overall vegetation health and thereby improve/increase forage for wild horses. This is true "in theory". However, managing for DPC may be used as one of the criteria for adjusting AML (downward), so it may not be a net increase in forage for horses	Same as Alternative B	Same as Alternative B

TABLE X: SUMMARY OF IMPACTS TO WILD HORSES

ALTERNATIVE A (NO ACTION ALTERNATIVE)	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
	MATCH TO VEGETATION CHANGES FOR DPC.		
<b>Vegetation Treatments</b>			
<p>B. Conducted on case-by-case basis as needed.</p>	<p>When consistent with healthy rangeland ecosystems, emphasize vegetation treatments to increase forage production.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Use vegetation treatments on an average of 3,030 acres per year over the life of the plan to restore diversity of seral stages and species, as appropriate.</li> <li>2. Work with the Northwest Colorado Sage-Grouse Working Group to identify, maintain, and restore an average of 530 acres of sagebrush per year. Emphasize creation of functional blocks of sagebrush as sage grouse habitat.</li> <li>3. Use vegetation treatments on an average of 1,600 acres per year to reduce encroachment of juniper and woody species to mimic natural conditions.</li> <li>4. Restore a total of 80 acres during the planning period of bitterbrush and other important winter forage species in the Sand Hills and Spring Creek LHAs.</li> </ol>	<p>Use vegetation treatments on an average of 7,570 acres per year over the life of the plan to restore diversity of seral stages and species, as appropriate.</p> <p>Work with the Northwest Colorado Sage-Grouse Working Group to identify, maintain, and restore an average of 2,000 acres of sagebrush per year. Emphasize creation of functional blocks of sagebrush.</p> <p>Use vegetation treatments on an average of 3,500 acres per year to reduce encroachment of juniper and woody species to mimic natural conditions.</p> <p>Restore an average of 50 acres per year of bitterbrush and other important winter forage species in all LHAs, starting with the Sand Hills and Spring Creek LHAs.</p> <p>Restore an average of 1,000 acres</p>

Deleted:  
Formatted: Highlight

TABLE X: SUMMARY OF IMPACTS TO WILD HORSES

ALTERNATIVE A (NO ACTION ALTERNATIVE)	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
		5. Restore an average of 100 acres per year of Mountain shrub.	of per year Mountain shrub.
	<p>Short-term forage loss, but long-term increase in forage production, given the treatment is in the HMA.</p> <p>There would be short-term displacement of wild horses during the time of treatment.</p>	<p>Provided the treatment is in the HMA, short-term forage loss, but over the long-term, would improve overall vegetation health and thereby improve/increase forage for wild horses.</p> <p>Increase in forage production may not be quite as great as under Alt. B because the emphasis would not be on forage production.</p> <p>There would be short-term displacement of wild horses during the time of treatment.</p>	<p>Same as Alternative C, except effects would occur over a larger area, provided the additional acres are within the HMA.</p>
C. No Similar Action.	Same as Alternative A.	Use vegetation treatments where Land Health Standards are not being met for reasons other than livestock (such as areas were reclamation efforts have not been successful or heavy-use OHV areas), improve conditions on 50 percent of sites during the life of the plan.	Same as Alternative C.
		<p>Would improve overall vegetation health and thereby improve/increase forage. If the reason standards are not being met is due to overgrazing by wild horses, it would not lead to an increase in AML.</p>	<p>Same as Alternative C</p>

Deleted: S

Deleted: for wild horses.

Deleted: seems unlikely we would allow an increase in horse use to reverse the benefits of a veg treatment.

TABLE X: SUMMARY OF IMPACTS TO WILD HORSES

ALTERNATIVE A (NO ACTION ALTERNATIVE)	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
<b>Forests and Woodlands</b>			
D. Conducted on case-by-case basis as needed.	Same as Alternative A.	Restore an average of 500 acres per year of Pinyon/Juniper woodland.	Same as Alternative C.
		Restoring pinyon/juniper woodlands could increase forage for wild horses by decreasing percent woodland cover and increasing understory.  There would be short-term displacement of wild horses during the time of treatment.	Same as Alternative C.
<b>Noxious Weeds</b>			
E. Identify and eliminate noxious weeds on a case-by-case basis consistent with current policy.	Same as Alternative A.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Prevent the spread of noxious weeds. Eliminate invasive species focusing on areas of new infestations, and where possible, extirpate existing populations, especially in Axial, Powder Wash, Douglas Mountain, Sand Hills, and Williams Fork LHAs, and in selected and Routt and Moffat County parcels.</li> <li>2. Partner with resource users and other stakeholders to reduce the occurrence of noxious weeds. Maximize utilization of cooperative agreements for control of invasive species.</li> </ol>	Same as Alternative C.
Would increase production of	Same as Alternative A	Same as Alternative A, except the	Same as Alternative C

TABLE X: SUMMARY OF IMPACTS TO WILD HORSES

ALTERNATIVE A (NO ACTION ALTERNATIVE)	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
preferred forage for wild horses.		degree of the effects would be greater due to more intensive management of noxious weeds.	
FISH AND WILDLIFE HABITAT			
A. Raptors (golden eagle, osprey, all accipiters, falcons, except kestrel, butteos, and owls): NSO within 1/8 mile radius of nest site. NSO area may be altered depending upon the active status of the nest site or the geographical relationship of topographical barriers and vegetation screening to the nest site.	No similar action.	Same as Alternative A.	Raptors (golden eagle, osprey, all accipiters, falcons, except kestrel, butteos, and owls): NSO within 1/4 mile radius of nest site. In addition, exceptions granted according to criteria established in Appendix X.
Prohibiting surface occupancy and surface disturbing activities would reduce vegetation removal and help to conserve forage for wild horses in these areas.  This would also prohibit construction of water improvements in these areas, which may limit management opportunities for water developments for wild horses.	Not prohibiting surface disturbing activities in these areas could result in removal of forage for wild horses.  This could also increase flexibility in constructing water improvements in these areas.	Same as Alternative A	Same as Alternative A, except effects would occur over a larger area.
Peregrine Falcon: NSO within ¼ mile radius of cliff	No similar action.	NSO within ¼ mile radius of cliff nesting complex. In addition, NSO	Same as Alternative C.

TABLE X: SUMMARY OF IMPACTS TO WILD HORSES

ALTERNATIVE A (NO ACTION ALTERNATIVE)	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
nesting complex. No exceptions.		area may be altered depending upon the active status of the nesting complex or the geographical relationship of topographical barriers and vegetation screening.	
Prohibiting surface occupancy and surface disturbing activities could reduce vegetation removal and help to conserve forage for wild horses in these areas. This could also prohibit construction of water improvements in these areas, which may limit management opportunities for water developments for wild horses.	Not prohibiting surface disturbing activities could result in increased removal of forage for wild horses.  This could result in increased flexibility in constructing water improvements in these areas.	Same as Alternative A	Same as Alternative A
<b>SPECIAL STATUS SPECIES</b>			
<b>Greater Sage-Grouse</b>			
Greater Sage-Grouse: NSO within ¼ mile radius of a lek site. NSO area may be altered depending upon the active status of the lek or the geographical relationship of topographical barriers and vegetation screening to the lek site.	No similar action.	For the purpose of reducing potential impacts to greater sage-grouse lek integrity, NSO within ¼ mile radius of a lek site. NSO area may be altered depending upon the active status of the lek or the geographical relationship of topographical barriers and vegetation screening to the lek site.  In addition, exceptions granted according to criteria established in	For the purpose of further reducing potential impacts to greater sage-grouse lek integrity, NSO within a 0.6 mile radius of a lek site. NSO area may be altered depending upon the active status of the lek or the geographical relationship of topographical barriers and vegetation screening to the lek site.  In addition, exceptions granted according to criteria established in

**Deleted:** Waterfowl and Shorebird: NSO on significant production areas (Waterfowl Habitat Management Areas and rookeries). No exce ... [1]

**Deleted:** Colombian sharp-tailed grouse: NSO within ¼ mile radius of a lek site. NSO area may be altered depending upon the active status of the lek or the geographical relationship of topographical barriers and vegetation screening to the lek site. ... [2]

TABLE X: SUMMARY OF IMPACTS TO WILD HORSES

ALTERNATIVE A (NO ACTION ALTERNATIVE)	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
		Appendix X.	Appendix X.
<p>Prohibiting surface disturbing activities would reduce vegetation removal and help to conserve forage for wild horses in these areas.</p> <p>This would also prohibit construction of water improvements in these areas, which may limit management opportunities for water developments for wild horses.</p>	<p>Not prohibiting surface disturbing activities would result in increased removal of forage for wild horses.</p> <p>This would result in increased flexibility in constructing water improvements in these areas.</p>	Same as Alternative A	Same as Alternative A, except effects would occur over a larger area.
<b>Mountain Plover</b>			
No similar action	No similar action	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Surface occupancy and use is prohibited within 1/8 mile of occupied nesting habitat for mountain plovers.</li> <li>2. <u>Exception:</u> An exception may be granted by the authorized officer if the operator submits a plan which demonstrates that the proposed action will not affect the mountain plover nest site.</li> <li>3. <u>Modification:</u> The boundaries of the stipulated area may be modified if the authorized officer determines that surface occupancy will not harm the</li> </ol>	Same as Alternative C

Deleted: Colorado River Fish ... [3]

TABLE X: SUMMARY OF IMPACTS TO WILD HORSES

ALTERNATIVE A (NO ACTION ALTERNATIVE)	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
		integrity of the nest or nest location.  4. <u>Waiver</u> : The stipulation may be waived if the authorized officer determines that the portion of the lease under the no surface occupancy restriction no longer provides potential to be used by the species for nesting.	
		Prohibiting surface disturbing activities could reduce vegetation removal and help to conserve forage for wild horses in these areas.  This could also prohibit construction of water improvements in these areas , which may limit management opportunities for water developments for wild horses.	Same as Alternative C
<b>Federally Listed and Candidate Plants</b>			
No similar action	The BLM should stipulate and implement fugitive dust control methods on permitted actions and activities occurring on public lands thru the NEPA process to prevent any adverse effects to federal listed or candidate plants.	Same as Alternative B.	Same as Alternative B.
▼	<u>Controlling fugitive dust could help maintain the quality</u>	<u>Same as Alternative B</u>	<u>Same as Alternative B</u>

Deleted: Colorado River Cutthroat Trout ... [4]

Deleted: Is this an issue in Sand Wash?

