

ATTACHMENT A

Resource Topics and Associated Planning Information

Resource/ Resource Use	LUP Handbook Decision Guidance	1989 RMP Objectives	Management Opportunities Identified in the AMS	Pre-Plan Questions to Address
<i>Air Quality</i>	Identify desired outcomes and areawide criteria or restrictions, in cooperation with the appropriate air quality regulatory agency, that apply to direct or authorized emission-generating activities, including the Clean Air Act's requirements for compliance with: 1. Applicable National Ambient Air Quality Standards (section 109); 2. State Implementation Plans (section 110); 3. Control of Pollution from Federal Facilities (section 118); 4. Prevention of Significant Deterioration, including visibility impacts to mandatory Federal Class I Areas (section 160 et seq.); and 5. Conformity Analyses and Determinations (section 176(c)).	Not specifically addressed.	The revision of the Little Snake RMP (revised RMP) will need to incorporate the objectives for air quality, describe the current condition of air resources within the RMPPA, provide actions or limitations to manage air resources, conduct appropriate analysis of impacts to air quality, ensure conformance with the State of Colorado State Implementation Plan (SIP), and provide for collaboration on regional issues with local, state and federal agencies.	Not specifically addressed.
<i>Soil and Water Resources</i>	Identify desired outcomes (including standards or goals under the Clean Water Act). Identify watersheds that may need special protection from the standpoint of human health concerns, aquatic ecosystem health, or other public uses. For riparian areas, identify desired width/depth ratios, streambank conditions, channel substrate	Soil: Prevent deterioration of soil conditions and stabilize and rehabilitate areas where accelerated erosion and runoff have resulted in unacceptable resource conditions. Prevent disturbance to fragile soil areas where	RMP changes to protect soils may be needed to reflect the expected future conditions in the RMPPA, and some standards and objectives may need to be clarified or changed. Specific emphasis will continue to be needed for the identified areas of fragile soils. Some standards and objectives	How will OHV use be managed in upland areas to avoid soil erosion problems and conflict with other resources? How will riparian vegetation communities be managed to improve or maintain water quality? How will water quality be maintained and restored over time to protect downstream beneficial uses of water and riparian habitat?

ATTACHMENT A

Resource/ Resource Use	LUP Handbook Decision Guidance	1989 RMP Objectives	Management Opportunities Identified in the AMS	Pre-Plan Questions to Address
	<p>conditions, and large woody material characteristics. Identify areawide use restrictions or other protective measures to meet tribal, state, and local water quality requirements. Identify measures, including filing for water rights under state permit procedures, to ensure water availability for multiple use management and functioning, healthy riparian and upland systems.</p>	<p>resulting erosion could not be controlled.</p> <p>Water: Maintain the integrity of streams and their associated riparian values on public lands that meet state water quality standards and have acceptable channel stability.</p> <p>Protect from further degradation and, if feasible, improve the quality of those streams and their associated riparian values that do not meet state water quality standards and do not have acceptable channel stability.</p> <p>Protect and maintain present groundwater quality and quantity.</p>	<p>may need to be clarified or changed to reflect recently listed impaired waters on the state water quality-limited (303(d)) list.</p>	
<p><i>Vegetation (including forests and woodlands, rangelands, and riparian areas and wetlands)</i></p>	<p>Identify desired outcomes for vegetative resources, including the desired mix of vegetative types, structural stages, and landscape and riparian functions, and provide for native plant, fish, and wildlife habitats. Designate priority plant species and habitats, including Special Status Species and populations of plant species</p>	<p>Manage the suitable pinyon-juniper woodlands and commercial forest lands to maintain stand productivity and to help meet fuelwood and saw timber demand on a sustained-yield basis.</p>	<p>General management opportunities for the revised RMP could include identification of desired outcomes for vegetative resources (i.e., Desired Plant Communities), including the desired mix of vegetative types, structural stages, and landscape and riparian functions. The</p>	<p>What new and existing rangeland projects are needed to improve rangeland resource values? What are appropriate standards for range improvements?</p> <p>How should the BLM prioritize implementation of management practices to maintain desired future conditions and improve undesirable conditions where feasible? Are there disturbed areas where BLM should look into</p>

ATTACHMENT A

Resource/ Resource Use	LUP Handbook Decision Guidance	1989 RMP Objectives	Management Opportunities Identified in the AMS	Pre-Plan Questions to Address
	<p>recognized as significant for at least one factor such as density, diversity, size, public interest, remnant character, or age. Identify the actions and areawide use restrictions needed to achieve desired vegetative conditions.</p> <p>In areas where Healthy Forests Restoration Act authorities are to be used, identify old growth forest stands or describe a process for identifying old growth forest stands in the land use plan based on the structure and composition characteristic of the forest type. Provide management direction to maintain, or contribute toward the restoration of, the structure and composition of old growth forest stands in areas where these authorities will be used. This management direction should consider the pre-fire exclusion old growth conditions characteristic of the forest type, taking into account the contribution of the stand to landscape fire adaptation and watershed health, and retaining the large trees contributing to old growth structure.</p>	<p>Improve range conditions in terms of species diversity and abundance, as well as increasing carrying capacities for both livestock and wildlife.</p>	<p>revised RMP could also designate priority plant species, including Special Status Species and plant species recognized as significant for at least one factor. Once this is determined, actions and areawide use restrictions needed to achieve desired vegetative conditions could be identified.</p>	<p>reseeding/reclamation?</p> <p>How will noxious weeds and other pests, including Mormon Crickets, be managed in these areas?</p> <p>How will the BLM maintain or improve forest and woodland communities, and how will woodlands be managed to maintain or improve rangeland and wildlife habitat?</p>
<i>Fish and Wildlife</i>	<p>Acknowledging the states' roles in managing fish and wildlife and working in close coordination with state wildlife agencies, describe desired habitat</p>	<p>Improve those rangelands that are key wildlife habitats and have the potential for increased forage</p>	<p>Management opportunities for the revised RMP could include identifying desired habitat conditions and/or population objectives for major habitat</p>	<p>Which management practices avoid conflicts between wildlife and livestock for vegetation and other resources?</p> <p>What are the cumulative impacts of resource uses</p>

