Appendix T
Summary of Impacts

This page intentionally left blank.

Appendix T. Summary of Impacts

Table T-1 summarizes the environmental impacts associated with the alternatives. Resources and resource uses in **Table T-1** are presented in the same order as **Chapter 2**, Alternatives. For the detailed impacts analysis for each topic, refer to **Chapter 4**, Environmental Consequences.

Table T-1: Impacts Summary

Management Action	Alternative A (No Action)	Alternative B	Alternative C (Proposed RMP~~Draft RMP/EIS Preferred~~)	Alternative D	~~Alternative E (Proposed RMP)~~
Air Resources (Section 4.2.1)					
Fire Management (Section 4.2.1.2.1)	Fire management decisions would have both adverse and beneficial impacts on air quality. Fuel treatments are proposed for up to 32,000 acres per year in the Decision Area, with up to 23,000 acres treated by prescribed burning annually. Short-term impacts include an increase in particulate matter 2.5 microns in diameter or smaller ($PM_{2.5}$), particulate matter 10 microns in diameter or smaller (PM_{10}), carbon monoxide, and ozone during prescribed fires. Long-term impacts include a reduction of wildfire threat, healthier vegetation, and carbon sequestration. Average annual emissions would range from 330 tons to 1,300 tons of PM_{10} and 230 to 1,030 tons of $PM_{2.5}$ annually, with an expected annual average of 930 and 685 tons of PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$.				
Mineral Resources (Section 4.2.1.2.2)	Increased emissions from oil and gas development would have an adverse impact on air quality. The impact is expected to be minor due to the low level of reasonably foreseeable development in the Decision Area (78 wells over the life of the RMP under all alternatives). Those areas closed to fluid leasable minerals would experience localized beneficial impacts on air quality; 60,000 acres would be closed to fluid leasable minerals. Annual emissions are estimated at 34 tons PM_{10}, 5 tons $PM_{2.5}$, 39 tons nitrogen oxides, 3 tons sulfur dioxide, 16 tons carbon monoxide, 99 tons volatile organic compounds, and 8 tons of hazardous air pollutants.	Same as Alternative A, except 99,000 acres would be closed to fluid leasable minerals.	Same as Alternative A, except 79,200 acres would be closed to fluid leasable minerals.	Same as Alternative A, except 57,300 acres would be closed to fluid leasable minerals.	~~Same as Alternative A, except 56,900 acres would be closed to fluid leasable minerals.~~

Management Action	Alternative A (No Action)	Alternative B	Alternative C (Proposed RMP~~Draft RMP/EIS Preferred~~)	Alternative D	~~Alternative E (Proposed RMP)~~
Mineral Resources (Section 4.2.1.2.2) *(continued)*	An estimated 0.045 million metric tons (MMT) of carbon dioxide equivalents would be generated annually from well construction and operation. Downstream combustion emissions from produced oil and gas are estimated at 2.5 MMT over the life of the RMP.	*(see above)*	*(see above)*	*(see above)*	~~*(see above)*~~
Travel Management (Section 4.2.1.2.3)	Increased recreation would adversely affect air quality through increased vehicle emissions, where motorized travel is open (301,900 acres), limited to existing routes (327,600 acres), and closed (102,100 acres).	There would be beneficial impacts on air quality through reduced vehicle emissions, where motorized travel would be closed (176,600 acres). No areas would be fully open to motorized travel. There would be some adverse impacts on air quality due to vehicle emissions, where motorized travel would be limited to designated primitive roads and trails on 550,500 acres; 4,600 acres would remain open.	Same as Alternative A, except motorized travel would be open on 18,300 acres and limited to designated primitive roads and trails on 589,300 acres; 124,000 acres would be closed.	Same as Alternative A, except motorized travel would be open on 19,500 acres and limited to designated primitive roads and trails on 614,300 acres; 97,800 acres would be closed.	~~Same as Alternative A, except motorized travel would be open on 18,300 acres and limited to designated primitive roads and trails on 615,500 acres; 97,800 acres would be closed.~~
Cave and Karst Resources (Section 4.2.2)					
Cultural Resources (Section 4.2.2.1.4)	Management restrictions associated with cultural resources would provide an indirect benefit to caves and karst features. This is because less surface disturbance is generally allowed to take place near cultural resource sites.				

Management Action	Alternative A (No Action)	Alternative B	Alternative C (Proposed RMP~~Draft RMP/EIS Preferred~~)	Alternative D	~~Alternative E (Proposed RMP)~~
Lands and Realty (Section 4.2.2.1.1)	Karst areas and other unidentified caves may be located on parcels identified for potential disposal, which would result in an adverse impact on cave and karst resources; ~~54,900~~55,900 acres are identified for disposal.	Same as Alternative A, except 57,000 acres are identified for potential disposal.	Same as Alternative A, except ~~117,300~~131,900 acres are identified for potential disposal.	Same as Alternative CA, ~~except 120,400 acres are identified for potential disposal~~.	~~Same as Alternative A, except 129,500 acres are identified for potential disposal.~~
Mineral Resources (Section 4.2.2.1.2)	Mineral resources management decisions would adversely affect cave and karst resources, where proposed mineral extraction would take place in or near cave or karst features; 566,462 acres of cave and karst features are open with standard leasing terms and conditions. The RPFO would be able to move the location of oil and gas wells up to 200 meters (656 feet) for mitigation purposes.	Same as Alternative A, except that all known cave entrances, passages, or aspects of significant caves or significant karst features would be managed as NSO within 200 meters (656 feet) of known features.	Same as Alternative A, except that all known cave entrances, passages. or aspects of significant caves or significant karst features would be managed as CSU within 200 meters (656 feet) of known features.	Same as Alternative A.	~~Same as Alternative A.~~

Management Action	Alternative A (No Action)	Alternative B	Alternative C (Proposed RMP~~Draft RMP/EIS Preferred~~)	Alternative D	~~Alternative E (Proposed RMP)~~
Recreation and Visitor Services (Section 4.2.2.1.3)	Recreation and visitor services management decisions would have both adverse and beneficial impacts on cave and karst resources. Increased visitation could degrade unique features. Areas closed to OHV travel could have beneficial impacts on cave and karst resources. SRMAs are not proposed under this alternative.	Same as Alternative A, except 1,100 acres of cave and karst features would be in proposed SMRAs and ERMAs.	Same as Alternative B.	Same as Alternative B.	~~Same as Alternative A.~~
Special Designations (Section 4.2.2.1.5)	Special designations would have a beneficial impact on cave and karst resources when they restrict surface-disturbing activities within the boundaries of the particular designation; 46,000 acres of ACEC designations are proposed.	Same as Alternative A, except 133,290 acres are proposed for ACEC designation.	Same as Alternative B, except 122,990 acres are proposed for ACEC designation.	Same as Alternative A, except 38,290 acres are proposed for ACEC designation.	~~Same as Alternative A, except 21,690 acres are proposed for ACEC designation.~~
Soil and Water (Section 4.2.2.1.6)	Soil and water decisions would have a beneficial indirect impact on cave and karst resources because those policies, laws, and proposed actions to protect soil and water would also protect cave and karst resources.				
Paleontological Resources (Section 4.2.2.1.7)	Paleontological resources decisions would provide an indirect benefit to caves and karst features. This is because less surface disturbance is generally allowed to take place near paleontological resource sites.				
Special Status Species (Section 4.2.2.1.8)	Special status species decisions would provide an indirect benefit to cave and karst features. This is because less surface disturbance is generally allowed to take place near special status species habitat.				

Management Action	Alternative A (No Action)	Alternative B	Alternative C (Proposed RMP~~Draft RMP/EIS Preferred~~)	Alternative D	~~Alternative E (Proposed RMP)~~
Cultural Resources (Section 4.2.3)					
Cultural Resources (Section 4.2.3.2.6)	Cultural resource management decisions would have beneficial impacts on cultural resources. This is because Azabache Station, Big Bend Mesa, and the Headcut Prehistoric Community would be managed to protect the cultural resources from surface-disturbing activities.	Same as Alternative A, except Fort Site and Ojo Pueblo would also be managed to restrict surface-disturbing activities in the 60-acre parcel where the sites occur.	Same as Alternative B.	Same as Alternative A, except Azabache Station would be managed to protect the cultural resources from surface-disturbing activities.	~~Same as Alternative D.~~
Fire Management (Section 4.2.3.2.2)	Proposed fuels treatments would both adversely and beneficially affect cultural resources. Adverse impacts include potential burning and ground disturbance of artifacts. Beneficial impacts include improved herbaceous cover and the reduction of catastrophic wildfire risk to sites. Fuels treatments would take place on 12,800 acres with high site probability and 235,900 acres with medium site probability.				
Forests and Woodlands (Section 4.2.3.2.8)	Forest and woodland management decisions would have beneficial impacts on cultural resources because no lands with high site probability would be proposed for forest product harvest areas.	Forest and woodland management decisions could have adverse and beneficial impacts on cultural resources; 3,400 acres with high site probability would be proposed for forest product harvest areas.	Same as Alternative B, except 9,600 acres with high site probability would be proposed for forest product harvest areas.	Same as Alternative B, except 11,800 acres with high site probability would be proposed for forest product harvest areas.	~~Same as Alternative D.~~
Lands and Realty (Section 4.2.3.2.3)	Proposed land disposals would have adverse impacts on cultural resources when cultural resource sites are on the proposed disposal parcels; 1,100 acres with high site probability for cultural resources could be proposed for disposal.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A, except 1,300 acres with high site probability for cultural resources would be considered for disposal.	Same as Alternative A, except 4,400 acres with high site probability for cultural resources would be proposed for disposal.	~~Same as Alternative C.~~

Commented [AA1]: This whole row (Alts A-D) to be verified with revised disposal data

Management Action	Alternative A (No Action)	Alternative B	Alternative C (Proposed RMP~~Draft RMP/EIS Preferred~~)	Alternative D	~~Alternative E (Proposed RMP)~~
Livestock Grazing (Section 4.2.3.2.7)	Livestock grazing management decisions would adversely affect cultural resources when livestock trample cultural resource sites. Grazing allotments make up approximately ~~89~~ 87 percent of the Decision Area.	Same as Alternative A, and livestock grazing management decisions would beneficially affect cultural resources because grazing would be unavailable within all special designations and riparian areas.	Same as Alternative B, except livestock grazing would be available only where grazing does not conflict with resources protected by the special designation and riparian areas.	Same as Alternative C.	~~Same as Alternative C.~~
Mineral Resources (Section 4.2.3.2.1)	Cultural resources could be adversely affected by mineral resources management decisions, but the impacts are expected to be negligible. This is because of the low predicted mineral development over the next 20 years (1.2 percent of the Decision Area), compliance with NHPA Section 106, and the leasing stipulations that would be applied to specific mineral development activities.				
Recreation and Visitor Services (Section 4.2.3.2.5)	Management decisions for recreation and visitor services could have adverse impacts on cultural resources from increased visitation. Recreation would continue in the Decision Area as currently managed. No SRMAs are managed under Alternative A.	Management decisions for recreation and visitor services would have both beneficial and adverse impacts on cultural resources; 286,800 acres would be managed as SRMAs and ERMAs, which would provide protection from mineral resource development. This would be the case where they are managed as CSU for fluid leasable minerals, closed to salable mineral extraction, or recommended for withdrawal from locatable mineral entry.	Same as Alternative B.	Same as Alternative B.	Same as Alternative B.

Management Action	Alternative A (No Action)	Alternative B	Alternative C (Proposed RMP~~Draft RMP/EIS Preferred~~)	Alternative D	~~Alternative E (Proposed RMP)~~
Special Designations (Section 4.2.3.2.4)	Special designations would provide long-term benefits due to reduced surface disturbance on ~~155,300~~158,200 acres managed as special designations, 105,900 acres of which do not overlap other special designation areas.	Same as Alternative A, except ~~269,300~~265,500 acres would be managed as special designations, 112,500 acres of which do not overlap other special designation areas.	Same as Alternative A, except ~~244,000~~235,200 acres would be managed as special designations, 112,900 acres of which do not overlap other special designation areas.	Same as Alternative A, except ~~147,600~~150,500 acres would be managed as special designations, 114,400 acres of which do not overlap other special designation areas.	~~Same as Alternative A, except 133,800 acres would be managed as special designations.~~
Travel Management (Section 4.2.3.2.9)	Travel management decisions that decrease motorized access would have beneficial impacts on cultural resources, while those decisions to open areas to motorized travel would have adverse impacts on cultural resources; 7,900 acres of high cultural resource site densities would be managed as limited to existing routes; 3,100 acres of high cultural resource site densities would be closed to motorized travel; and 3,900 acres of high cultural resource site densities would be open to motorized travel.	Same as Alternative A, except 8,300 acres of high cultural resource site densities would be managed as limited to designated primitive roads and trails, and 3,500 acres of high cultural resource site densities would be open to motorized travel.	Same as Alternative A, except 11,800 acres of high cultural resource site densities would be limited to designated primitive roads and trails, and 0 acres would be open.	Same as Alternative C.	~~Same as Alternative C.~~
Fire Management (Section 4.2.4)					
Cultural Resources (Section 4.2.4.1.1)	Cultural resources decisions may have adverse impacts on fire management because of restrictions on potential treatment areas. Restrictions would be applied on a case-by-case basis, and site-specific NEPA analyses would be applied for prescribed burns.				