TABLE X: SUMMARY OF IMPACTS TO WILD HORSES

ALTERNATIVE A (NO ACTION ALTERNATIVE)	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
	(palatability) of forage for wild horses, thereby maintaining the overall available of forage for wild horses.		
No similar action	No similar action	When possible and appropriate, revegetation should be limited to native species that will not compete with the rare species at that site to avoid introducing competitive species. Revegetation projects shall require a site specific plan for areas with listed and candidate plant species, to be developed in consultation with the Service.	Same as Alternative C
		Reseeding with native species could maintain overall structure and resiliency of vegetation health and thereby improve/increase long-term forage for wild horses.	Same as Alternative C
<b>Bald Eagle</b>			
Bald Eagle: NSO within ¼ mile radius of roost or nest site. NSO area may be altered depending upon the active status of the roost or the geographical relationship of topographical barriers and vegetation screening. No exceptions for nest sites.	Year round No Surface Occupancy within ¼ mile radius of both occupied and unoccupied nests. Definition of 'occupied nest' [from Northern States Bald Eagle Recovery Plan 1983, page D4]: a) young were observed, b) eggs were laid (eggs or eggshell fragments observed), c) one adult observed in incubating ("sitting low") posture on the nest during the incubation period, d) two	Same as Alternative B.	Same as Alternative B.

TABLE X: SUMMARY OF IMPACTS TO WILD HORSES

ALTERNATIVE A (NO ACTION ALTERNATIVE)	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
	adults observed at an empty nest or within the breeding area, and e) one adult and one eagle in immature plumage at or near a nest, especially if mating or reproductive behavior (display flights, copulation, nest repair, etc.) was observed.		
Prohibiting surface occupancy could reduce vegetation removal and help to conserve forage for wild horses in these areas.  This could also prohibit construction of water improvements in these areas, which may limit management opportunities for water developments for wild horses.	Same as Alternative A	Same as Alternative A	Same as Alternative A
No similar action	No Surface Occupancy within 100 meter radius of abandoned nests (unoccupied for 5 consecutive years, but with all or part of the nest remaining).	Same as Alternative B.	Same as Alternative B.
	Prohibiting surface occupancy could reduce vegetation removal and help to conserve forage for wild horses in these areas.  This could also prohibit construction of water improvements in these areas.	Same as Alternative B.	Same as Alternative B.

TABLE X: SUMMARY OF IMPACTS TO WILD HORSES

ALTERNATIVE A (NO ACTION ALTERNATIVE)	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
	<p>which may limit management opportunities for water developments for wild horses.</p> <p>Note: impacts would be minimal because of small (100 m) buffer.</p>		
No similar action	All surface disturbing activities (e.g., project construction) should be prohibited within ¼ mile of known roosts on BLM land, unless the activity will benefit wintering bald eagles or their habitat. Exceptions will require consultation for each individual action.	Same as Alternative B.	Same as Alternative B.
	<p>Prohibiting surface disturbing activities could reduce vegetation removal and help to conserve forage for wild horses in these areas.</p> <p>This could also prohibit construction of water improvements in these areas , which may limit management opportunities for water developments for wild horses.</p>	Same as Alternative B.	Same as Alternative B.
<b>WILD HORSES</b>			
A. Manage habitat condition in Sand Wash Basin HMA to maintain a herd range of	1. Maintain current Herd Management Area status. Manage at an appropriate	Same as Alternative B.	Same as Alternative B.

TABLE X: SUMMARY OF IMPACTS TO WILD HORSES

ALTERNATIVE A (NO ACTION ALTERNATIVE)	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
163 to 362 wild horses on a four year schedule with an appropriate management level of 362.	<p>management level (AML), currently identified as a range of 163 to 362 wild horses. The AML is a dynamic number that would be adjusted as range conditions warrant.</p> <p>2. Guidelines and criteria for adjusting AML include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Current monitoring data</li> <li>b) Rate of herd increase</li> <li>c) Competing uses</li> <li>d) Frequency of gather cycle</li> <li>e) Other population management options</li> <li>f) Herd genetics</li> </ul>		
Maintaining the wild horse population between 163 and 362 would maintain a genetically viable wild horse population. Gathering excess wild horses (above 362) would result in a reduced amount of resource competition for remaining horses. Gathers would subject all horses to stress and potential injury. Horses removed to maintain AML would be adopted and would lose their wild, free-roaming nature. The wild	Same as Alternative A	Same as Alternative A	Same as Alternative A

TABLE X: SUMMARY OF IMPACTS TO WILD HORSES

ALTERNATIVE A (NO ACTION ALTERNATIVE)	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
horses that remain would have more forage, water, and space available, and be healthier and more viable.			
Continue to manage wild horses in the Sand Wash Basin Herd Management Area.	Same as Alternative A	Same as Alternative A.	Designate the Sand Wash Basin Herd Management Area as the Sand Wash Basin Wild Horse Range and manage principally, though not exclusively, for the Sand Wash wild horse herd.
<p>Manages wild horses in compliance with the Wild Free Roaming Horses and Burro Act of 1971. Proper management of wild horses will reduce trampling and grazing of vegetation, thereby ensuring long term healthy vegetation populations.</p>	Same as Alternative A	Same as Alternative A	<p><u>A Wild Horse Range would not risk temporarily displacing wild horses. A Wild Horse range recognizes wild horses can be managed principally, though not necessarily exclusively, within the Sand Wash HMA. A Wild Horse R would afford wild horses in the Sand Wash HMA additional protection from conflicts with other resources should additional protection become warranted.</u></p> <p><u>If AUMs are converted from livestock to wild horses, flexibility in management will be lost, e.g. limiting season of use and controlling distribution. This will result in more growing season use, and areas of heavy and severe use, leading to loss of perennial vegetative cover and increased soil erosion. This could lead to decreased habitat conditions for wild horses.</u></p>

Deleted: 2

Deleted: Same as Alternative A, except management for other uses could temporarily displace wild horses from preferred locations.

TABLE X: SUMMARY OF IMPACTS TO WILD HORSES

ALTERNATIVE A (NO ACTION ALTERNATIVE)	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
<b>FIRE</b>			
Use maximum suppression on areas with high resource values, structures, commercial forest, oil and gas developments, cultural values, improvements, and to prevent fire from spreading to adjacent private property/structures, etc. and provide full protection to buffer areas near or adjacent to critical management areas for threatened, endangered and candidate species, Colorado BLM sensitive plant species, and research natural areas (RNA's).	Use appropriate fire management response in areas where fire not desired at all or wildfire is not desired such as ecosystems where fire never played a significant positive role in it's function; areas where suppression is required to prevent direct threats to life or property; private lands and urban interfaces, important cultural resources, areas with unnatural fuel buildups, and areas where seed bank does not exist for natural reseeding.	Same as Alternative B.	Same as Alternative B.
Use conditional fire suppression in areas with resources of low value or that do not warrant full suppression actions and/or high suppression costs, including fires in the Douglas Mountain area (the five WSA's adjacent to Dinosaur National Monument, Diamond Breaks WSA, West Cold Spring WSA, and Cross Mountain WSA).	Use conditional fire suppression in areas where fire is desired but where there may be social, political, or ecological constraints such as air quality considerations (proximity to Class I airsheds or non-attainment areas); threatened or endangered species or habitat considerations.	Same as Alternative B.	Same as Alternative B.
No similar action	Use minimal to no fire suppression in areas where fire is desired.	Same as Alternative B.	Same as Alternative B.
Use both planned and unplanned prescribed fire to	Use both prescribed fire and wildfire to improve resource	Same as Alternative B.	Same as Alternative B.

TABLE X: SUMMARY OF IMPACTS TO WILD HORSES

ALTERNATIVE A (NO ACTION ALTERNATIVE)	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
improve resource habitat, condition, etc.	habitat, condition, etc. where appropriate.		
<p>Wildland fires and prescribed would result in a temporary displacement of wild horses and short-term reduction in available forage. Suppression of fire would help to maintain vegetation cover and conserve livestock forage over the short term. Over the long term, continued suppression could increase the potential for large fires and substantial loss of forage. <u>Over the long term, it could improve range health by reducing shrub cover and increasing grass production.</u></p> <p>Wildland fire suppression activities, such as fire lines and staging areas, would also result in short-term forage losses. However, these impacts would be negligible and localized given the limited amount of acreage ultimately disturbed by these activities.</p>	<p>Same as A, except using no fire suppression in areas could increase impacts from fires, but decrease impacts from suppression activities. In the long term, allowing fire in desired areas could increase vegetation cover and diversity, improving forage for wild horses.</p>		
<b>CULTURAL AND HERITAGE RESOURCES</b>			
<b>Cultural Resource Surveys</b>			
Class 3 cultural surveys will be conducted on the specific sites	Same as Alternative A. In addition, prioritize non-project	Same as Alternative B.	Same as Alternative B.

**Deleted:** What did we say in livestock section about maintaining healthy communities?¶

**Deleted:** As acres of fire decreases in areas of maximum suppression, impacts of fire would be less intensive compared to areas with conditional suppression. However, impacts from suppression activities would be would be greater. Is this an issue in Sand Wash?

TABLE X: SUMMARY OF IMPACTS TO WILD HORSES

ALTERNATIVE A (NO ACTION ALTERNATIVE)	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
where surface disturbance will occur. If necessary, the surface disturbing activity will be relocated to a site in which surveys reveal no significant cultural/paleontological resources.	driven Class 3 surveys in the Sand Wash area and Vermillion Basin.		
Cultural resource management activities, such as inventory, excavation, and monitoring, would create negligible short-term localized direct impacts to wild horses. The most likely impact to wild horses from such management would be the temporary displacement of wild horses while the management activity occurs at a localized site. Even under the most intense cultural resource management (i.e., excavation), the amount of acreage disturbed would be very small relative to the size of HMAs.	Same as Alternative A	Same as Alternative A	Same as Alternative A
<b>PALEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCES</b>			
Evaluate all proposed surface-disturbing actions to determine inventory needs and sites potentially impacted by such activities.  Surface-disturbing activities in	Same as Alternative A, but change second paragraph to:  Surface-disturbing activities in Class I and II Paleontological Areas devoid of thick soils and vegetation and steep unsafe	Same as Alternative B.	Same as Alternative B.