ATTACHMENT A

Resource/ Resource Use	LUP Handbook Decision Guidance	1989 RMP Objectives	Management Opportunities Identified in the AMS	Pre-Plan Questions to Address
	<p>conditions and/or population for major habitat types that support a wide variety of game and non-game species.</p> <p>Designate priority species and habitats, including special status species, and populations of fish or wildlife species recognized as significant for at least one factor such as density, diversity, size, public interest, remnant character, or age.</p> <p>Identify actions and areawide use restrictions needed to achieve desired population and habitat conditions while maintaining a thriving natural ecological balance and multiple-use relationships.</p>	<p>production for wildlife grazing by improving soil and water resources. Maintain those rangelands that are at their desired plant communities.</p> <p>Determine stocking rates for wildlife and livestock that result in proper use of the public rangelands within the 13 conflict allotments.</p> <p>Issue decisions or enter into agreements to establish forage use and grazing capacity. The BLM will consult with the Colorado Division of Wildlife, affected grazing permittees, and other interested parties.</p>	<p>types that support a wide variety of game and non-game species. Priority species and habitats could also be designated, including Special Status Species, and populations of fish or wildlife species recognized as significant for at least one factor. Once this is determined, actions and areawide use restrictions needed to achieve desired population and habitat conditions could be identified.</p>	<p>on wildlife and wildlife migration corridors?</p> <p>What effects do wildlife populations, especially elk, have on the ecosystem? Should anything be done to affect population sizes?</p> <p>What areas are important for big-game winter range? How should they be managed? How is winter range changing?</p> <p>What is the importance of the planning area to habitat for sagebrush-obligate species from a regional perspective?</p> <p>To what extent should Chronic Wasting Disease influence the RMP development?</p> <p>What role can fuel treatments play in wildlife habitat?</p> <p>What are the areas of highest priority for protecting, maintaining, and restoring sage-grouse habitat?</p> <p>What practices will be authorized and implemented to provide adequate habitat and forage for wildlife while maintaining other uses and values of public land resources?</p>
<i>Special Status Species</i>	<p>Identify strategies, use restrictions, and actions decisions to conserve and recover special status species.</p> <p>Land use planning strategies and decisions should result in a reasonable conservation strategy for these species. Land use plan decisions should be clear and</p>	<p>Protect, conserve, and manage Colorado BLM sensitive plant species and locations with adjacent critical sites that affect their habitat. If any threatened/endangered or candidate plant</p>	<p>Management opportunities for the revised RMP could include identifying desired habitat conditions and/or population objectives for Special Status Species and identifying priority species that require immediate, intensive management. Once this is determined, actions and</p>	<p>What land use practices are necessary to protect T&E, Sensitive, and Special Status species?</p> <p>What are the areas of highest priority for protecting, maintaining, and restoring sage-grouse habitat?</p>

ATTACHMENT A

Resource/ Resource Use	LUP Handbook Decision Guidance	1989 RMP Objectives	Management Opportunities Identified in the AMS	Pre-Plan Questions to Address
	<p>sufficiently detailed to enhance habitat or prevent avoidable loss of habitat pending the development and implementation of implementation-level plans. This may include identifying stipulations or criteria that would be applied to implementation actions.</p> <p>Land use plan decisions should be consistent with BLM's mandate to recover listed species and should be consistent with objectives and recommended actions in approved recovery plans, conservation agreements and strategies, MOUs, and applicable biological opinions for threatened and endangered species.</p>	<p>species is identified in the Little Snake RMPPA, it would be protected through no-surface-occupancy stipulations and any other actions needed to prevent its deterioration and allow its recovery.</p>	<p>areawide use restrictions needed to achieve desired population and habitat conditions could be identified.</p>	
<i>Wild Horses</i>	<p>Identify the following (see 43 CFR 4700):</p> <p>1. Herd Areas. Herd areas (HAs) are limited to areas of the public lands identified as being habitat used by wild horses and burros at the time of the passage of the Wild Horse and Burro Act, as amended (16 U.S.C. 1331-1340). Herd Area boundaries may only be changed when it is determined that (1) areas once listed as HAs are later found to be used only by privately owned horses or burros, or (2) the HA boundary does not correctly</p>	<p>To protect wild free-roaming horses in the Sand Wash Basin from unauthorized capture, branding, harassment, and destruction.</p> <p>To manage herds of wild horses as an integral part of the public lands ecosystem under the principle of multiple use.</p> <p>To manage wild horse habitat to achieve and</p>	<p>Within the last ten years late winter recreational OHV use has been increasing in the HMA, as snow accumulation levels are relatively lower in this area of the RMPPA. Recreational travel restrictions have been considered to reduce wild horse harassment by OHV users during foaling periods in April and May.</p> <p>Although elk have wintered in the Sand Wash Basin for many years, their numbers have been increasing. Elk also began</p>	<p>What indicators will be used to identify levels of wild horse use compatible with sustaining a thriving, natural ecological balance? What is the appropriate management level (AML)? Is the current AML of the Sand Wash Basin HMA appropriate?</p>

ATTACHMENT A

Resource/ Resource Use	LUP Handbook Decision Guidance	1989 RMP Objectives	Management Opportunities Identified in the AMS	Pre-Plan Questions to Address
	<p>portray where wild horses and burros were found in 1971.</p> <p>2. Herd Management Area Designation. Herd Management Areas (HMA) are established only on areas within HAs within which wild horses and/or burros can be managed for the long term. For HMAs, identify the following:</p> <p>a) Initial and estimated herd size that could be managed while still preserving and maintaining a thriving natural ecological balance and multiple-use relationships for that area.</p> <p>b) Guidelines and criteria for adjusting herd size.</p> <p>3. Herd Areas Not Designated as Herd Management Areas. Where appropriate, the land use plan may include decisions removing horses from all or part of a herd area. Examples include intermingled and unfenced lands within herd areas where private landowners do not want to make them available for wild horse or burro use; or essential habitat components are not available for wild horse or burro use within a herd area.</p> <p>4. Wild Horse and Burro Ranges. An HMA may be considered for</p>	<p>maintain a thriving natural ecological balance.</p> <p>To maintain current data about wild horse populations and their habitat.</p> <p>To remove excess wild horse periodically to maintain appropriate management levels on the herd management area.</p> <p>To remove wild horses that stray from Sand Wash as soon as practical.</p>	<p>spending summers in the area within the past 15 years. This increased presence has resulted in greater competition for winter and summer forage, changes in vegetation composition and losses of native vegetation vigor.</p> <p>Utilization studies have documented flora decline on Seven Mile Ridge and Dry Mountain. The Colorado Division of Wildlife recognizes this problem and has increased late season hunting in the area. However, these actions have not been as effective as anticipated. Further action is necessary to resolve this conflict.</p> <p>The occurrence of other horses entering the RMPPA also creates conflicts related to competition for forage and habitat degradation. Wild horses from the Adobe Town Wild Horse Herd Management Area in Wyoming often move into the northern portion of the RMPPA and consume forage allotted for livestock and wildlife. In addition, the Sand Wash Basin HMA adjoins an allotment permitted for domestic horse use. The 4-strand wire fence separating</p>	