Commented [AA3]: To be updated based on changed CDNST acres

Commented [AA4]: To be updated based on changed CDNST acres

Commented [AA5]: To be updated based on changed CDNST acres

Commented [AA2]: To be updated based on changed CDNST acres

Management Action	Alternative A (No Action)	Alternative B	Alternative C (Proposed RMP~~Draft RMP/EIS Preferred~~)	Alternative D	~~Alternative E (Proposed RMP)~~
Forests and Woodlands (Section 4.2.4.1.2)	Forest and woodland management decisions would have short-term adverse impacts because of the increased fuel load for thinned trees on the ground. There would be long-term beneficial impacts because the fuelwood harvest would reduce fuel load once the firewood is removed. Accordingly, there would be 12,200 total acres of designated forest product harvest areas in the RPFO fire management units.	Same as Alternative A, except there would be 120,600 total acres of designated forest product harvest areas win the RPFO fire management units, providing for more beneficial impacts on fire management.	Same as Alternative A, except there would be 547,800 total acres of designated forest product harvest areas in the RPFO fire management units, providing for more beneficial impacts on fire management.	Same as Alternative A, except there would be 633,600 total acres of designated forest product harvest areas in RPFO fire management units, providing for more beneficial impacts on fire management.	~~Same as Alternative A, except there would be 633,700 total acres of designated forest product harvest areas within RPFO fire management units, providing for the most beneficial impacts on fire management.~~
Fire Management (Section 4.2.4.1.3)	Fire management decisions would have beneficial impacts on fire management because they would improve FRCC levels in the Decision Area. Up to approximately 32,000 acres of land rated FRCC 2 or 3 would be treated annually on the Decision Area, depending on budgetary and time constraints.				
Lands and Realty (Section 4.2.4.1.4)	Lands and realty decisions could have adverse impacts on fire management. This is because the disposal of land could lead to an increased development of infrastructure next to public lands. There would be 50,500 total acres of potential disposal in FRCC 2 and 3.	Same as Alternative A, except there would be 52,300 total acres of potential disposal in FRCC 2 and 3.	Same as Alternative A, except there would be 100,900 total acres of potential disposal in FRCC 2 and 3.	Same as Alternative A, except there would be 103,100 total acres of potential disposal in FRCC 2 and 3.	~~Same as Alternative A, except there would be 109,600 total acres of potential disposal in FRCC 2 and 3.~~

Commented [AA6]: This whole row (Alts A-D) to be verified with revised disposal data

Management Action	Alternative A (No Action)	Alternative B	Alternative C (Proposed RMP~~Draft RMP/EIS Preferred~~)	Alternative D	~~Alternative E (Proposed RMP)~~
Livestock Grazing (Section 4.2.4.1.5)	Livestock grazing would have both adverse and beneficial impacts on fire management. Adverse impacts from grazing would result in alterations to FRCC within the Decision Area. There could be beneficial impacts from reducing the understory vegetation fuel load and an increased availability of water for fire suppression. There would be 602,700 acres of proposed livestock grazing in RPFO fire management units.	Same as Alternative A, except there would be, 440,400, acres of proposed livestock grazing in RPFO fire management units.	Same as Alternative A, except there would be 602,700 acres of proposed livestock grazing in RPFO fire management units.	Same as Alternative A, except there would be 602,800 acres of proposed livestock grazing in RPFO fire management units.	~~Same as Alternative A, except there would be 602,700 acres of proposed livestock grazing in RPFO fire management units.~~
Travel Management (Section 4.2.4.1.6)	Travel management decisions would have a beneficial impact on fire management in those areas identified in the RMP/EIS for closure to travel; 102,100 acres would be closed to travel.	Same as Alternative A, except 176,600 acres would be closed to travel, with the most beneficial impacts on fire management.	Same as Alternative A, except 124,000 acres would be closed to travel.	Same as Alternative A, except 97,800 acres would be closed to travel.	~~Same as Alternative D.~~
Vegetative Communities (Section 4.2.4.1.7)	Vegetation treatment would have beneficial impacts on fire management because it would result in the long-term reduction of fire threats. Because vegetation treatments in the Decision Area are not identified in the RMP/EIS, there would need to be site-specific NEPA analyses would need to occur before treatment.				

Management Action	Alternative A (No Action)	Alternative B	Alternative C (Proposed RMP~~Draft RMP/EIS Preferred~~)	Alternative D	~~Alternative E (Proposed RMP)~~
Wildlife, Special Status Species, and Fisheries (Section 4.2.4.1.8)	No adverse impacts on fire management are expected.	Proposed surface restrictions to protect wildlife could require the modification of fire management during specific periods, thus resulting in adverse impacts on fire management decisions; 243,500 acres of surface protection would be proposed to protect wildlife within the Decision Area.	Same as Alternative B, except 214,100 acres of surface protection would be proposed to protect wildlife within the Decision Area.	Same as Alternative B, except 198,500 acres of surface protection would be proposed to protect wildlife within the Decision Area.	~~Same as Alternative B, except 198,300 acres of surface protection would be proposed to protect wildlife within the Decision Area.~~
Forests and Woodlands (Section 4.2.5)					
Fire Management (Section 4.2.5.2.1)	Up to approximately 32,000 acres of land rated FRCC 2 or 3 could be treated annually in the Decision Area. Fire management decisions would provide long-term beneficial impacts on forests and woodlands. This is because fuels treatments would improve forest conditions. Short-term adverse impacts would include the removal of vegetation during fuels treatments.				
Forests and Woodlands (Section 4.2.5.2.2)	Forest and woodland management decisions would have a beneficial impact on forest health. This is because the RPFO would use best management practices as specified under **Section 2.2.5.3**.				

Management Action	Alternative A (No Action)	Alternative B	Alternative C (Proposed RMP~~Draft RMP/EIS Preferred~~)	Alternative D	~~Alternative E (Proposed RMP)~~
Mineral Resources (Section 4.2.5.2.3)	Mineral resources management decisions could adversely affect forests and woodlands if proposed mineral extraction takes place in forest product harvest areas. There would be beneficial impacts where forests and woodlands are NSO, CSU, or closed to fluid mineral leasing (~~43,000~~43,400 acres), closed to salable mineral extraction (~~84,100~~84,600 acres), and recommended for withdrawal from locatable mineral entry (~~11,500~~3,400 acres).	Same as Alternative A, except ~~63,800~~64,200 acres would be managed as closed to fluid mineral leasing, ~~130,900~~135,800 acres would be closed to salable mineral extraction, and ~~169,800~~166,600 acres would be recommended for withdrawal from locatable mineral entry.	Same as Alternative A, except ~~55,100~~55,500 acres would be managed as closed to fluid mineral leasing, ~~100,900~~105,300 acres would be closed to salable mineral extraction, and ~~162,800~~159,200 acres would be recommended for withdrawal from locatable mineral entry.	Same as Alternative A, except ~~41,600~~42,100 acres would be managed as closed to fluid mineral leasing, ~~84,100~~84,500 acres would be closed to salable mineral extraction, and ~~16,900~~8,800 acres would be recommended for withdrawal from locatable mineral entry.	~~Same as Alternative A, except 41,500 acres would be managed as closed to fluid mineral leasing, 83,200 acres would be closed to salable mineral extraction, and 10,500 acres would be recommended for withdrawal from locatable mineral entry.~~
Travel Management (Section 4.2.5.2.4)	Travel management decisions would have both beneficial and adverse impacts on forests and woodlands; 194,400 forest product harvest acres would be open to motorized travel, 245,200 acres would be limited to existing routes, and 79,500 would be closed to motorized travel.	Same as Alternative A, except 123,400 acres would be closed to motorized travel, 392,600 acres would be limited to designated primitive roads and trails in the forest product harvest areas, and 3,200 acres would be open.	Same as Alternative A, except 87,200 acres of forest product harvest acres would be closed to motorized travel, 7,300 acres would be open, and 424,600 acres would be limited to designated primitive roads and trails.	Same as Alternative A, except 76,500 acres of forest product harvest acres would be closed to motorized travel, 7,500 acres would be open, and 435,200 acres would be limited to designated primitive roads and trails.	~~Same as Alternative A, except 76,500 acres of forest product harvest acres would be closed to motorized travel, 200 acres would be open, and 442,500 acres would be limited to designated primitive roads and trails.~~

Commented [AA10]: To be verified with revised Alt D CSU data

Commented [AA7]: To be updated with revised data for Alt B closed to salable minerals

Commented [AA9]: To be updated with revised data for Alt C closed to salable minerals

Commented [AA8]: To be updated with revised data for Alt B recommended for withdrawal from locatable minerals

Management Action	Alternative A (No Action)	Alternative B	Alternative C (Proposed RMP~~Draft RMP/EIS Preferred~~)	Alternative D	~~Alternative E (Proposed RMP)~~
Protection of Public Health, Safety, and Environment (Section 4.2.6)					
Mineral Resources (Section 4.2.6.2.1)	Hazardous materials risk from the use, generation, storage, transportation, or disposal of hazardous materials would be negligible, given the small number of wells projected. Nevertheless, any mineral exploration and development could increase the potential for adverse hazardous materials risks in the Decision Area.	Same as Alternative A, except that the RPFO would manage 50 acres as the Legacy Uranium Mines ACEC to protect health and safety by leasing fluid minerals with an NSO stipulation and closing the ACEC to salable mineral extraction.	Same as Alternative B.	Same as Alternative B.	~~Same as Alternative B.~~
Special Designations (Section 4.2.6.2.2)	Special designations would provide long-term benefits. This is because of surface disturbance restrictions on ~~155,300~~158,200 acres managed as special designations, 105,900 acres of which do not overlap other special designation areas.	Same as Alternative A, except ~~269,300~~265,500 acres would be managed as special designations, 112,500 acres of which do not overlap other special designation areas.	Same as Alternative A, except ~~244,000~~235,200 acres would be managed as special designations, 112,900 acres of which do not overlap other special designation areas.	Same as Alternative A, except ~~147,600~~150,500 acres would be managed as special designations, 114,400 acres of which do not overlap other special designation areas.	~~Same as Alternative A, except 133,800 acres would be managed as special designations.~~

Commented [AA12]: To be updated based on changed CDNST acres

Commented [AA13]: To be updated based on changed CDNST acres

Commented [AA14]: To be updated based on changed CDNST acres

Commented [AA11]: To be updated based on changed CDNST acres

Management Action	Alternative A (No Action)	Alternative B	Alternative C (Proposed RMP~~Draft RMP/EIS Preferred~~)	Alternative D	~~Alternative E (Proposed RMP)~~
Lands and Realty (Section 4.2.7)					
Land Tenure Adjustments (Section 4.2.7.2.1)	The types of direct impacts on the lands and realty program are when other resources are present, preventing or making it considerably more difficult to complete a transaction; ~~54,900~~55,900 acres meet FLPMA Section 203 criteria for disposal out of federal ownership. Approximately ~~683,300~~682,300 are proposed for retention. Under Alternative A, the smallest percentage of lands meet FLPMA Section 203 criteria for disposal out of federal ownership, and the RPFO has the opportunity to retain the most lands.	Same as Alternative A, except 57,000 acres meet FLPMA Section 203 criteria for disposal out of federal ownership. Approximately 681,200 are proposed for retention.	Same as Alternative A, except ~~117,300~~131,900 acres meet FLPMA Section 203 criteria for disposal out of federal ownership. Approximately ~~620,900~~606,300 are proposed for retention.	Same as Alternative ~~A, except 120,400 acres meet FLPMA Section 203 criteria for disposal out of federal ownership. Approximately 617,800 are proposed for retention~~C.	~~Same as Alternative A, except 129,500 acres meet FLPMA Section 203 criteria for disposal out of federal ownership. Approximately 607,900 are proposed for retention. Under Alternative E, the largest percentage of RPFO BLM-administered lands meet FLPMA Section 203 criteria for disposal out of federal ownership.~~
Rights-of-way (Section 4.2.7.2.2)	Right-of-way development would be allowed on 583,600 acres, avoided on 44,700 acres, and excluded on 103,300 acres.	Right-of-way development would be allowed on 70,900 acres, avoided on 68,200 acres, and excluded on 592,400 acres. Alternative B has the most restrictions on ROWs and the greatest adverse impact on land use authorizations.	Right-of-way development would be allowed on 88,200 acres, avoided on 406,000 acres, and excluded on 237,400 acres.	Right-of-way development would be allowed on 98,100 acres, avoided on 535,300 ~~423,800~~ acres, and excluded on 97,800~~209,600~~ acres.	~~Right-of-way development would be allowed on 607,900 acres, avoided on 26,100 acres, and excluded on 97,700 acres. Alternative E has the fewest restrictions and the fewest adverse impacts on land use authorizations.~~

Management Action	Alternative A (No Action)	Alternative B	Alternative C (Proposed RMP~~Draft RMP/EIS Preferred~~)	Alternative D	~~Alternative E (Proposed RMP)~~
Lands with Wilderness Characteristics (Section 4.2.8)					
Fire Management (Section 4.2.8.1.1)	There are no management decisions specific to lands with wilderness characteristics under this alternative.	Fire management would have short-term adverse impacts caused by noise and the presence of people, equipment, and operations, and evidence of stumps; however, it would result in long-term beneficial impacts from the restored natural landscape, which would enhance wilderness characteristic. There are 15,000 fuel treatment acres in lands with wilderness characteristics.	Same as Alternative B, except that 11,900 fuel treatment acres would be in lands with wilderness characteristics.	Same as Alternative B, except that no fuel treatment acres would be in lands with wilderness characteristics.	~~Same as Alternative D.~~

Management Action	Alternative A (No Action)	Alternative B	Alternative C (Proposed RMP~~Draft RMP/EIS Preferred~~)	Alternative D	~~Alternative E (Proposed RMP)~~
Forests and Woodlands (Section 4.2.8.1.6)	There are no management decisions specific to lands with wilderness characteristics under this alternative.	Lands with wilderness characteristics (37,500 acres) would be closed to forest product removal. This closes an additional 1,100 acres of lands with wilderness characteristics to forest product removal that are not in SRMAs but are closed to forest product removal under Alternative B.	Under this alternative, 11,100 acres of lands with wilderness characteristics managed to partially protect wilderness would be open to forest product removal. Vehicle travel associated with forest product removal would be limited to designated primitive roads and trails; 26,040 acres of lands with wilderness characteristics managed to protect wilderness characteristics would be closed to forest product removal; however, there are no fuel wood harvest removal areas in this area.	There would be 0 acres of lands managed to partially protect wilderness characteristics; all lands with wilderness characteristics would be open to forest product removal.	~~Same as Alternative D.~~
Livestock Grazing (Section 4.2.8.1.2)	There are no management decisions specific to lands with wilderness characteristics under this alternative.	Livestock facilities and grazing impacts would be evident on 91 percent of lands with wilderness characteristics under this alternative.	Livestock facilities and grazing impacts would be evident on all lands with wilderness characteristics under this alternative.	Same as Alternative C.	~~Same as Alternative C.~~