**TABLE X: SUMMARY OF IMPACTS TO WILD HORSES**

<b>ALTERNATIVE A (NO ACTION ALTERNATIVE)</b>	<b>ALTERNATIVE B</b>	<b>ALTERNATIVE C</b>	<b>ALTERNATIVE D</b>
<p>Class I and II Paleontological Areas will have an inventory performed by an accredited paleontologist approved by the Authorized Officer.</p> <p>Mitigative measures for specific locations identified on a case-by-case basis.</p>	<p>cliffs will have an inventory performed by a paleontologist with CO BLM paleo permit approved by the Authorized Officer.</p>		
<p>Paleontological resource management activities, such as inventory, excavation, and monitoring, would create negligible short-term localized direct impacts to wild horses. The most likely impact to wild horses from such management would be the temporary displacement of wild horses while the management activity occurs at a localized site. Even under the most intense paleontological resource management (i.e., excavation), the amount of acreage disturbed would be very small relative to the size of HMAs.</p>	<p>Same as Alternative A</p>	<p>Same as Alternative A</p>	<p>Same as Alternative A</p>
<b>SPECIAL MANAGEMENT AREAS</b>			
<b>Areas of Critical Environmental Concern</b>			
<p>The following sites, totaling 22,530 acres, are designated to protect enhance the values noted:</p>	<p>Designate no additional ACECs, and remove ACEC designation from all existing ACECs. (Manage 0 acres as ACEC).</p>	<p>Retain designation of the Irish Canyon ACEC (11,680 acres).  The following areas would not be</p>	<p>Retain Irish Canyon ACEC, Limestone Ridge ACEC, Lookout Mountain ACEC, and Cross Mountain Canyon ACEC.</p>

TABLE X: SUMMARY OF IMPACTS TO WILD HORSES

ALTERNATIVE A (NO ACTION ALTERNATIVE)	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
<p>Limestone Ridge ACEC/RNA (1,350 acres; remnant plant associations, Colorado BLM sensitive plant species, scenic quality).</p> <p>Irish Canyon ACEC, including the Ink Springs area (11,680 acres; remnant plant associations, Colorado BLM sensitive plant species, geologic values, cultural resources, scenic quality).</p> <p>Lookout Mountain ACEC (6,500 acres; Colorado BLM sensitive plant species, scenic quality).</p> <p>Cross Mountain Canyon ACEC (3,000 acres; threatened and endangered species, Colorado BLM sensitive plant species, scenic quality).</p>		<p>retained as ACECs. Management of these areas would be as described below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Limestone Ridge (1,350 acres)</li> <li>• Lookout Mountain (6,500 acres)</li> <li>• Cross Mountain Canyon (3,000 acres)</li> </ul>	<p>In addition, designate the White-Tailed Prairie Dog ACEC (289,438 acres), Cold Desert Shrublands ACEC (5,755 acres), Gibben's Beardtongue ACEC (5,477 acres), Bull Canyon ACEC (3,416 acres), G Gap ACEC (5,661 acres), Little Juniper Canyon ACEC (14 acres), Bassett Spring ACEC (117 acres), No Name Spring ACEC (76 acres), Pot Creek ACEC (2,230 acres), Whiskey Springs ACEC (2,758 acres), Willow Spring ACEC (88 acres), and Deception Creek ACEC (XX acres).</p>
<b>White-Tailed Prairie Dog</b>			
<p>No ACEC designated. Active white-tailed prairie dog colonies are avoidance areas for surface disturbing activities only within black-footed ferret reintroduction area.</p>	<p>Same as Alternative A</p>	<p>Same as Alternative A</p>	<p>Objective: Protect white-tailed prairie dog habitat.</p> <p>The following management applies only to areas within the designated polygon (Map X) containing active/inactive white-tailed prairie</p>

TABLE X: SUMMARY OF IMPACTS TO WILD HORSES

ALTERNATIVE A (NO ACTION ALTERNATIVE)	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
			<p>dog colonies:</p> <p>Minerals and Energy:                      No Surface Occupancy for oil and gas operations                      Locatable - Closed                      Other Minerals- Closed                      Coal – Not available for leasing</p> <p>OHV: Limited to Designated</p> <p>VRM: No classification related to prairie dog colonies.</p> <p>Lands and Realty: ROW – exclusion</p>
			<p><u>Controlling and/or prohibiting surface disturbing and disruptive activities within the area would reduce vegetation removal and help to conserve forage that would be available for wild horses in these areas. However, there will be some forage loss associated with activities relocated to outside the NSO.</u></p> <p><u>As WTPD habitat expands, there will be less forage available for wild horses. Could reduce habitat conditions if WTPD's were in areas used by wild horses.</u></p>
Natural Systems ACECs			

**Deleted:** Controlling surface disturbing and disruptive activities within the area would reduce vegetation removal and help to conserve forage for wild horses in these areas. It would also reduce displacement of wild horses from preferred locations. How much of this is this an issue in Sand Wash?

TABLE X: SUMMARY OF IMPACTS TO WILD HORSES

ALTERNATIVE A (NO ACTION ALTERNATIVE)	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
No similar action	No similar action	No similar action.	<p>Designate the following ACECs</p> <p>Cold Desert Shrublands ACEC (5,755 acres), Gibben's Beardtongue ACEC (5,477 acres), Bull Canyon ACEC (3,416 acres), G Gap ACEC (5,661 acres), Little Juniper Canyon ACEC (14 acres), Bassett Spring ACEC (117 acres), No Name Spring ACEC (76 acres), Pot Creek ACEC (2,230 acres), Whiskey Springs ACEC (2,758 acres), Willow Spring ACEC (88 acres), Deception Creek ACEC (XX acres).</p> <p>The Objective of these ACECs is to protect sensitive plants and plant communities.</p> <p>The following management applies only to areas within the designated polygons (Map X):</p> <p>Minerals and Energy:            Controlled Surface Use for oil and gas operations            Locatable - Closed            Other Minerals- Closed            Coal – Not available for leasing</p> <p>OHV: Limited to Designated Routes</p>

TABLE X: SUMMARY OF IMPACTS TO WILD HORSES

ALTERNATIVE A (NO ACTION ALTERNATIVE)	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
			VRM: No classification related to ACECs.  Lands and Realty: ROW – avoidance
			Controlling surface disturbing and disruptive activities within the area would reduce vegetation removal and help to conserve forage for wild horses in these areas. It would also reduce displacement of wild horses from preferred locations. Is this an issue in Sand Wash?
<b>Lands With Wilderness Character Outside Existing WSAs</b>			
<i>Vermillion Basin</i>			
Minerals and Energy: Open to new oil and gas leasing Locatable - Open Other Minerals - Open Coal – Not available for leasing  OHV: Open, some Limited to Existing  VRM: Not applicable  Lands and Realty: Considered on a case-by-case basis.	Objectives: Allow for oil and gas leasing, exploration, and development by utilizing state of the art technology, while protecting natural values. Manage for minimal surface disturbance by focusing development near existing trails, ROWs, canyons and washes and clustering wells where feasible. Manage to minimize visual intrusions, Lookout Mountain as observation point Control infrastructure by	Zone 1 (Northern Zone of High and Medium potential):  Objectives: Allow for oil and gas leasing, exploration, and development by utilizing state of the art technology, while protecting natural values. Manage for minimal surface disturbance by focusing development near existing trails, ROWs, canyons and washes and clustering wells where feasible. Manage to minimize visual intrusions, Lookout Mountain as observation point	Objective: provide quality primitive recreational experiences in largely natural settings  Designate as a backcountry SRMA.  Minerals and Energy: Closed to new oil and gas leasing Locatable - Closed Other Minerals - Closed Coal – Not available for leasing  OHV: Closed  VRM: Class II

TABLE X: SUMMARY OF IMPACTS TO WILD HORSES

ALTERNATIVE A (NO ACTION ALTERNATIVE)	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
	<p>requiring pre-planning, including transportation planning. Lease in larger leases (4 section blocks) in order to facilitate seismic exploration and allow operators to drill fewer wells</p> <p>Minerals and Energy: Open to new oil and gas leasing with a Controlled Surface Use stipulation. Stipulation language would reference Objectives above. Locatable – Closed Other Minerals - Closed Coal – Not available for leasing</p> <p>OHV: Limited to Designated Routes</p> <p>VRM: Class III, Class II for Vermillion Bluffs area</p> <p>Lands and Realty: Case-by-case basis, avoidance for Vermillion Bluffs and fragile soil areas</p>	<p>Control infrastructure by requiring pre-planning, including transportation planning. Lease in larger leases (4 section blocks) in order to facilitate seismic exploration and allow operators to drill fewer wells Long term goal for Vermillion Basin is to manage the area so that any disturbance caused by permitted actions will eventually be returned to the state prior to development.</p> <p>Minerals and Energy: Open to new oil and gas leasing with a Controlled Surface Use stipulation. Stipulation language would reference Objectives above. Locatable – Closed Other Minerals - Closed Coal – Not available for leasing</p> <p>OHV: Limited to Designated Routes</p> <p>VRM: Class III, Class II for Vermillion Bluffs area</p> <p>Lands and Realty: Case-by-case basis, avoidance for Vermillion Bluffs and fragile soil areas?</p>	<p>Lands and Realty: Exclusion area</p>

TABLE X: SUMMARY OF IMPACTS TO WILD HORSES

ALTERNATIVE A (NO ACTION ALTERNATIVE)	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
		<p>Zone 2: (Southwest area of Low and No Known potential) Objectives: Manage to protect naturalness, opportunities for semi-primitive recreation, and solitude.</p> <p>Minerals and Energy: Closed to new oil and gas leasing Locatable – Closed Other Minerals - Closed Coal – Closed</p> <p>OHV: The portion of Vermillion Basin south and east of Ted's Draw will be Limited to Designated Routes The remaining portion of Zone 2 will be Closed to OHVs.</p> <p>VRM: II</p> <p>Lands and Realty: ROW Avoidance - the portion of Vermillion Basin south and east of Ted's Draw</p> <p>ROW Exclusion – remaining portion of Zone 2</p>	
<b>VISUAL RESOURCE MANAGEMENT (VRM)</b>			
<b>VRM Class II</b>			
No similar action	Vermillion Bluffs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suitable WSR corridors</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suitable WSR corridors</li> </ul>

**Deleted:** Is this an issue in Sand Wash?  
Allowing surface disturbing and disruptive activities could result in increased removal of forage for wild horses, displacement of wild horses from preferred locations, and a loss in the wild and free-roaming nature of wild horses.