ATTACHMENT A

Resource/ Resource Use	LUP Handbook Decision Guidance	1989 RMP Objectives	Management Opportunities Identified in the AMS	Pre-Plan Questions to Address
	<p>designation as a wild horse or burro range when there is a significant public value present, such as unique characteristics in a herd or an outstanding opportunity for public viewing.</p> <p>5. Areawide Restrictions Needed to Achieve Objectives. For example, if domestic horses in HMAs are not compatible with wild horse management policies, then, domestic horse grazing must not be permitted in HMAs or adjacent to HMAs if domestic and wild horses are likely to intermingle.</p>		<p>these two populations is often damaged by elk or left unsecured (i.e., recreationists fail to close gates), allowing domestic horses to cross the management boundary and mix with the wild horses. Increasing recreational use and elk populations within the RMPPA is expected to exacerbate this problem. Management actions are needed to maintain the Adobe Town herd within its respective HMA and reduce the frequency of domestic horses entering the HMA.</p> <p>Approximately 98% of the public land within the HMA has been leased for oil and gas operations. Activation of these leases could negatively impact the wild horse herd and associated habitat. Mitigation of these activities to lessen the impacts to wild horses should include increasing timing limitations on drilling activity and enlarging the area with no surface occupancy (NSO) restrictions to include additional springs and important horse pasture.</p>	
Fire	Identify landscape-level (broad scale) fire management goals and objectives, including desired wildland fire conditions. Describe	In full suppression zones: Give first priority to	The RMP should be maintained to reflect the completion of the March 2000 Fire Management Plan, which is expected to	Is the current Fire Management Plan compatible with upland management objectives? What will be the criteria for implementing fuel treatments to improve upland and riparian condition?

ATTACHMENT A

Resource/ Resource Use	LUP Handbook Decision Guidance	1989 RMP Objectives	Management Opportunities Identified in the AMS	Pre-Plan Questions to Address
	<p>desired wildland fire conditions using Fire Regime Condition Class or other approved methods of description.</p> <p>Identify the suite of management strategies/actions (including appropriate management response, hazardous fuels treatments, prevention and mitigation methods) that can be used to achieve desired outcomes and underlying land use allocations. Include a description of geographic areas that are suitable for wildland fire use for resource benefit and areas where wildland fire use is not appropriate due to social, economic, political, or resource constraints (for example, wildland urban interface).</p> <p>Identify criteria that will be used for establishing fire management priorities. Public and fire fighter safety is always the number one priority during fire management activities.</p> <p>Identify restrictions on fire management practices (including both wildfire suppression and fuels management) if any are needed to protect natural or cultural resource values. Restrictions may be structured to allow the local manager the flexibility to apply</p>	<p>personal safety, life, or property.</p> <p>Prevent wildfire from causing any tree mortality in current and proposed commercial timber sale and woodland product contract areas.</p> <p>Prevent wildfire from destroying any perishable designated cultural resource sites.</p> <p>Prevent wildfires from destroying areas with significant riparian values.</p> <p>In conditional suppression zones, where conditions may not warrant the highest level of fire suppression:</p> <p>Suppress all wildfires by taking appropriate suppression action. Appropriate actions will be based upon preplanned analysis consistent with land management objectives including the threat of life and property,</p>	<p>provide excellent guidance to the fire program for several years. Additional maintenance may be necessary to reflect current fire management terminology.</p>	

ATTACHMENT A

Resource/ Resource Use	LUP Handbook Decision Guidance	1989 RMP Objectives	Management Opportunities Identified in the AMS	Pre-Plan Questions to Address
	<p>restrictions on a seasonal or annual basis, based on resource conditions, weather factors, and operational capability.</p> <p>Best management practices may be developed in conjunction with land use planning efforts.</p> <p>Some or all of these practices may be identified as land use plan decisions.</p>	<p>economic evaluations, and resource constraints.</p> <p>Use suppression strategies, which do not require unnecessary exposure of firefighters and equipment to threatening situations.</p> <p>Utilize appropriate suppression actions, which will avoid all unnecessary impairment of wilderness values and is consistent with Interim Management Policy.</p> <p>In prescribed fire zones:</p> <p>Use planned and unplanned ignition to meet the objectives of other resources, such as livestock and wildlife for use of fire to improve vegetative conditions.</p>		
<i>Cultural and Heritage Resources</i>	<p>Identify area wide criteria or site-specific use restrictions that apply to special cultural resource issues, including traditional cultural properties that may affect the location, timing, or method of</p>	<p>To identify and protect the cultural resources within the Little Snake RMPPA.</p>	<p>The RMP revision process could provide for the development of a proactive cultural resources management framework that incorporates changes in BLM policy and law.</p>	<p>What is the appropriate balance between providing for site preservation or conservation and recreational enjoyment, and allowing other activities that can affect the use of the cultural site and its setting, such as fire, mining, oil and gas extraction, grazing, and dispersed recreation?</p>

ATTACHMENT A

Resource/ Resource Use	LUP Handbook Decision Guidance	1989 RMP Objectives	Management Opportunities Identified in the AMS	Pre-Plan Questions to Address
	<p>development or use of other resources in the planning area.</p> <p>Identify measures to pro-actively manage, protect, and use cultural resources, including traditional cultural properties.</p> <p>The scope and scale of cultural resource identification are much more general and less intensive for land use planning than for processing site specific use proposals. Instead of new, on-the-ground inventory, the appropriate identification level for land use planning is a regional overview: (1) a compilation and analysis of reasonably available cultural resource data and literature, (2) a management-oriented synthesis of the resulting information (see Manual section 8110.) If land use decisions, however, are more specific in terms of impacts, they may require a more detailed level of identification of the scope and nature of cultural resources during land use planning.</p> <p>RMPs will include at least the following two goals: 1. Preserve and protect significant cultural resources and ensure that they are available for appropriate uses by present and future generations (FLPMA, section 103</p>		<p>If a Cultural Resources Management Plan (CRMP) is still desired, this planning effort can provide interim guidance for the cultural resources program and framework direction for the CRMP.</p>	<p>What kinds of cooperation are needed between the BLM, the tribes, other agencies, and private individuals to protect these areas?</p> <p>Where and how will interpretation be used as an education tool to increase the public’s awareness and appreciation of the cultural resources?</p> <p>Have new historic properties (i.e. National Register sites) including places of traditional cultural importance been identified since the last RMP that require special designation or site-specific use restrictions? Should they be designated a “heritage area” with a land management prescription that emphasizes the properties’ unique and nonrenewable character?</p> <p>Has a paleontological and cultural resource management plan been developed for the Sand Wash Basin?</p>