Management Action	Alternative A (No Action)	Alternative B	Alternative C (Proposed RMP~~Draft RMP/EIS Preferred~~)	Alternative D	~~Alternative E (Proposed RMP)~~
Mineral Resources (Section 4.2.8.1.3)	There are no management decisions specific to lands with wilderness characteristics under this alternative.	Mineral resources decisions would provide long-term benefits due to the closure to mineral extraction of 15,000 acres of lands with wilderness characteristics. The BLM would evaluate extraction of salable minerals on a case-by-case basis on 22,410 acres of lands with wilderness characteristics. Where permitted, the area affected by those operations could adversely affect wilderness characteristics.	Under this alternative, 11,900 acres would be closed to fluid mineral leasing. The BLM would evaluate extraction of salable minerals on a case-by-case basis on 3,100 acres of lands with wilderness characteristics, whereas 34,310 acres of lands with wilderness characteristics would be closed to salable and locatable mineral extraction. Where permitted, the area affected by those operations could adversely affect wilderness characteristics.	No lands with wilderness characteristics would be closed to fluid mineral leasing and salable mineral extraction and recommended for withdrawal from locatable mineral entry. The area affected by those operations could adversely affect wilderness characteristics.	~~Same as Alternative D.~~

Management Action	Alternative A (No Action)	Alternative B	Alternative C (Proposed RMP~~Draft RMP/EIS Preferred~~)	Alternative D	~~Alternative E (Proposed RMP)~~
Travel Management (Section 4.2.8.1.4)	There are no management decisions specific to lands with wilderness characteristics under this alternative.	Lands with wilderness characteristics (37,500 acres) would be closed to motorized travel.	Under this alternative, 26,100 acres of lands with wilderness characteristics would be closed to vehicle travel. This would benefit the naturalness and outstanding opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation. On 4,100 acres of lands with wilderness characteristics, vehicles would be limited to designated primitive roads and trails. This may adversely compromise the viewshed or soundscape on lands with wilderness characteristics, but no more so than under Alternative A; 7,300 acres of lands with wilderness characteristics would be open to vehicle use, which would adversely affect wilderness characteristics.	Same as Alternative C, except that 0 acres of lands with wilderness characteristics would be closed to motorized vehicle travel, 29,000 acres would be limited to designated primitive roads and trails, and 8,500 acres would be open to motorized vehicles.	~~Same as Alternative C, except that 0 acres of lands with wilderness characteristics would be closed to motorized vehicle travel, 35,900 acres would be limited to designated primitive roads and trails, and 1,700 acres would be open to motorized vehicles.~~

Management Action	Alternative A (No Action)	Alternative B	Alternative C (Proposed RMP~~Draft RMP/EIS Preferred~~)	Alternative D	~~Alternative E (Proposed RMP)~~
Visual Resources (Section 4.2.8.1.5)	There are no management decisions specific to lands with wilderness characteristics under this alternative.	The BLM would manage all lands with wilderness characteristics (37,500 acres) as VRM Class II. The level of change to the landscape would be low. Potential future projects would be constructed so as to not attract the attention of the casual observer.	The BLM would manage 26,400 acres of lands with wilderness characteristics as VRM Class II; in these areas, the level of change to the landscape would be low. Potential future projects would be constructed so as to not attract the attention of the casual observer; 11,100 acres of lands with wilderness characteristics would be managed as VRM Class IV. Wilderness values, such as naturalness, could be compromised.	Forty acres of lands with wilderness characteristics would be managed as VRM Class I, 2,200 acres would be managed as VRM Class II, 26,300 acres would be managed as VRM Class III, and 8,900 acres would be managed as VRM Class IV. When lands with wilderness characteristics are managed to VRM Class III or IV, wilderness values, such as naturalness, could be compromised.	~~Same as Alternative D, except that 2,200 acres of lands with wilderness characteristics would be managed as VRM Class II, 28,000 acres would be managed as VRM Class III, and 7,300 acres would be managed as VRM Class IV.~~
Livestock Grazing (Section 4.2.9)					
Cultural Resources (Section 4.2.9.2.8)	Adverse impacts are expected where grazing is restricted so as to protect cultural sites; 87 percent of Decision Area lands are grazing allotments; 13,985 acres of Decision Area lands are predicted to have a high probability of cultural resources, 237,368 acres have a medium site probability, and 25,921 acres have a low site probability.				

Management Action	Alternative A (No Action)	Alternative B	Alternative C (Proposed RMP~~Draft RMP/EIS Preferred~~)	Alternative D	~~Alternative E (Proposed RMP)~~
Lands and Realty (Section 4.2.9.2.1)	Lands and realty decisions could have both adverse and beneficial impacts on livestock grazing. Adverse impacts would result from a loss of forage from lands disposed of and devoted to other public purposes and the loss of AUMs from rights-of-way. Beneficial impacts would be result from the addition of forage through land acquisition. There would be 41,900 acres of grazing allotments and 5,238 AUMs lost by proposed land disposals.	Same as Alternative A, except 40,600 acres of grazing allotments and 5,075 AUMs would be lost by proposed land disposals.	Same as Alternative A, except 103,100 acres of grazing allotments and 12,888 AUMs would be lost by proposed land disposals.	Same as Alternative A, except 106,100 acres of grazing allotments and 13,263 AUMs would be lost by proposed land disposals.	~~Same as Alternative A, except 101,800 acres of grazing allotments and 12,725 AUMs would be lost by proposed land disposals.~~
Mineral Resources (Section 4.2.9.2.4)	Mineral extraction would adversely affect livestock grazing because acres and AUMs would be temporarily lost in areas where minerals would be extracted. Acreage would be reclaimed during the life of the action and on abandonment. These activities would be in areas that would avoid impacts on livestock grazing. Site-specific NEPA analyses would be completed for applications for disturbance, thereby reducing opportunities for direct adverse impacts related to this disturbance.				
Recreation and Visitor Services (Section 4.2.9.2.7)	Management decisions associated with recreation and visitor services would have adverse impacts on livestock grazing. If recreation increases in the long term, vegetation may be trampled or eliminated in some areas. Livestock grazing would incur minor impacts from vegetation loss associated with recreation.				
Renewable Energy (Section 4.2.9.2.2)	Renewable energy developments could adversely affect livestock grazing because they would remove AUMs from the Decision Area. No specific renewable energy projects are proposed in the RMP/EIS. Site-specific NEPA analyses would need to be completed when such projects are proposed.				

Commented [AA15]: To be verified with revised disposal data

Management Action	Alternative A (No Action)	Alternative B	Alternative C (Proposed RMP~~Draft RMP/EIS Preferred~~)	Alternative D	~~Alternative E (Proposed RMP)~~
Special Designations (Section 4.2.9.2.5)	Both adverse and beneficial impacts on livestock grazing would result from special designations. Restrictions on surface-disturbing activities in areas with special designations promote improved vegetative communities and range conditions. This comes about by reducing the likelihood that forage would be removed through development. In contrast, some of the ACECs proposed for designation also would eliminate or restrict livestock grazing under some alternatives. A hundred acres of special designations would fall within grazing allotments that would be made unavailable to grazing under Alternative A.	Under Alternative B, the largest number of acres would be unavailable to livestock grazing, which would have the most impacts on grazing operations.	Impacts under Alternative C are the same as under Alternative A.	Under Alternatives D, no acres would be unavailable to livestock grazing in special designation areas, and there would be the fewest adverse impacts on livestock grazing operations.	~~Impacts under Alternative E are the same as those under Alternative A.~~

Management Action	Alternative A (No Action)	Alternative B	Alternative C (Proposed RMP~~Draft RMP/EIS Preferred~~)	Alternative D	~~Alternative E (Proposed RMP)~~
Special Status Species (Section 4.2.9.2.9)	Special status species management decisions would adversely affect livestock grazing if it is restricted within wildlife exclosures, breeding habitat, and occupied habitat.	Same as Alternative A, except the BLM would require the placement of water developments and livestock salt and mineral supplements to be at least 0.25 mile~~s~~ from known locations of special status plants. The BLM would also consider concentrating browsing and grazing animals on known locations of special status plants but make adjustments as needed.	Same as Alternative A, except the BLM would require the placement of water developments and livestock salt and mineral supplements to be at least 500 feet from known locations of special status plants.	Same as Alternative A, except the BLM would require the placement of water developments and livestock salt and mineral supplement to be at least 300 feet from known locations of special status plants.	~~Impacts would be the same as under Alternative D.~~
Travel Management (Section 4.2.9.2.6)	Both adverse and beneficial impacts on livestock grazing would result from travel management decisions. Beneficial impacts are expected with an increase in the closure or limited use of roads. Under Alternative A, 102,100 acres would be closed, 301,900 acres would be open, and 327,600 acres would be limited to existing routes.	Same as Alternative A, except 176,600 acres would be closed to motorized vehicle travel, 4,600 acres would be open, and 550,500 acres would be limited to designated primitive roads and trails.	Same as Alternative A, except 124,000 acres would be closed to motorized vehicle travel, 18,300 acres would be open, and 589,300 acres would be limited to designated primitive roads and trails.	Same as Alternative A, except 97,800 acres would be closed to motorized vehicle travel, 19,500 acres would be open, and 614,300 acres would be limited to designated primitive roads and trails.	~~Same as Alternative A, except 97,800 acres would be closed to motorized vehicle travel, 1,700 acres would be open, and 615,500 acres would be limited to designated primitive roads and trails.~~

Management Action	Alternative A (No Action)	Alternative B	Alternative C (Proposed RMP~~Draft RMP/EIS Preferred~~)	Alternative D	~~Alternative E (Proposed RMP)~~
Vegetation Management (Section 4.2.9.2.3)	Vegetation management decisions would have both adverse and beneficial impacts on livestock grazing. Adverse impacts would last from immediately after vegetation treatments until after revegetation. There would be long-term beneficial impacts from increased rangeland health. Fuels treatments would take place on 492,800 acres available for grazing. Proposed forest product harvest areas would be on 12,200 acres available for grazing.	Same as Alternative A, except fuels treatments would take place on 359,200 acres available for grazing and proposed forest product harvest areas would be on 78,600 acres available for grazing.	Same as Alternative A, except proposed forest product harvest areas would be on 422,400 acres available for grazing.	Same as Alternative A, except proposed forest product harvest areas would be on 504,600 acres available for grazing.	~~Same as Alternative A, except proposed forest product harvest areas would be on 504,700 acres available for grazing.~~
Mineral Resources (Section 4.2.10)					
Cave and Karst Resources (Section 4.2.10.2.1)	Cave and karst resource management decisions would have adverse impacts on mineral resources where extraction opportunities are limited. This would be done to protect cave and karst features. The Pronoun Cave ACEC would be open to locatable and leasable mineral extraction. The ACEC would be avoided for salable mineral extraction.	Same as Alternative A, except oil and gas stipulations would prohibit disturbance within up to 200 meters (656 feet) of cave or karst features. The Pronoun Cave ACEC would be managed as CSU for fluid leasable minerals, closed to extraction of salable minerals and recommended for withdrawal from locatable mineral entry.	Same as Alternative A, except oil and gas stipulations would impose CSU restrictions for surface disturbance within up to 200 meters (656 feet) of cave or karst features. The Pronoun Cave ACEC would be managed as CSU for fluid leasable minerals, and extraction of salable minerals would be avoided.	Same as Alternative A, except oil and gas stipulations would be applied for cave/karst areas. The Pronoun Cave would not be managed as an ACEC, but CSU would be applied for fluid leasable minerals and the area would be open to salable and locatable mineral extraction.	~~Same as Alternative D.~~

Management Action	Alternative A (No Action)	Alternative B	Alternative C (Proposed RMP~~Draft RMP/EIS Preferred~~)	Alternative D	~~Alternative E (Proposed RMP)~~
Lands and Realty (Section 4.2.10.2.2)	Lands and realty management decisions could have adverse impacts on mineral resources through land disposal. Proposed land disposals would include 1,900 acres of moderate to high potential areas for fluid leasable minerals, 10,700 acres of moderate to high potential areas for salable minerals, and 4,400 acres of moderate to high potential areas for locatable minerals.	Same as Alternative A, except proposed land disposals would include 1,900 acres of moderate to high potential areas for fluid leasable minerals, 11,100 acres of moderate to high potential areas for salable minerals, and 4,400 acres of moderate to high potential areas for locatable minerals.	Same as Alternative A, except proposed land disposals would include 1,900 acres of moderate to high potential areas for fluid leasable minerals, 13,000 acres of moderate to high potential areas for salable minerals, and 9,100 acres of moderate to high potential areas for locatable minerals.	Same as Alternative A, except proposed land disposals would include 1,900 acres of moderate to high potential areas for fluid leasable minerals, 16,200 acres of moderate to high potential areas for salable minerals, and 9,200 acres of moderate to high potential areas for locatable minerals.	~~Same as Alternative A, except proposed land disposals would include 1,900 acres of moderate to high potential areas for fluid leasable minerals, 12,500 acres of moderate to high potential areas for salable minerals, and 9,100 acres of moderate to high potential areas for locatable minerals.~~
Cultural Resources (Section 4.2.10.2.3)	All mineral resource activities may be adversely affected by cultural resource leasing stipulations. Increased mineral development costs may be incurred due to cultural resource inventories, relocation of facilities to avoid cultural sites, implementation of alternative drilling techniques, or site excavation if sites cannot be avoided. If it is impossible to avoid, minimize, or mitigate impacts on a historic property, then the BLM Authorized Officer could deny development. Discovery of previously undocumented sites during construction could delay project implementation.				