... [5]

TABLE X: SUMMARY OF IMPACTS TO WILD HORSES

ALTERNATIVE A (NO ACTION ALTERNATIVE)	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Limestone Ridge area</li> <li>• Irish Canyon ACEC</li> <li>• Zone 2 and Vermillion Bluffs areas of Vermillion Basin</li> <li>• Dinosaur North wilderness character area</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Limestone Ridge ACEC</li> <li>• Irish Canyon ACEC</li> <li>• Lookout Mountain ACEC</li> <li>• Vermillion Basin SRMA</li> <li>• Dinosaur North SRMA</li> <li>• Cold Springs Mountain SRMA</li> <li>• Cross Mountain area outside WSA</li> <li>• Diamond Breaks area outside WSA</li> <li>• Pinyon Ridge area</li> </ul>
<b>ENERGY AND MINERALS</b>			
<b>Oil and Gas</b>			
<b>Leasing Decisions</b>			
<p>Lease with standard lease terms and conditions plus specified stipulations</p> <p>The RMPPA is available for oil and gas leasing. Areas have been designated for leasing with standard stipulations, seasonal restrictions, avoidance stipulations, performance objectives, or no-surface-occupancy stipulations; areas where no new leasing is allowed have also been identified.</p> <p>1,878,000 acres of BLM-administered mineral estate within the Little Snake RMPPA</p>	<p>Lease with standard lease terms and conditions and non-discretionary stipulations. Resources would be protected and impacts mitigated through site specific NEPA documents. See <a href="#">Appendix OG</a> for explanation of the BLM's oil and gas leasing and development process.</p>	<p>Lease with standard lease terms and conditions plus specified stipulations.</p> <p>Exceptions, modifications, and waivers could be provided as detailed in Appendix X.</p>	<p>Lease with standard lease terms and conditions plus specified stipulations</p> <p>Exceptions, modifications, and waivers could be provided as detailed in Appendix X.</p>

... [6]

TABLE X: SUMMARY OF IMPACTS TO WILD HORSES

ALTERNATIVE A (NO ACTION ALTERNATIVE)	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
are open to oil and gas leasing and development, subject to the lease terms and (as applicable) lease stipulations noted in Appendix A of the Amendment.			
Development of oil and gas would result in a short-term loss of vegetation on X,XXX acres within the HMA during the planning period. Mitigation requirements would result in long-term vegetation loss of X,XXX acres. Initial development could temporarily displace wild horses from preferred locations. In areas of high development, the wild and free-roaming nature of the wild horses could be reduced. Disturbance to wild horses from vehicle traffic and increased human presence. Possible road kill casualties.	Same as Alternative A, except stipulations would likely be less restrictive and therefore allow for increased disturbance.	Same as Alternative A, except stipulations would likely be more restrictive and therefore result in less disturbance.	Same as Alternative A, except stipulations would likely be more restrictive and therefore result in less disturbance.
<b>Closed to Oil and Gas Leasing</b>			
<b>No Surface Occupancy Stipulations</b>			
Special status plant species: NSO on habitat areas containing special status species (federally listed, proposed, and candidate). NSO may be altered after important factors are	No similar action	No similar action	No similar action.

Deleted: WSAs ... [7]

TABLE X: SUMMARY OF IMPACTS TO WILD HORSES

ALTERNATIVE A (NO ACTION ALTERNATIVE)	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
considered in the impact analysis such as the type and amount of surface disturbance, plant frequency and density, and the relocation of disturbances.			
NSO areas: Limestone Ridge ACEC; Cross Mountain Canyon ACEC; Little Yampa/Juniper Canyon SRMA; Cedar Mountain SRMA; Steamboat Lake State Park; Pearl Lake State Park. No exceptions.	No similar action	Lookout Mountain, Little Yampa Canyon SRMA, Juniper Mountain SRMA, Cedar Mountain SRMA	Lookout Mountain ACEC, White-tailed prairie dog ACEC
<p><u>Prohibiting surface disturbing activities within the area would reduce vegetation removal and help to conserve forage for wild horses in these areas. It could also reduce displacement and preserve wild and free-roaming nature. SEE WILDLIFE SECTION</u></p>		<p><u>Prohibiting surface disturbing activities within the area would reduce vegetation removal and help to conserve forage for wild horses in these areas. It could also reduce displacement and preserve wild and free-roaming nature. (SEE WILDLIFE SECTION</u></p>	<p><u>Controlling and/or prohibiting surface disturbing and disruptive activities within the area would reduce vegetation removal and help to conserve forage that would be available for wild horses in these areas. However, there will be some forage loss associated with activities relocated to outside the NSO.</u></p> <p><u>As WTPD habitat expands, there will be less forage available for wild horses. Could reduce habitat conditions if WTPD's were in areas used by wild horses.</u></p> <p><u>Prohibiting surface disturbing activities within the area would reduce vegetation removal and help to conserve forage for wild horses in these areas. It could also reduce</u></p>

Deleted: Is this an issue in Sand Wash?

TABLE X: SUMMARY OF IMPACTS TO WILD HORSES

ALTERNATIVE A (NO ACTION ALTERNATIVE)	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
			displacement and preserve wild and free-roaming nature. (SEE WILDLIFE SECTION)
<b>Controlled Surface Use Stipulations</b>			
No similar action.	Special status plant species: CSU on habitat areas containing special status species (federally listed, proposed, and candidate). Exception criteria detailed in Appendix X apply.	Same as Alternative B.	Same as Alternative B.
Fragile Soil Areas – performance objectives must be met prior to surface disturbance.	No similar action	Fragile Soil Areas (see Soils section for performance objectives and fragile soil criteria)	Same as Alternative C
Prior to surface disturbance on slopes of, or greater than, 40 percent, an engineering/ reclamation plan must be approved by the Authorized Officer. Stipulations may be excepted subject to an on-site impact analysis. Stipulation not applied where the Authorized Officer determines that relocation up to 200 meters can be applied to protect the riparian system during well siting.	No similar action	Prior to surface disturbance on slopes of, or greater than, 35 percent, an engineering/ reclamation plan must be approved by the Authorized Officer. Stipulations may be excepted subject to an on-site impact analysis. Stipulation not applied where the Authorized Officer determines that relocation up to 200 meters can be applied to protect the riparian system during well siting.	Same as Alternative C
Controlling surface disturbing activities within the area could reduce vegetation removal at important times and help to conserve forage for wild horses in these areas. It could	Same as Alternative A, except effects would occur over a smaller area.	Same as Alternative A, except effects would occur over a smaller/larger?? area. (need alternatives maps)	Same as Alternative A, except effects would occur over a larger area.

Deleted: See SMA section)

Deleted: Attached to leases where operations proposed within the area of an approved surface or underground coal mine will be relocated outside the area to be mined or to accommodate room and pillar mining operations. Stipulations may be waived subject to outlined conditions. ... [8]

Deleted: s this an issue in Sand Wash?

TABLE X: SUMMARY OF IMPACTS TO WILD HORSES

ALTERNATIVE A (NO ACTION ALTERNATIVE)	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
also reduce displacement during key time periods and preserve wild and free-roaming nature. <b>CHECK SAGE GROUSE CSU</b>			
<b>Open</b>			
All remaining areas subject to existing standard terms and conditions consistent with applicable law.	All remaining areas subject to existing standard terms and conditions consistent with applicable law.	All remaining areas subject to existing standard terms and conditions consistent with applicable law.	All remaining areas subject to existing standard terms and conditions consistent with applicable law.
Mineral leasing could result in surface disturbing and disruptive activities, which would result in increased removal of forage for wild horses. It could also temporarily displace wild horses and reduce their wild and free-roaming nature. Disturbance to wild horses from vehicle traffic and increased human presence. Possible road kill casualties.	Same as Alternative A, except stipulations would likely be less restrictive and therefore allow for increased disturbance.	Same as Alternative A, except stipulations would likely be more restrictive and therefore result in less disturbance.	Same as Alternative A, except stipulations would likely be more restrictive and therefore result in less disturbance.
<b>Locatable Minerals, Mineral Materials, and Non-Energy Leasable Minerals, Others</b>			
All public land is open to mineral entry and development under the General Mining Law of 1872 unless administratively withdrawn or proposed for withdrawal (proposed wilderness designation). Locatable mineral exploration and development on public	Same as Alternative A, except Limestone Ridge ACEC open to mineral location.  Vermillion Basin would be withdrawn from mineral location.	WSAs, Lookout Mountain ACEC, Cross Mountain Canyon ACEC, WSR suitable segments 1, 2, and 3, Vermillion Basin, Dinosaur North, Cold Springs Mountain; Cedar Mountain SRMA; South Sand Wash SRMA; Serviceberry SRMA; Flycreek SRMA; would be	WSAs, all ACECs, all suitable WSR segments, Vermillion Basin, Dinosaur North, Cross Mountain backcountry area, Diamond Breaks backcountry area, Pinyon Ridge backcountry area; Little Yampa Canyon SRMA, Juniper Mountain SRMA; Cedar Mountain SRMA;

Formatted: Highlight

TABLE X: SUMMARY OF IMPACTS TO WILD HORSES

ALTERNATIVE A (NO ACTION ALTERNATIVE)	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
<p>land would be regulated under 43 CFR 3800.</p> <p>No Action – all areas open except WSAs, Limestone Ridge ACEC</p>		<p>withdrawn from mineral location.</p>	<p>South Sand Wash SRMA; Serviceberry SRMA; Flycreek SRMA; Cold Springs Mountain SRMA would be withdrawn from mineral location.</p>
<p>Surface disturbances caused by development of locatable, mineral materials, and non-energy leasable minerals development could result in increased removal of forage for wild horses, as well as displacement and loss of wild and free-roaming nature.</p>	<p>Same as Alternative A</p>	<p>Same as Alternative A, except effects would occur over a smaller area Other areas not in HMA.</p>	<p>Same as Alternative A, except effects would occur over a smaller area. Other areas not in HMA.</p>
<p>Applications for removing common variety mineral materials, including sand and gravel, will continue to be processed as they are received. Interdisciplinary review of each proposal will determine stipulations to protect important surface values. Mineral material sales will not be allowed in WSAs, Cross Mountain Canyon ACEC, Limestone Ridge ACEC/RNA, Little Yampa/Juniper Canyon SRMA, and the Cedar Mountain Recreation</p>	<p>Same as Alternative A</p>	<p>WSAs, Limestone Ridge ACEC, Lookout Mountain ACEC, Cross Mountain Canyon ACEC, WSR suitable segments 1, 2, and 3, Vermillion Basin, Cedar Mountain SRMA would be closed to mineral material sales.</p>	<p>WSAs, all ACECs, all suitable WSR segments, Vermillion Basin, Dinosaur North, Cross Mountain backcountry area, Diamond Breaks backcountry area, Pinyon Ridge backcountry area; Little Yampa Canyon SRMA, Juniper Mountain SRMA; Cedar Mountain SRMA; Serviceberry SRMA; Cold Springs Mountain SRMA would be closed to mineral material sales.</p>