ATTACHMENT A

Resource/ Resource Use	LUP Handbook Decision Guidance	1989 RMP Objectives	Management Opportunities Identified in the AMS	Pre-Plan Questions to Address
	<p>(c), 201(a), 202(c); National Historic Preservation Act, section 110(a); Archaeological Resources Protection Act, section 14(a)).</p> <p>2. “Seek to reduce imminent threats and resolve potential conflicts from natural or human-caused deterioration, or potential conflict with other resource uses (FLPMA Sec. 103(c), NHPA 106, 110 (a) (2)) by ensuring that all authorizations for land use and resource use will comply with the NHPA Section 106.”</p> <p>All cultural properties in the RMP area, whether already recorded or projected to occur on the basis of existing-data synthesis, including cultural landscapes, will be allocated to the uses listed in Table C-1 according to their nature and relative preservation value. These uses pertain to allocations pertain to cultural resources, not to areas of land.</p>			
<i>Paleontological Resources</i>	Identify criteria or use restrictions to ensure that (a) areas containing, or that are likely to contain, vertebrate or noteworthy occurrences of invertebrate or plant fossils are identified and evaluated prior to authorizing surface-disturbing activities; (b) management recommendations are developed to promote the	To identify and protect the paleontological resources within the Little Snake RMPPA.	Changes in paleontological resources management policy and increases in paleontological resource data should be incorporated into the revised RMP. Decisions for inventory and management of paleontological resources could be determined based on fossil diversity, distribution, and	Has a paleontological and cultural resource management plan been developed for the Sand Wash Basin?

ATTACHMENT A

Resource/ Resource Use	LUP Handbook Decision Guidance	1989 RMP Objectives	Management Opportunities Identified in the AMS	Pre-Plan Questions to Address
	scientific, educational, and recreational uses of fossils; and (c) threats to paleontological resources are identified and mitigated as appropriate.		reasons for their importance to science. Priority areas for inventory could be identified, along with future research needs.	
<i>Special Management Designations</i>	<p>Administrative Designations:</p> <p>1) Manage WSAs under interim mgmt policy until released by Congress. ID management direction for WSAs should they be released from wilderness consideration.</p> <p>2) Assess all river segments and determine suitable/non-suitable for WSR and make recommendation to Congress for inclusion in NWSRS.</p> <p>3) Designate ACECs and identify goals, standards, and objectives for each area, as well as general management practices and uses, including constraints and mitigation measures.</p> <p>4) Designate RNAs and ONAs as types of ACECs using ACEC designation process.</p> <p>5) Designate Back Country Byways, National Recreation Trails, Watchable Wildlife Viewing Sites, Wild Horse and Burrow Ranges, or other BLM admin designations.</p>	<p>To determine the suitability or non-suitability of eight wilderness study areas (WSAs) for wilderness designation.</p> <p>To protect identified areas that contain important historic, cultural, scenic, and natural values or to protect human life and safety from natural hazards, pursuant to the FLPMA and BLM regulations at 43 CFR 1610.</p>	<p>Increased OHV use throughout the LSFO has begun to threaten the wilderness characteristics of WSAs. The revised RMP will need to address this issue through route designations and travel management decisions for these areas in order to continue to protect the wilderness characteristics of the WSAs. Additionally, the revised RMP will need to address BLM guidance, which requires that all WSAs be managed as VRM Class I areas.</p> <p>As part of the RMP revision process, the current ACECs will be evaluated to determine maintenance of relevant and important values. Management prescriptions for these areas will also be reviewed to insure they can protect the identified relevant and important values. The revised RMP will consider whether additional areas should be designated and managed as ACECs.</p> <p>Current law and policy requires that the LSFO, as part of the</p>	<p>Should the existing Little Yampa Canyon SMA continue to be managed as an SRMA? If not, why not? If so, should the existing SRMA boundaries be adjusted, and if so, where?</p> <p>Should Sand Wash Basin be identified as an SRMA? (SRMAs are identified through the planning process, not designated). If so, what, if any, restrictions should be placed on non-recreation uses?</p> <p>Are there other areas or sites in the planning area that warrant special designations to protect unique or special values? If so, where are they located, and what are their values?</p> <p>How will the LSFO River Wild and Scenic Wild and Scenic River Study be completed (preliminary eligibility and classification have been done and suitability study is still required)? Should the LSFO recommend any of its waterways for National Wild and Scenic River System designation? What management is appropriate for public land on waterway segments under study?</p> <p>Are there any management actions beyond the Interim Management Guidelines needed to prevent unnecessary and undue degradation of wilderness characteristics in the existing WSAs. If so, what are they?</p>

ATTACHMENT A

Resource/ Resource Use	LUP Handbook Decision Guidance	1989 RMP Objectives	Management Opportunities Identified in the AMS	Pre-Plan Questions to Address
	<p>Cave and Karst Resources: Identify Significant Caves as mandated by the Federal Cave Resources Protection Act of 1988. Criteria for identification of Significant Caves is set forth in 43 CFR Part 37 Subpart B (c). If it is determined that a cave meets these criteria, it must be designated as significant as set forth in 43 CFR Part 37 Subpart B (f). For each designated Significant Cave, consider whether or not an administrative designation (e.g., ACEC) is needed to provide adequate protection for significant cave resources.</p>		<p>planning process, conduct an analysis and identify river segments that may be eligible and suitable for inclusion in the National Wild and Scenic River System.</p>	<p>What management actions, if any, should be taken to protect possible wilderness characteristics in public wilderness proposals in the planning area?</p> <p>Have the past management actions been effective in protecting the prehistoric rock art in the Irish Canyon ACEC?</p> <p>How will the BLM evaluate ACECs that are nominated by the public?</p>
<i>Visual Resources</i>	<p>Manage visual resource values are managed in accordance with visual resource management (VRM) objectives (management classes). Designate VRM management classes for all areas of BLM land, based on an inventory of visual resources and management considerations for other land uses. VRM management classes may differ from VRM inventory classes, based on management priorities for land uses (see BLM Handbook H- 8410-1 for a description of VRM classes).</p>	N/A	<p>BLM policy requires that the LSFO designate VRM management classes for all areas of BLM-administered land. Visual resource values are to be managed in accordance with visual resource management (VRM) objectives and utilized in the implementation of land use decisions.</p>	<p>What are the visual considerations relating to upland conditions, and how will the BLM's Visual Resource Management (VRM) play a role? How will the BLM's Visual Resource Management (VRM) inventory be updated and what role will it play in resource management?</p>
<i>Coal and Oil Shale</i>	<p>Identify the following consistent with the goals, and objectives for natural resources</p>	<p>Maximize the availability of the federal coal estate for</p>	N/A	<p>Are there areas where mineral development should be recognized as being the highest and best use?</p>