Commented [AA16]: This whole row (Alts A-D) to be verified/updated with revised Alts A-D disposal data

Management Action	Alternative A (No Action)	Alternative B	Alternative C (Proposed RMP~~Draft RMP/EIS Preferred~~)	Alternative D	~~Alternative E (Proposed RMP)~~
Lands with Wilderness Characteristics (Section 4.2.10.2.4)	There are no management decisions for lands with wilderness characteristics under Alternative A.	Lands with wilderness characteristics managed to protect wilderness characteristics (37,500 acres) would be closed to extraction of leasable, salable, and locatable minerals. There are no moderate or high potential areas for leasable, salable, or locatable minerals on lands proposed for management of wilderness characteristics; therefore, there would be minimal to no impact on minerals from these management decisions.	Lands with wilderness characteristics managed to protect wilderness characteristics (26,040 acres) would be closed to the extraction of leasable, salable, and locatable minerals. Lands with wilderness characteristics managed to minimize impacts on wilderness characteristics (4,070 acres) would be closed to extraction of fluid leasable minerals, and extraction of salable and locatable minerals would be evaluated on a case-by-case basis. There would be an adverse impact on mineral resources where minerals could not be extracted.	Same as Alternative A.	~~Same as Alternative A.~~

Management Action	Alternative A (No Action)	Alternative B	Alternative C (Proposed RMP~~Draft RMP/EIS Preferred~~)	Alternative D	~~Alternative E (Proposed RMP)~~
Paleontological Resources (Section 4.2.10.2.5)	Mineral resources would be adversely affected by paleontological resources management decisions that restrict mineral development. The Torreon Fossil Fauna ACEC would be open to locatable and leasable mineral extraction. The ACEC would be avoided for salable mineral extraction. The Bony Canyon ACEC is not proposed under Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A, except the leasing stipulation for paleontological resources would implement an LN for fluid leasable minerals in areas of PFYC 3, 4, and 5. The Torreon Fossil Fauna ACEC would be closed to the extraction of leasable, salable, and locatable minerals. The Bony Canyon ACEC would be ~~NSO~~ CSU for fluid leasable minerals, closed to the extraction of salable minerals, and recommended for withdrawal from locatable mineral entry.	Same as Alternative A, except the leasing stipulation for paleontological resources would implement an LN ~~lease notice~~ for fluid leasable minerals in areas of PFYC 3, 4, and 5. Torreon Fossil Fauna ACEC would be NSO for fluid leasable minerals, closed to the extraction of salable minerals, and recommended for withdrawal from locatable mineral entry. The Bony Canyon ACEC would be CSU ~~NSO~~ for fluid leasable minerals, closed to the extraction of salable minerals, and recommended for withdrawal from locatable mineral entry.	Same as Alternative A, except the leasing stipulation for paleontological resources would implement an LN ~~lease notice~~ for fluid leasable minerals in areas of PFYC 3, 4, and 5. Torreon Fossil Fauna ACEC would be CSU for fluid leasable minerals and open to locatable mineral entry and salable mineral extraction. The Bony Canyon ACEC would be CSU ~~NSO~~ for fluid leasable minerals, closed to the extraction of salable minerals, and recommended for withdrawal from locatable mineral entry.	~~Same as Alternative A, except the Torreon Fossil Fauna ACEC would be CSU for fluid leasable minerals and open to locatable mineral entry and salable mineral extraction.~~

Management Action	Alternative A (No Action)	Alternative B	Alternative C (Proposed RMP~~Draft RMP/EIS Preferred~~)	Alternative D	~~Alternative E (Proposed RMP)~~
Recreation and Visitor Services (Section 4.2.10.2.6)	There would be adverse impacts on mineral resources if site-specific NEPA analysis were to require proposed mineral projects to be modified or prohibited to avoid impacts on recreation areas. No recreation-specific leasing stipulations are proposed for recreation and visitor services under this alternative.	Mineral resources would be adversely affected by recreation and visitor services management decisions that restrict mineral development in developed recreation areas and RMAs. A fluid mineral leasing NSO would prohibit surface-disturbing activities within the line of sight and sound or 0.25 mile~~s~~ (whichever is closer) of specific developed recreation areas and sites. Remaining ERMAs would be managed as CSU for fluid leasable minerals (in developed recreation sites), open to salable mineral extraction, and recommended for withdrawal from locatable mineral extraction.	Same as Alternative B, except a fluid mineral leasing NSO would prohibit surface-disturbing activities within the line of sight and sound or 200 meters (656 feet) (whichever is closer) of specific developed recreation areas and sites.	SRMAs and ERMAs would be managed as CSU for fluid leasable minerals (in developed recreation sites) and open to salable mineral extraction and locatable mineral extraction.	~~SRMAs and the ERMA would be managed as CSU for fluid leasable minerals (in developed recreation sites) and open to salable mineral extraction; all SRMAs would be recommended for withdrawal from locatable mineral entry, and the ERMA would be open to locatable mineral entry.~~

Management Action	Alternative A (No Action)	Alternative B	Alternative C (Proposed RMP~~Draft RMP/EIS Preferred~~)	Alternative D	~~Alternative E (Proposed RMP)~~
Riparian Resources (Section 4.2.10.2.7)	Mineral resources management decisions could be adversely affected by proposed leasing stipulations for riparian areas. The 100-acre Bluewater Canyon ACEC would be managed as NSO for fluid leasable minerals and open to locatable mineral entry; salable minerals extraction would be avoided.	Same as Alternative A, except 69,400 acres of moderate to high mineral potential areas within riparian areas (5 percent of Decision Area fluid mineral estate) would be protected by the riparian-specific leasing stipulation. The Bluewater Canyon ACEC (800 acres) would be NSO for fluid leasable minerals, closed to the extraction of salable minerals, and recommended for withdrawal from locatable mineral entry.	Same as Alternative B.	No leasing stipulations specific to riparian areas would be proposed under this alternative. The Bluewater Canyon ACEC would be managed as described in Alternative B.	~~Same as Alternative A.~~

Management Action	Alternative A (No Action)	Alternative B	Alternative C (Proposed RMP~~Draft RMP/EIS Preferred~~)	Alternative D	~~Alternative E (Proposed RMP)~~
Soil and Water (Section 4.2.10.2.8)	There would be no specific management decisions targeting the protection of sensitive soils under this alternative.	Mineral resources management decisions could be adversely affected by proposed stipulations for low reclamation potential soils and steep slopes on Decision Area lands~~:~~ • 91,100 acres of low reclamation potential soils would be managed as CSU for fluid leasable minerals in moderate to high potential mineral areas~~;~~ • 9,100 acres of slopes between 15 and 30 percent would be managed as CSU for fluid leasable minerals in moderate to high potential mineral areas • ~~8,800~~3,800 acres of ~~steep~~ slopes greater than~~(~~15~~-~~ 30 percent ~~or greater)~~ would be managed as NSO for fluid leasable minerals in moderate to high potential mineral areas~~.~~	~~Same as~~ Similar to Alternative B, except ~~steep slopes would be managed as follows~~: • 97,300 acres of low reclamation potential soils would be managed as CSU for fluid leasable minerals in moderate to high potential mineral areas • 10,000 acres of slopes between 15 and 30 percent would be managed as CSU for fluid leasable minerals in moderate to high potential mineral areas • 3,200 acres of slopes greater than 30 percent would be managed as NSO for fluid leasable minerals in moderate to high potential mineral areas	Similar to ~~Same as~~ Alternative B, except ~~steep slopes would be managed as follows~~: • 123,700 acres of low reclamation potential soils would be managed as CSU for fluid leasable minerals in moderate to high potential mineral areas • 15,100 acres of slopes between 15 and 30 percent would be managed as CSU for fluid leasable minerals in moderate to high potential mineral areas • 1,800 acres of slopes greater than 30 percent would be managed as NSO for fluid leasable minerals in moderate to high potential mineral areas~~.~~	~~Same as Alternative B, except steep slopes would be managed as follows: 6,600 acres of slopes greater than 30 percent would be managed as NSO for fluid leasable minerals in moderate to high potential mineral areas.~~

Commented [AA17]: This cell to be updated with revised Alt D CSU data

Management Action	Alternative A (No Action)	Alternative B	Alternative C (Proposed RMP~~Draft RMP/EIS Preferred~~)	Alternative D	~~Alternative E (Proposed RMP)~~
Special Designations (Section 4.2.10.2.9)	Special designations would have potential adverse impacts on mineral resources where a designation includes closures for salable and locatable extraction or NSO leasing stipulations; 18,600 acres of moderate to high mineral potential areas would be managed as CSU, NSO, or closed to fluid leasable mineral extraction; 14,000 acres of moderate to high mineral potential areas would be closed to salable mineral extraction; ~~12,600~~2,900 acres of moderate to high mineral potential areas would be managed as recommended for withdrawal from locatable mineral entry.	Same as Alternative A, except 34,200 acres of moderate to high mineral potential areas would be managed as CSU, NSO, or closed to leasable mineral fluid extraction; 22,200 acres of moderate to high mineral potential areas would be closed to salable mineral extraction; ~~32,600~~22,900 of moderate to high mineral potential areas would be managed as recommended for withdrawal from locatable mineral entry.	Same as Alternative A, except 33,900 acres of moderate to high mineral potential areas would be managed as CSU, NSO, or closed to leasable mineral fluid extraction; 8,200 acres of moderate to high mineral potential areas would be closed to salable mineral extraction; 14,700 acres of moderate to high mineral potential areas would be managed as recommended for withdrawal from locatable mineral entry.	Same as Alternative A, except 18,200 acres of moderate to high mineral potential areas would be managed as CSU, NSO, or closed to leasable mineral fluid extraction; 8,200 acres of moderate to high mineral potential areas would be closed to salable mineral extraction; 100 acres of moderate to high mineral potential areas would be managed as recommended for withdrawal from locatable mineral entry.	~~Same as Alternative A, except 15,100 acres of moderate to high mineral potential areas would be managed as CSU, NSO, or closed to leasable mineral fluid extraction; 9,700 acres of moderate to high mineral potential areas would be closed to salable mineral extraction; 1,900 acres of moderate to high mineral potential areas would be managed as recommended for withdrawal from locatable mineral entry.~~
Special Status Species (Section 4.2.10.2.10)	Mineral resources could be adversely affected by discretionary surface disturbance restrictions that are proposed for special status species. Under all alternatives, the BLM would consult with the USFWS for mineral resource development.	Same as Alternative A, except an additional leasing stipulation would be applied for surface-disturbing activities within 0.5 mile~~s~~ of active prairie dog colonies.	Same as Alternative A, except an additional leasing stipulation would be applied for surface-disturbing activities within 0.25 mile~~s~~ of active prairie dog colonies.	Same as Alternative A, and surface-disturbing activities would be strictly controlled in prairie dog towns if an activity would adversely affect prairie dogs or associated species.	~~Same as Alternative D.~~

Commented [AA21]: To be updated with revised Alt D CSU data

Commented [AA18]: To be updated with revised data for Alt B closed to salable minerals

Commented [AA20]: To be updated with revised data for Alt C closed to salable minerals

Commented [AA19]: To be updated with revised data for Alt B recommended for withdrawal from locatable minerals

Management Action	Alternative A (No Action)	Alternative B	Alternative C (Proposed RMP~~Draft RMP/EIS Preferred~~)	Alternative D	~~Alternative E (Proposed RMP)~~
Visual Resources (Section 4.2.10.2.11)	Mineral resources management decisions could be adversely affected by VRM decisions, specifically in VRM Classes I and II, where surface-disturbing activities would be the most restricted. Thirteen percent would be managed as VRM Class I and 8 percent as VRM Class II.	Same as Alternative A, except 42 percent would be managed as VRM Class II.	Same as Alternative A, except -9 percent would be managed as VRM Class II.	Same as Alternative A, except 3 percent would be managed as VRM Class II.	~~Same as Alternative A, except 2 percent would be managed as VRM Class II.~~
Wildlife and Fisheries (Section 4.2.10.2.12)	Discretionary measures required to mitigate the adverse impacts of mineral development on wildlife would adversely affect mineral resources. No leasing stipulations would be applied for wildlife habitat under this alternative; however, mineral resource developers would be required to avoid surface-disturbing activities in occupied migratory bird habitat during the nesting season.	Same as Alternative A, and proposed restrictions would be implemented for surface disturbance near raptor nests, big game winter range, big game fawning/calving habitat, prairie dog towns, and wildlife habitat projects.	Same as Alternative B.	Same as Alternative A, and proposed restrictions would be implemented for surface disturbance near raptor nests and prairie dog towns.	~~Same as Alternative A, and proposed restrictions would be implemented for surface disturbance near big game winter range, big game fawning/calving habitat, and prairie dog towns. Activities determined to adversely impact raptor nests and/or associated species or habitat would be strictly controlled.~~

Management Action	Alternative A (No Action)	Alternative B	Alternative C (Proposed RMP~~Draft RMP/EIS Preferred~~)	Alternative D	~~Alternative E (Proposed RMP)~~
Paleontological Resources (Section 4.2.11)					
Lands and Realty (Section 4.2.11.1.1)	Lands and realty decisions would have adverse impacts if lands proposed for potential disposal were to lead to the loss of paleontological resources; 3,800 acres of PFYC 4 and 500 acres of PYFC 5 would be available for disposal.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A, except 9,500 acres of PFYC 4 would be available for potential disposal.	Same as Alternative A, except 11,300 acres of PFYC 4 would be available for potential disposal.	~~Same as Alternative A, except 13,600 acres of PFYC 4 would be available for potential disposal.~~
Mineral Resources (Section 4.2.11.1.3)	Paleontological resources are expected to be negligibly affected by mineral resources due to the low predicted mineral development over the next 20 years (1.2 percent of Decision Area lands).	Mineral resource decisions are expected to have adverse impacts on paleontological resources by potentially disturbing areas with PFYC 4 and 5. The RPFO is proposing to implement an oil and gas stipulation that limits the amount of surface disturbance near paleontological resources. An LN ~~lease notice~~ for fluid leasable minerals would be implemented in areas of PFYC 3, 4, and 5. The BLM would determine whether a survey by a qualified paleontologist would be necessary before disturbance begins.	Same as Alternative B.	Same as Alternative B.	~~Same as Alternative A.~~

Commented [AA22]: This whole row (Alts A-D) to be verified/updated with revised Alts A-D disposal data

Management Action	Alternative A (No Action)	Alternative B	Alternative C (Proposed RMP~~Draft RMP/EIS Preferred~~)	Alternative D	~~Alternative E (Proposed RMP)~~
Renewable Energy (Section 4.2.11.1.4)	Renewable energy development may result in long-term adverse impacts because there would be no avoidance or exclusions areas for renewable energy projects.	Decisions may have an adverse impact on paleontological resources if renewable energy projects are proposed in areas with vertebrate fossils or noteworthy occurrences of invertebrate or plant fossils. Site-specific NEPA analysis would be conducted prior to the RPFO approving renewable energy projects within the Decision Area.	Same as Alternative B.	Same as Alternative B.	~~Same as Alternative B.~~
Special Designations (Section 4.2.11.1.2)	Special designations would have a beneficial impact on paleontological resources because of management restrictions that are applied within the boundaries of the particular designation. There would be ~~155,300~~158,200 acres managed as special designations, 105,900 acres of which do not overlap other special designation areas.	Same as Alternative A, except ~~269,300~~265,500 acres would be managed as special designations, 112,500 acres of which do not overlap other special designation areas.	Same as Alternative A, except ~~244,000~~235,200 acres would be managed as special designations, 112,900 acres of which do not overlap other special designation areas.	Same as Alternative A, except ~~147,600~~150,500 acres would be managed as special designations, 114,400 acres of which do not overlap other special designation areas.	~~Same as Alternative A, except 133,800 acres would be managed as special designations.~~

Commented [AA24]: To be updated based on changed CDNST acres

Commented [AA25]: To be updated based on changed CDNST acres

Commented [AA26]: To be updated based on changed CDNST acres

Commented [AA23]: To be updated based on changed CDNST acres

Management Action	Alternative A (No Action)	Alternative B	Alternative C (Proposed RMP~~Draft RMP/EIS Preferred~~)	Alternative D	~~Alternative E (Proposed RMP)~~
Recreation and Visitor Services (Section 4.2.12)					
Cultural Resources (Section 4.2.12.1.5)	Cultural resources management decisions would have both adverse and beneficial impacts on recreation. Camping would be prohibited at Big Bead Mesa (300 acres).	Same as Alternative A, except Alternative B would also allow limited motorized vehicle travel at Azabache Station.	Same as Alternative B.	Same as Alternative B, except Alternative D would also allow motorized vehicle access to the mesa top at Big Bead Mesa.	~~Same as Alternative B.~~
Livestock Grazing (Section 4.2.12.1.1)	Adverse impacts from livestock grazing on recreation and visitor services could occur where livestock compromises the recreational setting for recreational users. Grazing allotments make up approximately 87 percent of Decision Area lands.	Same as Alternative A, except 162,600 acres would be removed from livestock grazing, and some riparian areas and areas with existing and proposed special designations, such as ACECs, would be unavailable for livestock grazing.	Same as Alternative B, except livestock grazing would be available in riparian areas that meet the New Mexico Standards and Guidelines.	Same as Alternative C.	~~Same as Alternative C.~~
Mineral Resources (Section 4.2.12.1.11)	Mineral resources decisions would have an adverse impact on recreation and visitor services, resulting in reduced recreation potential on lands developed for mineral resources and a decreased recreation experience for most users on adjacent lands. This impact is expected to be negligible because mineral development would take place on 1.2 percent of Decision Area lands.				