TABLE X: SUMMARY OF IMPACTS TO WILD HORSES

ALTERNATIVE A (NO ACTION ALTERNATIVE)	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
management unit.			
Surface disturbances caused by removing mineral materials, could result in increased removal of forage for wild horses, as well as displacement and loss of wild and free-roaming nature.	Same as Alternative A	Same as Alternative A, except effects would occur over a smaller area Other areas not in HMA.	Same as Alternative A, except effects would occur over a smaller area Other areas not in HMA.
<b>Coal and Oil Shale</b>			
<b>Oil Shale</b>			
G. BLM will consider leasing other leasable minerals as each application is received. (ROD p. 10)	BLM will consider leasing Oil Shale as each application is received. Lands available for leasing are consistent with lands available for oil and gas leasing or coal leasing, depending on the extraction method (i.e. in-situ or mined),	Same as Alternative B, recognizing different areas will be open to leasing because of consistency with oil and gas and coal decisions in this alternative.	Same as Alternative B, recognizing different areas will be open to leasing because of consistency with oil and gas and coal decisions in this alternative.
Surface disturbances caused by oil shale mining could result in surface disturbing and disruptive activities, which could result in increased removal of forage for wild horses, temporary displacement, and could reduce wild and free-roaming nature. Disturbance to wild horses from vehicle traffic and increased human presence. Possible road kill casualties.	Same as Alternative A	Same as Alternative A	Same as Alternative A
<b>LIVESTOCK GRAZING</b>			

TABLE X: SUMMARY OF IMPACTS TO WILD HORSES

ALTERNATIVE A (NO ACTION ALTERNATIVE)	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
Appropriate actions for improving allotments not meeting Standards and Guides could include, but would not be limited to, adjustment of permitted animal unit months (AUMs), modified turnout dates, livestock water developments, range improvements, modified grazing periods, growing season rest, modified grazing systems, closing areas, riparian pastures, exclosures, implementation of forage utilization levels, and livestock conversions.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.
Managing the rangeland resource according to the Standards and Guides would result in healthy rangelands. Healthy rangelands would continue to provide forage needed for both wild horses and livestock.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.
Work closely with CDOW to reduce livestock/big game conflicts that would improve vegetative and forage conditions.	Work closely with CDOW to reduce livestock/big game conflicts, focusing on decreasing big game populations.	Same as Alternative A.	Reduce livestock/big game conflicts that would improve vegetative and forage conditions by focusing on decreasing livestock use.
<del>However, the idea in reducing conflicts between livestock and wildlife is to provide more forage for one or the other of those two doesn't increase</del>	<del>Same as Alternative A.</del>	<del>Same as Alternative A.</del>	<del>Same as Alternative A.</del>

**Deleted:** Could provide increased forage for wild horses by decreasing forage competition between big game and livestock.

TABLE X: SUMMARY OF IMPACTS TO WILD HORSES

ALTERNATIVE A (NO ACTION ALTERNATIVE)	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
<p><u>forage for wild horses.</u></p> <p>A. Implement vegetation land treatments on 68 allotments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Use such treatments as interseeding, burning and reseeding, spraying, and plowing and reseeding</li> <li>2. Adhere to established procedures and design specifications to protect all resource uses and values</li> <li>3. Complete a benefit/cost analysis and environmental analysis before any treatments are implemented.</li> </ol>	<p>When consistent with healthy rangeland ecosystems, emphasize vegetation treatments to increase forage production.</p>	<p>When consistent with healthy rangeland ecosystems, emphasize vegetation treatments to maintain a variety of habitats and sustainable livestock grazing.</p> <p>See Vegetation section for treatment targets.</p>	<p>When consistent with healthy rangeland ecosystems, emphasize vegetation treatments to maintain or increase a variety of habitats for wildlife species.</p> <p>See Vegetation section for treatment targets.</p>
<p>Vegetation treatments would result in short term forage loss. Over the long term, treatments would enhance overall vegetation health and increase forage production.</p>	<p>Same As Alternative A</p>	<p>Same As Alternative A</p>	<p>Same As Alternative A</p>
<p>No similar action.</p>	<p>Desired plant community objectives would emphasize commodity uses while complying with existing regulations pertaining to sensitive resources.</p>	<p>Desired plant community objectives would emphasize wildlife habitat, livestock grazing, watershed, and biodiversity values while maintaining or enhancing habitat for special status species.</p>	<p>Desired plant community objectives would emphasize wildlife habitat, watershed, and biodiversity values. Particular emphasis would be placed on maintaining or enhancing habitat for special status species.</p>
	<p>Managing for desired plant</p>	<p>Same as Alternative B, except the</p>	<p>Same as Alternative B, except the</p>

TABLE X: SUMMARY OF IMPACTS TO WILD HORSES

ALTERNATIVE A (NO ACTION ALTERNATIVE)	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
	<p>communities <del>for commodity uses would increase forage for wild horses due to similar preferences as livestock.</del></p>	<p>level of livestock forage production may not be as extensive because emphasis would not solely be on commodity uses.</p> <p>However, managing for DPC may be used as one of the criteria for adjusting AML (downward), so it may not be a net increase in forage for horses</p>	<p>level of livestock forage production may not be as extensive because emphasis would not solely be on commodity uses.</p>
<p>Construct range improvement projects on 69 allotments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Use improvements that will control livestock use, improve distribution, and improve riparian/wetland habitat</li> <li>2. Complete a benefit/cost analysis and environmental analysis before any projects are implemented.</li> </ol>	<p>Consider range improvement developments for the purpose of increasing livestock forage where they are economically feasible and consistent with other resources.</p>	<p>Consider range improvement developments for the purpose of improving rangeland diversity, condition, and sustainability, by such actions as control of pinyon-juniper encroachment and decadent sagebrush, etc.</p>	<p>Range improvements would be allowed only to maintain sustainable natural diversity of plant communities, and only when identified through the Rangeland Health assessment process.</p>
<p>Construction of range improvements would increase livestock distribution and allow for effective livestock use of more rangeland. This would improve range condition and help ensure a thriving natural ecological balance as directed</p>	<p>Same as Alternative A</p>	<p>Same as Alternative A</p>	<p>Same as Alternative A, except effects would be less extensive because emphasis would be placed on diversity of plant communities.</p>

**Deleted:** would enhance overall vegetation health and

**Deleted:** production

**Deleted:** However, managing for DPC may be used as one of the criteria for adjusting AML (downward), so it may not be a net increase in forage for horses

TABLE X: SUMMARY OF IMPACTS TO WILD HORSES

ALTERNATIVE A (NO ACTION ALTERNATIVE)	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
<p>by the Wild Free Roaming Horses and Burro Act of 1971. Depending on the range improvement it may also increase wild horse distribution and allow for more effective use by wild horses of the rangeland.</p>			
<b>RECREATION</b>			
<b>Special Recreation Management Areas</b>			
<b>South Sand Wash</b>			
<p>A. Currently the South Sand Wash area is managed as an OHV open area for cross-country use within the ERMA.</p>	Same as Alternative A	<p>The South Sand Wash area (35,571 acres) will be administered as a special recreation management area to provide quality OHV experiences.</p>	<p>The South Sand Wash area (35,571 acres) will be administered as a special recreation management area to provide quality OHV experiences.</p>
<p>B. No similar action</p>	No similar action	<p><u>Zone:</u> Zone 1: Road corridors <u>Activity Planning Framework</u> Management: Coordinate with Moffat County and stakeholder groups to improve County Road access in South Sand Wash and to gravel the surface of these county roads. Provide trailhead, parking and developed camping facilities. Administration:  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Minerals and Energy: Oil and gas leasing- Open Locatable - Closed</li> </ul> </p>	<p><u>Zone:</u> Zone 1: Road corridors <u>Activity Planning Framework</u> Management: Coordinate with Moffat County and stakeholder groups to improve County Road access in South Sand Wash and to gravel the surface of these county roads. Provide trailhead, parking and developed camping facilities. Administration:  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Minerals and Energy: Oil and gas leasing- Open Locatable - Closed</li> </ul> </p>

Deleted: 1972

TABLE X: SUMMARY OF IMPACTS TO WILD HORSES

ALTERNATIVE A (NO ACTION ALTERNATIVE)	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
		<p>Other Minerals - Open Coal – Not available for leasing</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• OHV: Open</li> <li>• Developed Recreation sites- closed to all mineral actions</li> <li>• VRM: Class IV</li> <li>• Lands and Realty: Determined on a case-by-case basis consistent with SRMA objectives.</li> </ul>	<p>Other Minerals - Open Coal – Not available for leasing</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• OHV: Open</li> <li>• Developed Recreation sites- closed to all mineral actions</li> <li>• VRM: Class IV</li> <li>• Lands and Realty: Determined on a case-by-case basis consistent with SRMA objectives.</li> </ul>
C. No similar action	No similar action	<p><u>Zone:</u> Zone 2: Open play area <u>Activity Planning Framework</u></p> <p>Management: Identify and sign main access routes through the area. Crucial winter range and other seasonally limited wildlife habitat areas would be closed to surface disturbing activities.</p> <p>Administration:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Minerals and Energy: Oil and gas leasing- Open Locatable - Closed Other Minerals - Open Coal – Not available for leasing</li> <li>• OHV: Open</li> <li>• VRM: Class IV</li> <li>• Lands and Realty: Determined on a case-by-</li> </ul>	<p><u>Zone:</u> Zone 2: Open play area <u>Activity Planning Framework</u></p> <p>Management: Identify and sign main access routes through the area. Crucial winter range and other seasonally limited wildlife habitat areas would be closed to surface disturbing activities.</p> <p>Administration:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Minerals and Energy: Oil and gas leasing- Open Locatable - Closed Other Minerals - Open Coal – Not available for leasing</li> <li>• OHV: Open area smaller than Alternative C, with Clay Buttes area Limited to Designated Routes</li> </ul>

TABLE X: SUMMARY OF IMPACTS TO WILD HORSES

ALTERNATIVE A (NO ACTION ALTERNATIVE)	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
		case basis consistent with SRMA objectives.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>VRM: Class IV</li> <li>Lands and Realty: Determined on a case-by-case basis consistent with SRMA objectives.</li> </ul>
D. No similar action	No similar action	<p><u>Zone:</u> Zone 3: Designated routes area</p> <p><u>Activity Planning Framework</u></p> <p>Management: Together with user groups and local government, identify and sign a system of trails to accommodate a wide range of vehicle types and difficulty of riding levels. Crucial winter range and other seasonally limited wildlife habitat areas would be closed to surface disturbing activities.</p> <p>Administration:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Minerals and Energy: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Oil and gas leasing- Open</li> <li>Locatable - Closed</li> <li>Other Minerals - Open</li> <li>Coal – Not available for leasing</li> </ul> </li> <li>OHV: Limited to Designated Routes</li> <li>VRM: Class III</li> <li>Lands and Realty: Determined on a case-by-case basis consistent with SRMA objectives.</li> </ul>	<p><u>Zone:</u> Zone 3: Designated routes area</p> <p><u>Activity Planning Framework</u></p> <p>Management: Together with user groups and local government, identify and sign a system of trails to accommodate a wide range of vehicle types and difficulty of riding levels. Crucial winter range and other seasonally limited wildlife habitat areas would be closed to surface disturbing activities.</p> <p>Administration:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Minerals and Energy: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Oil and gas leasing- Open</li> <li>Locatable - Closed</li> <li>Other Minerals - Open</li> <li>Coal – Not available for leasing</li> </ul> </li> <li>OHV: Limited to Designated Routes</li> <li>VRM: Class III</li> <li>Lands and Realty: Determined on a case-by-case basis consistent with SRMA objectives.</li> </ul>