ATTACHMENT A

Resource/ Resource Use	LUP Handbook Decision Guidance	1989 RMP Objectives	Management Opportunities Identified in the AMS	Pre-Plan Questions to Address
	<p>within the planning area:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Unleased coal lands that are acceptable for further consideration for coal leasing and development and those that are not (see 43 CFR 3461). 2. Areas unsuitable for surface mining of coal (43 CFR 1610.7-1) under the criteria set forth in 43 CFR 3461.5. 3. For acceptable lands, areas suitable for development by all mining methods or by only certain stipulated mining methods, such as surface or underground mining (see 43 CFR 3461). 4. Any special conditions that must be met during more detailed planning, lease sale, or <p>post-lease activities, including measures required to protect other resource values (see 43CFR 3461).</p>	<p>exploration and development.</p> <p>Facilitate orderly, economic, and environmentally sound exploration and development of the coal resource within the principles of balanced multiple-use management.</p>		<p>How will energy and mineral development, including pipelines and other infrastructure, be managed to minimize resource conflicts? Are there public lands that should be withdrawn from mineral entry because of conflicts with other public land uses? What types of activities or practices are suitable?</p> <p>Are there areas where some types of energy and mineral development should be restricted or prohibited?</p> <p>How can the RMP best protect existing mineral rights?</p> <p>What are the potential conflicts between coal development and CBM development?</p> <p>What are the visual considerations relating to management of energy and mineral resources, and how will the BLM's VRM play a role?</p> <p>What should the BLM do to protect sub-surface water quality?</p> <p>What reclamation practices will be implemented following mineral development activities?</p> <p>How will changes in resource use and management practices affect the economic stability of small rural communities in Northwest Colorado?</p>
<i>Fluid Minerals</i>	Identify the following consistent with the goals, standards, and objectives for natural resources within the planning area:	Maximize the availability of the federal oil and gas estate for exploration	CBM development has not been addressed in previous plans. Resource development potential, drilling, operational	What lease stipulations and Conditions of Approval are appropriate on oil and gas exploration and development to protect the natural resources?

ATTACHMENT A

Resource/ Resource Use	LUP Handbook Decision Guidance	1989 RMP Objectives	Management Opportunities Identified in the AMS	Pre-Plan Questions to Address
	<p>1. Areas open to leasing, subject to the terms and conditions of the standard lease form.</p> <p>2. Areas open to leasing, subject to minor constraints such as seasonal restrictions. (These are areas where it has been determined that moderately restrictive lease stipulations may be required to mitigate impacts to other land uses or resource values.)</p> <p>3. Areas open to leasing, subject to major constraints such as no-surface-occupancy stipulations on an area more than 40 acres in size or more than 0.25 mile in width. (These are areas where it has been determined that highly restrictive lease stipulations are required to mitigate impacts to other lands or resource values. This category also includes areas where overlapping minor constraints would severely limit development of fluid mineral resources.)</p> <p>4. Areas closed to leasing. (These are areas where it has been determined that other land uses or resource values cannot be adequately protected with even the most restrictive lease stipulations; appropriate protection can be ensured only by closing the lands</p>	<p>and development.</p> <p>Facilitate orderly, economic, and environmentally sound exploration and development of oil and gas resources using balanced multiple-use management.</p>	<p>requirements, spacing, and conflict with other uses should be addressed in detail in the revised RMP. Requirements for production water disposal in each area and possibly from each producing interval (if constituents are different) should also be addressed.</p> <p>Use conflicts among coal production, CBM development, and conventional oil and gas development were not addressed in the 1989 RMP and should be addressed in detail in the revised RMP.</p> <p>In areas of high erosion potential, reclamation has generally taken more time than specified in the lease or COA. The revised RMP should address this issue to minimize resource impacts.</p> <p>The administrative withdrawal of the Vermillion Basin Wilderness Characteristic Study Area (80,000 acres) could preclude energy related activities within this area. This issue should be addressed in the revised RMP.</p> <p>Conventional and unconventional oil and gas well</p>	<p>Are existing lease stipulations appropriate given the current conditions?</p> <p>How should the cumulative impacts of oil and gas development be addressed?</p> <p>What are the impacts and other pertinent issues surrounding access to oil and gas sites?</p> <p>How will the required Coal-bed Methane (CBM) Resource Assessment and development fit into the plan revision?</p> <p>What are the pertinent issues surrounding split-estate lands and impacts to surface owners? What can be done to resolve these issues?</p> <p>What should the BLM do to protect fragile soils? Should provisions to protect them be included in NSOs?</p> <p>What are the monetary impacts to the oil and gas and industry from lease stipulations and conditions of approvals for APDs? Will the increased cost stifle exploration and development of the resource within the LSFO area?</p> <p>How much of the oil and gas resources will be left in the ground as a result of severe mitigation measures or to lands being withdrawn from oil and gas leasing?</p> <p>Are cultural resources being adequately considered during the leasing process? How will LSFO implement the APD process improvements</p>

ATTACHMENT A

Resource/ Resource Use	LUP Handbook Decision Guidance	1989 RMP Objectives	Management Opportunities Identified in the AMS	Pre-Plan Questions to Address
	<p>to leasing.) Identify whether such closures are discretionary or nondiscretionary.</p> <p>5. Lease stipulations that apply to areas open to leasing.</p> <p>6. Whether the leasing and development decisions also apply to geophysical exploration.</p> <p>7. How identified constraints will be applied in areas currently under lease.</p> <p>8. Long term resource condition objectives for areas currently under development to guide reclamation activities prior to abandonment.</p> <p>A determination that lands are available for leasing represents a commitment to allow surface use under standard terms and conditions unless stipulations constraining development are attached to leases. All stipulations must have waiver, exception, or modification criteria documented in the plan (H-1624-1 and 43 CFR 3101.1-4). When applying leasing restrictions, the least restrictive constraint to meet the resource protection objective should be used (see H-1624-1) (<i>Southern Utah Wilderness Alliance et al., 128 IBLA 52 (1993)</i>).</p>		<p>drilling and completion in areas where there is the potential for oil shale development should be addressed in the revised RMP. Oil shale potential areas may be impacted if improper casing length and cementation is used during well drilling and completion to isolate the oil shale intervals.</p> <p>Current lease stipulations and Conditions of Approval (COAs) for oil and gas development should be reviewed to ensure they are consistent with resource management objectives.</p>	<p>identified for cultural resources (See WO IM No 2003-147)</p>