Management Action	Alternative A (No Action)	Alternative B	Alternative C (Proposed RMP~~Draft RMP/EIS Preferred~~)	Alternative D	~~Alternative E (Proposed RMP)~~
Lands with Wilderness Characteristics (Section 4.2.12.1.4)	Lands managed to protect wilderness characteristics are not proposed under this alternative.	Lands with wilderness characteristics would be closed to motorized travel, thereby restricting OHV use on Decision Area lands. Impacts would be beneficial on those visitors seeking recreation opportunities that prefer solitude and nonmotorized recreation. Those groups seeking more developed forms of recreation, especially motorized forms of recreation, would not have those opportunities.	Lands with wilderness characteristics decisions would close 26,100 acres to motorized vehicle traffic, limit motorized vehicles to designated primitive routes on 4,100 acres, and open 7,300 acres in the Cimarron Mesa area to motorized vehicle travel.	A total of 8,500 acres would be open to motorized vehicle travel in the Cimarron Mesa and Volcano Hill areas. This would provide the highest opportunity for motorized recreation.	~~A total of 1,700 acres would be open to motorized vehicle travel in the Cimarron Mesa.~~
Recreation and Visitor Services (Section 4.2.12.1.3)	SRMAs are not proposed under this alternative.	Recreation management decisions would have a beneficial impact on recreation. Five SRMAs and six ERMAs, totaling 286,700 acres of Decision Area lands, are proposed under this alternative.	Same as Alternative B.	Same as Alternative B.	~~Same as Alternative B, except one ERMA and three SRMAs totaling 72,400 acres are proposed.~~
Renewable Energy (Section 4.2.12.1.7)	Renewable energy developments would have negative impacts on recreation and visitor services. This is because they would remove recreation potential on the lands being developed and would degrade the recreation experience for most users on adjacent land.				

Management Action	Alternative A (No Action)	Alternative B	Alternative C (Proposed RMP~~Draft RMP/EIS Preferred~~)	Alternative D	~~Alternative E (Proposed RMP)~~
Special Designations (Section 4.2.12.1.2)	Special designations would provide long-term benefits to recreation because of restricted development. There would be ~~155,300~~158,200 acres managed as special designations, 105,900 acres of which do not overlap other special designation areas.	Same as Alternative A, except ~~269,300~~265,500 acres would be managed as special designations, 112,500 acres of which do not overlap other special designation areas.	Same as Alternative A, except ~~244,000~~235,200 acres would be managed as special designations, 112,900 acres of which do not overlap other special designation areas.	Same as Alternative A, except ~~147,600~~150,500 acres would be managed as special designations, 114,400 acres of which do not overlap other special designation areas.	~~Same as Alternative A, except 133,800 acres would be managed as special designations.~~
Special Status Species (Section 4.2.12.1.9)	Special status species decisions would cause short-term adverse impacts on recreation and provide long-term beneficial impacts for improved recreation setting for hikers, campers, and wildlife viewers. Seasonal timing or access restrictions on use of public lands may be needed to protect wildlife and special status species.				
Travel Management (Section 4.2.12.1.8)	Travel management decisions could have both adverse and beneficial impacts on recreation, depending on the type of recreationist. There would be 102,100 acres closed to motorized travel, 301,900 acres would be open, and 327,600 acres would be limited to existing routes.	Same as Alternative A, except 176,600 acres would be closed to motorized travel, 4,600 acres would be open, and 550,500 acres would be limited to designated primitive roads and trails.	Same as Alternative A, except 124,000 acres would be closed to motorized travel, 18,300 acres would be open, and 589,300 acres would be limited to designated primitive roads and trails.	Same as Alternative A, except 97,800 acres would be closed to motorized travel, 19,500 acres would be open, and 614,300 acres would be limited to designated primitive roads and trails.	~~Same as Alternative A, except 97,800 acres would be closed to motorized travel, 18,300 acres would be open, and 615,500 acres would be limited to designated primitive roads and trails.~~
Vegetation Management (Section 4.2.12.1.10)	Vegetation treatments would cause short-term adverse impacts from potential closures during vegetation treatments but long-term beneficial impacts from improved forage for wildlife and recreation setting for hikers, campers, and wildlife viewers.				
Renewable Energy (Section 4.2.13)					
Renewable Energy (Section 4.2.13.1.1)	The Wilderness Area (11,000 acres) would be excluded from renewable energy projects.				
Riparian Resources (Section 4.2.14)					

Commented [AA28]: To be updated based on changed CDNST acres

Commented [AA29]: To be updated based on changed CDNST acres

Commented [AA30]: To be updated based on changed CDNST acres

Commented [AA27]: To be updated based on changed CDNST acres

Management Action	Alternative A (No Action)	Alternative B	Alternative C (Proposed RMP~~Draft RMP/EIS Preferred~~)	Alternative D	~~Alternative E (Proposed RMP)~~
Fire Management (Section 4.2.14.2.1)	Adherence to the Fire and Fuels Plan Amendment would have beneficial impacts on riparian resources in the Decision Area; 3,600 acres of riparian areas would undergo fuels treatment projects under all alternatives. The BLM would implement BMPs to mitigate adverse impacts from the fuel treatments since the goal of the treatments would be to restore the native plant communities within riparian areas.				
Forests and Woodlands (Section 4.2.14.2.2)	Forest and woodland decisions would be beneficial because forest product harvest activities would be prohibited in riparian areas, except where forest restoration would benefit riparian areas.				
Livestock Grazing (Section 4.2.14.2.3)	Livestock grazing management decisions would have both adverse and beneficial impacts on riparian resources. Adverse impacts would result if improper livestock management practices resulted in the loss of riparian vegetation and trampling of soils. Beneficial impacts would occur from the stimulation of vegetation, removal of standing dead vegetation, and seed distribution. Riparian areas would be managed as described in the EIS for Riparian and Aquatic Habitat Management in the Albuquerque Field Office (BLM 2000).	Same as Alternative A, except the RPFO would remove grazing from riparian areas. Riparian areas would be the most protected from livestock grazing impacts under this alternative.	Same as Alternative B, except livestock grazing would be applied in riparian areas that meet the New Mexico Standards and Guidelines (BLM 2001).	Same as Alternative C.	~~Same as Alternative C.~~

Management Action	Alternative A (No Action)	Alternative B	Alternative C (Proposed RMP~~Draft RMP/EIS Preferred~~)	Alternative D	~~Alternative E (Proposed RMP)~~
Mineral Resources (Section 4.2.14.2.4)	Mineral development would adversely impact riparian resources within the Decision Area because no surface disturbance restrictions are proposed for riparian resources.	Same as Alternative A, except surface-disturbing activities would be prohibited (NSO) within 200 meters (656 feet) of the channels of ephemeral, intermittent, and perennial streams, or within 200 meters (656 feet) of the outer margins of riparian and wetland areas.	Same as Alternative A, except surface-disturbing activities would be subject to CSU for fluid leasable minerals restrictions within 200 meters (656 feet) of the channels of ephemeral, intermittent, and perennial streams, or within 200 meters (656 feet) of the outer margins of riparian and wetland areas.	Same as Alternative A.	~~Same as Alternative A.~~

Management Action	Alternative A (No Action)	Alternative B	Alternative C (Proposed RMP~~Draft RMP/EIS Preferred~~)	Alternative D	~~Alternative E (Proposed RMP)~~
Lands with Wilderness Characteristics (Section 4.2.14.2.11)	Alternative A would be the least protective of riparian resources because it would not manage areas within the Decision Area to protect or minimize impacts on wilderness characteristics.	Managing lands to protect wilderness characteristics would be beneficial to riparian resources because surface-disturbing activities are restricted. Alternative B would be the most protective since 37,500 acres would be managed to protect wilderness characteristics, and it would be the most restrictive for surface-disturbing activities. There are 243 acres of riparian habitat within these lands. Managing lands to maintain their wilderness characteristics would be beneficial to riparian resources where NSO stipulations or closing an area to oil and gas leasing are employed, precluding surface-disturbing activities. Alternative B would be the most protective since 37,500 acres would be managed to maintain wilderness characteristics and would be the most restrictive for surface-disturbing activities.	Same as Alternative B, except 26,040 acres of lands with wilderness characteristics would be managed to protect wilderness characteristics, and 4,070 acres would be managed to partially protect wilderness characteristics. Surface-disturbing activities within the lands with wilderness characteristics would be considered on a case-by-case basis. There are 26 acres of riparian habitat within these lands. Within 26,040 acres of lands with wilderness characteristics managed to protect those characteristics, 235 acres of riparian habitat would benefit from restrictions on surface-disturbing activities.	Same as Alternative A.	~~Same as Alternative A.~~

Management Action	Alternative A (No Action)	Alternative B	Alternative C (Proposed RMP~~Draft RMP/EIS Preferred~~)	Alternative D	~~Alternative E (Proposed RMP)~~
Recreation and Visitor Services (Section 4.2.14.2.5)	Recreation decisions would have beneficial impacts on riparian resources because dispersed camping would be prohibited within 46 meters (150 feet) of riparian areas.				
Renewable Energy (Section 4.2.14.2.6)	Renewable energy development would adversely impact riparian resources because no surface disturbance restrictions would be proposed for general riparian resources or floodplains.	Management decisions would beneficially impact riparian resources because active floodplains and 100-year floodplains are identified as exclusion or avoidance areas for wind and solar projects. Additionally, surface-disturbing activities would be prohibited within 200 meters (656 feet) of the channels of ephemeral, intermittent, and perennial streams, or within 200 meters (656 feet) of the outer margins of riparian areas and wetlands.	Same as Alternative B, except surface-disturbing activities would be subject to restrictions within 200 meters (656 feet) of the channels of ephemeral, intermittent, and perennial streams, or within 200 meters (656 feet) of the outer margins of riparian areas and wetlands.	Management decisions would beneficially impact riparian resources because active floodplains and 100-year floodplains are identified as exclusion or avoidance areas for wind and solar projects.	~~Similar to Alternative D, except renewable energy development would adversely impact riparian resources because no surface disturbance restrictions would be proposed for general riparian resources.~~
Riparian Resources (Section 4.2.14.2.7)	Management decisions would adversely impact riparian resources because no surface disturbance restrictions are proposed for riparian resources.	Management decisions would beneficially impact riparian resources because surface-disturbing activities would be prohibited within 200 meters (656 feet) of the channels of ephemeral, intermittent, and perennial streams, or within 200 meters (656 feet) of the outer margins of riparian areas and wetlands.	Management decisions would beneficially impact riparian resources because surface-disturbing activities would be subject to restrictions within 200 meters (656 feet) of the channels of ephemeral, intermittent, and perennial streams, or within 200 meters (656 feet) of the outer margins of riparian areas and wetlands.	Same as Alternative A.	~~Same as Alternative A.~~

Management Action	Alternative A (No Action)	Alternative B	Alternative C (Proposed RMP~~Draft RMP/EIS Preferred~~)	Alternative D	~~Alternative E (Proposed RMP)~~
Special Status Species (Section 4.2.14.2.8)	Special status species decisions would provide long-term benefits because no management action would be permitted on public lands that would jeopardize the continued existence of plant or animal species that are listed, officially proposed, or candidates for listing as threatened and endangered.				
Special Designations (Section 4.2.14.2.10)	Riparian areas would receive indirect beneficial impacts from proposed special designations because surface restrictions would be implemented within the special designations. There would be ~~155,300~~158,200 acres managed as special designations. 105,900 acres of which do not overlap other special designation areas.	Same as Alternative A, except ~~269,300~~265,500 acres would be managed as special designations. 112,500 acres of which do not overlap other special designation areas.	Same as Alternative A, except ~~244,000~~235,200 acres would be managed as special designations. 112,900 acres of which do not overlap other special designation areas.	Same as Alternative A, except ~~147,600~~150,500 acres would be managed as special designations. 114,400 acres of which do not overlap other special designation areas.	~~Same as Alternative A, except 133,800 acres would be managed as special designations.~~
Soil and Water (Section 4.2.14.2.9)	Adverse impacts would be mitigated because soils and water management decisions would comply with New Mexico Standards and Guidelines (BLM 2001) and would be managed in accordance with Executive Order 11988.	Same as Alternative A. Additionally, the RPFO would prohibit surface-disturbing activities within 200 meters (656 feet) of riparian areas and springs. Oil and gas leasing stipulations would implement CSU for 15 percent to 30 percent slopes, NSO for fluid leasable minerals for slopes over 30 percent, and CSU for low reclamation soils.	Same as Alternative B.	Same as Alternative A. Additionally, NSO for fluid leasable minerals for slopes over 30 percent would indirectly protect riparian areas.	~~Same as Alternative D.~~