TABLE X: SUMMARY OF IMPACTS TO WILD HORSES

ALTERNATIVE A (NO ACTION ALTERNATIVE)	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
<p>Allowing cross-country OHV use would remove and degrade forage for wild horses, displace wild horses from grazing, watering, and nursing areas, and can cause young foals to be abandoned by their mares. These impacts would reduce the wild and free-roaming nature of wild horses.</p> <p>The presence of motorized vehicles at key watering sources displaces the horses away from their water sources which can stress their health. This could also occur at other water sources within the intermittent drainages that provide the ability for the numerous wild horse bands to disperse throughout the basin area, allowing for better access for the horses to forage and feed.</p>	Same as Alternative A	<p>Same as Alternative A, except effects from cross-country OHV use would be less. Limiting OHV use to designated routes in these areas (rather than open to cross country use) would temporarily displace wild horses in the proximity of the OHV use, whether recreational OHV use or recreational wild horse observation. <u>Would cause less disruption to wild horses, would also destroy less vegetation, thereby preserving forage.</u> Wild horse forage would be preserved in areas adjacent to where OHV use is limited to designated routes.</p> <p><u>Heavy OHV use in open areas during certain times of the year displaces use of these areas by wild horses.</u></p>	<p>Same as Alternative C</p> <p><u>Managing this area as a Wild Horse Range could limit recreation during critical life periods. This would result in less displacement of horses.</u></p>
<b>Serviceberry</b>			
<b>Special Recreation Permits</b>			
Current plans provide no guidance on competitive events.	Permit no competitive events in WSAs.	Same as Alternative B	Same as Alternative B
	Authorize motorized and non-	Same as Alternative B	Same as Alternative B

**Deleted:** The Serviceberry area is open to OHV use under the current RMP; however, is temporarily closed to OHV use. This area is currently managed as part of the ERMA. ... [9]

TABLE X: SUMMARY OF IMPACTS TO WILD HORSES

ALTERNATIVE A (NO ACTION ALTERNATIVE)	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
	<p>motorized competitive events consistent with OHV area and route designations.</p> <p>No similar action</p> <p>Permitted commercial events in the ERMA will be evaluated on a case-by-case basis.</p>	<p>Permitted commercial events in backcountry SRMAs (Serviceberry SRMA) will be limited to 50 participants and non-motorized events.</p> <p>Permitted commercial events in the ERMA and non-backcountry SRMAs (Cedar Mountain SRMA, South Sand Wash SRMA, Little Yampa Canyon SRMA, and Juniper Mountain SRMA) will be evaluated on a case-by-case basis.</p>	<p>Permitted commercial events in backcountry SRMAs (Serviceberry SRMA, Flycreek SRMA, Cold Springs Mountain SRMA, Dinosaur North SRMA, ), will be limited to 25 participants and non-motorized events.</p> <p>Same as Alternative C</p>
		<p>Limitations on event type and the number of participants would help to further reduce removal and degradation of forage for wild horses. Also lessen disruption to horses from vehicles &amp; human interactions.</p>	<p>Same as Alternative C, except effects would be increased.</p>
FOREST PRODUCTS			
<p>Manage approximately 37,600 acres of woodland to produce a variety of woodland products on a sustained-yield basis and apply limited management to</p>	<p>Same as Alternative A.</p>	<p>Manage woodland communities for woodland health using fire and other treatments (see Vegetation section) and allowing product sales.</p>	<p>Same as Alternative C.</p>

TABLE X: SUMMARY OF IMPACTS TO WILD HORSES

ALTERNATIVE A (NO ACTION ALTERNATIVE)	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
the remaining woodland acreage.			
Harvest of woodland and associated surface disturbances could remove and degrade forage for wild horses over the short term. In the long term it could increase understory (grass) production, providing increased forage for wild horses.  Managing on a sustained yield would help to limit short-term impacts.	Same as Alternative A.	Woodland management actions and associated surface disturbances could remove and degrade forage for wild horses over the short term. In the long term it could increase understory (grass) production, providing increased forage for wild horses.	Same as Alternative C
<b>LANDS AND REALTY</b>			
<b>Rights-of-Way</b>			
No rights-of-way corridors are formally designated.  The existing and potential corridors identified as suitable on page 29 of the RMP/ROD and displayed on pages 32 and 33 of the RMP/ROD are considered open and are preferred routes.  Minor rights-of-way will be processed on a case-by-case basis, generally guided by the criteria identified for major rights-of-way.	ROWs allowed on a case-by-case basis.	Encourage ROW in the following existing corridors: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Major roads including county roads (e.g., CR 20, 4, 7, 57)</li> <li>• Power transmission lines</li> <li>• Oil and gas pipelines</li> </ul>	Encourage ROW in the following existing corridors: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Major roads including county roads (e.g., CR 20, 4, 7, 57)</li> <li>• Power transmission lines</li> <li>• Oil and gas pipelines</li> </ul>

Deleted: to livestock.  
Deleted: F

TABLE X: SUMMARY OF IMPACTS TO WILD HORSES

ALTERNATIVE A (NO ACTION ALTERNATIVE)	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
Rights-of-way will be allowed in all areas if needed to develop valid existing rights.			
<p>Is this an issue in Sand Wash? Development/construction of ROWs would remove forage for wild horses over the short term. Additionally, wild horses would be temporarily displaced during construction activities.</p> <p>Development of new ROWs outside existing developments would affect the wild and free-roaming nature of wild horses.</p>	Same as Alternative A	Same as Alternative A, except concentrating ROWs in identified corridors would reduce the potential to fragment of wild horse habitat.	Same as Alternative A
<p>Specific areas unsuitable for major rights-of-way are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• WSAs</li> <li>• Limestone Ridge ACEC/RNA</li> <li>• Lookout Mountain ACEC</li> <li>• Irish Canyon ACEC</li> <li>• Little Yampa/Juniper Canyon SRMA (lower unit)</li> </ul>	ROW Exclusion: WSAs; VRM Class I	<p>ROW Exclusion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• WSAs</li> <li>• VRM Class I areas</li> <li>• Portions of Vermillion Basin Zone 2</li> </ul>	<p>ROW Exclusion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• WSAs</li> <li>• VRM Class I and II</li> <li>• Lookout Mountain ACEC</li> <li>• Limestone Ridge ACEC</li> <li>• Irish Canyon ACEC</li> <li>• Cross Mountain Canyon ACEC</li> <li>• White-Tailed Prairie Dog ACEC</li> <li>• If released from Congress, WSAs recommended as non-suitable (Ant Hills, Chew Winter Camp, Peterson Draw, Vale of Tears)</li> <li>• Vermillion Basin</li> </ul>

TABLE X: SUMMARY OF IMPACTS TO WILD HORSES

ALTERNATIVE A (NO ACTION ALTERNATIVE)	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Dinosaur North</li> <li>• Cold Springs Mountain</li> <li>• Cedar Mountain SRMA</li> </ul>
<p><i>Is this an issue in Sand Wash?</i> Prohibiting ROWs would reduce vegetation removal and conserve forage for wild horse in the restricted areas.</p>	Same as Alternative A, except the effects would occur over a smaller area.	Same as Alternative A, except the effects would occur over a smaller area.	Same as Alternative A, except the effects would occur over a larger area.
<p>Specific areas that are sensitive for siting major rights-of-way are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Little Yampa/Juniper Canyon SRMA (upper unit)</li> <li>• Lookout Mountain ACEC</li> <li>• Horse Draw</li> <li>• Vermillion Creek</li> <li>• Ace-in-the-Hole</li> <li>• Vermillion Bluffs</li> <li>• G Gap</li> <li>• Hells Canyon</li> <li>• Portions of Vermillion Creek Drainage</li> <li>• Sand Wash Drainage</li> <li>• Buffalo Gulch/Twelvemile Mesa</li> <li>• Little Snake River</li> <li>• Sand Creek</li> <li>• Conway Draw</li> <li>• Deception Creek</li> <li>• Occupied black-footed ferret habitat.</li> </ul>	<p>ROW Avoidance:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• VRM Class II</li> <li>• Occupied black-footed ferret habitat.</li> </ul>	<p>ROW Avoidance:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• VRM II</li> <li>• West Cold Springs WSA</li> <li>• If released from Congress, WSAs recommended as non-suitable (Ant Hills, Chew Winter Camp, Peterson Draw, Vale of Tears)</li> <li>• Cold Springs Mountain</li> <li>• Cedar Mountain SRMA</li> <li>• Dinosaur North</li> <li>• Vermillion Bluffs in Vermillion Basin Zone 1</li> <li>• Portions of Vermillion Basin Zone 2</li> <li>• Occupied black-footed ferret habitat.</li> </ul>	<p>ROW Avoidance:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Natural Systems ACECs</li> <li>• Occupied black-footed ferret habitat.</li> </ul>

TABLE X: SUMMARY OF IMPACTS TO WILD HORSES

ALTERNATIVE A (NO ACTION ALTERNATIVE)	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
<p><i>Is this an issue in Sand Wash?</i></p> <p>Controlling the development of ROWs would reduce vegetation removal and conserve forage for wild horses in the restricted areas.</p>	Same as Alternative A, except the effects would occur over a smaller area.	Same as Alternative A, except the effects would occur over a smaller area.	Same as Alternative A, except the effects would occur over a smaller area.
<b>TRANSPORTATION AND ACCESS &amp; TRAVEL MANAGEMENT</b>			
<b>Travel Management</b>			
<b>Closed</b>			
<p>The following area would be managed as closed to OHV use:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Diamond Breaks WSA</li> <li>• Limestone ACEC</li> <li>• Cross Mountain WSA</li> <li>• Serviceberry area</li> <li>• Fly Creek area</li> <li>• Maybell Uranium pit</li> </ul>	<p>The following area would be managed as closed to OHV use.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Diamond Breaks WSA</li> <li>• Cross Mountain WSA</li> <li>• Maybell Uranium pit</li> </ul>	<p>The following area would be managed as closed to OHV use.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Diamond Breaks WSA</li> <li>• Limestone Ridge</li> <li>• Cross Mountain WSA (Including Wild and Scenic River segment)</li> <li>• Critical Wild Horse water source on the high water mark consistent with wild horse actions.</li> <li>• Water impoundments (year-round) and within the high water mark when dry, except where a designated road crosses impoundment.</li> </ul>	<p>The following area would be managed as closed to OHV use:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All WSAs</li> <li>• Limestone Ridge ACEC</li> <li>• Serviceberry SRMA</li> <li>• Fly Creek SRMA</li> <li>• Dinosaur North SRMA</li> <li>• Maybell Uranium pit</li> <li>• Critical Wild Horse water source on the high water mark consistent with wild horse actions.</li> <li>• Water impoundments (year-round) and within the high water mark when dry, except where a designated road crosses impoundment.</li> </ul>
		<p><i>C</i>closing critical wild horse water sources would reduce stress to horses from adjacent OHV use in these critical areas. Allowing horses to use available water increases</p>	<p><i>S</i>ame as Alternative C</p>

**Deleted:** (delete) Same as Alternative A, except the effects could occur over a larger area  
↑

**Deleted:** Areas not in HMA. Continuing to manage as closed to OHV use would preserve forage for wild horses and maintain the wild and free-roaming nature of wild horses in this area.