ATTACHMENT A

Resource/ Resource Use	LUP Handbook Decision Guidance	1989 RMP Objectives	Management Opportunities Identified in the AMS	Pre-Plan Questions to Address
<p><i>Locatable Minerals, Mineral Materials, Nonenergy Leasable Minerals, and Others</i></p>	<p>Identify the following consistent with the goals, and objectives for natural resources within the planning area:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Areas open or closed to the operation of the mining laws, mineral material disposal, and non-energy leasing. 2. In open areas, identify any areawide terms, conditions, or other special considerations needed to protect resource values. 	<p>Maximize the availability of the federal mineral estate for mineral exploration and development.</p> <p>Facilitate orderly, economic, and environmentally sound exploration and development of mineral resources within the principles of balanced multiple-use management.</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>How should wind energy resource development potential be incorporated into the revision process?</p>
<p><i>Livestock Grazing Management</i></p>	<p>Identify lands available or not available for livestock grazing (see 43 CFR 4130.2(a)), considering the following factors:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Other uses for the land; 2. terrain characteristics; 3. soil, vegetation, and watershed characteristics; 4. the presence of undesirable vegetation, including significant invasive weed infestations; and 5. the presence of other resources that may require special management or protection, such as special status species, Special Recreation Management Areas (SRMAs), or ACECs. <p>Decisions identifying lands available, or not available, for livestock grazing may be revisited</p>	<p>Improve range conditions in terms of species diversity and abundance, as well as increasing carrying capacities for both livestock and wildlife.</p>	<p>Several modifications and updates to existing livestock grazing management could be included in the revised RMP, such as:</p> <p>Consolidation of Section 15 lands would simplify and enhance management of these areas, with a cost savings to the BLM and livestock operators. This would include land exchanges and disposals.</p> <p>Scattered parcels of land throughout the RMPPA are currently not included in allotments. These areas could be used as common areas for use as relief pastures when forage is not available in</p>	<p>How will livestock grazing be managed to sustain resource values while maintaining stable watersheds and the continued production of forage?</p> <p>Upon review, what areas previously excluded from gazing could be grazed, and under what circumstances? Are there areas where, or situations when, grazing should be excluded? Should there be a grazing rest on vegetative treatments?</p> <p>What grazing practices and other upland practices are necessary to protect T&E species? What about sensitive resource values such as sensitive plants and Special Status species?</p> <p>How much grazing should be allowed? What types of grazing systems and practices should be used for which classes of livestock? Should the BLM adjust grazing capacities to fit with ESI</p>

ATTACHMENT A

Resource/ Resource Use	LUP Handbook Decision Guidance	1989 RMP Objectives	Management Opportunities Identified in the AMS	Pre-Plan Questions to Address
	<p>through the amendment or revision process if the grazing preference or permit on those lands has been voluntarily relinquished, or if there are outstanding requests to voluntarily relinquish the grazing preference. If an evaluation of Land Health Standards identifies an allotment or group of allotments where Land Health Standards cannot be achieved under any level or management of livestock use, then decisions identifying those areas as available for livestock grazing need to be revisited.</p> <p>For lands available for livestock grazing, identify on an areawide basis both the existing permitted use and the future anticipated permitted use with full implementation of the land use plan while maintaining a thriving natural ecological balance and multiple-use relationships. In addition, identify guidelines and criteria for future allotment-specific adjustments in permitted use, season of use, or other grazing management practices (<i>Joel Stamatakis; Steve Stamatakis, 98 IBLM 4 (1987)</i>).</p>		<p>scheduled pastures due to wildfire or vegetation treatments.</p> <p>The increasing elk population is creating conflicts with other grazing animals in areas where they concentrate in the late fall, winter and spring. The Land Health Assessments have identified areas that have been adversely impacted by wildlife. Increased pressure on forage and water is resulting in a downward trend of riparian and upland forage.</p> <p>The 2001 RMP Evaluation Report has also identified several issues that need attention in the revised RMP. According to the report, the discussion of livestock use adjustments as described in planned actions #1 through #5 is no longer accurate. Planned action number 10 (AMPs will be developed for all allotments) has not been implemented. Furthermore, other planned actions (#6 through #10), implementation priorities and monitoring have not been accomplished as described in the RMP. The applicable sections of the RMP should be reviewed to determine if the</p>	<p>data?</p> <p>Are the current allotment boundaries suitable? Do the allotments need to be updated? How will the BLM deal with allotments that cross state lines and unallotted parcels? Will the BLM utilize reserve common allotments? Should the BLM reexamine M, I, C classifications?</p> <p>What new and existing rangeland projects are needed to improve rangeland resource values? What are appropriate standards for range improvements?</p>

ATTACHMENT A

Resource/ Resource Use	LUP Handbook Decision Guidance	1989 RMP Objectives	Management Opportunities Identified in the AMS	Pre-Plan Questions to Address
			current Standard and Guide process adequately addresses these issues and whether additional RMP decisions are required.	
Recreation	<p>Naturalness, Solitude, and Primitive Recreation:</p> <p>1) Identify strategies and decisions that may be applied to protect or preserve certain lands in their natural condition, or to provide outstanding opportunities for solitude, or primitive and unconfined types of recreation activities. Land use plan decisions may include establishing goals and objectives that describe the desired outcome of the land and resources, desired outcome of the solitude or recreation experience, and allowable uses.</p> <p>Recreation and Visitor Services: Identify Special Recreation Management Areas (SRMAs). BLM recognizes three distinct types of SRMAs: 1. Community-Based SRMA; 2. Intensive SRMA; and 3. Undeveloped Big Open SRMA.</p> <p>For each SRMA identified, determine whether that market is Intensive, Community-Based, or</p>	<p>Protect and maintain a diversity of outdoor recreation opportunities, activities, and experiences.</p> <p>Provide high quality visitor services, including interpretive information.</p> <p>Maintain established recreation opportunity spectrum classes upon implementation of all planned management actions.</p> <p>Ensure maintenance and minimize degradation of existing visual resource management classes.</p>	<p>There are many areas of concentrated recreation use in the RMPPA that may benefit from increased management that could be provided by SRMA designation. Decisions concerning designation of Recreation Opportunity Spectrum (ROS) categories are also inadequate. The primitive nature of many areas has changed due to increased visitation and use. New ROS categories or some other system of recreation classification should be considered. Lastly, recreation decisions regarding trail designation and use are non-existent. Given the increasing use of trails in the RMPPA from both motorized and non-motorized recreationists, alternatives could be considered that establish trail designations that determine the appropriate amount, type, and season of use.</p>	<p>What types and levels of recreation should the planning area emphasize, discourage or limit? Do we need to determine and enforce carrying capacity for Special Recreation Permits (SRPs) or other recreation uses?</p> <p>What mix and emphasis of recreation opportunities on the public lands best accommodates a wide variety of users while ensuring resource protection?</p> <p>To what extent, and where (general areas), should the BLM develop facilities and generally improve recreation access opportunities to meet public demand, to provide for public health and safety, and to direct use away from areas of conflict?</p> <p>Should fees be charged for recreation uses? If so, in which geographic areas and/or for which uses?</p>