Commented [AA32]: To be updated based on changed CDNST acres

Commented [AA33]: To be updated based on changed CDNST acres

Commented [AA34]: To be updated based on changed CDNST acres

Commented [AA31]: To be updated based on changed CDNST acres

Management Action	Alternative A (No Action)	Alternative B	Alternative C (Proposed RMP~~Draft RMP/EIS Preferred~~)	Alternative D	~~Alternative E (Proposed RMP)~~
Travel Management (Section 4.2.14.2.12)	All alternatives would have beneficial impacts because riparian areas would be closed to motorized travel.				
Vegetative Communities (Section 4.2.14.2.13)	All alternatives would have beneficial impacts because vegetative treatments would reduce invasive species and restore native plant communities, improving the ecological health of the area.				
Wildlife and Fisheries (Section 4.2.14.2.14)	All alternatives would have a beneficial impact on riparian resources when projects are proposed to protect wildlife that use riparian areas as habitat.				
Social and Economic Resources (Section 4.2.15)					
BLM Expenditures and Employment (Section 4.2.15.2.7)	Average annual BLM expenditures would continue to support 212 total jobs and $9.2 million in labor income in the regional economy.				
Environmental Justice (Section 4.2.15.3.1)	While the potential exists for disproportionate adverse impacts on minority and low-income communities in the Planning Area resulting from management decisions, the level to which those communities would experience such impacts would depend on the nature of implementation. These impacts would be determined at a site-specific level of analysis for the specific implementation of projects. All alternatives could result in increased employment and labor income relative to current conditions over the next decade, from which minority and low-income populations may benefit. Continued access to traditional materials and sites would continue to provide valuable resources to communities in the area, sustaining lifestyles, traditions, ceremonies, and the heritage that remain an important part of area communities' lifestyles.				
Fire Management (Section 4.2.15.2.4)	Under all alternatives, approximately 32,000 acres would be targeted for fuels treatment dependent on budgetary and time constraints. If treatment targets were met, the risk and associated costs would be reduced under all the alternatives relative to current treatment levels.				

Management Action	Alternative A (No Action)	Alternative B	Alternative C (Proposed RMP~~Draft RMP/EIS Preferred~~)	Alternative D	~~Alternative E (Proposed RMP)~~
Forest and Woodlands (Section 4.2.15.2.3)	This alternative would continue to maintain the current accessibility of forest product collection areas (12,200 acres) that communities are accustomed to.	120,600 acres are available for collection of forest product. Variation in areas available due to site specific restrictions on harvest could, however, impact ability of local area residents to access the resource at their preferred locations.	Same as Alternative B, except 547,800 acres are available for collection of forest product.	Same as Alternative B, except 633,700 acres are available for collection of forest product.	~~Same as Alternative D.~~
Impacts on Counties (Section 4.2.15.2.6)	Payments to counties would total $825,690 annually. Development of mineral resources would contribute additional funds.	Payments to counties would total $837,245 annually. Development of mineral resources would contribute additional funds.	Payments to counties would total $755,747 annually. Development of mineral resources would contribute additional funds.	Payments to counties would total $825,690 annually. Development of mineral resources would contribute additional funds.	~~Payments to counties would total $825,690 annually. Development of mineral resources would contribute additional funds.~~
Livestock Grazing (Section 4.2.15.2.2)	Livestock grazing management would support approximately 198 total jobs and $2.74 million in labor income annually in the region.	Reduced grazing would reduce economic contributions to approximately 149 jobs and $2.07 million in labor income.	Impacts would be similar to Alternative A. On average, active AUMS would support 197 jobs and $2.72 million in labor income.	Same as Alternative C.	~~Same as Alternative C.~~
Mineral Resources (Section 4.2.15.2.5)	Based on annual levels of development and production forecast in the reasonably foreseeable development scenario, approximately 90 jobs and $3.5 million in labor income would be supported annually in the region.	Same as Alternative A, except the RPFO would implement a leasing stipulation requiring an NSO for fluid leasable minerals within areas managed for the maintenance of public health and safety and CSU for leasable mineral development near private residences.	Same as Alternative B.	Same as Alternative A, except the RPFO would implement a leasing stipulation requiring an NSO for fluid leasable minerals within areas managed for the maintenance of public health and safety.	~~Same as Alternative B.~~

Management Action	Alternative A (No Action)	Alternative B	Alternative C (Proposed RMP~~Draft RMP/EIS Preferred~~)	Alternative D	~~Alternative E (Proposed RMP)~~
Recreation and Visitor Services (Section 4.2.15.2.1)	Recreation and visitor services decisions would have beneficial impacts on social and economic resources because expenditures related to recreation would support approximately 34 jobs and $1.1 million in labor income annually.				
Role of Amenities, Migration, and Nonmarket Values (Section 4.2.15.2.9)	There would be ~~224,233~~199,000 acres of land managed as ACECs and VRM Classes I and II. Protection of these areas would enhance nonmarket values associated with natural amenities.	Alternative B would manage the most acres (~~574,100~~574,500 acres) as ACECs, to protect wilderness characteristics, and VRM Classes I and II, which would enhance nonmarket values associated with natural amenities.	There would be ~~319,000~~315,230 acres managed as ACECs, to protect wilderness characteristics, and VRM Classes I and II, which would enhance nonmarket values associated with natural amenities in these areas.	There would be ~~194,600~~157,490 acres managed as ACECs and VRM Classes I and II, which would result in a reduction in nonmarket values associated with natural amenities ~~as~~ compared with ~~to other a~~Alternatives A, B, and D.	~~The least amount of land (173,500 acres) would be managed as ACECs and VRM Class I and II, which would result in a reduction in nonmarket values associated with natural amenities as compared to other alternatives.~~
Soil and Water Resources (Section 4.2.16)					
Livestock Grazing (Section 4.2.16.2.2)	Livestock grazing would be managed in order to achieve and maintain the New Mexico Standards and Guidelines (BLM 2001), generally mitigating the impacts of grazing on soil and water resources. Up to 410,800 acres of sensitive soils would be available to livestock grazing.				
Mineral Resources (Section 4.2.16.2.3)	Allowing mineral development would have short- and long-term impacts on soil and water resources. In the short term, loss of vegetation associated with surface disturbances would increase runoff, erosion, and sedimentation though mitigative measures would be taken to minimize these impacts. No stipulations for steep slopes, riparian areas, or biological crusts are proposed; therefore,	Adverse impacts would be less than under Alternative A. Alternative B would implement CSU for fluid leasable minerals on steep slopes between 15 percent and 30 percent, NSO for fluid leasable minerals on slopes over 30 percent, and CSU for fluid leasable minerals on soils with low reclamation potential. Additionally, NSO for fluid leasable minerals within 402 meters (1,320 feet) of channels of ephemeral,	Adverse impacts would be less than they would be under Alternative A. Impacts on steep slopes would be the same as they would be under Alternative B. Impacts on water and soils from riparian area stipulations would be the same as under Alternative B except the CSU for fluid leasable minerals within 402 meters (1,320 feet) of channels of ephemeral, intermittent, and perennial streams or within the	Adverse impacts would be less than they would be under Alternative A. Alternative D would implement NSO for fluid leasable minerals on steep slopes over 30 percent, which would protect water and soils more than under Alternative A. There would be ~~187,700~~187,800 fewer acres open to fluid mineral leasing under Alternative D than under Alternative A; therefore, potential impacts on water resources from hydraulic	~~Adverse impacts would be slightly less than they would be under Alternative A. Alternative E would implement NSO for fluid leasable minerals on steep slopes over 30 percent, which would protect water and soils more than under Alternative A. There would be 25,500 fewer acres of BLM-administered minerals open to fluid mineral leasing under Alternative E than under Alternative A;~~

Management Action	Alternative A (No Action)	Alternative B	Alternative C (Proposed RMP~~Draft RMP/EIS Preferred~~)	Alternative D	~~Alternative E (Proposed RMP)~~
Mineral Resources (Section 4.2.16.2.3) *(continued)*	impacts would be greatest under this alternative. Water depletions for oil and gas hydraulic fracturing would likely continue to occur over the long term under Alternative A, which could result in depletion and degradation of surface water resources. Indirect impacts on water resources from fluid minerals development could also occur through wastewater disposal associated with hydraulic fracturing. Potential impacts on water resources from fluid mineral development wastewater disposal include contaminants reaching drinking water. Indirect impacts from hydraulic fracturing would occur in areas open to oil and gas leasing. The greatest acres would be open to oil and gas leasing under Alternative A; therefore, potential impacts from hydraulic fracturing would be greatest under this alternative.	intermittent, and perennial streams or within the outer margins of riparian areas and wetlands would be implemented. The leasing stipulation for biological crusts under Alternative B would protect these sensitive soils more than under Alternative A. There would be ~~201,600~~205,300 fewer acres open to fluid mineral leasing under Alternative B than under Alternative A; therefore, potential impacts on water resources from hydraulic fracturing would be less than under Alternative A.	outer margins of riparian areas and wetlands would be implemented and provide slightly less impacts on water and soils. The leasing stipulation for biological crusts under Alternative C would protect these sensitive soils more than under Alternative A. There would be ~~196,100~~199,700 fewer acres open to fluid mineral leasing under Alternative C than under Alternative A; therefore, potential impacts on water resources from hydraulic fracturing would be less than under Alternative A.	fracturing would be less than under Alternative A.	~~therefore, potential impacts on water resources from hydraulic fracturing would be slightly less than under Alternative A.~~

Management Action	Alternative A (No Action)	Alternative B	Alternative C (Proposed RMP~~Draft RMP/EIS Preferred~~)	Alternative D	~~Alternative E (Proposed RMP)~~
Renewable Energy (Section 4.2.16.2.4)	Alternative A would result in adverse impacts, such as the loss of vegetation associated with surface disturbances for renewable energy, which would increase runoff, erosion, and sedimentation. This is because there would be no avoidance or exclusions areas for renewable energy projects.	Alternative B may have long-term beneficial impacts on soil and water because sensitive soils are identified as avoidance areas for wind and solar projects; wetland and riparian areas are identified as exclusion areas for wind and solar projects; active floodplains are identified as exclusion areas for wind and solar projects; and 100-year floodplains are identified as avoidance areas for wind and exclusion areas for solar projects.	Same as Alternative B.	Same as Alternative B.	~~Alternative E allows for renewable energy developments in areas with sensitive soils; therefore, adverse impacts are the same as those under Alternative A. Alternative E allows for renewable energy developments in wetlands and riparian areas; therefore, as under Alternative A, adverse impacts could occur. Active floodplains are identified as exclusion areas for wind and solar projects under Alternative B. E; therefore, active floodplains would be protected more than under Alternative A.~~

Management Action	Alternative A (No Action)	Alternative B	Alternative C (Proposed RMP~~Draft RMP/EIS Preferred~~)	Alternative D	~~Alternative E (Proposed RMP)~~
Travel Management (Section 4.2.16.2.5)	Travel management decisions would have both adverse and beneficial impacts on soil and water resources. Where roads are closed, vegetation communities could become reestablished and improve soil conditions. Open travel management areas could result in vegetation loss, rutting, and increased soil erosion. There would be 102,100 acres closed to travel, and 301,900 acres would be open to travel; 327,600 acres would limit travel to existing routes.	Same as Alternative A, except 176,600 acres would be closed to travel, 550,500 acres would limit travel to designated primitive roads and trails, and 4,600 acres would be open to travel.	Same as Alternative A, except 124,000 acres would be closed to travel, 589,300 acres would limit travel to designated primitive roads and trails, and 18,300 acres would be open to travel. In addition, 13,700 acres of the open travel area contain sensitive soils in Cimarron Mesa.	Impacts would be the same as under Alternative A, except 97,800 acres would be closed to travel, 19,500 acres would be open, and 614,300 acres would limit travel to designated primitive roads and trails. In addition, 13,700 acres of the open travel area contain sensitive soils in Cimarron Mesa.	~~Impacts would be the same as under Alternative A, except 97,800 acres would be closed to travel, 18,300 acres would be open, and 615,500 acres would limit travel to designated primitive roads and trails.~~ ~~In addition, 1,500 acres of the open travel area contain sensitive soils in Cimarron Mesa.~~
Vegetation Management (Section 4.2.16.2.1)	Short-term adverse impacts could occur from vegetation treatments, but BMPs would be implemented to mitigate adverse impacts. Long-term beneficial impacts would occur from vegetation treatments; 12,000 acres are proposed for forest product harvest areas with sensitive soils; 32,000 acres per year would be treated for fire management.	Same as Alternative A, except 2,700 acres are proposed for forest product harvest areas with sensitive soils.	Same as Alternative A, except 371,700 acres are proposed for forest product harvest areas with sensitive soils.	Same as Alternative A, except 425,400 acres are proposed for forest product harvest areas with sensitive soils.	~~Same as Alternative A, except 425,400 acres are proposed for forest product harvest areas with sensitive soils.~~

Management Action	Alternative A (No Action)	Alternative B	Alternative C (Proposed RMP~~Draft RMP/EIS Preferred~~)	Alternative D	~~Alternative E (Proposed RMP)~~
Special Designations (Section 4.2.17) – Wilderness Area					
Lands and Realty (Section 4.2.17.3.2)	Adverse impacts could result from land disposals that occur adjacent to the Wilderness area because development on disposed lands would compromise wilderness values.				
Livestock Grazing (Section 4.2.17.3.4)	Livestock grazing would have adverse impacts on the Wilderness area. Livestock grazing would be allowed within the wilderness area.	Livestock grazing would be prohibited within the Wilderness area.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	~~Same as Alternative A.~~
Surface Disturbance (Section 4.2.17.3.3)	Adverse impacts could result from surface disturbance that occurs adjacent to the Wilderness area because development could compromise wilderness values.				
Visual Resources (Section 4.2.17.3.1)	Adverse impacts would result from VRM Class III or IV lands managed adjacent to the Wilderness area. Beneficial impacts would result from VRM Class I and II areas adjacent to the Wilderness area.				
Special Status Species (Section 4.2.18)					
Cave and Karst Resources (Section 4.2.18.2.1)	The Pronoun Cave Complex would be managed as an ACEC and would protect special status bat species known to occur within the complex.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	The ACEC designation would be removed from the Pronoun Cave Complex. Bat species would continue to be considered under site-specific NEPA analysis.	~~Same as Alternative D.~~
Cultural Resources (Section 4.2.18.2.2)	Cultural resources management decisions may have beneficial impacts on special status species because of restrictions on surface-disturbing activities that directly protect cultural resources and could indirectly protect habitat and critical habitat.				
Fire Management (Section 4.2.18.2.3)	All alternatives would result in short-term adverse impacts due to habitat loss, along with long-term beneficial impacts from reduced fuel loading, reduced fire risk, and diversified habitat.				