**Deleted:** (Same as Alternative A, except the -delete)

TABLE X: SUMMARY OF IMPACTS TO WILD HORSES

ALTERNATIVE A (NO ACTION ALTERNATIVE)	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
		distribution and helps prevent overuse in certain areas.	
<b>Limited to Designated Roads and Trails</b>			
<p>The following areas would be managed as limited to designated roads and trails:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lookout Mountain ACEC</li> <li>• Irish Canyon ACEC</li> <li>• Sections of Little Yampa/Juniper Canyon SRMA</li> <li>• Cottonwood Creek area</li> <li>• Cedar Mountain</li> <li>• Browns Park cellular site</li> <li>• Wild Mountain area</li> <li>• Hoy Mountain area</li> </ul>	<p>No areas would be managed as limited to designated roads and trails.</p>	<p>Designate routes determined through adaptive management and travel management planning.</p> <p>The following areas would be managed as limited to designated routes for OHV use:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Little Yampa Canyon SRMA</li> <li>• Cedar Mountain SRMA</li> <li>• Cottonwood Creek area</li> <li>• Irish Canyon ACEC</li> <li>• Lookout Mountain ACEC</li> <li>• Browns Park cellular site</li> <li>• Wild Mountain area</li> <li>• Hoy Mountain area</li> <li>• Zones within South Sand Wash SRMA</li> </ul>	<p>All areas not managed as open or closed would be managed as limited to designated roads and trails.</p> <p>Criteria in Appendix XX would be used to prioritize areas for transportation planning.</p>
<b>Limited to Existing Roads and Trails</b>			
<p>A. The following areas would be managed as limited to existing roads and trails:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Areas that meet fragile soil criteria</li> <li>• WSAs: All except Diamond Breaks and</li> </ul>	<p>The following areas would be managed as limited to existing roads and trails:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• WSAs: All except Diamond Breaks and Cross Mountain</li> </ul>	<p>All areas not managed as open or closed would be managed as limited to existing roads and trails.</p> <p>See adaptive OHV designation process explained below.</p>	<p>No areas would be managed as limited to existing roads and trails.</p>

Deleted: Areas that meet fragile soil criteria

TABLE X: SUMMARY OF IMPACTS TO WILD HORSES

ALTERNATIVE A (NO ACTION ALTERNATIVE)	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
Cross Mountain • Lands adjacent to Cross Mountain WSA • Sections of Little Yampa/Juniper Canyon SRMA • Pole Gulch area • Big Hole Gulch area • Cold Springs Mountain • Sections of Axial Basin • Willow Creek area • South Nipple area			
Limiting OHV use to existing routes reduces disturbance overall in the area because OHV uses remain on existing routes. Managing the area as limited to existing routes maintains forage for wild horses.	Same as Alternative A, except impacts would be on less acres. Area would be managed as open see affect above.	Same as Alternative A, except the effects would occur over a larger area.	Area would be managed as designated see affects above.
<b>Open</b> Approximately 71% of the Field Office would be managed as open to OHV use.	All areas of the Field Office that would not be managed as limited or closed to OHV use.	The following areas would be managed as open to OHV use: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• South Sand Wash SRMA (play area south edge and Clay Buttes area)</li> <li>• Hiawatha open, except from April 15 to July 15 it would be limited to existing routes.</li> </ul>	The following areas would be managed as open to OHV use: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• South Sand Wash SRMA (play area south edge, smaller area than Alternative C).</li> </ul>

**Deleted:** Does not apply to Sand Wash.

**Formatted:** Highlight

**Deleted:** Same as Alternative A, except the effects would occur over a larger area.

**Formatted:** Highlight

**Deleted:** designated

**Deleted:** .

**Deleted:** would temporarily displace

**Deleted:** Same as Alternative C.

**Deleted:** Limiting OHV use to designated routes would temporarily displace wild horses in the proximity of the OHV use, whether recreational OHV use or recreational wild horse observation. Wild horse forage would be preserved in areas adjacent to where OHV use is limited to designated routes. Fugitive dust from vehicle use would also settle on forage adjacent to existing roads, making it unpalatable for consumption. This could reduce the available forage for livestock, wildlife, and wild horses, and increase competition for remaining forage. This effect would be short term and would coincide with the displacement of and stress to wild horses from human activity.

**Deleted:** wild horses in the proximity of the OHV use, whether recreational OHV use or recreational wild horse observation. Wild horse forage would be preserved in areas adjacent to where OHV use is limited to designated routes. Fugitive dust from vehicle use would also settle on forage adjacent to existing roads, making it unpalatable for consumption. This could reduce the available forage for livestock, wildlife, and wild horses, and increase competition for remaining forage. This effect would be short term and would coincide with the displacement of and stress to wild horses from human activity. [10]

**Deleted:**

**Deleted:** W

**Deleted:** forage would be preserved in areas adjacent to where OHV use is limited to designated routes. Fugitive dust from vehicle use would also settle on forage adjacent to existing roads, making it unpalatable for consumption. This could reduce the available forage for livestock, wildlife, and wild horses, and increase competition for remaining forage. This effect would be short term and would coincide with the displacement of and stress to wild horses from human activity. [11]

**Deleted:** Fugitive dust from vehicle use would also settle on forage adjacent to existing roads, making it unpalatable for consumption. This could reduce the available forage for livestock, wildlife, and wild horses, and increase competition for remaining forage. This effect would be short term and would coincide with the displacement of and stress to wild horses from human activity. [12]

TABLE X: SUMMARY OF IMPACTS TO WILD HORSES

ALTERNATIVE A (NO ACTION ALTERNATIVE)	ALTERNATIVE B	ALTERNATIVE C	ALTERNATIVE D
<p>Allowing cross-country OHV use would remove and degrade forage for wild horses, displace wild horses from grazing, watering, and nursing areas, and can cause young foals to be abandoned by their mares. These impacts would reduce the wild and free-roaming nature of wild horses.</p>	<p>Same as Alternative A, except the effects would occur over a larger area.</p>	<p>Same as Alternative A, except the effects would occur over a smaller area. (see South Sand Wash SRMA impacts above)</p>	<p>Same as Alternative A, except the effects would occur over a smaller area (see South Sand Wash SRMA impacts above).</p>

Page 10: [1] Deleted		Kasey Pearson	12/1/2005 3:40:00 PM
Waterfowl and Shorebird: NSO on significant production areas (Waterfowl Habitat Management Areas and rookeries). No exceptions.	No similar action.	Same as Alternative A. In addition, NSO area may be altered depending upon the active status of the production areas or the geographical relationship of topographical barriers and vegetation screening. Exceptions: granted according to criteria established in Appendix X.	Same as
Prohibiting surface disturbing activities could reduce vegetation removal and help to conserve forage for wild horses in these areas. This could also prohibit construction of water improvements in these areas. Is this an issue in Sand Wash?	Not prohibiting surface disturbing activities could result in increased removal forage for wild horses.  This could result in increased flexibility in constructing water improvements in these areas.	Same as Alternative A	Same as

Page 10: [2] Deleted		Kasey Pearson	12/1/2005 3:41:00 PM
Colombian sharp-tailed grouse: NSO within ¼ mile radius of a lek site. NSO area may be altered depending upon the active status of the lek or the geographical relationship of topographical barriers and vegetation screening to the lek site.	No similar action.	Same as Alternative A  In addition, exceptions granted according to criteria established in Appendix X.	Same as
Prohibiting surface disturbing activities would reduce vegetation removal and help to conserve forage for wild horses in these areas. This would also prohibit construction of water improvements in these areas. Is this an issue in Sand Wash?	Not prohibiting surface disturbing activities would result in increased removal of forage for wild horses.  This would result in increased flexibility in constructing water improvements in these areas.	Same as Alternative A	Same as

Page 11: [3] Deleted		Kasey Pearson	12/1/2005 3:43:00 PM
<b>Colorado River Fishes</b>			
No similar action	No Surface Occupancy NSO) within critical or occupied habitat of Colorado pikeminnow ( <i>Ptychocheilus lucius</i> ), razorback sucker ( <i>Xyrauchen texanus</i> ), humpback chub ( <i>Gila cypha</i> ), and bonytail ( <i>Gila elegans</i> ). Exceptions that may cause adverse affect to listed fish (such as bridge abutments) will require site specific	Same as Alternative B.	Same as

	consultation with FWS.		
Is this an issue in Sand Wash?	Prohibiting surface disturbing activities could reduce vegetation removal and help to conserve forage for wild horses in these areas.	Same as Alternative B	Same as
No similar action	Minimize the impacts from erosion and habitat restoration associated with tamarisk and/or Russian olive control on critical and other occupied habitat of Colorado River fishes.	Same as Alternative B.	Same as
Is this an issue in Sand Wash?	Reducing erosion would help to conserve forage for wild horses in these areas.	Same as Alternative B	Same as
No similar action	BLM shall coordinate with Recovery Implementation Program to identify potential problem areas and conservation measures to reduce the risk of bank destabilization or increased sedimentation resulting from any land use activity or natural disturbance. For sites where habitat loss is a risk, remedial actions should be implemented to ensure that the suitability of the spawning habitat is maintained, or enhanced.	Same as Alternative B.	Same as
Is this an issue in Sand Wash?	If actions include restrictions on wild horses within riparian zones, forage and water resources could be lost. Depending on other available sources of water, this could be a significant impact.	Same as Alternative B.	Same as
No similar action	Where possible, implement measures to reduce selenium concentrations in the upper Colorado River basin. For example, decrease erosion in areas with selenium-rich soils (e.g., shale-derived soils), maintain adequate vegetation cover on the site, control ephemeral streamflow with water spreading structures, or apply NSO stipulations on steep slopes with selenium-rich soils.	Same as Alternative B.	Same as
Is this an issue in Sand Wash?	Maintaining vegetation cover on selenium-rich soils would	Same as Alternative B.	Same as