ATTACHMENT A

Resource/ Resource Use	LUP Handbook Decision Guidance	1989 RMP Objectives	Management Opportunities Identified in the AMS	Pre-Plan Questions to Address
	<p>Undeveloped Big Open. Divide recreation areas that have more than one distinct, primary recreation market, into two separate SRMAs.</p> <p>For each SRMA identified, delineate discrete, Recreation Management Zone (RMZ) boundaries.</p> <p>Anything not delineated as an SRMA is an Extensive Recreation Management Area (ERMA).</p> <p>Interpretation and Environmental Education: Identify the significant resources or areas that will be made available for interpretation. Identify goals and objectives for interpreting those resources and what management actions are necessary to achieve the goals and objectives.</p>			
Lands and Realty	<p>Identify the following consistent with the goals, and objectives for natural resources within the planning area:</p> <p>1. Lands generally required for retention (43 CFR 2400), proposed disposal, or acquisition (based on acquisition criteria identified in the land use plan; FLPMA section 205(b)) (<i>Oregon Natural Resources Council, 78 IBLA 124</i>)</p>	<p>To increase the overall efficiency and effectiveness of public land management by identifying public land suitable for retention or disposal or lands needed or acquisition.</p> <p>To allow the most efficient right-of-way</p>	<p>Criteria concerning land retention, disposal, and acquisition should be reviewed to ensure they provide adequate opportunity to accomplish appropriate land tenure actions.</p> <p>The revised RMP should consider the designation of major ROW corridors.</p> <p>The 1989 RMP identifies</p>	<p>What criteria should be used to identify lands for disposal and acquisition in the Land Tenure Policy Plan?</p> <p>Under what conditions should private land, with high resource values, be purchased from willing sellers?</p> <p>How much access to the public lands is needed, and what types? How should the agencies deal with increased pressure to access private</p>

ATTACHMENT A

Resource/ Resource Use	LUP Handbook Decision Guidance	1989 RMP Objectives	Management Opportunities Identified in the AMS	Pre-Plan Questions to Address
	<p>(1983)). Lands are to be retained in Federal ownership, unless it is determined that disposal of a particular parcel will serve the national interest (FLPMA section 102(1)).</p> <p>2. Lands that are available for disposal under a variety of disposal authorities, provided they meet the criteria provided in FLPMA (section 203 and 206 and 209) or other statutes and regulations.</p> <p>3. Lands identified for disposal that are, or are not, eligible under the Federal Land Transaction Facilitation Act of 2000 (FLTFA). Unless FLTFA is amended, only lands identified for disposal in a land use plan approved prior to July 25, 2000, are eligible.</p> <p>4. Proposed withdrawal areas including existing withdrawals to be continued, modified, or revoked (including how the lands would be managed if the withdrawal were relinquished and an opening order issued) (see 43 CFR 2300).</p> <p>5. Land Classifications under section 7 of the Taylor Grazing Act of 1934, as amended (43 U.S.C. 315f). The procedures</p>	<p>routes while identifying areas that would not be compatible with use as rights-of-way.</p>	<p>specific areas as suitable, unsuitable and sensitive for siting ROWs. These decisions are outdated because changes in data and resource uses, conditions and needs have occurred since completion of the 1989 RMP. As a result, the RMP revision process should include a reassessment of those identified areas and areas where surface disturbing activities are suitable, not suitable, or should be restricted.</p> <p>The 1989 RMP states “minor ROWs will be processed on a case-by-case basis, generally guided by criteria set for major ROWs.” However, it does not include an analysis of communication sites or wind and solar energy development.</p> <p>The revised RMP should include modification of language to ensure that impacts to other resources are considered, guidance for communication site inventory, and guidance relating to BLM memoranda for wind and solar energy development and ROW proposals.</p> <p>In accordance with the 1995 Black-Footed Ferret Reintroduction Amendment,</p>	<p>inholdings? How can the increasing demands for utility corridors and access to communication sites be best addressed?</p> <p>What areas within the planning area should be identified as unsuitable for right-of-way routes for major utilities and roads?</p> <p>Are public access easements needed in some areas?</p> <p>How can the BLM better address trespass situations?</p>

ATTACHMENT A

Resource/ Resource Use	LUP Handbook Decision Guidance	1989 RMP Objectives	Management Opportunities Identified in the AMS	Pre-Plan Questions to Address
	<p>applicable to section 7 outlined in 43 CFR 2400 must be followed. The following actions require classification: Recreation and Public Purposes Act sales (see 43 CFR 2740) and leases (see 43 CFR 2912); agricultural entries (see 43 CFR 2520, 2530, 2610); and state grants (see 43 CFR 2620). To the extent that the land use planning procedures pursuant to 43 CFR 1600 differ from applicable classification procedures under 43 CFR 2400, the latter procedures shall be followed and applied. The analysis that supports classification decisions is normally the same analysis utilized in the land use planning/NEPA process to make decisions concerning the disposal or retention of public lands. For any classification decision made through the land use plan, initiate the classification decision requirements (i.e., proposed and initial decisions required under 43 CFR 2400) at the time the decision document is issued for the land use plan.</p> <p>6. Where and under what circumstances authorizations for use, occupancy, and development (such as major leases and land use permits) may be granted (see 43 CFR 2740/2912, 43 CFR 2912, 43</p>		<p>ROWS on public land that have the potential to disturb occupied black-footed ferret habitat will be rerouted to avoid those prairie dog towns. This decision may need to be modified in the revised RMP based on updated data and analysis.</p> <p>The revised RMP should include language that addresses land use planning for lands acquired through exchange.</p> <p>The revised RMP should review and resolve the inconsistencies found in the 1989 RMP regarding acquisition areas identified in Map 3 and those in Appendix 3.</p> <p>Lands acquired since approval of the 1989 RMP do not have land use plan decisions applied to them. Therefore, the revised RMP may need to assess the need for updated decisions regarding these areas.</p>	