Management Action	Alternative A (No Action)	Alternative B	Alternative C (Proposed RMP~~Draft RMP/EIS Preferred~~)	Alternative D	~~Alternative E (Proposed RMP)~~
Forests and Woodlands (Section 4.2.18.2.4)	Both adverse and beneficial impacts on special status species would occur from forest and woodland management decisions. Two percent of Decision Area lands would be available for forest product harvest.	Same as Alternative A, except 16 percent of Decision Area lands would be available for forest product harvest.	Same as Alternative A, except 75 percent of Decision Area lands would be available for forest product harvest.	Same as Alternative A, except 87 percent of Decision Area lands would be available for forest product harvest.	~~Same as Alternative D.~~
Lands and Realty (Section 4.2.18.2.5)	Adverse impacts could occur from proposed land disposals; ~~54,900~~55,900 acres of Decision Area lands are ~~proposed~~ available for potential disposal.	Same as Alternative A, except beneficial impacts could occur from rights-of-way avoidance and exclusion areas; 57,000 acres of Decision Area lands ~~are~~ would be ~~proposed~~ available for potential disposal.	Same as Alternative B, except ~~117,300~~131,900 acres of Decision Area lands ~~are~~ would be ~~proposed~~ available for potential disposal.	Same as Alternative C~~B, except 120,400 acres of Decision Area lands are proposed for potential disposal~~.	~~Same as Alternative B, except 129,500 acres of Decision Area lands are proposed for potential disposal.~~
Livestock Grazing (Section 4.2.18.2.6)	Grazing allotments make up approximately ~~89~~ 87 percent of Decision Area lands. Adverse impacts from livestock grazing on special status species could occur.	Same as Alternative A, except livestock grazing would be prohibited within all special designations and riparian areas.	Same as Alternative A, except livestock grazing would only occur where grazing does not conflict with resources protected by the special designation.	Same as Alternative C.	~~Same as Alternative C.~~

Management Action	Alternative A (No Action)	Alternative B	Alternative C (Proposed RMP~~Draft RMP/EIS Preferred~~)	Alternative D	~~Alternative E (Proposed RMP)~~
Mineral Resources (Section 4.2.18.2.7)	Mineral resources decisions would have both adverse and beneficial impacts on special status species. Those areas that have restrictions for mineral development would beneficially impact special status species and their habitat. Six percent of special status species habitat would be managed as NSO, CSU, or closed to fluid leasable minerals; 7 percent would be closed to salable mineral extraction; and 1 percent would be recommended for withdrawal from locatable mineral entry.	Same as Alternative A, except 10 percent of special status species habitat would be managed as NSO, CSU, or closed to fluid leasable minerals; 13 percent would be closed to salable mineral extraction; and 18 percent would be recommended for withdrawal from locatable mineral entry.	Same as Alternative A, except 10 percent of special status species habitat would be managed as NSO, CSU, or closed to fluid leasable minerals; 9 percent would be closed to salable mineral extraction; and 17 percent would be recommended for withdrawal from locatable mineral entry.	Same as Alternative A, except 8 percent of special status species habitat would be managed as NSO, CSU, or closed to fluid leasable minerals; 7 percent would be closed to salable mineral extraction; and 2 percent would be recommended for withdrawal from locatable mineral entry.	~~Same as Alternative A, except 7 percent of special status species habitat would be managed as NSO, CSU, or closed to fluid leasable minerals; 7 percent would be closed to salable mineral extraction; and 1 percent would be recommended for withdrawal from locatable mineral entry.~~
Lands with Wilderness Characteristics (Section 4.2.18.2.14)	No lands would be managed to protect wilderness characteristics.	Decisions to manage lands with wilderness characteristics to protect wilderness characteristics on 37,500 acres would have beneficial impacts on special status species by reducing habitat degradation and fragmentation.	Same as Alternative B, except that under this alternative 26,040 acres would be managed to protect wilderness characteristics, which would benefit special status species by reducing habitat degradation and fragmentation. On 4,070 acres managed to partially protect wilderness characteristics; more miles of primitive routes would be available for motorized use.	Same as Alternative A.	~~Same as Alternative A.~~

Commented [AA38]: To be updated with revised Alt D CSU data

Commented [AA35]: To be updated with revised data for Alt B closed to salable minerals

Commented [AA37]: To be updated with revised data for Alt C closed to salable minerals

Commented [AA36]: To be updated with revised data for Alt B recommended for withdrawal from locatable minerals

Management Action	Alternative A (No Action)	Alternative B	Alternative C (Proposed RMP~~Draft RMP/EIS Preferred~~)	Alternative D	~~Alternative E (Proposed RMP)~~
Recreation and Visitor Services (Section 4.2.18.2.8)	Recreation management decisions could have adverse impacts on special status species due to habitat loss and human disturbance. No SRMAs are proposed.	Same as Alternative A, except SRMAs and ERMAs totaling 286,800 acres are proposed under this alternative.	Same as Alternative B.	Same as Alternative B.	~~Same as Alternative A, except SRMAs and ERMAs totaling 74,000 acres are proposed under this alternative.~~
Renewable Energy (Section 4.2.18.2.9)	Avoidance and exclusion areas would not be implemented under this alternative.	Avoidance and exclusion areas identified under this alternative would provide protection for special status species habitat.	Same as Alternative B.	Same as Alternative B.	~~Same as Alternative B.~~
Riparian Resources (Section 4.2.18.2.10)	There is no surface disturbance restriction for riparian areas under this alternative.	Management decisions to protect riparian areas would have beneficial impacts on special status species. Surface-disturbing activities would be prohibited within 200 meters (656 feet) of riparian areas.	Same as Alternative B, except surface-disturbing activities would be subject to restrictions within 200 meters (656 feet) of riparian areas.	Same as Alternative A.	~~Same as Alternative A.~~
Special Status Species (Section 4.2.18.2.11)	No management action would be permitted on public lands that would jeopardize the continued existence of plant or animal species that are listed, officially proposed, or candidates for listing as threatened or endangered.	Same as Alternative A, except two restrictions would be applied: 1) for surface-disturbing activities within 0.5 mile~~s~~ of active prairie dog colonies and 2) placement of water developments and salt and mineral supplements for livestock would be located 0.25 mile~~s~~ from known locations of special status plants.	Same as Alternative B, except surface-disturbing activities would be restricted within 0.25 mile~~s~~ of active prairie dog colonies, and water developments and salt and mineral supplements for livestock would be placed at least 152 meters (500 feet) from special status plants.	Same as Alternative B, except surface-disturbing activities would be restricted within active prairie dog colonies, and water developments and salt and mineral supplements for livestock would be placed at least 91 meters (300 feet) from special status plants.	~~Same as Alternative D.~~

Management Action	Alternative A (No Action)	Alternative B	Alternative C (Proposed RMP~~Draft RMP/EIS Preferred~~)	Alternative D	~~Alternative E (Proposed RMP)~~
Soil and Water (Section 4.2.18.2.12)	No surface disturbance protections for soil and water are proposed under this alternative.	Management decisions to protect soil and water resources would also beneficially impact special status species because surface-disturbing activities would be restricted. Surface-disturbing activities would be prohibited within 200 meters (656 feet) of riparian areas.	Same as Alternative B, except surface-disturbing activities would be subject to restrictions within 200 meters (656 feet) of riparian areas.	Same as Alternative A.	~~Same as Alternative A.~~
Special Designations (Section 4.2.18.2.13)	Special designations management decisions would have beneficial impacts on special status species because restrictions to surface-disturbing activities, such as mineral development, would be implemented in special designations. There would be 26,200 acres managed as ACECs for the protection of special status species.	Same as Alternative A, except 41,400 acres would be managed as ACECs for the protection of special status species.	Same as Alternative A, except 31,600 acres would be managed as ACECs for the protection of special status species.	Same as Alternative A, except 13,600 acres would be managed as ACECs for the protection of special status species.	~~Same as Alternative A, except 12,500 acres would be managed as ACECs for the protection of special status species.~~

Management Action	Alternative A (No Action)	Alternative B	Alternative C (Proposed RMP~~Draft RMP/EIS Preferred~~)	Alternative D	~~Alternative E (Proposed RMP)~~
Travel Management (Section 4.2.18.2.15)	Travel management decisions would have both adverse and beneficial impacts on special status species. Closed areas would provide protection to special status species habitat; 14 percent of special status species habitat would be closed to motorized travel.	Same as Alternative A, except 24 percent of special status species habitat would be closed to motorized travel.	Same as Alternative A, except 17 percent of special status species habitat would be closed to motorized travel.	Same as Alternative A, except 13 percent of special status species habitat would be closed to motorized travel.	~~Same as Alternative D.~~
Vegetative Communities (Section 4.2.18.2.16)	Vegetation treatments would cause short-term adverse impacts from habitat loss, but they would cause long-term beneficial impacts from improved vegetative communities and diversified habitat.				
Visual Resources (Section 4.2.18.2.18)	VRM Class I and II areas would be the most restrictive to surface disturbance. There would be 97,800 ~~96,600~~ acres managed as VRM Class I and 55,200 acres as VRM Class II.	Same as Alternative A, except ~~97,400 acres would be managed as VRM Class I, and~~ 306,000 acres would be managed as VRM Class II.	Same as Alternative A, except ~~97,500 acres would be managed as VRM Class I, and~~ 68,400 acres would be managed as VRM Class II.	Same as Alternative A, except ~~97,500 acres would be managed as VRM Class I, and~~ 21,400 acres would be managed as VRM Class II.	~~Same as Alternative A, except 97,800 acres would be managed as VRM Class I, and 16,600 acres would be managed as VRM Class II.~~
Wildlife and Fisheries (Section 4.2.18.2.17)	Wildlife and fisheries management decisions would have beneficial impacts on special status species and their habitat. Surface disturbance restrictions would benefit special status species. No surface disturbance restrictions are proposed under Alternative A.	Proposed restrictions would be implemented for surface disturbance located near raptor nests, big game winter range, big game fawning/calving habitat, prairie dog towns, and wildlife habitat projects.	Same as Alternative B.	Proposed restrictions would be implemented for surface disturbance located near raptor nests and prairie dog towns.	~~Same as Alternative D.~~

Management Action	Alternative A (No Action)	Alternative B	Alternative C (Proposed RMP~~Draft RMP/EIS Preferred~~)	Alternative D	~~Alternative E (Proposed RMP)~~
Travel Management (Section 4.2.19)					
Travel Management (Section 4.2.19.1.1)	Travel management decisions would have beneficial impacts on travel management because specific areas on Decision Area lands would have a clear travel category. This alternative closes 102,100 acres to motorized travel, opens 301,900 acres, and limits 327,600 acres to existing routes.	Same as Alternative A, except 176,600 acres would be closed to motorized travel, 4,600 acres would be open, and 550,500 acres would be limited to designated primitive roads and trails.	Same as Alternative A, except 124,000 acres would be closed to motorized travel, 18,300 acres would be open, and 589,300 acres would be limited to designated primitive roads and trails.	Same as Alternative A, except 97,800 acres would be closed to motorized travel, 19,500 acres would be open, and 614,300 acres would be limited to designated primitive roads and trails.	~~Same as Alternative A, except 97,800 acres would be closed to motorized travel, 18,300 acres would be open, and 615,500 acres would be limited to designated primitive roads and trails.~~
Vegetative Communities (Section 4.2.20)					
Fire Management (Section 4.2.20.1.3)	Short-term adverse impacts would include loss of vegetation during and after fuels treatments. Long-term beneficial impacts would include native and diverse vegetative communities.				
Lands and Realty (Section 4.2.20.1.2)	Adverse impacts on vegetation would occur if rights-of-way are granted for surface-disturbing activities. Beneficial impacts would occur in avoidance and exclusion areas for rights-of-way.				
Livestock Grazing (Section 4.2.20.1.1)	Livestock grazing would be managed to achieve New Mexico Standards and Guidelines (BLM 2001); therefore, beneficial impacts on vegetative communities would result from livestock grazing.				
Mineral Resources (Section 4.2.20.1.5)	All alternatives would cause adverse impacts from surface disturbance associated with mineral development; however, reasonably foreseeable development is estimated to be 1.2 percent of Decision Area lands, and the damage is would be expected to be temporary and reclaimed.				
Recreation and Visitor Services (Section 4.2.20.1.7)	Impacts on vegetative communities would be limited to isolated surface disturbances where activities such as dispersed camping and cross-country hiking occur. Where recreation is managed using an SRMA, BLM rules and guidelines would limit or control activities through specialized management tools, such as designated campsites, permits, area closures, and limitations on the number of users and duration of use.				
Renewable Energy (Section 4.2.20.1.8)	Renewable energy management decisions would have adverse and beneficial impacts on vegetative communities. Renewable energy projects would create surface disturbances of various magnitudes depending on the size and location of the project. Beneficial impacts would result from identification of exclusion and avoidance areas for renewable energy projects.				