	conserve forage for wild horses on these areas		
<b>Mexican Spotted Owl</b>			
Mexican Spotted Owl: NSO within ¼ mile radius of confirmed roost site and nesting site. No exceptions.	Non-surface disturbing activities in PACs shall avoid the MSO breeding season (March 1 through August 31).	Same as Alternative B.	Same as
Prohibiting surface occupancy could reduce vegetation removal and help to conserve forage for wild horses in these areas.  This could also prohibit construction of range improvements in these areas. Not an issue in Sand Wash.	Not prohibiting surface occupancy could result in increased removal of forage for wild horses.	Same as Alternative B	Same as
No similar action	Livestock grazing in protected and restricted MSO habitats shall meet BLM Colorado's Standards for Public Land Health within key habitat areas (riparian areas, meadows, and oak types) to provide for adequate levels of plant cover and forage for owl prey species. Monitoring in such areas should occur to determine current level of use as well as detecting any change in the relative composition of herbaceous and woody plants.	Same as Alternative B.	Same as
Not an issue in Sand Wash.	Meeting Standards for Public Land Health would result in maintaining or improving forage for wild horses.	Same as Alternative B.	Same as
<b>Yellow-billed Cuckoo</b>			
No similar action	In order to evaluate both long- and short-term impacts and/or benefits continue to implement livestock management practices and operations Public Land Health Standards and Guidelines for Livestock Grazing (1997) [emphasis on Standard #2]. Assess land health accordingly to establish baseline data and identify changes in YBC habitat suitability.	Same as Alternative B.	Same as
Is this an issue in Sand Wash?	Meeting Standards for Public Land Health would result in maintaining or improving forage	Same as Alternative B	Same as

	for wild horses.		
No similar action	Prohibit permanent surface disturbing activities within ¼ mile of any suitable YBC habitat. Exceptions should be evaluated on a case by case basis to avoid adverse impact.	Same as Alternative B	Same as
Is this an issue in Sand Wash?	Prohibiting surface disturbing activities could reduce vegetation removal and help to conserve forage for wild horses in these areas.  This would also prohibit construction of water improvements in these areas.	Same as Alternative B	Same as
No similar action	Prohibit non-surface disturbing activities within YBC habitat that will have adverse effects to the YBC or its habitat (e.g., boat and raft landings, outfitting camps, firewood collection) within ¼ mile of occupied habitat.	Same as Alternative B.	Same as
Is this an issue in Sand Wash?	Prohibiting activities could reduce temporary displacement of wild horses, if the habitat were located in the HMA.	Same as Alternative B	Same as

**Colorado River Cutthroat Trout**

No similar action	Improve or maintain watershed conditions and lake and stream habitat. Watershed conditions and stream and lake habitat will be maintained or improved for locations containing CCP's and CP's; and maintained for locations containing HUP's. Priority will be given to improving watershed conditions and stream or lake habitat for locations containing CCP's, where possible. Habitat improvement techniques will be used where appropriate to provide missing habitat components or improve existing ones. These techniques can include building instream structures to improve pool to riffle ratios, streambank stabilization, riparian	Same as Alternative B.	Same as
-------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------	---------

	management, instream cover, pool or spawning gravel enhancement, and provision of fish passageways.		
Is this an issue in Sand Wash?	Could improve riparian vegetation health and thereby improve/increase forage for wild horses in riparian areas.	Same as Alternative B	Same as

**Page 27: [5] Deleted** **Kasey Pearson** **12/1/2005 4:00:00 PM**

Is this an issue in Sand Wash? Allowing surface disturbing and disruptive activities could result in increased removal of forage for wild horses, displacement of wild horses from preferred locations, and a loss in the wild and free-roaming nature of wild horses.	Controlling surface disturbing and disruptive activities within the area could reduce vegetation removal and help to conserve forage for wild horses in these areas. It could also preserve the wild and free-roaming nature of wild horses.	Same as Alternative B, except impacts from controlling surface disrupting activities would be greater in Zone 2.	Eliminating disruptive activities would reduce impacts and help to conserve forage for wild horses in these areas. It could also preserve the wild and free-roaming nature of wild horses.
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

**Page 28: [6] Deleted** **Kasey Pearson** **12/1/2005 4:01:00 PM**

		Is this an issue in Sand Wash? Controlling surface disturbing and disruptive activities within the area could reduce vegetation removal and help to conserve forage for wild horses in these areas. Retaining the existing character of the landscape (VRM II objective) could also preserve the wild and free-roaming nature of the wild horses.	Same as Alternative B, except impacts from controlling surface disrupting activities would be greater in Zone 2.
--	--	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

**Page 29: [7] Deleted** **Kasey Pearson** **12/1/2005 4:07:00 PM**

WSAs	WSAs	WSAs; Limestone Ridge, Dinosaur North, Cold Springs Area (outside WSA), Vermillion Basin (Zone 2), Irish Canyon ACEC; WSR Segments 1, 2, and 3.	WSAs, Vermillion Basin, Limestone Ridge ACEC, Dinosaur North, Cold Springs Area, Canyon Area, all suitable for wild horses; Mountain View, Diamond, Pinyon Ridge, Little Yam, Mountain, SRMA; Dinosaur North, Cold Springs Area
Is this an issue in Sand Wash?			Prohibiting surface disturbing and disruptive activities within the area would reduce impacts and help to conserve forage for wild horses in these areas. It could also preserve the wild and free-roaming nature of wild horses.

**Page 31: [8] Deleted** **Kasey Pearson** **12/1/2005 4:11:00 PM**

Attached to leases where operations proposed within the area of an approved surface or underground coal mine will be relocated outside the area to be mined or to accommodate room and pillar mining operations. Stipulations may be waived subject to outlined conditions.	Same as Alternative A. [Assuming this is non-discretionary]	Same as Alternative A.	Same as
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------	---------

<b>Page 41: [9] Deleted</b> <span style="float: right;"><b>Kasey Pearson</b></span> <span style="float: right;"><b>12/1/2005 4:32:00 PM</b></span>			
The Serviceberry area is open to OHV use under the current RMP; however, is temporarily closed to OHV use. This area is currently managed as part of the ERMA.	Same as Alternative A, except temporary OHV closures would be removed and would be managed as open to OHV use.	The Serviceberry area (12,375 acres) will be administered as a Special Recreation Management Area (SRMA) to provide backcountry, non-motorized hunting experiences.	The Serv acres) wi Special R Area (SR backcour experienc
Does not apply to Sand Wash. Allowing cross-country OHV use would remove and degrade forage for wild horses and increase the potential for displacement and harassment of wild horses within the area.	Same as Alternative A	Prohibiting cross-country OHV use would help to reduce vegetation removal and degradation and result in preserving forage for wild horses in the area. It would also decrease the potential for displacement and harassment of wild horses within the area.	Same as
No similar action	No similar action	<u>Zone:</u> Zone 1: Willow Creek and north Serviceberry access <u>Activity Planning Framework</u> Management: Provide camping facilities and improved roads to these facilities in high impact areas related to hunting season uses. Develop a managed and maintained trail system within the area. <u>Administration:</u> Minerals and Energy: Open to oil and gas exploration and development Locatable – closed Other minerals – open Coal – Not available for leasing OHV: Limited to Designated Routes VRM – Class III Lands and Realty: Determined on a case-by-case basis consistent with SRMA objectives.	<u>Zone:</u> Zo north Serv <u>Activity Pl</u> Manage facilities in to hunting managed system wi Adminis Miner  OHV: VRM Lands or co ol

Does not apply to Sand Wash.		Limited controls on surface disturbing and disruptive activities within the area would moderately reduce vegetation removal and help to conserve forage for wild horses in these areas.	Same as
No similar action	No similar action	<u>Zone:</u> Zone 2: Serviceberry backcountry <u>Activity Planning Framework</u> Management: Develop a managed and maintained non-motorized trail system within the area. Administration: Minerals and Energy: Open to oil and gas exploration and development Locatable – closed Other minerals – open Coal – Not available for leasing OHV: Closed VRM – Class III Lands and Realty: ROW would be considered on a case-by-case basis	<u>Zone:</u> Zo backcoun <u>Activity PI</u> Manage managed motorized area. Adminis Miner  OHV: VRM Lands b ca
Does not apply to Sand Wash.		Limited controls on surface disturbing and disruptive activities within the area would moderately reduce vegetation removal and help to conserve forage for wild horses in these areas.	Same as

**Flycreek**

The Flycreek area is open to OHV use under the current RMP; however, is temporarily closed to OHV use. This area is currently managed as part of the ERMA.	Same as Alternative A, except temporary OHV closures would be removed and would be managed as open to OHV use.	The Flycreek area (12,342 acres) will be administered as a backcountry, non-motorized hunting area.  Increase education and interpretation during hunting season to reduce resource impacts and conflicts.  Develop a managed and maintained a non-motorized trail system within the area.	The Flycreek will be administered as a Recreation Management Area (SRMA) to non-motorized use.  <u>Zone:</u> All <u>Activity PI</u> Manage and maint system wi education hunting se impacts a property b
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

		<p>OHV – closed</p> <p>Minerals –  Open to oil and gas exploration and development  Locatable – closed  Other minerals – open  Coal - Not available for leasing</p> <p>VRM –Class III</p> <p>Lands and Realty: ROW would be considered on a case-by-case basis.</p>	<p>Adminis  Mine</p> <p>OHV  VRM  Lanc  b  b</p>
<p>Does not apply to Sand Wash.  Continuing to manage as closed to OHV use would preserve forage for wild horses and maintain the wild and free-roaming nature of wild horses in this area.</p>	<p>Same as Alternative A</p>	<p>Limited controls on surface disturbing and disruptive activities within the area would reduce vegetation removal and conserve forage for wild horses in these areas.</p>	<p>Same as</p>

Page 48: [10] Deleted

Kasey Pearson

12/1/2005 4:48:00 PM

wild horses in the proximity of the OHV use, whether recreational OHV use or recreational wild horse observation

Page 48: [11] Deleted

Kasey Pearson

12/1/2005 4:49:00 PM

forage would be preserved in areas adjacent to where OHV use is limited to designated routes

Page 48: [12] Deleted

Kasey Pearson

12/1/2005 4:47:00 PM

Fugitive dust from vehicle use would also settle on forage adjacent to existing roads, making it unpalatable for consumption. This could reduce the available forage for livestock, wildlife, and wild horses, and increase competition for remaining forage. This effect would be short term and would coincide with the displacement of and stress to wild horses from human activity.