ATTACHMENT A

Resource/ Resource Use	LUP Handbook Decision Guidance	1989 RMP Objectives	Management Opportunities Identified in the AMS	Pre-Plan Questions to Address
	<p>CFR 2911, and 43 CFR 2920, respectively).</p> <p>7. Right-of-way corridors, avoidance areas, and exclusion areas, along with any general terms and conditions that may apply (see 43 CFR Part 2800 and 2880).</p> <p>8. Identify both existing and potential corridors (potential corridors include existing right-of-way routes that can be considered for additional facilities and thus be considered a corridor if not already designated). Identify existing and potential right-of-way development areas for renewable energy projects (e.g., wind, solar, biomass, geothermal), communication sites, and other uses; describe likely development of potential corridors and other right-of-way sites as a basis for impact assessment and development of stipulations or conditions of use, and describe limitations on other uses in the potential corridors or a potential right-of-way development sites which would be necessary to maintain the corridor and right-of-way values.</p>			
<i>Transportation and Access</i>	1. Delineating Travel Management Areas	N/A	The RMP revision process should address whether there are continuing needs for access	Do we need to ensure consistency in BLM travel management strategies with the U.S. Forest Service and other agencies? If so, how? What

ATTACHMENT A

Resource/ Resource Use	LUP Handbook Decision Guidance	1989 RMP Objectives	Management Opportunities Identified in the AMS	Pre-Plan Questions to Address
	<p>Comprehensive travel management planning should address all resource use aspects (recreational, traditional, casual, agricultural, industrial, educational etc.) and accompanying modes and conditions of travel on the public lands, not just motorized or off-highway vehicle activities. The travel management areas (polygons) should identify acceptable modes of access and travel for each area (including over-land, over-water, over-snow and fly-in access (remote airstrips and float planes). These travel management areas should be developed and delineated in the RMP. In developing these areas, consider the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Consistency with all resource program goals and objectives; b. Primary travelers; c. Objectives for allowing travel in the area; d. Setting characteristics that are to be maintained (including ROS and VRM settings); and e. Primary means of travel allowed to accomplish the objectives and to maintain the setting characteristics. <p>2. Designation of Off-Highway Vehicle Management Areas All public lands are required to have OHV area designations (see</p>		<p>or additional road development. Additionally, the 1989 RMP designated areas open, limited or closed to OHV use. These OHV designations should be re-evaluated to determine if they are still valid.</p> <p>In accordance with the 1995 Black-Footed Ferret Reintroduction Amendment, OHV use will be closed within ¼ mile of release cages or release sites for 3-4 months during the release period. This decision may need to be modified in the revised RMP based on changes in data and resource uses, conditions and needs.</p>	<p>other jurisdictional issues, including with local counties, need to be addressed?</p> <p>Are there resources or areas that are significantly impacted negatively by either motorized or non-motorized modes of travel? Where does the BLM need to restrict motorized or non-motorized use? Where do we need to address planning for motorized and non-motorized routes?</p> <p>How will we design our travel system for designated routes and areas? Does resource damage and conflicts with other uses warrant the designation of “existing,” “designated,” or “closed” routes?</p> <p>How is the current road system impacting other resources and uses? How will future increased use impact resources?</p> <p>How should the road system be managed to provide access while protecting resources (seasonal closures, designated routes, maintenance, upgrades, reclamation, new roads, etc)?</p> <p>What roads and trails should be added to the official road system to protect resources through active maintenance? What roads and trails should be maintained, upgraded, abandoned, or constructed?</p> <p>If the BLM decides to change the area designation to "limited to existing routes," how should the BLM manage routes that are not on the official BLM road and trail system?</p>

ATTACHMENT A

Resource/ Resource Use	LUP Handbook Decision Guidance	1989 RMP Objectives	Management Opportunities Identified in the AMS	Pre-Plan Questions to Address
	<p>43 CFR 8342.1). Areas, roads and trails must be classified as open, limited, or closed to motorized travel activities. Criteria for open, limited, and closed area designations are established in 43 CFR 8340.0-5 (f) (g) and (h), respectively.</p> <p>For areas classified as “limited” consider a full range of possibilities, including travel that will be: limited to types or modes of travel, such as foot, equestrian, bicycle, motorized, etc., limited to existing roads and trails, limited to time or season of use, limited to certain types of vehicles (OHVs, motorcycles, ATVs, high clearance, etc.), limited to licensed or permitted vehicles or users, limited to BLM administrative use only, or other types of limitations. In addition, provide specific guidance about the process for managing motorized vehicle access for authorized, permitted or otherwise approved vehicles for those specific categories of motorized vehicle uses that are exempt from a limited designation (see 43 CFR 8340.0-5 (a) (1-5).</p> <p>At a minimum, the travel management area designation for wilderness study areas (WSAs) must be “limited” to ways and</p>			

ATTACHMENT A

Resource/ Resource Use	LUP Handbook Decision Guidance	1989 RMP Objectives	Management Opportunities Identified in the AMS	Pre-Plan Questions to Address
	<p>trails existing at the time of inventory, unless “open” is appropriate for a sand dune or snow area. Existing roads, ways and trails must be fully documented and mapped. This applies to both motorized and mechanized transport (see Wilderness Study Area Handbook H-8550-1, I.B.11, and refer to 43 CFR 8364.1 for mechanized transport). In addition, future designations may be made for a WSA if it is released from study.</p> <p>Except as otherwise provided by law (e.g., the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act), congressionally designated wilderness areas are statutorily closed to motorized and mechanized use. These areas should be shown in the land use plans along with the acreage affected.</p> <p>Existing laws, proclamations, regulations or Executive Orders may limit the use of the “open” area designation or impose additional requirements relating to travel management in specific circumstances.</p> <p>For RMP provisions related to National Scenic, Historic and</p>			

ATTACHMENT A

Resource/ Resource Use	LUP Handbook Decision Guidance	1989 RMP Objectives	Management Opportunities Identified in the AMS	Pre-Plan Questions to Address
	<p>National Recreation Trails, National Back Country Byways or other byway designations, see section Appendix C III Special Designations.</p> <p>Identify land areas available or suitable for transportation facilities. Identify types of transportation facilities that are appropriate for the planning area. Identify limitations, if any, on the types or locations of facilities for specified areas.</p> <p>Identify the area(s) having in-place transportation facilities that should be removed. Identify road repair, road rehabilitation, road construction, and maintenance standards appropriate to specific areas. Identify limitations, if any, on road repair, road rehabilitation, road construction, and maintenance actions. Identify limitations, if any, on road density (ie. miles/section) for specific areas.</p>			