Management Action	Alternative A (No Action)	Alternative B	Alternative C (Proposed RMP~~Draft RMP/EIS Preferred~~)	Alternative D	~~Alternative E (Proposed RMP)~~
Special Designations (Section 4.2.20.1.4)	Special designations would provide long-term benefits from restricted surface disturbance within ~~155,300~~158,200 acres of special designations. 105,900 acres of which do not overlap other special designation areas.	Same as Alternative A, except ~~269,300~~265,500 acres would be managed as special designations. 112,500 acres of which do not overlap other special designation areas.	Same as Alternative A, except ~~244,000~~235,200 acres would be managed as special designations. 112,900 acres of which do not overlap other special designation areas.	Same as Alternative A, except ~~147,600~~150,500 acres would be managed as special designations. 114,400 acres of which do not overlap other special designation areas.	~~Same as Alternative A, except 133,800 acres would be managed as special designations.~~
Travel Management (Section 4.2.20.1.6)	Travel management decisions would have both adverse and beneficial impacts on vegetative communities. Closed areas would allow vegetation to become reestablished, while open areas would result in vegetation loss. There would be 102,100 acres closed to motorized travel, 301,900 acres would be open, and 327,600 acres would be limited to existing routes.	Same as Alternative A, except 176,600 acres would be closed to motorized travel, 4.600 acres would be open, and 550,500 acres would be limited to designated primitive roads and trails.	Same as Alternative A, except 124,000 acres would be closed to motorized travel, 18,300 acres would be open, and 589,300 acres would be limited to designated primitive roads and trails.	Same as Alternative A, except 97,800 acres would be closed to motorized travel, 19,500 acres would be open, and 614,300 acres would be limited to designated primitive roads and trails.	~~Same as Alternative A, except 97,800 acres would be closed to motorized travel, 18,300 acres would be open, and 615,500 acres would be limited to designated primitive roads and trails.~~
Visual Resources (Section 4.2.21)					
Visual Resources (Section 4.2.21.2.1)	Alternative A would manage for the following VRM classes: Class I: 97,800~~96,600~~ acres Class II: 55,200 acres Class III: 58,300 acres Class IV: 152,600 acres Undesignated: 368,900 acres	Alternative B would manage for the following VRM classes: Class I: 97,800~~97,400~~ acres Class II: 306,000 acres Class III: 27,900 acres Class IV: 300,300 acres	Alternative C would manage for the following VRM classes: Class I: 97,800~~97,500~~ acres Class II: 68,400 acres Class III: 69,900 acres Class IV: 495,900 acres	Alternative D would manage for the following VRM classes: Class I: 97,800~~97,500~~ acres Class II: 21,400 acres Class III: 83,200 acres Class IV: 529,500 acres	~~Alternative D would manage for the following VRM classes:~~ ~~Class I: 97,800 acres~~ ~~Class II: 16,600 acres~~ ~~Class III: 74,800 acres~~ ~~Class IV: 542,400 acres~~

Commented [AA40]: To be updated based on changed CDNST acres

Commented [AA41]: To be updated based on changed CDNST acres

Commented [AA42]: To be updated based on changed CDNST acres

Commented [AA39]: To be updated based on changed CDNST acres

Management Action	Alternative A (No Action)	Alternative B	Alternative C (Proposed RMP~~Draft RMP/EIS Preferred~~)	Alternative D	~~Alternative E (Proposed RMP)~~
Wildlife and Fisheries Resources (Section 4.2.22)					
Cave and Karst Resources (Section 4.2.22.2.1)	Cave and karst management decisions would have beneficial impacts on wildlife. The Pronoun Cave Complex would be managed as an ACEC and would protect bat species known to occur within the complex. The BLM will comply with white nose syndrome decontamination protocol and BLM IM 2010-181 and subsequent revisions.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	The ACEC designation would be removed from the Pronoun Cave Complex. Bat species would continue to be considered under site-specific NEPA analysis.	~~Same as Alternative D.~~
Cultural Resources (Section 4.2.22.2.2)	Cultural resources management decisions may have beneficial impacts on wildlife because of restrictions on surface-disturbing activities that directly protect cultural resources and could indirectly protect habitat.				
Fire Management (Section 4.2.22.2.3)	Fire management would cause short-term adverse impacts from habitat loss, but it would cause long-term beneficial impacts from reduced fuel loading, reduced fire risk, and diversified habitat.				
Forests and Woodlands (Section 4.2.22.2.4)	Forest and woodland management decisions would have both adverse and beneficial impacts on wildlife. Wildlife habitat could be degraded or enhanced depending on the location, goals, and methods used for forest product harvest projects. Two percent of Decision Area lands would be available for fuelwood harvest for home use.	Same as Alternative A, except 16 percent of Decision Area lands would be available for forest product harvest.	Same as Alternative A, except ~~74~~ 75 percent of Decision Area lands would be available for forest product harvest.	Same as Alternative A, except ~~86~~ 87 percent of Decision Area lands would be available for forest product harvest.	~~Same as Alternative A, except 87 percent of Decision Area lands would be available for forest product harvest.~~

Management Action	Alternative A (No Action)	Alternative B	Alternative C (Proposed RMP~~Draft RMP/EIS Preferred~~)	Alternative D	~~Alternative E (Proposed RMP)~~
Lands and Realty (Section 4.2.22.2.5)	Lands and realty management decisions could have adverse impacts on wildlife through land disposals and through the authorization or expansion of rights-of-way. There ~~would be~~are ~~54,900~~55,900 acres available for potential land disposal.	Same as Alternative A, except beneficial impacts could occur from rights-of-way avoidance and exclusion areas, and 57,000 acres would be available for potential land disposal.	Same as Alternative B, except ~~117,300~~131,900 acres would be available for potential land disposal.	Same as Alternative C~~B, except 120,400 acres would be available for potential disposal~~.	~~Same as Alternative B, except 129,500 acres would be available for potential disposal.~~
Livestock Grazing (Section 4.2.22.2.6)	Grazing allotments make up approximately 89 percent of Decision Area lands. Livestock grazing decisions could result in both adverse and beneficial impacts on wildlife.	Same as Alternative A, except livestock grazing would be prohibited within all special designations and riparian areas.	Same as Alternative A, except livestock grazing would only occur where grazing does not conflict with resources protected by the special designation.	Same as Alternative C.	~~Same as Alternative C.~~

Management Action	Alternative A (No Action)	Alternative B	Alternative C (Proposed RMP~~Draft RMP/EIS Preferred~~)	Alternative D	~~Alternative E (Proposed RMP)~~
Mineral Resources (Section 4.2.22.2.7)	Mineral resources management decisions would have both adverse and beneficial impacts on wildlife. Beneficial impacts would result from closing or restricting mineral extraction activities in wildlife habitat. Six percent of wildlife species habitat would be managed as NSO, CSU, or closed to fluid leasable minerals; 7 percent would be closed to salable mineral extraction; and 1 percent would be recommended for withdrawal from locatable mineral entry.	Same as Alternative A, except 10 percent of wildlife species habitat would be managed as NSO, CSU, or closed to fluid leasable minerals; 13 percent would be closed to salable mineral extraction; and 18 percent would be recommended for withdrawal from locatable mineral entry.	Same as Alternative A, except 10 percent of wildlife species habitat would be managed as NSO, CSU, or closed to fluid leasable minerals; 9 percent would be closed to salable mineral extraction; and 17 percent would be recommended for withdrawal from locatable mineral entry.	Same as Alternative A, except 8 percent of wildlife species habitat would be managed as NSO, CSU, or closed to fluid leasable minerals; 7 percent would be closed to salable mineral extraction; and 2 percent would be recommended for withdrawal from locatable mineral entry.	~~Same as Alternative A, except 8 percent of wildlife species habitat would be managed as NSO, CSU, or closed to fluid leasable minerals; 7 percent would be closed to salable mineral extraction; and 1 percent would be recommended for withdrawal from locatable mineral entry.~~
Lands with Wilderness Characteristics (Section 4.2.22.2.14)	No lands with wilderness characteristics are managed to protect those characteristics under this alternative.	The 37,500 acres of lands managed to protect wilderness characteristics would provide beneficial impacts on wildlife and fisheries by reducing habitat degradation and fragmentation.	Same as Alternative B, except 26,040 acres would be managed to protect wilderness characteristics, benefitting wildlife and fisheries. The 4,100 acres managed to partially protect wilderness characteristics would allow motorized travel on designated primitive roads and trails. The 7,300 acres would be open to vehicle travel and other activities that may cause habitat fragmentation.	Same as Alternative A.	~~Same as Alternative A.~~

Commented [AA46]: To be updated with revised Alt D CSU data

Commented [AA43]: To be updated with revised data for Alt B closed to salable minerals

Commented [AA45]: To be updated with revised data for Alt C closed to salable minerals

Commented [AA44]: To be updated with revised data for Alt B recommended for withdrawal from locatable minerals

Management Action	Alternative A (No Action)	Alternative B	Alternative C (Proposed RMP~~Draft RMP/EIS Preferred~~)	Alternative D	~~Alternative E (Proposed RMP)~~
Recreation and Visitor Services (Section 4.2.22.2.8)	Wildlife could be adversely impacted by recreation due to wildlife harassment, habitat fragmentation, and habitat degradation. There are no SRMAs or ERMAs under this alternative.	Same as Alternative A, except 537,800 acres of SRMAs and ERMAs are proposed.	Same as Alternative B.	Same as Alternative A, except 305,000 acres of SRMAs and ERMAs are proposed.	~~Same as Alternative A, except 72,400 acres of SRMAs and ERMAs are proposed.~~
Renewable Energy (Section 4.2.22.2.9)	Renewable energy decisions would have adverse and beneficial impacts on wildlife. Decisions to avoid or exclude certain areas from renewable energy development would result in beneficial impacts on wildlife. Avoidance and exclusion areas would not be implemented under this alternative.	Same as Alternative A, except avoidance and exclusion areas identified under this alternative would provide protection for wildlife habitat.	Same as Alternative B.	Same as Alternative B.	~~Same as Alternative B.~~
Riparian Resources (Section 4.2.22.2.10)	Riparian resources management decisions would have beneficial impacts on wildlife. Restrictions on surface-disturbing activities within riparian areas would have indirect impacts on wildlife. There is no surface disturbance restriction proposed for riparian areas under this alternative.	Same as Alternative A, except surface-disturbing activities would be prohibited within 200 meters (656 feet) of riparian areas.	Same as Alternative A, except surface-disturbing activities would be subject to restrictions within 200 meters (656 feet) of riparian areas.	Same as Alternative A.	~~Same as Alternative A.~~

Management Action	Alternative A (No Action)	Alternative B	Alternative C (Proposed RMP~~Draft RMP/EIS Preferred~~)	Alternative D	~~Alternative E (Proposed RMP)~~
Soil and Water (Section 4.2.22.2.12)	Soil and water resource management decisions would have beneficial impacts on wildlife. Restrictions on surface-disturbing activities on steep slopes and low reclamation soils would have indirect impacts on wildlife. No surface disturbance protections for soil and water are proposed under this alternative.	Same as Alternative A, except surface-disturbing activities would be prohibited within 200 meters (656 feet) of riparian areas.	Same as Alternative A, except surface-disturbing activities would be subject to restrictions within 200 meters (656 feet) of riparian areas.	Same as Alternative A.	~~Same as Alternative A, except NSO would be applied on slopes over 30 percent.~~
Special Designations (Section 4.2.22.2.13)	Special designations proposed to protect wildlife and vegetation would directly benefit wildlife species and their habitats. ACECs designated to preserve historic, cultural, and scenic values (as opposed to wildlife or vegetation) would indirectly benefit wildlife by limiting human and surface disturbance, preserving habitat, or preventing noise. There would be ~~155,300~~158,200 acres managed as special designations, 105,900 acres of which do not overlap other special designation areas.	Same as Alternative A, except ~~269,300~~265,500 acres would be managed as special designations, 112,500 acres of which do not overlap other special designation areas.	Same as Alternative A, except ~~244,000~~235,200 acres would be managed as special designations, 112,900 acres of which do not overlap other special designation areas.	Same as Alternative A, except ~~147,600~~150,500 acres would be managed as special designations, 114,400 acres of which do not overlap other special designation areas.	~~Same as Alternative A, except 133,800 acres would be managed as special designations.~~

Commented [AA48]: To be updated based on changed CDNST acres

Commented [AA49]: To be updated based on changed CDNST acres

Commented [AA50]: To be updated based on changed CDNST acres

Commented [AA47]: To be updated based on changed CDNST acres

Management Action	Alternative A (No Action)	Alternative B	Alternative C (Proposed RMP~~Draft RMP/EIS Preferred~~)	Alternative D	~~Alternative E (Proposed RMP)~~
Special Status Species (Section 4.2.22.2.11)	Activities meant to protect and conserve special status species would also benefit other wildlife species that share habitat with targeted special status species.				
Travel Management (Section 4.2.22.2.15)	Travel management decisions would have adverse and beneficial impacts on wildlife. Areas proposed for closure to motorized travel would protect wildlife and wildlife habitat; 14 percent of wildlife habitat would be closed to motorized travel.	Same as Alternative A, except 24 percent of wildlife habitat would be closed to motorized travel.	Same as Alternative A, except 17 percent of wildlife habitat would be closed to motorized travel.	Same as Alternative A, except 13 percent of wildlife habitat would be closed to motorized travel.	~~Same as Alternative D.~~
Vegetative Communities (Section 4.2.22.2.16)	Vegetation treatments would cause short-term adverse impacts from habitat loss, but they would cause long-term beneficial impacts from improved vegetative communities and diversified habitat.				
Visual Resources (Section 4.2.22.2.18)	VRM Class I and II areas would be the most restrictive to surface disturbance and would provide indirect beneficial impacts on wildlife; 97,800 ~~96,600~~ acres would be managed as VRM Class I, and 55,200 acres as VRM Class II.	Same as Alternative A, except ~~97,400 acres would be managed as VRM Class I, and~~ 306,000 acres would be managed as VRM Class II.	Same as Alternative A, except ~~97,500 acres would be managed as VRM Class I, and~~ 68,400 acres would be managed as VRM Class II.	Same as Alternative A, except ~~97,500 acres would be managed as VRM Class I, and~~ 21,400 acres would be managed as VRM Class II.	~~Same as Alternative A, except 97,800 acres would be managed as VRM Class I, and 16,600 acres would be managed as VRM Class II.~~

Management Action	Alternative A (No Action)	Alternative B	Alternative C (Proposed RMP~~Draft RMP/EIS Preferred~~)	Alternative D	~~Alternative E (Proposed RMP)~~
Wildlife and Fisheries (Section 4.2.22.2.17)	Wildlife and fisheries management decisions would have beneficial impacts on wildlife and wildlife habitat. Surface disturbance restrictions would benefit wildlife. No surface disturbance restrictions are proposed under Alternative A.	Proposed restrictions would be implemented for surface disturbance located near raptor nests, big game winter range, big game fawning/calving habitat, prairie dog towns, and wildlife habitat projects.	Same as Alternative B.	Proposed restrictions would be implemented for surface disturbance located near raptor nests and prairie dog towns.	~~Proposed restrictions would be implemented for surface disturbance located near big game winter range, big game fawning/calving habitat, and prairie dog towns.~~